

THE FREE NATION

The monthly magazine for members
of The Freedom Association

October 2021



"Free speech is not the cause of the tensions that are growing around us, but the only possible solution to them"

We must escape the European human rights trap

Violence is the problem - not men

Post-Brexit shortages and history rhyming





Council & Management Committee

Founders

Viscount De L'Isle VC, KG, PC, GCMG, GCVO (1909-1991)
 Norris McWhirter CBE (1925-2004)
 Ross McWhirter (1925-1975)
 Major John Gouriet (1935-2010)

Council

Patron: Prof Simon Heffer PhD FRHistS
 Chairman: David Campbell Bannerman
 Deputy Chairman: Dr Adrian Hilton
 Hon. Secretary: Tony Hilder
 Hon. Treasurer: Tim Scott
 Hon. Chaplain: The Rev'd Dr Peter Mullen

Jillian Becker
 Brendan Chilton
 Sir Christopher Chope OBE, MP
 The Rt Hon. the Baroness Cox
 Philip Davies MP
 Alex Deane
 Cllr Tony Devenish
 Sir Ranulph Fiennes, Bt OBE PM*
 Mike Fisher
 The Rt Hon. the Lord Hannan of
 Kingsclere
 Dr Charles Hanson
 Roger Helmer
 Neil Herron

Philip Hollobone MP
 Sir Gerald Howarth
 Lindsay Jenkins
 The Rt Hon. the Lord Kamall
 Justin Kornberg
 Barry Legg
 Russell Lewis
 Michael McGough
 Laura Midgley
 Prof Patrick Minford CBE PhD
 The Rt Hon. the Viscount Monckton
 of Brenchley
 Brian Monteith
 The Rt Hon. the Lord Moylan

David Nuttall
 The Rt Hon. the Lord Pearson of
 Rannoch
 Andrew Roberts
 Andrew Rosindell MP
 Colin Smith
 Ewen Stewart
 Walter Sweeney
 The Rt Hon. the Lord Vinson LVO
 Mark Wallace
 The Rt Hon. the Earl of Wemyss and
 March DL
 Tony Woodcock
 Sir Mark Worthington OBE

Management Committee

Committee Chairman: David Campbell Bannerman
 Hon. Secretary: Tony Hilder
 Hon. Treasurer: Tim Scott
 Philip Davies MP
 Alex Deane
 Michael McGough
 Laura Midgley

Staff

Chief Executive: Andrew Allison
 Digital Media Officer: William Yarwood
 Office Manager: Rebecca Allison

The Freedom Association's 'Ten Principles of a Free Society'

1. Individual Freedom
2. Personal and Family Responsibility
3. The Rule of Law
4. Limited Government
5. Free Market Economy
6. National Parliamentary Democracy
7. Strong National Defences
8. A free press and other media
9. Freedom of Religion and Belief
10. Freedom of Speech, Expression and Assembly

“Free speech is not the cause of the tensions that are growing around us, but the only possible solution to them”

By Andrew Allison, Editor

I was planning to be in Manchester for four days at the Conservative Party Conference, but because of the Conservative Party, my plans were thrown into disarray.

I was told a few days before the conference began that my media pass was approved. I was then told two days later that it was rejected. After querying this, I was told on the eve of the conference that there had been a mistake and that I should collect my pass from the Radisson Hotel. On the afternoon of Sunday 3rd October, I joined the queue with hundreds of others to collect my pass. After waiting for more than 45 minutes, I was told that my pass had been rejected. Anticipating this turn of events, I showed the young lady I was dealing with the email I was sent 24 hours earlier. She went away for a few minutes and told me that the person who authorised my pass was not part of the media team and therefore was not authorised to authorise it. I felt like I was in an episode of *Yes Minister* or *The Thick of It*.

To say that I was unhappy is an understatement. “Are you telling me that I have wasted my time travelling here today?”, I asked. “Sorry”, came the reply, “Due to restrictions, we are not allowing any freelancers into the conference.”

I felt that she was perhaps being a little disingenuous. I have been attending conferences for years using a media pass, because in addition to my work for The Freedom Association, I am also asked to write pieces, in a personal capacity, for newspapers and websites. This part of my work has never been an issue before, but apparently it was in Manchester a couple of weeks ago.

The following day I bumped into the journalist, Michael Crick. I was explaining to him the reason they gave for not allowing me in. “So they lied to you then?”, was his reply. He then went on to tell me that I was not alone. It appears that the party has been refusing conference media passes left, right,



and centre - although according to Michael, more were refused for those who are from the left!

I have no doubt that my criticism of the Government on television, radio, and in print, was the real reason I was refused entry, but why make me travel to Manchester to hear the bad news? I put that down to incompetence. And if you had seen the chaotic scenes of people not having good enough photographs and who had not passed police checks, you would understand why.

I did, though, need to be in Manchester on the Monday of the conference. I was chairing a fringe meeting we held in the Museum of Science and Technology. But before that started, one of our Life Members took me out to lunch. And a damned good lunch it was, too. My grateful thanks go to him. I don't wish to make meat eaters jealous, but it was the best piece of prime rump steak I have ever eaten.

Our fringe meeting asked the question, “How can we conquer cancel culture?” I knew



before chairing it that two of the panelists couldn't make it. Our Chairman, David Campbell Bannerman, had tested positive for Covid a few days before. Another, Alex Deane, couldn't make the conference at all. These things happen. But thankfully, Baroness (Claire) Fox of Buckley and Chris Green MP were in attendance. And thanks to the metaphorical arm twisting of Graham Eardley from the Bruges Group (who is also one of our members), Joy Morrissey MP, who had been speaking at the previous session, kindly agreed to come on to the panel. In all fairness, she didn't need much convincing!

I started proceedings by reminding those present that this was the first Conservative Party Conference since the late, great Sir Roger Scruton died in January 2020. I felt that the following quote from Sir Roger would be useful in framing the discussion we were about to have:

“Free speech is not the cause of the tensions that are growing around us, but the only

possible solution to them.”

All three panelists were excellent, and although I think it is fair to say that none of us came up with a definitive answer to the question, cases were highlighted and all agreed that we must scrap the Human Rights Act (HRA). This is not to say that we do not value human rights; the opposite is true. As you will read in Martin Howe's piece (first published in the *Telegraph*):

“The UK played an active role in drafting the European Convention on Human Rights, with the aim of safeguarding war-torn Europe against the return of Fascist or totalitarian regimes. It sets out a series of basic rights which, if you go by the words of the Convention, would gain universal support across the political spectrum.

“Unfortunately, the Convention has not been interpreted according to its words, nor according to the intentions of the states who drafted it. For 70 years, the Human Rights Court at Strasbourg has been “interpreting”

it in ways which engraft new or extended rights onto it which are not justified by its wording. In some cases – such as prisoner voting – these can be shown to be contrary to the actual intentions of the drafters of the Convention.”

Fighting cancel culture, scrapping the HRA, and promoting a UK Bill of Rights are very

much at the centre of everything we are doing at the moment, and I hope that you will join us in the events we will be holding, and help promote our recommendations as we publish them during the next few months.

Andrew Allison is Chief Executive of The Freedom Association

The problem of Taiwan

By Tony Brown

In August 1914, the unknown gamble for Germany was how the UK would jump in response to their troops attacking France through Belgium (the Schlieffen Plan). Everything else had been calculated and the Germans were confident their strategy would deliver victory via fast, early success against the French through the capture of Paris (just like in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870). The German's fear was that, if they failed to take Paris and cause early French capitulation, they would find themselves engaged in a long war of attrition - which, if the resources of the British Empire were added to those ranged against them, they might, indeed probably would, lose. They had no real plan for a long war. (Neither did anybody else!)

They also knew that their battle plan violated the terms of the 1839 Treaty of London guaranteeing Belgian's territorial integrity - with the UK as a key guarantor.

Nobody knew what the British Cabinet would decide - including the British cabinet itself! It engaged in protracted, anguished debate about what was the 'right thing to do' and as close as forty eight hours before the delivery of the ultimatum to the German Ambassador which took Britain to war, it looked quite possible that the Cabinet would opt the other way and leave Belgium (and France and Russia) to their fate.

It was much easier for Vladimir Putin over the Ukraine. He was confident the USA and the UK would not intervene over his creation of Russian puppet states in Eastern Ukraine despite the fact that this



violated the obligations of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum in which Ukraine had traded its nuclear arsenal for Russian, British and American guarantees of its independence and territorial integrity.

It is very clear that the Chinese are entirely serious in their goal of incorporating Taiwan back into their regime. Last century, it was a long-term goal of which they knew they could only dream. Today, a much more powerful and economically successful China is making it increasingly clear that it's time for their dream to become a reality.

And that is potentially a major problem. The Taiwanese don't want it but do not themselves have anything like the power necessary to stop it. If the Chinese land troops

and Taiwan receives no international help, the outcome is not in doubt. Taiwan becomes part of mainland China. The Chinese know this perfectly well.

The issue for them is how the USA would react. Let's be clear about AUKUS. It has been created to resist Chinese expansionism.

The current global energy crisis was triggered by a breakdown in relations between Australia and China leading to a breakdown in the supplies of Australian coal which fuel the Chinese economy. This souring of Australian-Chinese relations, combined with wider fears in the USA and the UK about Chinese ambitions in the South China Sea as well as Taiwan, caused the Australians to decide that their diesel submarine agreement with France offered nothing militarily useful. Nuclear-

powered submarines are essential and the new thinking has caused the creation of AUKUS much to Macron's fury.

Game theory began being applied to international relations because so much of it is a 'game of chicken'.

And that is where it gets seriously dangerous.

All of Germany, Italy and Japan spent most of the first half of the twentieth century playing 'games of chicken' with the League of Nations (key members, the British Empire and France) and the USA (crucially not a member). Failure to respond and take effective action against Japan over Manchuria and Shanghai, Italy over Abyssinia, and Germany over the Rhineland, Austria and Czechoslovakia sent the message that the democracies were 'frit'



and there was nothing these expansionist powers could not get away with. Meanwhile Stalin watched from the sidelines, keen to exploit international tensions for his own purposes and prepared to ally with anyone to that end, hence the USSR and Germany signing the Molotov Ribbentrop Pact in August 1939 which paved the way for their dismembering Poland just weeks later.

The Chinese will be calculating just how far they can go with their plans to regain Taiwan - and to take as their waters the South China Sea way beyond what the international agreements about EEZs (Exclusive Economic Areas) would give them.

Would the USA and its allies (AUKUS) really do much to defend Taiwan? New Zealand has already made it's position clear. They declined to join AUKUS, though invited, because they feared provoking China and acquiring obligations to others which at least for Jacinda Ardern do not constitute New Zealand's vital interests.

Worse, expansionism and bellicosity tends to be adopted by undemocratic regimes as a

way out of economic difficulties e.g. Mussolini, Hitler, Galtieri, Saddam Hussein! The Chinese power difficulties and despite their buying gas, massively raising its price in international markets, mean much of China is now on a three day week.

International 'games of chicken' and brinkmanship are both highly dangerous and problematic for democracies dealing with non-democracies: just how would AUKUS (and the EU) react to a Chinese invasion of Taiwan? Would they take the view that it is - to quote the former British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain of Czechoslovakia in 1938 - a "quarrel in a far away country, between people of whom we know nothing"?

It is through no fault of their own and they have done nothing to deserve it but Taiwan really is an international problem of the trickiest kind!

Tony Brown was a Political Adviser to the former Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy and its predecessor, Europe of Freedom and Democracy

There was an old woman who didn't know what to do...

By Revd Dr Peter Mullen

Lovely weather in Eastbourne last week, so I walked up to Beachy Head where I hoped to catch sight of further convoys of illegal immigrants being welcomed by the police handing out pizzas and burgers. Turning a corner on the coastal path that looks down at the lighthouse, I saw sitting there an old lady in tears, wringing her hands and shaking violently. I bent down and asked her:

"What's the trouble love?"

She said, "I'm on my way to the cliff edge to chuck myself off."

"No, you don't want to do that! Let's pop into the Beachy Head pub and you can tell me all about it."

We sat by the window and I ordered her a large gin and tonic while I sipped my usual low calorie Coke. The gin seemed to do the trick



for, once she began talking, I thought she'd never stop:

"I've tried umpteen ways of killing myself but look I'm still around – just about. So I thought I'd jump off here and make sure."

I asked her name and she replied, "Geebee. Everyone calls me Geebee, but I was christened Great Britain." And so she began her inventory of despair:

"One of my first attempts was to renounce the name I was christened and change it to Multi Kulti. A deadly thing to do, but unfortunately it takes quite a long time to take full effect. Then I thought a quicker way would be to join the EU – but those nice people in The Freedom Association turned up and helped get me out.

"Then I hit on the great idea of starving and freezing myself to death. So I stopped eating everything except a few herbs. I got very thin and scrawny, as you can see, and developed all sorts of nasty problems with my innards. Also my diet gave me what they call mental health issues so that I started going down on one knee before I watched football on the telly. And standing on the doorstep every Thursday evening to clap for all the pen-pushers in the NHS. But somehow I still clung on.

"One of my mental health issues took the form of a psychotic delusion; I became convinced that the world was getting hotter and hotter. The seas would rise and we'd all be flooded and drowned – everybody except the bosses in the BBC. Margate sands would become a torrid desert and Halifax turned into a dustbowl. And my psychotic delusion told me this catastrophe was all my fault for driving to cousin Elsie's on a Tuesday and flying to Ibiza now and again for a bit of a break.

"By this time, I was really down in the dumps. What could I do? Well, I thought my end would come more quickly if I stopped making a coal fire. I also gave up going into the garden and doing a bit of fracking. I decided to get all my heating and lighting from Putin Gas PLC – because they'd turn it off in the middle of winter and I'd freeze to death in next to no time.

"My mental health issues got worse and I started to believe that boys could change into girls and girls into boys. A boy can grow a cervix, you know and a lass can grow a... well, never mind. And a man/woman could easily do some chest-feeding. I thought, 'Why not let men with deep voices, beards and hairy legs into the ladies' loos so long as they identify as women?' I got the idea that the proper name for a pregnancy is a failed abortion and that slaughtering 200,000 unborn children every year should be known as pro-Choice. I came to think there was something really evil about monkeys and calling a banana a banana. It was around this time that I withdrew all my savings from the Westminster Bank and gave them away to the Chinese. Really, my life was getting to be pretty bleak and I was miserable, but somehow, as you can see, I'm still hanging on. The true nadir came and I was convinced I must be near death when I found myself voting for the Conservative Party. But you can still linger for a long time even after doing something as suicidal as that. I even had hallucinations that the Home Secretary was doing nothing to remove gangs of psychopaths gluing themselves to the M25 and holding up all the traffic. Still I hung on.

"So I've come here to throw myself off Beachy and make sure."

Although I knew it would put her over her permitted units of alcohol for the week, I bought her another large gin. I said, "Look love, you mustn't chuck yourself off Beachy. You might land on an illegal immigrant – sorry, I mean asylum-seeker – and do them some damage. Tell you what, I'll drive you home. You just sit there with all the lights out, eat your herbs and try to remember who won Strictly Come Dancing and you'll have snuffed it before you can say Sir David Attenborough."

But who was I to talk? I'm thinking of chucking myself off too – and so are a lot of my mates.

Peter Mullen is Hon Chaplain of The Freedom Association

Post-Brexit shortages and history rhyming

By Edward Spalton

‘History does not repeat itself, but it often rhymes.’ This saying, attributed to Mark Twain, came to mind as I read of the latest disruption to supply chains and shortages of fuel and raw materials – largely the consequence of COVID lockdown policies around the world.

In 1973 something very similar happened shortly after we joined the EEC. On top of the rise in food prices as a result of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), there was a huge price shock shortly afterwards caused by war in the Middle East and a massive hike in oil prices – which transmitted itself to commodities of all sorts worldwide.

Early in that year Sir Emrys Jones, who had been Senior Adviser to the Minister of Agriculture and Director of the Agricultural Development Advisory Service, addressed a group of feed technologists. We were surprised to learn that he had been deeply opposed to the CAP, although he had certainly done his duty in an exemplary way to prepare the industry for joining it. We had been completely ready by January 1st with no begging for ‘grace periods’ or for delays in implementation. At the time he addressed our group, he had resigned from the civil service and become Principal of the Royal Agricultural College, Cirencester.

So we got a very different talk to what we had expected. Instead of a deep, forward-looking assessment of how the new European system would work out in the long-term, we heard of the many urgent difficulties the college faced in practical matters as a result of the commodity crisis. One was a shortage of toilet paper because, as he said, ‘our Victorian drains block solid after a week of the *Daily Mail!*’

Sir Emrys was a very practical man, raised on a Welsh hill farm. He was making the wider point that our customers would be looking for sound advice on how to cope with the crisis and our value as suppliers would be increased if we could provide it along with our usual



products. He was delighted to be free from Whitehall. When I asked how he liked his new job, he said ‘Man! If it wasn’t for the bloody students and the bloody governors, the job would be bloody perfect!’

There were shortages in the shops. Sugar was in short supply. It wasn’t long after that when people began to fear that salt would be next, and panic buying soon cleared the shelves. Now, of course, there were millions of tons of salt under Cheshire so there was no shortage. But retail packaging ran out and, being based like toilet paper on imported material, could not instantly be replaced. So even a simple product like salt was in short supply because it depended on more complex supplies to render it fit for pre-pack sale through the supermarkets.

With regard to food, Margaret Thatcher commented on the 1975 Agriculture White Paper:

‘We are the most vulnerable country with our need for food imports. Therefore it is vital that we secure access to continuous and good sources of food supply. In some years supplies from the continent will be more expensive: in other years they will be cheaper. But the great benefit is access and the greater stability of supplies.’ (Hansard 1024)

We still are vulnerable in this respect – more so today with a population which has grown by some 10 million in recent years.

Consider today’s far more complicated situation where manufacturers rely on complex ‘Just in Time’ supply chains for

supplies of all sorts from all parts of the world. It was Toyota which led the way in Just In Time supply chains. They have used their experience to refine their system. Almost alone amongst motor manufacturers, they are not short of microchips, those increasingly vital components. It is no use starting up car production if you haven't got the right ones. The cars would not go!

It is interesting to learn how they achieved this. They took into account the time it would take to restore supply after a disruption and increased available stock accordingly. It is easy to restart production of some other materials, such as the plastics used in cars. They do not need so much of a buffer stock. But building or re-starting a microchip factory is a lengthy business and the prudent stock level reflected this.

Not only is all of Europe short of qualified lorry drivers to carry goods for export or import; all over the world there are supply chains which are out of joint. Shipping containers are not where they need to be. Ships are in the wrong ports. Highly skilled production teams have to be recruited and retrained.

In 1973 at the time of joining the EEC, in the middle of the turmoil of keeping our businesses going, we tended to lump all these effects together in our minds and blame them on the European project. But just because things happen at the same time or one after the other does not mean that one event has necessarily caused the other. They become associated in our minds because people experienced the effects simultaneously or very close together. So not every snag and shortage



will be down to Brexit or the EU – just as they were not all due to the EEC when we joined.

The circumstances are similar to those which coincided with our joining the EEC but on a bigger scale, so I think we can say that history has indeed ‘rhymed’ – but more loudly this time because of the length and complexity of supply chains and the techniques used to manage them with the minimum possible capital.

Edward Spalton is Chairman of the Campaign for an Independent Britain (CIB) and is a member of The Freedom Association. This piece was first published on CIB’s website (www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk/) and is published here with kind permission.

We must escape the European human rights trap

By Martin Howe QC

Dominic Raab put reform of the Human Rights Act back on the agenda at the Conservative Party conference. Quite rightly, this controversial and difficult subject has been kept on the back burner while the Brexit process has been underway. But now that Brexit is complete – except in Northern Ireland – the reform of our human rights law is long overdue.

The UK played an active role in drafting the European Convention on Human Rights, with the aim of safeguarding war-torn Europe against the return of Fascist or totalitarian regimes. It sets out a series of basic rights which, if you go by the words of the Convention, would gain universal support across the political spectrum.

Unfortunately, the Convention has not been interpreted according to its words, nor according to the intentions of the states who drafted it. For 70 years, the Human Rights Court at Strasbourg has been “interpreting” it in ways which engraft new or extended rights onto it which are not justified by its wording. In some cases – such as prisoner voting – these can be shown to be contrary to the actual intentions of the drafters of the Convention.

The Strasbourg Court is just as political and activist as the EU’s own Court of Justice at Luxembourg, but has a lower quality of judicial brainpower. Its politicised interpretations of the Convention have included extending its reach into overseas

Martin Howe QC: Chatham House - Attribution 2.0 Generic (CC BY 2.0)



military occupied areas or even war zones, causing huge difficulties for our Armed Forces, and asserting that “whole life” sentences of the kind handed out to the murderer of Sarah Everard are contrary to the Convention unless they are “reducible”.

We have the longest history of the protection of rights and liberties of any country in the world. It stretches back over 800 years to Magna Carta, with rights being progressively expanded by the common law



and by Parliament in statutes such as the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the corresponding Claim of Right in Scotland.

Tony Blair's Human Rights Act did not just import the European Convention into our law. It also required our courts to "take account" of judgments of the Strasbourg Court. Our courts over-interpreted the words "take account" to mean that they must follow consistent Strasbourg case law.

The way forward is not to scrap the Act, but to replace it with a UK Bill of Rights firmly based on our own traditions on the protection of liberties. It should remove the worst Strasbourg-created misinterpretations, and enhance rights in certain areas according to our own priorities as a nation, such as strengthening the protection of freedom of speech. It should be interpreted and applied

by our courts, with the balance between rights, or the balance between rights and other considerations such as the protection of the public, ultimately subject to decision by Parliament.

It seems that the Government is contemplating reforming our human rights laws along these lines but remaining in the European Convention. The ideal solution would be for us to stay within the Convention but leave the jurisdiction of the Strasbourg Court – but unfortunately the Convention was amended to remove this possibility many years ago.

So the risk is that conflict could arise in future at the international level between the Strasbourg Court and the UK over the way in which we interpret and apply Convention rights. I fear that this could result in political

and diplomatic pressure which might cause our government to buckle in the face of unjustified Strasbourg case law.

The question is why we need to be subject to the jurisdiction of an external court in this way. Commonwealth countries such as Canada and Australia constitutionally protect fundamental rights through their own court systems, without it being thought in any way necessary to superimpose an international court on top.

When we were in the EU we had the theoretical legal right to leave the Convention, but now we have left the EU it will be a lot

easier in practice. If we are truly Global Britain, what is the point of remaining in this Continental legal structure when we can better protect rights through our own legal system? The argument that Putin will pay more attention to judgments of the Strasbourg Court against Russia if we remain only has to be stated to be laughed out of court.

Martin Howe QC is chairman of Lawyers for Britain. This article was first published in the Daily Telegraph on 6th October 2021 and is republished here with kind permission.

Making the Dole Pay

By Dave Atherton

Eight years ago, and living in Kent, I was in between jobs. Stony broke, I got a job picking cherries at a local farm; a pleasant 30-minute drive through the vistas of the Garden of England and eight hours of hard graft tottering on ladders, trying to sort the perfect ones from the bruised. It was piecework, and after receiving about £150.00 for 40 hours being self-employed, the Minimum Wage was something you muttered under your breath.

It was nice to be in the fresh air, it was good to be able to pay the gas bill and have a pint. Best, you were making a positive impact for the farmer and on the economy. Yes, there were Europeans, but strangely most were locals or possibly Londoners who maybe reliving their equivalent experience of their grandparents' hop picking.

Post Brexit, coupled with Covid, many EU citizens headed home, leaving gaps in the labour market. Stories of Welsh agricultural workers being paid £1,000 a week and broccoli pickers getting £30 an hour have surfaced. While understandably many will be pleased that people are being relatively well paid, the downside is these increased costs will by osmosis, and will seep into higher prices for everyone, fuelling inflation.

In the food chain there are also shortages of slaughtermen, butchers and lorry drivers,



but paradoxically, we have 1.6 million unemployed. Is it not time to dangle carrots to pick carrots and use the stick if need be?

Sometimes it is apocryphal, sometimes it is true, but the archetypal builder or painter and decorator always has a pressing appointment in the morning every two weeks, but we see them by lunchtime. Abuse of the benefits system is real, although precise figures are hard to come by. People are claiming Universal Credit, but working full time. So here is my idea on Making the Dole Pay.

Take for example the Essex turkey farmer who wants staff five weeks leading up to Christmas. People who are unemployed sign onto an internet portal at the end of the week at the farm, put in five days' work, or how many days they have worked. Then when the job has finished, click on the button that they are looking for a new job, and their previous full unemployment status and payments returns. One of the objections I have seen is the hassle of signing on and off. I am sure we can all login and click a button.

How the money works is like this. Keeping the figures easy, let us assume the dole is £70.00 a week, and the rent paid per month is £400.00, being paid £10 per hour and working 40 hours per week. The state claws back £40.00 a week and £60.00 a week rent, leaving the former unemployed person £300 a week. The taxpayer is saving £400.00 a month. You can adjust the figures to suit.

As someone who works in recruitment, contracts do get extended, temporary jobs do become permanent jobs, it also gets the long term unemployed into the habit of work.

Frankly, those who decline or those that swing the lead should have their benefits cut or completely stopped for a while. However, of course there are people who are disabled or physically or mentally impaired will be exempt.

Obviously, a system like this is open to abuse, but I would argue that it is being abused at the moment, and this actually might encourage people to be honest, knowing they will be better off. Harsh penalties for those who do commit fraud, except for honest, clerical mistakes.

Britain is £2 trillion in debt with rising taxes and stubborn unemployment. Economic growth is the key to future prosperity and bringing in hundreds of thousands of unemployed people to plug gaps has to be the way forward.

Dave Atheron is Chairman of Freedom2Choose (a lifestyles freedom organisation), journalist and broadcaster



Violence is the problem - not men

By Nick Buckley MBE

The Sarah Everard murder is shocking. It is the plot of a horror movie. The very person we pay and rely on to protect us from evil was the very manifestation of it. The fact he used his 'power' as a police officer to subdue, handcuff and transport this poor lady to her death is chilling. Everyone I know would have followed his instructions. Allowed themselves to be physically restrained and then quietly sat in the back of this car.

Within 6 days of Sarah going missing, Wayne Couzens – a serving police officer, had been arrested for her murder. This is a great piece of work by the police - a fact that no one talks about. This does not mean the police should not look internally to see if they missed an opportunity to stop this evil man sooner, for we all should be trying to improve.

Couzens has now been convicted and will spend the rest of his life in jail. A better result could not have been expected for this brutal crime unless we bring back the death penalty – I am for that. But this outcome was not enough for some people. It was not enough for the radical, men-hating feminists - 'all men are to blame'.

We know the world can be a dangerous place. Last year, a 90-year-old woman in the UK starved to death because social services forgot to visit her. Last month, an Italian woman went for a walk in the woods and a pack of wild dogs killed her. And in the last few days, I guarantee a woman somewhere in the country has died in a car accident. Yet none of this will stop us from using social services, going for a walk, or getting in a car.

We traverse life assessing risk as we go along. We take sensible precautions to reduce risk while at the same time living our lives. This is not to say that worrying is silly - far from it. The more we are aware of the danger the more we can be prepared and precautions can be taken, if needed.

But if we allow our emotions to overrule our common sense then we become petrified and unable to function for we perceive danger everywhere. This is what is happening today.



Men are a danger. Police are a danger. If you want to be safe as a woman, then having more men and police around you is the best option.

Men can be violent – we all know this. But women are also violent and dangerous, for it is a human trait. We forget sometimes that we are animals who happen to be living in a concrete jungle.

According to government figures, women commit a third of all domestic violence and 10% of all murders. 43% of all female crime is violent crime. Women are not Disney princesses, they are human, and humans are violent. The real difference between the sexes is that men are more physically powerful, so do more damage.

I understand why some women are afraid. It is a natural reaction to such a horrible incident. Fear is useful - it keeps us alert and stops us from being eaten or falling off a cliff. It is sensible to be concerned about personal safety. Men are concerned for they are murdered at three times the rate of women.

I have some good news, violent crime is falling – it has since records began. In the last 25 years, we have seen a 72% reduction in violent crime incidents. This is great news. We still have more to do and we must not rest on our laurels. It is official, we live in a very safe

country – but bad things will still occasionally happen.

The recent outpouring of misandry on social media has been shocking. All men need educating not to rape - men are dangerous criminals - and the most pernicious, boys need de-masculinising so they do not grow up to be like men. We are in the middle of a 'man-hating' epidemic. Toxic masculinity. Patriarchy. Mansplaining. Man-spreading.

How did we get here? The simple answer is some women hate men, they are known as feminists. All men-haters are feminists, but not all feminists hate men; a subtle difference. Only 7% of Brits identify as feminists, for the myth they are fighting for equality has been exposed through their vile utterances. Life teaches us to turn away from hate for it leads to a dark unhappy place.

If we are to carry on reducing violence, then we need to concentrate on prevention and early intervention - to stop people from becoming offenders and reduce the number of victims. Let us ensure that children are not raised in violent homes for violence breeds violence. We need to keep fathers in the home for this hugely benefits both boys and girls. Highlight children who are more likely to be

dysfunctional, so we can put in place help and support.

I would crack down on low-level antisocial behaviour for many of these perpetrators are also the violent criminals. I would lock away violent offenders sooner and for longer, or until they pass the peak age for offending. A faster criminal justice system is needed to get offenders in front of a judge in months, not years. And let's run a pilot project for a fast-track corporal punishment sentence for certain offences.

Life is not a competition between men and women. It is a partnership. We bring different skills and experiences to the table and work together to create the best life, especially for the next generation. I want my fiancée, daughters, mum, sister, niece and granddaughter to be safe and happy. I am not fighting against them, I am fighting for them. Men are not a danger to women - a tiny minority of people are a danger to us all.

When life is in danger, remember who shouts 'Women and children first!' - it is men.

Nick Buckley MBE is Founder and Chairman of the charity, Mancunian Way

