

Rishi will need some populism

To become a President or the leader of a majority party modern democrats need to assimilate enough populism to win. The elite establishment view is based around the iron discipline of accelerated progress to net zero, whilst including political correctness and the boom/bust lurches of their economic advice. The elite currently favour recession to tame the inflation their damaging over extended experiment in money printing brought us. This is not a winning ticket.

Populists of the so called right have been adopting some socialist policy features, favouring price controls on basics, subsidies and even windfall taxes. Their more unique and positive remedy of lower taxes is a good selling point, as is their opposition to government lecturing and regulating so many aspects of our lives. They see use of a car as part of our freedoms, and resent culture war thought controls.

Populists of the left want to tax the rich more. Their selling point is the offer of more free money to more people, as they work away at proposals to shorten working weeks, offer minimum incomes and promise ever more "free" public services on a universal basis. They are happy with taxing and regulating cars off the road and with making it more and more difficult to run a free enterprise business. They recruit plenty of thought police.

An incoming leader like Rishi Sunak has difficult judgements to make. He sits at the top of an establishment official and quango ridden government which will wish to expunge populist traits from his policy mix. If he lets them do this he will not rescue the opinion polls. If he insists on too much populism the elite will seek its revenge.

Can a government Minister do things the elite dislike?

Both Priti Patel and Suella Braverman have sought to implement a popular policy of ending people trafficking and the large flows of young men from safe European countries into the UK. Both have encountered substantial resistance from officials, the legal profession and the courts. We need to ask why.

No one can doubt both women want to stop the dangerous trade. No one can doubt their energy and determination. Both had or have backing to legislate to make clear the policy and ensure all the powers are in place for enforcement. It is odd they need to as by definition illegal migrants are already breaking the law and the authorities already have enforcement powers.

Every time Ministers get people booked on a plane for removal because they are criminals last minute legal procedures intervene. The Home Office allows a huge backlog of asylum claims to build up for people who have come from France and often got to France from a country that posed no risk to them. Why cannot they reach correct but quick decisions about these cases? It is not fair on the migrant to keep them waiting for many months unable to work and unsure if they can stay. It is certainly not fair on taxpayers who have to pay ballooning hotel bills to keep them in idleness.

It is time the official machine accepted that ending dangerous journeys and illegal economic migration is a worthy aim. The politicians speak for the majority as they should. They deserve support and help. They are not as some seem to think the problem. The new Home Secretary has promised legislation to again clarify to officials and courts this trade has to stop. She will need to make sure this time the law is watertight as so many seem to want to stop the implementation of this popular policy.

[My Intervention at the debate on the UK Infrastructure Bank Bill \[Lords\]](#)

Rt Hon Sir John Redwood MP (Wokingham) (Con): Can the Chief Secretary explain why the bank is investing in a very expensive cable electricity link between the United Kingdom and Germany, given that we are in the same time zone and have similar weather, and both countries are chronically short of electricity capacity? It does not sound like a good idea to me.

John Glen MP, Chief Secretary to the Treasury: I will not be able to comment on specific investments. As I said, a series of investments have been made in the last 12 months, and I would be happy to correspond with my right hon. Friend and put him in touch with the bank so that the logic behind that decision can be explored with him.

[My Intervention in the Ministerial Statement on National Security](#)

Rt Hon Sir John Redwood MP (Wokingham) (Con): What urgent action will the Government take so that we grow more of our own food, produce more of our own oil and gas, and refill our depleted reservoirs? Having more domestic supply of the basics is now fundamental to national security, given the obvious threats from Russia and others.

Tom Tugendhat MP, Minister of State for Security: I will not comment on the details of the taskforce, but I think I can safely say that that is a little beyond even what I was hoping for. I will not go into details, except to say that my right hon. Friend is absolutely right: the reality is that supply chains in our country and around the world have changed as covid has influenced different issues, and sadly the nature of the decoupling that some states have sought to pursue has changed the way in which we must consider our own security.

[The elite does not like debate or challenge](#)

Recent history shows it is very difficult for Prime Ministers and Ministers to challenge the internationalist orthodoxy even in a relatively strong and well based democracy like the UK.

I do not buy into silly conspiracy theories that the world is run by a couple of billionaires who enforce their views on world governments. I do observe that there is a very powerful consensus pumped out by most western governments, by leading international bodies, and by many academics and professionals. This consensus can make dreadful mistakes, as it has in economics with the recession machine of the Exchange Rate mechanism, then the boom/bust of the banking crash and now the rough ride from excessive money printing and inflation to recession again.

Many experts, professionals and officials genuinely believe the consensus they help form. Others have to go along with it if they want to get a job or if they wish to be in the rooms where the conversations take place that shape these things. It is very difficult getting a university science post if you challenge aspects of the global warming story. It is difficult influencing economic policy if you point out Central banks often get it wrong. It is very difficult in the UK to become a government Minister if you consistently advocated leaving the EU. It is very difficult being Home Secretary if you want to stop illegal migration.

The elites interplay with conventional media to constantly reinforce their spin lines. Forecasts and opinions by international bodies and conforming governments are treated as facts. Alternative views and forecasts are ignored or traduced. It leads the populist majorities that form to become more disillusioned with the media as well as with governments. It leads more to then prefer bizarre conspiracy theories.

How many times were we told inflation would stay at 2% however much money they printed? How often were we told when inflation was setting in it would be temporary? Why were those of us who wanted to stop the money printing in 2021 not allowed airtime to put the alternative view?

Most governments pursued lockdown in response to covid, trying to prevent an alternative policy. Most governments claim to want to rush to net zero, though many miss targets or refuse to work to targets applying to them. They usually want to increase the power and revenues of the states they lead.