Time for change within UKIP

Hugh Williams

Following my article published in *eurofacts* July 2017 in which I ventured to outline a way forward for the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), I wish to add further evidence.

What I proposed was that, instead of being like all other political parties with a quiver full of policies, UKIP should come forward with a completely different persona. Their appearance should be totally unlike any other party – their raison d'être being, quite simply, to champion the election of independent MPs and councillors.

If this were UKIP's role, we might then get representatives in our various seats of government who think for themselves; people who vote according:

1. To their consciences;
2. To their constituents' wishes; and
3. To their country's needs; instead of being forced (whipped) to vote for the party line no matter what their preference might be. With representatives of that calibre, it's likely that they would vote for what *we* want.

(If anyone wishes to see the whole article, it can be found in Volume 22, Number 11 &12, issued on 21 July 2017. There's an easy to find PDF of the edition on the June Press under *Eurofacts* - www.junepress.com)

It might be sensible to mention here that, for those who are already disagreeing with this proposal on the basis that, without whips, a party might never get its business through Parliament, my answer to this objection at the time, and quoting from that article, was, "Tough. Isn't that what democracy is all about?"

I also suggested that, so long as the UKIP candidate was adamant in his or her determination that the UK should never belong to the EU, UKIP would offer guidance as to how their elected members might vote, but this guidance would never amount to any form of whipping.

The reaction that this article provoked at the time was both muted and mixed. On the whole readers seemed not that interested but, in the case of those who did react, I'd say slightly more than 50% were in favour - or at least the majority was not against the idea.

The reason that I am raising this subject again is because I have come across some fascinating historical information which seems to indicate that, though this suggestion of mine might seem to some to be both mad and unworkable, it's been not only tried before but it's been used with remarkable success. My information comes from *The History of Christendom* Vol 1 p 218 by Warren H Carroll. It comes from where he is writing about the centuries immediately before the birth of Christ.

While these quotes seem very supportive of what I have suggested, I have italicised the two sections that seem particularly relevant.

"The Senate had no formal powers; under the Roman constitution it was simply an advisory body but until the last century of the Republic, its advice was almost always taken, especially on matters of foreign policy and domestic taxation, which were its chief concern. The Senate of Rome had no committees, no agendas and for a long time *it had no organised parties* and never took a vote by division of the house. *Decisions were made by consensus. Where there was no consensus, the status quo was left unchanged.*"

I'm thinking that if the Roman Republic, which then became the mighty Roman Empire, didn't do too badly with this system of government - it worked for about 700 years - maybe UKIP should champion this system of government and encourage the UK to take a leaf out of the Romans' book?

[This timely idea comes as UKIP is trying to find a new leader.- Ed]

Hugh Williams is a former UKIP candidate (8 times), and author of Brexit Choices *and* 101 Reasons Why we should leave the EU. *Publisher of* Brussels Laid Bare *by Marta Andreasen.*