

# London Swinton Circle

## *Online Magazine*

Autumn 2019

### **Contents**

Let the Work of Change Commence	2
Conservative Party Manifesto 2019	3
un/real information	5
Online Harms	8
The Challenge of Extremism	10
What it means to be British	14

## Let the Work of Change Commence

By Allan Robertson, Chairman of the London Swinton Circle

With a Conservative Majority of 80, we could at last pass some seemingly controversial legislation.

What do we need:-

- Legislation passed that allows a Grammar school in every town in the UK, if not there already. The expansion of Grammar schools has been supported by Conservatives for a very long time but not a lot could be done to implement the commitment. The British Empire to be praised in schools – not excoriated.
- The BBC licence fee decriminalised – there are some BBC services that I am willing to pay for but do not wish to be compelled to pay for.
- Update and modernise the Treason Act so that those UK ‘citizens’ working for foreign terrorist organisations can be prosecuted and be severely punished
- Restore internment and intern all the released terrorists from the past decade (was there not 78 already released on licence?). The recent events on London Bridge at the end of November cannot be allowed to happen again with those known and already under “supervision” (tag) committing further offences. However, we commend the Police for shooting dead the terrorist who attacked conference attendees in Fishmongers’ Hall where he was a conference ‘guest’.
- Repeal the Human Rights Act
- Ensure that UK lower courts are not subject to the dictates of the European Court of Justice
- Remove the right of British citizens to take cases to the European Court of Human Rights.
- The UK Parliament must assert for itself the right to determine the citizenship rights of Expatriates living in European countries and not the European Court of Justice (eg: Brexpat – Hear Our Voice, a case on behalf of 5 expats in the Netherlands 2018)
- Increase the number of Type 45 Naval warships from 6 to 12, as was originally supposed to be the case back in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, when the Labour Government decided to renege on that particular commitment, however, the six existing Type 45s need to be first free of the crippling engine problems that have hitherto bedevilled their service so far
- Repeal legislation that Westminster passed earlier this year imposing single sex marriage and abortion on Ulster, returning this matter to the Northern Ireland Assembly
- Create a Department of the Union with a powerful secretary of State to promote the maintenance of the British Union. The rising tide of Scottish nationalism has led to demands for a second independence referendum. The last one was only in 2014. Hardly a once in a generation time frame. However, these ridiculous demands need to be faced down. However, we need to make a positive case for the union, we need to be bringing up relevant Historical examples from the past and at the same be looking forward to the future. It should never be complacent. Britishness needs to be emphasised and promoted at all times, every day.
- Abolish the Parades Commission in Northern Ireland, returning the issue of parading permissions to the local Police Commander and the local authority
- Introduce an Academic freedom and Free Speech on Campus Bill that would establish beyond doubt in law that the rights of free speech and academic freedom are UNFETTERED by whether or not some individuals may find the ideas and opinions expressed unwelcome, disagreeable or even deeply offensive. Establish an

Academic freedom code of practice, an academic's freedom covers all his work, including speaking engagements, not merely peer reviewed papers

- Abolish the Fixed Term Parliament Act. It led to paralysis at a time when the UK needed decisive action. The decision to call a General Election rests with the Sovereign, acting through her Prime Minister. The decision should not be justiciable.
- Affirm that Prisoners are not allowed to vote, including those released on parole, on a tag or temporary release
- The Government should also introduce legislation to provide particular protection to UK forces who served in Northern Ireland. The legislation should prohibit investigations or prosecutions of past incidents that have already been investigated unless and until the investigating and prosecuting authorities can persuade a court that compelling new evidence has arisen and that further investigation and/or prosecution would be in the interests of justice. The prosecution would have to be agreed by the Attorney General for England and Wales.

### Conservative Party Manifesto 2019

The Conservative Party's election victory can be taken perhaps (understandably we still have doubts) as, at last, a step towards Brexit. Boris Johnson's slogan "Get Brexit Done" perhaps more than anything else has given the Conservative Party a victory which they did not otherwise deserve considering their previous party leaders.

But all Brexit can be is an opportunity. It could be the opportunity to take a long road that ultimately leads to freedom and independence from the rest of the international superstructure, we are after all still ensnared in the Council of Europe, NATO, the ILO and the UN. There will be many in the political élite who do not want us to take the journey, and it is not impossible that our destiny will again be thwarted by the internationalists. Brexit could be the opportunity to restore links and ultimately ever closer union with our sister states of Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Likewise, there will be many in the political élite who do not want this, preferring instead 'regional unions' rather than national unions. We cannot forget that 26 counties of the British Isles still remain under foreign domination. Rather than talk about borders there should instead be talk of co-operation and reconciliation. We must support the Southern Irish in leaving the EU as the first step on the road to the reunification of our fatherland. A long road to travel, but the end will justify the arduous journey. What Boris Johnson makes of Brexit, if anything, will unfold in due course.

But though the country and its media might have thought otherwise over the last three years there is more to politics than just Brexit. In the Conservative Party Manifesto 2019 Boris Johnson offers policies which he guarantees to implement. While funding for the NHS and for "science, schools, apprenticeships and infrastructure" is largely uncontroversial some other points are made which need to be scrutinised.

- "20,000 more police and tougher sentencing for criminals."

After austerity cut police and closed police stations this seems a bit of a reversal. What is the point of more police if criminals are not actually punished? What does 'tougher' sentencing actually mean, does it simply mean terrorists like Usman Khan getting an extra week inside? The Conservatives meekly say they will "update the Human Rights Act" when they should abolish it and restore the death penalty.

- The Conservatives remain the party of not punishing criminals.

- “An Australian-style points-based system to control immigration.”

This sounds like something being done about immigration but is nothing of the sort, it is merely regulation. The Conservatives are doing nothing about non-working immigrants who are already here; why are these not being migrated? The Conservatives support “a memorial recognising the contribution of the Windrush Generation”, but absolutely nothing for the victims of immigration in places like Rotherham and many other cities across our country. They boast of building at “least a million more homes” without indicating that one of the drivers for more housing is more immigrants. How are the Conservatives going to protect the Green Belt when they are allowing ever more settlement from overseas? The Conservatives claim they will tackle some of the abuses of immigration which they themselves have allowed and tolerated for years and which has been paid for with British taxpayers’ money, but no restitution is offered to the British taxpayer.

➤ The Conservatives remain the party of mass immigration.

- “We will not raise the rate of income tax, VAT or National Insurance.”

But why are they not cutting tax? Why is VAT not being looked at: if adopting an Australian-style points-based immigration system why not adopt an Australian-style Goods and Service Tax; or abolish VAT altogether to bring us into line with Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands? Or, why not impose a tariff on goods and services from the EU to try and recuperate our losses incurred from being under their misrule? Obviously, the issue is what are the taxes being used for. Filling potholes obviously. But why spend taxpayers’ money on, for example, addressing “ethnic disparities in youth unemployment”<sup>1</sup>, and on “integration plans”<sup>2</sup> for non-assimilable migrants, rather than migrating them? The failure to tackle immigration is one, but admittedly not the only one, underlying factor for not cutting taxation. Another factor is out-of-date alliances; why are we still wasting money on NATO when it does not protect us from terrorism? Another underlying factor is the commitment to internationalism. The UK is one of the top funders of the UN, even though there is no democratic mandate for our government to spend one penny on it; if we are to continue with it we should cut our funding down to a level comparable to that of Russia for example, or at the very least follow Spain’s example and make some reduction.

➤ The Conservatives remain the party of high taxation.

The Manifesto, being also a Unionist manifesto, states that the Conservatives will “Strengthen our Union”. However, it refers to our country being composed of “four nations”. As Alistair McConnachie has always reminded the Swinton Circle<sup>3</sup>, ours is one nation. It should be one unitary state, though that position has been undermined by the ‘Unionist’ Conservative Party. The devolutionist Conservative Party is confusing the words nations and states. Whatever the argument about terminology, the fact is Northern Ireland is not and never has been a ‘historical nation’ (other than part of it being part of the Dalriada, the first state to provide a unifying link between our two main islands). Ireland is the historical fourth part which forms our country . Northern Ireland is an administrative creation, it is a devolved part of Ireland, the southern administration of which is currently in abeyance. The Manifesto rightly recognises the disaster of SNP administration – or “government” as the ‘Unionist’ Conservatives call it, again indicating they do not adhere to the UK as a unitary state. The

<sup>1</sup> [PM announces £90m to address ethnic inequalities in youth unemployment](#)

<sup>2</sup> [Five councils to help with Government integration plan](#)

<sup>3</sup> [One UK: The British Union from 30 First Principles](#)

Manifesto rejects the SNP's calls for another false-independence referendum, but the Conservatives must be held to this.

After David Cameron and Theresa May it is understandable that many will continue to be sceptical about the Conservatives. Certainly, based on the Manifesto there is nothing to show that the Conservatives intend to move away radically from their previous position, other than, possibly, with regard to the EU. The Manifesto recognises that the Conservatives must "start the necessary task of restoring public trust in government and politics", as belief in democracy and parliament was undermined by the Remainers.

The Conservatives' Manifesto is not a manifesto for the future it is only for the present. The best that can be hoped for at the moment is stability.

## un/real information

By Arthur St Hugh

The Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee published its final report on [Disinformation and 'Fake News'](#) in February 2019, to which the Government [responded](#) in May 2019.

It can be agreed from the outset that there should be greater regulation of the internet, and that there should be promotion of "digital literacy" but otherwise the whole exercise that has been undertaken is flawed. Objectivity exists only in mathematics not in politics. Rather than contemplate the facts politicians endlessly interpret things and make claims and gossip and label each other and generally 'talk rubbish'. Incredibly, the Government believes in something called "fact-based political debate", which if ever implemented would leave Parliament largely silent. For an approximation of objectivity in politics we need a patriarchal government, which would make authoritative statements to be accepted without discussion or dissent.

Their concern is with the new techniques of manipulation. Manipulation of the masses is an intrinsic part of democracy, but new technology means how that is done and by whom has changed. The fear of fake news and disinformation is because we have a weak, non-authoritarian, government and it may be that other governments and political actors are better able to manipulate the masses of this country than Westminster can.

Fake news is rapidly discarded from consideration by the Committee, allegedly over definition. With reference to Donald Trump's use of the phrase they comment that " 'fake news' has been used to describe content that a reader might dislike or disagree with".

For the Committee then, whether the content is fact or fake is irrelevant if the reader dislikes or disagrees with it. It is literally irrelevant because the reader rejects it; but one would have thought it must be of some concern if people are rejecting content which is truthful. But then that leaves content which a reader does like and agrees with, but which could still be fact as much as fake; curiously, the Committee and the Government does not make it clear that they may be proclaiming content as disinformation which might be truthful.

Rather than fake news there is instead the Government's definition: "the deliberate creation and sharing of false and/or manipulated information that is intended to deceive and mislead audiences, either for the purposes of causing harm, or for political, personal or financial gain". Note the "and/or manipulated information", the information might be fact rather than fake but it is how it is being used that is of concern.

Traditional media is something tangible within reach of the Government. Online media, however, may originate from anyone and from anywhere. A weak Government cannot influence it, but it can influence the electorate because the electorate has access to it. As people move away from traditional media to online sources where potentially more information can be found, where less time might be invested in choosing a news outlet and where there is more acceptance of transient and unknown sources, and also where more time is spent on social media where, as with politics, one does not contemplate facts but where one endlessly interpret things and make claims and gossip and label each other and generally 'talk rubbish', a problem is created for a liberal Government reluctant to use regulation or restriction.

What is undeniably of real concern (as opposed to fake concern) is "the use of 'deepfakes', audio and videos that look and sound like a real person, saying something that that person has never said". This should be regarded as straightforward fraud and deception, and criminals are undoubtedly investing in this as another way to rob people of their money. The other investors in fraud and deception are, of course, the politicians. Politicians could resort to the accusation of 'deepfakes' to deny recordings of the election promises and guarantees which they have subsequently disowned upon election, or, they will create 'deepfakes' themselves to rewrite the past to support the present as per Orwell's *1984*.

One way of dealing with those that create or support disinformation is to make them responsible for it, with prohibitive fines as necessary, and to a certain extent the Government agrees that: "the independent regulator should have the ability to launch legal proceedings against them, with the prospect of large fines being administered". But will political disinformation be treated in the same way? Will Sinn Fein be fined for claiming that there is any other form of true government in and for Ireland other than that of Her Majesty's? Will the SNP be fined for talking about independence when they actually mean 'dependency of the EU'? Will the *Morning Star* and the *Socialist Worker* be fined for claiming the Conservatives are Tories and right-wing? One suspects that the Left will be allowed to continue to "deceive and mislead audiences" unchallenged. When "The Government acknowledges the potential threat to democracy posed by disinformation" then, that does not necessarily mean the same as a 'potential threat to the British Government', rather it can be inferred that what is meant is a threat to the internationalist régime of which the Government at Westminster is a subsidiary.

An issue is that "social media companies and search engines use algorithms, or sequences of instructions, to personalise news and other content for users" which may be helpful or a nuisance depending on your requirements. A problem that is identified is that of Mark Zuckerberg and Facebook. "Facebook seems willing neither to be regulated nor scrutinised... Facebook has continually hidden behind obfuscation... Mark Zuckerberg has shown contempt towards both the UK Parliament and the 'International Grand Committee', involving members from nine legislatures from around the world". So why not block Facebook? Iran and China do so, we could do too. If it cannot be regulated then restricting access to it should be the next step.

The bogeyman of the day is something called Artificial Intelligence (AI). Originally a term to describe a theoretical mechanical mind, it now seems to have been downgraded to the status of a type of computer program. AI is being used to influence individual voters. Unsurprisingly, this is regarded with some favour in the EU. The Your Vote Matters project, which is "funded by the European Union's Justice Programme (2014-2020) / Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (2014-2020)"<sup>1</sup> helps match voters to candidates<sup>2</sup>. As its advert joyfully proclaims "Play the game and see which politicians, national parties and EU political

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://yourvotematters.eu/en>, About YourVoteMatters.eu <https://dittval2019.se/sk/page/about-electio2019-eu>

<sup>2</sup> BBC [How Robots Are Coming For Your Vote](#)

groups match your own views". And we all can agree that democracy is a game, and not just in the EU. Needless to say, the World Economic Forum also looks favourably on AI 'suggesting' to the voter who to vote for<sup>3</sup>. Those who manipulate the game are investing in the new tools to do so.

The herd must be led. Should we condemn rather than applaud modern technology if it can be used to move the sheep into a pen more efficiently? The only question we should have is, does it work? Whoever is selling AI must presumably be able to back-up their sales brief.

Certainly, the Committee and the Government believes it works. "The work of AIQ highlights the fact that data has been and is still being used extensively by private companies to target people, often in a political context, in order to influence their decisions. It is far more common than people think." The very idea that AIQ and Cambridge Analytica might have tried to persuade voters to consider Brexit - though there was nothing that they could do to make people actually vote - was clearly unacceptable to the pro-EU politicians. However, the principle is accepted; AI could be used for sinister purposes rather than for promoting something in the interest of the British. But could AI ever be worse than democracy where political parties can be used for sinister purposes rather than for acting in the interests of the nation? Remainder politicians were not being operated by a computer program.

What is the difference between AI generated information or disinformation and traditional leaflets, posters, and very occasionally a politician making a speech? The Committee's concern was with regard to the use of personal data to select the recipients of the political adverts, but if the data is being used to select those who are likely to be receptive then it is merely a more efficient way of targeting those who were already inclined to vote that way anyway. Can it be demonstrated that it could persuade those who would not be inclined to vote that way to vote that way? It is the ideas of Gustave Le Bon and Edward Bernays but in cyberspace. There is an issue of unfairness it is true, in that those with the AI can bombard their likely voters while those who do not have it cannot; but the question still stands, does it actually affect the voting in practice? Obviously, it can never be proven scientifically because it is not possible to run the same election multiple times but under different conditions to test the effect.

When considering the use of technology by certain foreign countries there is an outbreak of hysteria. "The speed of technological development has coincided with a crisis of confidence in institutions and the media in the West. This has enabled foreign countries intent on destabilising democratic institutions to take advantage of this crisis." The Committee claims there has been "clear and proven Russian influence in foreign elections", though if there has been they have not done very well in destabilising our democratic institutions, as the House of Commons is, alas, still with us. The Government states however, no doubt to the annoyance of the Remainers, that "There is no evidence of successful foreign interference in UK democratic processes, this includes the 2016 referendum and the 2017 general election." The Committee presumably regards this as fake news for it feverishly demands that "The Government should be conducting analysis to understand the extent of Russian targeting of voters during elections."

Foreign governments influencing our politics is nothing new, it is as old as our democracy itself. If democracy is prone to foreign influence why single out Russia? By what criteria can Russia be considered a worse influence than the US and the EU? Apparently, the answer is because the "Kremlin-aligned media" had "a clear anti-EU bias" - but it is in our national interest to be anti-EU ! The left-wing MPs of the Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee obviously felt otherwise, not least it's Chairman, the anti-Brexit Damian Collins, which

---

<sup>3</sup> World Economic Forum [Would you let an AI vote for you?](#)

immediately raises the question of whether they themselves were influenced by “hostile state actors”.

“Ukraine is a country where the UK Ministry of Defence and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office have a deep interest in safeguarding its national security in the face of Russian aggression.” This is a shocking statement. Besides the fact that it deliberately leaves out the US and EU whose imperialist “interest” this actually is – we can argue whether that omission constitutes misinformation or disinformation – what actual interest can the UK have there? By rights, Ukraine and Russia should be part of one state; just because Little Englanders do not believe in a United Kingdom or in a Greater Britain of the UK and the Dominions that does not mean they should project their disintegrationist views onto other countries. Those that spread fake news about ‘Russian aggression’ might well be receptive to Sinn Fein and their disinformation about ‘British aggression’.

The fact of the matter is that an internationalist democracy is open to influence by literally anyone. The idea that ‘British’ democracy should only be abused and exploited by certain countries is a perverse idea to uphold while at the same time promoting the idea of an open and inclusive democracy. The democratic politicians accept without question the colonisation of our politics as being normal but now protest over who can be a member of the gang in the gang rape of our country. The public must consider whether the demonising of one country might in fact be due to the malign influence of another country. If we do not want such influences then we must put an end to internationalism and democracy because regulation will never work.

The Government’s own proposals are given in the Online Harms White Paper, which is considered below.

## Online Harms

The government released a [White Paper](#) in April 2019 on proposals to tackle something it calls “online harms” (a phrase which grates on the English ear) which is a general cover term for a variety of activity on the internet ranging from that which is criminal to that which is not so, which is claimed that the public regard as harmful. The government is claiming it is responding to the public’s concern that there is harmful material on the internet, it is not stating that the government considers, for example, “child sexual abuse material” wrong as a matter of principle because that would be illiberal. A problem for the government is that the public are clearly concerned about personal data collection yet the “digital economy” and government surveillance requires such collection.

Every government has the right to censor, on ideological and on moral grounds. The government proclaims it is acting in accordance with the first of those, to protect its “democratic values”, but makes no reference to any moral reasoning, instead, as one might expect of materialists, its secondary claim to censorship is around concerns about the trust in the “digital economy”.

The government wants to make it more difficult for terrorists and paedophiles to use the internet, but unfortunately the measures proposed are not as a supplement to the government otherwise dealing with terrorists and paedophiles. Perhaps then it is not actually terrorists and paedophiles that it is concerned about. This seems to be borne about by one of the identified issues:

There is also a real danger that hostile actors use online disinformation to undermine our democratic values and principles. Social media platforms use algorithms which can lead to 'echo chambers' or 'filter bubbles', where a user is presented with only one type of content instead of seeing a range of voices and opinions. This can promote disinformation by ensuring that users do not see rebuttals or other sources that may disagree and can also mean that users perceive a story to be far more widely believed than it really is.

So rather than see the punishment of terrorists and paedophiles what we see is an awareness that "hostile actors" might seek to influence elections through the internet, rather than through politicians and newspapers as they traditionally used to do. The difference, then, is that this "hostile foreign state activity" is targeting the electors rather than the elected. But would that have any real effect? If the elector in Britain has the choice between three internationalists, one with a blue rosette, one with a red, and one with a yellow, or yellow and black in Scotland, then receiving "disinformation" about one of them so they vote for one of the others is not going to make any real difference. And what of the politicians themselves who are promoting "disinformation"? Apparently

The government is particularly worried about disinformation (information which is created or disseminated with the deliberate intent to mislead; this could be to cause harm, or for personal, political or financial gain).

Yet what action will the government take about those who spread "disinformation" such as Remainers, Sinn Fein and SNP?

Government regulation of the internet should be supported as part of a general policy of dealing with terrorists and paedophiles, but there is no general policy. Terrorists and paedophiles should be punished, irrespective of whether they use the internet or not. It seems that so long as terrorists and paedophiles do not interfere with the online economy they will not be punished. We are all aware of the government's lax attitude toward punishing criminals. It is therefore not surprising to learn prisoners are uploading material to the internet. The White Paper states

Prisoners openly uploading content from prisons can also undermine public confidence in the prison service

- though one might add, perhaps not as much as early releases or voting for prisoners<sup>1</sup>.

The fear that Britons will naturally have under intolerant liberal democracy is that the government will use this measure not to defend us but to suppress us.

Our society is built on confidence in public institutions, trust in electoral processes, a robust, lively and plural media, and hard-won democratic freedoms that allow different voices, views and opinions to freely and peacefully contribute to public discourse.

It will be questioned whether we can all "freely" air "views and opinions", it will be recognised that a "plural" media is not the same as a patriotic media, and it is accepted that confidence in the public institution at Westminster has been undermined by the vast numbers of MPs refusing to recognise the result of the referendum and take our country out of the EU.

The White Paper claims, based on what evidence is not known, that

The Russian State is a major source of disinformation. The Kremlin has used disinformation to obfuscate and confuse audiences around their illegal annexation of Crimea, intervention in eastern Ukraine and the shooting down of Malaysian Airlines flight MH17

To claim there is any illegality in relation to actions in Crimea and Ukraine is itself disinformation. Russia, Crimea and Ukraine are part of, or should be part of, one national community 'All the Russias' (being Great Russia, New Russia, and Little Russia) just as, for example, the British Isles, Canada, Australia are part of, or should be part of, one national community, 'Greater Britain'. It would, obviously, be preferable if the monarchy was restored in All the Russias: monarchy unites whereas republicanism divides. Why does the White Paper not condemn as illegal the actions of the EU in interfering in the Ukraine? Obviously a government is at liberty to determine who its friends are and who its enemies are, but it

---

<sup>1</sup> House of Commons [Prisoners' voting rights: developments since May 2015](#)

undermines confidence in democracy when 'our' government seeks to "obfuscate and confuse audiences" on behalf of Westminster's "international partners" rather than determining matters solely on the basis of our national interests.

There does not seem to be any evidence that "AI based algorithms and false or misleading information" can actually "manipulate the public with unprecedented effectiveness." One would like to see the computer program that can convince this author that any of the politicians at Westminster are worth voting for. However, it is accepted that there are those who can be easily manipulated, but then is that not an argument against democracy? Indeed, the White Paper undermines its own case by referring to "legitimate influence and illegitimate manipulation". What is the difference? We can surmise that the government at Westminster makes a judgement on whether that influence/manipulation accords or not with the will of its "international partners". While talk of "consensus" and "common approaches" with "international partners" can be accepted when dealing with material which is morally wrong, it becomes a worry when referring to political material because the government might well be affected in its judgement by foreign influence/manipulation which is detrimental to our nation.

The White Paper calls for protection of public figures from online abuse "which goes beyond free speech and impedes individuals' rights to participate". But this itself is open to abuse by the politicians, for example by those who support terrorism and paedophilia who might demand protection by crying that they are the victims of "hate speech". It is not clear exactly how "this abuse corrodes our democratic values and dissuades good people from entering public life", and unfortunately the White Paper is not able to reference "fact-checking services" to substantiate the claim. It may well be that people, good or otherwise, are indeed dissuaded from entering public life for fear of being abused as a 'racist' or a 'climate change denier', but one gets the feeling those are not the people that the government and its "international partners" want to participate in their democracy anyway.

The White Paper is a muddle of various subjects; by pulling them all together a false impression is created of equivalency. Yet this was deliberate as the Ministerial foreword indicates, the White Paper is an attempt to address a "comprehensive spectrum of online harms" - note the use of the analogy word, spectrum, rather than something more descriptive - "in a single and coherent way". Could it be that it was done this way because the public support the blocking of "child sexual abuse material" but are perhaps indifferent to Russia's political viewpoint? The harm to individual women and children will be different than the effect on the government. Regulation of the internet should take place for the right motives. Terrorists and paedophiles should be punished, not merely taken offline, because they are terrorists and paedophiles. It is accepted that a government has the right to moderate the internet and suppress free speech online. Iran and China do so, we could do the same. The question is, do we have the confidence that the government would suppress those "different voices, views and opinions" that are detrimental to our nation and religion, or simply suppress those who criticise the government and its "international partners"?

## The Challenge of Extremism

By Arthur St Hugh

The Commission for Countering Extremism has produced a report "[Challenging Hateful Extremism](#)".

Sara Khan, the Lead Commissioner, claims quite fancifully that "Our" – in her case adopted - "country has a long tradition of championing rights; from Magna Carta in 1215 to the

adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Human Rights Act 1998. Hateful extremism stands in stark contrast to the rights and freedoms that we enjoy.” This claim demonstrates the belief system of Sara Khan and the liberal élite. The rebellion at Runnymede, for that is what is meant by 1215, did not actually produce any of the rights we have today, praising it merely glorifies treason and rule by élite rather than legitimate rule by monarchy. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has nothing to do with our country and traditions, rather, having failed to uphold our empire and our independence it was one of the things the Westminster defeatists and internationalists acceded to and forced upon our nation. Likewise, would there be a Human Rights Act 1998 without the servile submission to the European Union; again, not our traditions. In each case given ‘rights’ actually means loss of sovereignty and loss of national independence. For the members of the liberal international community ‘human rights’ forms the cornerstone of their belief system, and so once it can be imagined that “extremism itself is a human rights issue” then the extremists take flesh as those who are “undermining the universality and indivisibility of human rights”.

The obvious flaw in this project is that they are taking as their centre against which to compare other viewpoints the ideology of the international community as expressed through its administrative vehicle at Westminster. The only objective view for the British nation is the British nation; ideological viewpoints should be examined from the perspective of whether they are beneficial or detrimental to our nation.

Apparently “hateful extremists” are “threatening the social fabric of our country”. The Commission after listening to various correspondents concluded there were three categories beyond the pale of democratic discourse, “terrorism and violent extremism, hateful extremism and the restriction of rights and freedoms”, but astonishingly felt that it was the latter of those that needed countering not the first. Could it be that they actually thought that the survival of the political ideology of the liberal élite was of more importance than the lives of ordinary people? Could it be that because terrorism is almost exclusively identified with one type of immigrant they instead chose to consider “hate” because being such a vague label they could get away with applying it to the political enemies of the liberal élite? Indeed, this becomes apparent when they identify the three haters. Inevitably the “Far Right” takes precedence, seemingly because they give precedence to “natives” rather than “aliens” (the report puts these two words in quotation marks). Note the use of the condescending term natives rather than British; the internationalists refuse to recognise our national existence and our right to a national polity. Squeezed in the middle are the “Islamists”, but note this is not because of “terrorism and violent extremism” but rather because they are “defending a single communal Muslim identity against the West’s corrupting influence”. It can be taken that what is meant by “corrupting influence” is the multiculturalism and secularism so beloved of liberals. Added to this is a new entry, the “Far Left’s conflation of anti-imperialism and antisemitism” (it can only be guessed why the first term merits a hyphen and latter does not). But this is itself a conflation. The Far Left have always been opposed to imperialism, that is one of their defining political principles. Why the Labour Party - the Far Left compared to ‘mainstream’ left-wing parties such as the Conservatives - now merits the label anti-semitic (by which is actually meant anti-Jew) needs to be considered. It may be that some within the Labour Party are genuinely concerned about the plight of the Palestinians (who are Semites). It may be that they are representing certain “aliens” with a “single communal Muslim identity” within or without the Labour Party, though this is not a connection that the Commission chooses to state, yet as the reference to politicians given later shows it is something of which they are aware.

The Commission intends to come up with a definition of hateful extremism by Spring 2020, but it accepts that “extremism is a contested concept”. It is of interest that the public did not feel that the Government’s definition of extremism as opposition to ‘shared values’ was helpful because rather tellingly “they felt that the concept of shared values was confusing as it was unclear who shared those values in a multicultural society”. The Commission

recognises that “Terrorism is the ultimate expression of extremism. Our evidence confirms it is what most members of the public think of first when talking about extremism”, yet, irrespective of what the public think the Commission is seemingly pushing for a definition not unlike that of the Government’s but refined by claiming those who oppose the ‘shared values’ of the liberal internationalist régime are “hateful”. And surely nobody wants to be a hater nowadays – though in the USA there is a dating app for them<sup>1</sup> .

Extremist views do not necessarily equate to murder or are necessarily a harm to society unless they are put in practice. Not everyone who reads Karl Marx becomes a mass murderer like Trotsky. But because some Marxists became mass murderers should all Marxists be condemned? We could say yes because Marxism if put into practice would be harmful to the majority based on what happened under Communism, but is that likely to happen in our country? The Marxist beliefs are by definition extremist when compared to the liberal left because they extol the replacement of the values and myths of the liberal left. Should every extremist doctrine or ideology be banned on the unprovable grounds that it will lead inevitably to a murderous totalitarian state, or should it be accepted that it is more likely that it will not? The evil that was Communism did not become the government in every country where Marxism was preached.

Unsurprisingly the Commission also has difficulty in defining the haters. It is explained that “Far Right” is a “ ‘container term’ ” for “several groups and individuals with different ideologies”. They expound a number of “narratives”, which could just as easily be considered as an attempt to explain the world around them rather than as evidence of “hate”, though it is accepted that some of them may well hate the world that the liberal internationalists have now created around them.

The “Far Left” is defined as three tendencies, two of which we can all agree is hateful extremism: “Vanguardism” which is seemingly the Communist interpretation of Marx, though why not then just say Communism; and “Anti-fascism, while at times a form of counter extremism, can lead to violence and hostility against people considered right-wing” which plain common sense demands should be criminalised. But then there is the bizarre conflation previously mentioned: “Anti-imperialism, rooted in early twentieth century antisemitic theory that criticised the influence of “international” (meaning Jewish) financiers that can manifest today as opposition to the US and its allies, especially Israel and the UK”. This is a conflation of three things. Anti-imperialism as indicated above is a ‘core value’ of the Far Left and is a position that can also be held by pro-Semites and by Jewish left-wingers. While the Far Left did indeed use to criticise international financiers until they gave in and became just another party of the plutocracy it is debatable whether the Jewishness or otherwise of the financiers was their primary concern. One wonders if the third aspect is the real one but it was felt necessary to disguise it. Because criticising the policies of the US and Israel and the UK is clearly within the bounds of acceptable discourse perhaps it had to be tainted with a charge of anti-semitism to make it seem abhorrent, and then clothed in the name of an actual left-wing doctrine, that of anti-imperialism, to make it “Far Left”?

Islamism, falling into third place in the narrative being constructed by the Commission, is apparently a “separate political ideology” from Islam though it can be guessed that Islamists disagree with that definition and who can really say that they would be wrong to disagree, and is “based on a binary worldview”, though, of course, most ideologies and religions are, and which “pits the Muslim nation ... against non-Islam and non-Muslims”. Islamists see “division” rather than liberal diversity “as necessary” so that the “ummah can strive towards the establishment of an Islamic state (Caliphate) that implements a literalist interpretation of Sharia law.” But is the establishment of such a state, so long as it is not in our country, really an issue that is of concern to us? What is of concern for the British is the immigration

---

<sup>1</sup> CNBC [On this dating app, every one is a 'Hater' — and it brings people together](#)

and colonisation which allows the Islamists to spread their world view in our country, not the peculiarities of their doctrines. The report notes that in one survey Muslims “are seen more negatively by the public” than other religious groups, and that “Twenty-nine percent of people polled believe that Islam is a threat to the British way of life and think that it is “incompatible.” But rather than condemn the immigration policy which allows the “dominant terror threat” to transplant itself here, the report calls instead for more research “to establish the cause and effect of Far Right anti-Muslim narratives and wider societal attitudes.”

Because the government at Westminster will not take a national position but instead enacts the position of the international community it cannot give an authoritative command on what is acceptable and permissible in immigrant communities which means they remain as colonies free to express, promote and enforce the politics of their homeland. Because the colonists do not have to adhere to the religion, mores and norms of the British nation they are instead in a position of continual negotiation with the international community through the medium of Westminster. Any shift in the centre of the international community, something over which the government at Westminster has no control, could mean that those migrants labelled as extremist today might well be redefined as acceptable tomorrow. At the political level the report states that it “heard from victims how in some cases politicians would side with and support powerful and influential perpetrators of hateful extremism and rights restriction, often community or faith leaders. This was often the case if such leaders held significant influence in minority communities and were able to encourage communities to vote for a particular politician.”. The Commission fails to acknowledge that changing demographics means changing values.

While mention is made of other types of extremism, such as believers in “animal rights”, it is notable that the report largely revolves around Muslim migrants and the reaction to them, the addition of the Far Left being either a diversion or a failed attempt at balance. Rather than considering that in itself, something the Commission cannot do as internationalists committed to mass immigration, there is this conceptualisation of these two groups as entities who exist within themselves with little connection to the rest of the world, and who are not behaving in the peaceful manner that the international community requires. ‘Challenging Hateful Extremism’ is thus really ‘Managing an Effect of Uncontrolled Immigration’. What the “extremism” articulated in the report actually means is a potential threat to the international order if it escalated to the point of conflict. Teaching “equality, tolerance and democracy” is an attempt at teaching passivity; all régimes demand obedience to their own ideology. No “strategy” and no amount of money will end this construct they call “extremism” because it is an effect not a cause. If we again had our own government and country, there would of course be no Islamists, but equally there would be no Far Right. Whether there would be a Far Left would depend on circumstance and foreign influence.

What is striking about the report is the evidence that the Muslim community puts up a much stronger resistance to the attempts to counter extremism within their community than British people do. This is something the British should learn from the Muslims. Indubitably it is because they have greater consciousness of themselves as a community, whereas the British lack national consciousness at present. Why the British are more susceptible to the nihilism of internationalism may be because they are situated closer to the current centre of the international community, whereas Muslims colonists have their homelands situated on the periphery of the West. As such they would have an intrinsically different perspective. Their view of Jews and “LGBT+” could be determined by reference to the view held within their homelands. It is natural to look to the centre of one’s own community, we cannot therefore condemn colonists for looking to that centre in their homelands. What as patriots we should be condemning is our own people not looking towards our own national centre but looking outward to the international community. But for the Commission that is exactly what we should be doing, rather than focusing on ourselves and our rights it emphasises instead belief in “human rights”. For the Commission the “European Convention on Human Rights”

appears to be almost some sort of written constitution, rather than a temporary concession made by weak government.

While we must all support measures to tackle terrorism, and encourage those in power to consider the causes of it, the report does not give sufficient justification for accepting its construct of “extremism” and therefore the government should not put the Commission on a statutory footing. While we continue with democracy it is better to just allow the “difficult debates” rather than paying bureaucrats to determine what they are and who can have them.

### What it means to be British

*by Allan Robertson, Loyal Order Order 20 Lord Carson Memorial, Ash.*

For me Britishness is about preserving certain eternal values, it is about contributing massively to what we consider to be civilisation on this planet, it is about fighting against oppression and injustice, whether in the Falklands Islands or for the rights of religious minority groups in Iraq whose physical survival was endangered by a terrorist group that was well funded, skilled in torture and manipulation of minds and practised in mass murder. Britishness is about the rule of law, fair judicial processes, a level playing field in sporting competitions, concepts like innocent until proven guilty, the promotion of religious tolerance, and implementation of democratic decisions at the ballot box by the legislature, even if we have to assert our will several times to get a legislature that is willing to pass what a clear majority have voted for.

For me Britishness is represented by the Union flag or Jack. To show that the values of Britishness prevail in any given part of the country the Union flag must fly 365 days a year on all public buildings (Not 17, 19 or 21 days a year!). Sadly, if the Union flag is not flying you can be sure that the local administration does not place as high a value on British values as Orangemen and women do. Whenever I visit a UK town I look at the public buildings and see what is flying. It can be very instructive. In Scotland we have too many saltires flying at the expense of the Union Flag, this is not right and is subverting the constitutional position of Scotland within the Union. Overseas many people have fought to continue to be British as they believed that to be anything else was to their detriment. Let us redouble the fight to keep our UK together in the 3<sup>rd</sup> decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.