

INTERNATIONALISM

We may be proud of the achievements of the British working class. Indeed as its heirs we should be. However in the midst of this justified pride, patriotism in the best sense, we often tend towards chauvinism, in our ignorance in the rest of the world.

We not only do not attempt to understand development abroad, we often seem by our ignorance to imply that such developments do not affect us.

Such an attitude is un-Marxist, especially in this stage of development of Imperialism, with its international connections and entanglements. We are scarcely more in a position to effect a revolution unaffected by international developments than Luxemburg or San Marino.

And even when we do make one of our infrequent analyses of foreign affairs, it often seems to be culled from the pages of Peking Review, which naturally reflect China's position as a socialist state existing in a hostile world rather than the interests of the workers of a given country, let alone the interests of revolution as a whole.

On the EEC, we made our judgement which was on the face of it at least, completely opposed to China's stand. The sky didn't fall. The chairman was not summoned to Peking to explain our lapse, nor was he likely to be.

After our show of independence on this front we seem to have lapsed. In Angola, for instance, we seem to be pretending that the situation is exactly the same as it was a year ago. By our silence on this issue we are giving tacit support to the unholy alliance of the CIA, SA, and the sweepings of the British military gutter merely on the grounds that the USSR was involved on the other side.

Where on those grounds do we stand in relation to Vietnam, to the middle east, to Oman? In all of these issues the issue was "on the side of the angels" as we saw it.

We must formulate our own policies and our own opinions based on Marxism-Leninism and related wherever possible to how it affects us. Our lack on this score was adequately demonstrated by Chou En Lai when he threw our first delegation to China off balance by a simple but unthought of problem - How did the closing of the Suez Canal affect Britain?

Nowhere is our failing more apparent than on Ireland. Our Chairman said that this Party would stand or fall on its attitude to Ireland. From our position and lack of thought now, we will fall shortly if that is true!

Our policy on Ireland can be expressed in a single slogan - Troops Out! We do not as a party attempt to discover or explain the continued presence of our troops there, or what will replace them. Is it of no account that the National Capitalist class in Ireland, North and South has almost disappeared? Is it of no account that Britain has more investment in the South than the North?

That the only thing that could replace British domination is a United Socialist Ireland? Why do we not assist and support those who fight for such an end to sectarianism, for the replacement of Religious War by Class War? Not to do this allows anti-working class elements like the Provisionals to bomb Ireland away from Socialism.

It is almost certain that Wilson would have committed British troops to Vietnam if he were not certain of the storm of protest from the working class. Similarly the Vietnamese accepted as important the Anti-War movement in the USA which gave the White house the eventual choice between either abandoning a losing or lost war or even greater social strains at home.

Where is the movement in Britain? What has the Party done since it first took the initiative over Ireland but let others -less fitted to do so-take it from us? Are we scared of the reaction of the British public fed on horror stories and chauvinism? One can only suspect so, and if this is so we do ourselves scant service for sure as counter-revolution attempts to follow revolution the Ruling Class will attempt to use on us the same tactics now perfecting in Ireland.

We need not degenerate into a solidarity movement à-la' Tariq Ali "Viva Everyone but the working class", our internationalist duty is not just a phrase or a nice idea - it is a concrete and essential part of our preparations for our revolution.

The best example we have for instance of the bankruptcy of "the peaceful road to Socialism" is the debacle in Chile. And yet we allow the Revisionists and Trots to prance about with the liberal sympathy for the events which their reformist politics directly lead to. While our propaganda drew no lessons from the events, our silence gave such ruff-raff tacit support!

Our line includes the international experience of the class.

We must ensure that no such example as Chile is neglected. For if we do we are fair bid to allow the same failures to occur here, the same bloody lessons to be relearnt in Britain.

The above may seem "uncharitable" may seem negative, but when our silences are contrasted with our positive statements -cf. on Bangladesh, we show that we are capable of correct Marxist interpretation of foreign affairs regardless of the countervailing stampede of Liberals and Trotskyists: then we appreciate our deficiencies more by comparison with our achievements.