A rough record of the Blogs

Aim 400 words Max

These are the drafts, which are copied onto the website. Some tweaks are made once on the website/blog so these are not exactly as published. Very close though.

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.

Standard Footer - Comments are not being provided for 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

Oldest first.

From first round of Blogs May-August 2024

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 <u>by</u> 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.)

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?

The practical elements of his reply
The UK Government does not support Israel's campaign in Gaza, has regularly condemned the actions of the IDF, and since coming into office, has taken a number of significant steps to try to stop the suffering of the Palestinian people:

- Restarted UK funding to UNRWA, reversing the previous Conservative Government's decision to halt support, in recognition of its vital role in providing humanitarian assistance to Palestinians.
- Suspended the around 30 export licences for offensive arms following a legal and risk assessment, covering the items deemed at risk of being used in breach of international humanitarian law. To be clear – the UK does not licence any weapons exports for use in Gaza.

- Suspended negotiations on a UK-Israel Free Trade Agreement and paused wider cooperation under the UK-Israel 2030 Roadmap.
- Sanctioned two Israeli Ministers — Bezalel Smotrich and Itamar Ben-Gvir — alongside individuals and entities within the settler movement, in response to incitement and extremist rhetoric.
- Summoned the Israeli Ambassador to formally raise concerns over the civilian impact of the conflict and breaches of international humanitarian principles.
- Announced millions of pounds of funding in additional humanitarian aid to Palestinians.
- Reaffirmed that the UK is not exporting bombs or ammunition for use in Gaza.
- Coordinated UK-led diplomatic efforts, including visits by the Foreign and Defence Secretaries to key Gulf states to promote de-escalation and humanitarian access.
- Issued a joint international statement with Canada and France condemning Israeli military operations and displacement proposals.
- Withdrawn the previous Government's opposition to the ICC's warrant for Prime Minister Netanyahu and confirmed he would face arrest if he enters the UK.
- Confirmed the UK's position that Israel must change course, with continued calls for an immediate ceasefire and the unimpeded flow of humanitarian aid.
- Agreed to the evacuation of children in urgent need of medical treatment from Gaza, in partnership with international and regional partners.
- Confirmed the UK's intention to recognise the State of Palestine as a step towards a just and lasting peace at the United Nations General Assembly in September 2025.

The Government is keeping the situation under review and will take further actions which might make a positive difference to the situation on the ground. Ministers continue to work for an immediate ceasefire to stop the horror in Gaza. The UN must be allowed to send humanitarian assistance into Gaza on a continuing basis to prevent starvation. Hamas must release the hostages. We support the US, Qatari and Egyptian governments in their attempts to bring about a ceasefire.

I will continue to use my position within Government to push for action that prioritises peace, the provision of aid and the protection of civilians in Gaza.

'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 – Sort Nationalism With Classism

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.

I will continue the 'We need more of a say' blogs, probably starting with how to get our views from these screens into the actual decision-making process of politics through our elected representatives.

But, to keep topical, I'm picking up on what 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 - how we talk to each other as voters and get people to base their views on the system and how to get our needs met in it.

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

We should argue that there are 101 bigger issues affecting our well-being, mostly involving how 'we' and 'us', the 'host' population, behave towards each other, especially the wealthy and the business class. Even naming the business class is a hugely important step. They are hidden from view 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, 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 provides work for everybody. It's like importing an overseas market, with no transport costs to price you out of the

market. But instead of debating migrants too much, ask also ‘what do the conservatives and people who go on about ‘whites’ being neglected have in mind for how they would relate to and treat each other if there weren’t these minorities? What do the likes of Farage and Trump, and ordinary nationalist (not ‘far right’, that’s not descriptive enough) activists, plan to do about those 101 issues? About health services, housing, and the rest?’ And the business class’s minority power over the rest?’

The whole issue is covered in ‘Nationalism and Classism, a fifteen-minute read, at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_5af29c0781464baca2f3440ed48aa47d.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

Blog 10 – We need more of a say.. (4)

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.

Check Blogs 5, 6 and 8 for earlier ‘We need more of a say.’

Progressives love a good demo but walking the streets for a few hours as an amorphous crowd is nothing when there’s all those many solidly established institutions exercising actual decision-making power – businesses, the law courts, parliaments, congresses, banks, councils, government departments, and so on - daily.

Future blogs will say more about how we can get access to such real power. But first, some general points. Though spitting feathers as an individual on social media can spread opinion, things really get done by people organised, in organisations. Conservatives boost the idea of the individual but it’s a diversion, they themselves exercise power organised as businesses, conservative media and parties.

And organising requires more than just expressing your pet views. This writer has done a lot in unions and progressive parties and it’s surprising sometimes how your stonking, undisputable opinion comes up against other people’s differing views. In organising, you have to accommodate them and work with them. It’s through structured, organised, respectful debate, so that’s alright. As when one of my shop steward students said to me ‘Eddie, with all due respect, you’re talking crap.’

You have to put in some time and effort. It all has to be resolved in meetings, debates and votes. In the UK Labour Party the NEC (National Executive Committee) is the most decisive body and I get a vote for who goes on it. I just took part in a policy consultation with them on major policy issues.

Many people won’t do all this because it’s not so much fun. But it means you are acting with full adulthood, trying to sort out society, in a proper way, with others.

The ruling class, the Business class, don't mind all this. They organise first of all to run their businesses. And then they've got something to protect, which they usually do through their conservative parties. Because of them taking the trouble, there's a sense in which they deserve their power – but not as much as they get and they should be more civilised about how they use it - and we deserve our lack of it. The hard fact of the matter is that, to make them do that, we need to match their organisation.

As ordinary citizens, there's no everyday, accessible democratic processes in place. You can write to representatives like MP's, but others might be writing differently. We need some decision-making processes to mandate them. We shouldn't have votes without proper debate – we need to talk to each other about how our decisions affect each other. So maybe Citizens Assemblies followed by constituency votes (referenda).

There's a thorough discussion of democracy, comparing parliamentary and union democracy, in the full 'Us, Politics and the System' at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_b4c119a749af49a28286fcc7648f5cbb.pdf from page 230-275. And more about Citizen's Assemblies at pages 296-297.

MP's reply on Citizen's Assemblies. I recognise the importance of maintaining effective dialogue that reflects the full range of views across civil society. Citizens' assemblies and other participatory methods can be a valuable part of a wider toolkit for policy development and public engagement. However, while citizens' assemblies might be a useful way to complement to our representative democracy, they are not intended to replace it, and the government do not plan to introduce them at this time.

Blog 11

29 August 2025

Chickenshit politics

Did you read the piece 'Nationalism and Classism', linked from Blog 9? And here again - https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_5af29c0781464baca2f3440ed48aa47d.pdf

It argues to tackle nationalist politics, which relies upon an 'insider' identity, by urging people not to look at 'outsiders' but at the 'insiders' and how they behave towards each other. Particularly how the wealthy behave towards their fellow-country(w)men.
So, with the current wave of anti-outsider activity in the UK, isn't it time to use this view to show up how it's not only nasty but ridiculous? Time to say to people 'C'mon, this is chickenshit politics. Asylum seekers and migrants aren't the people who run the country and any problems they cause are trivial compared to what the insiders who do run it do. That's the business class and the main reason Labour can't do enough for you is their resistance'.
Ask people who mention the migrant/asylum issue 'What do you think of how the conservatives in the House of Lords are trying to wreck the much-needed and long-awaited Employment Rights Bill?'
The crucial thing is simply to *name* the business class. They get away with running the country invisibly because we don't do that. They are the ruling class.
They are organised, in businesses and conservative parties.

Asylum seekers and migrants are the weakest people in the country. Unlike the business class and their conservative parties, they aren't even an organised 'they'. They haven't even established the right to be here. It's chickenshit to target the weakest when you don't have a go at the strongest.
Identifying by nationality and colour – in most countries – is lining up with and backing those who care least about you, have most of the power, and cause most of your problems – conservatives like Farage. And against people like yourself who are different but in insignificant ways.

Blog 12

Unionise, Unionise, Unionise…

I'd continue on the anti-outsider nonsense but we shouldn't let conservative diversions like that make us totally neglect our own priorities. One is to boost the right to unionise. Most of what gets done in this world is by people who organise with others. By far the best at that are business people. Their organisation is *as* businesses - many of them vast organisations, with thousands, hundreds of thousands and millions of us working under their direction across the globe. Our biggest problem is that while they are organised, in the central process of producing wealth and wages, we are mostly not.

Partly that's because we allow unionisation to be unmentioned in daily life. A TV programme this week showed how some footballers lost their retirement money by letting dodgy financial operators handle it. And they have the tax people bankrupting them for unpaid tax on the dodgy schemes.

They were foolish and greedy of course. But they were rightly pleased to have come together at last to help each other fight the case. But why didn't they and the programme talk about them not having done this first, way back? Then, they were already organised, in the player's union, the Professional Footballer's Association. Couldn't they have asked the PFA for advice then? The PFA are a strong organisation and help their members in many ways. Though they might keep away from operating as financial advisers themselves, they might do what my union, Unite, did when I recently asked for, and got, a recommendation for a trusted financial adviser.

The need for organising, unionising, for mutual info and support, was neglected not only by the players but by the programme makers. You see it often in TV dramas where someone gets disciplined or sacked, in an industry where you know they'll be unionised, and you don't see them being represented by a union rep, and managers just acting as if all-powerful.

It was the same with the postmasters. They were each told for years by the *organisation* they worked under, the Royal Mail, that they were the only one mis-handling cash. They resisted individually, in ignorance of their shared plight. Some got bankrupted and some killed themselves. They did at last come together and win. But nowhere in the coverage is this point – it wouldn't have happened if they had maintained strong union links.

Back to the issue of recent weeks in the UK – the collective meaning people attach to the 'us' of national identity. All the footballers were British, many of them white. The financial business people who mis-treated them were also British and white.

P.S. Angela Reyner supports the super-important Employment Rights Bill that conservatives are trying wreck, on behalf of their class, the business class. Let the MP's sort out any minor wrong-doing, we need people like her on the much bigger issues of our rights and public services.

Blog 13

The Business Class, the Business Class - exploding the insider promise.

Progressives in the UK are having to tackle the support the alternative conservative party, Reform, are getting from targetting asylum seekers and migrants - outsiders. Progressives have the same problem with conservatives doing that in other countries, like in the USA.

It's easy to tackle. Recognise that people flying the national flags and all that aren't getting what they need or feel entitled to. They are given a big promise from being 'British' or 'American' or whatever nativist identity, that as 'insiders', citizens, 'the country' will see them right. We need to ask them, to deal with that, to look away from the 'outsiders' – they are pretty weak, they don't run the country - and ask 'How does the *insider* promise stack up?' We just need to identify and name those who do run the country and betray the promise. Give people a clear direction to who they are. It's the business class. We need to get into the habit of recognising that, using the term, and referring to them in political debate.

To expand - we let people think political parties 'run the country' – they do claim to – and so people blame our progressive parties as well as outsiders. We need to point out how political parties and government don't really run the country. But when pointing out the others who do, we don't clearly identify and name them. We only talk, vaguely, of 'the wealthy', 'the rich and powerful', 'capitalism' or 'the ruling class' (without actually naming that class.)

It's easy to name them properly and how they are clearly a class. Talk about not just their wealth how they *get* wealthy: How it's from them owning and organising and running most of the production of goods and services: How it's from business and work relationships with the rest of us in the everyday work process: and how that means they dominate everybody else, and get huge wealth, in that process, that they resist being taxed and used for their fellow-nationals. How they are clearly driven by self-interest - their conservative defenders declare that to be the basic human condition - not by fulfilling the promise to 'insider' fellow-nationals.

They are the Business class. That includes together the financiers, the venture capitalists, the private equity, 'the bond markets', the property developers, but also all productive businesses. They are, altogether, clearly a class, the dominant class and the base for conservative parties, including Reform. They mistreat fellow-national, often fellow-white 'insiders', at work, and resist progressive parties who try to use government to improve things for the rest.

Having identified and named them, we need to put relationships with them, and negotiations on tax, investment, regulation, employment rights and the rest, at the centre of political debate, not asylum seekers or migrant workers.

Identifying and naming them, and referencing them in all political debate, enables us to say to people turning to nationalism and Reform - don't think political parties are everything - see how they come from the system – and how in it you are neglected or done in the fellow-insider, fellow-national business class, not the powerless 'outsider' asylum seekers and migrants. Don't support their conservative parties (Reform is one).

Support progressive parties. If they aren't good enough, let's deal with that, but not by turning to something worse.

Blog 14

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.

Still with the anti-outsider nastiness - we need to say – 'Yes, your expectation that 'being British' means 'the country' will see you right is correct. That's the promise of politics. But then say 'Surely that means tackling why it's not happening, independently of the immigration issue, and supporting centrist or even socialist politics?' And 'You need to make the expectation a practical thing, not just assume it. Because some fellow-nationals and fellow-whites oppose and obstruct it. Conservatives – which includes Reform – just don't believe in it. Their core belief and practice is that everyone's out for themselves, it's all about self-interest. And for them, it is. And they oppose public services because they do OK without them'.

And we need to say 'Look past the political parties and government and look at the system below that - at the people who run most of production, work, and the generation and distribution of wealth – the business class. They and their conservative parties oppose the nationalist expectation of government looking after the people, against public services and support.'

But the actual flag-flying isn't based on this practical view. It's based on a simple, unthought-out identity, of 'Britishness' or whiteness, that takes no account of the actual behaviour of fellow-nationals towards each other. We need to question and challenge this identity and argue the practical view.

The unthought-out identity has as a base a wider platform of less nasty national identification, where almost everybody identifies with people and things simply from them being fellow-citizens, ignoring their real actions and politics. In everyday life and debate, we need to challenge the validity of this platform. Start with the business class, but also ask people generally 'what sense is there in identifying automatically with anyone or anything 'British' or 'American' or wherever, in sport, products, and a whole range of things and people? We don't know them. They could be conservatives or otherwise nasty and opposed to your interests. If they are Ok people, fine. If not, don't support them'.

The absolute key thing is to name the business class. Try it, in your head, then in the next conversation where it fits. Get used to using it. Because it names the people really responsible for the flag-wavers, and the rest of us, not getting what we need. Rather than just labelling them 'the rich and powerful' or 'the billionaires', it opens up the observable production, work and wage relationships that make that true.

And let's take the flag-waving personally – it's not only the hitting on innocent people, let's start thinking of the people doing it as letting the rest of us down, and themselves, because we're trying to sort out their problems and ours properly, by tackling conservatives and the business class, and they are siding with them.

For more – Nationalism and Classism,
https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_5af29c0781464baca2f3440ed48aa47d.pdf

And 'The Essential Us, Politics and the System',
https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_e2ab52bdc6fd4e9fa8d383e9b20ec6c7.pdf

Blog 15 for Friday 26 September

The rich. The rich and powerful. The wealthy. The elites. The wealthy elites. Wealthy interests. The billionaires. The billionaire class. The 1%. These are all too vague, shapeless, don't identify any actual people well enough to hold them to account.

And just referring to their wealth keeps hidden and unexamined how they *get* rich and wealthy. And that lets them present their wealth as just being there, *theirs,* which it isn't, for most of them. It comes from what the rest of us do.

'Business', business interests, 'the business 'community'' still don't identify any actual people or group. 'Capitalism' just presents an image of a disembodied thing outside human agency. Capitalists or the capitalist class at least speaks of actual people. But nobody really has a vision of who *they* are.

These vague terms leave these people invisible in political thinking and debate. Instead, everybody blames 'politicians', including ours, who have to try to improve things for the majority while not having much power over these people. Naming them will help.

And we need to identify how they get wealthy. It's from the source of all wealth - the work process. It can be stored and transferred in money and property, but it all comes from work, production. We need to identify who has the central role in production, work, trade and wealth generation, the key activity in society.

Again, 'Capitalism' and 'capitalists' is the nearest people come to identifying them. But that only refers to a phase in business where surplus money is re-invested. More important by far is the everyday work, production and trading process, where income that covers costs, profits, wages and wealth, and generates capital, is generated.

The people who organise and manage all this mostly do it by running businesses. Included in that are the financial businesses and 'bond markets' and suchlike. Businesses are, together, pretty much 'the economy.' We need to name them and put their activity at the centre of political debate. They are clearly a class and the best name for them is the business class.

Try noticing them as a class. When you are out and about, look at all the lorries and factories and offices and construction companies and the rest and ask 'Who owns them?' Try noticing their role in everything. Try calling them the business class. Just to yourself. Then try saying it. It comes with practice. It works well when talking with people if you start by saying 'Production, trade and work are the most important processes in society and a small number of people organise them. They are the business class.'

They aren't all hateful but they are the political bloc that gets business people's rights widely accepted. They protect them with the image of all being plucky self-made small business people. That image gives important political cover to them all, excusing the power of the bigger, middle-sized businesses, all the way to the corporations.

It's ridiculous how we don't have a name for them. Identifying them and bringing their role into political debate enables sureness in understanding why the majority are badly-treated. And it explains who conservatives, the Republicans and Trump represent and are working for.

A thorough exposure of the business class is at pages 113-127 of the full *Us, Politics and the System* at https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_adf27dc02c7d4ef3a62e88b12c19ae27.pdf

Blog 16

Tax Them And Spend

The UK Chancellor is producing a budget soon. Key to it is how to raise the money to tackle people's discontent, some mis-directed into nasty, dangerous nationalism and even support for the conservative parties, and the business class they represent, who are responsible for them not getting what they are promised and expect.

There's enough wealth in the UK and many countries to provide what people are demanding, but there's monstrous inequality in who gets it. That's because of the unfairness of our trade deal with the business class, enabled by conservative parties. (There's a lot said about trade deals, but only those involving the business class. What about *our* trade deal with *them*?)

The business class claim they deserve the wealth they get for organising most of the production, work and wealth creation, and need it as an incentive to do that. Here is our base argument when looking at that - 'It's our money in the first place, not theirs'. See that argument in full in The Three Summary Charts, page 3, at the link below.

We can start to correct the inequality at source, in the work process, The Summary Chart page 3 explains how that is an unfair trade deal from which they get most of the wealth they claim is theirs. See the other link below for the full explanation in the full work 'Us, Politics and The System', pages 73-113. Following from that, we need widespread unionisation so we can bargain with the business class fairly.

When government taxes them in the work process, like the recent rise in National Insurance in the UK, they argue that hinders them in keeping the business running. OK, maybe - businesses can't always be sure of balancing the books or making a reasonable return on investment until the accounts are done. So maybe allow them a bit of leeway there.

But then the business class as a whole do end up cornering huge wealth from it all, and the rest of the population not getting what they are promised and expect. So get some of it back by taxing them fairly too.

Overall - we have a deal with them, at work and through taxes. Make the best deal we can, that they will wear and not refuse to invest. Then do our best with public money we can raise.

And if that's not enough, and they still take huge amounts – keep saying it's our money not theirs, and direct criticism away from our progressive governments to where it belongs, with the business class and conservatives. Blame them, publicly, continually. Ridicule their claim to patriotism. Shun them in public life.

Link to The Summary Charts, see page 3.
https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_f8e8549319a54c32993ae1c3abe285a2.pdf

Link to the full 'Us, Politics and The System' see pages 73-113
https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_adf27dc02c7d4ef3a62e88b12c19ae27.pdf

Blog17 – The Micro-Summary

***The Micro-summary** – Politics is all messed up and people in a state about it, even in the wealthy west where things could really be right for everyone.*

The starting problem is that everyone thinks political parties and governments 'run the country'. But they don't. They don't run the economy, the relationships in business and work where we make our living. (And some get wealthy). They are left to run as free markets, mostly. And the whole point of free markets is that governments don't control them. The most important free-market relationship is in the work process.

What people say about politics is confused because it isn't based on these core workings of society – 'the system'. We need to make it so that it is.

In free-markets, in the business system, in making goods and providing services, mass production (industrialism) is more efficient. So it constantly drives out small-producers. So most production becomes done in a relatively few large operations. And this leads to a minority of people, business people, the business class, running most of the economy, not governments. Through organising as businesses, the business class get power over everyone else at work, and great wealth. In politics, they use that to promote politics that favours them, conservative politics.

Their conservative parties say them having this power is fair, because everybody is free to trade as individuals and start and run a business. But with mass production, even with smaller businesses, business people take wealth from the system not as individuals but, with those large operations, with many staff, as companies, collectively. They get wealthy more from the work everyone else does for them than from what they themselves do.

The false view that this is all about individual rights gives political cover to business freedoms that conceals how they actually work collectively.

The key mechanism is that with large, industrialised operations they have large workforces. That means they can keep production going without any one particular worker. That means they can bargain harshly with workers one at a time and get wealthy from charging more for our work than they pay us.

Again - they are a class, the business class - the clearest example of a class. Because they run most production, they are the economy. That means they have inherent political power even outside party politics. And then, on top of that, they – business people of all sizes of business -organise conservative parties and media. Through that they protect their power over everybody else in the work process by making business freedom in free markets the dominant political view, one that severely constrains progressive parties.

So, contrary to how people talk, the political parties don't simply 'run the country.' the parties come from people in the system organising to protect their role and interests in it. And the majority don't get what they want from work or politics because the business class put more into that than most workers put into organising as workers at work, and into progressive politics.

For a foundation for people getting what they need, we need a clear view of these basic political and trading relationships – the system. The works that make up 'Us, Politics, The System, Class' provide it. Then we need to put our relationships with the business class – at work, and in taxation and provision of public services – at the centre of political debate. Only then discuss the political parties and politicians.

Make sure to at least read 'The Essential Us, Politics and The System', a short read in large text for smartphones.

https://www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org/_files/ugd/e8d212_e2ab52bdc6fd4e9fa8d38

Blog 18 - Class now in the title

No festive references spring to mind so straight to business - literally. This work is now titled 'Us, Politics, The System, ***Class***' (was Us, Politics and The System). The work has had many titles but it's not been including the key conclusion of examining us, politics and the system – that class is central. Class defined, of course, by role in the production process, not simplistically by income or culture. Starting with recognising the existence and role of the business class, the most organised and powerful group in society, far better organised, conscious of their rights and interests and capable of promoting them than the rest – the working/worker/employed class. So class needs to be in the title and now is, from v. 2025.20.

But you don't get that in most discussion. For example, in the huge number of social media posts people in America make about Trump, most of it is about him and his attack on democracy or his nuttiness. That, and him, is the immediate problem, but it's about much more than him. People make some mention of billionaires, the Heritage Foundation and the like, as well. Maybe of the Republicans, of conservative politicians. But never the base problem – the mass conservative movement including millions of ordinary business people and individualistic workers pushing business rights and wealth and how it co-opts many people into supporting the people who are the main cause of their problems. It's the same with Farage and Reform in the Uk – deeper than their racism, they are a conservative party, a business class party, and that's what we need to be saying about them.

Instead, with all the hostility to outsiders like migrants and asylum seekers - and the encouraging defence of them – and with all the talk of the Budget and taxes, and public services - no mention of real class, starting with the business class. Instead, a lot of people disregarding that and just saying all politicians are the same, as if Starmer, even with his faults, can be just replaced by 'trying' Farage and Reform. A mistake many Americans made about replacing Biden with Trump.

The working class – again, properly defined by role in the production process - don't see the business class, and mostly don't know themselves either as the working class.

In a forthcoming blog I will explore conservative ideas about how society should work, and how conservatives get mass support for them, that explain how the business class induce many people – prominently Trump and Farage supporters - to support them and put their parties in government despite them being hostile to their interests. It will probably be called 'The American D…elusion'.

So - please note the title change to 'Us, Politics, The System, Class.'

And also note - the new web address www.uspol.org. It's easier to remember and pass on to other people and takes you to the existing website – still www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org .

Blog 19 – Its not about Trump –

Its about The American D...elusion

People are saying a lot about Trump. He is the immediate problem but let's reject personality politics and not be mesmerised by him. Trump and other leaders, whether mainstream or other populists like Farage, Meloni or Milei, are only there because political movements put them there. Our job is to identify these movements and tackle them, not just talk about their front(w)men. They are conservative movements. They exist in most countries.

To identify the one that put Trump in, start with the people in his administration. Then the Republican members of Congress, the Republican activists who organise and fund their electoral campaigns, the Republican judges, the Republican National Committee, State Senators and State congress(w)men. The State Governors and Secretary's and Committees. The Republicans on electoral boards and school boards. The whole membership of the Republican party. Then there's the many ordinary people – like the seventy or more million Americans who voted for Trump and for those other office-holders.

To identify the whole conservative movement - Politically active members of the business class lead it and run the conservative media and think tanks. Then there's the corporations and other big business people using their wealth in politics. But importantly, the movement has a broad base of ideological support in many or most of the whole business class, people who run all sizes of business, all the way down to the small traders. And, with some of the best-qualified workers and some who aren't, from many ordinary citizens. In the UK, we call them 'working class Tories'.

To bind this support together as a body of conservative political opinion that they use to justify monstrous wealth inequality, the conservative movement in America uses 'the American Dream' – the claim that with free markets or 'capitalism', 'anyone can make it'. That everybody can operate independently and succeed by their own efforts. Most Americans believe in it. Conservative ideologues claim it is the essence of liberty. It can deliver at times, in enough work for most people and high enough wages. And that wins the support of many workers. It has people believing the conservative claim that the system is all about self-reliance', with a whole cultural imagery of 'the rugged individual'.

But its not 'The American Dream', its 'The American Delusion'. (Though not really American - conservatives worldwide make the same claim. Its 'The Conservative Delusion.')

Here is why it's a delusion - Conservatives talk a fantasy as if we can all be independent traders. But high-volume, industrial production of goods and services constantly drives out small. So 'the free market business system' develops, inevitably, to a small number of people, business people, running most production. Most economic activity isn't done by independent individuals but, with large workforces, highly collectively, with most people <u>having</u> to be workers (white collar included). People don't spot how it all being about the individual doesn't match how things actually work collectively. That's because there's an infinite gradation of business size from truly independent small traders up to the corporations and the multi-ownership billionaires and you can't easily see a crossover point. But it starts with even smaller businesses, when they employ people, however few.

With this small class, business people – the business <u>class</u> - running most of the production of goods and services, most work is in working for them or for public bodies. In large workforces. And as just one worker in a large workforce, you have to trade your labour to them along with many others, each of whom they can easily do without, one at a time - 'There's the door if you don't like it.'

And so, while any one <u>can</u> achieve 'The American Dream' and 'make it' on their own, its just impossible for <u>most</u> to. Because the business class dominate everybody else in the key work process where they might do it, where most <u>have</u> to make their living.

And through the unequal job relationship, they get their wealth largely off everybody else's work.

They get political support from their whole class. Down to most small business people, or up from them, business rights are their core political belief. And support for conservative policies and parties. But they get wider acceptance beyond their class by presenting their wealth as fair reward for their own individual effort and skills. That gives vital moral and political cover to the business class's actually collective power. It masks how their power and wealth is actually gained through the collectivism of high-volume, industrial production of goods and services, by the majority, as workers, in a very unequal power relationship with them.

This draws most people into passively endorsing the core conservative aim of economic freedom for business people. They just accept it as the system, without much thought. And the business class distract people's attention from their key role and power, and divide them, with various well-known alternative topics.

So most people's ability to achieve The American Dream depends on their weak power relationship with them, if not unionised. And they viciously oppose that.

Then, built into the idea of individual liberty, conservative movements say that everyone is only out for themselves, that self-interest is just how people naturally are. They justify brutality in the process of wealth creation and distribution with 'It's 'Sink or swim' and 'Survival of the fittest'. They use these anti-social ideas to justify harsh, unpatriotic behaviour towards fellow-citizens, the worker majority.

So, being treated brutally in making their living, workers need insurance against it from good government services. But conservatives claim caring about your fellow-country(w)men is socialism or communism. Their political philosophy is not to care about them. And that small government means freedom.

But with small government we are left with this system of high-volume production, or 'industrialism', in unregulated 'free markets', run by these selfish uncaring people, with them in power instead of democratic institutions.

They are not all bad but the dominant, most politically active of them are. Over the last forty years, fronted by Reagan and Thatcher in the US and UK, they have consciously attacked the majority of people. The system, in their hands, won't deliver The American Dream.

So the majority suffer, but don't see all this. They are diverted onto minor issues, and divided amongst themselves. And so we get conservative governments, including populist pretend-alternatives led by frontmen like Trump, and the support for Farage. Even though their central, conservative policies, mainstream and populist, are against the interests of the great majority.

And, from not seeing that the business class dominate, whichever party is in government, some workers see progressive parties and politicians as no different to conservative ones – 'they're all the same'. And, not having their needs met, just wanting blind 'change'. Even though, as with the Republicans and Trump, and would be with Reform and Farage, it's for the worse.

The Democrats in the USA, and Labour in the UK, go along with the conservative delusion that free markets, dominated by the business class, with the values just enumerated, can deliver for all. They try to not be as vicious as conservatives about how it works, and to try instead to insure citizens against its inadequacies.

To tackle the unfairness they offer 'opportunity'. But that doesn't improve things for the majority. It just means the outcome of who gets on in the system is fairer. We need to press the progressive parties to provide fairness for all, on the basic issue of economic power, by encouraging worker's collective response to the business class's collective power – widespread, universal unionisation.

In summary - our job as progressives is to show the worker majority how the Conservative Delusion is a delusion – to say, again and again, that conservatives and the business class get to dominate and abuse fellow-citizens not by individualism but from collectivising the non-business-class majority in mass production of goods and services. And, as the solution, not to vote for their parties and front(w)men like Trump but to unionise and vote progressive to tackle them.

For more, read, from the website www.uspoliticsandthesystem.org –

more memorably, simply www.uspol.org –

The Essential Us, Politics, The System, Class; The Ten, Twenty and Thirty Minute Reads

(Ten and Twenty on the website, all three early on in The Compact UsPol and the full UsPol);

The Compact Us, Politics, The System, Class; The Right To Unionise;

and dip into the full Us, Politics, The System, Class.

Cut from 16.

And don't blame innocent outsiders who come here not as an organised 'them' (as the business class are) but as just ordinary individuals. We need their labour, they produce as well as consume so are not a drain, and they don't leech off us.

(I'm Ok with migrants as long as they're not conservatives. We've got too many of them as it is.)

Future Blog It's us.

People, commentators,

Not Starmer, Labour, dems,

corbyn campaign - change - lp just follows

Unfair Dismissal – Representation

Budget – 40-% of economy – not.

Pensionms, welfare, bond interest – transfer of wealth

Military or NHS drug companies or construction or highways – public planned spending but not part of GDSP – Optegra – whole point privatisation.

Employment - work done – prob gives closest measure. About 20/80%

Employment Rights - representation