

Aim 400 words Max

Oldest first.

Posted 17/07/25

Regulate the ruling class...

The UK Chancellor, Rachel Reeves, is going to scale down regulation of the big financial operators that were brought in after they caused the crash of 2008. She's doing it to encourage them to stimulate growth. As a policy, it's obviously dodgy. But we need to observe, and talk to each other, about the bigger, more general point – how we rely on these people for directing much of the economy. To run the country, you could say. And we need to bring that into play when judging the state of things and what governments achieve or don't achieve. Labour let them do it because we don't give them firm enough instructions to regulate them and direct the economy with public spending rather than private. Conservatives - which includes Reform – let them do it because they represent them – the business class.

And beyond this big point is another – what do we do about it? A lot of people and commentators are saying that Reeves de-regulating the financial section of the business class is crazy. But we need to not just talk about that but about how to get a more democratic say in these policies and not just leave them to what amounts to an elected dictatorship, Prime Ministers and other Ministers. We'll come back to that often in future blogs because there is this a big discrepancy between all the opinions we have on politics, and our minimal powers to affect them.

Posted 25 July 2025

We need more of a say (1)

Here in the UK, people are furious about Starmer's inaction on Israel's mass killings in Gaza. And about him failing to improve public services enough, and refusing to do the obvious thing of doing it by taxing the rich fairly. I'll say more about those actual issues in upcoming blogs but really, the big issue is that we don't get a say in any of this. We just get one vote for an MP every four or so years, choosing that person and their party's promises over a huge range of issues. Then their leader gets dictatorial powers and all the talk is of what they will or won't do. When the MP's we elected challenge the leader, that's seen as something radical when it should be the norm, we shouldn't leave it all to one person. We rail against it all on social media but we all feel, correctly, that we are powerless, except for being able to vote differently next time, probably let in a worse party, and have no power over them either.

We really need more of a say. Protesting on the streets is inadequate – you just fill the streets for a few hours, or maybe longer, but placards and chants leave the actual institutions and processes of power and action untouched. We need more. This blog will continue this argument over the days ahead, with ideas for what we need to do to get more of a say in what's done and not done.

Posted 26 July 2025

We need more of a say (2) - Gaza

Protesting is not enough. Some big protests have made a difference, like the Civil Rights marches in the US in the 60's, and some of the big regime-change protests in Eastern Europe around 1990. But most are futile, like the massive protests against the UK invading Iraq. Protests are short-lived noise vaguely addressed to the leader or government that are easily ignored, involving no exercise of any real rights or process. We need proper access to power and decision-making.

In the UK, we can write to our MP's. It's not much of a right, as will be discussed in this 'We need more of a say' series of blogs. But, feeling angry and powerless like many people are over Gaza, I figured my MP is a person who does actually have the power, along with other MP's, to force Keir Starmer into action or replace him. So here is my recent letter to him. Not got a response yet but you might like to do something similar -

Dear J,

Could you please give us answers to the following questions -

1. What exactly is the extent of UK military support for Israel?

- The often-discussed sale of Arms and military equipment?

- Or also Direct involvement with Israeli military action?

(a Palestine support group were quoted in the Guardian recently saying the UK was re-fuelling Israeli military aircraft).

- Other support like intelligence?

2. Why does the UK support Israel? Is it acquiescence and support for long-standing US policy as summarised here -

Our understanding is that US support for Israel is in order to have a co-operative state in the region as a deterrent to the Arab oil states becoming too free to differ from Western business interests. That includes oil supplies but probably also western business investments in other resources and access for American business people to markets.

3. If so, is it not the case that the UK and we in the Labour party should not continue with this support since Israel is now engaged in mass slaughter of people in Gaza? Plus what they do in the West Bank.

4. Who decides Labour policy and actions on Israeli military action? Is it just Keir Starmer? The Cabinet? The Parliamentary party? The NEC?

- What rights to influence it do we ordinary members have?

'We need more of say' will be continued over the next week or so, linked to other current issues, taxing the rich to fund public services being the next.

For 1 August

Standard Header - In these blogs, a current political event is illuminated by reference to the basic relationships explained in 'Us, Politics and The System.' To give readers an idea when to look for a new post, the initial plan is to do a new one at least once a week, on Fridays.

Let's have it out in the progressive movement, with the rich, and with voters – should we fix public services by taxing the wealthy more?

In the last blog, it was promised 'We need more of say' will be continued over the next week or so, linked to other current issues, taxing the rich to fund public services being the next.

And in today's Guardian we have

Starmer and Reeves should consider wealth tax, says former shadow chancellor

https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2025/jul/31/chancellor-should-consider-a-wealth-tax-says-former-minister-anneliese-dodds?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other

Labour in the UK have been relying on growth to provide greater tax income so they can improve services without raising taxes. But they don't run the economy, the business class does, and that method is out of their control and not happening. So they are losing voter support and members because of not improving public services enough, and even cutting them.

But with the ridiculous amounts of money the super-rich and some of the rest of us have, the wealth is there already. We need to have it out in public debate, led by the Labour party, about raising the desperately-needed money by taxing them more fairly.

These are the likely reasons - we rely upon the wealthy, the business class, to invest in and run the economy. Would taxing them more make them not do that, so we'd better not? If it's not true, do it. If it is true, let's condemn them for not being the patriots they claim to be and not be vicious towards Labour for not improving public services enough. Let's blame the real culprits.

The other main reason is that if we agree we could tax them more without damaging the economy, the Conservative media would still work, with some success, at convincing voters, particularly the better-off,

otherwise, and Labour would lose enough voters to lose the next election. So the progressive movement, of which the Labour Party is the biggest element, need to have that debate with voters and become a lot more effective at getting across to voters than they are.

This should underpin this debate – most of what the wealthy have is not rightly theirs in the first place. This is spelled out in ‘Us, Politics and The System’ in two places in – ‘It’s your money not theirs’ in The Summary Charts, page 4, at

https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_f8e8549319a54c32993ae1c3abe285a2.pdf and at page 279 of the main work at

https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_b4c119a749af49a28286fcc7648f5cbb.pdf .

No room to discuss here the overall theme of ‘We need more of a say.’ Next blog, probably.

Standard Footer - Comments are not being offered in this blog right now. Reader’s reflections are best spread outwards, to somebody else the reader knows, as written about in ‘How To Talk Politics With Each Other’ at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_1f348918923e4f33bac1b09b314affbb.pdf

Posted FRIDAY 8-8-25

Standard Header - In these blogs, current political events are illuminated by reference to the basic relationships explained in ‘Us, Politics and The System.’ To give readers an idea when to look for a new post, the initial plan is to do a new one at least once a week, on Fridays.

Blog 8 - We need more of a say (4).

I’ve spoken about what little say we have, even in countries said to be democracies, on the issues we vigorously go on about on social media. In the UK at present there’s Gaza, there’s raising the tax income that’s needed for the public spending needed to satisfy people’s expectations from government, and many more issues, where people feel utterly frustrated and alienated from politics by their lack of influence.

There’s a lot of ways we could get more of a say, from making MP’s more accountable, to Proportional Representation, citizen’s assemblies, things like ‘town halls’ in the US, referendums and more. But before all that, let’s confront why we get so little say. In the UK, there’s an often-stated argument that we can’t be trusted with any more democracy and we can only have representative democracy – where we just get to elect people who then make up their own mind on everything, on our behalf.

Some always quote bringing back hanging as something unwelcome that people would probably want doing if they had more of a say. Right now, there’s people, not interested in tackling those who run the country, the business class, and the big issues that come from their dominance, who are very agitated about a relatively small issue, migration and asylum. Then there was Brexit.

The answer has to be, well we’re not happy with what our representatives are doing and we do want more of a say. You can’t be having referendums on every issue so what we need is ways of getting the representatives to actually represent us more faithfully. More on those methods in future ‘We need more of a say’ blogs.

But to deal with the overarching argument that people can’t be trusted - along with more of a say, we need to develop better-directed, more civilised political views amongst ourselves.

To do that, to address, vigorously, our whole understanding of the system and the basics. And to talk each other more on that basis. As argued in '*Us, Politics and The System*', to get a shared basis for our various views by recognising the existence and dominance of the business class as the main problem, as summarised in '*The Essential Us and The System*' at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/files/ugd/e8d212_7a38c84e326f41508a42fc351d94c66f.pdf

Standard Footer - Comments are not being offered in this blog right now. Reader's reflections are best spread outwards, to somebody else the reader knows, as written about in 'How To Talk Politics With Each Other' at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/files/ugd/e8d212_1f348918923e4f33bac1b09b314affbb.pdf

For Friday 15 August 2025

Blog 9 –

DRAFT

I will carry on with the 'We need more of a say' pieces, probably starting with how to get our views into the actual -decision-making process of political though our elected representatives. But, to keep being topical, I'm picking up on something I said in Blog 7 'Right now, there's people, not interested in tackling those who run the country, the business class, and the big issues that come from their dominance, who are very agitated about a relatively small issue, migration and asylum.' And linking it to the central issue of how we talk to each other as voters to establish views that actually meet how the system works and how to get our needs met.

So how do we respond, on social media and in person, to those who treat immigration and asylum seekers as the big issue, and vote for conservative parties – that includes Reform in the UK - because of that?

We should argue that there are 101 bigger issues affecting our well-being, mostly involving how the 'host' population behave towards each other, especially the business class and the wealthy. Even naming the business class is a hugely important step. They are hidden from proper scrutiny by the apparently unassailable argument about the 'freedom' everybody has to start and run a business. That is thoroughly covered in *The Essential Us, Politics and The System*' at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/files/ugd/e8d212_7a38c84e326f41508a42fc351d94c66f.pdf

But, going back to the immigration issue, instead of debating it too much, it's better to ask 'If there weren't these minorities, what do the conservatives and people who go on about 'whites' have planned for how they relate to and treat each other? What do the likes of Farage and Trump, and ordinary nationalist activists, plan to do about the business class's minority power over the rest? About health services, housing, and the rest?

A useful insight is to see, and say, how immigrants create jobs. It's because they too have needs for all the usual things and create demand that provided work for everybody. It's like

importing an overseas market, with no need for transport costs to price you out of the market.

But mainly, the whole issue is covered in 'Nationalism and Classism at

https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/files/ugd/e8d212_5af29c0781464baca2f3440ed48aa47d.pdf

10. USA – decent people – billionaires – cover – illusion of Am dream – make it. Trump, - conservatives

11 corbyn campaign change lp just follows

From first round of Blogs May-August 2024

[The Blog August.pdf](#)

Current events illuminated by the insights of these works.

Examples - In the UK Election - Taxing The Rich -

People abandoning the Labour Party for not being radical enough –

Manchester United telling staff they can no longer work from home –

the Postmasters scandal in the UK.

[The Blog](#)

18 August 2024

Also in work is 'Parties Are Not Public Services', which shows how people are wrong to think political parties owe them a duty to please them, and to criticise them viciously when they don't, because the parties are just some of the same voters who organise together, bat the options around, and come up with the best policies and candidates they can manage to agree on, and those voters who don't simply have to choose the best on offer.

13 June 2024

Originally a Letter to The Guardian on 3rd August 2024

Taxing The Rich

While agreeing that the super-rich should be made to pay more tax to help fund public services, many voters will still be swayed by the conservatives framing of taxation as taking money off people that they have rightfully earned, and their opposition to taxes as 'allowing people to keep more of their hard-earned money'. So we could do with legitimising the case for taxing the rich. Conservative opposition to taxation in general is just cover for allowing their class to keep more of the money they take from our hard work. There are few, if any, self-made billionaires. Able though they are, most of their wealth is made in businesses, which usually have many staff. They do most of the work. The owners sell it and pay the staff less than they take in for it. THEY tax us, at source. It's our money not theirs in the first place. Taking it back from them through government is just correcting that.

5 June 2024

Letter to The Guardian 03/06/2024

Alienated Lefties, Get Real

Nesrine Malik excuses the self-indulgence of those who are proposing to abandon Labour because, to get into government, they are accommodating to those of their fellow-voters who aren't as radical as them (or me). (Ignore the plight of the alienated voter at your peril, Guardian Journal, 3rd June). In quoting Ralph Nader, she illustrates the folly of such solipsism. By taking votes from Al Gore in the 2000 US Presidential election, he and those who voted for him gave us George Bush, the Iraq War, and prevented Gore from tackling climate change. Those who feel alienated do, indeed, have to vote for the least bad option, and avoid a peril of their own making; and then to consider what they can do - not just what the Labour leadership can do - to change the views of an electorate who, in the last election, voted in these Conservatives led by a clown, Boris Johnson.

31 May 2024

Manchester United have told staff they can't work from home anymore. There's a lot of discussion about it on forums like //reddit. Whether it's fair or not, whether it's best for United themselves. But the main point is missed - the staff should be organised, unionised, so they can respond to it with a collective, equitably negotiated position. But they aren't organised. They aren't united. That's not to criticise them too much, it's just pointing to the central issue.

And, since they aren't unionised, there is no Manchester United. It's a business run by an anti-union part-owner.

(This writer has supported United since 1957, supported the tradition of playing positive, dynamic football.)

The Postmasters scandal in the UK –

the entire coverage has been of the awful behaviour of Royal mail management. But managements can act brutally because they are organised, as businesses and public services, and the Staff are often not organised.

The postmasters were told for years, individually, that they were the only one having problems. Even at the level of information, proper organisation would have countered that. The Postmasters won their case in the end by organising. If they'd been properly organised from the off, it could all have been nipped in the bud.

(There was an organisation/union but it wasn't solid and active enough, not all postmasters were members, and it is said the officers were too close to management.)