

THE PALACE OF WESTMINSTER: A SUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO SMOTHER THE 'MOTHER OF ALL PARLIAMENTS'.

On the 21st of February, during a debate in Parliament on the situation in Gaza, which was led by the Scottish Nationalist Party, the disUnited Kingdom witnessed a one-day parliamentary coup d'état. To understand the context for this event it must be observed that a convention exists within the British Parliament called [opposition days](#) designed to allow opposition parties the opportunity to set the agenda for the designated day, rather than the government. 20 days per parliamentary session is allocated for this purpose, of which currently 17 is in the purview of the Labour Party and 3 in the purview of the Scottish National Party (SNP).

The SNP intended to use their day to debate and vote on an immediate ceasefire in Gaza. Here is the substance of their five part resolution:

1. **Immediate Ceasefire:** The SNP motion calls for an immediate cessation of hostilities in the region. It recognizes the urgency of ending the violence to prevent further loss of life and suffering.
2. **Humanitarian Crisis:** The motion notes that the death toll has exceeded 28,000, with the majority of victims being women and children. Additionally, it highlights that 1.5 million Palestinians are currently sheltering in Rafah, a city in the Gaza Strip, and many of them have nowhere else to go.
3. **Largest Refugee Camp:** The SNP condemns any military assault on Rafah, which is now considered the largest refugee camp in the world. The situation there is dire, and urgent action is needed to protect civilians.
4. **Release of Hostages:** Alongside the call for a ceasefire, the SNP demands the immediate release of all hostages taken by Hamas. This reflects their commitment to addressing humanitarian concerns on all sides.
5. **Collective Punishment:** The motion also calls for an end to the collective punishment of the Palestinian people. It emphasizes that innocent civilians should not suffer due to the conflict.

The two points in the resolution which drew the ire of the Zionists was the unconditional demand for a ceasefire (1) and for an end to the collective punishment of the Palestinian people (5). The Zionists spun the narrative that this resolution was not so much about the plight of the Palestinians as it was a political manoeuvre to ambush the Labour Party.

Here is the Labour amendment to the above resolution:

"That this House believes that an Israeli ground offensive in Rafah risks catastrophic humanitarian consequences and therefore must not take place; notes the intolerable loss of Palestinian life, the majority being women and children; condemns the terrorism of Hamas who continue to hold hostages; supports Australia, Canada and New Zealand's calls for Hamas to release and return all hostages and for an immediate humanitarian ceasefire, which means an immediate stop to the fighting and a ceasefire that lasts and is observed by all sides, noting that Israel cannot be expected to cease fighting if Hamas continues with violence and that Israelis have the right to the assurance that the horror of 7th October cannot happen again; therefore supports diplomatic mediation efforts to achieve a lasting ceasefire; demands that rapid and unimpeded humanitarian relief is provided in Gaza; demands an end to settlement expansion and violence; urges Israel to comply with the International Court of Justice's provisional measures; calls for the

UN Security Council to be meet urgently; and urges all international partners to work together to establish a diplomatic process to deliver the peace of a two-state solution, with a safe and secure Israel alongside a viable Palestinian. state, including working with international partners to recognise a Palestinian state as a contribution to rather than outcome of that process, because statehood is the inalienable right of the Palestinian people and not in the gift of any neighbour.”

This amendment is crafted in disingenuous speak. It does not propose, as any serious amendment would, to delete clause 1 in the SNP resolution calling for an unconditional cease fire, and replace with: a conditional humanitarian cease fire based on Hamas agreeing to disarm itself (cease violence). Nor does it propose to delete clause 5 condemning collective punishment, and replace with: Israel requires assurances that the atrocities of October 7th cannot happen again. Predictably the amendment starts off by sympathising with the dire conditions of Palestinians in Rafah and it commiserates over the loss of Palestinian life, all of which should automatically lead to condemnation of the Israelis, except that the sentence concludes with the condemnation of the terrorism of Hamas, and therefore by implication Hamas rather than the Israelis are held responsible for the state of siege in Gaza.

The amendment then does that irritating imperial thing of turning the world upside down and inside out, or what is the same thing, turning the bully into the victim: “*noting that Israel cannot be expected to cease fighting if Hamas continues with violence*” So Israel is the victim, it only fights if it is attacked! Here we have a people - the Palestinians - brutally oppressed during the 1936-1939 *Uprising* by British Imperialism aided by the recently militarised Zionists, followed by the UN handing over much of their country to the Jewish settlers, followed by the Nakba in 1948 which drove Palestinians off their land and into exile (Gaza was originally ruled by Egypt) followed by intensifying discrimination, humiliation and persecution extending over three generations of Palestinians, and despite this heinous historical and enduring crime, the Labour Party upholds the right of Israel to forcibly maintain this oppression particularly and especially when any resistance is met.

The dishonesty of the Labour Party reeks as the Thames outside Parliament once did when it was an open sewer of filth. When settlers colonise a territory depriving the indigenous population of their rights, in this case the right to return, the settlers themselves forfeit all their rights. Accordingly these settlers do not have the right to defend themselves, because in reality this right turns out to be the **right to offend**, the right of the oppressor to suppress the oppressed.

Nor can the Zionists rely on the Old Testament sanctifying their right to the *holy land*. The Old Testament is a charter for ethnic cleansing and stoning. The O.T. acknowledges the Jews were not the original people of the area, having escaped from Egypt. The O.T. admits that the land now called Israel was already inhabited by a settled people, the Canaanites, who had to be ethnically cleansed. This is recounted in the Book of Joshua where god instructed his chosen to drive out the Canaanites by destroying their city of Jericho, and the edicts even included killing the Canaanite livestock less the nomadic jews become pastoral. To think there are those who waste their lives studying the O.T. line by line in the 21st Century, the century of space flight, makes for a sick miracle. That all these feudal religions are still existent in capitalist societies speaks to the alienation of private property and the machinations of the capitalist class.

Starmer and his shadow cabinet were petrified over what would happen were the SNP resolution to be brought to a vote last week. Rumours were swirling about that despite a three-line whip a number of Labour MPs would vote for the resolution. It had to be stopped and it was stopped with the help of the House Speaker Sir Lindsay Hoyle. Hoyle is a Zionist as was [his father](#) who set up the *Labour Friends of Israel*

and without any question, had Lindsay Hoyle been an anti-Zionist, he would not be a knighted Sir but a slighted Cur.

To rescue Labour from itself, Hoyle conspired with Starmer to deny the SNP its day. Starmer admitted in a now [deleted Sky interview](#) that during the morning he had consulted the Israeli President Hertzog how best to proceed. The question is whether Hoyle too conversed with Hertzog, or whether Starmer merely relayed the advice from Hertzog to Hoyle. Even if it is only the latter, it still constitutes a foreign power interfering in British Politics were it the case that both Hertzog and Starmer had reached an agreement that the SNP motion was to be stopped from going ahead by roping in Hoyle. This is more politically consequential than the narrative which actually took over, namely that Labour as the next government in waiting, had bullied Hoyle into subverting Parliament by breaking with convention and keel hauling the SNP.

Thus not only did the Labour Party avoid the embarrassment of a fractured vote against the SNP motion, but their amendment got passed by default because both the Tories and the SNP vacated parliament in protest of the Speaker's abuse of Parliament. The Labour Party was quick to grab the opportunity presented by the passing of their resolution at its first reading, to claim they were now the only party in Britain to have passed a ceasefire resolution. The Party knows full well that three out of four Brits when polled support an immediate ceasefire. No doubt in campaign leaflets dropping through letterboxes this bland claim will be made prominent to convince voters that Labour supports Palestine.

And how did the undemocratic Hoyle try and squirm out of his deception, well he blamed it all on us. It was all the pro-Palestinian demonstrator's fault. By their number, they had created a climate of fear in the country which put parliamentarians at risk. He went on to insist his abuse of parliament was motivated only by goodness and concern, driven by a desire to defuse an explosive situation (despite the fact that the [number of arrests](#) during the marches and demonstrations around the country were fewer in number than a typical music festival). Try as he could, he saw no other way. The logic was torturous, the intent clear, to deflect from the fact that Zionism had colonised parliament through using the smokescreen of threatening demonstrators. Surely Hoyle's next logical step should be to attach mezuzahs on all the door frames in Parliament to protect MPs from evil spirits, you know the ones who expose the hypocrisy and corruption of the British establishment. What a snivelling dishonest coward, all of which qualifies him to become a fellow of the [Israeli Ministry for Diaspora Affairs and Combatting Antisemitism](#).

However it seems that Islamophobia is contagious. Its new variant has re-infected the Tories as well. Sunak found himself decrying all the pro-Palestinian protests from his podium outside Downing Street on Friday, going so far as to say it was disrupting daily life in Britain. Tory after Tory has been rolled out to say the government needed to clamp down on all this unBritish activity. Are government ministers and party spokespeople simply appealing to the right in the party, are they electioneering, are they engaging in simple distraction, or is there something more in play, something deeper, something more fundamental? Why the fear? The answer is found in the streets. It is the growing anti-Zionists alliance which is seeing hundreds of thousands of white British people joining with their Muslim brothers and sisters around the country, becoming a united force which is beginning to threaten British Imperialism itself. Something which is spreading into the unions despite being blocked by the trade union bureaucracy. A force which is starting to have a degree of permanence about it, which is learning to organise, learning to mobilise. And when that happens, a political movement of resistance is more likely to be borne, one capable of checking the war-mongers, and it is this threat, this new power, that the ruling class fears and cannot tolerate.

The Rochdale by-election.

By George he did it. George Galloway and his Workers Party of Britain won the by-election gaining nearly 40% of the total vote. His winning margin was nearly 5,700 votes. In fact if we add up the total right-wing vote including the Tory and Reform vote, they barely add up to Galloway's total, which tends to diminish the fear of a resurgent right. Taking the shine of this victory was the [low turnout](#) which amount to only 39.7% of registered voters meaning only one in three adults in Rochdale decided to register and vote.

Predictably that rabid British Zionist mouthpiece which claims to represent all Jews in Britain, the [Jewish Board of Deputies](#), claimed Galloway's victory amounted to *"a dark day for the Jewish community in this country and for British politics in general."* And castigated him as someone *"who has brought the politics of division and hate to every place he has ever stood for Parliament."* Now that is Chutzpah.

To put Galloway's victory into perspective. In 2017, Labour's share of the vote in Rochdale was 58% falling to 52% in the election held in 2019. The Tory vote during those two general elections was 28 and 31% respectively showing how these two parties dominated the electoral landscape. Then they gained over 80% of the vote. This week they won less than 20% of the vote.

Of course Rochdale is exceptional given the disowning of the Green and Labour candidates by their respective Parties before the elections and Reform choosing a discredited politician. However the situation has definitely become fluid. The Tories are holed beneath the water line and Labour has the Gaza albatross on its shoulder. As an ex-advisor to Tony Blair put it: *"Labour must treat the electoral threat posed by the Workers Party of Britain as 'incredibly seriously'".* He is right.

Most polls reveal that 71% of the British population support an immediate unconditional ceasefire in Gaza which is being ignored by mainstream politicians other than the SNP and the Green Party. This figure will rise in the aftermath of the Zionists machine gunning and shelling starving Palestinians queuing for food on Thursday. The IDF account of the incident was once again risible, why do they even bother when most people don't believe a word that comes out of their mouths including growing numbers of Israelis.

George Galloway has announced that the Workers Party of Britain has already chosen 59 candidates to stand in key constituencies, those where Gaza is of deep concern. Many other parties including the newly established Transform party (or the substitute Labour Party) have been emboldened to increase the number of candidates they will be standing in the next general election.

This does not mean these candidates will beat their Labour rivals in the general election, were the main concern will be to get the Tories out. Nor can it be expected that by autumn, which is the likely date of the next election, that no ceasefire will be in place in Gaza. But it does mean that the cumulative votes of independents could be sufficiently large so as to prevent a Labour win in some seats. This will be particularly acute because turnouts are likely to be low given that Labour does not inspire voters while the Tories are repellent. It seems Labour's sedate stroll to the elections, stepping over Tory bodies, is over. What appeared to be a monumental landslide before, is no longer certain, and that must imperil Starmer's leadership.

The same is true for Biden. In the Michigan primary, protestors revolted by Biden's foreign policies particularly in Palestine, organised a protest vote, setting themselves the goal of reaching 10,000 [uncommitted votes](#), instead they got ten times as much, equal to 15% of the vote. (The Russian like non-

entities standing against Biden got even fewer votes.) The large number of uncommitted votes if repeated in the November Presidential elections, could cost Biden the state.

Israel, that spoilt out of control bastard child of imperialism is certainly making life difficult for its parents particularly the USA and the UK. Given the bad education and example the imperialists set their offspring, it was always going to be the case that when their child grew up it was going to go off the rails and become a genocidal killer. But worse for its parents, its behaviour has sparked a global movement of revulsion and opposition which is undermining imperialism itself thereby negating any gains Israel provided the West in its juvenile years. But like all parents', imperialism finds it difficult to break from its child, criticising it in public while supporting it in private.

The darker side.

The ruling class values 'rule by consent' centred on the ballot box above all else. It is the cheapest most effective way to rule because it allows the ruling class to colonize the minds of their citizens. But they are not fools. They know rule by consent requires concessions or what is the same thing rule by reward. When that is no longer possible, when concessions have to be clawed back, when the mass of society, the workers, are made poorer, rule by consent loses its appeal. The voters express their disenchantment with the system by no longer voting or they start switching their votes away from the preferred mainstream parties of the ruling class, in this case Labour and Tory in the UK, or in the USA, the Democrats and probably the Republicans.

Preparing for the day when the ballot box will no longer immobilize increasingly angry and hostile sections of society, particularly as living standards and climate standards collapse, as one crisis follows on the heels of another with the inept ruling class unable to respond adequately, so the capitalists are preparing repressive legislation. In the UK this takes the form of four recent draconian bills, the *Police, Crime, Sentencing, and Courts (PCSC) Act*, the *Public Order Bill*, the [*Covert Human Intelligence Sources \(Criminal Conduct\) Act 2021*](#), and the [*Strikes \(Minimum Service Levels\) Bill*](#). All four pieces of legislation are designed to increase the power of the state to control society and to spy on it, while reducing the political and industrial space in which to protest and make one's demands felt.

The West always boasted about the freedoms they allowed their citizens in contrast to the USSR and China, but this was always contingent on favourable objective and subjective conditions, namely the prosperity of their societies and the pacificity of their workers. That is all ending now, and the capitalists are preparing for direct rule, for the time when rule by the ballot will have to be replaced with rule by the bullet.

Conclusion.

Rochdale is a barometer measuring the growing discontent of voters. It is reminiscent of the Corbyn era fuelled by austerity, though it is now more advanced. Galloway won because his campaign had two strands, not only one, not only Gaza, as his detractors would have it. He spoke not only against the destruction of Gaza, but he also spoke out against the decay blighting Rochdale itself. Had he not addressed the decay in Rochdale, blaming it on neglect by the main parties (Rochdale Borough Council has a majority of Labour councillors), he would not have gained as many votes. Therefore, while the immediate cause may have been Gaza, it was the underlying, intolerable, and enduring conditions in Rochdale which motivated voters in the area to vote for him as well.

This is the lesson to be learnt from Rochdale. The program of the Workers Party of Britain, which will be discussed at a later date, does not offer a way forward for workers, but it does highlight that voters are becoming restless. It will force those in the Labour Party to consider whether Starmer's adoration of Zionism is becoming a liability. Whether his well publicised and equally unashamed fraternisation with big business is a vote winner. When questioned after the defeat in Rochdale, Starmer predictably imitated those dolls which in the past could only say a few select words no matter how many times their button was pressed - in this case Starmer could only boast about how he had forced needed change upon the Labour Party, and how at all times, he had acted swiftly and decisively when called upon to do so. He seems to believe that simply posturing as a strong leader will suffice. If he is left with only muscles to show off, this is because he has stripped off his clothes, his policies one by one, ending up as the naked emperor.

These boasts may come back to bite this short-fused leader, not because he is out of words, but because he is out of time, this is not 1996, but the decade of repeated crises and insurmountable challenges for capital. If he is still the leader of the Labour Party when the elections are called, therefore the next Prime Minister, he will drown politically, joining the succession of failed Prime Ministers since Johnson.

Brian Green, 1st March 2023.