

## **The Twenty Minute Read Of How We Relate**

(v.2024.4)

### **Ending With 'What Will It Be Like If People Do As These Writings Urge?'**

#### **Go By Facts Or How You Feel?**

*'How We Relate' shows how the system - work, business, money, politics - works, by looking at it in everyday life. What it shows is observable fact, not just opinion or one narrative of many. Taking the key example - As even a Trumper said when I explained the unfairness and inequality of the labour process to him 'It's just the arithmetic, isn't it?'*

*But many say they don't understand politics and vote by feelings. They won't vote for a party leader because they don't 'like' them. Or they'll vote for a party because they do like their leader. Or they'll vote for politicians*

*who just promise 'change' or 'hope' instead of voting on real policies.*

*And many see political parties as just alternative management teams who offer to 'run things' better than the others and all we do is vote for one or another. As when people say - 'I thought we should give the other lot a chance'. Or they'll base their politics on the feelings of belonging offered by low-content 'identities'.*

*Basing your politics on how you feel instead of on the facts of business and job relationships and on policies is no way to use your democratic rights. 'Feelings' will be addressed again at the end of this paper. But first, a*  
***A System Analysis to base politics on, a common framework for our political thinking...starting with –***

***Business people run the world.  
Because they organise together.***

***And because the rest mostly don't.***

*This is a core fact to help explain most of politics.*

*Business people are a class and they run the world because they run 'the economy', because they organize (most of) the goods, services, and jobs. But people don't talk about this as the hugely significant political fact that it is. They just accept, unspoken, that business people organise production, trade and jobs as if it's the natural order. They don't even speak of business **people** but of businesses, companies, corporations. Or more likely just of what 'they' are doing.*

*So most political debate is not about how we all earn our living, income and wealth. For all the serious issues around public services and the role of the state, and the daft distractions of culture and identity wars, this, the*

*basic, underlying issue, is not addressed.*

*If people do talk of the system, usually as 'capitalism', it's as if it's self-existing. They don't talk about how it works, think they haven't the power to change it, and think all we could so is change to another 'self-existing' system like socialism or communism, that most people think won't work. So they just expect 'politicians' to 'run the country', which means managing the system or letting it alone.*

*This is all a consequence of conservatives winning the argument on the key economic issues so everyone treats them as settled. Yet conservative ideas are facile and don't correspond with observable reality. Progressive politics makes far more sense but isn't argued for strongly enough. This paper aims to enable it to be.*

*Most of the system runs independently of politics. Normally, politicians don't really control what goes on every day. And the basic business and job relationships that shape it all were established over the centuries, in practice and in piecemeal legal decisions, never publicly debated or democratically voted for. They, the system, persist from before we won limited democracy. Since then we've not developed an adequate awareness of how the system works, or the organised strength, to change it. In countries with little or no democracy, business people just seize political power through their conservative activists.*

*We can challenge business people through politics but, by being the economy, they have the power to seriously limit what politicians can do.*

*We need to look at how we can regulate this most powerful group.*

*Some think the world is secretly run by 'the deep state' or some Jewish people or 'the Illuminati'. But it's business people, and not a secret. You can see it by just looking around you, at what you've got in your home, what's in the high street, what's on the road, in your job, in leisure activities. It's business people, who are represented in politics by conservatives. (Who come in all colours, races and nationalities.)*

*We depend on business people to organize production and jobs because we aren't mature and organized enough to do it ourselves. But it means we leave essential public needs – jobs, incomes, the economy – to be provided privately, by them, not for us all, their fellow-countryfolk, but for their own gain. We allow them to run the world*

*economy greedily and recklessly, with the unregulated free markets they demand, and to cause instability such as the crash of 2008. In Britain, the Conservatives used that as an excuse to attack public services and support. That attack caused many affected workers to support Brexit – ‘we can’t see what’s wrong and who causes it so let’s blame foreigners’. The US business class instigated the forty-year standstill in American workers’ living standards and the job losses in the rust-belt that led many to turn, angry, insecure and confused, to Trump.*

*The big business class people get insanely wealthy from our work while causing billions to live in insecure jobs and poverty. Insisting on a right to ‘make a return on capital’, they generate the needless growth that is wrecking our planet.*

*Since we do depend on them we have to do deals with them, at work and in politics. But we need fairer deals. For that, we, the worker majority, first need to see how they dominate us.*

*We need a better term for the system than 'capitalism'. That just evokes remote financial operations. 'Free markets' only refers to trade. Neither refer to production, work and business - the central processes where capital is made and where we are all involved! Business is how we experience the system and how we refer to it every day. So let's call it 'the business system'.*

*And call them **the business class**. When politicians and commentators even acknowledge that they are an identifiable group, they call them 'the business community'. Community? Community?? They are a class and we*



*need to name them as one. Especially the corporate and financial operators. Not 'the 1%'. Too vague, doesn't refer to what they do. The business class are the ruling class, not vague 'elites' or 'the establishment.*

*Conservative politicians and parties are of them and represent them. Their key policy is to let business people do what they want. That's what 'free markets' and 'laissez-faire' economics mean. The power the business system grants to business people is what conservatives aim to conserve.*

*They conceal this by:*

- *presenting the system as a self-existing thing, above us, just 'there'. But it is only the customary everyday relationships in business, work, jobs and trade.*

- *talking about 'businesses', 'companies', 'corporations', 'multi-*

*nationals' and 'the markets' as if they too are extra-human, self-existing entities. But they are just people, fellow-citizens and we can hold them to account in political debate and democratic government.*

- *claiming to be just 'politicians' looking after everyone's interests. They just honestly think the business system is fair for everybody, and effective: just honestly believe giving business people great freedom, protection and low taxes, with the rest not having the right to organize, and little state support, is how to do it!*

- *justifying business people's power and wealth as fair outcomes of a fair system. They aren't, it isn't. It is shockingly loaded against the worker majority.*

*Their case is absurd but they get away with it because we don't examine*

*it. This system doesn't exist by itself - it's an ongoing set of relationships that conservatives actively maintain, protect and extend. Capitalism isn't the problem – it's capitalists. It's their system, not ours. Their business system has its points and the rest of us have no complete alternative system to hand. But however good they claim it to be everyone knows it's not good enough. We need to regulate it, and them.*

*Progressives and organised workers have better policies, that can make the system fair, civilized, stable and sustainable. But they don't see what it is that enables business people to dominate, and what's wrong with it, and concede to them their free-market business system. That limits progressives' ability to do what's needed and so they often disappoint people .*

*But progressive parties can't do it all on their own. We, the voters, also don't understand the system and how it limits progressive parties, and workers don't vote with enough conviction, in enough numbers, for progressive party policies that will regulate business people and improve the majority's lives.*

*For this, and for civilized, planet-saving politics, we need to match business people's organised power as the business class by getting ourselves organised into a corresponding mass political force, operative every day, permanent. Just as business people are organised together as businesses, the central framework needs to be non-business people, mostly workers, blue collar and white, organised as workers.*

*We need to spread knowledge of more key features of the system:*

- *in industrial society the economies of scale mean production, trade and services inevitably come to be dominated by fewer, larger operations; run by a minority, the business class; and inevitably mean the majority have no option to make their living but to work for one or another of them.*

- *business people are organized. A business is people organized together, at work, with shareholders, suppliers, customers, managers and staff; endorsed by the state with privileges such as limited company status.*

- *their collective organisation and activity at work makes them the economy (most of).*

- *so they can and do dictate to governments.*

- *when conservative parties win elections, it amount to business people themselves being the government.*

*What conservatives really exist to conserve is business people's rights and privileges.*

- *independent conservative activists run mass media to set a pro-business political agenda and pro-business political thinking, and to divert attention from what they do and direct it at minorities.*

*Business people, the business class, do deserve more than the rest, because they take the trouble to organize and be active every day, in businesses. And we can credit them for the public utility of their enterprise and risk-taking. (But not, on risk-taking, as much as they credit themselves. The bigger the business, the more they spread the risk across projects and investment funds, successes cover losses. And losses are protected by limited company and bankruptcy laws).*

*Some can be decent, maybe more the smaller ones and small traders. But competition pressures even the decent ones to be bad so we need to regulate competition. It has benefits, but not as many as co-operation.*

### ***The Rest - The Worker Class?***

*Aside from them, all who need a job to make a living are workers. Blue-collar, white-collar; shop floor, office; manual, technical, engineer; teacher, lecturer. Even managers. The working class, the great majority of the population. But people muddle definition of class with 'middle class', that 'classes' by spending power and lifestyle, and 'working class' that 'classes' people by culture and education. We need to class people by how they make their money, by how they take part in the vital activities of production, work, business and wealth*

creation. So maybe it's the worker class and the business class?

### **The Job Deal – A Bad Deal**

Every worker knows the power an employer has over them - in the deal they make when starting a job; in how employers and themselves behave while in a job; in how easily they can sack you.

Unique to the book 'How We Relate' is that it shows just **how** business people, and public authorities, overpower people in the job deal. Workers and progressive parties need to understand this clearly, and how it entitles people who are workers to organize in unions.

**This is how ... in our industrialised world, economies of scale mean most jobs are in workplaces with many workers ...**



***... so the employer can usually get the work done without any one of them.***

***This is why workers are weak and employers and the business class strong, and why there is the huge disparity in wealth.***

### ***'The 'Market Ratio' In 'Free' Labour Markets***

***Here it is again - In the deal each of us makes with an employer, depending on how many other staff they have, a worker will be ten, hundreds or thousands of times weaker. That how big a difference there is between how much they need one worker and how much one worker needs the job. This is inequality in the ratio of need.***

***It means each worker is of only 'marginal use' to an employer. That's why people get a bad deal and bad treatment in jobs - because whilst***

*making a deal with one worker, the employer has all the others to rely on for output.*

*Go to another job - 'There's the door if you don't like it' – and, in our industrial societies, you are at the same disadvantage. It operates against better-qualified, so-called middle class workers the same as the less-qualified.*

*This demolishes the conservative claim that free markets mean freedom and opportunity. That 'you can make it by your own efforts' and, in the US, achieve 'the American Dream'. This claim vaporizes before the plain fact that in modern industrial society most work isn't individual, it's collective, and having many staff gives employers power over workers that far outweighs whatever opportunity there may be. To make their living, people shouldn't have to sell themselves so unfairly.*

And the huge inequality in wealth is because this unfair job deal enables business people to pay workers less than the full value of the work they do. This is where profits and most wealth come from, from control of the work process, because that is where wealth is produced. The rich claim it is because of their superiority, their ability and effort. Yes, some is from that. But it's mostly from the unrecognised and unfair power they have in the labour process that produces wealth.

This all entitles the worker majority of citizens to organize in unions. It is the mature, adult, legitimate response to the injustice of trading with employers alone, one at a time: to organize together so employers can only have **all** of us or none of us, and negotiate together, with strength, for union conditions.

## **Centrists and Liberals – Not Woke Enough**

*There's a few inequalities but the biggest is in the job relationship because it's inequality in everyone's most important task – making their living. Inequality of power. We fail to identify it, expose it, and use it to establish and spread the case for the right to organize as workers. Most workers do recognise bosses' power but see it as part of the natural order and let the business class alone. While some then blame other people for their problems instead.*

*The failure to challenge inequality of power in the job deal is enables some 'white working class' people see action against other inequalities as favours done for minorities, that they don't get. They are badly-treated by their fellow-white conservative business class. But*

*not knowing the case for their right to organise to stand up to them, they turn and are easily turned on minorities and liberals and progressive parties and, in the USA, vote for business-class boss-class Trump's minority-bashing.*

*The 'white working class' should see non-union job deals as an over-riding inequality they share with minorities. And that they should organise with the minorities and liberals to tackle this. This will improve their condition more than attacking the minorities, who don't in fact do much or anything against their interests, and voting for outsider-bashing businessmen like Trump; or, in the UK, for outsider-blaming policies like Brexit.*

*Liberals are just fair-minded better-off people who tackle the obvious inequalities based on skin colour and gender. But they depend on business*

people to run the economy and some are business class themselves so don't see the biggest inequality clearly enough, that between employers and all workers. They need to challenge this inequality as much as the others and support all workers, white and of colour, whatever gender or personal tastes, in getting equal to employers by unionising.

### **The Case For Organising Summed Up**

Look at all the institutions that organise and operate in society. Business people organise together and operate as companies, even protected from their responsibilities by limited company and bankruptcy laws. They have trade and employer associations. There's government itself, government departments, national, state and regional government, city and town councils, courts, schools, hospitals, fire

*authorities, the police and military, churches, sports clubs, printed, televised and digital media and more. These are all people organised, collectively. For so many of us, the worker class majority, not to be organised likewise in making our living is ridiculous. And, by being so hostile to workers organizing, vicious, from the conservative, business class side.*

*Make the case for the right to organize to fellow-workers, and even conservatives, with the simple arithmetic - employers with many workers have an unfair advantage over them as individuals.*

*For equality for all, for equality for workers of all colours, genders and personal lives, the right to organize and the right to union recognition from employers should be a recognised civil right.*

## ***Individual But Also Very Collective***

*Conservatives, representing the business class, talk of the individual as the basis of society. Yes, we are individuals, but in a very social and collective world.*

*Keep in mind - these are industrialised societies. That means large-scale collective working methods, not just smoky factories. We co-operate very collectively in all the companies, corporations and banks, the public authorities, in production, trade, and at work. It's the business class who do the collectivizing, by constantly industrializing work. It's collective even though it's not democratically controlled.*

*In this collective world, look at how collectively organized business people themselves are – the owners, the boards, the CEO's, multiple*



departments, middle managers, supervisors, and we staff, on many work sites and in many countries. Team-building exercises, 'There's no I in team' and so on. Compared to them, the rest of us are mostly poorly organised as workers, atomised. Many are organised but not with enough confidence and conviction, and nowhere near as many as need to be. As said, we need to take the trouble to organize at work and trade with employers on equal terms; and in politics to identify and organize distinctly as the worker class, to be strong enough to regulate the whole business class.

### **How Collective Do We Want To Be?**

The conservative argument that making our living is about the individual and politics mainly about the liberty to do so imagines a non-

*industrial fairytale world that has never existed. Except maybe in 19<sup>th</sup> century America where land was easily available to whites. In this fantasy land we can all be small traders, can set up in business, and it's all in your own hands, you aren't affected by what everybody else does. But the success of industrialism means we can't all be small traders. Most people have to find work in large organisations and in most jobs, without union organisation, you are dominated by your boss, with little individual freedom.*

*The self-employed, one-person businesses, traders, tradespeople, do operate as individuals in making their living, and unintentionally act as a buffer class, obscuring the fundamental reality of mass, business class-organised industrialised collectivism. And even for them, the*

*market system means they too are affected by what everybody else does, particularly big business people.*

*How much we want to operate as individuals is an issue but the fact is we are highly collective and the question is more ‘How collective do we want to be and in what ways?’ It’s a big political question, at the heart of US politics and elections. We need to make it central to the debates about the state, freedom, public spending on public support and public services, taxes, socialism, patriotism, military spending and military service. So here goes...*

### ***Public Services and Taxes – The Individual, Liberty, and the State***

*The business class do ‘take care of business’, make the big decisions on money, managing, and selling goods and services, in activities we all depend on to make our living. For that, they*

*deserve a fair amount. But they take more than their fair share using the unfair power in the job deal.*

*They take so much from this collective work they get enough wealth to not need public services and support. They claim they get the money by individual effort so their conservative parties say everyone is individually responsible for meeting their needs by doing the same. With that argument they block **public services and income security** for the worst-off, and the taxes needed for them.*

*Many people think the rich have too much money but also accept this claim that it's from their own effort and that in the business system everybody has the freedom to do the same. So conservatives, notably in the US, deter many from supporting public spending and public services by convincing them*

*that taxes to pay for them are attacks on this liberty. But the claim that the money is from their own efforts is false, and taxes just a way for the majority who helped make it to reclaim some of it from them. And public services and welfare are just fellow-citizens backing each other up on basic needs, spreading the risks and costs with the common practice of insurance. Taxes are just for collective spending, democratically decided, like people do in many types of clubs.*

*But the conservative claim to be for individual liberty, a small state, and being against public support is false. To protect themselves and their business interests, they are vigorous collectivists. They strongly promote patriotism, and even compel allegiance to 'the nation' and 'the country'. They support huge public spending on the*

*police and the military. They even force citizens into compulsory, life-risking military service to protect their privileged trading relationships. They oppose socialized health care but support socialized warfare. We need to ask, are they simply rugged individuals, or also collectivists?*

*We need to say to workers who conservatives deter from supporting progressive parties by calling public services ‘socialism’ – ‘To support conservative politics instead, while expecting ‘the country’ to look after you, as the MAGA people do, is a kind of socialist expectation itself. But it’s one that must fail. Because conservatives’ core policy is that everyone has to look out for themselves in the business system and the country – the state - shouldn’t support those who can’t make it on*

*their own'. They say the unregulated business system will enable people to meet their needs and their ambitions themselves. And sometimes it does, for many. But the evidence keeps re-appearing – it often doesn't, disastrously, and you need the state to provide. The business class won't.*

*Taxes and Public Services isn't all one way – you need to support others too, which can mean collective spending via taxes that doesn't always benefit you directly. There's plusses and minuses. But you can't rely on conservative business people for support. You need to ally with fellow-citizens who actually believe in mutual support, and support and vote for progressive parties.*

*Just blaming conservatives and the business class for diverting people from voting for public support and services like this does us no good. They are just*

taking the trouble to look out for themselves in their brutal, uncaring system and if that involves diverting us that's what they'll do. It's our own fault for not taking the trouble to understand the system and not demolishing conservatism's feeble, self-contradicting politics.

### ***The Individual and 'Identities'***

Now, look at individualism and the 'Identities' that people readily adopt, and conservatives promote. They too are in opposition to the supposedly basic notion of individualism. They are collective. And though they are low-content, everyone makes a lot of them. Far more than they do of class, properly defined by how people earn a living or make money.

Identities divert us from seeing the business class and blaming them and their system. So note again, we need to



*see how we relate to business people, public service managers and each other; to see that we are the worker class; to see it as our main identity; and to talk to each other about it, as fellow-workers and mature citizens. And to organize, at work and in politics, and not let them distract and disarm us with low-content 'identities', some that unite us falsely with them; others that divide us against each other.*

### ***The National Identity***

*Conservatives' trumpeting of individualism is nonsense. It's demolished by the reality of how collectively our societies function, with our intensely collective economic systems, with the job deal that enables employers to treat fellow-countrymen and women terribly, and with their unstable business system regularly hurting many innocent people,*

*enterprising individuals and small business people too. But many believe in the individualist view, and to believe conservatives, so do they.*

*Yet they and most people adopt this opposite, collectivist view – the national ‘we’. Conservatives use the ‘we’ to mask class identities, theirs and ours. We don’t see their dominant role, workers drop their class identity in favour of it. Progressive parties lose their independence from the business class in it.*

*People go along with it because it gives them feelings of significance, belonging and security, from being (weakly) part of so strong an institution as a country and being one of so many other people – being ‘British’, ‘Americans’, Russians, French, and the rest. You don’t have to do anything like organize, at work or in politics. Just by*

*living in a country you get to be in a big national 'we'.*

*Conservatives use the prestige of the nation state to draw people into national identities which mean unity with them rather than with each other in opposition to them. Independently active conservatives overwhelm people with national identities in print, radio and digital media. But again, conservatives contradict themselves with their core belief that people should manage on their own (dressed up as individual freedom) - 'it's everybody for themselves' - the well-off earn it through ability and hard work - that the less well-off are less able or are idle - that those in trouble should not get state support - that people should be left to sink or swim.*

*To conservatives 'the nation' only really means the laws and institutions*

*that enable business people to use, misuse, discard and abandon fellow-countrymen and women. Their opposition to public services and welfare means they don't believe 'the country' should support its citizens! Conservative parties talk big about 'the nation' but won't support the people who are the nation. In the US, not even with their health.*

*Workers who vote for them self-harm. We should ask - Is 'the nation' the institutions or is it the people? Is this one society? What will conservatives and business people do for their fellow-nationals? What will they give up for them? Will they be enterprising, not just for their own greed but for the good of fellow-nationals, for only fair rewards? Will they agree their fellow-citizens shouldn't have to trade with them for*

*work in unfair deals? Shouldn't they have the right to organise in unions (and be recognized by employers)?*

*If we vote in governments to regulate the business class, to make them act decently towards fellow-nationals (and the planet), will they accept it? Or will they, if regulated, disinvest, as conservatives always threaten?*

*With how little conservatives and business people care for their compatriots, nationality only really means people reside in the same system of politics and law. There are practical things to it, rights and obligations you are entitled to, or had better abide by, but anything more depends on what fellow-citizens actually do with and for each other.*

*To accommodate to how people do suffer from their brutality, conservatives do promise citizens their*

*needs will be met, but by the business system. It doesn't do that of course and they have to promise the state will support. But they do no more to support fellow-countrymen and women than the minimum they can get away with.*

*People who are workers - the great majority - shouldn't share with the business class and conservatives the national identity they laughably claim to believe in and should downplay the whole notion of 'the country' and a 'we' with them.*

## ***'The Nation' Hides***

### ***The Business Class***

*But most people, and progressive parties, ignore this clear conflict of interests between the business class and the worker class and do go along with 'the nation' , incorporating the system, as the framework for politics.*

*So when the business system fails, people can't even see the business class or take them on about its failings. The business system is accepted as the natural way of things, as part of the national framework. The business class blend into it and recede from view.*

*So conservative business class activists are able to divert us into blaming an abstraction, 'the economy'. Progressive parties and voters also accept the business system and go along with conservative's talk of problems being with 'the economy' and affecting all of 'us', and limit themselves to disputing which party has the greater competence to 'manage' the economy. Which they don't in fact do.*

### ***'The Nation' Blames Outsiders***

*So, having hidden themselves and their system from responsibility,*

*conservative business class media and politicians use the national mindset to further divert 'Britons', 'Americans' etc. into thinking that their problems are caused not by them but by 'outsiders'.*

*Most workers don't yet walk around with the understanding of the system and business people's responsibility for its failings presented here. So falling in with the powerful voices of conservatives and their media and blaming outsiders is an easy option. This is people unable to tackle the people above them turning on those below them. It's punching down instead of up.*

*The key to tackling this is to grasp that being able to blame outsider groups depends on there being an insider group and to examine its credentials.*



*For outsiders to blame there's 'foreigners', people in other countries, who don't live under this system of politics and law, so are outside the national 'we'. 'Foreign competition' is blamed for job losses. But native business competitors do the same.*

*In the UK after the 2008 crash, many workers, instead of blaming conservative free market madness, and the Conservative government for making them pay for it with huge cuts in public services, blamed the foreigners of the European Union for their problems and thought leaving it would fix them. They supported 'taking back control' only to hand it to the Conservatives. Now, in 2024, that is being seen as the bad move it was.*

*And inside the country there's foreigners who people are encouraged to believe they have 'insider'*

entitlement over - migrant workers, refugees. Brexit voters were against Eastern European workers using EU free movement of labour to 'come here and take our jobs'. Yet they didn't blame British business people who used free movement for them and their operations and investment to export their jobs,' often to EU countries. Anyway, migrant workers create jobs - they buy things here, so businesses don't have to go to the trouble of exporting them to them.

Also inside 'the country', conservative and populists divert people from blaming them by encouraging citizens to divide into 'insiders' and minority 'outsiders' by colour, gender or being different by personal things like sexuality. National and white - or, as in India, religious

*'identities' - set people against each other instead of them.*

*When challenging the 'outsider' diversions don't over-debate the 'outsiders' themselves. The hostility to them depends on the insider 'we' and that's what you need to question. There's usually little content in it. We need to call out conservatives and the business class on nationalism and patriotism. Ask how much 'the country' really means to conservatives? How much do they really care about fellow-nationals? What will they pay towards the taxes needed for their fellow-citizen's health and public services, and support when they suffer from their unstable business system?*

*Nationalism can never work for workers simply because it leaves business people unchallenged. Conservatives will lead workers in*

*being hostile to foreigners, and workers might vote in nationalist governments. But then what? The business class will still have power over workers, will still misuse and abandon them, obstruct them from organizing, and won't release their wealth for public services.*

*That's conservatives. But as well, how much does anyone white care for other white people? What do the 'we's' of colour (and nation) mean in real mutual support in getting the basics you need in life? What policies would an all-white society have to ensure fairness, security in getting life's needs, health services, and the rest?*

### ***Another Conservative Diversion – 'Them' and Conspiracy Theories***

*Another diversion used by populist conservatives is to point people at local and central government rather than*

*the business class. As said, the business class dominate, and don't want to be regulated. In democracies, central and local government could be a way of the non-business class majority getting some control over them and providing some social support to make up for the mis-use of citizens at work and in wealth distribution that the business system embodies. But they don't give citizens much power, and that is why conservative argue that everything should be done via the ballot box, because it's a remote way of getting at them. Business people claim the right to be able to do what they want and you have to understand the system to see how they should be called to account, and people don't. But local and central government to do make the promise of acting in people's interests. And much of what local and*

central government does can be found fault with, and the democratic connections with citizens are weak and remote. So a lot of people, not seeing the business class, are being wound up to see traffic control, necessary because we have all made millions of private decisions to run far too many cars on the road, as 'the council' or 'them' conspiring to control people. And environmental protection, clean air zones. And vaccinations. The answer? Show people the power of the business class, the ruling class, such as in cutting council funding through their conservative parties, and how that needs tackling before the council. As for the council, look into Sortition, people's assemblies, to make what they do more accountable and have more legitimacy.

## **Voters And The Economy, The Business System**

*The mainstream parties rely on business people to run the economy, the business system. Allowing them the freedoms to do that is the main policy of the conservative parties who represent them. And the centrist parties accept the business system. So, either because of rich business people's demands for incentives and personal wealth, or because their system goes into crisis, both conservatives and centrist parties often don't deliver what they promise to voters.*

*Conservatives often get away with not delivering (for the majority) because of being effective at blaming other things and other people than their system, that they maintain works best left free of regulation. They are good at dividing voters and diverting*

*them onto scapegoats. Often successfully enough to stay in government.*

*Centrist parties, also leaving the economy to be run by the business class, but without saying so, take the blame when it goes wrong. Not being as uncivilized and nasty as conservatives, they don't blame minorities so they can't evade responsibility like they do. Because everybody thinks the government 'runs the country', voters blame them for the crises. E.g. after the 2008 crash caused by the finance section of the business class, Labour got blamed in the UK in the 2010 election; the Democrats in the US in 2016.*

*So then, when all mainstream parties fail, fringe conservatives – also supporters of the business system, members of the ruling business class –*



*call the main parties and the state 'the establishment' and 'the elite', charge them with letting down workers and 'the country', and pose as radical challengers to 'the establishment'. Workers, and people in general, don't see how the business system works and how the economic failures are the responsibility of the business class and the business system. Believing in the promise of 'the country' and national identity, they are pointed at the 'metropolitan elite' as people betraying their insider status. That includes those established parties who try to treat everyone fairly. And at outsider minority groups. So, many, taken in by the radical challengers, back nationalist, populist, business-class people like Trump. This is not the answer.*

## ***Class Organisation In Politics***

*The case has been made for people's right to organise at work. Organisation should be the base from where they represent themselves in politics too. It should be about having the sense and the right to participate in the economy and politics as mature, dignified adults with comparable power to the business class. About full citizenship.*

*This is a leap for many people. When conservatives even accept our right to organise unions, they say it should only be about conditions at work, that political rights are only individual, only to be exercised in place-based geographical constituencies.*

*And this is how most people do see political activity. That you are grouped by where you live, some of your fellow-constituents associate as political parties, the constituency parties form*

*the national parties; and every few years you can vote for one of them.*

*But in place-based constituencies people have little organic connection. Being grouped just by address, with no definite connection with each other, does not amount to much, democratically. It is far more meaningful to base political activity on how we associate in making our living in business, the economy and work, the central, vital activities. And so are the relationships we have there, with fellow-citizens, as bosses or workers.*

*In the years between elections, voters, atomised, don't talk to each other much about politics or how they vote, in an organised way. Mouthing off to people you don't know on social media doesn't amount to that. And nor do they in election campaigns. And they vote secretively, individually.*

*But they do get, day in and day out, a huge amount of information and debate about the parties' leaders and policies from the mostly business class owned or business-system accepting media. Media businesses are run by business people, formally independent of conservative parties, who pose as independent commentators while campaigning frenziedly for conservative politics. The daily blast of conservative, business-class politics from them shapes much of political debate and influences most people's political opinions and how they vote when elections do take place. The parties themselves only contact you during the elections, and even during elections you still receive most of your information and debate from the conservative dominated media.*

*Conservatives and business people don't build their political strength from just being individual, atomised voters in the constituencies. They build it from being organised, collectively. Firstly in their economic roles, in businesses, at work, where they organize by class without even being in political parties. As said, this gives them great political power because governments, and the rest of us, rely upon them to organize most of the goods, services and jobs we need - they organise most of 'the economy'. Look at how national governments and local councils entice them with grants, tax breaks, planning permission, low regulation, 'flexible labour markets' (that's us being dominated by our bosses). Then, as companies and through trade associations, they fund think-tanks,*

*contribute to conservative parties, and lobby politicians.*

*Then, being individually wealthy, they fund conservative parties, campaigns and candidates. But they mostly don't earn their money from their individual efforts. Their political donations are from what they make at work, from us, from our work! So they take money from us at work and use it against us in politics; then say politics is nothing to do with us in our unions, only about us as atomised individuals, once every few years, in place-based constituencies.*

*So, as well as their economic and financial strength, the business class get their political strength from work. The worker class majority need to do the same. But worker's organization in politics is pitiful compared to business people's. Politics is about running the*

country collectively but we don't do much together, aside from a few party activists at election times. We accept the limits of constituency-based politics, that atomises us, where we don't talk to each other about our shared class position, where we can't develop class politics. While all the time, between elections and during them, we ingest business class political thinking from their media.

Like business people, workers are entitled to, and should, base their political thinking, their debate and their activity on their shared economic, work-based role, their work-based collective organisation. They should use the meaningful relationships they have with each other as union-organised fellow-workers to communicate with each other, daily, on political issues and voting choices.

*Political views developed there can go into the voting system expressed in constituencies.*

*Wherever workers organize, in unions, activists do act together politically. But it is marginalized, not getting through to inactive members and the millions who are not unionised. Just as the case for organizing together on pay and conditions at work needs to be more clearly made to workers, so does the case for using that as their main political base.*

*Here are the central arguments of 'How We Relate': we need to establish, as a civil right, the right to organise as workers, and be recognized by employers; we need to do it, to actually organise, all across the world; and if we are not to forever flounder around weakly in the vague constituency-based relationships of the electoral*



system, being divided and overwhelmed by conservatives, the business class and their media, we need to use our workplace organisation as our main forum for developing our politics as the worker class.

### **What To Do**

Spread this or some similar understanding of the system. Urge people to use the relationships between the business class and the worker class as the framework for political thinking; and downplay the framework of 'the nation'; to base their politics on who they actually are in 'the system' - urge each other to adopt authentic identities that come from their real, active roles, especially in making a living, in working together; as blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, shop floor, office; manual,

*technical; teacher, lecturer; and even managers (as workers); of all nations, colours, genders, ages and personal tastes.*

*Business people inter-act intensely 24/7/365, in serious work-based relationships, between countries, worldwide. And they identify as business people. Convince each other of our right to do the same. Base it on the undeniable simple arithmetic of the job deal – on how employers having many workers makes it an unacceptably unequal deal for every worker.*

*Urge workmates and other workers to see being a union member as normal, natural, everyday, expected. And for this relationship with each other at work to be as serious and meaningful as the one they have there with our employers. Say to each other*

*'Organized, you aren't alone against the boss. You get a feeling and a reality of support, security and fair treatment. You get real action to protect and improve your conditions. You get the adult dignity of being on an equal footing them.'*

*Urge each other to get organized, in nearly every job, section, department, workplace and trade; between almost every workplace and industry, trans-nationally, worldwide. Then do deals with business people and public service managers as near-equals.*

*And with politics based on class, convince each other as voters not to fall for conservative myths of individualism, opportunity, and seemingly low taxation; nor let them divert us into targeting fellow-worker 'outsiders' instead of them.*

*Conservatives should never get into government. With workers being such a large majority, we should always be able to vote into government strong progressive, pro-worker parties and back them to strike fair deals on worker's rights with the business class as a whole.*

*But basing your hopes on finding great leaders won't work. However able, they can't regulate the business class on their own. For that, we need an organised, everyday, permanent, social force that can match business people's everyday, permanent, recognized social force. That is us, organised as workers, in our unions and in our progressive parties.*

*Ambitious, all this? Yes. It would take many steps, taken by many millions, organizing and acting together. But it's what's needed if we are to get our*

*world into a civilized state and to not wreck it.*

*We can start by getting each other to see that the system is the problem, and to talk about it. And to agree that we are entitled to and should be organizing so we can play mature, active, roles in the system.*

### ***So, Go By Facts Or By Feelings?***

*Returning to the issue of people not wanting to bother with all that and just go by feelings. How We Relate deals with that by giving people, for the first time, a clear explanation of the system, that anyone can understand, so they shouldn't find politics too much to think about.*

*But on feelings and facts –*

*The great majority of decent humanitarian people - progressives, liberals, trade unionists and socialists - have the strongest hand in making*

people feel they belong, are fairly treated, supported, secure and looked after. Conservative identities - nationalist, white, nativist - and anti-outsider politics don't offer real support. They say nothing about what they would do for people if the 'outsiders' weren't there to blame. Nothing about how relationships would be between fellow-nationals and 'whites'. Nothing about what to do about the business class's power, about jobs and incomes. Nothing about support at work, supporting each other in health, housing, education, social insurance.

And we can show

- how the 'individual freedom' conservatives claim to offer is cover for business people's collective seizure of wealth in the work process.

- *that real freedom is based on supporting each other, not abandonment.*

- *that shallow ‘identities’ can’t deliver what proper organisation as workers and voters can.*

*At work, strong union organisation replaces feelings of powerlessness with feelings of real support and dignity.*

*Progressive and socialist politics and governments give genuine support and security in income, health, education, equal treatment and equal opportunity and in regulating business people.*

*Most people want fairness in society. Conservatism aims for unfairness, abandonment, and isolation. The fairness that progressive politics is all about is a powerful appeal to people’s feelings that conservatism can’t offer. And with wide, everyday organisation, we can get all this over to people, and*

*deliver it. So though this work offers not an appeal to feelings but a thought-out factual analysis, we can do that too.*

## ***What Will It Be Like***

### ***If People Do As These Writings Urge?***

*It will be common knowledge that business people have the central role in society and that it is because they are – by owning and organising the production of most goods, services and jobs – ‘the economy’; that that makes them the most powerful group in society; that this is because they are organised (as businesses), and are granted the right to organise; that they are a class, the Business class; that they are ‘the rich’.*

*It will be the common view that most of the rest, a large majority, are workers (however well-educated and paid they*



are); that most of the wealth the rich have is made by the work workers do for them; that workers are entitled to balance business people's power with their own.

It would be the norm, widely accepted, that they too need to be organised and are entitled to be; that almost all of them would be organised; and that as organised workers, this majority will stand up to business people and public sector employers at work, negotiating together for good conditions and pay, locally and across industrial sectors, and internationally.

It will be widely recognised that since being organised at work makes the business class most of the economy, that also gives them political power that can limit governments; that they also have conservative parties and conservative press and broadcast

*media promoting politics and laws that govern business and work relationships that favour them.*

*It will be recognised that like them, workers can use their organised relationships with each other in business, work and public services, to communicate and organise with each other on politics, independently of the business-class-owned media; that they develop their own politics and support and vote for progressive parties.*

*It will be recognised that most of rich people's wealth comes from paying workers less than the value of the work they do for them; that they get so well-off from that that they don't need public services and public support; that that is why they oppose taxes; that it is fair to reclaim the wealth they make from workers by taxing them to fund good public services and welfare.*

*Due to the majority being class-conscious as workers and aware of the difference of political interests between them and business people, and organised politically as well as at work, they will always elect progressive governments. These will regulate business people generally to make society fair and sustainable.*

*More, much more, at*  
[\*\*www.howwerelate.global\*\*](http://www.howwerelate.global)  
*and*  
[\*\*www.therighttounionise.com\*\*](http://www.therighttounionise.com)

*This Twenty Minute Read is constantly improved. Changes are usually just sequencing and clarity. For the latest version check the website.*