

INTEMPERATE INTRODUCTION

2017 THE YEAR PROTECTIONISM MOVES CENTRE STAGE, GLOBALLY

Donald Trump will be in the White House and has threatened to tear up the North American Free Trade Agreement and bury the Trans Pacific Partnership. The far right Front National Presidential Candidate Marine Le Pen will continue scaring the political establishment in France and across Europe with her increasingly successful rejection of open borders and her overtly anti-globalisation stance.

Given that the high watermark of free trade is now over, its time for the left, greens and small 'c' conservatives to start to consider what form of protectionism should replace it. The right with its usual political sure footedness is already utterly dominating this discussion. The rest of the political spectrum is caught like hares in headlights, with no comprehensive idea of what to do.

It is to fill this vacuum that I have written 'Progressive Protectionism - taking back control. It offers an internationalist, more equitable and environmentally protective end goal for groupings of nation states to protect and re diversify their national economies and help others to do the same.

THE CASE FOR 'PROGRESSIVE PROTECTIONISM'

SUMMARY OF POLICIES

'Progressive Protectionism' will require the introduction by nation states of a set of interrelated and self-reinforcing policy priorities:

- In response to rising wealth inequalities within and between nations, the lack of economic security for the majority and the growing environmental damage inherent in economic globalisation, there must be a rejection of the underlying causes of this worsening situation: evermore open markets and the fetishisation of international competitiveness and export dependence. These must be replaced by the reintroduction of protective safeguards to ensure revitalised local and national economies. These will include the reintroduction of tariffs, quotas, capital controls and the ability to strengthen constraints on the numbers and pace of immigration. This is the fundamental mind wrench that will do most to curb the present power of big business to play countries off against each other and to threaten to relocate unless countries bow the knee to open borders and global competition. It is the necessary precursor to being able to introduce the rest of the policies;
- Introduce a site-here-to-sell-here policy for manufacturing and services domestically or regionally;
- Control and localise finance such that the majority stays within its country of origin;
- Control the numbers, rate and ability of new immigrants to stay and work temporarily or permanently
- Introduce fairer and socially positive taxes and resource and pollution taxes and tackle aggressive tax dodging nationally and globally in order to fund social and environmental improvements and help pay for the transition to permanent, sustainable and flourishing local economies;
- Increase democratic involvement both politically and economically to ensure the effectiveness and equity of the movement to more diverse local economies;
- Implement a local competition policy to eliminate monopolies from the more protected economies;
- Re-orientate the end goals of aid and trade rules such that they contribute to the rebuilding of local economies and local control worldwide.

Under these circumstances, beggar-your-neighbour globalisation gives way to the potentially more cooperative, better-your-neighbour Progressive Protectionism.

What I'm not advocating is the oxymoronic protectionism of the 30s, where the goal was often for each protected industry or country to increase its economic strength by limiting imports and then hoping to compete and export globally at the expense of others. Unsurprisingly the more countries did this, the less trade there was between them. Progressive Protectionism aims at reducing permanently the amount of international trade in goods, money and services and to enable nation states to decide the level of migration that their citizen's desire.

Progressive Protectionism Needs Regional Groupings of Countries

Aside from the United States, no one country has the economic and political power to introduce Progressive Protectionism policies on its own. Should a single nation attempt such a challenge to the interests of big business, then it would almost certainly face threats of large scale relocation and investment strikes. However the European Union would be a powerful enough bloc to be the first one to pursue this path.

A New Direction for Europe

'Progressive Protectionism' involves proposing a new direction for Europe, one of a cooperative grouping of countries prioritising the protection and rebuilding of local economies. This could provide a hopeful and secure future for its people and turn the EU from an increasingly discredited entity to one which provides a positive answer to voters concerns. Cross border issues like responding to non European migration, climate change, pollution and crime would still require intra European cooperation and so would become a priority for a newly popular European Union.

To achieve this, what is required is to start a debate in Europe about turning the Treaty of Rome into a 'Treaty of Home Europe-wide'.

The Treaty Changes Required

It is the Treaty of Rome which in Europe forces the abolition of controls to the free movement of people, goods, money and services. What seems to have been overlooked is that it was not hewn out of stone by Moses. It's an outdated political agreement that is now increasing economic insecurity through austerity, relocation of businesses and the rapid migration of workers and so is prompting growing opposition. To overcome this, the fundamental changes proposed in converting the Treaty of Rome to a Treaty of Home Europe-wide can be summarised as:

EC Treaty of Rome

Article 3 (ex Article 3)

(c) an internal market characterised by the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital;

Proposed 'Treaty of Home'

Article 3 (ex Article 3)

(c) a market characterised by the maintenance, as between Member States, of appropriate controls to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital in order to allow regional, national and local economies to prosper.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS

Progressive Protectionism is a shift away from open markets to allow Nation States to take back control of the scale of capital, goods, services and people entering and leaving their country. The end goal is to allow national economies to rediversify and prosper by maximising local economic activity. They will do this in a way that reduces inequalities and power imbalances, improves social welfare and adequately protects the environment. Such an ambitious agenda will require cooperation amongst regional neighbours and a re-orientation of the end goals of aid and trade rules to help rebuild local economies and local control worldwide.

When I use the term progressives I mean those who support policies which respond to the democratic wishes of the majority, but in a way that improves social conditions overall within and between countries, which drastically increases environmental protection and helps improve conditions in poor countries in particular.

CHAPTER ONE: TIME TO MINIMISE PERMANENT MIGRATION - GLOBALLY

The most contentious aspect of Progressive Protectionisms policies for many is the question of controlling the influx of migrants into their country. This is covered in Chapter One which begins with the scale of global migration and the reaction to it, particularly from those people living in the richer countries which today experience high levels of migration. It explains why the present open borders to movement of people within Europe is undemocratic and anti internationalist, as it steals the brightest and the best from poorer countries. The question of who gains and loses from migration is then looked at, followed by the adverse environmental effects of large scale migration.

The final section of Chapter One explains what kind of migration policy fits in with the end goals of Progressive Protectionism i.e. An End to New Permanent Migration. Also highlighted is why the future will inevitably be one of seeing all foreign policy, aid and trade agreements in terms of helping minimise migration globally. This will allow

a range of progressive policies, from fair tax to limiting arms sales, from decarbonising economies and reducing resource use, to finally escape the realm of moral handwringing and become political priorities.

This being the most contentious part of the book, it ends with problems that rarely seem to be addressed by commentators and the politically active and ones that I certainly have no answer to. These involve the implications for present migration and asylum policies of the rate of population growth in poorer regions close to the continents where most migrants want to come i.e. Europe and North America.

CHAPTER TWO: PUTTING POPULATION CENTRE STAGE

In the Chapter Two I deal with the other component affecting the future numbers of people within a country i.e. domestic population size. This looks at the reasons why global population numbers are projected to rise by over a billion more than was forecast a mere six years ago. It debunks the idea that ageing populations in rich countries need more immigration and explores the right to fertility control as well as the responsibility for choice of family size. It details how the policies of Progressive Protectionism will help reduce and eventually stabilise population growth, and for those countries that need it, result in a decline in their numbers, a crucial goal for a densely populated country like the UK.

It ends by explaining why it is the responsibility of the environment movement to take the lead in curbing such increases. This latter point is included because it was they who first drew global attention to the need for population control in the 1960s and 1970s. Since then most of the green groups have fastidiously ignored this topic, particularly in the face of developing countries' activists and leaders saying it was a form of colonialism, racism etc. Others, particularly on the left, claimed that the root of environmental problems was the consumption patterns of the rich, not the growing numbers in poor countries. Since then most environmentalists have been gutlessly asleep at the wheel over this issue.

CHAPTER THREE: CONTROLLING CAPITAL AND INVESTMENT

The constant mantra that Britain is open for business is replaced by the indelicate assertion that it is Britain's legs that are open for business and we are being screwed. Foreign steel and other imports hit manufacturing, overseas companies snap up British ones, foreign landlords leave investment homes empty, the ghastly gig economy increases job insecurity and the population grows ever higher.

'Invest here to prosper here' capital controls will make it easier for nations to raise adequate level of taxation on big business by increasing corporation tax. Corporations' normal response is to threaten relocation or investment strikes but under Progressive Protectionism such an approach is less plausible because its prioritising of 'site here to sell here' policies mean they will have to stay and pay the national taxes required to retain tariff free access to the domestic market.

Governments will no longer be ruled by the need to be internationally competitive and so will be freer to set whatever levels of tax they deem necessary to meet the needs of their citizens. These could range from income tax, to 'sincome' tax on alcohol, tobacco, sugar, fat and junk food or a land value tax.

CHAPTER FOUR: BORDER CONTROLS FOR GOODS AND SERVICES

Seeing Britain's future as predominantly dependent on trade in the coming era of 'peak trade', will soon be seen as quaintly passé as 'The sun will never set on the Empire'

This chapter looks at a key aspect of this transition for all countries - how to ensure that eventually as many goods and services as is feasible are produced domestically.

Given developments such as 3D printing and small batch production of goods, then in technical terms there is little that can't be manufactured inside a country or grouping of neighbouring states. Small nation states might choose to join with others regionally to form a more viable entity. For very large industries such as airplane production the delineation might be the actual grouping of countries which make up a geographically bounded economic bloc, such as the European Union or North America. For most sectors the gradual increase of fossil fuel energy costs through resource tax rises and hopefully the decisions to leave them in the ground to tackle climate change would act as another inducement for production being sited as close as possible to local markets.

CHAPTER FIVE: A PROGRESSIVE PROTECTIONISM COMPETITION POLICY

A Progressive Protectionism competition policy would encourage enterprise, innovation, efficiency and a widening of choice, but would do so in a way that maximises domestic production. Now that emphasising cheap imports and increasing international competitiveness is no longer a goal, then the residual trade with other countries will be

shaped by competition laws which favour commerce that rebuilds national economies worldwide.

Thus Progressive Protectionism's international competition laws will discriminate in favour of trading with countries that have their own localist domestic laws. This priority will help encourage and ensure that the materials or goods traded will be produced with minimal pollution, and by workers and their communities who benefit directly from such commerce, so contributing to improvements in their social and environmental conditions. Thus the local economy and communities of the exporting country are constantly being strengthened.

These competition policies should address a number of concerns often expressed about protected domestic markets. There is an understandable unease that once there is protection from foreign competition for those providing goods, finance and services, then the quality of such safeguarded provision could decline. Also there is a concern that what could evolve would be a kind of post war, Eastern European, set in aspic bureaucracy entailing inefficiency, poor products and bad services. It is therefore vital to retain the positive sides of competition, i.e. the need to produce high quality products, but on a more level, more local, playing field.

Positive advances in ideas, product design or manufacturing from other parts of the world will not be denied to other nations by this localist approach. The utilization of the best new ideas and technologies found abroad will be facilitated by the technological, managerial and information flows encouraged under Progressive Protectionism's trade and aid rules (see Chapter Eight) and by joint ventures or licensed production with such innovators from other countries. The actual production will of course be domestically based.

CHAPTER SIX: WHAT WOULD A 'PROGRESSIVE PROTECTIONISM' ECONOMY LOOK LIKE DOMESTICALLY

The first few chapters of this book have made the case, and detailed the policies, for controlling the free flow of people, capital, goods and services and the competition laws these will require. These are the key prerequisites for achieving 'Progressive Protectionism'. Chapter Six outlines what sort of domestic economy could emerge under this system, how it would be paid for and why it will need to take place amongst regional groupings of nation states.

To return a sense of hope for the future and economic security for the majority, all governments need urgently to consider embracing a 'jobs in every community' programme. There are two localised and secure labour intensive sources for this. The first is employment in a range of social services, especially the new growth area of looking after the elderly. The second is decentralised infrastructure projects focusing on a decades long, multi skilled programme of energy refits of all nations' millions of dwellings, a shift to localised renewable energy and food production and the building of local transport and flood defence systems. The former could be predominantly funded by governments' borrowing at historically low interest rates and the latter by Central Banks e- printing billions of euros, pounds and dollars via 'Infrastructural Quantitative Easing', involving no increase in the public debt.

CHAPTER SEVEN: SAVING EUROPE BY CHANGING THE TREATY OF ROME TO THE 'TREATY OF HOME'

Aside from the United States, no one country has the economic and political power to introduce Progressive Protectionism policies on its own. Should a single nation attempt such a challenge to the interests of big business, then it would almost certainly face threats of large scale relocation and investment strikes. However the European Union would be a powerful enough bloc to be the first one to pursue this path.

'Progressive Protectionism' involves proposing a new direction for Europe, one of a cooperative grouping of countries prioritising the protection and rebuilding of local economies. This could then provide a hopeful and secure future for its people and turn the EU from an increasingly discredited entity to one which provides a positive answer to voters concerns. Cross border issues like responding to non European migration, climate change, pollution and crime would still require intra European cooperation and so would become a priority for a newly popular European Union.

To achieve this, what is required is to start a debate in Europe about turning the Treaty of Rome into a 'Treaty of Home Europe-wide'.

It is the Treaty of Rome which in Europe forces the abolition of controls to the free movement of people, goods, money and services. It's an outdated political agreement that is now increasing economic insecurity through austerity, relocation of businesses and the rapid migration of workers and so is prompting growing opposition. To overcome this, the fundamental changes proposed in converting the Treaty of Rome to a Treaty of Home Europe-wide can be summarised as:

EC Treaty of Rome Article 3 (ex Article 3) (c) an internal market characterised by the abolition, as between Member States, of obstacles to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital;

Proposed 'Treaty of Home' Article 3 (ex Article 3) (c) a market characterised by the maintenance, as between Member States, of appropriate controls to the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital in order to allow regional, national and local economies to prosper.

No other free trade agreement in the world insists on the free movement of people, neither do the rules of the World Trade Organisation. It is impossible to imagine for example that the North American Free Trade Agreement between the US, Canada and Mexico would ever have come into force had it insisted on the free movement of people.

CHAPTER EIGHT: LEAVING FREE TRADERS A GAST (GENERAL AGREEMENT ON SUSTAINABLE TRADE)

For Progressive Protectionism to occur worldwide new trade rules are necessary. Such a set of world trade rules would have completely the opposite end goal and principles to the WTO. Instead of the fundamental freer market rules developed under GATT and now policed by the WTO, the General Agreement on Sustainable Trade (GAST) would be administered by the World Localisation Organization (WLO) and have the purpose of protecting and rebuilding local economies worldwide.

The utilization of the best new ideas and technologies found abroad will be facilitated by the technological, managerial and information flows encouraged under Progressive Protectionism's trade and aid rules and by joint ventures or licensed production with such innovators from other countries. The actual production will of course be domestically based.

APPENDIX: THE MYTHS SURROUNDING FREE TRADE

This Appendix takes a critical look at the oft repeated generalisations about the 'glorious joy of free trade'. It then looks at its intellectual underpinnings and finds them wanting

Free Traders Exaggerate The Advantages Of Free Trade

A World Bank Statistic often used by free traders is that 'more than 700 million' have been lifted from poverty in the last few decades. However the World Bank used the term poor to refer to those living with an income below \$1.25 per day in 2005. This figure is derided by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) which states that the \$1.25-a-day poverty line only provides an indication of the most extreme poverty. UNCTAD takes \$5 as the minimum daily income which could reasonably be regarded as fulfilling the right to achieve "a standard of living adequate for health and wellbeing" (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, art. 25.1).

Using this definition of poverty as anyone receiving less than \$5-a-day, then the picture is not one of a reduction of hundreds of millions lifted out of poverty, as so often quoted by those in favour of globalisation. In fact their estimation is that under today's global economic system the number of impoverished individuals living in those conditions today is a staggering 4.3 billion people, or 60% of today's global population of 7.4 billion.

Free Traders Crying Crocodile Tears For The Poor

The most succinct Third World criticism of the 'free trade helps the poor' approach that I remember was voiced in Seattle in 1999 at the World Trade Organisation meeting. There a northern development NGO member at a public meeting asked whether the path to poverty alleviation for the South lay in being granted maximum access to the markets of the North. Sara Larrain, a Chilean grass roots environmentalist who stood for President on a manifesto based on a two-year community consultation process, responded exasperatedly 'why is it that people from the North think exports benefit us, they are wrecking our environment and increasing inequality?'

THE CHALLENGE TO PROGRESSIVES

THE TWIN FAILURES OF PROGRESSIVES: offering no detailed alternative to the free market and not addressing public anxiety and anger about large scale migration.

I Know What You Are Against, But What Are You For?

In my more than 40 years of campaigning on environmental, developmental and economic issues I have constantly pushed for proposition rather than just opposition. I have become increasingly furious that those movements and individuals campaigning for a fairer, greener future with less inequality have made two monumental errors. The first was failing to provide an alternative to neoliberalism. Instead of proposing and campaigning for a comprehensive set of rules governing the flow of capital, goods and services that could improve the majority of peoples lives, the concentration was on opposing the latest trade agreement on the table.

This was perhaps understandable when evermore free trade agreements were seen as inevitable and positive by

the vast majority of commentators and political parties, and when standing up against them risked being dismissed as being followers of some bygone protectionist heresy. The status quo was and much of it still is in the thrall of Margaret Thatcher's most corrosive, four letter, pro free market legacy TINA (there is no alternative!).

Tim Lang and I tried to move the debate for opposition to proposition with our 1995 book 'The New Protectionism - protecting the future against free trade'^[1] and in 2000 I made a similar attempt with the humbly entitled opus 'Localisation – a global manifesto'.^[2]

However for the anti globalisation movement not to attempt to develop an overarching alternative once the system was on its knees in 2007/8, and during its stumbling aftermath since, is truly unconscionable. This lack of any proposals for a systemic new direction from civil society, academics and political parties meant that Governments had no effective roadmap other than pumping huge amounts of tax payers' money into bailing out the financial system and continuously cutting interest rates in the hope of encouraging adequate levels of debt fuelled economic activity.

A Craven And Gutless Refusal To Tackle Public Concerns About Immigration

The second huge error by progressives was their failure around a decade ago to countenance addressing the concerns of the majority in Europe about a rapid and uncontrollable rise in immigration as millions of workers from the new member states in Eastern Europe came to Western Europe.^[3] In the UK, a favourite destination, the number of East Europeans here has increased by nearly one million since 2004, when it stood at 167,000.^[4] In the US it was 'unauthorized' immigration that soared from an estimate 3.5 million in 1990 to average over 11 million for the last five years, with about half from Mexico in 2014 i.e. 5.6 million, down from 6.4 million in 2009.^[5]

These large scale migrations occurred at a time when on average, between 65-70% of households in 25 high-income economies experienced stagnant or falling real incomes between 2005 and 2014; and where in the US, the median real income for full-time male workers is now lower than it was four decades ago. The income of the bottom 90% of the population has stagnated for over 30 years.^[6] This toxic mixture has unsurprisingly led to a political backlash. This has benefited the intellectually fleet footed extreme right in Europe and resulted in the rise of Donald Trump in the US and the Brexit vote in the UK.

PROGRESSIVE PROTECTIONISM - THE ONLY ANSWER

A vain Emperor cares about nothing except wearing and displaying clothes hires two swindlers who promise him the finest, best suit of clothes from a fabric invisible to anyone who is unfit for his position or "hopelessly stupid". Finally the swindlers report that the suit is finished, they mime dressing him and the Emperor marches in procession before his subjects. The townsfolk play along with the pretence, not wanting to appear unfit for their positions or stupid. Then a child in the crowd, too young to understand the desirability of keeping up the pretence, blurts out that the Emperor is wearing nothing at all and the cry is taken up by others. The Emperor cringes, suspecting the assertion is true, but continues the procession.

The Emperor's New Clothes by Hans Christian Andersen^[7]

A vain economics and political establishment cares about nothing except wearing and displaying clothes labelled 'no alternative to open markets'. They are the lackeys of rich swindlers who threaten that this truth must be accepted unconditionally or all credibility is gone, the rich will pull out of the country. They further demand that this economic inevitability must be constantly reiterated on the national and world stage. Most of the politically active buy into this rich elite's swindle, albeit trying unsuccessfully to make it kinder, gentler and greener. Then a white haired baby boomer, blurts out that this always favours the rich and that their bluff can only be called and their power curbed by countries taking back control of national borders, denying the rich the ability to threaten relocation and

[1] <http://www.abebooks.co.uk/book-search/title/the-new-protectionism-protecting-the-future-against-free-trade/author/colin-hines-tim-lang/>

[2] <https://www.amazon.co.uk/Localization-Global-Manifesto-Colin-Hines/dp/1853836125>

[3] http://archiv.eurotopics.net/en/home/presseschau/archiv/magazin/wirtschaft-verteilerseite-neu/migration_2007_11/debatte_migration_2007_11/

[4] <http://www.migrationwatchuk.org/key-topics/european-union>

[5] <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/11/19/5-facts-about-illegal-immigration-in-the-u-s/>

[6] <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/aug/21/death-of-neoliberalism-crisis-in-western-politics>

[7] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Emperor's_New_Clothes

so allowing the rebuilding of local economies. The 'PROTECT' Party he forms wakes up the 99% and gathers huge support. The economic and political establishment cringe as they begin to suspect the crowd is turning, but continue the open borders parade...until voters bring this destructive journey to an end and globalisation is replaced by Progressive Protectionism.

Author's Vanity (beyond belief) Quote

We are at an economic and political turning point which calls for a rethink of the magnitude formerly carried out by the likes of Keynes and Beveridge. The economic and social tectonic plates are rapidly shifting and we have the opportunity to plan for a very different but better future. It is time to recognise that pushing for ever more open markets is soooooo last century, and is increasingly being challenged.

The Mindwrench Needed For The Transition To Progressive Protectionism

"You can't buck the market." Margaret Thatcher 1989

"B.....uck the Market" Authors Vanity Quote

The astute reader will detect from this book's highly intemperate/ I know best/ arrogant tone that it is written more in seething anger than sorrow. The rage comes from the lamentable inadequacy of what I consider 'my side' to provide a plausible alternative to neoliberalism's chief and most destructive battering ram: open borders for money, goods, services and people. The left, green and small 'c' conservatives who favour flourishing, sustainable local economies and businesses have much to unite them, but are at present in utterly impotent disarray.

Getting my defence in first this book is not, to put it mildly, a 'magisterial' work of an eminent and objective economist and yes it could indeed do with an edit. What this book is the culmination of decades of frustrated spitting of spleen firstly at an electronic typewriter then on a computer screen by a little known environmentalist. My main access to the more open minded section of the public for this evolving protectionist platform has been through endless letters kindly published in the Guardian newspaper over the decades. How limited and sad is that.

Why So Angry?

Why you may possibly be asking yourself is someone who has worked with the greens and the left for decades attacking his own side so vituperatively. Mostly I must confess it is frustration over what is in effect my failure to persuade them that controlling open borders to people, goods, money and services is the only way to ensure that they can achieve their myriad campaign goals. I've tried it with reports, books, speaking at meetings etc usually I hope with a tinge of humour and optimism for what can be achieved.

But we are running out of time. Tackling the increasingly obvious downsides of open borders which this book addresses has to be done fast. We are quite simply at an economic and political crossroads of the kind last seen in the economically insecure Thirties. The key is who will win the public opinion race and hence the power. Will it be the scapegoating, extreme right, who at present dominate the political new ideas stage. Or will it be those left, green and small 'c' conservatives who could be united behind an approach that tackles chronic and growing insecurity through the protection and revitalisation of sustainable local economies.

We don't have time for the left and greens to stick to their failed calls for nirvana with no policies for taking back control of the borders. This is the only thing that can effectively challenge the power that the 1% has grabbed. The alternative is that they will carry on increasing their wealth and power by more continued, relentless bludgeoning of the nation states with demands for more open borders. This will result in the continuation of an economic system designed to weaken the economic security of the 99% for the benefit of the 1%.

The left and green activists and their supporters know the problem, they just don't have the vision, courage or backbone to go against the mindset that is allowing neoliberalism to continue to rule the world. Until Trump came along in the US and Le Pen in Europe, virtually no one challenged the unholy trilogy of open borders, international competitiveness and export led growth. At present there is no systematic promotion of policies that can see off this programme of the elites. What is needed is to replace it with an emphasis on rebuilding sustainable local economies and providing citizens with a sense of security and hope for a better future. Heartbreakingly people now seem resigned and actually accept that the next generation will be poorer and more insecure than most of their parents.

This has to stop. But it won't happen if those opposing neoliberalism's malign march continue to prefer the tried, tested and failed path of fragmented issue specific skirmishes which unsurprisingly they constantly lose. The only way to reverse this trend and to actually defend the people, communities and the environment they purport to

want to help is for them to seriously consider uniting around the heresy of 'Progressive Protectionism'. The policies required are outlined at the beginning of this Intemperate Introduction and detailed in the chapters to come. With absolutely no due humility I assert that this approach is the only serious counterweight to the present open market system's relentless increasing of inequality and environmental degradation.

Only by campaigning for policies that will achieve such a 'protect the local, globally' end goal will power be stripped away from global corporations and self interested wealthy elites and so stop them ruling the globe for their own narrow advantage. The biggest threat to their continued dominance will be if countries take back control of the borders for goods, money, services and people.

They will then be robbed of the power of the threat to relocate. since if they do so they will be denied access to the local markets. Rejection of the free market will mean they can no longer force governments to make their peoples endure the race to the bottom inherent in the ruthless pursuit of international competitiveness. Once citizen's, NGOs, community groups and politicians who really want fundamental change take this path, then there is a chance at least of achieving changes that benefit the vast majority. This will come from allowing local economies in all countries to flourish and so give people much needed hope for a more secure and improving future.

Time For A 'PROTECT' Party

The UK Independence Party and its more far right counterparts in Europe, plus Donald Trump in the US have been able to gather the support of the economically insecure and have proposed policies, particularly on immigration, which have changed the political landscape and balance of power in these countries.

However it's now time to float the idea of forming a PROTECT PARTY with polices to attract the left, greens and small 'c' conservatives and get the victims of globalisation mobilised to reengage with a political process which holds out hope of actual improvement and increased security for their own lives and that of their community and country.

'It Aint Me Babe'

I couldn't possibly lead such a party because I'm far too lazy and can't be bothered to feign the interest in football so necessary these days for public and political credibility. If a rich person, a group of such people, or better still crowd funders from those alienated from all existing parties can get together the funding needed for the formation of such a party, then this book provides the policies that it could advocate, (or that eventually other parties could support when they are woken up by the huge support for the policies of this new party).

So over to you...