

PARTYGATE, PARTY OVER?

By Christopher J. Wilkinson ([Website](#), [LinkedIn](#), [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Telegram](#), [MeWe](#))



Source: Philtweir, [Wikimedia](#) (Public Domain)

Partygate may radically redefine the state-citizen relationship.

The Metropolitan Police are said to be [investigating a series of political gatherings that took place between 2020 and 2021](#) potentially in breach of government regulations. For one occurrence, photographed in May 2020, the Prime Minister [deemed it to be work-related](#) (at a time when many were not permitted to be at work by government) with a [bring your own booze requirement for attendees](#) (at a time when pubs were forcibly shut, again by government).

A [redacted version of a Partygate report](#) by Sue Gray, a civil servant currently in the position of Second Permanent Secretary in the Cabinet Office, is due for release this week but could be delayed; controversially, it is said that information is being withheld so as not to compromise the [Metropolitan Police's own inquiry](#).

Details of the events seemingly demonstrate the [Prime Minister living life close to normal](#) while the wider nation had to endure his government's arbitrary [lockdown rules](#), adhere to [social distancing](#), consume [fear-inducing propagandist broadcasts](#), refrain from [seeing their friends and loved ones](#), suffer from [deteriorating mental health](#) and [domestic violence](#), and in the worst cases [die alone](#) from conditions left untreated by a supposedly enviable state-run health service. The hypocrisy of "do as I say, not as I do" could not be clearer.

Was it right for the many to follow the rules while the few broke them? What does the secrecy surrounding these events indicate regarding the supposed severity of the pandemic? Has Partygate changed how some perceive government rules, or their tendency to obey authority without question? Will Boris Johnson survive as Prime Minister? Blacklist Press asked for thoughts on Partygate and received the following responses:

By LibertariDan ([Telegram](#))

I won't bore you with each charge in the Partygate scandal. We've heard them enough. Nor are they so terribly surprising (which is not to suggest I approve). After all, what took place at Number 10 that wasn't also taking place up and down the country at various times and places? If we imagine that such

breaches of the rules only happened among the 'great and the good' of the privileged, while the rest of the nation was strictly in obeisance, then we've not been paying attention.

Throughout the last two years, attitudes towards the strict application of the rules have varied enormously from person to person. Is it fair to suggest that it's hypocritical, for any who have stretched the rules themselves, to be baying for Johnson's head over Partygate? Perhaps, but then we should ask – what of those who did stick to the rules?

There is a place inhabited by those who rule and lead that comes with both privilege and commensurate responsibility. If you're in the lofty position of setting rules for everyone else, the obligation to live up to them is yours to the greatest degree. We may debate the necessity of the rules, the right to make them, their contradictory nature or the future of the NHS. But none are the core of the Partygate problem. Partygate poses instead a question about the sacrifice demanded by the rules, which will be incurred by any who do follow them.

Either the rules were essential for saving lives or they weren't. Presented as if they were essential, and consequently followed by millions, the rules resulted in huge personal and economic costs. Topped with authoritarian enforcement, and dire warnings, I find it hard to believe that anyone in power did not design for the public to take the strictest interpretation of the rules as the only interpretation. I don't recall any effort made to correct this belief. Can we then imagine Boris didn't know?

The bottom line of Partygate is this: either the rules mattered, or they didn't. The reported events at Number 10 send the message they didn't - at least not to the degree millions understood them to. For those who lost so much believing they did, that is intolerable. For Johnson the heart of the matter is whether the public believe those inhabiting such lofty heights are living up to their commensurate responsibilities. If not, perhaps they should not be in the position of exercising such authority over the lives of others. If they won't strive to require it of their own house, are they unfit to occupy a place requiring it of anyone else?

As for me, I welcome the return of freedom over a more disciplined tyrant able to keep his own rules. Perhaps, in being pressured to return freedom to us, something good can come out of Partygate.

By Stephen McNamara ([Twitter](#))

Politics touches everything in life. It's involved in all our highs and lows, in our greatest achievements and in our worst nightmares. There is one universal truth when negotiating through the politics of any subject – and that is integrity. Without integrity, the politics crumbles. Without integrity, negotiations break. Without integrity, trust is gone. If you do not have integrity, then your place in politics is one of universal untruths.

By Mike Swadling ([Website](#), [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [YouTube](#), [Gettr](#))

When I was a kid, my father used to say that "Conservative politicians were always caught having an affair, and Labour politicians were caught with their hand in the till" owing to the Conservatives preaching family values and Labour being against the rich. A lot has changed since then in both parties, but the principle is still the same for politicians – practice what you preach. This is no truer than when you impose an unprecedented lockdown, leaving healthy people isolated and the sick to die alone. In such circumstances it is imperative the politicians who impose these laws upon us strictly abide by them.



Source: John F. Francis, [Wikimedia \(CC0 1.0\)](#)

Perhaps the most important principle of Magna Carta is that no man is above the law, not even a king. It is the most important constraint we have on government, that they too must follow their foolish rules. No matter what you think of Boris or this government, it matters that he broke the lockdown rules he imposed, and it matters that his team broke the rules. Saying it doesn't matter because Number 10 is

an office won't cut it. If the Prime Minister and their close team can ignore or exempt themselves from the laws they pass on us, then that important principle established in Runnymede will be gone.

By James Goad ([Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Gettr](#), [Rumble](#))

It's easy to become embroiled in a Boris/Tory hate-fest at the Downing Street shenanigans. Given the plentiful examples of perception manipulation employed by government, I can't help thinking it's another psy-op. It wouldn't be a bad time for distraction tactics. The new 'Bill of Rights' being proposed will make us all subordinate to parliament whenever it declares some sort of emergency. The less focus on that, the better.

INDEPENDENTS FOR LIBERTY

By Harley Dalton, Steward of Independents for Liberty ([Website](#), [Facebook](#), [Telegram](#))

The beginning of a new year is supposed to be a time to feel refreshed, to set your mind to improvements and to seek out new opportunities; yet, for those who believe in liberty, there has seldom been a bleaker set of circumstances than those in which we find ourselves. Our nation and society are moving rapidly away from the sensible principles of liberty which have engendered tremendous progress since their adoption post-Enlightenment.

It is no exaggeration to say that authoritarianism is now the dominant political tendency here in the UK. Under the auspices of disease control and with that most primitive emotion, fear as both carrot and stick to influence a compliant population, our government has created a terrifying concoction of anti-liberty social and political norms; we now live in a society of open discrimination against dissent, ruthlessly reinforced by news media lockstep, social media censorship, undisguised government propaganda and, perhaps the worst of it, the curtain-twitching of our very own friends and family.



Source: [Independents for Liberty](#) (used with permission)

This, in the face of what ought to be the universally recognised fact that it goes against everything that makes our modern civilization possible. The record of history demonstrates the power of liberty – in morality, to make better people and a more tolerant society; in economics, to kindle prosperity, wellbeing, and the spirit of innovation. Meanwhile, the sorts of policies which are antithetical to individual human freedom – the exact sorts of policies which are being adopted (with literally violent zeal) throughout state and cultural institutions – have caused almost nothing but misery, hardship, and destitution in every area of human endeavour.

If there was ever a moment in modern times that needed credible libertarian voices, it is now. Liberty requires people to defend it, so who are they? If Wikipedia is to be believed, Britain's most famous libertarian is Andrew Marr. Is the best libertarians have to show for our efforts really to have as our leading voice a former Maoist whose opinions are almost exclusively those of the statist left?

We need to do better, and that starts by finding and elevating those among us who wish to speak out. It's no secret that libertarians the world over, but especially here in the UK have been lousy in our political activism. To be fair to us, we're up against a system of managed opposition that excludes libertarian voices and elevates... let's say 'questionable' intellects to fight important issues on our behalf. But let's not shy away from the fact that we have misused the channels that are available to us. Libertarian in-fighting is literally a meme.

