

Make no mistake – Brexit is a revolution

The departure of Priti Patel has made Department for International Development (DfID), fleetingly, a relevant topic of debate. Now to me, if you want to understand Brexit you are best looking at DfID. The reason being that its very existence is the product of the left wing capture of the establishment and is emblematic of it. It is the canary down the mine.

A lot of crap has been written about “the establishment” by people who confuse money and status with power. Real power is control over the institutions because from there you can subvert the culture. Not for nothing did the USSR invest so much energy in infiltrating UK academia and media – and not for nothing did the EU set about doing the same thing. If you can do that then you *are* the establishment.

Though there has been much denial that the EU influences education, the denials are from a position of ignorance. The EU does not keep its objectives secret. The “conspiracy” is hidden in plain sight.

Cultural changes and global interdependence have led to the creation of a tremendous variety of European and international networks, focused on specific objectives. Some have been supported by Community funding. These networks link businesses, communities, research centres, and regional and local authorities. They provide new foundations for integration within the Union and for building bridges to the applicant countries and to the world.

Though it's dressed up in Eurocratese when you look at the flow of funding it all starts to make sense. Universities are recipients, as are NGOs and the BBC. For years we on the right have complained about the encroachment of the soft left social

democratic NGO inspired consensus only to be met with calculated ridicule from BBC Radio 4 “comedy” output. See The Now Show/NewsQuiz. Except we were right and we still are.

The reason the EU influence tends to be NGO inspired claptrap is because the globalist NGOs are immensely powerful lobbyists. But there’s more to it than that. Because there is no European demos to speak of and the EU does not enjoy democratic legitimacy it had to manufacture it by way of paying NGOs huge sums to lobby it. A well documented phenomenon. A mutually advantageous PR merry-go-round. Everything from climate change to saving the bees. Astroturfing as it is now called.

It has since set the agenda for media campaigns, and academic syllabuses. This then works its way into popular culture. Not least through children’s television. There was always a dose of NGO propaganda on the BBC from Red Nose Day (and the celeb culture therein) to the near constant agenda-driven content of *Blue Peter* and *Newsround*. School projects and teaching materials were also subverted. I would perhaps venture this is why millennials are such credulous wet blankets and hopelessly enamoured with the EU.

By the early nineties the buzzword “sustainability” could be found everywhere – and culminated in Cameron’s husky hugging eco-conservatism (just as the fad was waning). In between we’ve had any number of job-killing eco targets driving energy costs up for the poor. But this is the mentality which is common to the globalist elite. It is ultimately politically sterile left wing populism with its own dogmas, demanding conformity for advancement just like any other political bubble.

The encroachment of this political consensus was so advanced at one point that politicians thought it was an election winner. It was this assumption that caused Cameron to sanitise the Tory party and alienate the right, pushing them out into

Ukip. I think that was probably when Brexit became an inevitability. The Tory party was weaponising virtue signalling. This brings me to an illuminating piece from Prospect Online, featuring the testimony of a DfID official.

When the financial crisis hit in 2008, Cameron forgot his previous commitment to match Labour's wider spending total and embraced retrenchment. DfID, however, was immune. Aid was not merely shielded from the planned cuts, like the NHS, but continued to be earmarked for the rises required to get Britain to 0.7 per cent.

Cameron ventured to Rwanda where he gave a speech about development and announced the launch of his party's own aid venture, Project Umubano. An annual two-week trip to Rwanda for Conservative Party MPs and activists, this proved to be Cameron and Mitchell's secret weapon. As an aid project, Project Umubano is terrible. It's gap-year-style volunteerism—building classrooms, teaching English, helping out in health clinics. The Instagram feeds of the volunteers are filled with pictures of them surrounded by smiling, grateful children. It's striking how many people who have been involved in Umubano refer to their trips to "Africa", not Rwanda.

But as a political project, it was genius. It attracted a stream of volunteers—ambitious would-be Tory MPs soon realised that a fortnight teaching English in a Rwandan village was a sure-fire way of getting yourself on the new "A" list for a safe seat. A decade on, the project's alumni includes MPs, Lords and special advisers. Mitchell admits that helping Rwanda was only one aim of the project. "I introduced it, above all, to try to make sure that within the Conservative Party there is a core of people who are passionate about development. One of the reasons I bigged it up this year [on its 10th anniversary] was to try to rectify this drift in the Tory Party."

Now you might write this off as typical Tory cynicism but this is endemic to the culture of Westminster. Here I come back to the words of a controversial blogger, who I shall not name. He observes that in the immediate aftermath of Jo Cox's death tribute after tribute bore witness to Jo Cox's uniqueness. "But in reality, nothing could have been further from the truth. In fact, women like Jo Cox are ten a penny across the West these days – bland, compliant functionaries who have been marinated in political correctness and are happy to regurgitate the platitudes and attitudes of their political masters. And are well-rewarded for doing so.

She was that toxic combination of self-righteousness and entitlement which believed itself possessed of a special moral insight into the moral shortcomings of their own people. Never slow to parade her compassion, she was also calculating enough to help more dubious causes, as when she lent her name to a government minister who was lobbying for Britain to begin bombing in Syria. Bombing and babies; it was all business for Jo Cox.

Hers was the typical smooth career path of the modern political cog. From her grammar school, where she was the Head Girl, she seamlessly moved onto an extended period at two universities before emerging as professional aid worker for Oxfam and Save the Children. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation was another fashionable international development outfit in which she managed to wangle a position as "advisor."

She certainly travelled extensively, but to what extent did she get her hands dirty? Rather than mopping sweat-covered brows, her role as a policy consultant seemed to revolve swanning around seminars, conferences and committee rooms in Brussels and London. Networking, rather than counselling, seems the main skill in this field.

The safe Labour seat seems to have been a reward for acting as a bag-carrier for prominent political wives such as that of

former Prime Minister Gordon Brown and a former Labour leader and Euro aristocrat Neil Kinnock. Her constituency seat had been represented by local white men for decades so an all-female shortlist had to be imposed on the local party to ensure an acceptable candidate could be given this plum.

It was a gilded lifestyle with a houseboat on the Thames beside Tower Bridge at which she hosted networking events for important left-wing women. There was a second house in her constituency which was a venue for a huge Solstice party each year.

The role of international aid worker is highly valued among a section of shrewd university-educated females. It offers a particularly attractive combination of a good salary in an expanding sector, frequent foreign travel and high status among the do-gooding circles."

As you might expect these words, at the time, went down like a lead balloon, but are nonetheless true. This is how the system works and if you want to get a close to power this is the narrative you must follow regardless of your party affiliation.

The reason the sentiment at the time was that the political parties were all the same is because they were. Nobody dared break ranks. Except of course Ukip, whose asinine "plain talking" garnered much support as a protest vote against an increasingly venal and shallow political class incapable of relating to the public.

In fact, the vote to embed the 0.7% GDP aid spending target was carried by a massive majority in the Commons while all polling suggested that few wanted to see an increase in aid spending. The terms "virtue signalling" and "out of touch" don't even begin to cover it. This is a form of madness.

Our DfID official observes that in the post-Brexit world, "one reason that aid is proving so suddenly vulnerable is that

nobody ever made the argument about what modern development involves. It's not just grain handouts and paying for teachers or nurses. Often our support goes on things which, when ripped from its context and placed in size 72 font on a tabloid headline, can look like a waste. One such project was created in Ethiopia, an innovative crackdown on an epidemic of child marriage".

It was called Girl Effect and Dfid funded it to the tune of £5.2m. A culture brand was created, called Yegna, which included a radio show and a girl group. The aim was to change perceptions of what girls could do, instead of entering into a marriage before they were 16. DfID thought it was a success, giving it an A rating.

Well of course it did. It makes everybody feel lovely. And that's what counts isn't it? Same as sending half a dozen clapped out RAF Tonkas to fire missiles over Syria makes us feel like the right hand of vengeance. Doesn't actually matter if it has no measurable effect or even if the effects are vastly counter-productive.

And this is what we critics mean when we say there is no accountability. The system is largely self-audited by its own values (however far departed from reality they may be). We should note that the example cited is largely in line with UN Sustainable Development Goals which is pretty much written into the DNA of all UN regulatory activity. Watchers of UNCTAD and the fringes of the WTO will have seen a massive drive for gender equality and all the popular claptrap of the NGO set.

This is usually without listening to the natives who are not especially imbued with meddlesome Western cultural and moral imperialism. Very often there is devastating blowback which seldom ever goes reported.

It is not a good idea to impose Western social mores on tribal peoples. Ultimately it is the women of the West who have

asserted their own equality and through trade we need to enable other women to do the same. Ploughing in with moralising lectures from upper middle class white saviour barbies is most certainly not the way to do it.

The touchy-feely narcissistic aid doctrines of the West have on a number of occasions proved utterly disastrous. Not for nothing do we see African nations starting to expel NGOs. They're a menace.

This is not to say that DfID could not be put to good use but firstly the culture must change and our institutions must be decontaminated. Our aid policy is running almost entirely independently of the FC0, largely to an alien agenda to questionable effect. Its perverse culture is deeply intertwined with the EU which accounts for £5bn of our aid spending.

The whole system has lost the plot, lost its moral centre, forgotten who it serves – and who pays its way. In this regard it's something of a pity that Ms Patel has blown it for herself. An idiotic wrecker is probably the right medicine for a department as bent out of shape as DfID.

For all that we have nominally had a conservative government for the last seven years we have in fact been living under the same régime since the early nineties. There has been a silent coup where the instruments of state have been re-purposed to serve the agenda of Brussels and the globalist NGOcracy. It is difficult to tell where one ends and the other begins.

This is why the establishment has fiercely resisted Brexit because it affects their income stream and their access to the levers of power. When they say that Brexit means we will be less influential they mean *they* will be less influential. This is actually their naivety at work in that the culture rubs off on them and they go native. Hence why academia will go to bat for Brussels every time.

There are plenty of commentators who have noted there is a certain revolutionary zeal about Brexiters. They are not wrong. We want the narcissistic wastrels purged. We want the adults back in control. We want to see academic rigour and an academia that doesn't mindlessly spout leftist doctrine as though it were the centre ground.

Now you'll get no argument from me that the Tory right are absolutely insane but these wreckers will break the institutional melding between the EU and UK, it will cut off the funding for divisive EU political agendas, and it will starve the beast; forcing many of the decisions politicians thus far have been too cowardly to take.

Often I get lectures from the great and the good that revolutions are destabilising and often dangerous. Indeed they are. The Tory right will be the first to be consumed by it. But it will rip through politics like a cleansing forest fire.

You tell me it isn't necessary and there are other means of achieving change, but there really isn't. The system saw Ukip coming a mile off. It knows how to play political judo. The system is rigged for stability. That is part of its merit. But when it has been captured by an occupying force, we have no other choice. As much as the right-on, mustn't offend, must not act in the national interest mentality has completely consumed DfID, the intellectual stultification that comes with it is widespread.

It goes hand in hand with the political correctness of the left to the point where a shadow minister must resign for the criminal act of telling the truth. When Westminster is more concerned with Julia Hartley-Brewer's knee than systemic child abuse it becomes a matter of urgency to clear the lot of them out – no matter the cost. Make no mistake, this is a revolution and if it does not succeed then the UK will be consumed by the narcissism and venality of the establishment to the point where nothing functions. By the looks of things

we may be too late.