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In the recent budget, the government made two key decisions. First, it decided to tax the British public at levels not seen since the end of the Second World War, and second it chose to spend more of our money in 2023 and 2024 than at any point since the mid-1970s. In 2019 government revenue as a share of GDP was 33.1%, under the plans set out by the Chancellor this will now reach a staggering 37.1%.

This has naturally reignited the age-old debate about Britain’s taxable limit and the right level of public spending. **But one thing nobody seems to be talking about is the waste that’s not just leading to our economic decline, but which is also causing us to become a more divided society.**

This report, compiled and investigated over a period of months, details over £7 billion worth of savings that are to be had by the British taxpayer if the government stops funding the politically motivated campaigns that are dividing us and making us poorer.

**We’ve submitted Freedom of Information Requests to 6,000 public bodies,** and gone line by line through the accounts of government departments and the external bodies and charities they’re funding.

This report sets out the damaging and politically motivated activities that are being funded by ever-increasing amounts of taxpayers’ money.
The items are separated into four distinct sections:

**Section 1** concerns “Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity” (EDI) positions and training. Ten thousand EDI jobs are costing the UK taxpayer £557 million a year, as well as 1 million working days lost. The money saved from these positions could fund around 12,500 nurses.

**Section 2** looks at government grants to charities (a total of £778 million per year). Not only does this waste taxpayers’ money, it does us all harm as these groups are using our money to cause public disturbances, commit crimes, block roads and frustrate the government’s policies in the courts.

**Section 3** examines EDI related public procurement contracts and the millions we’re spending on race, sexuality, unconscious bias and EDI training (£212 million every year).

**Section 4** details the largest part of our investigation – quangos, at a total cost of £5.49 billion every year. Whether it’s the Office for Students using £2.5 billion to impose “anti British” diversity schemes and “decolonisation” on students, the Arts Council spending money on “unlearning whiteness”, or even HS2 spending half a billion on EDI, this waste is divisive, ongoing and increasing year on year. We have been exceptionally careful to separate the good work many of these organisations are doing, from the bad, politically motivated uses of taxpayer funds which are not eye wateringly difficult to cut.

**These items are costing the taxpayer over £19 million every single day – more than £7 billion a year**, dividing us into warring factions and holding our country back.

If we get rid of them we’ll create just that little bit more freedom to do the things people really want, like tax cuts and spending more on frontline public services. We’ll become a more united society too.
SECTION 1
EDI POSITIONS AND TRAINING

METHODOLOGY

We submitted Freedom of Information Requests to 6,000 public authorities, including
- central government departments,
- devolved government,
- local councils,
- universities,
- school boards,
- emergency services,
- health bodies,
- the UK Parliament,
- court system,
- Armed Forces,
- and media and cultural bodies.

The information requested was:

- The number of full time equivalent (FTE) roles in the organisation that are mainly or exclusively focused on issues of equality, diversity or inclusivity (excluding general HR professionals).
The combined salaries or relevant pay bands of these roles.

- During the last 12 months, the number of staff days across the organisation which were committed to attending equality training programmes.¹

**EDI POSITIONS: £427 MILLION A YEAR - ENOUGH TO FUND 12,500 NURSES**

The UK taxpayer, now facing the highest tax burden since the Second World War, is currently paying the salaries of approximately 10,000 staff that focus predominantly on issues of equality, diversity, and inclusivity (EDI) or spend a significant proportion of their time on such matters.

The cost of these roles to the UK taxpayer is £427 million per annum and the mean salary of an EDI role (£42,700) is significantly higher than the average nurse salary of £34,000.²

**Ending the divisive funding of politically motivated EDI roles would liberate enough taxpayer money to pay the salaries of 12,500 nurses.**

The Sun previously reported that NHS trusts are employing around 800 members of “diversity” staff, with this level of waste costing the taxpayer £40m a year – enough to pay for an additional 1.3 million GP appointments.³

Other prominent organisations which have prolific waste include the BBC, which spends £1.2 million on 15 members of staff, the Crown Prosecution Service, which has 21 members of staff earning a combined salary of £1.1 million, and 7 officers at Sport England earning £280,000.
COUNCILS - 794 EDI STAFF MEMBERS COSTING £30 MILLION A YEAR

The 397 local councils across the UK employ between them 794 equality, diversity, and inclusivity members of staff. On average, every council across the UK employs 2 full-time members of staff and has an average annual expenditure of £67,000.

The aggregated total of these roles costs the UK taxpayer £30 million a year. Notable councils include East Lothian Council and its 45 members of staff, Leicestershire County Council which employs 40 members of staff and spends £1.25 million every year in order to do so, and the 13 members of staff on the books of Manchester City Council.

Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council, where one in five children are living in poverty, spends £345,000 a year to employ 8 full-time members of staff.

Bradford City Council, representing the 13th most deprived area in the UK, has 12.5 FTE roles at a cost of £665,000 a year.

These roles are clearly not essential to the deliverance of council functions and offer an opportunity for significant savings to be made. This is demonstrated by the fact that Maldon District Council and Carlisle City Council do not employ any such members of staff, avoiding unnecessary costs and eliminating a source of divisive politics in their communities.

UNIVERSITIES - 4 EDI STAFF MEMBERS PER UNIVERSITY COSTING OVER £30 MILLION A YEAR, WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD EMPLOYING THE MOST AT 10 TIMES THE NATIONAL AVERAGE

The UK taxpayer pays a vast subsidy to UK universities, through both research funding and through student loans. A 2021 report by the House of Commons notes that “the ultimate cost to the public
sector is currently thought to be around 54% of the face value of loans to full-time undergraduates.\textsuperscript{6}

The 175 universities across the United Kingdom are abusing this taxpayer generosity by employing 724 members of staff that engage in EDI issues – around four staff members per institution. This comes at the yearly cost of £30.2 million to the UK taxpayer.

The University of Oxford employs the most EDI staff members with a total of 40 at a cost of £2.04m, the University of Liverpool employs 27 at a cost of over £1m, and the University of Bristol has 17 roles with combined salaries of over £750,000.

POLICE FORCES - ALMOST 5 EDI STAFF MEMBERS FOR EVERY POLICE FORCE IN ENGLAND AND WALES, COSTING THE TAXPAYER £10 MILLION A YEAR

An average police force in the United Kingdom will have 4.8 FTE roles committed to EDI at a cost of £181,000 a year. Taken as a whole, this means that the UK’s 48 police forces employ 250 members of staff to “embed equality, diversity and inclusion initiatives into all parts of business” (as described by Cleveland Police).\textsuperscript{7}

WHITEHALL DEPARTMENTS - SPEND £12 MILLION PER YEAR

In Whitehall departments there are approximately 255 members of staff that focus exclusively on equality, diversity, and inclusivity, at a cost to the taxpayer of £11.5 million a year. This includes 10 at DEFRA costing over £400,000.
ED! TRAINING: £150 MILLION A YEAR AND 1 MILLION WORKING DAYS LOST

At a time where British productivity is under the spotlight, over a million staff days a year are being lost to equality, diversity, and inclusivity training. Two main brackets of training can be discerned across the public sector. First, there are training programmes which members of staff at all levels undertake, and second there are management training programmes such as Sports England’s “Inclusive Leadership Programme”, which provide guidance and advice to individuals in senior leadership positions.

The average cost per day lost is estimated to be £150 – based on estimates made by TotalJobs.com which states that the average public sector salary is £42,000. This results in the conclusion that the UK taxpayer loses £150 million in public sector staff time each year.

Notable amongst these million days are the 24 days a year spent by the Intellectual Property Office (IPO) on the “respect at work boardgame”, 1,458 staff days spent by the London Fire Brigade, the 13,000 staff days spent by the Northern Ireland Fire and Rescue service on equality training, the 4,800 days committed by Essex Police, as well as the “African Drumming Sessions” provided to staff at Warwickshire County Council at the taxpayer’s expense.
Government grant making is vital for many local and issue-specific voluntary, charitable and social enterprises, and much of it enables help to be given to the most vulnerable in society.

**However, charities are directing more and more resources towards politically motivated campaigns which offer no productive value to the taxpayer and which create unnecessary division and toxicity in our political discourse.**

Government funding is directed to charities primarily in the form of grants, but there is also a drive underway – being led by the Civil Society and Youth Directorate within the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) – to increase the participation of charities in public sector procurement processes. The intent, as set out by the Civil Society and Youth Directorate’s Policy Procurement Note O6/20, is that the application of a “social value model”, that includes considerations of climate change and inequality, “will be mandatory in central government” and should be a “differentiating factor in bid evaluation.” This moves the Civil Service towards replacing the central principle of taxpayer value for money.

Four case studies have been outlined below to illustrate the significant sums of public money that are being directed towards
charitable organisations engaging in politically motivated campaigns.

Public funding of these projects should, of course, be stopped immediately.

CHARITIES OPPOSING GOVERNMENT ATTEMPTS TO STOP ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION: £203 MILLION

Ending the migrant boat crossings in the English Channel and breaking the business model of human traffickers is a principal objective of the Home Secretary. A key strand of the government’s approach to this issue is the UK-Rwanda Migration and Economic Development Partnership which aims to “deter illegal entry into the UK”.

However, the government has faced stiff resistance from well-resourced and organised groups campaigning against the plan, despite a majority of the British public supporting the proposal.

Between 2017 and 2021 the Government has handed £203 million to charities that have vocally and vociferously criticised the government’s plan to process illegal immigrants in Rwanda.

This includes £17.7 million to Refugee Action that has described the plan as “racist at its core”, £27 million to the Refugee Council which
called it “cruel and unworkable”, £5.6 million to BOND which called it “shamefully cruel”, just under £5 million to Unseen which echoed the sentiments of BOND, and £65.5 million to Migrant Help which celebrated the attempts to delay the first Rwanda flight in June 2022.14

THE ADVICE, ISSUE REPORTING, AND ELIGIBILITY CONTRACT: £235 MILLION

Migrant Help doubles its profits, paid for by the taxpayer, after failing at Manston.

In addition to receiving the £65.5 million above, Migrant Help – under the Home Office’s Advice, Issue Reporting, and Eligibility (AIRE) contract – is the organisation responsible for running support services for those currently in accommodation and awaiting a decision on their case, and was gravely implicated in the recent failings at Manston.15

This contract is worth £235 million over its ten-year lifetime, set to conclude in August 2029, and comprises guidance functions that were previously exercised by the accommodation providers themselves, following a separation of functions in 2019.16 In 2020 the National Audit Office concluded that the functions of the contract were not being met by Migrant Help and that it “continued to miss its targets for most performance measures.”17

Under the terms of the AIRE contract’s Statement of Requirements (SoRs), it is Migrant Help’s responsibility to ensure detainees are informed about their legal rights. Migrant Help must provide:

- “signposting” to “legal services and representation”.18
- “advice and guidance to Service Users through a variety of channels”.19
- “a Single Point of Contact (SPOC)” for asylum seekers looking to report issues.20
The contract requires Migrant Help to be accredited with the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner (OISC), the regulator tasked with ensuring that adequate immigration advice is provided to those individuals who seek it.

Registration with OISC was a key requirement of the tender process. However, the regulator has failed to satisfactorily monitor the quality of advice being provided by Migrant Help. This has been laid bare by the court case announced 3 November 2022 launched by Bail for Immigration Detainees (BID) (itself also registered with OISC) which claims there was “unlawful failure to provide access to outside support.”

BID legal director Pierre Makhlouf said: “withholding information on their right to access legal rights is an inhuman approach towards those in need of compassion.”

A second case, announced recently by Detention Action, also stated that they were taking action because the Home Office has provided “inadequate or non-existent access to legal advice.”

The HM Chief Inspector of Prisons’ report on conditions at the Manston migrant centre, during the crisis of November 2022, found that “we did not see any detainees being informed about their legal rights….there were no records of visits to the site by legal representatives.”
Despite these failings, Companies House accounts show that Migrant Help Trading recorded a doubling of its profits between 2020 and 2021, from £0.52 million to £1.23 million, and that this came “primarily from providing interpreting services that supported the greatly expanded AIRE contract.”

Migrant Help breaches contract and gives £500,000 to campaign group Care4Calais to take the government to court over its Rwanda plan.

The AIRE contract sets out that the “Provider” (Migrant Help) “shall not...take any action that may adversely affect the Authority (the Home Office).”

Yet Migrant Help has used up to £500,000 in taxpayer funds to allow the activist group Care4Calais – the group launching a legal case against the UK government - to attend accommodation centres, as well as “calling on the Prime Minister and Home Secretary to scrap their unthinkably cruel plans to ship people seeking refuge to Rwanda.”

HEALTH GROUPS CAMPAIGNING AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ON COVID-19, BREXIT, PUBLIC SECTOR PAY AND CLIMATE CHANGE: £200 MILLION

During the Covid-19 pandemic groups such as the NHS Confederation controversially attempted to stipulate what the Government’s health policy should be. The Taxpayers’ Alliance highlighted that £28 million was given to the organisation – primarily from the Department for Health.

However, this is not the only health organisation that actively campaigns against the government, despite being in receipt of large amounts of taxpayer funds on a recurring basis. The UK Health Alliance on Climate Change is a collaboration of several
dozen health organisations which “coordinate action, provide leadership and advocate for just responses to the climate crisis” whilst in receipt of £110 million since 2017.

Actions from the alliance include legal action against DEFRA, calling for climate reparations, collaborating with Extinction Rebellion, and involvement in public disturbances.

The public disturbances entered into by the alliance includes cracking glass on public buildings and blocking bridges in central London. On 7 April 2022 they, along with Doctors for Extinction Rebellion, blocked the road outside HM Treasury demanding an end to fossil fuels. On 10 April 2022 the group blocked, along with Extinction Rebellion, Lambeth bridge and were subsequently arrested.

**LGBT CHARITIES, LED BY STONEWELL, ATTACKING THE GOVERNMENT: £140 MILLION**

In April 2022, there was a mass boycott of the Government’s “Safe to be me” conference, an event that was designed to celebrate the 50-year anniversary of the first pride marches in London. The event, that cost several hundred thousand pounds of taxpayer funds in itself, was then ultimately cancelled after over 100 charities (led by Stonewall) which have received a further £140 million from the Government since 2017, used the opportunity to make a political statement about the government’s approach to conversion therapy.
PUBLIC SECTOR BODY SPENDING ON ISSUES RELATING TO RACE, SEXUALITY, UNCONSCIOUS BIAS AND EDI: £212 MILLION

These contracts are available on the public website contractsfinder.gov.uk, and were collated via the search of key words allowing for the identification of activities in these areas.

Public sector bodies have spent £212 million of taxpayer money on politically contentious issues since the beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic.

This list of public procurement contracts includes:

- **£30 million** by NHS England on the “provision of specialist Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (ED&I) advice and expertise”.
- **£10 million** by the NHS confederation on a “Race observatory”.
- **£9.6 million** by Defra Commercial Group on “access to specialist Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) expertise.”
- **£2 million** by Telford and Wrekin County Council on “equality, diversity, and inclusion training”.
- **£800,000** by the General Medical Council on “EDI training for managers”.
- **£677,000** by Warwickshire County Council on “equalities training and guidance”.

**£212 MILLION**
• £500,000 by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority for the “facilitation of equality panels”.
• £230,000 by Liverpool City Region Combined Authority to “develop a high-quality bespoke Race Equality and Anti-Racism training product”.
• £227,000 by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council for an “equality and diversity e-learning programme”.
• £219,000 by NHS England to “support the roll-out of the NHS rainbow badge”.
• £126,000 by Devon County Council on an “equality reference group”.
• £38,000 by the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation for EDI consultancy.
Quangos and Arm’s-length bodies (ALBs) are responsible, according to the Public Accounts Committee, for handling £265bn of taxpayers’ money every year. 39

In September 2021 the Public Accounts Committee voiced concerns that inadequate scrutiny was being given to the expenditure of these organisations.40

Set out below are a series of proposals that look to make savings to the budgets of certain quangos by removing the waste spent on politically motivated campaigns. In all instances, the removal of the funds highlighted would not prevent the body from continuing to operate – particularly as many of them generate significant income from private sector activities.

The combined expenditure of these quangos in the suggested time period will amount to almost £20 billion, with savings of £5.49 billion being proposed.

Slicing out the controversial waste would allow the taxpayer to recoup significant sums of money with the added benefit of removing divisive schemes which sow discord in the public sphere.
OVER 250 HIGHER EDUCATION “ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION PLANS”:
£2.5 BILLION ON RACE EQUALITY CHARTERS AND DECOLONISATION

The Office for Students (OfS) is the UK’s Higher Education Regulator which aims to ensure all university students have a “fulfilling experience”. It has an annual expenditure of roughly £1.5 billion (£7.5 billion over a five-year period) and much of its expenditure is focused on helping students with disabilities and mental health needs.

However, its “access and participation” agenda – which since 2019 has required all universities and higher education institutions to produce an action plan - are pushing higher education institutions towards introducing politically motivated measures, that include “decolonising the curriculum” and signing up to the “Race Equality Charter”. This agenda will cost the British taxpayer a total of £2.5 billion over five years.

In February 2022, the OfS reported that “over 250 access and participation plans have been agreed, committing more than two and a half billion pounds over five years” to support universities in achieving equality objectives.

In August, the Daily Telegraph reported that “access and participation plans” (APPs) were being constructed in collaboration with the controversial campaign group Advance HE which was also running, as part of its business model, a consultancy service designed to help Higher Education providers produce, and monitor, their APPs.

Advance HE receives £14 million in public money from universities procuring its services:

In 2021, universities spent £7.5 million in public money acquiring “other services” such as consultancy services and conferences.
from Advance HE. This represents half of the campaign group’s annual income, with another £6.9 million coming from membership fees for the Athena Swan programme and the Race Equality Charter (purchased by individuals and universities).

The Sunday Telegraph has reported that government sources consider this campaign to be “egregious wokery.” Despite this, 96 universities were found to have signed up to the REC’s prescriptions and 23 universities had received an REC award. The Telegraph also reported that almost all those universities which received an award did so by pledging to “decolonise” courses and teaching methods.

In June 2022 she wrote to universities instructing them to “consider whether membership of these schemes...truly represent good value for money for taxpayers or students.” This followed a joint letter by 25 Conservative parliamentarians urging the education secretary to ban universities from joining a scheme which “encourages the elevation of identity politics, irrespective of intellectual integrity.”

However, it is not just universities that are funding Advance HE, with central government also making significant payments to it in recent years, including a £150,000 payment by the Business Department in January 2022 for the “Collection of the Outcomes and Outputs from the EPSRC Inclusion Matters Investment.”
This study looked to ascertain the extent to which the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council had embedded Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion practices into its systems and procedures.

Similarly, following a Freedom of Information request, the Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office admitted that it was not aware of exactly how much money from its £6 million “Skills for Prosperity” contract was going to Advance HE:

“the management of the Skills for Prosperity programme is undertaken by a Palladium-led contractor on behalf of FCDO under a contract of the value of £6.1m. Advance HE is named as a sub-contractor of the programme however the FCDO does not hold details of any services procured or grants Palladium have awarded to each of the sub-contractors.”

ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION PLANS BIND UNIVERSITIES TO COMMITMENTS TO “DECOLONISE”, CARRY OUT “UNCONSCIOUS BIAS TRAINING”, AND REPORTING “MICROAGGRESSIONS”

Regrettably a similar process has taken place with the Office for Students’ access and participation plans. Not only do an overwhelming number of universities directly refer to Advance HE’s “Race Equality Charter” in their access and participation plans, but they state their commitment to decolonisation, unconscious bias training, and to implement EDI strategies.

The access and participation plans encourage universities to institutionalise politically motivated measures, such as:

- The University of Keele “supporting a project in partnership with the Keele Students’ Union to ‘decolonise’ our curriculum”.
- The University of Nottingham undertaking “activities (that) seek to address issues surrounding lack of inclusivity in the curriculum (e.g. predominance of white authors and white-heritage
examples); unconscious bias of teachers..."55.

- The University of Warwick boasting that “a number of departments have undertaken considerable change projects already, with History focusing on decolonising the curriculum”56.

- The University of Oxford encouraging “local initiatives to diversify the curriculum, through academic workshops and seminars”57.

- The University of Cambridge focusing on inclusive practices, as well as Race Equality Charter’s Priority...actions related to inclusive teaching, learning and curricula”58.

- The University of Northumbria looking to “develop materials around decolonising the curriculum in consultation with the Students’ Union and student support services”59.

- Loughborough University committing to “improve our practices and policies through actively working towards national awards on EDI such as Athena SWAN, Race Equality Charter and Disability Confident”60.

- King’s College London will focus on “supporting staff and students to identify and report microaggressions”61.

- The University of Kent will be making use of the “Diversity Mark” to “start the institutional conversation about diversification of teaching, curriculum and reading lists”62.

**ARTS COUNCIL ENGLAND: £642 MILLION**

The amount received by Arts Council England (ACE) as grant-in-aid has increased by £136.95 million since 2019/2020 and the body now has an overall annual budget of £623 million in 2022/2023, a near 30% uplift63, and worth £3.1 billion up to the end of the latest National Portfolio programme in 2026.

In August 2022 it was reported by the Daily Mail that the Arts Council had linked £428m in arts funding to a US-based politically motivated campaign called OF/BY/FORALL.64 ACE used taxpayer funds to buy resources on “inclusivity” from the campaign group, to which it said all funding applicants would be required to refer.65
One resource provided by OF/BY/FORALL was entitled ‘Five Steps to Reimagine Your Organization’ and includes telling organisations to consider “unlearning...a culture of whiteness that prevented people of color from feeling included.”

Another, ‘A Framework for Action in Response to Moments of Outrage & Crisis’, suggested that organisations “proactively shift assets from your white organization to Black-led organizations”, offer “safe space to activists”, and use “professional development resources for anti-racist and race equity trainings.”

The Daily Mail reported that this revelation - that US-style culture war materials were being supported and disseminated by the Arts Council - led to over 20 Conservative MPs to write to the Culture Secretary demanding reform. They stated that: “our constituents are already facing an unprecedented cost-of-living crisis, yet the fruits of their hard work are being used to divide society and implement racist policies.”

**FUNDING FOR NATIONAL PORTFOLIO ORGANISATIONS 2023-26: £505 MILLION**

In November 2022, the Arts Council announced the 990 “National Portfolio Organisations” that would be receiving taxpayers’ money for the period 2023-2026 (a total of £2.1 billion).

Analysis shows that 19% of these organisations can be identified as politically motivated and engaging in campaigning activities. The annual funding that these organisations are set to receive every year is £126 million, and over the lifetime of the programme will amount to a total cost of £505.2 million.
Examples of the campaigning undertaken by these groups includes:

- **The Beacon Collaborative**, will be in receipt of £163,333 a year, and advocates recommendations to “support orgs addressing intersectional oppression”.

- **The Crafts Council**, which will receive over £2 million a year, and looks at “challenges to women of colour in craft spaces and on social media, including racism, microaggressions and gaining recognition as expert makers”.

- **The Chineke Foundation**, which is set to receive £700,000 a year, and celebrates the fact that it “presented a season with over 60% of music written by composers from the global majority” (a contentious term which encapsulates those individuals who are classed as having been “minoritized”).

- **Autograph ABP** awarded over £1 million a year to “champion photography that explores issues of race, identity, representation, human rights and social justice” whilst hosting discussions on “decolonising the camera”.

- **Sadler’s Wells** will receive over £2 million a year and has at the core of its work a commitment to acknowledge “the pain and injustice caused by systemic racism”, to “address bias (conscious or unconscious) at every level”, and to introduce a “racial equality task force” an “anti-racism steering group”, and an “EDI steering group”.

- **Tara Theatre**, has been granted £422,000 a year to carry out projects like “Unconscious? Exploring Bias in UK Theatre” that sets out to “explore racial bias, stereotyping and discrimination in the creative industries” and

- **Apples and Snakes**, given £463,000 a year, has supported politically motivated causes such as “a vigil for black girls and boys dehumanised in our education and policing system.”
CIVIL SERVICE HR: £135 MILLION

Most government departments possess internal HR systems, such as Metis at the Home Office and Hera and the Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office. In 2020/2021 in the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, for example, up to £80 million was spent on HR services.75

However, Civil Service HR imposes a further layer of bureaucracy on top of existing departmental HR processes.

According to the Cabinet Office, “Civil Service HR (CSHR) is accountable for cross-Civil Service HR policy”76 and has produced the pan-Whitehall documents on Equality, Diversity, and Inclusivity such as the ”Civil Service Diversity and Inclusion Strategy: 2022 to 2025” which says: “we will continue to build a more inclusive Civil Service going further than the current Equality Act provisions.”77

CSHR was incorporated into the Cabinet Office in 2016/2017 and originally received £16.77 million to provide HR support to government departments.78 As of 2020/2021 its income had ballooned to a record high of £135 million79 (a more than eightfold increase).

This organisation “sets the policies for departments to follow, it delivers services to departments…and it heads the HR profession across government.”80

It was reported in May 2022 that senior government aides were “alarmed” by the number of individuals working in Civil Service HR, alleged to be over 70081, and saw great potential to institute savings by reducing the resulting waste (including the £180,000 salary received by the Chief People Officer82).

The human resources requirement of government departments
should be met at the departmental level. A centralised HR body is unnecessary gold-plating. Its pan-Whitehall agenda does nothing but implement further onerous EDI training on civil servants and facilitates further waste of taxpayer money.

Numerous examples exist of Whitehall departments engaging in damaging HR training schemes such as one at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing, and Communities which informed white members of staff that they were “privileged”\textsuperscript{83}, a cross-Whitehall World Afro Day to raise the problem of “hair bias against Afro hair”, and the Treasury recognising over 100 different genders.\textsuperscript{84}

**THE CIVIL SOCIETY AND YOUTH DIRECTORATE: ENTIRE BUDGET OF £377M SHOULD BE SAVED**

The Civil Society and Youth Directorate has two primary functions: first to improve public contracts awarded to the Voluntary, Charitable, and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector\textsuperscript{85}, and second to oversee the delivery of the £338m Youth Investment Fund. It has a resource budget of £39 million but outsources its functions (and this entire £338 million budget) to a politically motivated campaign group called Social Investment Business.

**A revolution in government procurement: the test is now “social value” not value for money.**

As we saw in Section 2 of this report, The Civil Society and Youth Directorate is the driving force behind attempts to introduce “social value” to the procurement process across government: in September 2020 a government procurement policy notice was released that said “social value should be explicitly evaluated in all central government procurement.”\textsuperscript{86}

Under this ambition, government departments will no longer be required to focus exclusively on value for money and project
delivery when hiring outside firms (a strange thing to introduce at the height of the pandemic). Instead, the ability of social ventures to access taxpayers’ money will be increased if they offer “social value”, that includes addressing “climate change” and “inequality”, and that this new concept must be seen as a “differentiating factor in bid evaluation.”

This revolution in government procurement is supported by the Civil Society and Youth Directorate’s contract readiness fund, which has recently been announced for the years 22/23 to 24/25. This fund will award over £900,000 to charities to help them compete for public sector contracts.

**August 2022: £338 million handed over to an external private company.**

On 8 August 2022 the Directorate announced it had handed funding control of the Youth Investment Fund, worth £338 million, to Social Investment Business. Given that this is the Directorate’s flagship programme, it is unclear what the remaining £39 million resource budget is being spent on.

**A private company which doesn’t think value for money to the taxpayer is important.**

Social Investment Business (SIB) declares that, when allocating public money, its investment policies place “diversity, equity and inclusion on an equal footing with financial performance and social value.” This therefore goes one step further still than the prescriptions made by the Civil Society and Youth Directorate.

SIB has also bound itself to the recommendations of a report produced by Middlesex University on “minoritised ethnic communities” which requires SIB to “address power dynamics; reviewing their own governance and decision-making processes
and structures” as well as those organisations it works with and looks to provide with funding.93

THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY: £600M UPLIFT, AND A NEW “CLIMATE CHANGE” PRIMARY FUNCTION ESTABLISHED IN SEPTEMBER 2020 DURING THE PANDEMIC

The Environment Agency (EA) was set up in 1996 to protect the British environment for future generations. However, in 2020 – again at the height of the pandemic - it departed from this mission and declared that its new primary function has become boosting awareness of climate change amongst the public:

“We will work to influence businesses, citizens and communities to increase their resilience by helping them to adapt to future climate risks. This means being prepared for incidents when they happen and helping businesses better understand the financial risks caused by climate change and nature loss.”94

In 2010, the Labour government presided over the EA spending £1.1 billion (£1.3 billion in 2021 prices). Under the Coalition this fell to £408 million in 2011. However, it has now reached £1.1 billion in 2021 – up £200 million from 2020, and a more than £600 million increase (147 per cent) in real terms since 2011.

This burgeoning budget has coincided with the agency focusing an ever-growing amount of resource towards EDI strategies and tackling the “burning injustice” of its staff demographics being too white.95 A real terms £600 million uplift in funding cannot be justified if it is seemingly being directed towards a prevalent focus on contentious issues around EDI.

Its 2021/2022 annual report, released in October 2022, which speaks of the steps being taken as a result of its “current investment in Equality, Diversity and Inclusion resources and action”, also includes.96
A “Race Action Plan”.
- A “Big Conversation on Race”.
- “An Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion Co-ordinator” attending leadership meetings.

These measures come on top of the creation of employee networks on race and sexuality, and a focus on “tackling unconscious bias”.

The Environment Agency has also funded, in February 2022, a report by the international climate change group, the Institution of Environmental Sciences, entitled “A challenging environment: Experiences of ethnic minority environmental professionals” which drew conclusions such as: “The tendency for environmental documentaries to be voiced by white, male voices was given as an example of how the environment and the sector can feel inaccessible to people from ethnic minorities”.

A recent £96 million contract tender by the EA was entitled “Leadership, management, personal effectiveness framework (including equality, diversity and inclusion)” and looked for an external organisation to help in “refreshing its learning and development curriculum”, with a particular focus on “embedding EDI” within the agency.

According to the EA’s tender notice, “sustainability and equality, diversity and inclusion are at the heart of what we do and how we work”, and the contract will look to build on this.

This was to be achieved by acquiring “access to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) professionals to provide specialist knowledge and professional expertise and guidance to support our learning and development.”
NATURAL ENGLAND: THE £80 MILLION UPLIFT THIS YEAR CAN BE SAVED

Natural England receives an annual grant-in-aid payment of £149 million, a capital budget of £55.8 million, and a resources budget of £87.7 million. Its purpose is to work with bodies, such as the Soil Association, to help preserve the wellbeing of the English countryside.

However, despite it receiving a budget uplift of £8.5 million in resource spending, and an additional £70.5 million in grant-in-aid compared to 2020/21, its work has shifted towards politically motivated campaigns and endeavours. Budget uplifts should not be used to enable quangos to expand into the political domain, and if the increases are not being directed towards augmenting existing functions, they should be saved.

The FOI results produced by our investigation show that Natural England has four members of staff focused on EDI, earning a combined salary of approximately £120,000.

In its 2020/21 annual report, Natural England talks about the first steps it has taken to address perceived inequalities, including “a long-term investment plan and short terms actions such as changing the way we recruit and hosting our first ever “Pride in Nature” event.”

“EDI is of growing importance to Natural England”, it continues, whilst a “six-month EDI Delivery Plan has been published”.

Natural England also launched in 2020/21 “a Wellbeing Strategy and an Equality, Diversity, Inclusion Delivery Plan”, “signed up to the new Defra Group Equality Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) strategy 2020-2024” and created an “EDI Steering Group” whose Chairman “is one of Natural England’s Chief Officers”.
Illustrative of this new commitment, at the beginning of 2022, it commissioned a report to examine the “Diversity in images of England’s green and natural spaces.”

**UK RESEARCH AND INNOVATION: £130 MILLION WASTED ON POLITICAL CAMPAIGNING**

UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) is the quango discharged with funding research that could ultimately support important future industries. It has an annual budget of £7.9bn to nurture and develop economically useful research, but is wasting some of this money on politically motivated research and individuals.

In October 2022, the Daily Telegraph reported that the organisation had failed to achieve the “efficiencies” demanded of it, with a 21% uplift in the number of staff it employs since its creation in 2018. This includes, as revealed by Freedom of Information requests, the 22 members of diversity staff, which have an annual cost of over £1 million.

**Ensuring that all UKRI funding goes towards helping the advancement of learning, rather than controversial political campaigns about race, would offer significant savings to the UK taxpayer.**

Analysis of its accounts shows that every year UKRI completes 1,200 transactions which pertain to “EDI” at a cost to the taxpayer of £4 million.

Most concerning is the production by the controversial group Advance HE, for UKRI, of an “EDI review” in 2019. This review cost £117,000 and its conclusions have been used by UKRI to introduce EDI considerations to all “decision and policy-making” and guide its “actions and interventions.”
Amongst the analysis provided by these reviews, and therefore used by UKRI to underpin their work, was the assessment that “the EDI training interventions that reported the most efficacy focused on race equality or unconscious bias.”

Similarly, in March 2022, £31,434.48 was spent by UKRI on “consultancy services” pertaining to “EDI and people.”

However, the problem of waste is more systemic, as highlighted by the former Business Secretary, Jacob Rees Mogg, who said in October 2022 that “there were significant savings to be had through UKRI in the grant-making that goes on there.”

He cited two examples:

• £483,621 towards a “UK-China transnational strategic partnership for immersive storytelling in museums and cultural institutions”.

• £655,735 for a project entitled ‘A Girls’ Eye-view: Girlhood on the Italian screen since the 1950s’.

Analysis of the funding provided by UKRI shows that approximately £130 million a year is wasted on this kind of divisive, politically motivated campaigning, rather than research, which also fails to produce any economic return to the hard-pressed taxpayer.

This includes, in the last year, a £99,000 grant to a University of Strathclyde project entitled: “EDI in Scottish Heritage” which aimed to “articulate the impact on continuing 21st-century forms of racism” and £196,000 to the University of Greenwich for the project: ‘Exploring Cultural Diversity in Experimental Sound’ which looks to assess “institutional Whiteness which demand investigation
and critical reflection.”

Other projects titles include:

- “#BeObjective #BeKind #Be... Journalists’ emotional labour in the era of social media” (£144,000).
- “Understanding Displacement Aesthetics and Creating Change in the Art Gallery for Refugees, Migrants and Host Communities” (£777,000).
- “The Colour of Diversity: A Longitudinal Analysis of BFI Diversity Standards Data and Racial Inequality in the UK Film Industry” (£761,000).
- “Commercial sex in the UK and Republic of Ireland: Current knowledge and future challenges” (£7,000).
- “We are Bristol: Reparative justice through collaborative research” (£292,000).

The long-term nature of these projects means that researchers will be financially supported by the UK taxpayer for several years if their application for funding is successful.

This has meant that some funded-projects, such as £100,000 for a research project focused on “Decolonising UK Earth Science pedagogy”, and £809,000 on “Decolonising Robert Louis Stevenson”, provide individuals with a long-term taxpayer-funded platform through which to run their political campaigns.

**NATIONAL LOTTERY COMMUNITY FUND: £452 MILLION CURRENTLY BEING WASTED ON POLITICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CAMPAIGN GROUPS**

Every year the National Lottery Community Fund injects around £600 million into UK communities through projects that are making a difference at the local level. The Fund’s continued success will be vital during the current cost-of-living crisis, and in 2021 it received £200 million in public support during the Covid-19 pandemic to
allow it to continue with its grant-making duties. However, a small proportion of its grants are going to support campaign groups and activities which seek to divide communities, rather than help them.

**£55 million on politically motivated projects**

In 2021, the Fund allocated £55 million of the public’s money to politically motivated projects. This did not go to help vulnerable children, fighting deprivation or to support those suffering from isolation. Instead, it was squandered on projects such as “Global Black Thrive CIC”. This organisation, which received £1.5 million, criticises western practices of education, health, and criminal justice because “the knowledge that is recognised and valued within western societies is often from a eurocentric perspective, therefore silencing the voices of Black people.”

Similarly, it awarded £361,000 to the “Norfolk Pride Project” which regularly puts on political campaigning activities in schools.

**£397 million on “climate action” in Britain’s more prosperous areas**

Since 2016, the National Lottery Community Fund has also spent £397 million on “supporting communities across the UK take climate action”. Rather than help the most vulnerable in society, grants are being given to prosperous areas of the country, and projects in affluent neighbourhoods, that aim to produce “environmental action” and “engage people and communities with COP26 and inspire positive climate action.” This includes funding for “Greener North Huntingdonshire” to boost climate awareness, a “climate action conference” for young people in East Hampshire, and to create in David Cameron’s former constituency of Witney, “a peer to peer support network to share best practice for establishing and maintaining a community tree nursery”. This is the very opposite of “levelling up”.
BRITISH COUNCIL: £58 MILLION ON POLITICALLY MOTIVATED ARTISTIC PROJECTS

The British Council is now overwhelmingly self-sufficient in funding, and its annual reports show that the majority of its income comes from operating services. For every £1 grant-in-aid received from the government, the British Council earns £5.40 through the provision of commercial activities.122

The £142 million grant-in-aid which it receives from the UK Government is primarily to be delivered as part of the UK’s Overseas Development Aid budget. The ODA budget is provided by the British taxpayer to help communities overseas, yet the British Council has increasingly sought to conflate this support with the contentious EDI agenda.

This includes, as set out in its EDI strategy, an increased focus on “anti-racism learning and development interventions, including upward mentoring and awareness sessions on allyship, decolonisation and different forms of racism.”123

Roughly £58 million of the grant-in-aid funding that the British Council receives is subsequently spent on artistic projects, that aim to produce a climate where “the world will look to the UK for the development of policy and practice regarding the place of culture in inclusion, representing marginalised voices and access to the arts.”124

Such projects include the “Sound and Music (England) supporting women, non-binary and LBGTQI+ artists working in electronic music.”125
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE ARTS: £14M WASTED WHILE THE ORGANISATION HAS GIVEN UP ON PRINCIPAL TASKS OF TACKLING OBESITY AND HELPING CHILDREN IN THEIR EARLY YEARS

NESTA is independent from Government and was founded under New Labour to promote innovation in the areas of science and technology. It receives £14 million in public funding a year, and around £14 million a year from commercial activities independent of government.126

As a commercially viable organisation, it is entitled to pursue any objective that it chooses, but if this deviates from its founding purpose it should not expect taxpayer support. Yet this is currently what is happening.

NESTA’s new EDI strategy states that it is overhauling the purpose of its investments to focus primarily on innovation that address inequality and decarbonisation, rather than tackling obesity and children’s early years setbacks: “By 2025, the majority of our innovation missions’ endowment funding will be spent on activity to improve the circumstances of people from minoritised and disadvantaged groups.”127

HIGH SPEED 2 LTD: £500 MILLION BEING SQUANDERED ON EDI

The company set to deliver the controversial £100 billion project HS2 spends £352,000 on 4 members of EDI staff a year, and is using its significant expenditure clout – as the UK’s largest construction project – to inject EDI into the wider industry.

The company states that it aspires “to embed EDI principles throughout our complex supply chain, and in so doing change the diversity and culture of the industry”. This manifests itself as stringent EDI requirements for all construction companies hoping to receive a contract working on HS2. These contractual performance
measures cover “policies and procedures; recruitment; workforce monitoring and reporting; supplier diversity; training; and a requirement to obtain an externally-verified EDI standard.”

The government has not indicated that it would look to reassess the project, but significant savings can be made by ending the contractual stipulation which requires companies in the HS2 supply chain to receive external validation of their EDI standards. 

**Contracts should be awarded based on the suitability of the company to provide the service, not the extent to which it conforms to a political agenda.**

Yet HS2 ltd points its subcontractors towards an “externally-verified” EDI standard designed by Clear Assured, which charges companies up to £20,000 a year in subscription fees. Ending this practice now, if the project is to continue, could therefore yield significant savings over the next decade, as well as reducing the amount of politics being injected into the construction industry.

**OFFICE OF THE IMMIGRATION SERVICES COMMISSIONER: £4.3 MILLION TO BE SAVED SO THAT THE HOME OFFICE ISN’T FUNDING THE SAME LAWYERS THAT ARE ATTEMPTING TO DESTROY ITS OWN POLICIES**

The OISC was created by Tony Blair in 1999 and is “funded through a grant-in-aid budget” of £4.3m as well as fees that it collects from immigration advisors.

As an executive non-departmental public body its duty, as set out by the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999, is to regulate those giving immigration advice and services across the UK.

This means anyone that wishes to give immigration advice, work on asylum cases, or represent clients at a Judicial Review, must have been trained, examined, and ultimately pass, the relevant OISC accreditation process.
OISC’s business plan states that a core part of its remit is: “assessing and registering those who want to be an immigration adviser.”

However, this core function has been outsourced to a legal firm that is run by political activists who led the legal charge against the Government’s Rwanda plan.

In December 2020, HJT Training, founded by Mark Symes and David Jones, won a contract worth £116,000 to provide the “competence assessment and moderation process of immigration advisors” for OISC.

On top of providing the assessment, HJT training are “officially recognised and trusted by the OISC for the exam training.”

Despite performing government functions, the leadership team have been directly challenging government policy. On 15 June the first flight transporting migrants to Rwanda was abandoned because of injunctions secured from the Court of Appeal by Garden Court Chambers, and HJT Training founder Mark Symes.

On 15 October the Home Secretary announced that there would be an “urgent review" into the Office of the Immigration Services Commissioner following these revelations.

OISC also failed to properly intervene in the case of the events at the Manston migrant centre, despite its own annual report making it clear that one of its key roles is “auditing the performance of organisations and advisers ensuring standards are maintained.”

The AIRE contract (as set out above) makes it clear that the maintenance of high standards by the service Provider would fall under the remit of OISC:
“The Contractor must ensure that it is fully compliant with the requirements of the Office of the Immigration Service Commissioner (OISC)...and is regulated as required under section 84 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999.”138
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