

STATE TERROR

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



Source: © Tomas Castelazo, www.tomascastelazo.com, [Wikimedia](#) (CC BY-SA 4.0)

Few amongst the audience would question the notion that for the past two years citizens of the United Kingdom have been oppressed by the state. The oppression has taken the form of psychological (or asymmetrical) warfare backed up by the threat of force. State agencies and a propagandised, compliant public have been all too keen to exert pressure on those who don't conform. This can arguably be summarised as state terror.

It would be wrong to look at this terrorism as something new. There are many provable instances where citizens of these isles have been manipulated by acts of terror either on its own citizens or a high-profile individual for a political objective. Whilst the methods employed have varied, the ultimate objective has always been broadly aligned; the removal of inalienable rights under 'emergency' legislation or regulatory measures. I'll grab a handful of examples, which will not come close to covering the many instances of state terror.

In 1952, [a storm ripped through the town of Lynmouth](#) killing thirty-five people. Until recently I laughed at the notion of 'chem trails' (chemicals sown into the atmosphere at altitude to achieve various weather-related or public health outcomes). However, when a freak weather condition suddenly hits a town in this manner in a region where the [RAF were releasing chemicals](#) as part of weather-formation experiments, and the state covers it up, it leaves a question mark.

Wind the clock forward thirty-five years to 1987: [Michael Ryan kills sixteen people](#) with a semi-automatic weapon, including his mother. After holing up in a school, Ryan expressed concern to a policeman about the fate of his mother, allegedly claiming surprise at his mother's death. Odd, given he'd shot her shortly before. Gaps in memory are consistent with people subject to hypnosis. Similarly, Sirhan Sirhan cannot remember anything about the incident in the Ambassador Hotel in June 1968. A certain consistency emerging here. The [Firearms \(Amendment\) Act 1988](#) was passed in the wake of the events in Hungerford. Problem, reaction, solution.

On July 7, 2005, four explosions occurred in London: three on Tube trains and one on a bus. The state narrative crumbled on inspection. The flaws in the state narrative were many, and these were borne out in a [video documentary](#) and [a book](#), which break down the events in detail. There is no evidence that the 'bombers' were even on the transport. The explosions took part at the very same time as a live exercise where bombs went off on the exact same Tube trains as they went off on the day. An echo perhaps of the large-scale military exercises co-incidentally happening on 9/11. The producer of the

documentary was later [sent to prison](#) after offering his documentary as evidence to the judge at the trial of several alleged co-conspirators.

'[Exit from Brexit](#)' is a documentary film produced by Richard Hall of richplanet.net. It covers the events surrounding the alleged assassination of Batley and Spennings MP Jo Cox in 2016, a few days prior to the referendum on the European Union. It is astonishing how just one person looking into the details of the affair can wipe the floor with the official story. This was a staged 'terror incident' designed to achieve a political purpose, rather than terrorise the general public into submission.



Source: Albert Bridge, [Wikimedia \(CC BY-SA 2.0\)](#)

An act of [fake terror was played out in Manchester](#) on May 22, 2017, at an Ariana Grande concert. The alleged bombing left


twenty-two concertgoers dead, plus the alleged Islamist perpetrator. Richard Hall of has again [deconstructed the event](#) and pulled apart the official story. On the face of it, this echoed the shenanigans at the [Boston marathon](#) four years earlier. In addition to the use of pyrotechnics and '[crisis actors](#)', the event was characterised by the supine media regurgitating approved lines.

The parent of these events was doubtless the continental hijinks of [Operation Gladio](#), a NATO organisation comprising state actors committing outrages against the inhabitants of Cold War western Europe. First implemented in Italy to try and generate a backlash against a national power share with communists, it specialised in civilian train bombings. Years later, Madrid.

The current tyranny should be seen in this context. There are few lengths state institutions and supra-national globalist organisations will not go to achieve a desired objective. Can we draw the conclusion that we have been in a prison all our lives, and it's only now that state actors are taking away the pieces of stage theatre that have hidden the brick walls?

HAVE THEY EVER HEARD OF THE LAFFER CURVE?

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



Source: BlakWolf, [Wikimedia \(CC BY 2.5\)](#)

A couple of weeks ago [in an article in the Telegraph](#), Johnny Leavesley the former Conservative Party treasurer party donor asked of the Government “*Have they never heard of the Laffer Curve?*”. You have to wonder. Surely a Conservative government would have heard of the Laffer Curve, but alas it appears not. This is a government that has increased corporation tax and is increasing National Insurance rates. Do they really believe this will raise more money?

Whilst it is unlikely anyone reading *Free Speech* is unaware of the Laffer Curve, it is maybe worth just noting what it is in case anyone from the government is reading. Named after Arthur Laffer, the Laffer Curve illustrates the relationship between the rate of taxation and the resulting government revenue. The curve shows that no income is raised at a zero per cent tax rate, and similarly at a one hundred per cent tax rate, as no one would work to pay all their earnings to government. Somewhere in between is a tax rate that maximises revenue for government.

Separate to a moral case for keeping more of your own income, even if you believe in a high spending government, higher tax rates make no sense. People often assume the higher the tax rate, the higher the tax take – but this is not the case. As a little thought experiment, do you believe more income would be raised with an eighty per cent tax rate or twenty per cent tax rate? If you think of your own circumstances, it's likely that at an eighty per cent tax rate it would not be worth your while working in your current role. It is quite possible you would look for cash in hand work and you certainly wouldn't be looking to take on more hours in a role taxing you so high, whereas a twenty per cent tax rate is possibly less than you pay today. You might be tempted to work more hours or take on a more stressful but rewarding role knowing you get to keep more of your money.

My own experience with the Laffer Curve came some years ago working with a team of engineers who were all approaching a new higher tax bracket. Much of our work involved weekend overtime and everyone's hand would shoot up at first opportunity to work a lucrative Saturday. Then suddenly our incomes that year had breached the threshold, we noticed we were no longer taking home the lion share of our income for the weekend, instead it was split fairly evenly with government. Strangely none of us could remember the Minister or the Senior Civil Servant coming in to help us with our work at the weekend, but somehow, they were always there to help us with the income for it. From that point onwards finding someone to cover a weekend became increasingly difficult, and 'bribery' in the form of overtime no longer automatically worked.



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

The great mistake people often make is to forget that working itself comes at a cost. The cost is your free time, your energy, time not spent with your family or friends. This all has to be weighed up against the rewards you receive for working. This is equally true for businesses, as setting up a business requires an investment of money and energy. Many people set up businesses in areas they'd already worked and where they could already draw decent income. When you take on the risk and extra effort of running your own business you need to see the extra reward. What feels like a small increase in corporation tax maybe the difference from someone starting their own enterprise, employing people, and creating value or staying in a role they have today and letting somebody else hold the risk.

Nevertheless, the government seems committed to the idea that raising tax rates will raise the revenue needed to recover from the economic armageddon of lockdown. Prior to the pandemic, the United Kingdom government had been spending just over thirty-nine per cent of gross domestic product. It shot up to over fifty-two per cent last year and is likely to remain over forty per cent for some years to come. What does the government know that we don't, and why do they think increased tax rates will somehow help?

Since the 1970s, government tax receipts have never exceeded thirty-eight per cent of gross domestic product. Mostly, they have hovered around thirty-five per cent. In this time, we have had governments of Labour, Conservative, LibLab Pacts, Conservative-Liberal coalitions, the UUP propping up James Callaghan, and the DUP propping up Theresa May.

The basic rate income has been as high as thirty-five per cent and as low as twenty per cent. The top rate has been as high as eighty-three per cent and as 'low' as forty per cent. Yet the total tax take has never been lower than thirty-two and a half per cent of GDP and has never exceeded thirty-seven and a half per cent of GDP.

Higher tax rates don't increase tax revenue. The Laffer curve is something this government has clearly never heard of.

LIBERTY BECOMES THE ENEMY

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

When liberty becomes the enemy of the state, you have a serious problem. [Canada has a serious problem](#). The Trudeau formula seems to be that if you have an unhealthy large ego and can't get what you want done in politics through democratic and peaceful means, debauch the law and use the classic combination of media manipulation and state overreach to force your will into reality while censoring opposing voices and denouncing good in anti-human propagandistic messages.

The [global influence of the Freedom Convoy](#) cannot be understated or underestimated. [As participants in the M5 equivalent have identified](#), the impetus has been to protest the state-induced erosion of freedom, choice, and rights in the face of governments hell bent on practicing and preaching oppression. Vaccination mandates are wrong. No state should hold such supremacy over the citizenry of any country. Vaccination is a personal choice. The truckers have every right to refuse.

The state has been at the very heart of the instability. The people, at large and by contrast, have comparatively been a rock of constancy. The more tyrannical the state's actions become, the more observers can conclude their motivation is not to stop a virus but to control human behaviour. The empty 'pandemic' narrative may still be the scapegoat, but the mask is slipping further with every passing day. The British government, let alone Canada's, has in recent months [threatened job losses for those who refuse vaccination](#). Hundreds of individuals [have been arrested by Ottawa Police](#). Thousands of individuals [have been fined by Ottawa Police](#). The actions taken by the Trudeau regime run against natural rights; our inalienable objective rights as human beings existing beyond the subjectivity of law.

Spectators outraged by Trudeau's actions can [take comfort in the likelihood of a successful legal challenge](#) since the Emergencies Act is subject to the [Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms](#) and the [Canadian Bill of Rights](#). The latter explicitly identifies freedom of expression, freedom of peaceful assembly, and freedom of association as guaranteed rights. The characterisation of the Freedom Convoy by Trudeau as an 'emergency', complemented by unlawful use of Canada's Emergencies Act 1988, is a despotic indictment. By a measure of his actions, [Trudeau has failed the Oakes test](#) – a mechanism used to ensure infringements of the Charter are objective and proportional in a 'free and democratic society'. [From an elementary search of one Freedom Convoy website](#), it can be deduced the motivation behind the organisation of these individuals is perfectly peaceful and legal.

If freedom were a worldwide religion, the hands of Canadian government would be soundly cut off for committing apostasy.

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.