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The UK will be committed to Afghanistan in some manner ... for the next 30 to 40 years.
General Sir David Richards
Chief of the General Staff
The Daily Telegraph, Aug 15 2009

Since September 11 2001, the West has had a feeling of living on borrowed time ... it does seem certain that the political, economic and cultural assumptions of the West will now be contested ...
... do we have the same national character that enabled Harry Patch’s generation ... to do what was asked of them?
Charles Moore
The Daily Telegraph, Jan 3 2009 and Aug 8 2009

The United Kingdom presents itself as a target, as a fragmenting post-Christian society.
The Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)
Risk, Threat and Security (see Appendix A)

The international recession could be a ‘watershed moment’ that will shift the balance of power away from the West.
Jonathan Evans (Head of MI5)
The Daily Telegraph, Jan 7 2009

This debt blow-out has hastened a power shift that has sapped the West’s ability to impose its will on the rest of the world.
Liam Halligan
The Sunday Telegraph, Aug 9 2009
This is a most interesting paper which should be widely read. It certainly makes a very useful contribution at a time when we do seem to be in a frightful mess.

The remarks about the family are to the point and the author is well qualified to make them.

The situation has recently deteriorated, and the reputation of parliamentarians has deteriorated even further.

I do hope this paper has some influence.
# THE LONG WAR
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PREFACE

Recently, the Royal United Services Institute (the RUSI) published an excellent report entitled Risk, Threat and Security (1) (and see APPENDIX A). The report says that ‘The United Kingdom presents itself as a target, as a fragmenting, post-Christian society’, and that ‘there were many similarities with the years just before the First World War’. It emphasises the vulnerable state of society, making me consider my experience as a divorce lawyer and former soldier, and leading me to conclude that it might be useful to share my thoughts with others, and that they might be relevant to the promised Strategic Defence Review.

It was in 1978 that a Committee (of which I was Chairman) published The Case for Family Courts (2) in which we drew attention to the rise in divorce and breakdown in society. In 1981 the same Committee published a report entitled The Future of Marriage (3). It drew further attention to the rising tide of divorce and breakdown in society and called for reform of the divorce laws and a pro-marriage policy. It recommended the establishment of a Royal Commission. Although the report received some publicity there was no response from Church or State.

That report of 1981 was written on the assumption that marriage was the foundation of society, an assumption that ten years later was of doubtful validity. The question in 1991 became: ‘Can marriage survive?’ Therefore, I then wrote and published The Decay of Marriage (4) in which I concluded that we were faced with a fundamental choice regarding the nature and regulation of society. ‘Should we accept divorce, cohabitation and illegitimacy as the normative standards of behaviour or should we seek to re-establish marriage as the foundation of society?’ I argued that there were two important unresolved questions: ‘Will cohabitation provide a satisfactory alternative to marriage?’ And: ‘Can children be reared satisfactorily without the influence of fathers?’ I also concluded that ‘a healthy economy and a healthy family life are complementary’.

By 1991 there was also some general concern at the breakdown of a cohesive society and this concern found expression in the Children Act 1989 and the Family Law Act 1996, an Act to reform the divorce laws.


The Act is a charter for children. Its overriding purpose is to promote and protect children’s welfare - central to the philosophy is the belief that children are best looked after within the family. Local authorities now have duties to promote the upbringing of children in need by their families, so far as is consistent with their welfare. To meet these duties, local authorities are required to identify children in need in their area and to provide a range and
level of support ...

In this publication I have not attempted to cover the working of the 1989 Act in detail but in a report of 2001 to the same parliamentary group I said:

By October this year [2001] the Children Act will have been in operation for ten years and it is time to take stock ... Although the central philosophy of the Act is that children are best looked after within the family since the Act has been in operation there has been no significant decrease in the number of children in care; whereas in the ten years before the Act came into operation the number of children in care fell by a third ... Meanwhile the cost has more than doubled ... It is surely time for another authoritative report from the Audit Commission.

The Family Law Act 1996 was enacted to introduce mediation and reconciliation into the divorce process during a compulsory period for reflection. Nevertheless, the Lord Chancellor did not bring the main provisions into operation and in 2001 said that he would repeal them. However, the statute has neither been brought into operation nor repealed, and no detailed explanation has been given to Parliament.

We now have the prospect of a Long War. Do we ‘present a target as a fragmenting, post-Christian society’?

The current situation is that the answers to the questions I posed in 1991 are that society in 2010 has indeed accepted divorce, cohabitation and illegitimacy as normative standards of behaviour, that cohabitation has not provided a satisfactory alternative to marriage, and that in general children cannot be reared satisfactorily without the influence of fathers; thus, in the past thirty years I have witnessed a social revolution which I believe has now created a Broken Society with Low Morale, whereas we need a Cohesive Society with High Morale to win a Long War. **Are we prepared for a Long War?** That is the vital question, and one that should be answered by the forthcoming Strategic Defence Review.

I am grateful to General the Lord Guthrie for writing the Foreword to this publication.

George Brown
The Temple, London EC4Y 7DE
(email: ggbrown@amserve.com)
A fractured and fragmenting family will give us a fractured and fragmenting world.

Professor Brenda Almond

The Fragmenting Family, Oxford University Press

In all these ways, our social fragmentation, the sense of premonition and the divisions about what our stance should be, there were many similarities with the years just before the First World War.

There has to be a common understanding shared by people government and defence forces that the risk and threats exist.

The Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)

Risk, Threat and Security
INTRODUCTION

We have created a Broken Society, with Low Morale and a Broken Economy, and we are engaged in a Long War in an increasingly dangerous world.

Morale is defined as ‘confidence, determination, etc. of a person or group’. Low morale is synonymous with a Broken Society, high morale is synonymous with a Cohesive Society.

A Broken Society and a Cohesive Society

What do I mean by a ‘Broken Society’ and a ‘Cohesive Society’? In the late summer of 1945 I was taken to see some property in the East End of London. It consisted of a long street with continuous lines of small houses on either side. It was a lovely summer evening and across the street there were little Union Jacks flying, remains of a recent street party celebrating victory and an end to the bombing. Some of the women were sitting outside on their front door steps, chatting across to each other, and they gave us a cheery greeting as we passed. Inside, the houses were cramped and somewhat squalid, but each had a small garden where I noticed captive racing pigeons. At the end of the street was a public house which we visited and were told that it acted as a club for the men in the street. We were also told that behind the pub was a garden where the older men took any youths who displayed anti-social behaviour and ‘taught them the error of their ways’. There was also a shop, where the women would congregate.

Recently, I visited the same area. All the small houses, the pub and the shop had gone, to be replaced by two high-rise blocks of flats. There were no cheery greetings, the alleys were dirty and smelly, the walls covered in graffiti. In the blocks, the lifts were out of order. There was evidence of material wealth unknown in 1945 such as cars and television aerials, but I left the area feeling depressed, whereas I had enjoyed my previous visit. In 1945 I had seen poverty but I had also seen married families, social cohesion and high morale.

Our Society

Regrettably, our society is now fragmented and lacks cohesion. Jill Kirby wrote in Broken Hearts(1):
Our society is in the grip of collective insecurity. There is a sense that social disintegration lies not far beneath the surface. The most disturbing aspect of rising levels of violent crime is the increased prevalence of youth crime, including attacks by children on their peers ... the council estates across the street remain bleak and neglected. They are blighted by poverty, drugs and crime ... we also see growing evidence of child homelessness, drug abuse among the young, the physical abuse and neglect of babies and children, high rates of teenage pregnancy and a continuing cycle of broken relationships.

She continues:

As the evidence continues to accumulate, there is one persistent factor that so often links all this unhappiness. It is the disintegration of the family.

Government Policy

The main plank in the Government’s policy towards the family is the reduction in child poverty, but this ignores the fact that child poverty is not simply a matter of cash, for a very high proportion of the three million children now growing up in poverty are in one-parent families and extra funds can never solve the emotional damage caused by their being raised in a broken home. Moreover, financial subsidies encourage marriage breakdown because they make it more attractive to be a lone parent. A quarter of all children in the UK are now living in one-parent families compared with a European average of just 14%(2). Financial subsidies also encourage the culture of welfare dependency, in many cases even for those who work, many of whom receive more in tax subsidy than they earn, even before allowing for the cost of child care. Welfare dependency encourages a culture of deceit and dishonesty and, as has been widely reported, with 40% of all families soon to be in receipt of means-tested benefits, this is already a serious problem and one which tends to weaken moral fibre and national morale.

David Ruffley, the Shadow Minister for Welfare Reform, said that the Government is paying tax credits or out of work benefits to around 2.1 million people claiming to be lone parents(3). Yet the official estimate is that there are only 1.9 million lone parents in the UK.

The Welfare State

During the past decade, the Fighting Services feel their interests have been neglected.
For example, expenditure on Social Protection(4) was increased from £153 billion in 1996 to a projected £177 billion in 2003-2004. This compares with an increase from £27 billion to £31 billion for the Fighting Services fighting two wars. As Colonel Dewar wrote in an editorial in The Officer (July/Aug 2004):

“The Government is dicing with death ... it is taking a risk with the security of the nation ... there is a bottom line in defence spending below which no responsible Government can afford to go. This Government is about to breach that bottom line.

Family Laws

We have 50,000 children growing up in the care of the local authorities and a further 350,000 in contact with the social services: does not this indicate that the Government should reform the Children Act 1989, the overriding purpose of the Act being to promote the welfare of children from broken homes? We have a divorce rate of 45 per cent: does not this indicate that the Government should reform the law of divorce, i.e. the dissolution of marriage? There is much complacency (see also Preface).

Marriage

The marriage rate is at its lowest since records began in 1862. The traditional definition of marriage is ‘the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all other’(5) and for nearly two thousand years marriage has been the foundation stone of western civilization, creating stable societies with a moral base, supported by Church and State. It was, therefore, not surprising that in 1998, in its consultation document Supporting Families(6), the Government said: ‘Marriage is still the surest foundation for rearing children ... we want to strengthen marriage.’

A Broken Society

Consequently it is very surprising that in 2000 the same Government abolished the Married Couples Tax Allowance and is now, in effect, pursuing a pro-one parent family policy. According to the Institute for the Study of Civil Society(7), far from encouraging family stability, the Government is undermining it with a tax and benefit system that makes marriage an
unattractive option for the less well-off. Poorer couples where one partner works, both work or both live on benefit are all penalised if they get married. ‘We have subsidised the choice to be a lone parent and in so doing have discouraged the choice of parents to commit to shared responsibility for children through marriage.’ Frank Field, the former Minister for Welfare Reform, has calculated(8) that a single parent with two children, working 16 hours a week, will gain a weekly income after tax credit payments of £487, whereas the breadwinner of a two parent family, also with two children, will be required to work 116 hours to get the same income.

Dr Eamonn Butler, in his study *The Rotten State of Britain*(9), says, ‘Three quarters of the poorest households would be better off splitting up’. Marriage has been downgraded and family break-ups encouraged by making it profitable to become single parents. This has resulted in a Broken Society and a Broken Economy.

**A Broken Economy**

The lifestyle of the Broken Society has resulted in very high levels of private borrowing and debt and this, in turn, has contributed to a huge national debt. As David Cameron and George Osborne have said, we need to change from an economy based on debt to an economy based on saving and investment.

**Morale**

As a result of our Broken Society, our self confidence is low. In the words of the RUSI report: ‘Our loss of self-confidence weakens our ability to develop new means to provide for our security in the face of new risks’.

**The Long War**

Tony Blair warned the nation that:

The nature of the global threat we face in Britain and around the world is real and existential ... that we are in mortal danger of mistaking the nature of the new world. If the twentieth century scripted our conventional way of thinking, the twenty first century is unconventional in almost every respect. It was not defined by Iraq but by September 11.

Suicide bombers have struck in London and Glasgow and there have
been numerous other aborted attempts.

In the July/Aug 2004 issue of *The Officer*, Colonel Dewar wrote:

The threat to our nation is both serious and prolonged. Few doubt that we are engaged in at least a 20 year campaign against a determined and dangerous enemy.

A resurgent Russia has recently invaded Georgia; China is expanding her armed forces; and North Korea already has, and Iran may soon have, nuclear capability: we live in an increasingly dangerous world.

**Conclusions**

‘The threat to our nation is both serious and prolonged,’ say the RUSI. Therefore, in Chapter 1 I propose to examine our engagement in a Long War which we must win. In order to win we will need a healthy, Cohesive Society with high morale, but what we have is a Broken Society and a Broken Economy with low morale (see Chapter 2). In Chapter 3 I examine how we might create a Cohesive Society, in Chapter 4 I explore the importance of high morale in time of war, and in Chapter 5, I draw some conclusions.
‘Defence and Security must be restored as the first duty of Government’.

The Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)

Risk, Threat and Security
CHAPTER 1  THE LONG WAR

A Long War

It is easy to forget that we are fighting a war, but our troops in Afghanistan are engaged in a vicious guerilla campaign in hostile environment. By now it should be clear that there are elements in Islam who are waging a *jihad* (holy war) against the West, a war which may last for many years. The enemy believe we are indeed a broken society, which will lose the will to resist.

This *jihad* is waged in open combat in Afghanistan but elsewhere by terrorist cells, who frequently use suicide bombers. In our own country suicide bombers have struck in London and Glasgow and there are numerous reports of aborted plots.

Melanie Phillips writes(1): ‘Londistan has become a country within a country, that is growing in strength’. MI estimates that there are about 2,000 active terror supporters in Britain, and claims schoolchildren are being recruited by al-Qu’eda(2).

Admiral Sir Alan West, the Government’s Security Adviser, is of the opinion that it will be at least fifteen years before Britain and its allies finish off the threat posed by Islamic extremists(3).

Afghanistan

The head of MI5 says(4) that ‘What happens in Afghanistan is extremely important because what happens there has a direct impact on domestic security’, but it is difficult for the general public to comprehend the challenge. The Defence Correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph* writes(5):

> Military planners are preparing for a long campaign ... **in fact the main problem might not be in the fields of Helmand but in the living rooms of Britain and America.** [Author’s emphasis]

It is not only our domestic security which is at risk but also the future of NATO and the Anglo-US relationship. The United States is well aware that Britain - which has launched an unprecedented spending spree to help stimulate the economy - has never-theless postponed the construction of two aircraft carriers and has left those troops it has sent to Afghanistan begging for helicopters.

General Sir David Richards, the Chief of the General Staff, has predicted that Britain’s commitment to Afghanistan could last 40 years, and Bob Ainsworth says, ‘We must see the job
through in Afghanistan’. David Miliband says(6), ‘We are in Afghanistan through ‘necessity’ and clearly implies that we are there for the long haul. But the Daily Telegraph comments(7):

Mr Brown must explain in detail why the defeat of the Taliban - at the cost of many shocking casualties - will make British cities safer. Otherwise, public support for the whole enterprise will collapse.

Another important objective must be to reduce the supply of drugs at source in Afghanistan.

Any premature withdrawal from Afghanistan by NATO could have disastrous effects on Pakistan.

Pakistan

Peter Carvell writes(8):

The Taliban are not mainly in Afghanistan now, but in Pakistan ... the Taliban are said to be setting up caches of arms in every city, even as far south as Karachi ... they are now using the fedayeen groups to cause panic with sudden attacks ... take a look at the map and you will see why Pakistan is often called the tinderbox of the world where one spark could ignite global war.

Pakistan has nuclear weapons.

Iran

Con Coughlin writes(9):

Ignoring Iran’s nuclear plan would be the West’s greatest blunder ... unless Iran can be prevailed upon to rein in its nuclear ambitions, the world is heading towards a new era of calamitous conflict ... all the indications are that Mr Ahmadinejad is in no mood for a compromise ... the most likely outcome, or so it is now argued, is that leading Arab states, such as Saudi Arabia, Syria and Egypt, seek to acquire their own nuclear arsenals ... add to this the massive nuclear stockpile that its already at Israel’s disposal ... and it is easy to understand why a poly-nuclear Middle East ... would pose the greatest threat to world peace since the creation of the Iron Curtain.
Other Dangers

Russia has ordered a comprehensive military rearmament after accusing NATO of encroaching on Moscow’s sphere of influence in the former Soviet Union. President Dmitry Medvedev’s announced that a ‘comprehensive rearmament’ would begin in 2011(10).

North Korea has a nuclear capability, ballistic missiles and one million men under arms.

Gerard Baker writes(11):

Today China with its vast store of US Treasury bonds has American prosperity in its grip. Russia with its stranglehold on continental energy resources can intimidate Europeans ... Meanwhile, the global struggle against Islamism weakens the resolve, resources and unity of the West, while Russia and China deflect jihadism’s ambitions through useful accommodation with its practitioners in Iran, Syria and Palestine ... For liberalism to prevail ... it will require a good deal more willingness by the West to defend itself and its interests ... Look at where we stood in 1940 or 1979 ... who can be so confident surveying the state of morale ... that such a triumph is inevitable in this century? [Author’s emphasis]

Economic Power

Asian military budgets in 2008 totalled ,173 billion compared with ,144 billion by European NATO members. Officially, China spent ,38 billion on its armed forces in 2008, but experts put the true figure at twice that. Beijing’s official defence budget has risen by about 15 per cent every year for most of the last decade. In 2008 it increased by 19 per cent(12).

Liam Halligan writes(13):

Many of the emerging markets (Ems) are doing quite nicely, thank you. While the Western world screams, most of the populous industrialising nations of the East are still expanding at a fair old clip ... the Western world has run up huge debts on money borrowed from the East to fuel the shop-till-you-drop consumption of the last 15 years ... this blow-out has hastened a power shift that has sapped the West’s ability to impose its will on the rest of the world ... the collective view of the leading credit experts ... their verdict is ... that Ireland is twice as likely to default as China. Who says the ‘sub prime’ crisis is almost over? The truth is
that its impact will never end.

Conclusions

My judgment is that conflict and instability in this new age will be ever present. In the coming decades I’ve no doubt that our Armed Forces and our security institutions will be called upon to protect our mutual interests often in distant places.(14)

Bob Ainsworth

Con Coughlin, in Britain is Fighting a War (15), says:

It is not just soldiers who win wars, Governments also have a crucial role to play - and to judge by the response of most Western governments to the threat we face from radical Islamism we are simply not competing on equal terms with the enemy.

The Head of MI5 has warned that ‘The international recession could be a ‘watershed moment’ that will shift the balance of power away from the West’.

The RUSI has warned that:

In all these ways, our social fragmentation, the sense of premonition and the divisions about what our stance should be, there were many similarities with the years just before the First World War.

It does seem certain that the political, economic and cultural assumptions of the West will now be contested, and the world may be heading towards a new age of calamitous conflict.

The confidence and loyalty of the people are the wellspring from which flows the power with
which all threats to society are ultimately met ...

The Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)
Risk, Threat and Security, Feb 08, Vol.153, No.1

A society so sick that it cannot be led.

Lord Rees-Mogg
The Times, October 27 2003

The pursuit of individual’s best options narrowly constructed has led to disharmony and a worse rather than better outcome for society as a whole.

Professor Brenda Almond
The Fragmenting Family, Oxford University Press
CHAPTER 2  A TARGET, THE BROKEN SOCIETY WITH LOW MORALE

Does the UK present a target, a society with low morale?

In one generation the numbers marrying have halved and the numbers divorcing have trebled while the proportion of children born outside marriage has quadrupled: this has resulted in a Broken Society. This is giving rise to concern throughout society which is reflected in reports from many different sources.

Threat and Security

The Royal United Services Institute (the RUSI) is the leading study group of the Armed Services and its report - *Risk, Threat and Security* (1) by Professor Gwyn Prins and the Marquess of Salisbury (Appendix A) - is based on a seminar with many distinguished members of the RUSI. Some extracts from the report follow:

*The confidence and loyalty of the people are the wellspring from which flows the power with which all threats to defence and security are ultimately met ... there is a loss in the United Kingdom of confidence ...*

*The United Kingdom presents itself as a target, as a fragmenting post Christian society ... the country’s lack of self-confidence is in stark contrast to the implacability of the Islamist terrorist enemy within and without ... there are many similarities with the years just before the First World War ... Defence and security must be restored as the first duty of Government ... We propose twin committees, one a cabinet committee and the other a joint committee of the two Houses of Parliament.*

The Deputy Political Editor of *The Daily Telegraph* comments(2): ‘*It is the vulnerable state of British society that attracts the most criticism*’.

Adolescent Health

In December 2003, the British Medical Association published a report on ‘Adolescent Health’(3) from which the following extracts are drawn.

*In the light of the available evidence, the future health of the population and pressure on the health service are legitimate causes of concern ... UK adolescents ... now have one of the highest levels of alcohol use and binge
drinking in Europe ... up to one in five adolescents may experience some form of psychological problem ... the prevalence of sexually transmitted infections (STIs) among adolescents is high and increasing.

Most of the problems and behaviours reviewed in this report are shared by adolescents from different social backgrounds. [Nevertheless] coming from a non-intact family and favouring peer opinion over that of the family are risk factors for smoking, drinking and drug use ...

Mental health difficulties are more common in lone parent households than in two parent families. The quality of family relationships, levels of parental stress and family type have all been linked to adolescent mental health.

Commenting on the report, the Director of the children’s charity Kidscope is quoted(4) as saying:

It might go against the liberal agenda but kids need guidance and they need father figures. There are too many of them out there who have no father figures and no positive male role models.

Dr Trevor Stammers, a senior tutor in general practice at St George’s Medical School in south London, is reported as saying:

The significance of the lack of male role models for young people is now indisputable whether you like the idea or not.

It has been reported(5) that, for every ten hours a week a mother works, the odds on her having a child who is overweight by the age of 3 are increased by about 10%. According to the Health Survey of England(6), published in 2006, there is an inexorable upward trend in obesity, with nearly half of teenage girls and more than a third of teenage boys being overweight or obese

The Birth Rate

According to reports(7) from the Office of National Statistics, the fertility rate for the UK is 1.79 children per woman but ‘women who are fertile will need to have three children each to sustain the current population of Britain at around 59 million’. This is because, according to The Daily Telegraph(8):

Of the large number of women (around 20 per cent) who are infertile or choosing
not to have children - a figure likely to increase because of the spread of sexual diseases that can cause infertility such as chlamydia - and the aging population.

Whereas the French Government have introduced a €700 million scheme to encourage women to have more babies in order to avoid a dismal economic future, so far our Government have not followed their example, although Patricia Hewitt believes that women have a duty to the economy to breed new workers to pay for their old age. Janice Turner asks(9): ‘Did the Government not calculate that if you lumber female graduates with student loans they are not going to make babies any time soon?’ The fear is that in 50 years’ time, we will be an unproductive, economically weak nation where many will be unfit or feeble and earning nothing.

Jill Kirby writes(10):

British families are becoming demoralised by the welfare state. As the cost for compensating for family instability has risen over the last 30 years, Britain has at the same time experienced a steady decline in family size, particularly among families at average income levels … an important source of social cohesion is lost.

Mark Steyn comments(11):

Demographics is a game of last man standing. It is no consolation that the Muslim birth rates will start falling in 2050 if yours are off the cliff right now. The last people around in any number will determine the kind of society we live in.

There could be more active Muslims than active Christians in the UK before the middle of the century, according to a report in The Daily Telegraph(12).

Christmas Day

The UK census for 2001 found that 30 per cent of the 21.6 million households contained dependent children; of these, 22 per cent were lone parent households, 11 per cent were cohabiting, and 8 per cent were ‘other’ households (e.g. grand-parents). 58 per cent were in married couple households, but these included 10 per cent with a step-parent. Already, therefore, a majority of our children are not growing up with their natural parents in a married couple household.

Jim White reports(13) that television executives consider that there is no point in scheduling anything worth watching on Christmas Day as research tells them that it is ‘hand-over day’:

In divorced circumstances children tend to spend Christmas Eve and Christmas
morning with one partner before being delivered to the other on Christmas afternoon, in order to enjoy Boxing Day with them. Thus while thirty years ago most families would have been hunkering down in front of their television sets at 7 pm on Christmas Day to watch Eric slap Ernie about, these days for a significant proportion of Britons, that is precisely the time they will be sitting in a motorway service station waiting to facilitate the exchange of children.

**St Valentine’s Day**

*The Times* reported(14) that Melanie Johnson, the Health Minister in 2004, had launched a campaign, centering on Valentine’s Day, highlighting the dangers of unsafe sex and the risk of sexually transmitted infections (STIs). The campaign was prompted by concern over the rising numbers of STIs among young people. Between 1997 and 2006, cases of syphilis were up by 1,607 per cent, gonorrhea by 46 per cent, chlamydia by 166 per cent and herpes by 36 per cent. Professor Pat Troops of the Health Protection Agency said(15): ‘If you look over 10 years, it’s an incredibly worrying situation.’

The Government campaign was ‘aimed at targeting those most at risk by using thought-provoking imagery and direct language’. A website - www.playingsafely.co.uk was launched to support the campaign, which featured cartoon images of cards with powerful messages about the risk of STIs, and advertisements appeared in newspapers and on radio as well as on spoof Valentine cards and on beer mats in bars. One image was of a sunset scene of a couple on the beach and a poem:

Oh, Valentine, since you came to me/You’re always in my thoughts.

I’ll never forget the night we met/And you gave me genital warts.

Another showed a pink teddy bear in obvious pain, with the message: ‘I love you so much it hurts ... when I pee’.

The St Valentine’s Day campaign does not appear to have produced immediate results because it has subsequently been reported(16) that:

Children aged 12 may get free condoms ... A scheme to stem teenage pregnancies and the spread of sexually transmitted diseases could mean school children as young as 12 being given ‘credit cards’ entitling them to free condoms.

The Government plans to give teenage mothers ‘personal contraception advisers’. The UK’s teenage pregnancy rate(2007) is the highest in Western Europe(17). Moreover, it has been
reported(18) that:

Young women are increasingly using abortion as a form of birth control ... Despite easy access to contraception and the morning-after pill, the trend for terminations among those in their 20s is rising inexorably.

Since 2001 there has been easy access to the morning-after pill which then went on sale over the counter in chemists’ chops. Critics warned at the time that this development would encourage promiscuity and already around 20 per cent of 16 and 17 year olds say they have used it.

HIV

In a parliamentary reply to the Health Minister(19), Lord Darzi of Denham said that the number of people living with the HIV virus in 2007 was a record 73,000, the number of new diagnoses having trebled since 1998.

Burnout for Mothers

According to a report in Good Housekeeping(20), a third of working women say they are driven to exhaustion by trying to balance work and home commitments.

The research among 1,000 women suggests that a growing number are suffering from burnout, a condition once associated with only the most pressured of jobs.

Jill Kirby comments:

While the evidence shows that a growing number want to prioritise times with their children, Government policy is aimed at driving women into full-time employment.

87 per cent of pregnant women and working mothers say the Government should put more energy into financially helping mothers to stay at home rather than trying to force all mothers back into the workplace.

Research for the Government has found that increasing numbers of mothers do not want to go out to work, preferring to stay at home with their children. More than half (53 per cent) of mothers who do not return said it was because they wanted to be with their children(21). The report Women in the World Today(22) suggests that each full time parent saves the state £29,000 a year in services but points out that the tax systems makes no allowance for families
where a parent chooses to stay at home to care for a child. Theresa May MP is quoted in this report as saying: ‘Policy will have at its heart the need to give women real choice over their own lives - a choice that remains elusive for too many women in twenty first century Britain’.

Frank Field, the former Minister for Welfare Reform, blames(23) yob culture on Labour for making mothers go back to work while Emma Thompson says(24):

    We see a society that is desperate for the glue, the social cohesion [Author’s emphasis] which a mother at home can provide ... I think paying women to stay at home to look after their own is the way forward ... the point about women’s liberation was choice.

**Reefer Madness**

The Home Office has published figures suggesting that a line of cocaine is now cheaper than a pint of lager or glass of wine, while United Nations researchers report(24) that children in Britain are the worst in Europe for cannabis use, with some 44 per cent of 15 to 16 year olds saying they have tried the drug.

Although recently the Government in effect decriminalised the possession of cannabis, they have now had a change of mind and reclassified it as Class B.

**Collapse of Schools**

According to a report by Cambridge University’s Faculty of Education(25), secondary education in England is collapsing under the twin strains of Government pressure on schools and deteriorating pupil behaviour.

    Teachers tended to attribute much of pupils’ unacceptable behaviour to breakdown in family life and a deterioration in the values and norms of society. One teacher said: ‘Parents are struggling. Their children are out of control. Their partners have left. They can’t pay the bills. They are fragile’.

**A Ladette Culture**

According to a European School Survey(26), teenage girls are now bigger binge drinkers
than boys for the first time as more women turn to excessive consumption of alcohol. Professor Plant, in presenting the report, said: ‘Something has been going on since the late 1990s which is un-precedented. There has been an enormous increase in heavy drinking among young women’. He suggested that the rise in binge drinking among teenagers was linked to the emergence of a ladette culture. ‘Raising teenagers can be extremely tough, but my concern is that vast numbers of British parents seem to have given up’.

The number of children taken to hospital after excessive drinking is at a five year high and 62 per cent were girls, says the Government, and a separate report shows that nearly a quarter of girls between 14 and 15 get drunk at least once a week compared with a fifth of boys(27).

A Yob Culture

A recent report(28) shows that only 32.6 per cent of all absent fathers paid child maintenance; and that 48 per cent of separated and divorced fathers had no contact with their children.

Janet Daley writes(29):

Anyone who has observed what has become the great British Saturday night out, with its binge drinking and its frenetic, mindless violence, will know that something ugly and hollow is eating away at the heart of this country ... There is a degradation and a brutishness that seems to be beyond recall.

A 2007 Home Office report(30) discloses that offences of assault, criminal damage and harassment between the hours of 3am and 6am rose sharply in the 12 months since the introduction of all-night drinking. The Commons Public Accounts Committee says the much-vaunted Government crackdown on anti-social behaviour has failed to deliver relief, and anti-social behaviour is costing , 3.4 billion a year(31).

One in four teenage boys aged 14 to 17 admits being a serious or prolific criminal offender, according to a Home Office study(32):

The first Crime and Justice Society Survey of householders in England and Wales found evidence of 1.7 million active teenage offenders. The Home Secretary described the figures as ‘appalling’.

In 2007, more than 20 youngsters were killed in a string of high profile deaths on London streets(33), and the use of knives in muggings in the UK increased in just two years from 25,000 to 64,000(34).
A Broken Economy

Consumer debt is now at record levels - personal lending has now reached 1.25 trillion, the equivalent of an average debt per household of 50,000. The ratio of debt to income has risen from under 50 per cent in the 1970s to over 140 per cent today. British consumers are on average twice as indebted as those in Continental Europe. It is said that ‘Personal debt is the most serious social problem facing the UK’(35), and:

In terms of personal and corporate debt, Britain is, I think it is true to say, the most indebted nation on earth, in fact just not now but for all time, that is truly frightening and we need to address that.(36)

Morale

‘The electorate is uncertain and anxious ... we need to know ourselves and what we stand for’, says the RUSI report, which also quotes Shakespeare: ‘This England that was wont to conquer others, hath made a shameful conquest of itself’. For example:

- Britain’s prison population is at a record level and prisoners have to be released early - in 2008 some 42,000 prisoners were released early.
- The country now faces a very serious health threat from sexually transmitted infections’, says that British Medical Association.
- The Government is paying tax credits or out-of-work benefits to around 2.1 million people claiming to be lone parents, yet the official estimate of lone parents in the UK is 1.9 million.
- A record 151,000 work permits were issued in 2008 to non-EU citizens, while unemployment increased by 290,000 to 1.92 million.
- 2.7 million people are drawing incapacity benefit, while it is estimated that 1 million of them are capable of work.
- The 2008 British Social Attitude Survey concludes that Britons are the least motivated workers in the developed world. We are now seeing the emergence of third and even fourth generation in families in which no one has done a day’s work.
- Britain has a quarter of the world’s CCTV cameras, the largest number of any country.
- The Government has established a national therapy scheme of cognitive
behavioural therapy.

- Members of Parliament have shamelessly profiteered by claiming expenses and allowances to which they are not entitled.

**Marriage**

The marriage rate is at its lowest since records began in 1862, while the divorce rate is about 45%.

**Conclusions**

These are all surely symptoms of a Broken Society with low morale, when what we need is a Cohesive Society with high morale in order to create a happy and prosperous society and to win a long war.

Kathy Gyngell writes(38):

The publication this week [April 2009] of the Social Trends report from the Office of National Statistics marks a new point in the demise of the traditional family. Today having a child is the first major milestone of adult life, ahead of marriage. Now 30 per cent of women under 30 give birth by the age of 25, but only 24 per cent of under 30s get married. Try as it might to lift children out of economic poverty, the state cannot lift them out of the emotional poverty that results from this situation.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in an open letter(39) to party leaders, said that family breakdown had contributed to a generation of 'rootless and alienated youths which was fuelling crime'. He added: ‘Support for family stability was not a matter of middle-class, Middle England nostalgia, but of life and death’. [Author’s emphasis].

The RUSI sees ‘a loss in the United Kingdom of confidence’, and a broken society with a broken economy is so beset with problems that there is little interest in, and support for, the Armed Forces.

Do we have the necessary will, social cohesion and morale to win a long war and to meet unforeseen dangers? Clearly, the policies that have resulted in the creation of this broken society need to be changed.
CHAPTER 3  A COHESIVE SOCIETY WITH HIGH MORALE

If we are no longer to present as a ‘Target, a Broken Society’, we will need to develop a Cohesive Society with high morale.

Social Capital

Since 1945 we have developed a comprehensive welfare state and have concentrated on producing a stable and prosperous economy. However, we have neglected the maintenance of a healthy and cohesive society, and what has been called our ‘social capital’. What is to be done?

The Welfare State

I agree with James Bartholomew when he writes in The Welfare State We’re In(1), that ‘it is not going too far to say that there seems to have been a revolution in the culture and character of the British people in the last sixty years - they are less polite and more violent’. He notes a deterioration in healthcare and parenting and an increase in unemployment and benefits dependency. He believes that even greater prosperity could have been achieved without the moral decline. ‘People who are allowed no responsibility become irresponsible’.

The United States faces similar problems but in that country action has been taken. In The Price of Parenthood(2), Jill Kirby shows that the USA has reduced welfare dependency by more than 50%. At the same time, the birth rate has increased, family breakdown has levelled off, child support payments have increased and teenage pregnancies have fallen by around 30%. She says:

The British Government has failed to grasp two important lessons from the American experience. The first is that welfare assistance must return to historical roots and become once again a measure of temporary support for those in need rather than a way of life ... in plain terms, if long term dependency remains a viable option, then there will always be long term state dependants.

Marriage

The marriage rate is at the lowest since records began in 1862. Jill Kirby continues:

Secondly, taking mothers out of dependency does not involve only getting them
into work but getting them into families. That means removing welfare penalties for couples, tackling teenage pregnancy and supporting and encouraging marriage. The philosophy behind America’s marriage initiatives is based not on sentimental hankering for tradition but on hard headed evidence which proves that marriage is the most effective route out of poverty as well as being the best environment for children. These are two lessons which Britain cannot afford not to learn.

**Tax and Welfare Payments**

The most obvious reform would be to reinstate the Married Couples Tax Allowance. The fiscal disincentive to couples staying together should be removed and the couple element in Working Tax Credits enlarged. But, in general, tax credits should be phased out and replaced by tax allowances where possible, since the latter promote personal responsibility.

**Giving Mothers the Choice of Staying Home or Going Out to Work**

Emma Thompson says(3): ‘If tax allowances were transferable both husband and wife could set £4,500 against tax’. Alternatively, income splitting would allow the income of both spouses to be aggregated and split in two to compute the tax rate for each spouse.

It is reported(4) that the Australian Prime Minister John Howard has introduced tax reforms which assist all two-parent families with children and allow one of the parents, if they wish, to spend the children’s early years at home through transferable tax allowances. Alice Thomson reports(5):

The next generation of women have decided that they don’t want to be Shirley Conran ... almost a quarter of nursery places are now vacant ... the number of women in senior management positions in the 350 biggest companies has fallen by 40 per cent ... it was too hard to be perfect at everything.

**Health and Education**

To promote personal responsibility, generous tax relief should be given for health insurance and vouchers awarded for education.

**Human Rights**
Tom Utley writes:

Human rights are just lovely - in theory. It is only in practice, after you have tried to write them down on a piece of paper, that they lead to aberrations ... the sooner we withdraw from the convention and repeal the Human Rights Act, the better for British justice.

The Church of England is concerned that the legislation is being used by secularists to advance a liberal agenda and that it has encouraged intolerance.

The Permissive State

Wherever there is a social problem the Government’s reaction seems to be to give ground, to be ever more liberal, and thereby to exacerbate the problem. For example:

- there is a high rate of teenage pregnancy - the morning-after pill can now be purchased over the counter in chemists shops;
- we have a very high rate of cannabis use, with 40% of 15 year olds experimenting with it - the Government did, in effect, decriminalise the possession of cannabis;
- binge drinking is a feature of the Great British Society night out, so the Government relaxes the licensing laws;
- there is a high level of household debt but students are encouraged to take on loans and the Government has proposed to build super-casinos.

In one generation the numbers marrying have halved and the Government reacts by proposing that:

... all official documentation which currently requires details of marital status should be altered to read ‘civil status’ and that references to marriage should be replaced with neutral terms.

Patriotism

Since 1997 average net immigration has more than trebled to about 200,000 a year: nothing like it has happened before. In The Poverty of Multiculturism, Patrick West writes that multiculturism is ‘a response to the dreadful shortcomings of our own culture’. He goes on: ‘The faults of thirty years of state-endorsed multiculturism have been racial tension and inter-racial segregation’, and concludes: ‘A country can remain cohesive only if there is at least a residual sense of togetherness, in other words, patriotism’.
Multiculturism was divisive and wasteful at the best of times, its legacy in a period of economic crisis poses a dangerous threat to social cohesion(10).

**A Cohesive Culture**

Belief in lifelong marriage has been a fundamental part of the Christian religion. The Church should therefore be very concerned at the breakdown of marriage and the high rate of divorce. Digby Anderson writes(11): ‘As late as the 1960s the dominant ideal of marriage in Britain was a Christian one’. Since then, there has been what amounts to a social and spiritual revolution, driven by the high rate of divorce. He continues:

This huge revolution has never been systematically attacked by the Church of England. Bishops and other leaders have not been shy of courting publicity for all sorts of other stances but never has any body taken a firm stance on this betrayal of the essence of Christian morality ... The leaders of the C of E have either failed to see the break-up of the family as a threat to their own membership, in which case they have been remarkably stupid, or they have not cared sufficiently to do anything about it. Of course, these trends are powerful and difficult to resist, but resisted they must be if the Church is not to undertake the wholesale conversion of England for each generation.

At least the Church should unite in denouncing sexual promiscuity and emphasis the importance of marriage with children being brought up by their parents.

**A Healthy Economy**

Jeff Randall writes(12): *We are in denial about the causes of recession and therefore cannot face up to the action required to lift us out of it.* [Author’s emphasis]

He goes on to quote Niall Ferguson Professor of History at Harvard University, writing in *The Financial Times*: ‘The reality being repressed is that the western world is suffering a crisis of indebtedness. In which case, pumping out yet more debt will not be the answer. It is simply a short term fix that in the long term creates an even bigger disaster’. This increase in indebtedness has coincided with an increase in the instability of family life.

In the UK, consumer debt is at record levels (see Chapter 2). In *The Family*(13), a report to the President of the United States in 1986 (Chairman, Gary L Bauer), it was stated:

The freedom to make our own lives - the essence of democratic capitalism - can flourish only when the family is strong. Strong families make economic progress
possible, passing on the values central to a free economy ... families save, and even more importantly, they teach children the values upon which savings are built, delaying gratification now for some future good.

A healthy economy, a healthy family and a healthy democracy are complementary.

David Cameron and George Osborne have said that we need to change from an economy founded on debt to an economy founded on savings and investment. Therefore it will be necessary to reduce the divorce rate from 45 per cent. For the great majority, divorce is a financial disaster with the resources that supported one household having to be divided between two. Similarly, the 25 per cent of households with only one parent find it difficult to make savings and investments.

The last Conservative Government reduced the married couples tax allowance and in 2000 the Labour Government abolished it altogether. These were mistakes for now we have:

- the lowest marriage rate since records began in 1862;
- a broken society; and
- a broken economy.

If we are to have a healthy economy we need to revert to a pro-marriage policy.

Divorce

The Royal Commission of 1956, the last report in this field, said(14):

To give people a right to divorce themselves would be to foster a change in the attitude to marriage which would be disastrous for the nation ... people have good and bad impulses and we conceive it as the function of the law to strengthen the good and control the bad.

The law in 1956 was based on a finding of misconduct: adultery, cruelty and/or desertion. Not only was the ‘guilty’ party divorced but he/she had a reduced claim to maintenance and child custody.

The Divorce Reform Act of 1969 (which initiated the current divorce law) as interpreted by the Courts did in effect give people the right to divorce themselves on the ground that ‘the marriage had broken down irretrievably’. Andrew Marr writes(15):

This irretrievable breakdown clause, often oddly called ‘no fault’ divorce, was followed by a rocketing rate of divorces rising from around 7 per cent of marriages in the late fifties to close to 50 per cent now. The causes of this
domestic revolution are many and include greater publicity about sexual gratification, domestic violence and greater female independence. But the 1969 Act was a huge factor.

As Baroness Deech writes(16) from Oxford:

It is no coincidence that the rate of marriage started to decline in 1970 for it was in that year that new laws removed fault as a consideration for divorce ... Since the removal in 1977 of the need for a court appearance in divorce it has become easier to end a marriage than, say, a tenancy.

While Rebecca O'Neil says(17) that ‘the State could strengthen the institution of marriage by ending ‘no fault' divorce settlements’, the divorce laws, as at present interpreted by the judges, have no moral base, no sense of right and wrong, upon which the laws and the cohesion of society depend.

We have already seen (Chapter 2) that the present laws result in much bitterness post-divorce with a high proportion of fathers paying no child maintenance and having little contact with their children.

If we are to have a cohesive and healthy society and economy, there is therefore a strong case for reforming the divorce law in order to reduce the high rate of divorce and the bitterness.

A Summary of General Policy Recommendations

To create a healthy, cohesive society with high morale and a healthy economy, we need:

1. To support marriage as an essential element in a cohesive society and the best way of bringing up children.

2. To reform taxation and welfare benefits.

3. To give mothers the choice of staying at home or going out to work.

4. To reform the welfare state with the aim of promoting personal responsibility.

5. To repeal the Human Rights Act.

6. To reject the permissive (politically correct) philosophy.

7. To encourage a cohesive culture based on our western Christian traditions, and on patriotism.

9. To reform the divorce laws with the aim of reducing the high rate of divorce and the bitterness.

Conclusion

These measures are surely necessary if we are to have the necessary cohesion, and high morale, to win a long war.
Our servicemen and women are overstretched, underfunded and suffering severely because of earlier political mistakes.

Field Marshall Lord Bramall
Daily Telegraph, June 16 2007

Public indifference risked sapping at our volunteer army’s willingness to serve ... soldiers do not ask why - but they do ask for respect and honour.

General Sir Richard Dannatt
Daily Telegraph, September 22 2007
CHAPTER 4 MORALE AND A LONG WAR

Morale

In war, morale is of vital importance because it is ‘the will to win’. We have seen that ‘morale’ may be defined as confidence, or determination; the dictionary also defines morale as ‘Moral condition (esp. of troops) as regards discipline and confidence’. A very important element in maintaining high morale is social cohesion.

Social Cohesion

It is no surprise, therefore, that in the armed forces, high morale is engendered by fostering social cohesion. The British Army, in particular, is famous for developing social cohesion through the regimental system and belief in itself. In war, the morale of the civilian population is of equal importance. In 1940, the social cohesion of the civilian population was largely formed by the married family unit, for divorce and illegitimacy were comparatively rare and the social services almost unheard of. It is unlikely that in the current war there will be a bombardment similar to that in 1940 but, as noted above, we have already experienced suicide bombers, and there may well be other challenges such as the deployment of biological and chemical weapons against us. The thought is horrible but we cannot exclude the use of nuclear weapons - Dame Eliza Manningham-Buller says(1) ‘It remains a very real possibility’, and President Obama considers it a very serious threat.

In 1940 it was clear that civilian and military were in the war together, but that common interest is not so easy to recognise today. In a letter published in The Sunday Telegraph, a young officer writes(2):

When taking my platoon to dinner the night before our deployment to Iraq, everyone of them feigned their profession for fear of abuse ...

The Fighting Services and Society

The creation of small all-Regular Fighting Services has resulted in very fine fighting forces, but at the same time it has tended to isolate them from civilian life. In war, however, all sections of the nation are involved and are interdependent. The fighting services depend upon the families for a supply of good new recruits but, as we have seen, many potential recruits lack the influence of a father in their upbringing.
The Defence Correspondent of *The Sunday Telegraph* reports(3) that Major General Graeme Lamb, then Commander of the Army’s 3rd Division, warned the Infantry Conference in Warminster that the Army was:

... in danger of losing its reputation as a highly respected British institution because it is being forced to recruit soldiers from a society which has in the past thirty years become marginally more dysfunctional and increasingly self-interested and, in places, morally corrupt.

The Royal United Services Institute reports(4) an alarming rise in the taking of cocaine in the Army with its use more than quadrupling since 2003 and more than 1,500 troops having failed drug tests in the past two years. An MoD spokesman is quoted as saying that ‘Drug abuse in the Army is about a tenth of that in the civilian workplace’.

In 2008, 38 per cent of recruits to the Army gave up or were thrown out in training. A Commons report(5) warns that early resignations from the armed forces have risen over the past two years with the departure rate for officers in the Army and Royal Air Force at a ten year high.

A third of military families say they are living in substandard accommodation that is dirty, with outdated kitchens and heating(6).

**Leadership**

An important element in developing social cohesion and morale is good leadership. The decision by the Prime Minister to make the Secretary of State for Defence also responsible for Scotland showed poor leadership as it displayed a cavalier attitude towards defence and a woeful disregard for the importance of maintaining high morale. As Field Marshal Lord Bramall writes(7):

I would have thought that our defence affairs were in a big enough mess as it is, without diluting the Secretary of State’s ability to improve things by giving him another significant ministerial appointment (Scotland) to carry out at the same time.

*The Daily Telegraph* recently reported(8) that the Army is operating with ‘woefully inadequate’ resources in Afghanistan, putting soldiers’ lives in great danger. Despite Tony Blair’s promise in 2006 that the army would be furnished with whatever equipment it needed, there are still dangerous gaps in what is being delivered, while Major General Julian Thompson writes(9):

Make no mistake, the British are fighting a real war in Afghanistan ... their
predicament is made worse by indifference on the part of many of the politicians who sent them there.

The recent decision of the Government to hold an important debate on defence on the same day as the local and European elections (June 9 2009) was another indication of its indifference.

Lord Salisbury, in a pamphlet for Politeia(10), has shown how officials, faced with ministers who are unwilling to show judgment or take a lead on vital issues of national security, have allowed a vast tangle of a structure to develop, with no clear accountability or control.

The Defence Budget

The defence budget has hit its lowest level as a proportion of GDP since 1930. Ministers have sent troops into five conflicts since 1997 while simultaneously cutting the defence budget from 2.7% of GDP in 1999 to only 2.2% in 2006. Camilla Cavendish comments(11):

Defence is a core business for government ... but it is a business that urgently needs updating - and funding - if Britain is to remain the warrior nation that she still aspires to be.

There are now 46,000 fewer servicemen and women than in 1997, and Britain has lost a third of its attack submarines, warships and aircraft carriers, 479 armoured vehicles and 168 fixed wing aircraft(12).

India has laid down the keel of a 40,000 ton aircraft carrier. Britain has post-poned the construction of two aircraft carriers while giving , 825 million to India(13).

Conclusions

The Commons Defence Committee reported(14):

We are deeply concerned that the Armed Forces have been operating at or above the level of concurrent operations they are resourced and structured to deliver for seven of the last eight years, and for every year since 2002.

Jonathan Evans, the head of MI5, has warned(15) that ‘the international recession could be a ‘watershed moment’ that will shift the balance of power away from the West’.

The RUSI is right to conclude that the problems within the Armed Forces reflect the
problems of society as a whole. The representation in Parliament clearly needs strengthening, and they are also right to recommend twin committees: one a cabinet committee and the other a joint committee of the two Houses of Parliament.

Are we prepared for the long haul? **That is the vital issue.** To succeed, we need to create a cohesive society with high morale and ‘Defence and security must be restored as the first duty of Government’.
I do not know how much longer the Services can go on like this.

General the Lord Guthrie

The Daily Telegraph, November 9 2007
CHAPTER 5   GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

‘Few doubt that we are engaged in at least a 20 year war campaign against a determined and dangerous enemy’ - Colonel Dewar (2004). Are we prepared for the long haul?

There is by now surely ample evidence that we are not a cohesive society with high morale and in truth we are a ‘Broken Society’. Perhaps the most serious symptom of our malaise is the way our children are treated. UNICEF has branded the UK as the worst country in the developed world in terms of children’s sense of their own well-being(1), and our Children’s Commissioner has warned of a crisis at the heart of our society in the way children are treated by adults. This treatment stems largely from the instability of family life; as the Archbishop of Canterbury said: ‘Support for family life was not a matter of Middle England nostalgia, but of life and death’.

It is surely not just a coincidence that we face the worst economic downturn in many years, while our marriage rate is the lowest since records began in 1862.

Our enemy, the jihadi/terrorists, consider that we are indeed a Target, a Broken Society which will lose the will to resist. Therefore, in order to win this war we need to create a Cohesive Society. In Chapter 2 I have made a summary of the nine major policy reforms required to create such a society. I am in no doubt that the most important reform is ‘to support marriage as an essential element in society and the best way of bringing up children’. Clearly there are those who disagree because, although in 1998 the Government said, ‘Marriage is still the surest foundation for rearing children ... we want to strengthen marriage’, in 2000 the same Government thought it politic to abolish the Married Couples Tax Allowance. That was a mistake. The experiment has failed!

What is the single most effective measure that would support marriage? Financial incentives would certainly be a help, but the reduction in the number of marriages long preceded the reduction in the Married Couples Allowances. The single, most immediate - and comparatively inexpensive - measure would be to reform the divorce laws. As Baroness Deech said, ‘It is no coincidence that the rate of marriage started to decline around 1970”, because it was in 1971 that the Divorce Reform Act 1969 came into operation. There has been much complacency about the state of our divorce laws, but there is some evidence that reform of the divorce laws would now be popular. ‘Married couples want divorce to be harder’, said The Sunday Times(2).

The previous generations have always considered marriage to be a founda-tion stone of western civilization.
We are in a long war which we must win, and that means that support for the Armed Forces and the Security Services must be a priority and their needs must be understood and appreciated by the whole nation.

Lack of public support for the Armed Forces, and problems with the Armed Forces, reflect the problems of a Broken Society and Economy.

Defence and Security must be restored as the first duty of government.

We can and will succeed in ‘creating a cohesive society’, with a healthy economy and high morale, and we will win the long war, but the global terrorist threat demands not just new international efforts abroad but new efforts to integrate at home, for it does seem certain that the political, economic and cultural assumptions of the West will now be contested and the world may be heading towards a new era of calamitous conflict.

Meanwhile, we await with interest the findings of the promised Strategic Defence Review.
APPENDIX A

'RISK, THREAT AND SECURITY'

The Case of the United Kingdom

Precis of an article by the Royal United Services Institute

first published in the RUSI Journal, February 2008 Vol 153, No. 1

(www.rusi.org/journal)

by

Gwyn Prins: Professor of The London School of Economics

and

Robert Salisbury: The Marquess of Salisbury and a Privy Councillor

* The article expresses the consensus of a private seminar series which met at intervals between May 2006 and January 2008. In addition to the authors, those participating included: Sir Mark Allen, Vice Admiral Sir Jeremy Blackham, Chris Donnelly, Field Marshall the Lord Inge, Tom Kremer, Lord Leach, Baroness Park of Monmouth, Douglas Slater, General Sir Rupert Smith and Professor Hew Strachan.*

The security of the United Kingdom is at risk and under threat. The mismatch between the country’s military commitments and the funding of its defence moved Lords Bramall, Boyce, Craig, Guthrie and Inge - five former Chiefs of the Defence Staff - to take the unusual step of raising their concerns publicly in a House of Lords Defence debate on 22 November 2007. Security is not only a question for Chiefs of the Defence Staff. It matters to every citizen of the United Kingdom. Security is the primary function of the state, for without it there can be no state, and no rule of law. Anxiety about defence and security runs far and wide.

This article addresses the bones of that anxiety: the sources of risk and threat both overseas and at home. It argues that weaknesses at home, particularly divisions in our attitude to our defence, contribute to turning risks into threats. Repeated assertions by ministers that all is well, that the matter is well in hand and can be safely left to them to manage in-house, no longer carry conviction.

The uncertainty has to be addressed. The confidence and loyalty of the people are the wellspring from which flows the power with which all threats to defence and security are ultimately met. The present uncertainty suggests our arrangements need review and renewal.
Linked to those changes is a loss in the United Kingdom of confidence in our own identity, values, constitution and institutions. ‘This England was wont to conquer others,’ wrote Shakespeare, ‘hath made a shameful conquest of itself’. This is one of the main factors which have precipitated risks into threats. As long as it persists, it will have the power to do so again. The United Kingdom presents itself as a target, as a fragmenting, post-Christian society, increasingly divided about interpretation of its history, about its national aims, its values and its political identity. That fragmentation is worsened by the firm self-image of those element within it who refuse to integrate. This is a problem worsened by lack of leadership from the majority which in misplaced deference to ‘multi-culturalism’ failed to lay down the line to immigrant communities, thus undercutting those within them trying to fight extremism. The country’s lack of self-confidence is in stark contrast to the implacability of its Islamist terrorist enemy, within and without.

Thus we are in a confused and vulnerable condition. Some believe that we are already at war, but all may agree that generally a peace time mentality prevails. In all three ways - our social fragmentation, the sense of premonition, and the divisions about what our stance should be - there are uneasy similarities with the years just before the First World War.

We need to know who we are ourselves and what we stand for. Once we know these things and admit them, we can restore our divided house to harmony and thence to security.

The stiff geometry of the Cold War world has given way to a less predictable (although actually older and familiar) flow of forces in world affairs, but the mindset of Cold War planners and analysts and the institutions shaped them still linger.

Defence and security must be restored as the first duty of government. Our common understanding of and allegiance to the United Kingdom must be restored. Moves are needed to take defence and security as far as possible back out of the arena of short term politics. We propose twin committees, one a Cabinet Committee (of ministers, with service personnel and officials not just formally in attendance, but actually as full members) and the other a Joint Committee of the two Houses of Parliament.

*Sir Mark Allen is a retired member of HM Diplomatic; Vice-Admiral Sir Jeremy Blackham is a former Deputy Chief of Staff; Chris Donnelly is a Director of the Institute of State and Governance, Oxford; Field Marshall the Lord Inge is a former Chief of the Defence Staff; Tom Kremer is author of The Missing Heart of Europe; Lord Leach is an international banker; Baroness Park of Monmouth is a former member of SIS and diplomat; Douglas Slater is a former Clerk of the House of Lords; General Sir Rupert Smith is a former Deputy Allied Supreme
Commander Europe; and Professor Hew Strachan is Chichele Professor of the History of War at All Souls, Oxford*
APPENDIX B - REFERENCES

PREFACE
(2) The Case for Family Courts (1978), Conservative Party Political Centre
(3) The Future of Marriage (1981), Conservative Party Political Centre
(4) George Brown, The Decay of Marriage (1991), Family Education Trust

INTRODUCTION
(1) Jill Kirby, ‘Broken Hearts’, CPS 2002
(3) ‘400m for lone parents’, Daily Mail, Dec 18 2000
(4) Social Trends 2005, HMSO
(5) Hyde v Hyde and Woodmansee (1816)
(7) The Lone Parent Trap, CIVITAS 2003
(8) Frank Field, ‘Families left outside the big tent’, The Sunday Telegraph, July 8 2007
(9) Dr Eamon Butler, The Rotten State of Britain
(10) Col. Dewar, Editorial, The Officer, July/Aug 2004
(11) David Cameron, ‘Built to Last’

Chapter 1  The Long War
(2) ‘A lot to learn from Muslims’, The Daily Telegraph, Nov 10 2007
(5) ‘Britain is fighting a war’, Con Coughlin, The Daily Telegraph, Mar 3 2009
(10) ‘Medvedev orders ...’, The Daily Telegraph, Mar 8 2009
(14) ‘Decades of ... wars’, Bob Ainsworth, The Daily Telegraph, Jan 26 2010
(15) ‘Britain is fighting a war’, Ibid

Chapter 2  A Target, The Broken Society with Low Morale
(3) Adolescent Health, BMA 2003
(6) ‘Ministers fail to control obesity’, The Times, April 22 2007
(8) ‘Have three babies to sustain population’, The Daily Telegraph, Dec 12 2003
(9) Janice Turner, ‘The have-it-all girls’, The Times, Oct 3 2004
(10) Jill Kirby, ‘The Price of Parenthood’, CPS, 2005
(11) Mark Steyn, ‘Europe’s problem is that it is barren’, The Daily Telegraph, Dec 23 2003
(12) ‘Muslims will soon outnumber ...’, The Daily Telegraph, March 25 2008
Chapter 3  A Cohesive Society with High Morale

7. ‘Church attacks human rights’, The Daily Telegraph, JUNE 8 2009
10. ‘Britain betrayed’, The Daily Telegraph, Jan 3 2009
12. The Daily Telegraph, Feb 6 2009
13. ‘The Family Preserving America’s Future ...’, 1986, Chairman Gary L Bauer, not published
14. Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce (1956) Cmnd9678 (out of print)
15. Andrew Marr, A History of Modern Britain, Pan
17. Rebecca O’Neill, The Facts behind Cohabitation, CIVITAS

Chapter 4  Morale and a Long War

1. ‘Nuclear alert ...’, The Sunday Times, July 8 2007
(4) ‘Soldiers ... taking drugs’, *The Times*, Dec 14 2007
(8) *The Daily Telegraph*, June 16 2007
(9) *The Independent*, June 19 2007
(10) Lord Salisbury, ‘Clear and Accountable?’; Politeia, www.politeia.co.uk
(15) ‘Slump increases terrorism’, *The Daily Telegraph*, Jan 7 2009

Chapter 5  General Conclusions

    (UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre, Florence)
(2) ‘Married couples want divorce to be harder’, *The Sunday Times*, Jan 14 2007
APPENDIX C - THE AUTHOR

Major George G Brown was educated at Eastbourne College and the Queen’s College, Oxford. In 1945 he was commissioned from Sandhurst and served with the 1st Royal Gloucestershire Hussars in Austria. From 1946 to 1948 he was ADC to General ‘Dick’ McCreery (‘C.in.C’ of B.A.O.R.) and then joined the 12th (later 9th/12th) Royal Lancers, serving in Germany, Malaya, Aden and the Trucial Oman. After the Staff College in 1958, he also held a number of staff appointments, including GSO2 at the RAC Centre, from where he retired in 1965.

In 1966 he was called to the Bar by the Inner Temple and for thirty years practised in divorce and family law in London and on the Western Circuit. He is the author of *Getting a Divorce; The New Divorce Laws; Brown on Divorce; Brown on Separation; Finding Fault in Divorce*; and *The Decay of Marriage*.

He was Chairman of the Committee Reports *The Case for Family Courts, The Future of Marriage*, and *Reconciliation and Conciliation in Divorce*.

He was a Deputy County Court Judge.

He is a Past Master of The Worshipful Company of Tylers and Bricklayers.

He is married with two children and three grandchildren.