

Richard Carvath's *SalfordOnline.com* Blogs

A selection of 7 blog articles originally posted on SalfordOnline in 2009

Women and Me

13th November 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

There seems to be some confusion on SalfordOnline about my views on women and women's dress. I suspect that much of this is deliberately stirred up by political opponents. In this blog-post I'd like to set the record straight and clarify exactly what my views are. What follows is a quick patch together adaptation of several extracts taken from my book *Definitely Sexy*. Mark my words, my position is this: Women and Men are Equal before God!

Sexual attitudes and actions affect the whole of us as human beings (not to mention others). God requires that we should be holy and pure in all of our relationships. We can and should learn to control our passions and sexual appetite. Either we are in control of our passion or our passion is in control of us! Sexual purity is rooted in God's holiness. We can and should exercise self-control. Purity of heart is the foundation upon which right sexual conduct is built. From this foundational attitude and condition, right sexual conduct is manifest in lives characterised by modesty, chastity, faithfulness and gentlemanly conduct. Righteous living always works to one's benefit; sexual immorality always works to one's detriment. To be sexually pure is to receive no sexual gratification from any source other than your spouse. Lust perverts the proper functioning of our sexual natures. The Bible refers to lust as "...shameful, a sin to be judged" and as "...a fire that burns to Destruction..." Rather than the desire to pursue women in order to find unity with one woman in marriage, male sexuality is distorted into the desire to pursue women in order to use and to own women for physical sexual gratification. Female sexuality is distorted from the desire to be attractive to a prospective husband into the desire to seduce for gain or opportunity those men who can be manipulated (by playing with their sexual desires). The woman manipulating men with 'feminine wiles' has fallen for lust's tempting suggestion of the dominating power she could have – whereas the man out to bribe, force or deceive women into bed has fallen for lust's tempting suggestion of the unlimited pleasure that could be his. The lustful man thinks he can have the pleasure of sex without the hard work of relationship – without commitment and the building of intimacy and trust. The lustful woman thinks she can have the benefits of committed relationship (and the emotional satisfaction of deep intimacy) which she craves simply by suggesting her body's availability (or even giving her body) outside of committed relationship – and in return for something which requires neither the formation of genuine relationship nor the fulfilment of genuine commitment. Knowing our specific male or female vulnerability to lust's lies enables us to fight back to best effect in the knowledge

of God's true purposes for male and female sexuality. Modest women seek to discourage lust (and encourage true love) by their manner of dress because they know that since sex is meant to be private to a marriage relationship then so should their bodies be.

British society desperately needs to rediscover true masculinity and femininity. Men and women today dress and act alike; this is the unisex mentality. 'Unisexuality' – which emerged from the 1960s sexual revolution – is anti-human and anti-God. Unisexuality dehumanises an essential part of people, whether men or women; unisexuality creates confusion about identity and truth. Unisexuality teaches men and women to despise true masculinity and femininity in themselves and in members of the other gender. Modesty and chivalry are inevitably (and quite deliberately) crushed in a unisexual culture. Unisexuality is really all about sexual immorality and, more than that – because we are not unisexual but male or female – it is actually a subtle form of sexual perversion. Men and women are programmed to complement each other sexually; masculine and feminine sexuality function differently. Generally speaking: (1) Men are much more aroused by visual stimuli than women – men are affected by looking at women much more than women are affected by the sight of men – whereas women are sexually stimulated primarily by touch (and intimate emotional expression and conversation); (2) Men are made to be sexually proactive (to go after women); women are made to be sexually reactive – responding to male pursuit; (3) Male sexual desire tends to be more powerfully rooted in physiology than for women, whilst female sexual desire tends to be more established in emotional yearning. Men experience greatest sexual intimacy immediately before and during intercourse; for women sexual intimacy comes 'more generally' through the whole sexual process of touch, embrace and conversation (whether by words or body language) – one consequence of this is that the frequency of intercourse is generally less important to women than men.

For men the mere sight of exposed female flesh is a significant sexual stimulus, as is the simple act of a woman removing an article of clothing, so women – avoid provocative dress. Of course a woman can provoke a man to lust by her behaviour alone, if she so desires, even whilst she wears something as innocuous as, say, a loose-fitting, full-length trouser suit covering her whole body, for the simple reason that she is a woman – but it strikes me that the more prevalent and immediate problem in the UK today is the number of women who choose quite deliberately to be provocative in dress. Women: Do you dress decently? Whilst you should neither act nor dress provocatively (and the two go together), let's focus on clothing for a moment. I'm not going to attempt to specify exactly what is and isn't decent dress in every possible situation but allow me to make a couple of common sense suggestions. Even if your manner of dress covers most of your body, if your clothing is either very tightly-fitting or else has a transparent quality then you are in effect exposing your body – most particularly in regard of your breasts, bottom, pelvic region and thighs – and that is not modest dress. Never wear mini-skirts (with or without tights) – it is prostitutes' attire; the hemline of any decent dress or skirt should never be any higher than just above the knee – if you do wear a hemline any higher than this it is tantamount to inviting any man that sees you so dressed to contemplate quite readily the prospect of lifting your skirt and parting your thighs (and etcetera). Never expose your cleavage or otherwise make a display of your breasts in public; breasts

should be for your husband's eyes only. I'll say no more; most women have good judgement and know the difference between tarty and respectable.

The virtue of modesty is primarily a concern for women and the virtue of chivalry is primarily a concern for men, although the essence of these virtues is holiness and this is a concern for both men and women alike. Modesty serves to prevent enslavement to sexual lust and also to safeguard relationships. The Bible is crystal clear about modesty in women – urging women that: “Your beauty should not come from outward adornment, such as braided hair and the wearing of gold jewellery and fine clothes. Instead, it should be that of your inner self, the unfading beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which is of great worth in God's sight.” – and also that modesty is primarily an attribute to be manifested by women and directed towards men. Jesus said: “...I tell you that anyone who looks at a woman lustfully has already committed adultery with her in his heart.” It is clearly implied in this statement by God Himself that it is primarily men that are prone to lust in response to visual stimulation – and so it is that Jesus taught men that it is wrong to look lustfully at women – but the corollary of this truth is that there is an onus on all decent women to be modest and not to dress, speak or act in a manner likely to tempt men towards sexual lust.

Modesty enhances the beauty of a woman; modest women are much more attractive than immodest women and are much more likely to make and keep a good marriage relationship. A modest woman does not dress, speak or otherwise behave in a sexually provocative manner; she does not show more of her body than is decent and she does not act so as to suggest she is easily available for sex. A truly sexy woman has no need of such crudeness to powerfully exude her feminine appeal and she is not so foolish as to degrade and demean her personal dignity and worth in the sight of others by such immodest acts as exposing her legs or breasts or ‘talking dirty’. The immodest woman gains a bad reputation for herself and quickly becomes a magnet for those men who only want her for one reason – to use her for sex; the immodest woman that willingly obliges such bad men is no different from a prostitute; she is a prostitute offering herself free of charge. The immodest woman gets NO respect! The immodest woman objectifies her own self; if a woman dresses immodestly she should not be surprised by the workplace whispers, “Oh yeah, so-and-so, she's a dirty little whore!” The decline since the 1960s in standards of female modesty in dress, speech and behaviour is a major reason why there is now such a high prevalence of wrongful discrimination against women today and also so much violence and sexual crime.

The virtue of chivalry is concerned with the care and respect which men ought to show towards women on account of women's relative weakness and vulnerability. As with modesty in women, the outward actions of chivalry (or their lack) emanate from the heart attitude of men towards women and above all towards their creator God. Chivalry as a concept was well understood and well practised in this country for two hundred years prior to the 1960s sexual revolution; chivalry was synonymous with gentlemanly conduct and the qualities which constituted a gentleman were universally understood. The gentleman was esteemed across society; moreover any man could be a gentleman because the mark of a gentleman was his good manners flowing from a good heart attitude; from

the poorest to the richest, good Christian men were gentlemen. God ordained man as the natural guardian of woman, to look after her and if necessary sacrifice his life for her (and by extension her children). Chivalry is a core expression of true masculinity as instituted by God – the masculine and chivalrous man honours, serves and protects women. The chivalrous man appreciates women for who they are as people (and not merely as sex objects). The chivalrous unmarried man does not seek to have sex with women outside of marriage; rather he is prepared to wait until he marries his wife. Though he be neither rich nor handsome, the chivalrous man is a man attractive to women – and this is unsurprising because all women desire to be treated right (and in which desire women enjoy the full support of God).

A man who attempts to persuade a woman not his wife to have sex [fornication] by telling her that he loves her is a liar – plain and simple. If, as is possible, though probably infrequently, a man happens to sincerely but wrongly believe that his desire is inspired by love then in truth he is a self-deceived liar. Contraception as an aid to fornication is not chivalrous; it is to treat a woman as a whore. Chastity, courtship, marriage and sex in marriage thereafter – now that's chivalrous. On the other hand a condom is, well, just a piece of plastic to ejaculate in, just an object to be used for selfish gratification in the same way as the unfortunate woman. The chivalrous mentality treats a woman as a person and a lady; the contraceptive mentality treats a woman as an object and a tramp.

Having mentioned the male virtue of chivalry and indeed the concept of masculinity itself, and having asserted that “God ordained man as the natural guardian of woman...” it is perhaps the right time to ask: ‘Who’s the Daddy?’ in a relationship. Well the answer is of course that man is ‘the Daddy’. Let’s consider the marriage relationship; God has ordained that in a marriage the man should be the ‘head’ of the marriage and that the wife should submit to her husband. This is a natural law principle (instituted by God). When two Christians marry the woman promises to obey the man (and this is consistent with what the Bible teaches). A marriage comprises two people and it is because of this that the man has to have headship: when problems arise which cannot be resolved by mutual agreement then it is necessary for him to exercise the final authority of headship and decide for both – otherwise the marriage would be liable to faltering on the rocks of unresolved disputes (and clearly, since marriage is a permanent relationship, such situations cannot be allowed to remain unresolved).

It must be emphasised that male headship in marriage does not in any way imply that women are somehow lesser than men. Women and men are of equal worth in the sight of God; every woman and every man is a bearer of the image of God. Male headship is not about husbands ‘lording it over’ wives or treating women as possessions or inferiors. God requires women to obey their husbands (in matters of paramount importance where the two are in disagreement) and God requires men to love their wives sacrificially and unconditionally, to serve and protect their wives and to seek the best for them. In fact male headship in marriage is meant to be a ‘servant-hearted headship’ and not a ‘dictatorially-minded headship’; the former is loving and the latter is hateful – clearly it is a loving, servant-hearted headship to which husbands are intended by God. Men and women are made equal by God however, at the same time, we have different roles to play

(which are also given to us by God); it is in the nature of what it is to be either a man or a woman. And God doesn't make mistakes: if you are a man then you are meant by God to be a man and if you are a woman then you are meant by God to be a woman, and to live your life accordingly. We hurt our selves (and others) when we 'go against the grain' of our God-given gender and the God-given purposes and implications of our gender. In marriage God intends that the woman should obey Him by submitting to her husband's authority, and God intends that the man should obey Him by exercising his headship justly and lovingly out of a sacrificial heart which desires the best for the woman – the sort of attitude in which the man is even prepared to give up his own life for his wife's sake.

Lenient Sentences Mock Justice

10th November 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

Steven Newbury, 18, of Ashley Street, Ordsall, has recently been sentenced at Minshull Street Crown Court to 4 years 8 months imprisonment in a young offenders' institution. And what did he do?

In Peel Green in January of this year Newbury was part of a gang which robbed three young teenage boys of cash and mobile phones. Newbury forced the boys to drop their trousers and took photos of them with the phones he had just stolen.

In February of this year near Buile Hill Park, in company with two younger accomplices, Newbury again robbed two teenage boys. The gang threatened their victims with a knife; one victim required 10 stitches for a face wound. The gang stole an iPod and a mobile phone.

The two younger villains involved in the Buile Hill attack were both sentenced to 18 month detention and training orders. As one of these villains was being led away after the passing of sentence he gave a thumbs-up sign to Judge Bernard Lever. The Judge later commented: "It's a sad state of affairs that youths are doing cartwheels in the dock after they've been sentenced."

Quite frankly, I think that sentences such as these are derisory and make a mockery of justice. Anybody convicted of a crime involving robbery at knifepoint should be banged up for at least 10 years. Until sentences reflect the seriousness of the crime, our criminal 'justice' system will continue to fail to deter feral youths from carrying and using knives in the course of their criminal lifestyles.

We need much tougher sentencing, and we also need to address the single biggest cause of boys growing up and entering a life of crime: the breakdown of the family, the lack of moral parental discipline and especially the absence of fathers in the upbringing of their sons.

A Victory for Common Sense

6th November 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

VICTORY!!! Finally, after three years of hell for St. George's RC High School, Schools Adjudicator Canon Richard Lindley has stepped in and saved the school. This is an enormous victory for common sense against all odds! For once, genuine grassroots democracy has prevailed: St. George has slain the Dragon.

Well done to Mr. Harte, Mr. Fisher and the hundreds of parents, children, teachers, councillors and others who fought, marched and campaigned tirelessly in the pursuit of justice. Victory is sweet indeed. Congratulations St. George's RC.

A High Price to Pay for Poverty

26th October 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

This morning I was in a pawnbrokers in the Salford and Eccles area; I was there to sell some DVDs. I had 7 DVDs to sell and all of the discs and their cases were in mint condition. I wasn't selling because I was desperate for the money – I'm not on the breadline [though I have been] though I'm certainly not rich either – but many if not most of the people selling to or borrowing from a pawnbroker are living in poverty.

There certainly are a lot of pawnbrokers in Salford and Eccles... you know, the Cash Converter or Cash Generator type of places. I sold the 7 DVDs and was given £3.90 for the lot. I know for a fact that the shop that bought my DVDs will put those DVDs on sale for a combined retail price of just under £20. Now that's what I call profit!

I'm fortunate that I'm not desperate for £3.90 just to eat today or to put some 'lecky' on the meter - but many of the 'customers' of pawnbrokers in Salford and Eccles are that desperate. Pawnbrokers are a common enough necessity for Salford's worst off – the jobless, the sick, the low paid and those swimming in debt – and pawnbrokers never go out of business during a recession.

I'd say it's a fair observation that pawnbrokers make money out of other people's misfortune – from a moral standpoint it's not a business I'm particularly fond of but pawnbrokers aren't going to disappear off our high streets through lack of demand any time soon.

But how do we raise people out of the poverty which pushes them into being so exploited? That is the question.....

Public Health Crisis

23rd October 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

I'm not teetotal. I appreciate a good whiskey! We all know that alcohol is fine in moderation and can help to enhance our socialising – it's only when we drink too much that it is harmful.

Unfortunately for an increasing number of British people alcohol is an addiction – and we are well aware of the negative consequences in our town centres and neighbourhoods of people who act anti-socially because they've had a skinful.

Over a million British adults are dependent on alcohol. In our country almost 9,000 people die annually from alcohol-related diseases [and alcohol abuse is responsible for further deaths too – such as those caused by drink drivers]. Last year there were over 860,000 alcohol-related hospital admissions. Salford and Eccles is a hotspot for alcohol-related problems.

Last week the Government decided against banning pub 'happy hours' and supermarkets' bulk booze deals. The Government is not going to bring in regulations which would've banned irresponsible drink promotions and bulk discounts on alcohol purchases. Needless to say the big supermarkets and the alcohol industry are very happy with things the way they are.

But is it right that we have such a widespread availability of very cheap booze? Do we have the balance right in regard of alcohol pricing, 24 hour licensing and the range of retailers permitted to sell alcohol? I'd say we don't presently have the balance right myself. I believe tighter regulations on alcohol could help to significantly cut alcohol-related disease, crime and anti-social behaviour without crippling the hospitality industry or preventing any of us from enjoying a sensible drinking habit.

Sheffield University researchers assert that 3,400 lives could be saved every year by setting a minimum price of 50p per unit of alcohol. Do you think politicians should legislate to set a minimum price per unit of alcohol?

16

20th October 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles

I am strongly opposed to prostitution and pornography (which is simply prostitution-by-proxy) and as such I'm personally engaged in activism against traffickers and brothel gangsters. One aspect of my work which is specific to the Salford and Eccles area (and which is in the public domain) is the 'BrothelWatch' campaign which I lead against the WFB brothel in Swinton.

Yesterday The Sun reported that: "British virgin girls as young as 12 are being sold to mega-rich Arabs for sex at up to £50,000 a time. Parents force the schoolgirls into

prostitution and then sell them to millionaire paedophiles. Vice Squad cops nicked three women and a man from Manchester after secretly filming them offering to pimp six girls aged between 14 and 23 at a five-star West London hotel. They also taped the gang bragging how they were prepared to peddle even younger, prepubescent girls. The gang – described as being 'like something out of TV's Shameless' – with most unemployed or on benefits also had links to Newcastle and Liverpool."

Conservative estimates suggest that there are presently at least 10,000 child prostitutes in the UK. It was because of the exploitation of young girls for prostitution in what was known as the 'White Slave Trade' – and in the wake of years of campaigning headed up by the great Christian champion of women Josephine Butler (1828-1906) – that Parliament raised the age of consent to 16 in 1885 as a vital safeguard to help protect girls being sold into sexual slavery.

The legal age of consent remains unchanged 124 years later (and was most recently upheld in British statute law with the Sexual Offences Act 2003). I fully support the age of consent as it currently stands at 16. The age of consent continues to help protect younger teenagers and children from sexual exploitation by adults and older teenagers and – with better enforcement – it could also help once again to deter underage teenagers from the harmful consequences of underage sex.

But the age of consent is under constant attack from those who seek to lower or abolish it; only last month the prominent homosexual Peter Tatchell called for it to be lowered to 14. I believe that the legal age of consent remaining set at 16 is right – and I also believe that it should be fully and properly enforced... the problem is that presently it isn't.

At present we have a curious situation in the UK in that whilst the age of consent is still largely enforced as an essential tool in the fight against child trafficking and the paedophilic exploitation of children, the age of consent is largely not enforced in regard of underage teenage children who engage in underage sexual activity with other underage children.

We have a de facto situation in which the British State actively encourages underage British schoolchildren to break the law of the land against their own best interests and the welfare of our society as a whole. The British State in effect actively incites the underage sexual debut of British schoolchildren by means of sex-ed at school – despite the fact that they aren't old enough to give consent – and it directly facilitates underage sex by providing underage boys and girls with contraception and abortion without parental knowledge or consent.

It is a rather strange situation we have going on in our schools today in which underage British schoolgirls are getting contraception and abortions from State sex-workers at school without parental knowledge or consent, and yet schools have to contact parents for permission to administer a paracetamol tablet if their child has a headache! Consent is required for paracetamol – but referrals are made for underage schoolgirls to have abortions which are kept secret from parents! [Many people think this serious anomaly is a very recent phenomenon but in fact NHS doctors have been able to provide

contraception and abortion to underage girls without parental knowledge or consent since 1974.]

So we have this bizarre situation in which the law of our land is crystal clear that the legal age of consent to sex is 16 and yet the NHS, teaching staff and others actively assist in what is a criminal offence! Surely that is itself a crime, isn't it?

It isn't in the interests of anybody that British schoolchildren become sexually active below the age of consent [apart of course from those who are exploiting children in order to make money – for example the media, sex-ed lobby groups and the contraception and abortion trade etcetera].

In a sane and civilised society, nobody should be sexually active before the age of 16 at the very earliest and that's why I believe the age of consent should once again be applied in full, which would of course mean an end to underage persons being provided with contraception or abortion by the State, not least because the State itself decrees that sexual activity under 16 is illegal.

I'd love to see an end to the premature sexualisation of our kids – which is primarily a form of commercial exploitation – but that won't happen until we rigorously apply the age of consent so as to end the State's foolish hypocrisy and complicity in depraving our underage children.

Who's Reading Who?

24th August 2009

By Richard Carvath, Prospective Independent MP for Salford and Eccles.

If there's one thing that's still great about Britain today it is our dogged defence of freedom of speech. We are all passionate about freedom of speech - and rightly so! We ought to be grateful that the British press is free to report as it pleases – but sometimes I think it's worth pausing to ponder the question: 'Just what do our journalists do with their freedom?' Do we read the newspapers or do the newspapers read us? Are the most heavily reported news stories actually as important as they seem to be, or are they important only because that's what the newspaper wants us to think (and to the extent that we swallow a story's message)? Do we read between the lines? Do we look for hidden motives? Everything is not always as it seems. Even with a free press, there is sometimes a fine line between the journalist and the propagandist!

In reference to the news, my grandfather – a brickie all his life – used to say, "Believe nothing of what you hear and only half of what you read!" Wise words. When it comes to how our journalists use their freedom in the UK today, the greatest area of concern to me is how they report politics and controversial social issues. Many British newspapers – and almost all local newspapers in particular – claim to be 'apolitical'. My dictionary defines 'apolitical' as: "Having no interest or involvement in political affairs." By that definition there isn't a paper in the country that can claim to be apolitical! [Maybe I need a better dictionary!] But with our traditional British sense of fair play I think we have a common understanding of what the spirit of being apolitical means in practice for any newspaper

which makes that claim, even though we may quibble over how exactly to define the quality of being impartial about politics.

Presumably if a local newspaper is politically impartial it will, for example, give fair and even coverage to the policies and local activities of all General Election candidates standing for a constituency which is on its patch? You would think so, I hope. It isn't easy editing an apolitical local newspaper and Editors don't always get their priorities right – especially when it comes to politics. The biggest danger is to give one or two candidates far more coverage than they deserve – and to the extent that some other candidates might not even get reported at all!

Imagine the power to influence if you're a popular and well-read local newspaper with an effective monopoly on the reporting of local political news, events and personalities. . . it's the proverbial 'licence to get away with murder' isn't it!

If you effectively 'are the news', if you're the one who decides 'Who's Hot and Who's Not' then the likelihood is that your own social and political persuasions are going to affect how you report the news and even what news you do and don't report. You might just decide that it's better – in your opinion – not to report on some news and some people at all, but, if you do that, is it still reasonable to claim to be politically impartial? Probably not!

I often say that 'Politics is a dirty business'. It's true! In fact I think politics has a fair claim to being arguably the dirtiest business of all. . . but journalism must surely run politics a very close second! It is hard to maintain personal integrity in either politics or journalism. I don't mind admitting that I have many struggles – and dilemmas seem to turn up daily! Perhaps our best hope is simply to throw up our hands and say, "God help Journalists, God help Voters and God forgive Politicians!"