

Intro

A while back we conducted an interview with [Jane Hill](#) the leader of [Anew UK](#). It was partly brought about by a discussion we had on social media discussing aspects of modern agriculture and how it seemed to be failing to feed the people of this planet. We did not seem to be on the same page at the time.

I was struck by the fact that Jane was not engaging with us in a confrontational manner on a matter we did not see eye to eye with, but from position of willingness to “Learn from each other”. This is rare on social media nowadays. Lately we seem to have all been trained to immediately turn everything into ‘Them and Us’ confrontations. Of course, this is the establishments way of making sure they stay in power while we all bite each other in the ankles.

This prompted me to enquire what Anew UK was all about, and Jane suggested we discuss it face to face, so we scheduled a Zoom call, agreeing that if anything was to arise from this mutual ‘Interview’ that Dangerous Globe would write it up and post it.

Now read on...

DG How would you describe AnewUK?

JH It came about from a group that had formed on social media who all seemed to be suffering from the same problem, political homelessness. Not only did none of the current parties in the UK supply what this group felt was important to them in the way of policies, but they didn’t come anywhere near close. The general feeling was that if a party or movement aligned with 75% of our views then perhaps we could go for them sacrificing the 25%. The consensus seemed to be that current parties were struggling to tick even 25% leaving 75% of our principles in the dust. That seemed a hill too big and too far away.

DG OK, we can identify with that, so are you talking about forming a political party?

JH In the UK, the current political system does not work for the majority of people; it does however serve to keep career politicians in their careers. These people who have no understanding of what it’s like for the working man in the UK and haven’t for decades. Back in the early 80s, both my husband and I were politically active and members of one of the 3 main political parties at that time. 1989 saw us move home and it was at that time we both realised that we did not align too well with the new manifesto of that political party but continued to support and vote for it for another 10 years despite our misgivings.

So no, we weren’t looking to form a new political party, but we are looking to bring in a new form of governance. However, to enable us to do this, we have had to set ourselves up as a political party as you can only change the system from within and we need to use the current system to get our message across, hopefully seeing us enter it from where the changes will begin.

DG OK so what would that look like?

JH For example, instead of 650 MP’s lets have it based on Shires with a leader in each and maybe a dozen working together with them. Our ethos is to move from the current political governance system to one based on policy, not a face, and one which is based on that of a General Council. There are approx. 48 ‘shires’ or regions within the UK. By changing to a General Council with leaders, deputies and administrators in each region the number of MGCs (Member of the General Council) would be greatly different to the current level; around 337 instead of 650, saving the taxpayer £2.7m a year in salaries alone at the current salary level. Likewise claimable expenses

would be reduced – no more duck houses in private ponds, grossly over-rated wallpaper or refurbbs of No.10 and certainly no more reclamation of private home energy bills.

DG How do you view the immigration issues we see today? There seems to be a lot of activity across Europe in this matter...none of it very concrete or co-ordinated

JH It's a longstanding issue that hasn't gone away, in fact it seems to be getting deliberately ignored by politicians of late. Anyone who wishes to come to the UK and is a genuine asylum seeker applying through the correct routes is more than welcome. The illegal side of immigration is another issue and much less about seeking asylum and more about economics. People who want a better life and are happy to fork out thousands to traffickers to smuggle them in, can also apply through the correct channels and that does not mean the English Channel.

Our world leaders are encouraging mass migration and national governments have gone along with it, actively signing agreements to this effect, the last by Theresa May. There has been no consultation with the British people on the subject. This has eroded our national identities. The UK cannot support more people financially, nor can we simply find them a house to live in, there are plenty of citizens already homeless and now, due to the economic crisis, they are faced with the choice of eating or heating this coming winter. The government spending vast sums of money keeping migrants in hotels could be put to better use surely? *(Currently costs to the UK government has exceeded the estimated £1.2 million a day and is now [£4.6 million a day.](#))*

Britain needs to be stronger on this issue, but the idea of sending them all to Rwanda is not the answer. Until we rid ourselves of the link to the ECHR that option is pointless. The emphasis should be on prevention of illegal entry not some arbitrary agreement with a foreign government.

DG Farming? We touched on this briefly on social media a while back

JH The UK Government is offering £120k pounds to farmers to retire and give up their land adding to the food crisis still further. We need more farmers not less. Farmland not in productive use should be opened up to food cooperatives or allotment holders to grow food locally.

The Nitrogen issue seems to be just another lie used to scare people...we need to get people onside not scare them to death.

We also advocate removal of GMO foods and the use of toxic chemicals such as Glyphosate to grow our food. People have no idea how toxic and damaging to the body Glyphosate is.

We are also against the Precision Breeding Project which seeks to genetically modify not only crops but also animals for human consumption. Bill Gates has already started work on this when he recently visited a company in Glasgow, albeit under the guise of 'ensuring less disease in cattle, therefore making the cattle healthier'.

DG The monarchy? (The Interview took place before the Queen's death)

JH If we must have a monarchy, legislation is required to defund them. They have assets enough to ensure that with wise investment that they can afford to pay their own way in society.

For example, private flights (planes and helicopters) for the royal Princes amounted to £113 million in first 6 months of 2022. This should not come from the public purse. Charles and his sons are also very outspoken on environmental issues and on how we, the people, should all reduce OUR carbon footprints while they do the opposite. Do as I say don't do as I do, all very hypocritical. People need to wake up to this.

DG In your Transparency section you mentioned the G7, UN and WHO, and may I add the WEF. Do you see these entities as connected in any way?

JH Yes of course they are, they often share the same key members and now seem to be sharing many of the same politics and policies. Universal Basic Income, the CASHLESS Society, the Green Agenda and Net Zero, which are only 'buzz' words to disguise a Business-as-Usual strategy.

There is also a lot of talk about "Improving the human Genome". Two key projects here; The Human Genome Project and the Human Augmentation Project. The first seeks to isolate and store millions of human genomes; the latter being the UK's version of the US's MK Ultra with the addition of implants and genetic modification. Both projects are backed by and funded by the UK Government but neither has had any discussion at all in the public theatre. We are told the experts know best but we find that to be untrue far too much of the time.

As with all Government backed projects, positivity is the strapline, when in reality the end game is much more sinister.

DG Energy?

JH Where do we start with this? We believe the UK is energy sufficient, yet we are told it isn't. The idea of Net Zero is a fallacy, there is nothing green about the green agenda. Electric vehicles are made with the same processes as petrol and diesel vehicles only with added batteries that require a wide range of elements that petrol or diesel vehicles do not. Now that energy prices have started to climb, there is a distinct possibility that they could also become uneconomical from the point of sale/purchase. We need all forms of energy and that includes reopening coal mines, building more nuclear power stations, lifting the ban on wood burners in parts of London and bringing back into operation gas storage facilities.

Within the current energy price hikes, the standing charge, which is being increased each month, should be scrapped as well as the Green Levy, which was never voted for by the people of the UK.

Summary

The DG would like to thank Jane for her time and open responses to our questions. Answers were quickly supplied, lacking that time delay that politicians use to gather their wits and create the right spin.

I confess that most of what I have read and heard from Anew UK strikes a chord with me, which has something to do with the fact that we are of a certain age/generation. That doesn't make us bad people though. We have lived through a lot of UK politics and witnessed most of the tricks and dodgy dealings that have taken place over the years.

We have also witnessed a much friendlier time in our society, as well as the explosion of information now available to us.

It is said that a lot of it is mis/disinformation or fake news, but we were lucky enough to be taught the skills of observation, dissemination, and comprehension at an early age. Things you do not acquire using a multiple-choice questionnaire form.