

The Evolution Of No-Platform

The following address was made to a gathering of The Extremists Club in Central London, November 28, 2017. This is not a verbatim transcript but is near enough. I have removed the ums and ers, have added additional words for clarity, and I have generally omitted comments from the audience. The supplementary text is in green.

I have made several corrections including at the very end when I said “I just hope we don’t have to wait until somebody is thrown in gaol for claiming a woman is not a woman” instead of “I just hope we don’t have to wait until somebody is thrown in gaol for claiming a man is not a woman” – an obvious error.

I must apologise for the poor quality of the lighting; I had no control over that, neither did the cameraman. You may have to turn up the volume a bit, unusually for me, most times people tell me either to pipe down or shut up.

I made this speech largely from notes rather than a script, unfortunately my eyesight is as poor as the lighting, which explains my dithering at times. Be that as it may, I am vain enough to consider this to be an important address, one that should be heard/read in conjunction with *The Great Free Speech Experiment*.

Thanks to Josh in Marylebone High Street for showing me the kindness of strangers.

Everyboy hear me?

Anybody present when I gave my *The Great Free Speech Experiment*?

Well, this is the reason you’re not entitled to free speech.

Everybody familiar with no-platform?

In my humble opinion, no-platform is the reason why we are where we are today, in the Western world and the non-Western world to a great degree, not just in my lifetime but it goes back to just before the 1920s. If it hasn’t caused a particular problem, it’s made it a lot worse.

When I say no-platform I mean not the state banning people initially, I mean the thugs in the street, Antifa and the like. I think we're all aware of Antifa; there have been Antifa clones here, Anti-Fascist Action and so on. No-platform is Antifa and everything that goes with it: pressuring venues, whispering campaigns, but largely it is the use of force to stop people holding *bona fide* meetings. This does spill over into legislation, and the reason we have this legislation is primarily because of no-platform. It is the denial of any sort of platform, and if they had their way they would deny us from holding meetings and speaking here.

The rationale behind it is very simple it is: if you had free speech, you wouldn't allow anybody else to have it, and this free speech is so dangerous because...who decides? They decide. It is no-platform by any means necessary, not by any legal means necessary, but by any means, up to and including murder. There have been murders, not that many, but certainly people have been viciously attacked. There were attacks in the 1990s here, and more recently we have seen Antifa in the United States attacking people as we saw in the case of the Trump supporter who was holding a flag, a guy walked up to him and hit him over the head with what appeared to be a cloth, it was but it was wrapped around a bicycle lock, and it split the victim's head open.

He was traced through 4chan, I think it was, and it turns out this guy is an academic, a professor.

What happened to him?

I think he's in prison awaiting trial at the moment. You'd think these people having some sort of education that it would mean something, but it doesn't do any good at all, the indoctrination is so bad. There are so many left wing academics. As I say, by any means necessary, including extreme violence, and when this violence occurs it is always the right that is said to be responsible for it.

Initially, no-platform was used against so-called fascists - anyone they called a fascist - but if you look at some of the laws we have in this country, they are far more oppressive than either Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia. We are spied on all the time; there are cameras everywhere. If you make an international phone call, someone is listening. If you send an e-mail, someone is collecting that. There are lots of manufactured offences for which you can be arrested and thrown into gaol.

If you send money through Western Union or MoneyGram, the forms you have to fill out...You can't open a building society account without two forms of ID. They failed to get ID cards imposed, but back in the 1930s they were complaining Jews were made to wear the yellow star...look at it now. These people don't think.

A member of the audience pointed out that in practice you need a bank card.

It isn't just about protecting your money, and protecting people with CCTV, it's about controlling us.

Pippa King has done a lot of work on this; you'll find her videos on-line. She also has a website. She's a housewife and music teacher from Hull. She isn't right wing as such; she got into this when they tried to fingerprint her kids for the school library. She noticed this by chance and told the headmistress "You didn't ask my permission" and she was told "I don't need your permission".

What they're doing in schools now is mind-blowing.

There's a subtle irony here that only a fascist government can ban fascism.

This whole nonsense of no-platform has caused the Overton window to shift further left.

Is everyone familiar with the Overton window?

It's named after a bloke called Overton who was killed in a plane crash in 2003; it's the window of acceptable discourse - you can discuss this subject in certain terms, and no more. You can't discuss race, you can't discuss certain aspects of history, and now it's coming to sex as well, as we will see shortly. Some subjects are becoming increasingly taboo.

The Overton window shifting is not always and necessarily a bad thing, for example, we used to shove little boys up chimneys. That hasn't been acceptable for a long time.

[In 1863, this abhorrent practice was said to be "as bad as the Negro slavery, only it is not so known".]

So stamping out bad practices is not a bad thing. The idea that women should have their own bank accounts and should be able to manage their own money is not a bad idea, ditto all sorts of other things, but by and large we are going left, left, left...big state.

[The extensive use of and the hysteria attached to no-platform has shifted the Overton window progressively left, so that now ideas that were once considered mainstream are no longer acceptable, and ideas that were once considered unacceptable are now mainstream.]

I first became aware of no-platform around 1974 when I was 18. I was living in Ladbroke Grove at the time and was not a political animal.

It was only after I moved to Leeds in 1977 that I became aware of it big time. I haven't been there for a while but as some of you may know, Leeds has a strong Marxist presence, or it did when I lived there.

This included the *Corner Bookshop* which was run by loony second wave feminists, women's liberation as it was then misknown.

[There was also a fairly large right wing presence, which included me when I joined the British Movement in 1980.]

At one time the National Front used to be able to sell their newspapers in the city centre, and violence was used against them at times.

When I was researching not no-platform but related subjects many years ago, I found what may well be the first instance of no-platform in the UK. I can give you a precise citation. For those of you who use Kew, you'll find this in

File CAB 24/162, page 153: this is Special Branch Report No. 226 of October 11th, 1923.

It's under *EXTREMISTS AND THE BRITISH "FASCISTI"*.

There is a report on the inaugural meeting of the London branch of the organisation which was at Hammersmith on October 7. The meeting was opened by Miss Bennett, a former suffragette. It was said to have been disrupted by "extremists".

Anyone know who founded the British Fascisti?

[One person did.]

It was founded by Miss Rotha Beryll Lintorn Lintorn-Orman. Today, most people think Sir Oswald Mosley was the kingpin, but he was a mainstream politician at that time. The organisation was founded in May 1923, and its name

was Anglicised shortly, becoming the British Fascists. Miss Lintorn-Orman died young, about forty in 1935 in Grand Canaria. She is said to have borrowed the name and very little else from Italy. The British Fascisti were not fascists at all in any meaningful sense of the word, but radical Conservatives. Their practices included sending the King a telegram for his birthday and subversive stuff like that.

The main objection to Fascism, certainly with the rise of Nazism, was anti-Semitism. Yet Mussolini, who is generally acknowledged as the father of modern Fascism, was no anti-Semite; there was at least one Jew in his Cabinet. Anti-Semitism was something that was tacked onto the movement in Germany, not by, or not only by, Hitler.

Interestingly and again I can give you a precise citation, in 1926 a Jewess claimed to have been a leader of Fascism in Italy before Mussolini.

American Hebrew, November 5, 1926, pages 820 and 863, contains an interview with Signora Amalia Besso who claimed to have been a leader of women's fascism in Italy before Mussolini.

A Woman Leader of the Italian Fascisti.

Says her movement, Fascio Femminile, was founded in 1917.

Of course these ideas actually go back a long way, to ancient Greece, as do communism, socialism and democracy, authoritarian government, leadership, etc. Confucius had similar ideas. Mussolini's was the modern version.

Another report on the British Fascisti can be found in CAB 24/162, page 433: this is Special Branch Report No. 230. of November 8th, 1923.

Page 13 of the report reports on a meeting of the British Fascisti held in Hammersmith. 20 people attended. A further 130 "local communist unemployed" turned up and disrupted the meeting.

CAB 24/162, page 577: a Special Branch report dated November 22nd, 1923. Report No. 232.

At page 15 of the report is "EXTREMISTS AND THE FASCISTI IN LONDON."

This reports that on November 15, about 150 people were present including many extremists who disrupted the meeting.

The speakers outlined the principles of the movement

[which included “the protection of the King and the Empire and opposition to communism.”]

So you can see there was already a very well organised no-platform movement in the UK as far back as 1923.

No-platform started a bit earlier in Germany, and was used against the nascent German Workers Party or the German Labour Party which Adolf Hitler joined as member number 7. Although he does not use the phrase, Hitler explains in *Mein Kampf*, Volume II how what he calls the reds would turn up at the party meetings *en masse*, and that this would result in the police being called.

Volume 2, page 523: “The only real outcome of police intervention was that the meeting would be dissolved, which was precisely what our opponents wanted”.

[Authorised version]

As a result of that, and of the violence that was meted out by their opponents.

Page 528: the party bodyguard had been assembled by the summer of 1920.

His idea was to stop their meetings being disrupted by any means necessary.

These sort of strong arm tactics worked for Hitler, but they backfired on Sir Oswald Mosley, spectacularly.

When Mosley formed the British Union of Fascists he made it clear that it would not operate an anti-Jewish policy; he was quite clear about that. By and large this was accepted by Organised Jewry in good faith, but not by the thug element. It isn't necessary to exaggerate the Jewish involvement in communist movements, but there was a substantial presence in the East End of London where the BUF had a large presence, and the attacks on the organisation were unrelenting.

There was an unremitting hate campaign against Mosley, and in the end Mosley turned against Jews and began using anti-Semitic rhetoric in his publications.

In 1934, Mosley held a large meeting at Olympia which was subjected to the same disruptive tactics we've seen pretty much all the time since then.

Mosley's response was to tell his stewards to use extreme violence against these people, and of course, who was to blame? Mosley was to blame. The far right is to blame. They always blame the far right.

[We saw similar treatment of especially the National Front in the 1970s. Any violence meted out by the Front was condemned, as it should have been, but any violence inflicted on NF members, well, that was their fault as well.]

We saw similar treatment used against Donald Trump. How anyone can call Trump a fascist I don't know, unless you consider the American Constitution to be fascist. I don't agree with Trump on everything, I think his policy on Iran is misguided; I'm not too fond of the way he is going about trying to bring North Korea to heel, but his policy is America for the Americans, America first. And when he says Americans, he means all Americans, not just white Americans. And I don't see anything wrong with that. He hasn't done so much to rein in the police who as I am sure some of you will know are a law unto themselves in America; it isn't just blacks they shoot and beat up, it's whites, and at times women.

They tried using the same tactics against Trump, but fortunately they didn't work.

Leaving aside the efforts on right wing politicians, this is allowed and indeed encouraged as is the promotion of all manner of lunacy from the race lobby, and now we've got it from the LGBT lobby, what used to be called the gay movement but now we have the ever expanding acronyms: LGBTQI now or something. It's ludicrous.

Before coming to that though I would like to return to the Jewish Question, so-called. There are some people, including one person in particular who attends these meetings but isn't here tonight, some people who see the hidden hand of the Jew behind everything. Jews have been heavily involved in these movements and this hysteria, and while the idea of a Jewish plot or Jewish conspiracy is plausible if you look at it in a certain way, but Jews have not created a plot, rather some Jews have helped create a Frankenstein's monster. And we all know what happened to Dr Frankenstein. And in fact this monster has turned against Jews at times, in particular Israel. I'm not a fan of Israel, we've all seen the terrible conditions of the occupation of the West Bank, but what has been happening in the Middle East of late in particular Syria...are the Israelis quite as bad by comparison? They didn't cause Syria to explode.

What has happened is that the no-platform movement split on Israel. You have the pro-Israel lot, Organised Jewry and a lot of right wing Christians for whom

any opposition to Israel is anti-Semitism. And then you've got the anti-Zionist lobby who see Israel as a form of Imperialism, America's watchdog in the Middle East, rather than the tail wagging the dog. And of course they regard the Israelis as racists and even as Nazis. They have prominent supporters like Roger Waters, and it can be quite amusing at times especially on campus when you see the anti-Zionist wing trying to treat the Israel Lobby the same way they treat the extreme right. To them, Zionism is part and parcel of the Great Satan.

In the early 1970s, any National Front supporter or anyone who opposed immigration was branded racist. The word used then was racialist but in time became racist. If that was not bad enough, the emergence of identity politics has seen the extension of no-platform from Nazis, racists, anti-Semites, fascists, the whole anti-immigration lobby, to any form of normal sexuality. The word racism has been around for quite a while; sexism was first used in 1866 - in a different context - but in the 1960s, the idea of sexism became dominant: women were oppressed by men, and at the top of the tree of oppression you have white heterosexual Anglo-Saxon men who are oppressing everybody.

They tried to no-platform sexists, then it was extended to homophobes, and the latest development of this nonsense is the divide between feminists and trans-sexuals. And again this is quite amusing, you see the vile man-hating dyke Julie Bindel being no-platformed by the trans-sexual lobby. The whole thing is contrived. I am 61 years old, I've interviewed one trans-sexual back in 1990 something; I've seen in the flesh maybe three or four real ones. What's happening nowadays with trans-sexualism and gender is complete nonsense, it's insanity, it's madness.

With regard to racial issues, these idiots have moved the Overton window so far to the left that you can't discuss race because race is a social construct and has no basis in biology. You can kid people about that to some degree by fudging the data, confusing nationality with race, blacks and half-blacks, but the idea that race doesn't exist is ludicrous. That though is their paradigm. Now they're trying to do the same thing with sex, we're told that gender is a social construct.

Let me make my position clear here, I think we're all in favour of - I don't like the term "equal rights" because that's a misnomer, but fairness. We don't treat everybody equally; we don't treat a ten year old who burns down a house the same way as we would a thirty year old, though perhaps after Jon Venables we should rethink that. I've got no problem with people being treated fairly, all things considered, but they go way beyond that. Their concept of fairness is equality of outcome, and towing their line. You can't argue with stupid, I've tried often enough over the past thirty odd years, and I've just about given up. What has been happening especially in Canada with the sexual grievance lobby,

especially on campus, is insane. You find all sorts of wonderful stuff on YouTube, including video of angry feminists trying to shut down a men's rights meeting. They're standing outside screaming right up in a police officer's face, and swearing at him.

The easiest way to get arrested in this country is to swear at a police officer, but they're standing there and taking it. This is bad. The Overton window has shifted so far left that if you haven't seen this, you won't believe it. I can assure you it's true, you will find it on YouTube. The latest idea is that you can self-identify, choose your gender, this and that.

Now we all self-identify after a fashion, and there is nothing wrong with that. There is a man at the moment standing at the back of the room who self-identifies as a cameraman. As he's done this many times before, and is filming this now, that is perfectly reasonable, but if he decided to self-identify as a bat and jump out the window, how far would he fly?

I've tried self-identifying as the billionaire lover of Taylor Swift; I'm still waiting for that yacht. Lauren Southern has exposed this for the insanity it is. Anybody heard of Lauren Southern?

[They had!]

For those of you who haven't, Lauren Southern is a Canadian Libertarian. She ticks all the right boxes, for me anyway. Personality, soft spoken, blonde, drop dead gorgeous, everything. Your trophy girlfriend.

Last year she carried out a bizarre experiment. She used a concealed camera, and you will find the footage on YouTube. She went to a clinic and told the woman behind the desk that she'd been living as a man and had self-identified as "a gender-nonbinary person" for the past year.

She didn't overdo it, she wore a hat and kept her hair done up as a woman might if she worked in say a warehouse, but there was no way even a blind man would not have identified her as a woman. There was nothing butch about her. Her documentation was in order, and with only a few questions, she was given a doctor's note that said she identified as male. Then she went a government booth in a public building, with her documentation in order, and applied for an ID card as a man. This time she was still wearing her hat, but her hair was long and flowing. And without too much trouble she was issued an ID card that said she is a man.

This is insane. What is even more insane is that at some point, probably now, if you disagree with somebody's assigned sexuality in Canada, you're committing a criminal offence. This is the end result: truth doesn't matter.

But the insanity doesn't stop there, some of these lunatics are actually trying to deny the reality of sex, not simply gender, but sex. On YouTube you will find a 36 second clip by a professor of gender studies, a male professor with the name Nicholas Matte, who said there is no such thing as biological sex. Sex doesn't exist. What can anybody say?

This has gone so far, but I think we have Hillary Clinton to thank for getting us out of this mess. Anyone remember her comment?

[The basket of deplorables comment was recognised by most if not all present.]

Half of Donald Trump's supporters could be placed in a basket of deplorables. She went on to say these were racists, sexists, homophobes, xenophobes...

In other words, if you vote for Donald Trump, read if you don't vote for me, you are a bigot, a person who is beyond the pale. How could you be anything else?

That was a step too far, and people are beginning to see through it. Of course, they didn't vote for her, and hopefully she will be indicted at some point for her crimes against America.

This is what no-platform has led us to. Where is it going? It is leading us towards tyranny. This is the reason we've had this so-called war against fascism and racism and sexism, and all the other isms; it's destroying our freedom, it's destroying us, but hopefully people are waking up. I just hope we don't have to wait until somebody is thrown in gaol for claiming a man is not a woman.

So this is basically the history of no-platform and its development up to date. Hopefully it will start moving the other way, but I'm not that hopeful.

There followed a discussion about my presentation and related issues, with particular reference to sex , sexual identity, and sexual perversion (ie male homosexuality).