

Nations - Just Politics and Law

2018.1 First numbered version

What *are* countries, nations? Most people feel a strong identification with ‘their country’. But they are just systems of politics and law. When I argue to people that they are just pieces of territory with a political and legal system governing the people living on it, and that nationality is just having been born under a particular political system, they tell me its about more – that its about feeling an attachment to the surroundings and culture they grew up in and are familiar with, and identifying as a part of the country. A shared language also contributes to people feeling a mass connection as a group. These feelings have some validity. They are discussed at length in *You Politics and Work, section 3* as well as here.

But the real, definite definition of a nation is obviously the official political institutions and authorities. People feel strongly about them too, but in varying ways. Some feel positive about them. But many feel powerless, badly treated. And these alternative feelings can co-exist within the same person! That’s with good reason. Because the generalisation of seeing meaning in countries and nations covers up some big, practical problems in how people in them actually view each other and treat each other.

There’s a better base for defining a country or nation than either the feeling of belonging and shared culture, or the institutions of politics and law. Re-define ‘the country’ as ‘*the people*’ - your fellow-citizens. That mean re-defining ‘patriotism’. A patriot should be someone who defends and promotes the well-being of their fellow-citizens in the basic, important, practical things. Like supporting them with their health by voting for good, free health services; like voting for them to have good social insurance, job security, good education services, the right to organise as workers.

With this definition, a patriot must surely be a socialist? Or at least a social democrat? Not someone who defers to ‘the country’ as the political institutions above us, but who looks at whatever is done in terms of ‘Is that good and fair not just for me but for the mass of the people?’

PROBLEM

This view is taken by progressives and liberals. But there’s a big problem with it. A strong minority don’t agree at all. Conservatives most basic belief and practice is to look out only for themselves and to say to everybody else ***You Are On Your Own***. That’s what the ‘individualism’ of conservatism means. With that as justification, business owners, corporations, shareholders, stockholders, bank owners believe they are *entitled* to neglect and mis-treat fellow-nationals. And if, because of their actions and their biased free-market business system, the working class suffers deprivation and poverty,

they argue that's nothing to do with them. Its working class people's own problem. Its no reason for regulating business people, for state action and taxation of their wealth and state spending. They do *talk* with concern about all citizens. They do it to appear justified in what they do, and because their conservative parties need votes. But that's all it is – just talk, to mask their real lack of concern.

Most countries are very unequal, inequality engineered via unfair relationships fiercely, sometimes viciously, implemented by conservatives for business people. Look at how, in opposition to the 'we' of the nation, business, work and politics are said to be all about individuals. Strong political arguments, and laws, deter and prevent people from challenging the inequality and unfairness of the business system. Laws, like contract law, base society on so-called individual success. And failure. They contradict the 'we' of nationality. The national 'we' does not really give people mutual support.

In many ways individual freedom is desirable. But there's a *big* political balance to be struck around it. It is used as a cover for neglect of each other, of fellow-nationals. It legitimises the neglect of fellow-citizens in their most basic needs. And it grants business people the freedom to exploit fellow-citizens, to employ and exploit them on unfair terms, to make money from them unfairly. The big battle of political ideas and practical politics is between this supposed individualism and the supposed collectivism of the national 'we'. Do you think the right balance is struck in the country you live in?

In fact, saying individual freedom is the basis of society, of the country, ignores the fact that almost everybody - business people and the great mass of people who are workers – *don't* operate as individuals. These are industrial societies based on mass production, of services as well as goods. Business people's so-called individual enterprise and 'self-made' success usually comes not from their individual skill and effort, but from them organising highly collective, industrialised work. And the laws of the free-market business system allow *them* to operate not as individuals but as *groups* – as *companies* – while denying workers the right to do that, as organised trade unionists.

'The country's' laws are set up deliberately to enable business people to exploit or discard fellow-nationals. They are the people who really run countries and they support the mass of fellow-citizens only as far as they need some of their votes. The British Conservative Party are an example. They talk support. But they give very little.

The USA has been a big experiment in all this. There, people believe fiercely in individual freedom, 'the American Dream' of 'making it big on your own'. But the reality of actual, industrialised collectivism, the inter-dependence of everybody through the economy, gets through, as during the 2016 Presidential election, when voters demanded collective help. But from Trump?

People allow themselves to be persuaded that the free-market business and work system is a natural feature, 'just there', and everyone jostles in it for survival or success in a more or less equal way.

And not, as it really is, simply a set of relationships that heavily favour business people, the business class. This confuses people when they look for a target for their sense of injustice and entitlement.

Equal Citizens We Are Not

'Your country' is supposed to mean a lot to you despite the obvious, well-recognised fact that most countries are very unequal, very unfair. Everyone in the USA knows about the American corporate business class, the 1%. Countries are not, and are not intended to be, genuinely supportive of the mass of the population. Casual, unexamined assertions such as 'this is the best country in the world' (UK) and a 'great country' (the USA) mask this.

Who is the national 'we'? What do the 'we' actually do for each other, and together? And what are the antagonisms between them? Look at most countries. How much does the state care about you? They even mis-treat and neglect those who fight their wars for them. And how much do fellow-nationals care about each other? In most countries, *real, practical* supportive relationships between people as fellow-nationals are shallow.

The only universal joint activity is voting, just every few years. (If they have the vote, of course). In the UK, voting is seen as a private act. You just go to the school room, make one private mark on a scrap of paper. It's not a shared, collective, open activity. There's not much real discussion, political debate and decision-making between citizens. People generally don't do enough for each other and together with each other to justify the ever-present, fervent identification with nation and country that is all around. People do recognise this – they commonly talk of the government and the authorities as ***them***.

It's the same with other identity groups, such as localism - identifying by town or region, 'where you're from'. They too don't involve real relationships. It's mainly just a tenuous association with a well-known but barely-associated aggregation of people.

In all countries, there *are* real relationships, that really mean something. There's real groups to feel you belong to, to identify with. There's real, grassroots football; there's other sports clubs; there's charities, run by many thousands of volunteers; there's parents associations, neighbourhood associations, motoring clubs, religions. And lots more. *Above all, where workers, the working class, organise in unions, there's mutual protection and promotion of each other's interests in their jobs, against business people and state employers, in the essential activity of making a living.* What real groups do you belong in or identify with? Who can you *really* identify with - people you can define as a group because they share your attitudes, who will actually do things for you and others like you. Decent people.

When people say they see 'the country' as based on a shared culture, the thing to do is to ask, did that country come from the shared cultural identification? Did the people who feel these things act together to form each political system that makes up a country? Or did the country

come from small numbers of powerful people taking control, first of all of smaller territories, then, usually by violence, taking over bigger ones? It is probably worth somebody really looking into this. This is a start. Take the country you identify with; and one other; and have a think about how they, as political power structures, grew. This writer has an extensive knowledge of history and geography, more thoroughly European and North American than, say, Africa, Asia and South America. And before maybe, in the future, expanding this into a proper analysis, he believes that in most cases, countries and nations are formed by the power-hungry few, not the decent many. In the main book *You Politics and Work*, there is discussion of this in relation to Wales, Italy, Spain, the USA, India and Pakistan. (This is in *Its The Same All Over*, from page 182 in the download Web version, page 140 in the printed version.)

People do feel nationality is very significant. But who *really* is, or has reason to be, all that crazy about the political system or the government they live under? In most countries people do have some, or many, rights worth defending. But that's a practical thing. Some countries are better than others, in some ways. But maybe worse in other ways. And all countries should be much better. People are entitled to far more rights and protections than they get. No country is really worth the mass, intense identification that you see all around you.

Within each country national identities unite people just because they live under the same political and legal system, who are not really united. The free-market business system is basic to everybody's lives and is as important as the governing system. When it fails working class people, national identity leads some to turn to nationalism and nativeisms to protect their interests. They believe the answer to their mistreatment lies in worse treatment for groups cast as outsiders. Its the nationalist mindset that leads to this belief, that unites working class people with conservatives and business people. It divides people just because they live under different political systems, who shouldn't be divided. There are real relationships between people in different countries. And the same identity, felt internationally – decent people who will really do things for you and together with you - makes more sense than 'the nation'.

That all describes reality accurately, doesn't it? So why do most working class people adopt the unity of national identity, the base for anti-working class nationalism?

The Security of The Group

It is explained by a very basic need. We need to feel the security of being in a group. Despite talk of individualism, not many people really find all they need in just their own life. Most need to feel membership of groups. They need to identify with recognised or successful associations or organisations. To belong to social groups, things bigger than just themselves. They need the group's status and authority.

If membership of a group involves real relationships, real mutual support, Ok, that makes sense. But many, maybe most, of the identities people adopt or that are pressed on them are almost completely insubstantial. Identities based on real relationships are very under-developed. People use the false ones because its easy. You can easily associate, loosely, with groups (or with celebrity worship, individuals) you have little real connection with, but whose status and achievements are widely recognised. It helps you overcome feelings of being isolated, insecure, insignificant. You can associate and ride on the back of the group's or stars recognition, status and success.

Football

Examples of this are prominent and widespread, you'll have noticed it. Take people's fervent identification with football teams. Watch the international football championships. Look at the extreme expressions of identity by the fans from various countries. Look at all the wearing of team colours, the face-painting and the rest of it, broadcast approvingly and enthusiastically from the stadiums to living rooms all over the world. Ask if they express any real collectivism between fans and team or, more importantly, between citizens of that country. Take, for examples, the awful relationships between the working class and peasants of Brazil, and the landowning and business classes there, and their political parties. Or Columbia. Or many other countries.

Fan's identify with national football teams just from living under the same political system. Beneath the loose identification based on the overall political notion of 'the nation', in actual football few fans have any real relationship with the teams or any real involvement in the game. They've no cause to be proud of whatever the players achieve. And no right to feel let down by them nor abuse them when they fail. In England, the national team that fans fervently support and expect success from is organised by the FA, The Football Association. Yet England fans despise the FA!

At the grassroots, few of the fans who go wild about the national team's performance in the televised championships give any time and effort to developing facilities and players. They don't get youngsters together on weekday evenings to coach them, get them together for matches, get the nets and corner flags up for games, don't do any referee-ing. This writer has done all that, organised and managed adult and youth football teams. And he is a regular in the most fervent section of fans at one of the biggest football clubs in the world. So this is no outsider, anti-football view.

In 'club' football, look for real, practical collectivism between club owners and fans, between players and fans, and between fans themselves, and you'll not find much of substance. In fan's fervent support of the 'clubs', they aren't part of any real group. They are just borrowing status from the team, piggy-backing on their fame. Its just an entertainment business, organised by business people they've got nothing to do with except as individualised, paying customers. They are just consuming football. As a product, they get not just the meaning of

belonging to a significant group, they also get the thrill of group conflict.

But being a fervid follower of a team is just assumed to be something people do and is overwhelmingly accepted and endorsed. It has the solid base of coming from people's need for endorsement by believing they are part of a significant group. But the media promote it energetically too. That's partly for newspaper sales and viewing figures. But the media is mainly owned by business people and they magnify the fervour so as to push working class people into group mindsets that divert and divide them. And, with the national teams, into mindsets that unite working class people, unconsciously, with them, the business class. National mindsets that don't threaten their influence and power. They are so strong they mean people acquiesce to whatever governments do, like make war. *And that's the main objection to it all.* It could be harmless fun. But mainly it diverts and divides us and unites us with them.

There *are* real relationships between people, and there are real groups. But not in mass sporting identities. Enjoy the game. But realise that by taking these affiliations and rivalries as seriously as they do, to the extent of real, deep, lasting hatred between fans of different teams, working class people dividing themselves when they need to unite.

They Are Just Political and Legal Systems. That's All

People identify with and feel they belong to many social groups. Football is just an example. The biggest are countries, nations. But few in any country play any part in the governing institutions they feel so much part of. They have usually been set up by other people long before they were even born. And even then, it rarely involves everybody. Take the American War of Independence, fought for freedom from the British landowner oligarchy who ruled Britain and America. Credit to those Americans who fought, but many of the colonists didn't actually support it or take part in it. But many British people did, because they too wanted freedom from the oligarchy in Britain. In fact, more British people supported the US war of independence than Americans did! And these days, while some do make the effort to improve a country's laws and institutions, the mass of citizens are not usually involved, not in proper, organised relationships. And conservatives resist changes to 'the country' that would benefit the mass.

So, why do people go along with baseless group identities?

In football, people feel as much fervid identification with 'club' teams as national teams. Its baseless because it is associating and identifying with *other people's* success and achievements, people you have no real links to – the people who actually play the game and the business people who run the teams. Aside from a game of football or whatever sport, its pretty meaningless.

These sports identities could be all just good fun. But with the country, the nation, it means more because 'the nation' has the status of real,

established political power, the power to make laws and wars. Belief in 'your country' is the most serious political belief and causes serious problems. Belief in nationality and the political system that defines it masks the reality of how badly fellow-nationals treat each other. People don't have enough of a sense of entitlement to claim decent treatment from the people who run the country. So they turn on, are turned on to, others, those defined as outsiders.

They Are Just Political Systems. That's All

Still, again, to expand a bit on what's just been argued - why do people feel so much about 'the country' and nation and nationality, when they themselves will tell you plenty about what's wrong in it?

Again, it's because people need to belong. Each one of us feels safer, stronger, more significant, more validated, as part of social groups or organisations that mean something to other people. Groups that are publicly recognised, with wide recognition. And maybe with authority, authority to which you can plead for assistance, and for defence against other groups.

But again, how much assistance and defence does the country actually give you? And how much assistance and defence do you get from ordinary fellow-nationals? In the USA, many people refuse to support their fellow-countrymen and women even with their health. You can't be much of an American patriot if you won't take care even of your fellow-American's health.

And in how many countries do you get much defence against the most powerful groups within it, like big business people? The sense of 'belonging here' means that people look to the nation and nationalism for help and support when they feel they are owed better treatment or feel threatened. But they don't see the centrality of the free-market business system and how it unfairly favours the business class over them, so they don't feel entitled to challenge the people who make sure it is there, their fellow-national business people and conservatives. They lack a sense of how to challenge these fellow-nationals who cause most of the problems.

But national identity does give them a sense of entitlement over 'outsiders'. So they don't 'punch upwards' against those who run the country and mistreat them. They 'punch downwards' against people they see as less entitled than them – outsiders – minority groups, immigrants, foreigners. Some will support nationalist parties that promise action over outsider groups. But these parties have no serious plans to do anything for their fellow-nationals. They are usually business class parties simply diverting people from attacking *them*.

In extreme crises, like economic crashes, when 'normal' parties can't manage the economy, the damaging effects of national identity are extreme. Look at what happened in Germany under the Nazis. Not only what happened to Jewish people, but to all German people. They were led to disaster, mass death and destruction. Because of the strength of the national idea enough people voted for the Nazis to let them into

government. It's good to note that it was only 26% of German people who did that, in the last free election. But that was enough to let them form a government, with assistance from a party of big business people.

Most people aren't taken in by nationalist parties who promise the futile policy of attacking outsiders while leaving big business people alone. But it doesn't take many workers to be pulled that way to stop progressive parties from getting into government. Recently, in both the USA and the UK, it was the same effect - support for business-man Trump for President because he attacked 'outsiders'; and in the EU referendum in the UK, some workers blaming migrant workers. In both cases it was because they don't see how to tackle the problem people in the *insider* group - business people, the business class. In not understanding how the problem is business people and their business system, they are not alone. Even our activists and politicians, and liberal politicians and the liberal press, don't get that. They, and we, need to, urgently.

To Tackle Racism, Expose The Falsity of 'Insider' Groups

Some British workers voting to leave the EU for anti-outsider reasons, American working class people voting for Trump, and for populists like him in some European countries, are all examples of the mistaken actions that come from national, nativist and white-ist views. It is workers taking the opportunities available to them to strike out against being mistreated. Blaming 'outsiders' is going for the wrong targets. But its made easy by the whole widespread mindset of identifying by nationality or colour. You just have feel you are an insider with entitlement to decent treatment from the political system, be hostile to 'outsiders', and vote in support of populist, nationalist business politicians. These fellow-workers of ours do that because its easier than challenging the rich, powerful insiders - business people, conservatives. To identify instead by real, relationship-based organisation, you have to do more. You have to join together with others on the basis of real commitments *to each other*. With national identity and white-ism you don't have to do any of that. No real input, no real commitment needed. Radical-sounding, populist business politicians will do the organising. Just back them. (Populism is when people, atomised, not organised by their real relationships as workers, take the easy route of voting for big-talking leaders. These leaders don't have much in the way of real policies, just rousing oppressed 'insiders' against innocent 'outsiders'.)

By building the myth of an entitled insider group, the business class's political activists build the basis for racism. Anti-racists usually limit the argument to defending the outsider groups - looking at Jews, West Indians, Asians, Mexicans, immigrants, asylum seekers, refugees, East European workers, Muslims - and defending them against the allegations of them taking jobs, using services, eroding native culture and the rest. And pointing out the benefits they bring. *But looking at the outsider groups is looking in the wrong direction. The real issue, the*

real problem, is the mistaken belief in the insider group. What needs tackling is the 'insider' belief of nationalism, 'white-ism' and 'nativism', and showing what little sense it makes. At how little positive support the business class members of the insider group give to native-ist working class people, as they do to the working class altogether, of all origins.

(It does need to be said about the 'outsider' groups that they are rarely acting as a group. They are just individual humans doing their best for themselves, like we all do. So just like there's no real 'insider' group, there is no real outsider group either, in economic or political sense, just on less important cultural habits. So talk of an outsider 'them' is wrong.)

What actual benefits do white workers expect from being native-ist or white-ist and voting for nationalist-talking politicians like Farage and Trump? They might do things against minorities. But they are business-class activists more than they are nationalists, and won't do anything positive for working class people, white or any other colour. No job protection, no decent wages, no house building programmes, no health service. Although Trump attacks free trade and in the election said some critical things about American big business people exporting jobs, in office he's favouring them. Free trade is better than protectionism, better for total trade. The issue is not free trade itself but who gets the benefits. Big business people, the corporate owners, stock holders, get it, that's why it was engineered. But workers need to make them pay some of the benefits down to the working class. People like Trump won't do it. He will, from a nationalist viewpoint, criticise other business people. But aside from crude, debatable protectionism, he'll not do much for American workers. He'll not regulate business people, he'll not promote your right to organise, your right to make business people treat you right.

Some workers mis-read anti-discrimination action - it has to extend to all workers

All of the working class are badly treated by the business class. But as well as that, some are badly treated because of their colour, gender and sexual inclination. All workers are treated unfairly because all politicians, (and everybody really) support or go along with the business system. So they don't challenge business people's unfair power over all workers and bad treatment of all workers. But some supporters of the business system, liberals in the USA, progressives elsewhere, are more civilised than others. Discrimination based on people's personal biological or private attributes is so obviously wrong, they tackle it. Oppressed white workers see this, and are encouraged to see it by conservative, business class political activists, as favouritism towards the minority groups, and neglect of themselves. They see it as oppression of 'the white working class.'

They are oppressed and neglected and they need to tackle that. But not by turning on workers who are even worse treated but have got some protection from that by fighting for it and by decent politicians

granting it. *They need to tackle the unfair treatment of, the discrimination against, all people as workers. They need to tackle the widespread acceptance of business people's rights to mis-treat and abandon all workers.* It's the bedrock belief of conservatives. Liberals and progressives concede it to them and try to do the best they can for the rest, including tackling discrimination against minorities and women. Then, absurdly, conservatives point worse-off workers at the liberals, who, being business people, professionals or better-off workers, are portrayed to workers as an elite. Maybe a 'liberal metropolitan' elite. But its the conservatives, the rich business class, the 1%, who are the real elite. The liberals mistake is to only tackle the discrimination against minorities. They need to tackle too the wholesale unfairness perpetrated on *all* workers, white, black, whatever, by business people. The core of this is the right to organise in unions, laid out in my book 'The Right To Organise In Unions.'

The Shallow Base For National Identities

Let's look at what people base national identities on. As said, they mainly take it as being born under a particular governing system.

Then, maybe, a shared culture or 'way of life'. But in modern society, there are too many varieties of culture for there to be a single one worth defining as a national identity.

Then, some see it as based on 'racial descent'. But really its nothing more than colour of skin. People see that as meaningful simply because we do judge each other, subconsciously, on appearance. We notice difference more than we notice similarity. Different skin colour *is* strikingly noticeable. But it has little real meaning. Look more deeply, at DNA and chromosomes - we're far more the same than we are different. Just one chromosome out of 46 is the difference between men and women.

So genetically we are not much different. But how relevant is genetics to grouping people anyway? There's a lot of work been done on how much of people's characteristics come from either nature (genetics) or nurture. Even with people as closely related as brothers and sisters, they can be very different from each other. There's not enough in descent and genetics to base significant, political, group identities on, and far less on simple skin colour. Descent, genetics, skin colour, 'way of life', are far less significant for grouping people than their roles in business and work.

Then, look in the other direction. Turn from the issue of hostility to people who look different, and look now at how people behave towards people who look the same – towards *each other*. Taking white people as the example, those who see skin colour as important should be asked – what is there about you and other white people that means you are all on the same side? Are you prepared to do something for each other, like on the practical issues of health, jobs, public support, and the rest? Because there's nothing about descent or skin colour that guarantees people's behaviour towards *each other* – towards others of *the same colour*. That applies to people of all colours, black, Asian,

whatever. There is nothing guaranteed about any racial group that means they are all on the same side on these basic issues.

But 'outsider' groups adopt, in a positive way, the identity seemingly given them by colour, gender, sexual preferences, religion and the rest. Some people even say politics as mainly based on the various identities. It's a mistake. To identify positively by colour and gender is as low in meaning as the hostile discrimination. Yes, there is the shared issue of the oppression placed upon you by 'insiders' and it has to be fought. But to base politics on these identities instead of on real business and work relationships is accepting the discrimination!

'Outsiders' as well as 'insider's' need to see the centrality of business and job relationships, of the business class identity and the working class identity, of people's actual behaviour and politics, and see the superficiality of the commonly accepted identity groups.

In earlier history and geographical locations there have been societies where everybody is of the same colour and culture. But there's nothing fixed about it. There's no real relationship in gender and colour. People don't really function together by race, certainly not in today's industrial and urban societies. There's no organisation relating to jobs, housing, education, health services and the rest. There's more to you than your gender or colour. For example, working class women are more oppressed by their class than by their gender. Working class people of colour, the same. So refuse to be discriminated against because of these identifiers, and don't self-define by it.

There are far more meaningful relationships than the 'identity group' ones. Identity needs to come from real relationships. Class is the main one. Maybe family too but best, from being able to rely on each other by class, at work, against bosses' bossiness, by being organised. And talking politics to each other as organised workmates. Not just locally, but across your employers operation. Which can be worldwide.

They Are Just Political Systems. That's All

In most countries, conservatives, conservative parties, big business people, the business class, encourage everybody to feel they are part of 'the country'. But it is also done by the 'newspaper' and other media owners. These are business people who operate outside the formal party system. Here's how they influence people. They alternate between reassuring them with the inclusivity of belonging to the country; and set them against others by dramatising and inventing threats from the various 'outsider' groups. The inclusivity diverts workers from 'punching up' against the big business class; the supposed threats from 'outsiders' divert them instead into 'punching down' against them. Conservatives don't need to divert everybody like this. They just need enough people to be taken in by the 'insider' feeling against 'outsiders' to split and reduce the opposition to them. It works, and will do until we stop it by sorting ourselves out.

They Are Just Political Systems. – Re-cap / Summary

The actual existence of a country, with a political system and laws and all that is, for sure, a real thing in our lives. But it needs to be treated as just a pragmatic thing and Ok, live with that as far as daily life requires.

But don't feel serious, emotional collective identity with other people just because they were born and live under the same political system as you. It doesn't guarantee they'll treat you right. Far from it, some of them are your worst enemies. Reject the fervour and flag-waving. It's just people grasping personal significance by identifying with something big and successful that, in most cases, they aren't *really* part of. Stay independent of the governing institutions and those of your fellow-nationals who don't care about you. Those who workers do know of, when they talk of 'them', those who run the country, the business class.

We, people in general, do need to feel part of big, successful organisations. But they should be those we really do contribute to and get support from. That's another story, argued thoroughly in my book *Look At The System* at www.lookatthesystem.com But start with recognising how shallow national identity is, and football identities, and local identities. What is usually meant by 'patriotism' means you support 'the country' but it gives you little in return. It takes from you loyalty and the emotional feel of socialism, but with your side of the bargain missing.

Declare your emotional and group identity independence from the nation that really doesn't respect you, and that most of us don't respect. Don't identify with the government, don't follow the government blindly. The common saying 'My country right or wrong' is an abandonment of mature, adult citizenship in favour of allowing them to do some awful things. National identities excuse illegal, mass-murdering wars, made in your name. And they have excused the most awful genocide.

And when you stand back from sharing national identity with some awful people, you realise you have to be internationalist too, that you should identify with 'the people' and workers in other countries too. Because you have real links with them as much as you are with your fellow-worker fellow-nationals. Conservatives, while they urge you to be nationalist, actually operate their trade, their financial dealings and businesses in many countries. That links you too, factually, with their staff there. While smaller businesses may not operate in other countries, their supplies and sales are almost certainly international to a degree. It's an inter-linked world. So if you want support and help from others, you can't just look inside the country you live in.

Countries Are Just Political and Legal Systems.

Be against all national identities and nationalism.

Think about it.