

# London Swinton Circle

## *Online Magazine*

Mid-Year 2016

### ***Contents***

Political Ructions	2
French Regional Elections	4
The Decision Making Process	7
Book Review	9

## Political Ructions

by Allan Robertson  
Chairman of the London Swinton Circle

So we have finally toppled David Cameron as Prime Minister. An agreement to introduce a referendum if there was a Conservative Majority Government elected in 2015 probably staved off a leadership challenge in 2014. I think it also ensured that more folk voted Conservative as they wanted a referendum and voting Conservative was the only way to achieve this. However, a Brexit victory scuppered his hopes of seeing out this Parliament as PM. I did not support him back in 2005 and nothing that has happened in the intervening decade has made me change my mind. I occasionally agreed with him on certain policies such as the cap on benefits, getting tougher with people making no progress in getting a job or refusing to make sex Education compulsory in schools. However, my political disagreements with Cameron were massive: Coalition with the Liberal Democrats, a referendum on Independence for Scotland with no threshold to be reached for change to happen; open ended interventions in Libya (2011) and Syria (proposed; 2013), removing 40% of our nation's firepower in defence cuts in 2010, continuing Austerity after 2015, longer Sunday opening hours, continuing the Blairite liberalisation of gambling laws, same sex marriage 2013, changing the laws of Monarchical Succession in 2013, and ending secure tenancies at a time when it is increasingly difficult to rent or buy flats or houses affordably. No wonder there was a massive political rebellion on June 23rd with these toxic waste dump policies.

Last week on email I said I was supporting any of the Brexit MPs for Party leader, Michael Gove, Andrea Leadsom and Dr Liam Fox. It was disappointing that Dr Fox, in my view the strongest of the three candidates, did the least well. There are no good reasons for his only getting 16 votes. He was actively involved in the Brexit leave campaign and made several good speeches and was interviewed regularly. He was a very strong performer. Andrea Leadsom performed well in the Guardian Members debate on March 15 which I attended. She and Nigel Farage had to bat away numerous lies told by Nick Clegg and Alan Johnson that night. Andrea also was involved in a very tough debate with the ever odious trio of Ruth Davidson, Amber Rudd and Nicola Sturgeon. Mr Gove was the only leading brexiteer whom I did not see perform during the Referendum. After he entered the leadership race it came to my attention that the ever odious Nick Boles MP was his campaign manager. This was a very bad choice as this man wanted to bulldoze the green belt and destroy rural England when he was Planning Minister. Having gained 48 votes in the first MP ballot, the Gove camp was hoping to overhaul Andrea Leadsom on 66 votes. However, they got zero votes from the Fox and Crabb camps. Their votes went to May and Leadsom and indeed Mr Gove even lost two votes in the intervening 2 days. The main argument against Mrs Leadsom was that she has only been an MP for 6 years but I seem to recall President Obama only entered the Senate in 2005, before becoming President in 2009. Donald Trump has never held office at all but is now the Presumptive Republican nominee. However, the Leadsom campaign sank with all hands shortly after it left port so to speak. Now Theresa May will have to deliver Brexit or face the wrath of millions of voters. Key Brexiteers did back her for sake of party unity but they will need to be given good jobs in the new cabinet. No Euro sceptic group should wind itself for sometime to come.

Circle member Chris Watts argues the case for invoking Article 50 right away as follows: "As always, along come the lawyers! Mishcon de Reya, a London-based law firm, say that the Govt cannot lawfully invoke Article 50 without a formal act of Parliament. Such an act might be blocked in one or both Houses of Parliament as both have a pro-Remain majority. The argument is, first, that the June 23rd referendum was not legally binding, which is correct.

Second, that once Article 50 is invoked it may lead within two years to formal Brexit without any further parliamentary action which would contradict the 1972 European Communities Act, which gives supremacy to EU law! Hence the need for a new Act. Hopefully, political reality will prevail. May might face overwhelming pressure to hold a parliamentary vote before invoking Article 50 but it's hard to see MPs choosing to overturn the decision of the referendum.

The reason I advocate invoking Article 50 soon is because when it is invoked, a two-year deadline is set, and most of the bargaining power is handed to the other 27 EU countries, which get to agree on the terms for Brexit without Britain having any vote on them. Delaying that process has problems. By the end of this year we will move into heated campaigning for the French presidential election next spring. Holland, Germany and (probably) Italy are also heading for tricky elections next year. Domestic political considerations will make it hard for other EU leaders to be helpful to May next year, so invoke Article 50 NOW".

As for the Labour Party. Only 10 righteous MPs, 8 men and 2 women, and the rest a complete waste of space. Labour's In Campaign suffered a massive rejection from its voters in the North and Middle of England. They have consistently put the interests of the Foreigner over British people and have turned Britain into a politically correct nanny state. It really is time for this party to disappear and be replaced by a genuine British Workers Party, campaigning against excessive remuneration for failing bosses which happens all too often today, foreign aid, multi-nationals, zero hours contracts, massive immigration from the EU, the Commonwealth or the rest of the World, special treatment for minorities, misery wages, and casual jobs for foreigners on farms and elsewhere. There, I have outlined their manifesto for them.

On immigration, I agree strongly with Andrew Green's conclusion in his [latest article](#) on Conservative Home website, 'The stakes are high and go far beyond the narrow interests of one sector or another. Our population is growing at about half a million a year, the equivalent of a city the size of Liverpool. Roughly two thirds of this increase is a result of immigration. If this is allowed to continue, our population will increase by 10 million in the next 20 years – more than the entire population of London. The public have sensed this and have clearly signalled that it is unacceptable to them. It is now for the political system to respond with some clear headed and effective action'.

As for the negotiations on the exit, personally I think the EU should sling us out on our ear. I really have no interest in negotiations which lead us to join EEA or keep freedom of movement of people. We need to get out of free movement (otherwise known as nation-destroying mass immigration) and we should be able to negotiate our own trade deals with EU countries with whom we wish to keep relations with. In the interim, we need absolute assurances that this Parliament will pass NO MORE EU DIRECTIVES, will BOW TO NO MORE EUROPEAN COURT JUDGEMENTS, and WILL NOT FILL THE VACANCY LEFT BY LORD HILL AS EU COMMISSIONER. NO EU ELECTIONS IN THE UK IN 2018! WE NEED A PLAN TO MAKE UK MEPs REDUNDANT.

I am also in favour of a General Election once the new PM has settled in. I would go for an April 2017 poll. I don't think it is right that we can change a PM and not allow the voters a verdict on the transition.

Bremain rally participants who said they were European and not British are traitors. TIME FOR A BREXIT SHOW OF STRENGTH ON THE STREETS.

## French Regional Elections

by Sam Swerling

The French regional elections, which took place over two Sundays in December 2015, the 6th and the 13th, offered a realistic opportunity for the Front National (F.N.) to measure the extent of its continuing progression in French politics under the dynamic leadership of Jean-Marie's youngest daughter, Marine Le Pen.

The internal ructions within the party had already produced seriously damaging publicity leading ultimately to the old man's expulsion from the party and his removal as *président d'honneur* of its leadership.

As an augury of future successes, including Marine's challenge for the French presidency in May 2017, the F.N. had already done formidably well in the European parliamentary elections in May 2015, coming top of the pile with 24 elected M.E.P.s, the largest among French parties. The names include the great scholar and intellectual, Bruno Gollnisch (first elected in 1989); youngest ever Lyon University law school, and Jean-Marie's right-hand man for over 20 years. Others included Jean-Francois Jalkh, the party expert on immigration statistics, a French M.P. (1986-1988) (one of 36) during the years of proportional representation, whose knowledge is encyclopaedic; and Florian Philippot, deputy party leader, ex-civil servant and multiple academic prize winner and Marine's closes associate.

In the event, the F.N. outdid all its own expectations and those of the commentariat of the political class. It arrived top in six of the 13 regions gathering 28.42% of all the votes cast, defeating the centre-right parties, reconstituted as L.R. U.D.I. and, MoDem, which obtained 27.08% and the Socialist party of President Hollande who, despite his firm stance in handling the terrorist atrocities, appears to be more than ever a busted flush.

The F.N. figures in the six regions in which they were successful show a very clear breakthrough into the political mainstream.

In *Alsace - Champagne - Ardenne - Lorraine* Florian Philippot's list pulverised the other candidates into submission:

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Florian Philippot	641,122	36.06%
LR/UDI/MoDem	Philippe Rickert	459,138	25.83%
PS	Jean-Pierre Masseret	286,438	16.11%

The remaining 22% of votes were split between six smaller lists.

In *Centre - Val de Loire* Philippe Loiseau, the F.N. *chef de file*, led his party to victory in five of the six departments as follows:

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Philippe Loiseau	262,154	30.49%
LR/UDI/MoDem	Philippe Vigier	225,776	26.25%
PS	François Bonneaux	209,022	24.31%

The remaining 19% of votes were split between five smaller lists.

In *Bourgogne - Franche-Comté* the F.N. list was led by Sophie Montel, a party member of over 30 years standing. It triumphed in seven out of the eight departments.

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Sophie Montel	303,128	31.48%
LR/UDI	François Sauvadet	231,053	24.00%
PS	Marie-Guite Dufay	221,357	22.99%

(The MoDem component candidate of the centre-right ran separately, gaining 31, 429 votes - 3.26%)

The remaining 17% of votes were split between six smaller lists, all of whom failed to qualify for the second round.

In *Languedoc - Roussillon - Midi-Pyrénées*, the F.N. list was led by Louis Aliott, Marine Le Pen's companion and the party's secretary-general. The F.N. achieved here an historic score for the region.

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Louis Aliott	653,543	31.83%
PS	Carole Delga	501,287	2.41%
LR/UDI/MoDem	Dominique Reynié	386,977	18.84%
EELV-FG	Gérard Onesta	210,602	10.26%

The remaining 13% of votes were split between six smaller lists which failed to qualify for the second round.

In *Nord - Pas De Calais - Picardie*, the northernmost region of France, the F.N. list was led by Marine Le Pen to triumphant success, doubling its vote from the previous poll in 2010.

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Marine Le Pen	908,989	40.64%
LR/UDI/ MoDem	Xavier Bertrand	558,360	24.96%
PS	Pierre de Saintignon	405,189	18.12%

The remaining 16% of votes were shared between six other smaller lists which failed to qualify for the second round.

In *Provence -Alpes - Côte d'Azur*, the northernmost region of France, the F.N. list was led by Marion Maréchal-Le Pen, niece of Marine, and rising star of the party.

Party	List Leader	Votes obtained	Percentage
FN	Marion Maréchal-Le Pen	719,706	40.55%
LR/UDI/ MoDem	Christian Estrasi	469,881	26.48%
PS	Christophe Castaner	294,395	16.59%

The remaining 17% of votes were shared between six other smaller lists which failed to qualify for the second round.

A little about Marion herself. She is the adopted daughter of Samuel Maréchal, whose first marriage was to Yann, Jean-Marie's middle daughter. Maréchal was a former director of the *Front National de la Jeunesse* (F.N.J.), the Front's youth wing. Maréchal's second wife is a grand-niece of ex-president Félix Houphouët-Boigny of the *Côte d'Ivoire* (Ivory Coast), who was a close friend of Jean-Marie Le Pen for many years. Enemies of the F.N. would not wish to know this.

Marion has made a rapid advance in nationalist politics, winning a parliamentary seat at Carpentras in southern France (Vaucluse). Very early on she made her mark in parliamentary debates with her *sotto voce* measured arguments. In a recent prime-time television debate with Alain Juppé, 72-year old Sarkozyist Mayor of Bordeaux, Juppé was trounced on every polemical issue, to the amazement of those watching.

In an article in *The Sunday Telegraph* of 5 December 2015, French journalist Anne-Elisabeth Moutet described Marion as "the new girl wonder of the far-right, a glamorous 25 year-old poised to break down many conservatives' qualms."

The big question would now become: following their excellent first-round results (almost certainly proving that on a once-only voting system the F.N. would become the government of France), could there be a translation of that vote into the second-round results? If, for instance, Marine Le Pen became a regional president she would control a region the size of Denmark and a budget of £3.6 billion. In the case of Marion being voted into the presidency of PACA the budget would be upwards of £4.2 billion. As the boffins would say: "there's everything to play for".

Alas, history of French second-round elections and the sheer cussedness of the centrist and left parties would continue to exclude the F.N. from regional power by instructing their rank-and-file to vote for the centre-right. By dint of such self-loathing and undemocratic manipulation are French elections won and lost. Yet the final results display a substantial movement of opinion towards the F.N. The party is on the march; it's long overdue success many not be far off, especially if there should be constitutional revision of the voting system.

Hereunder, therefore, are the second round results in the six regions where the F.N. finished on top in the first round.

*Alsace - Champagne - Ardenne - Lorraine*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
LR/UDI/MoDem	Philippe Rickert	1,060,029	48.40%	104
FN	Florian Philippot	790,141	36.08%	46
<i>Divers Gauche</i>	Jean-Pierre Masseret	339,749	15.51%	19

*Bourgogne - Franche-Comté*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
PS	Marie-Guite Dufay	402,941	34.68%	51
LR/UDI	François Sauvadet	382,177	32.89%	25
FN	Sophie Montel	376,902	32.44%	24

*Centre - Val de Loire*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
PS	François Bonneaux	364,211	35.43%	40
LR/UDI/MoDem	Philippe Vigier	355,475	34.58%	20
FN	Philippe Loiseau	308,422	30.00%	17

*Languedoc - Roussillon - Midi-Pyrénées*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
PS	Carole Delga	1,092,969	44.81%	93
FN	Louis Aliott	826,023	33.87%	40
LR/UDI/MoDem	Dominique Reynié	520,011	21.32%	25

*Nord - Pas De Calais - Picardie*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
LR/UDI/ MoDem	Xavier Bertrand	1,389,315	57.77%	116
FN	Marine Le Pen	1,015,649	42.23%	54

*Provence -Alpes - Côte d'Azur*

Party	List Leader	Votes	Percentage	Seats
LR/UDI/ MoDem	Christian Estrasi	1,073,485	54.78%	81
FN	Marion Maréchal-Le Pen	886,147	45.22%	42

\*

## The Decision Making Process

by Arthur St Hugh

Democratic regimes may be described as those under which the people are deluded from time to time into the belief that they exercise sovereignty, while all the time real sovereignty resides in and is exercised by other and sometimes irresponsible and secret forces.

Mussolini *The Doctrines of Fascism*

Political decision making in essence follows the same pattern whether it is at the local, national or global level.

First, a decision is conceived by a Decision Maker and his advisors. Second, consensus is reached through informal discussion with partners. Third, the decision is advertised, and there is formalised discussion through committees and perhaps consultation. Fourth, the decision is publicly taken by the Decision Taker.

A Decision Maker is the *auctor*, he who is the originator of a decision, and the Decision Taker is the *auctoritas*, he who makes a decision law.

Under a monarchy or a dictatorship there is inevitably a contraction of the stages with specifically the unimportant stage three becoming otiose. In contrast, this stage, whilst irrelevant to the decision making process itself, is of vital importance for the performance of democracy, for it is the exhibition at which those who have been elected make their display.

In a sovereign state the Decision Maker and the Decision Taker are one and the same. In a non-independent state, such as a state under internationalism and globalisation, they are different; the Decision Taker becomes nothing more than an actor, and it may not be clear who the Decision Maker actually is.

A weak Decision Maker is unduly influenced by advisors, however, the advisors never have authority. In a non-independent state, such as a state under internationalism and globalisation, it may not be known who the advisors are. Conspiracy theorists have become

fixated with meetings of entities like the Bilderberg group or the Trilateral Commission but in reality they appear to be second stage functions, where consensus is reached with partners to ensure there will be no objection to the decision, and they do not tell us where, or from whom, a decision originates.

The stupid may think they are being cynical if they say that it does not matter who makes the decisions. But an unknown Decision Maker is what renders a people powerless. As a last resort a Tsar or a *Duce* can be overthrown, but that is not possible when the Decision Maker is not visible. And why should the people pay for what is only the façade of a national government? The only function of the House of Commons is simply to proclaim the decisions of the rulers in the international superstructure, it is a grossly overpaid version of the old town criers. Because the House of Commons is not the Decision Maker its 650 attendees could equally be replaced with 650 individuals chosen at random, or 650 women, or 650 disabled people, or 650 asylum seekers or 650 empty chairs.

If there are those who are indifferent there are also those who actively prefer that decisions are made elsewhere. Just as the Left once looked to the Second and Third International so now many Muslim immigrants look abroad to ISIS. And in the recent referendum almost half of the voters voted to Remain under foreign domination. A staggeringly large proportion of the population then, prefers all decisions to be made other than by the British. We cannot simply write-off that vote as an accident or a mistake because of the substantial number of people who went out of their way to consciously and deliberately vote for foreign rule, and who are now doing their best to overturn the Leave vote. Nietzsche proclaimed: "Independence is an issue that concerns very few people: - it is a prerogative of the strong" (*Beyond Good and Evil*, §29). Whilst we could accept that all these people are weak, could part of the preference for foreign rule be because our government, as the alternative, is equally weak? But do we have a nominal government as a result of internationalism and globalisation or is it that internationalism and globalisation exist because of weak governments? It seems we are stuck in a very negative feedback loop.

A common complaint is that the mainstream parties are all the same, by which is meant that the parties are no longer identifiable by separate ideologies, they have merged into one herd. What does, indeed what can, conservatism or liberalism or socialism mean in the context of a House of Commons where it is accepted that decisions are made elsewhere? It is difficult to find an alternative from amongst them because all the mainstream parties exist primarily as a conduit for foreign rule. Those who voted to Leave the EU were voting for the abstract principle of independence rather than following a potential independent, national, Decision Maker. Nigel Farage had the ability to oppose but not propose, and he has now given up, whilst Boris Johnson was a shameless opportunist. And it may well be that some of those who voted to Leave actually did so as a protest against David Cameron rather than as a commitment to self-determination.

We have what Max Weber would have described as a 'leaderless democracy'. The party bosses generate apathy rather than inspire national cohesion. We reluctantly had a referendum - which the Remain vote undoubtedly expected to win, and almost did - because no one in the current political elite *desired* an independent Britain. And because the referendum was a matter of chance rather than choice we are left with the appearance of anarchy in the absence of any national leaders. This means the internationalists will be able to retain their control through existing, and new, channels as they are unlikely to be challenged. The EU forms a major regional layer in the globalist superstructure, but it is not in itself essential for the successful functioning of that superstructure; and Britain will continue to suffer the baleful effects of the EU whether we are officially controlled by it or not while it exists. A problem is never resolved by fleeing from it.

The referendum was a device for a government unused to making decisions in the interests of our nation, and it granted the abdication of responsibility for the outcome in seeking the advice of 'the people'. But now a decision has to be made whether to heed that advice or whether to ignore it; and if accepted then there will be further decisions to be made. If the British, whether those in government or without, are unwilling to make the decisions necessary for the survival of our nation then, as the servile Remain voters accept, they do not have the right to be free and independent and must suffer the decisions made by others however detrimental they are to our nation.

\*

### **Book Review: Credible and True – The Political and Personal Memoir of K. Harvey Proctor**

Published by [Biteback Publishing 2016](#)

by Allan Robertson

The book is 476 pages long, including a detailed index. There are no pictures, other than two of Harvey taken in 1987 and 2016. Recently Harvey Proctor has been to hell and back accused of murder by the politically correct and incompetent knaves otherwise known as the Metropolitan Police (the list of incompetent and idiotic Police Commanders in that Force is indeed very long. There is obviously some special breeding programme that produces these people. They could be the subject of a whole article in itself. To quote DCI Gently the Force has 'form' and lots of it). Nor do I believe in the guilt of the other persons investigated by the Met, including Edward Heath, Leon Brittan, Rhodes Boyson, Keith Joseph, or Field Marshal Lord Bramall. With regard to Mr Heath, we can certainly accuse him of Treason as he took us into the EEC by stealth and deceit. I don't care if he was responsible for illegal killings in Northern Ireland. If Army Intelligence assassinated terrorist targets in 1971-73 this was because putting people on trial at that time would have been difficult for lots of operational reasons and the death and destruction at that time was simply unacceptable.

I met Harvey back in October 1985 at the Blackpool Conservative Party Conference. I don't remember what the Monday Club fringe meeting was about when we did meet. I remember Sir Teddy Taylor and Professor Patrick Minford were speakers. Harvey had provided an immigration article for me for the first issue of Challenger newsletter. He paid his 50p and we had a general discussion about the then political situation. I also remember Harvey addressing the 1983 Blackpool Conference when there was a full scale debate on immigration and repatriation. The headline in the Glasgow Herald the day after the debate was 'Racialism voted down'. Harvey says in his book that his Billericay Association motion was only narrowly defeated. Under the Cameron Dictatorship such a motion would not be permitted and folk proposing it would be expelled from the Party and probably even subjected to police/ DPP harassment. Yes we live in a wonderful democracy.

Its Harvey's time as an MP that principally concerns this review. He lists some of his friends in the House as being Dick Body, Dr Alan Glyn, Kenneth Lewis, Mark Lennox-Boyd, and Charles Irving. He writes that Edward Heath never spoke a word to him in the 8 years in which he was in the house. Harvey has enormous admiration for Mrs Thatcher's conduct of the Falklands conflict and felt that she was good at small talk and was sympathetic to the plight of her colleagues.

On pp 110-115 Harvey highlights the breaches of faith by the first Thatcher government on limiting New Commonwealth immigration. A number of issues went to a division of the house in 1982-83. The Government was defeated 290 votes to 272 votes on 15/12/82. Harvey's speech from Hansard is reprinted. It makes stirring reading. The Government reversed its commons defeat in February 1983 by 298 to 261 votes. 'Numerous previous rebels got back into line. I retained my principles.' Harvey argued that continued mass immigration was a threat to law & order, liberty and identity in this country. He argued that those with rights to come to the UK would have to lose them in the years ahead. I had forgotten that Buster Mottram sought the Conservative nomination in Basildon while Harvey went for Billericay in 1983. Harvey achieved an excellent majority of 14,615 in June 1983. There were crude arson attempts against Harvey's home during the election. He said the Police were 'uninterested' in pursuing the matter. I think Harvey's card was marked by the Police many years ago and their vendetta continues thirty years on. Absolutely disgusting.

On January 30 1984 a BBC Panorama documentary smeared Harvey, Gerald Howarth and Neil Hamilton as 'Maggie's Militant tendency'. Harvey also discusses his views on Ulster and recalls a visit to Crossmaglen with Harold McCusker MP. Harvey did not think a lot of Teresa Gorman, his successor in Billericay. Indeed he gave evidence against her in a libel action in later years. In Gorman's defence she was popular with Bee Carthew and other lady members of the Swinton Circle. However, I know that she was not well regarded by many of her male Parliamentary colleagues. I was advised by more than One MP to ditch her as President of the Circle. Until the publication of this book, Harvey had not publicly revealed that there was a serious attempt on his life by two men in 1987. It involved kidnapping, actual bodily harm, robbery and the forced taking of sleeping tablets. Harvey had very little confidence in the Police and did not report the incidents to them. The only criticism I would make of Harvey is that sometimes he was a little naive in his personal relations, certainly in his younger years, and ended up in situations he ought not ever to have got into. But having said that he was a very hardworking and diligent MP who remained true to his principles and convictions. It is good to see numerous references to his friend Bee Carthew in the book. Bee was my predecessor in the Swinton Circle.

On p47 of the book Harvey discusses the policies of the Monday Club in 1969-72. By the time I joined the Club in 1984 the policies had not altered very much. Better and more detailed positions had been taken on law and order and immigration, and in particular on how multicultural doctrines were affecting education in schools. A 1985 paper examined the Swan Report. The club was right to oppose Winds of Change in Africa and decolonisation for the sake of it. Harvey was a paid Monday Club Organiser and attended meetings throughout the UK. I believe JBD established an Ulster branch in 1969. He confirms on p53 my understanding that the Club was split on the EEC. A great pity. G K Young was pro-EEC as was Jonathan Guinness who became Chairman. Sam Swerling is noted as having strong corporate economic views. It is fair to say that Sam is not a devotee of free market economics and privatisation. You can be opposed to socialism and the free market because you believe that both undermine the nation and our national identity. I agree with all of Harvey's praise of Sam! Harvey's employment with the club ended in 1971, falling out with the didactic Cedric Gunnery over the opening of post. As Director, Gunnery insisted on opening post even if it was not addressed to him! After leaving Club employment, Harvey went to work as a research assistant for a group of MPs opposed to entry in to the EEC. He became PPC for Hackney and Shoreditch and contested the seat in both 1974 elections, retaining his deposit in a safe labour seat.

On a point of principle, this book should be bought by true Conservatives interested in freedom of speech and the protection of our democratic liberties. Harvey is very frank in his book and you should have enough information to come to a conclusion about the allegations made against him in the latter chapters when his life collapsed for a second time. Strongly recommended.