



Britain, Land of Magna Carta, Is Slowly Becoming a Soviet State

"But there's no England now" is a famous lyric composed by songwriter and Kinks band member Dave Davies. One could wonder if he was aware of a certain irony, or if the given connection is actually by design. That is, the song containing the lyric was released in "1984," which also is the title of the famous George Orwell story, set in Britain, that, sadly, well describes what the U.K. is becoming: a dystopian state where the police punish people for contradicting the regime's ideology and de facto land seizures are on the table.



RistoArnaudov/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Watch Your Tongue, Subject

Just consider a series of stories from just the past week. First up is the plight of Allison Pearson, a columnist who has written for the *Daily Mail* and other outlets. Pearson, 64, has been under investigation by the Essex Police for about a year. Her trespass?

She sent a tweet — in 2023 — which was quickly deleted.

The Telegraph has the story:

[The situation] began when Pearson reposted a video showing two men holding a flag on a British street and flanked by a group of police officers.

The original author suggested that police had "picked a side" just weeks after the October 7 massacre and amid heightened tensions over the policing of Gaza protests.

The image angered Pearson, who shared it.

"How dare they," she wrote. "Invited to pose for a photo with lovely peaceful British Friends of Israel on Saturday police refused. Look at this lot smiling with the Jew haters." [Tweet below.]

But unbeknown to her, the video was from Manchester and the flag was not related to the Middle East. Instead, it was held by supporters of the Pakistani political party Pakistan Tehreek-e-Insaf.

The Aftermath

As mentioned, Pearson quickly deleted the tweet upon recognizing the misinformation. It shouldn't matter, though. If she's guilty of defaming the Pakistani party, they can sue her for libel (much easier to prove in Britain). Instead, the tweet is being investigated as both a possible "Non-Crime Hate Incident" (NCHI) and a possible violation of the "Malicious Communications Act." And the Essex Police say they're investigating Pearson under the "Public Order Act" for allegedly inspiring racial hatred.





Oh, all the while, the following is going on in Britain — with the cops nowhere to be found.

Of course, the journalist is <u>far from the first</u> Briton to be bitten by the U.K.'s Orwellian "hate-speech" laws. (Note: Hate-speech laws don't outlaw hate — they outlaw what the regime hates.) In her case, however, some public figures are rallying to her defense, with fellow journalist Rachel Johnson a good example.

"The Government is putting a numbing effect on discourse," Johnson <u>warned</u>. "We should remember we are not in Eastern Europe under the communists."

No, Rachel, you're not. You're in Western Europe under the neo-communists.

"That's a Man, Baby"? Austin Power Is Out of Style

Next up is an unnamed 17-year-old British girl who has been suspended from her soccer league for six games. Her sin is that she questioned a "'bearded' transgender opponent," as *The Telegraph* puts it, asking "'Are you a man?'" Because, of course, if the regime's agents say they're holding up five fingers when it's only four, you must agree. (Video below.) Questioning authority is for a free people, and Britons should never mistake themselves for that.

The good news is that the girl is being defended by a civil-rights group, The Free Speech Union. This organization, do note, is aiding Allison Pearson as well.

Property Rights? Not for "Greedy" Farmers

A couple of years ago, Dutch farmers <u>were targeted</u> with onerous greentopian "emissions targets" that threatened their livelihood. Now Britain may do the Netherlands one better in a move that, <u>writes</u> American Thinker (AT), should inspire the "British people to brush up on Karl Marx and communist history." As *The Guardian* <u>reports</u>, approvingly:

Half a million people die every year. Under the reforms to inheritance tax relief on agricultural land proposed in the budget, about 500 individuals who inherit land worth more than £2m (£3m if they were married to the deceased) will join the rest of society and have inheritance tax levied on their bequest — albeit at half the rate, with an enlarged exemption and 10 years to pay it.

"What a generous government," AT writes in response. It "fines people just for owning land but then gives them ten years to pay off the debt!"

Oh, but *The Guardian* is not done — with being the guardian of the pseudo-elites. The paper also states:

The hoarding of land that has gone on since the bung was introduced by Margaret Thatcher in 1984, which has so steadily driven up land prices and farmers' rents, will at last be checked as some of the larger estates are obliged to sell parcels of land to pay inheritance tax, as they did before 1984 without the world falling in, rather than be enabled to own it in perpetuity.

Taxation Without Respiration?

There's an issue, however, with inheritance tax in principle. That is, the resources in question were *already taxed* during the lives of the people who worked for them. And now they're to be taxed again?



Written by **Selwyn Duke** on November 19, 2024



I'm with publisher Steve Forbes on this. He once said while running for president, "No taxation without respiration."

Moreover, is £2m worth of land really all that much? It's nothing, in fact, compared to what King Charles and family own — which is free from inheritance tax. And how much do they own? Per AT:

Charles III is the world's largest landowner, and the "royal family" combined owns "more than 6,600,000,000 acres of land around the world" which amounts to "1/6 of the surface of the planet."

I verified this, too. In fact, the royals own 37 times as much land "as the global runner-up, the Catholic Church," <u>relates</u> Big Think.

So, then, we should tax the royals, right? Here's a better idea: Instead of lobbying to tax more people, we should advocate for inheritance taxes' complete elimination.

Reading Between the Lines

So what's really going on? As AT writes, this

isn't about a wealth distribution from most privileged to least privileged, it's about wealth distribution from the middle class to the uber-wealthy, using "the sores of discontent" (recall Saul Alinsky's strategy) of angry, useful idiots as the vehicle.

As you might remember, one of the most revealing themes of *The Communist Manifesto*, the communist revolution can only "be effected ... by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property," which is why Mao Zedong, Joseph Stalin, Pol Pot, Che Guevara, and Fidel Castro all came for private property, and particularly farmers — farmers feed people, and controlling the food supply means controlling the population.

Interesting, though, is that the statists never complain about how much in resources the *government* controls. And why would they? Just as a business owner tries to grow his business and soccer officials try to grow their soccer league, statist try to grow the state.

It's growing nicely in Britain, too — and legitimate freedoms are shrinking. Of course, those two things go hand in hand.





Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

24 Issues Per Year
Optional Print Edition
Digital Edition Access
Exclusive Subscriber Content
Audio provided for all articles
Unlimited access to past issues
Coming Soon! Ad FREE
60-Day money back guarantee!
Cancel anytime.