

FROM RUSSIA WITHOUT LOVE

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



Source: TASS News Agency, [Wikimedia \(CC BY 4.0\)](#)

Our globalist leaders are simply not up to the challenge of combating post-Cold War mavericks such as President Putin, placing European peace in the greatest peril since the Second World War.

The Russian military build-up seen in recent weeks appears to be following the same blueprint as the annexation of the Crimea some eight years ago. As of February 13, 2022, the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) has [advised against all travel to Ukraine and has encouraged British nationals to leave via commercial flights due to an accumulation of Russian forces on the border](#) with some Embassy staff having already been withdrawn. The FCDO has also [advised against all but essential travel to the Ukrainian Kharkiv Oblast border, North Ossetia, Karachai-Cherkessia and Kabardino-Balkaria](#) as well as [advising against all travel to the borders of the Ukrainian Donetsk and Lugansk Oblasts, Chechnya, Ingushetia, Dagestan, Budyonovsky, Levokumsky, Neftekumsky, Stepnovsky and Kursky](#).

[President Putin's long-term strategy is one of ethno-nationalism](#); reuniting the peoples of the former USSR, whom he considers to be at one with the Russians, by force and against international law. Ukraine is irreconcilably within the Russian sphere of geopolitical

influence. As a former member of the USSR, the internal political and institutional resistance to a Russian invasion will founder [as Ukrainians have remained inherently divided on the issue of transitioning to capitalism and democracy](#). The Minsk agreements, which sought to establish a ceasefire between the opposing factions via diplomatic means, suffer in their effectiveness [due to differences of interpretation between the Ukrainian government and the Kremlin](#).

Economic sanctions [have come to be seen as a form of appeasement](#). The sanctions imposed on Russia by the European Union in the wake of the annexation of the Crimea in 2014 [had the astonishing effect of failing to stem economic damage to the latter, putting €100 billion of potential export revenues and two million jobs at risk](#). The lacklustre sanctions, which primarily targeted Russia's financial, defence and energy sectors, [were effective until July 31, 2021](#). Now, [at a time of soaring wholesale fuel costs](#)

[and demand-side inflation](#), such an approach would undoubtedly hurt our own energy consumers most. The Ukraine situation will not be resolved by such reactionary policies. Economic sanctions must not take the place of stronger and more durable diplomatic efforts. Conflict has always been and must continue to be a last resort.

Our Prime Minister, a [backer of the economic sanctions](#), is reasonably inexperienced in confronting deteriorating foreign relations and [his actions pertaining to Brexit prove he is not the most suitable diplomat Britain could hope for at this time](#). Perhaps he should perhaps be prompted by his own words uttered as Foreign Secretary on February 22, 2018 – ‘we should remind ourselves of the enormity of what happened and redouble our determination to stand up for our values and uphold international law. We all have an obligation to stand up to Russia in a measured and resolute way’. The damp squib of previous attempts do not fill me with hope in this respect. [Regardless of whether the actions of the next few days produce bloodshed](#), as undeserved and upsetting as that would be, they shall set a precedent for further similar events which may occur in future. If we are to learn anything from twentieth century history, it's that the barbarities of Nazi Germany [could have been avoided by early, firm action against aggressors that threaten the peace and stability of ourselves and our allies](#). There is [every reason to consider Putin an enemy](#), and there is very little reason to consider him an ally. I fear we're already too late, and it's all the fault of our blameless leaders.



Source: President of Ukraine website, [Wikimedia \(CC BY 4.0\)](#)

AGAINST ARBITRARY APPLICATION OF THE LAW

By LibertariDan ([Telegram](#))



Source: Rama & Musée Bolo, [Wikimedia \(CC BY-SA 2.0 FR\)](#)

I'm a big fan of the rule of law. Not the behemoth of legal red tape as we experience it now, but rather I favour just enough law to defend our natural individual rights, and with good reason.

As Ayn Rand observed: "There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals, one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for men to live without breaking laws."

Given this reality, virtually every one of us will likely have breached some law, code or regulation at least once. Why haven't you been pulled up about it? We might tell ourselves the law has bigger fish to catch, or we were

lucky enough to not get caught, or not even realised we had. If the law ever decided it did want to pull you up, could it find something?

Do you even know how many laws and regulations there are and what they are? It's impossible. Yet, even if you're guilty unknowingly, too bad, ignorance of the law is not a defence. The sheer volume of laws and regulations therefore reduces your confidence in both your innocence and your freedom. Could you ever be certain you are innocent, enough to push back, when challenged? Or are you uncertain enough to back down?

Under normal circumstances the overabundance of laws might be balanced by the fact law enforcement personnel can't memorise all the laws and regulations either. But a computer, an algorithm, that uses criteria fed to it, which doesn't have a bad memory and doesn't care about cause (or even the lesser probable cause), is a relentless adversary. What if such a computer were used to [generate lists of people, or types of people, for 'law enforcement' to single out](#)? We call this profiling.

What if you were matched to an 'undesirable' profile? With so many laws and regulations the odds of someone finding that one way you're in breach of some regulation few knew or cared about, is so much more likely. Too many laws and regulations mean too many ways to be singled out. And since resources can't possibly pull up everyone, but still might pull up anyone, the 'rules' become tantamount to a mechanism for arbitrary detention.

From a human rights perspective arbitrary detention is the violation of the right to liberty, typically outside of recognised laws. But I argue that, in a world where technically everyone might be found guilty of some violation, where so many laws violate natural rights, then arresting selectively against the recognised laws is the same as being arbitrary.

You see it when only certain kinds of people are arrested and charged for certain offences, while others are 'released without charge' or not even investigated. We see it when young men are pulled over for 'driving while Black', and we see it when the right kind of young men avoid punishment for drug offences while our prisons are overflowing with less privileged offenders. We can conclude then, that too many laws to handle means that in its application the law is neither blind nor impartial.



Source: Rainerzufall1234, [Wikimedia \(CC BY-SA 4.0\)](#)

We might ask whether Partygate is such an example of arbitrary application of the law. We recall other people fined in relation to Covid regulations, but will it happen here? Or will what happens with Partygate leave us suspicious that the law has become arbitrary, something to keep you in line, while it lets the 'right kind of people' off. Too many laws leads to arbitrary arrest - and that's the hallmark of regimes that do not respect human rights, and allow one rule for the high cadres and another for the rest.

This article [was originally published on the LibertariDan website on September 3, 2020](#) and has been edited and reproduced here with permission from the original author.

HAPPY ST. VALENTINE'S DAY!



FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

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



Source: Mike Swadling (used with permission)

Last week, I attended [The Freedom Association](#) (TFA) Jillian Becker Lecture held in London. Nigel Farage gave this year's lecture, with an introduction from TFA's Chairman and former MEP David Campbell Bannerman and a great summary by Chief Executive Andrew Allison.

Farage, as you can expect, gave a great speech covering many topics not least of all the need to fight against Net Zero environmental policies. He stayed for a fantastic question-and-answer, and never looks better than thinking on his feet with a live audience. For me, possibly the best thing about the event was that it was great to meet up with people you know, people you've heard of, and new people involved in all sorts of searches for freedom, or as Nigel put it; 'it felt like old times'.

The Freedom Association itself has a proud history of supporting freedom in our country. Its ten principles of a free society cover individual freedom, responsibility, the rule of law, limited government, free markets, national parliamentary democracy, and – something in desperate need of bringing to the fore – freedom of speech, expression, and assembly.

It is a great organisation, and [I would encourage anyone to join](#) not least for events like this but also because it's a great way to support the fight for freedom in Britain. The event was also a great opportunity to meet people from difference parties; the Conservatives, the Reform Party, UKIP, the Heritage Party, journalists from the left and right, people from academia, and a range of activists all believing that we have a right to be free.

Events like these are also a great opportunity to make new contacts. I was busy picking up business cards from people in a variety of thinktanks who I certainly hope to persuade to be on our podcast if not at a live event. One of the greatest feelings I got from the experience was the overwhelming sense of community and comfort in not being alone in one's beliefs.

Social media is no substitute for real life meet-ups in the flesh, especially with a large crowd. I had a similar experience recently going to see 'Kevin Bloody Wilson', the Australian singing comic, at a local theatre. All the political correctness we see in life, all the push back against 'insensitive' jokes, suddenly disappears when you're in a theatre full of people singing songs with names to rude for me to mention.

But things are improving on this front. We hold a regular Libertarian Drinks here in Croydon as part of Dick Dellingpole's *Third Wednesday* group. They are gaining popularity across the country, and [you can find your local meet-up on the website](#). One is due to be set up in Christopher Wilkinson's home city of Lichfield sometime soon. What's been excellent for us is seeing the group expand from what started as a pro-Brexit group to include some people too young to vote at the time of the referendum! As we hopefully put lockdown well and truly behind us, in real life is clearly the way forward. In the meantime, [the whole Jillian Becker Lecture is now available to watch on YouTube](#).

DO YOU WANT TO WRITE FOR US?

WE HOPE YOU'VE ENJOYED READING *FREE SPEECH*. IF YOU'D LIKE TO SUBMIT AN ARTICLE FOR THE NEXT EDITION, PLEASE HEAD OVER TO [OUR WEBSITE](#) FOR MORE INFORMATION. IT'S EASY TO GET YOUR WORK PUBLISHED AND A GREAT WAY TO REACH OUT AND CONNECT WITH OTHER PRO-LIBERTY INDIVIDUALS. MEANWHILE, YOU CAN FOLLOW BLACKLIST PRESS ON [FACEBOOK](#), [TWITTER](#) AND [TELEGRAM](#) TO KEEP UP TO DATE WITH OUR NEW RELEASES.