

# London Swinton Circle

## *Online Magazine*

Spring 2017

### **Contents**

Minority Government	2
The Political Memoirs of Sam Swerling	5
Film Review	6
See It, Say It, Suffer It	7

## To Have, Or Not To Have, A Minority Government? That Is The Question

by Christopher Luke

Theresa May has been criticised recently for forming a Minority Government with the support of the ten Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) MPs from Northern Ireland. The Labour Party, clearly vexed by their inability to form a Minority Government/Rainbow Coalition of their own (with assistance from the DUP, Liberal Democrats, Plaid Cymru, Scottish National Party and other MPs), have been quick to denounce Madame May's coalition with the Democratic Unionist Party, yet have conveniently suppressed the fact that a previous Minority Labour Government (the Callaghan Administration of 1977-79) was kept in office with the support of Northern Ireland's Unionists until a critical vote of "No Confidence" was moved by the then Conservative Opposition in March 1979, following the "Winter of Discontent" a few months earlier.

More recently, nine Ulster Unionist Party (UUP) MPs – then led by Jim (later Lord) Molyneux – kept a then Minority Conservative Government in office, after John Major withdrew the Conservative Whip from a number of his own Euro-Sceptic backbenchers, who opposed the ratification of the Maastricht Treaty, in July 1993. Critically, the nine UUP MPs at the time supported a Government motion noting the then Conservative Government's opposition to adopting the European Social Chapter, rather than an Opposition amendment (tabled by the Labour Party) to suspend ratification of the Maastricht Treaty until HMG had also adopted the European Social Chapter, believing the Government motion to be the lesser of two evils and, were it defeated, it may well have prompted John Major to go to the country and subsequently lose a General Election to the Labour Party, which was pledged to adopt the Maastricht Treaty with the European Social Chapter.

In both of the aforementioned cases, where Northern Ireland's Unionists kept a Minority Government in office, the Union of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was maintained by Northern Ireland's largest party (which does not have, and is unlikely to ever have, any elected MPs in Great Britain) lending its support to the largest party in Great Britain (which does not have, and is unlikely to ever have, any elected MPs in Northern Ireland), in order that the latter may indeed form a Minority Government to govern the United Kingdom as a whole. The significance of this should not be forgotten amidst the current cries of "done deals" and "unholy alliances", particularly as it should not be overlooked that Northern Ireland remains the only part of the United Kingdom where, should the electorate choose to secede from the Union, successive Labour and Conservative Governments have expressed an intention to respect the wishes of the electorate, even though such as move would set in motion the disintegration of the United Kingdom as a whole.

I am not aware of any preconditions the Democratic Unionist Party may have made to Theresa May to support her current Administration under its "Confidence and Supply" arrangement, following the recent General Election, though I do know that, at the time the Ulster Unionist Party supported John Major's Administration, the nine UUP MPs committed themselves to support the Government of the day so long as it felt that the Government was governing in the best interests of the United Kingdom in general and of Northern Ireland in particular. That was historically the baseline of Ulster Unionist Party support for sustaining the life of any Minority Government (be it Labour or Conservative). There was never any formal pact, or deal struck, between John Major's Government and the then nine Ulster Unionist Party MPs, just an "understanding of stated positions", although the Major Government's decision to belatedly establish the Northern Ireland Affairs Select Committee shortly after the UUP's support for the Government motion on adopting the Maastricht Treaty (without the European Social Chapter) nevertheless led many to conclude a deal had been done.

Back in the late 1970s, the Union of the United Kingdom stood – as it does now – at a crossroads as to whether there should be no change in how it is governed (as favoured by the Conservative Party); or whether there should be a move towards devolving greater legislative powers to Belfast, Cardiff and Edinburgh (as favoured by the Labour Party); federalising the government of the United Kingdom (as favoured by the Liberals, the forerunners to the latter-day Liberal Democrats); affording Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland independence and setting in motion the disintegration of the UK (as favoured by Scottish, Welsh and Irish Nationalists); or establishing ever closer union between Northern Ireland and Great Britain (as favoured by the Ulster Unionist Party under the stewardship of Jim Molyneaux, ably assisted by his parliamentary colleague Enoch Powell).

Ironically, at the time when the then Minority Callaghan Administration sought unsuccessfully to devolve legislative powers to Scotland and Wales, it (albeit reluctantly) agreed to increase Northern Ireland's representation in the House of Commons (following Ted Heath's earlier prorogation of the then Northern Ireland Parliament) in recognition that legislative powers were unlikely to be devolved to a future Northern Ireland Assembly, without a majority of the Northern Ireland electorate agreeing to some form of power-sharing government (which was then thought inconceivable by the majority of Ulster voters). Regretfully, in doing so, the Callaghan Administration (and successive Conservative and Labour Governments) did not move to cease legislating for Northern Ireland by non-amendable Orders-in-Council as a "temporary provision" until such times as the electorate of Northern Ireland finally embraced legislative devolution (with power-sharing government) just over twenty years later.

The dynamics have changed considerably following the establishment of the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly in 1997, and the re-establishment of a devolved legislature in Northern Ireland as part of the Good Friday Agreement of 1998, as significantly a large number of unionists in Ulster now appear to accept a form of devolved government which previous generations considered to be an anathema to them, at the same time as Scottish and Welsh Nationalists continue to clamour for the devolution of further powers from the United Kingdom Parliament if neither the Conservative nor Labour Party are prepared to grant Scotland and Wales the "national" independence that they seek. Consequently, at the same time as legislative devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland has unleashed "the West Lothian Question" – whereby Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish MPs can vote on English matters at Westminster, but English MPs cannot vote on analogous matters devolved to the Scottish Parliament, Welsh and Northern Ireland Assemblies – the Conservatives have tried to address this anomaly by only allowing English MPs to vote on English laws, to the detriment of the United Kingdom Parliament's remit which is to legislate for the United Kingdom as a whole and anthropomorphise the Union of the United Kingdom of Great Britain (i.e., England, Scotland and Wales) and Northern Ireland. Whereas before 1997, the United Kingdom was largely governed as a unitary state, the constitutional vandalism of the Blair Witch Project and future administrations has, in turn, led to a more decentralised UK with increasingly fragile ties to govern, and join, the component parts of the Kingdom together as one nation. And as successive Labour and Conservative Governments blindly seek to satisfy the unquenchable thirst of Nationalist politicians by devolving more and more powers to the devolved institutions in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, so the glue which once held the United Kingdom together is rapidly becoming unstuck, as fresh demands are made for further constitutional change including the introduction of a new voting system, possible creation of an English Parliament, and either abolition or reform of the House of Lords.

We are constantly being told that there is no going back to a Pre-1997 scenario, however romantic that may be, to those (like me) who believe the United Kingdom to be a unitary state. Both the Conservative and Labour Parties – which are the two most likely to form a government in the UK Parliament – are committed not to reverse the last two decades of

legislative devolution in Scotland and Wales, and are more than ever convinced that legislative devolution (with permanent compulsory coalition government) in Northern Ireland is the only show in town insofar as the governance of Northern Ireland is concerned unless, and until, a majority of Northern Irish electors vote to become part of an All-Ireland Republic. Strange is it not, that the Labour Party and others should suddenly become so vocal in opposing what appears to be a voluntary coalition of Conservative and Democratic Unionist MPs (to enable Theresa May to form a Minority Government in the UK Parliament), when they have been, and remain, deadly silent in opposing the permanent coalition arrangements in the Executive of Northern Ireland? One could argue that the latter is arguably less accountable, less democratic and less representative of the Ulster electorate as a whole, on account of the coalition being permanent, and denying the electorate of Northern Ireland the opportunity to vote-in, and vote-out, parties who enjoy executive and legislative powers over essential services.

Against that backdrop, many Conservative Party Members appear confused over the differences between the status quo, devolution (i.e., administrative devolution and/or legislative devolution), federalism and independence/ separatism – and, in a concerted effort to appear in-touch with popular opinion, seem content to dance to the tune Nationalists (of all hues) pipe, in-spite of the Tories’ natural aversion to constitutional change, but with little or no understanding of the aims and objectives of those who ultimately seek to destroy the identity of the United Kingdom as a unitary state – a nation of unions – and not, as some have mischievously suggested, a union of nations (via, for example, the Acts of Union of 1536, 1707 and 1801, the Union of the Crowns of 1603 and the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1690), to name but a few shared common landmarks in our history.

Almost alone today, Alistair McConnachie and *A Force For Good* are championing the cause of celebrating what unites the United Kingdom as a nation and what must be done to maintain the integrity of the Kingdom from attack, be it by foe from without or, more deceitfully, traitor from within (see [www.aforceforgood.org.uk](http://www.aforceforgood.org.uk)). It would be tragedy indeed if, having secured our orderly (and long-overdue) withdrawal from the European Union, the present (or even a future) UK Government was to discover that, by increasingly surrendering to the demands of narrow nationalists in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, it had woken up to find it has precious little left to unite us as nation, to enable and empower all our people to stand tall in the much wider world beyond our shores. We – by whom I mean English, Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish people, collectively and individually – need to act fast. and arrest and reverse the rot which seeks to destroy us; by celebrating our shared culture and heritage which makes us not only one nation, but all of us equally proud to be British. To me at least, that transcends the current question of whether we should, or should not, have a Minority Government.

### **THE AUTHOR**



Christopher Luke (pictured left) was Joint-Founder & Chairman of Easington Constituency Young Conservatives from 1986 to 1988, and a Member of both the Young Monday Club and Monday Club Northern Ireland Policy Committee from 1984 to 1989. A former Secretary of Friends of Ulster, Loyal Orange Lodge 1688 (House of Commons) of the Loyal Orange Institution of England and past member of the UK Independence Party Constitutional Affairs Policy Group, he is a Past Treasurer of the London Swinton Circle (a group of Powellite Tories based in London & the Home Counties) and an Honorary Life Member of Queen’s University Belfast Ulster Unionist Association.

Comments, criticisms and suggestions on it are welcome and should be sent to Christopher Luke, Flat 5 Kirkdale House, Kirkdale Road, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Kent, TN1 2SB or e-mailed to him at [unionist1603@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:unionist1603@tiscali.co.uk).

## The Political Memoirs of Sam Swerling

### **Sam Swerling *Nation, Tradition & Liberty: - A Political Memoir (2017)***

available from all good online booksellers

The Memoir covers the period of Sam Swerling's political activities from 1966 to 2016. A long-time activist with the Conservative party he was a Conservative Councillor and Chairman of the Monday Club and also stood as a Conservative party Parliamentary candidate. He wryly comments "If I had softened my views I might have made it into Parliament"; but Sam Swerling has never compromised on conservative politics.

The Memoir is largely composed of many articles that Sam Swerling wrote at various times and on various matters; a remembrance of a time when Conservatives were able to make sustained intellectual arguments against the Left whereas today many Conservative politicians today would probably struggle going beyond a tweet, and the policies they have appear to have been generated by somebody else's Think Tank. The latter was a problem starting to occur during Sam Swerling's time. In a 1972 pamphlet *Some Uncivil Liberties*, for example, Sam Swerling warned the Greater London Young Conservatives against affiliating with the National Council for Civil Liberties (today known as Liberty).

Perhaps inevitably someone who holds "distinctive Tory nationalist opinions" would come into conflict with a Conservative party which had decided to veer to the Left. For Sam Swerling "Nation, tradition, hierarchy, charity and order should be the new watchwords of Conservatism", but the party preferred "the spineless, soft sentimentalism of a bogus compassion and 'inclusiveness' " which failed to deal with "the growing immigration problem, the mounting crisis of law and order, the increase in communist subversion" and with multiculturalism. The Conservative party's suspension of the Monday Club in 2001 was a defining moment in time, the Conservative party made it clear that it would refuse to listen to Conservative party loyalists because they held traditionalist conservative views; Sam Swerling notes the earlier rehearsal for this action during 1972/73 and the decline of the Club during the late eighties and early nineties.

While Sam Swerling would look to the example given by the Front National in France noting that the FN "had many similarities with the Monday Club" in that both were "traditionalist, patriotic movements" the Conservative party would instead swoon into the arms of David Cameron. Sam Swerling noted early on that Cameron "travels with the lightest intellectual baggage of any Conservative leader" and that he is "predisposed to political, economic and social liberalism, and is determined to move the party in that direction", a prediction which would be proved true.

The book concludes with that "marvellous day for all who believe in freedom" the referendum result whereby the British people made it know that they wished to leave the European Union. But it is no longer the European Union which is the main threat to our liberty and way of life. At the book launch at the Old Kings Head, Borough High Street on March 24<sup>th</sup> Sam Swerling suggested: "We are now at war with sections of Islam. We need an Emergency Powers Act with a Minister for Internal Security", referring to the legislation passed in 1939 at the beginning of the Second World War. Sam Swerling called for the internment of many on the MI5 watch list, people who had come to attention before but were not on the current radar for whatever reason like the perpetrator of the recent attack, Khalid Masood. He proclaimed that "Present strategies are ineffective and need to be changed" and in essence that has been Mr Swerling's refrain throughout his political life.

## Film Review – The Promise

by Allan Robertson

Not to be confused with the 2011 Channel Four drama, also known as The Promise, set later in the 20th Century in Palestine. Different conflict. Sadly the new film about the Turkish massacres of the poor old Armenians has only been moderately reviewed. The reviewers seem mainly to object to it because there is a love triangle or quadrangle in the film, thinking this is a modern Hollywood obsession or invention. As it happens, this film was funded by an Armenian billionaire (Kirk Kerkorian) as an Independent film. It also has a really good cast. Dr Zhivago (1965) also had a love triangle, the film certainly did not suffer as a result. Indeed the 2002 of Dr Zhivago remake augmented the triangle with some new really good (of an explanatory nature, not of a sexual nature) triangle scenes. So triangles and quadrangles are good so far as this reviewer is concerned.

The film starts in Armenia in 1914 and follows Michael (Oscar Isaac), a man working in an apothecary, who dreams of becoming a doctor. But to afford the fees, he gets betrothed to a local woman and uses the dowry to go to school in Constantinople. Once he arrives, he quickly falls for Ana (Charlotte Le Bon) but she is already in a relationship. Her boyfriend is Chris (Christian Bale), an American journalist reporting on the growing tensions between Turkey and its Armenian population. As Michael and Ana get closer (Ana is not happy with Chris's boorish public behaviour, though he is a brave and public spirited journalist), war breaks out on 29 October 2014 (for Turkey, not the UK) and the three find themselves in the middle of a terrifying situation.

Thereafter the film is terrifying right throughout without a break. The happy scenes in Constantinople of insulting German officers & Turkish would - be mass murderers at parties on the Bosphorus, fumbling about dissecting corpses in Medical school, or having drinks with the lovely Ana (Charlotte Le Bon) become a distant memory, another lifetime, 10,000 years before.

One character who deserves special mention is Emre (Marwan Kenari). Unlike his high ranking and homicidally and genocidally inclined father, he was not a fanatical Turkish nationalist. His father forces him out of medical school into the Army. Personally I think he is a bit of a play boy but with a good heart. He does Michael quite a few favours as well as Chris. It is he who phones US Ambassador Henry Morgenthau (played by the excellent James Cromwell) Morgenthau's son was Roosevelt's Secretary for the Treasury during WW2) alert him to Chris's capture and his imminent execution at Army HQ. Turkish intelligence must have been listening into the phone call. Chris (Christian Bale) was released to be deported as Ambassador Morgenthau intervened but Emre faced a Turkish Army Fire Squad. Dressed only in a white shirt and trousers (his uniform and boots removed) he faced death bravely.

## See it, Say it, Suffer it

by Arthur St Hugh

Those of you who love barbarians and sometimes praise them, in a way worthy of condemnation, give thought to their name and understand their ways. Surely there is no name by which they could be appropriately called other than 'barbarian', a fitting word connoting savageness, cruelty and terror? However many may be the gifts with which you befriend them and however many the acts of compliance with which you placate them, they can think of nothing other than looking on the Romans with envy, and, to the extent that things turn out in accordance with their will, it is their constant desire to darken the brightness and nobility of the Roman name. They desire not a single one of the Romans to live. And in cases where it is known that they have spared their subjects until now, they spare them for to use as slaves: for they have never loved a single Roman.

Victor of Vita *Historia Persecutionis Africanae Provinciae* § 62  
(John Moorhead translation 1992)

What was as shocking as the Muslim terrorist attack at the Manchester Arena was the reaction of the political elite: the stock phrases of condemnation and stage tears of sympathy as if it were an unfortunate but natural occurrence for which they were in no way responsible. The killing of our folk was presented as a *representation of terrorism*, a carefully controlled image separated from context to comply with the official political discourse which declares terrorists to be separate from their community. The attack was beyond what can ever be tolerated and yet it was implicitly *politically acceptable*, and could not be otherwise lest the masses should think that something was wrong. Fortunately for Theresa May the masses proved as indifferent as ever. Negligence and apathy is what unites the United Kingdom.

That these terrorist attacks are not isolated events and are part of a larger pattern of behaviour is not itself the concern of the ruling elite, rather their concern is that the people should become conscious of what is happening. In Britain's 'fear society' it is difficult for people to feel confident to publicly question the ruling elite's love of Muslim migrants and corresponding disregard for the welfare of the British people. The mainstream parties seek conformity, and they expect the masses to self-enforce it. Twitter, and the media's selective use of twitter comments, has proved quite effective in creating a consensus acceptable to the establishment.

One individual who often chooses not to conform on various issues is Morrissey. In his [facebook posting of 23 May](#) Morrissey pithily criticised the political management of the event; it deserves to be quoted in full:

Celebrating my birthday in Manchester as news of the Manchester Arena bomb broke.  
The anger is monumental.

For what reason will this ever stop?

Theresa May says such attacks "will not break us", but her own life is lived in a bullet-proof bubble, and she evidently does not need to identify any young people today in Manchester morgues. Also, "will not break us" means that the tragedy will not break her, or her policies on immigration. The young people of Manchester are already broken - thanks all the same, Theresa. Sadiq Khan says "London is united with Manchester", but he does not condemn Islamic State - who have claimed responsibility for the bomb. The Queen receives absurd praise for her 'strong words' against the attack, yet she does not cancel today's garden party at Buckingham Palace - for which no criticism is allowed in

the Britain of free press. Manchester mayor Andy Burnham says the attack is the work of an "extremist". An extreme what? An extreme rabbit?

In modern Britain everyone seems petrified to officially say what we all say in private. Politicians tell us they are unafraid, but they are never the victims. How easy to be unafraid when one is protected from the line of fire. The people have no such protections.

*The Guardian*, the mouthpiece of the establishment, offered a suitably soviet-esque rebuke of Morrissey's crimethink:

The claim that politically correct leaders routinely refuse to mention Islam when referring to terror attacks carried out by people holding a violent interpretation of the religion is common on the far-right. In recent years, many politicians have acknowledged the role of such an ideology once it has been confirmed, while also stressing that it is alien to the vast majority of the religion's adherents<sup>1</sup>.

It is a false, and dangerous, conception that extremists are a race apart, that they are a parallel entity only tangentially connected to the moderates, though they may well be a minority. An extremist simply holds an exaggerated version of the belief of the moderate. That exaggeration may be a distortion or a perversion of what the moderate holds to be true, but only while the moderate determines what is true. Should the extremist be in a position to determine what is true then it is the moderate who is judged to hold a mistaken view - which is what is occurring in the area under ISIS misrule.

At the Cheltenham Science Festival in June Richard Dawkins stated that "it's quite apparent that at present the most evil religion in the world has to be Islam."<sup>2</sup> Apparent that is to everyone but the mainstream political parties and *The Guardian*.

Nietzsche proposed that "The evil acts at which we are now most indignant rest on the error that he who perpetrates them against us possesses free will, that is to say, that he could have *chosen* not to cause us this harm."<sup>3</sup> Does the Muslim terrorist, his mind aflame with jihadist Islam, have any other choice but to strike against those not so enslaved? Equally, do the mainstream politicians, their minds in meltdown with globalisation, have any other choice but to implement mass immigration even though it is the conduit for Islamic terrorism?

For if Islam is evil as Dawkins contends, are not those who sponsor it also by extension evil? - that is, the Conservative Party, the Labour Party, and the other mainstream parties? Ultimately the victims of the Manchester Arena terrorist were the victims of the immigration policies of the Conservatives and other Westminster politicians. For Muslim extremists are not here by accident or chance, they are here because the Conservative and Labour parties deliberately gave over the UK to colonisation by Muslims. Conservative and Labour politicians could argue that they wanted Britain colonised by moderate Muslims rather than extremists, but when you are colonised you get the whole population, the good and the bad, those who hold the moderate opinion and also those who hold the extremist opinion.

What is the response of the mainstream parties to Muslim terrorism? They want to bring in thousands more Muslim immigrants to replace the terrorists who have been killed. What is the response of the mainstream parties to the victims of Muslim terrorism? They want to bring in tens of thousands more Muslim immigrants to replace the Britons who have been killed. It is the response of those who lack the free will to make a choice that would not cause us harm. It might be accepted that the "vast majority" will not be extremists and

---

<sup>1</sup> Morrissey attacks politicians and the Queen over Manchester terrorism response [The Guardian 23 May 2017](#)

<sup>2</sup> Richard Dawkins: Islam Is 'the Most Evil Religion in the World' [Breitbart News 15 June 2017](#)

<sup>3</sup> *Human All Too Human* On the History of Moral Sensations §99

terrorists but in accepting mass immigration you wilfully also accept a proportion who are, or who will be, extremists and terrorists.

What there is not is punishment, even though Muslims comprehend - and expect - punishment as the legitimate response. Tarique Ghaffur, a Muslim former police chief, proposed internment<sup>4</sup>. But that measure would swiftly be made impractical as the Conservative Party is committed to importing ever more Muslim terrorists. Executions, which is how Muslim countries deal with Muslim terrorists, is simply unthinkable to the appeasement-prone liberal establishment.

Anything less than punishment of terrorists and their accomplices is a passive endorsement of terrorism. By not punishing the Government gives a clear signal to Muslim extremists that terrorism is permissible. It can be imagined there is a point at which terrorism would not be tolerated, but what is it, is it a hundred victims a year, a hundred victims every month, a hundred victims every week? Or a much, much larger number? The Government will not say what the upper limit of acceptable number of victims from terrorism is, but we all know from experience that it is not zero. So the Government is in effect giving Muslim extremists *carte blanche* to engage in terrorism up to that theoretical upper limit - is that not evil?

Muslim moderates will not be motivated to do anything about the Muslim extremists in their community while they continue to see the Government not punishing the Muslim community for the Muslim terror attacks; after all, when the Government appeases the Muslims it is the moderate majority who benefit. Islamic terrorism has become as politically acceptable for them as it is for the youthful voters for Jeremy Corbyn.

Apologist for terrorism Jeremy Corbyn believes, and he is not alone, that Muslim extremism is somehow due to Westminster's current foreign policy, yet in most cases the ideological origins of Muslim extremism are decades old as detailed for example in Innes Bowen's *Medina in Birmingham, Najaf in Brent: Inside British Islam* (2014). And, of course, the concept of jihad predates Jeremy Corbyn by several centuries.

Likewise, it would be wrong to suggest Muslim terrorism is in any way comparable to IRA terrorism. The aim of the IRA is regime change in the six remaining free counties of Ireland not the colonisation of the British Isles. There are only a few million people in Ireland, there are well over 300 million people across the northern Indian sub-continent, and about 100 million people in Northern Africa - and neither the Conservatives nor Labour has put a limit on how many millions of them can settle in the British Isles.

We cannot resolve the ideological causes of Muslim extremism because their origins lie within their homelands (their centre) not within the Muslim colonies in the UK and Western Europe (their periphery). Innes Bowen in her *Medina in Birmingham, Najaf in Brent: Inside British Islam* details the origins of, for example, Jamaat-e-Islami and the Deobandi movement principally in what became Pakistan. Wahhabism originated in what is now Saudi Arabia. Yet the Conservative party is to waste millions of taxpayers' money on pretending they can resolve it. Imagine if in the last century the Government had spent millions of taxpayers' money on having a chat about the greatness of capitalist democracy with members of the Communist Party of Great Britain in the hope that would cause the USSR and People's Republic of China to cease being communist. It is the equivalent of throwing money down a wishing well, except it is an awful lot of the people's money that the Government is throwing away and neither the Conservatives nor Labour are wishing the Muslim problem away.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ex-Met chief calls for internment camps for 3,000 extremists [Mail on Sunday 27 May 2017](#)

It seems we can expect no solution from the increasingly pointless British armed forces. Terrorism is unconventional warfare, it is being waged against the British and yet the British armed forces who are supposedly there to defend us simply will not engage the enemy. Billions of pounds are spent on NATO yet NATO fails to protect us from Muslim terrorism; Britain deploys troops in Estonia yet that is not where British citizens are being killed by Muslim terrorists. Lee Rigby was killed outside a barracks but where were the soldiers, why did they not rush out and if too late at least exact retribution? As Balfour told King Edward VII: "A soldier who invariably believes that the enemies of his country is right, is seriously handicapped in the discharge of his proper duties"<sup>5</sup>.

As we cannot resolve the problem of the ideology of Muslim extremism, the best we could do is decolonise the UK and Western Europe. Communism did cease in Russia, and communism was the extremist version of that capitalist-friendly version of socialism we were used to in Britain. Communism withered away because it failed to take over the world. It is extremely likely that Muslim extremism will abate when Islam fails to take over the world; unfortunately, it is the mass immigration policy of the West which fuels the belief that it can. It is then not Westminster's foreign policy which incites Muslims to extremism but its immigration policy which invites it.

We can all see the problem is Muslim colonisation; we can all say the problem is Muslim colonisation; but until the agents for the colonisers are removed from power the problem will not be sorted.

In response to the Manchester Arena slaughter Katie Hopkins tweeted on 23 May 2017:

"Western men. These are your wives. Your daughters. Your sons. Rise up. Demand action. Do not carry on as normal. Cowed."

Semantically her last word blocks the preceding exhortation, but does that not correctly illustrate the psychological problem of Western men, that they are oppressed and so cannot act? He who cannot act is condemned to suffer the actions of those that can act.

\*

---

<sup>5</sup> In 1902 referring to General Sir William Butler's position with regard to Egypt and South Africa at the end of the nineteenth century; quoted in R.R. James *The British Revolution 1880-1939* (1977) p188