

**The United States continues in its project  
of global war**

The United States continues in its project of global war. The role of the most powerful state in the world pushes it to this and the economic conditions in which the entire planet now finds itself renders this a prospect without return.

Bush is the responsible leader of a nation that is now constrained to set out on the road of a continual war: yesterday Afghanistan, today Iraq, tomorrow other states and so on.

Many think that the choice of the United States is dictated by the necessity to defeat the so-called "terrorism" of the "rogue states", i.e., of those states that support and finance a few groups inclined to attack the centers of international power that, in this historic phase, are substantially in the hands of American capitalism. This is only partly true. The connection, if it exists, between the groups that attacked New York, razing to the ground the symbolic towers of US financial domination, and the conniving states, relates to the leadership in power that has little or nothing to do with the populations that suffer exploitation in Afghanistan (little has changed in that country) and Iraq, as in the United States itself. The confusion only serves to justify the war, but has no logical basis whatsoever. In Bush's belligerent No logic is of any use.

America has to go to war. This is the real problem. It must do so in order to finance its arms factories, to utilize its army, to put wings on its economy, partially transforming it into a war economy capable of defeating the principle fear of capitalism in that land: the competing growth of other markets, growth in a position to reduce the revenue of US capital in the world. War is the principal productive activity of the American economy; it always has been. Starting from the Second World War, one can say that there has not been a period of time of more than three years in which this great country has not been at war in some part of the world. Thus it is not just the problem of "oil", but the entire American economy that must be protected with the war, otherwise, there will be inflation and corresponding galloping unemployment, the collapse of the American myth, and the calling into question of the entire model of the global economy.

The Arab world is certainly (almost completely) in ferment, but it is not sufficiently homogenous to become one of the privileged partners in the region of the Middle East. Bush thinks that shattering every attempt at Arab coalition could indicate a way of controlling the economies (almost all based on oil) of these lands and thus also their prospects for growth and improvement. In view of the difficulties in which Israel (traditional police in the region on the USA's account), finds itself, direct American intervention is obligatory.

But one cannot brutally play the card of war; it is necessary to find allies. Great Britain, that has militarily occupied Northern Ireland for centuries, applying the worst repressive methods, is one of these. Spain, that does the same in the Basque country, is the second in order of importance. But the English and Spanish people cannot be in agreement with the criminal decisions of their political leaders, and they will know how to respond at the opportune moment. In any case, in the present

moment, Bush saves face that could have been put into question by the decisions of France and Germany (Berlusconi's opportunism doesn't deserve any comment). The reason why Chirac and Schröder have not become Bush's allies has little to praise about it. They are not (as is obvious) against the war, but they are against every possibility for the increase of the economic and political power of the United States. They are fully aware of being the strongest countries in the European Union and therefore expect nothing other than to pose themselves as an alternative coalition to the American superpower.

No to the war of the states is the only possible response at this moment, a response that is, furthermore, always the only one possible everywhere. Not a vague humanitarian pacifism that is against the war because it doesn't have the sanction of the UN (appalling fig leaf for weak and parochial spirits without any cannons to bless), but an attentive response to exploiters and rulers of every sort. War is certainly the element on which the world in which the global domination of the economy makes us live is based, but if we must speak of war, then we will make ourselves supporters of our own war, the proletarian war, the war without flags, which could at any moment advance to the attack on every structure of power, every oppressor, every manger of other people's lives.

As always revolution remains the only possible road to follow. And the moment when the master is weakest is when the misery of his intentions shows, when - as in this case - it attacks, makes war, disguising itself behind so-called good intentions.

We want to bring down Saddam (obscene dictator) but also Bush (a dictator no less obscene), who is distinguished from the start only by the fact that in order to do the same things he has need of a better diplomatic array, some more chattering, some puppet allies, a poor idiot like Berlusconi to whom to write a "thank-you" note for support even if only moral.

The shadings that differentiate Bush from Saddam are really slight; this is why, at his time, they appear so very similar not only to the "interventionists", Blair and Aznar, but also to the "abstentionists", Chirac and Schröder.

At bottom, the masters are all equal, even if they wear clothes of different colors. It is necessary not to forget this.

From "Contro la loro Guerra, contro la loro pace" ("Against their war, against their peace"), n. 1 - Trieste, 19 March 2003

Guerra Sociale (2002-2010)  
critica libertaria al capitalismo

The United States continues in its project of global war

**[guerrasociale.anarchismo.net](http://guerrasociale.anarchismo.net)**