

---

# Rebuilding British Democracy

British National Party  
General Election 2005

## Manifesto



---

## Contents

Introduction: Freedom; Security; Identity; Democracy

1. Leaving the European Union – The *sine qua non*
2. Democracy – Resolving the crisis of our highest value
3. Immigration – A crisis without parallel
4. Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving Britain
5. Culture, traditions and the civil society
6. Tough on the causes of crime – Criminals
7. Social inclusion – One healthy nation
8. Education for a British future
9. Britain-first economics – The antidote to globalism
10. Extending ownership and responsibility
11. Abolition of income tax
12. Public service, not corporate profit
13. Transport – Life's too short to spend in a traffic jam
14. Food production – A radical shift
15. The environment – Our 'blessed plot'
16. Britain and the world – Good fences, good neighbours

Conclusion: Popular nationalism – The idea whose time will come

---

### Introduction

"Rebuilding British Democracy" is the title of our general election manifesto for a very good reason. As British voters, we are repeatedly told that we live in an elective democracy; whereas in truth what exists is a sham and an illusion. Genuine democracy, where the population's will is given expression by the elected representatives, is starkly absent from Britain.

Decisions are made by institutions over which the electorate has little or no control. National parliaments and assemblies in Westminster, Edinburgh, Cardiff and Belfast are little more than rubber-stamping closed shops for rule by diktat from Brussels and Strasbourg. In addition, decisions are rarely made by those representatives with the interests of the majority of British voters in mind. Vociferous lobbyists and pressure groups blackmail and cajole to get their way; the corporate industrial and commercial giants have the money to buy and influence individual representatives and entire political parties.

A whole raft of repressive legislation has been enacted in the past thirty years to stop the social experiment of multi-culturalism from falling apart. Even more repressive legislation is planned as the reality that multi-culturalism cannot work, sinks in to even the most ideologically blinkered politician.

It is the "average" man and woman who suffers from the failings of our politicians to grasp the issue and restore genuine democracy. It is the taxpayer who funds the vast State instruments of repression and the wasteful paperwork that keeps unproductive bureaucrats in their positions.

It is the pensioner who suffers by living isolated, behind bolted doors, fearful of being a victim of crime. It is the schoolchildren who suffer from obesity and ailments associated with a poor diet. It is the hourly paid worker who suffers when he or she is sacked as their job is exported to a call-centre in India.

### Freedom

The British National Party exists to put an end to this injustice. We will return power to the men and women of Britain, the taxpayers, pensioners, mums and dads and workers, and remove it from the unelected commissioners in Europe. We will provide a safe environment for all, where there is freedom from fear of crime, freedom from repression of the State, freedom of association and freedom of speech.

### Security

The British National Party believes that security means the well being of life, limb and property. This means safe neighbourhoods with vibrant communities, working towards a common goal; it means security and safety while using our transport systems. It means security of long term employment after a decent education without the fear that factories, offices and shops will be closed and jobs exported to the third world.

### Identity

The British National Party believes in genuine ethnic and cultural diversity and the right of ALL peoples to self-determination and that must include the indigenous peoples of these islands. The British peoples are embroiled in a long term cultural war being waged by a ruling regime which has abandoned the concept of " Britain " in pursuit of globalisation. We are determined to win that cultural war, and to that end, we must take control of our national borders. We must also stop further attempts to

enforce multi-culturalism on an increasingly sceptical and unwilling populace. The future of our culture is not up for debate - it is part of our individual and collective existence on this planet and we are under an obligation to pass on to generations yet unborn, the collected knowledge, wisdom and lore, which we ourselves have inherited.

### **Democracy**

The wishes of the British electorate cannot be made manifest until we have the powers restored to our national parliaments and assemblies and put an end to the blackmail and underhanded tactics to buy influence. Honesty, integrity and transparency will be restored to civic and public institutions.

### **Summary**

This is the largest and most comprehensive election manifesto the British National Party has compiled. It clearly illustrates that we are neither a single issue party, nor an ephemeral protest group. The BNP is serious about winning our nation back and this manifesto sets out our plan to achieve this goal.

### Leaving the European Union – The *sine qua non*

The European Union is an aspiring super state which would deprive the British people of their right to democratic self-government; subject us to alien rule in the interest of a bureaucracy which has no loyalty to the United Kingdom and bring about the eventual liquidation of Britain as a nation and a people.

The federal European project is incompatible with many of the most deep-rooted of our traditional national and personal freedoms, and our hard-won democracy: The fundamental basis of a democratic national state that its people elect their own representatives, whose job it is to rule in the national interest; the principle that no Westminster parliament may bind its successors; trial by one's peers; the presumption of innocence, habeas corpus; our currency and the ability to reward or replace our political masters for their handling of the economy – these are just a few of the most important rights we will lose forever unless we withdraw from the EU.

Even today, our elected national parliament is little more than a rubber-stamp for rule by diktat from Brussels. This is why we have placed this section first in this manifesto: The freedom of action of the governing party at Westminster is so restricted by European rules and regulations that there is effectively no point any party putting forward any proposals in any important area of policy. Whether these concern ambitious schemes for the economy, or Tory promises to 'get a grip' on the asylum shambles, all are essentially empty soundbites because our own elected government no longer has the power to act on our democratically expressed wishes.

Withdrawal from the European Union would therefore be the most important single foundation stone of our rebuilt British democracy. Without it, virtually nothing can be achieved.

Fortunately, the present price of withdrawal would not be anything like as high as the Europhile scare-mongers claim – although it will become higher the longer and the deeper Britain is immersed in the EU. The present regime claims that membership is necessary to our prosperity is a myth. European nations such as Switzerland and Norway sustain higher standards of prosperity than Britain without belonging to the European Union. In fact, the EU is a liability to our economy because of its tendency to strangle business with unnecessary regulations whose sole purpose is to increase the power of the Brussels superstate that wishes, for the purpose of aggrandising its own power, to rule Britain. This is wholly unacceptable.

It is also untrue that leaving the EU would cut Britain off from the commercial markets in which our industries sell their goods. Not only does the EU have free-trade arrangements with several non-member states, but its average tariff on non-EU trade is approximately 1.5%, an insignificant barrier. Furthermore, the EU would not be permitted, under World Trade Organisation rules to which it is signatory, to discriminate against British products in retaliation for Britain leaving the EU.

It is estimated that complying with the vast thicket of EU regulations costs Britain approximately £40 billion per year. This is 2% of GDP, roughly half what we spend on the NHS, and could fund numerous improvements in public services if it were recaptured. The Common Agricultural Policy alone is estimated to impose a 26% tax on food. (source: Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign Bulletin , Sept. 2004).

### Unaccountable

The EU is spectacularly corrupt, as is only natural in an unaccountable institution. According to Marta Adreasen, former Chief Accounting Officer of the EU, 95% of EU funds are not properly accounted for and there has not been a proper audit in 14 years. (Source: Ashley Mote press release , 21 October 2004).

Britain's net contribution to the EU is now widely estimated to run at around £1.2 million every hour of every day of the year. In simplistic terms, this endless haemorrhage of wealth goes a very long way to explaining how the transport systems of France and Spain are so much better than ours, or why British pensioners are among the worst provided for in Europe. How could the situation be any different, when our Masters have spent decades giving our money away in pursuit of an unworkable imperial fantasy?

Finally, the greatest single threat posed by the European Union comes from the plans (supported by the Conservative Party) to expand further into Bulgaria and Romania in 2007, and subsequently into Turkey. The former expansion would give eight million Sinta gypsies the right to move into Western Europe, the latter would at a stroke increase the EU's Muslim population by more than 75 million. This would mark the end of Europe's ancient and historic close identification with Christendom, and the beginning of the end of secular democratic government in the West.

From Edward Heath onwards, our political and liberal media 'elite' have lied and conned us into "ever greater union" with a federal European superstate. That deceit will end on the day the British National Party win a British general election and ceremoniously tear up the Treaty of Rome on the following morning.

### Democracy – Resolving the crisis of our highest value

This country is the birthplace of modern democracy. This is no surprise; it is clear from what is known of the way in which free men and women among Celtic, Anglo-Saxon and Norse ancestors had a significant say in the running of their societies that personal freedom has deep and strong roots among the native peoples of our islands.

Even when those freedoms were suppressed, as under the time of feudal darkness that followed the Norman Conquest, and again during the pauperisation of the yeomanry and creation of an urban proletariat during the Enclosures and Industrial Revolution, our people have always fought and even died to secure them again. From Magna Carta to the Peasants' Revolt, through the Levellers, the Chartists, the early Labour movement and the suffragettes, we have defied the executioner, the rack, and the prison door to wrest liberty of conscience, speech, action and political association from monarchs, barons and bosses, and from popes, priests and censors.

Now our dearly-bought birthright of freedom is under mortal threat once more. The political elite are nearing the end of a process which will outlaw any expression of opinions deemed to be politically incorrect. This despite the fact that it is central to the very idea of democracy that all views be allowed to be espoused and that they stand or fall only in the marketplace of ideas.

In addition to this savage attack on free speech, recent decades have seen an unprecedented increase in the power and 'reach' of the State. The surveillance technology which theoretically protects us from the nihilistic tyranny of terror in fact threatens to subject us to the perpetual tyranny of Big Brother.

Fortunately, a variety of the policies proposed later in this document – particularly British neutrality vis-à-vis the Middle East and the US-led 'Clash of Civilisations', our rejection of mass immigration, and the reintroduction of the death penalty for terrorists – will so reduce the threat of terrorism that it will no longer be plausible for us to be asked to submit to this monstrous growth in State power in order to avoid becoming terrorist targets.

Our forefathers fought two World Wars partly so as to ensure that, except for the duration of those wars, they and their families would not have to prove who they were to any agent of the State who decided on a whim to ask for such information. This is an enormous difference between the traditional British system whereby the police and similar officials are the servants of the people, rather than the hired hands of the central State with power over the law-abiding, which is the underlying norm which helped make possible all the excesses and horrors of totalitarianism on mainland Europe throughout the 20th century.

Just as the terrorist threat which their actions have largely created is used by the political elite as an excuse for taking away our freedoms, so they use the lack of faith in politicians for which they are responsible as an excuse to subvert our democracy. The widespread use of electoral fraud by Labour activists - recently described by a senior judge as behaviour suitable to a corrupt banana republic - was made possible by a massive expansion in the availability of postal voting which was 'justified' in part as a means of increasing the proportion of electors voting.

The reality is that falling turn-outs can only be reversed by efforts by politicians to show that they can make a difference, and that between them they provide a real range of genuine alternatives. The prevailing choice of "More of the same or none of the above" is the reason for voter apathy, and the problem that must be addressed if the low turnout trend is to be reversed.

The 'justification' offered by Labour peers as they struggled in 2004 to persuade even the crony-packed House of Lords to introduce all-postal voting across the whole of the north of England was even worse: In this case it was openly admitted that the main reason for the change was that the higher turnout would help to "stop the BNP:"

Making artificial changes to electoral boundaries or procedures carried out in order to disadvantage one particular party is known as 'gerrymandering'. Resentment over the practice when carried out against the Catholic minority in Northern Ireland in the 1960s is widely regarded as having been a key factor fuelling the growth of the IRA and thirty years of terrorism there.

It is utterly unacceptable that law-abiding majority communities on the mainland are now being subjected to the same denial of their democratic rights. And while the British National Party has no intention of being provoked or driven into any kind of illegality, the fact remains that by showing such contempt for democracy in England – while simultaneously giving way at every turn to terrorists in Ulster - New Labour are inviting angry young men in multi-cultural cities to conclude that violence pays.

### **Dismantling the repressive State**

Add to this the growing and relentless persecution of the BNP, both collectively and as individuals, in ways ranging from denial of banking facilities to dismissal from jobs and unions, and it is clear that Britain is already a long way down the slippery slope to being a fully blown totalitarian state. Even if we inherit the mechanism of such a repressive State on our election to national power, we pledge to dismantle it by the following means:

1. All laws against traditional free speech rights will be repealed, starting with the vague, politicised, and hypocritically-enforced laws pertaining to race and religion, which are virtually never enforced against foreigners attacking the racial and religious groups indigenous to Britain.
2. Guarantee the right of organisations and individuals who espouse unpopular opinions but have not broken any laws (other than illegitimate laws against free speech) to organise and campaign free from interference from or discrimination by, the police, other state institutions, and bodies such as trades unions, employers' organisations or commercial entities.
3. Guarantee the rights of individuals to join, and organise according to their political beliefs in, trades unions and professional bodies.
4. All political parties should be protected by a new law which makes the employment of violence or intimidation for political purposes a serious offence carrying a minimum of two years in prison, or a doubling of the usual sentence for the offence, whichever is the greater.
5. We will disband all government-sponsored attempts to exploit ethnic minority voters by means of such programmes as Operation Black Vote.
6. A ban on postal voting for all except the seriously sick and elderly. No use of electronic or other non-polling booth voting systems, as none will yet command the confidence of the electorate in the way which the traditional ballot box does.
7. Instruct the Electoral Commission to deal as a matter of urgency with the way in which organisations which do not themselves contest elections are at present permitted to denigrate individual candidates or parties, thereby allowing their rivals to circumvent the proper spending limits on election material.
8. Ban the conducting or publishing of opinion polls in the last three weeks of an election campaign, as these can be used to 'stampede' voters and manipulate

the democratic process.

9. In order to ensure that vested interests cannot 'buy' political parties, we will legislate to ensure that political parties must organize and function only with such funds as they are able to raise from their own members and supporters. State funding, corporate donations by businesses or pressure groups, and political dues from trades unions will all be outlawed.
10. The rejection of ID cards – the core technique and expression of the repressive Surveillance State.

### Democracy and the media

A separate danger to genuine democracy comes from the concentration of ownership and control of the mass media in too few hands, particularly when the hands concerned are those of foreigners whose primary loyalty is not to Britain, or media barons who have so much wealth that they can seek to turn it into political influence and power.

The great problem with the power of the media, the 'Fourth Estate', is that it is at present not subject to any democratic check or control. We will address this danger as part of our campaign to strengthen and extend genuine democracy.

The BNP stands for the revolutionary principle that the printing presses and broadcast channels of the media must tell the truth in their reports. We will enact laws that will ensure that the dictatorship of the media over free debate in our society is dismantled and a truly democratic system is created that allows all sections of our society free and unfettered access to the media.

The era where the big media barons and news corporations could control public opinion through printing lies has to end. The abuse of the free press by the media corporations to propel political parties to power through promoting them in their papers subverts democracy itself. We are very reluctant to deal with this problem through expropriation, since such interference with legitimately acquired property rights – however justified on one level – would create an immensely dangerous precedent on another level.

On the assumption of power we would therefore hold meetings with the proprietors in question in an effort to thrash out ways in which they would agree to ending any possibility of abuse of their power, in exchange for being left to enjoy the purely financial benefits of their ownership, albeit probably at more realistic levels of taxation than they are allowed to get away with at present.

The BNP has been the victim of media lies and smears and has been denied justice by the Press Complaints Commission. We will replace the PCC – an organisation dominated by those upon whom it is supposed to sit in judgement – with a truly independent body with the power to grant the victims of media falsehood the Right of Reply with equal prominence, plus financial compensation.

For particularly bad cases, we will create a new criminal offence of "The deliberate dissemination of falsehoods about an individual or organisation for financial or political gain" by any media outlet.

### Bringing power closer to the people

In addition to defending democracy against creeping totalitarianism, we also intend to introduce sweeping reforms to strengthen and extend it. Once again, we reiterate that it is essential to withdraw from the European Union, but unlike most other Eurorealist groups we are not content with repatriating power back from Brussels just to hand it

back to a group of inherently distant politicians in Westminster – not even if we are the dominant party within that body.

A key factor is that we no longer have the luxury of just returning without much thought to straight-forward London-based government. From the moment it took office in 1997, the Blair regime set about demolishing the traditional British constitutional settlement. The combination of this giant act of vandalism with pressure from the European Union intended to break the United Kingdom up into bite-sized pieces, has left the old UK as broken as Humpty Dumpty.

For all the resentment against the soaring costs of their Parliament and Assembly buildings, the Scots and Welsh now have devolved administrations wielding very significant powers (albeit within a tight EU straight-jacket) as, whenever Sinn Fein/IRA aren't robbing too many banks, does Northern Ireland. Such devolution of power is, to an extent, in keeping with the democratic nationalist principle of subsidiarity. Furthermore, even if that were not the case, any attempt by a central BNP government – which will almost certainly be elected primarily by voters in England – to abolish these local parliaments would probably spark a powerful reaction in their favour. Returning to rule from one British parliament in Westminster is not an option.

Neither, however, is muddling along with the wholly unsatisfactory situation which pertains at present, whereby the elected representatives of English voters quite rightly have no say over many decisions affecting the people of Scotland, Wales and Ulster, whereas MPs from those places are able to vote on issues which affect the English. There is also the problem that much of the power wielded by these local parliaments has not been devolved down from Westminster, but concentrated upwards by robbing it from our traditional counties. Thus this is not an exercise in bringing power closer to the people, but in putting it in the hands of a faceless and relatively remote bureaucracy and a class of minor but pompous and overpaid professional politicians.

Such a typically New Labour shambles is a recipe for friction and for future division among the British Family of Nations, particularly if Labour's plan to carve up England into artificial areas of regional government goes ahead, thereby arousing English nationalist anger at the fact that "everyone else gets recognition and self-government, but not us." Knowing the terrible damage caused by such division on the island of Ireland, we must at all costs deal with this problem to everyone's mutual satisfaction.

Meanwhile, of course, there still remains the Irish Question itself, waiting to explode into bloody life once again on account of a bogus 'Peace Process' that rewarded terrorists and institutionalized sectarianism at the very heart of government.

Starting, as all true democracies must, from the grass-roots up, our solution to this interlocking group of problems is as follows:

1. Devolve all the powers properly capable of being exercised at local level to revived County Council government, returning to the traditional pre-1974 boundaries. These powers to include control of Planning applications;
2. Add a specifically English parliament, sitting in Westminster, to the family of devolved parliaments already in being, including Stormont. Each of these should deal with such functions of the present devolved administrations as cannot sensibly be given to the county Councils, plus as many of the powers repatriated from Brussels as can be dealt with at this level. We envisage a particularly strong brief in terms of cultural development for this level of government;
3. Create a pan-British parliament to deal with overall economic policy and provide the authority and accountability required for the Ministry of Finance, and matters such as foreign policy on which it is clearly essential for the British nations to speak with one voice. This body would have its formal base on the Isle of Man, though it would sit in rotation in each of the national parliaments.

The role of a House of Lords stripped of its Blair cronies as a revising chamber is still in need of assessment. At this stage, however, we can state that we see an opportunity to bring in not a simple elected duplicate of the Lower House, but a body which gives more weight to experience in certain fields, involvement in charities and community groups and such like. This offers the opportunity to bring to bear on government the objectivity of non-party political experts and individuals chosen on the grounds of talent and service. Clearly further work is needed on this concept in order to make the most of this opportunity for better government at the expense of the present bastard offspring of ancient and modern patronage and cronyism.

There would be a permanent standing invitation for Eire to join the pan-British parliament as an equal partner. It would be a matter for the citizens of each of the British nations to decide for themselves if they wished for the reigning head of the House of Windsor to be their Head of State, but he or she would not be head of the pan-British parliament, thereby making it realistic to hope that the Irish would find it possible to rejoin the British Family of Nations, taking their rightful place side-by-side with the representatives of England, Scotland, Wales and Ulster, and ending for ever the Brothers' War which has been our Achilles Heel, tragedy and shame since our Masters set us at each others' throats generations ago.

### **Citizens' Initiative referenda**

We believe that such constitutional changes would lead to significantly better government. That said, history warns the prudent, and those who love freedom, to beware of all governments and all ruling elites – not least those that strive towards perfection.

Accordingly, we propose as a vital check and balance on the political class the introduction of Citizens' Initiative Referenda on the Swiss model. Under this, individual citizens only have to collect the requisite number of electors' signatures on any given petition – the wording of which they decide themselves – in order to compel either the local or national government to hold a referendum on the subject.

If passed by between 50% - 66% of those voting, such a referendum result would in turn trigger a full-scale council/parliamentary debate on the subject, with heavy moral pressure on the politicians to follow the wishes of the majority. If passed by more than 66% of those voting, however, the result of such a referendum would automatically be binding on the authorities, who would have no choice but to accept the will of the people and enact their wishes as law.

This is the vital factor which turns the Citizens' Initiative referendum into a sword for genuine democracy, as opposed to the government-created plebiscite beloved of dictators from Hitler to John Prescott.

### **The Armed People – the ultimate protection against invasion or tyranny**

The exploitation of the 1996 Dunblane Massacre of sixteen school-children and a teacher by a homosexual paedophile to provide an excuse to disarm many thousands of law-abiding citizens was one of the most breath-takingly cynical acts of the Blair regime. Put simply, guns do not kill people, criminals kill people – especially when innocent people do not have guns with which to defend themselves.

We would restore to the legitimate and law-abiding sportsmen the right to possess and shoot all the varieties of weapon they were entitled to before New Labour's 1997 totalitarian gun-grab.

That, however, is only the start. In a world where modern technology automatically and almost irresistibly gives the State powers of surveillance, analysis and potential

repression that past dictatorships could not even have managed, it is more important than ever that the citizens of a modern Britain have at their disposal the means, in extremis, to resist any totalitarian government that has managed to get control of those powers.

This would be all the more necessary once we have re-established the once taken-for-granted fact of significant government direction (albeit through a non-party political Ministry of Finance) of the commanding heights and overall direction of the economy.

Such an increase in the power of the State is clearly necessary if we are to compete against Far Eastern economies whose use of similar organisational techniques gives them a long-term edge over old-fashioned Western capitalism. But if we are not to drift towards an over-mighty State which could all too easily lose sight of its own limitations and role as facilitator rather than master, then such an increase must be balanced by a corresponding decrease in the authority of the State elsewhere.

It is primarily for this reason – although defence against violent criminals and some at present unforeseen potential foreign aggression are also important considerations – that we advocate the adoption of the modern Swiss model for a responsibly armed citizenry. Under this all law-abiding adults who have successfully completed their period of military service are required to keep in a safe locker in their homes a standard-issue military assault rifle and ammunition.

It is clear that this system contributes to Switzerland 's very low rate of burglary and violent crime, as well as having helped make that tiny country extremely unappetising to foreign aggressors throughout the last century. The people of Switzerland have not had occasion to use their arms to bring to heel any home-grown tyrants either, and the fact that the State does not possess a monopoly on the potential use of force in a struggle between slavery and freedom means that they are unlikely to have to do so. This state of affairs has a great deal to commend it.

### **A Bill of Rights**

The rights of British citizens as they are confirmed emerge from the details above must be set down in a formal Bill of Rights, the starting point for which should be those parts of Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights of 1689 which are still relevant to modern times.

We propose this not because we believe that a written document necessarily prevents future governments from seeking to undermine or distort the guarantees. The point is that, by setting everything down in readily accessible print in a document of universally-known importance, it provides a tripwire to alert a future generation to the fact that, as is the way of the world, a ruling class has arisen that has once again come to think of itself as more important than those in whose name it governs.

## **Immigration – A crisis without parallel**

Britain's very existence today is threatened by immigration. As a nation we must rebuild trust in the immigration system amongst the British electorate whilst simultaneously ensuring that National Security is maintained in this era of global terrorism.

We are proud of the fact that at a time when several other political parties and many sections of the media are finally awakening to this issue we alone of all the political parties have a decades-long record of pointing it out. If even Tony Blair can say that it is "neither racist nor extremist" to raise "genuine concerns" about the flood of asylum seekers, then it is no longer feasible to pretend that this crisis does not exist. All those persons and organisations who have endured years of abuse for telling the truth are owed a serious apology by their critics.

To take just one example, it is a hard fact that, according to official figures, 15% of the UK's male prison population is black, despite black people accounting for only 2% of the total population. Victim-reported figures concerning the race of criminals give the lie to the leftist argument that this is due to discriminatory prosecution. It is an inescapable statistical fact that immigration into Britain increases the crime rate.

Figures for unemployment, welfare dependency, educational failure, and other social pathologies tell a similar story for most other foreign ethnic groups. There is simply no escaping the fact that choosing to admit such persons into the country in significant numbers means choosing to become a poorer, more violent, more dependent and worse-educated society.

### **Our programme:**

1. In any society claiming to be based on the rule of law, it must be beyond serious controversy that all illegal immigrants must be deported as soon as they are discovered. We will increase the funding and political will behind such operations by the police and the courts.

The present regime propagates the myth that such deportation could only be accomplished by authoritarian police tactics, alien to British values. This is obviously false, as even under the present unacceptably lax deportation policies, tens of thousands of people are deported from the UK annually without incident.

2. Every nation, no matter how open or closed its immigration policy may be, has the right and duty to maintain sovereign physical control of its borders. We will begin by increasing the funding of existing border controls by 500% and shall continue to increase budget and personnel until our borders are secure against significant intrusion. In particular, the first company of British troops to be withdrawn from Iraq on the day a BNP government assumes office would be redeployed to secure the Channel Tunnel and Kent ports against illegal immigration.

The regime propagates the myth that Britain cannot, in the face of modern international travel and trade, secure its borders at reasonable cost and convenience. This is also obviously untrue, as the border control example of other advanced nations (the most relevant being that other great island state, Japan) proves.

3. Under present circumstances we would abide by our obligations under the 1951 United Nations Convention on Refugees. We recognise the existence of legitimate international refugees from persecution and war, but point to the fact that international law provides that such persons must be given – and must seek

– refuge in the nearest safe country. So, unless a flood of refugees from a civil war in France or Denmark shows up on our shores, these refugees are simply not Britain's responsibility and have no right to refuge here.

This is not a position of callousness: it is a principled stand that all the problems of the world are neither Britain's fault nor our responsibility – or even in our capacity - to solve. In order to further the proper handling of refugees in the appropriate place (not in the advanced Western societies to which they gravitate out of economic self-interest) we will be prepared to contribute funds to refugee relief programmes which respect these principles.

4. We will reform the laws and law enforcement of the UK so that, with respect to refugees and illegal immigrants, there are no blind eyes turned to violations, no amnesties to reward law-breaking, and no extensive appeals against legal decisions. We will place the burden of proof upon the claimant to prove his or her legitimate presence in this country. We will require persons whose cases are pending to be held in refugee centres, not at large in the community.
5. We will impose a permanent lifetime ban on re-entry into Britain for any reason on any person found guilty of having violated British entry or immigration laws, enforced by instant deportation.

### Our Agenda for Change

On current demographic trends we, the native British people, will be an ethnic minority in our own country within sixty years. By 2020, an extra 5-7 million immigrants will have entered Britain, whilst immigrant communities already resident here are having more children than the indigenous British people. The estimates for the numbers of illegal immigrants resident in the country vary from 250,000 to over a million.

To ensure that we do not become a minority in our own homeland, and that the native British peoples of our islands retain their culture and identity, we call for an immediate halt to all further immigration, the immediate deportation of all bogus asylum seekers, all criminal entrants and illegal immigrants, and the introduction of a system of voluntary resettlement whereby those immigrants and their descendants who are legally here are afforded the opportunity to return to their lands of ethnic origin assisted by a generous financial incentives both for individuals and for the countries in question.

We will abolish the 'positive discrimination' schemes that have made white Britons second-class citizens. We will also clamp down on the flood of 'asylum seekers', the vast majority of whom are either bogus or can find refuge much nearer their home countries. Britain is full up and the government of Britain has as its first responsibility the welfare, security and long-term preservation of the native people of Britain.

One of the most important rights that any nation possesses is the right to decide who shall enjoy citizenship and residence within its national borders. In a time of global terrorism, asymmetric warfare and open trade borders, the issue of illegal immigration must be considered as an aspect of National Security and not just an issue of social policy.

The liberal consensus on immigration must be balanced by the interests of National Security. Recent arrests of cells of Islamic terrorists living in the country plotting mass murder in Britain illustrate the link between illegal immigration and terrorism. The link between illegal immigration and crime in our communities – including the ruthless exploitation of the immigrants themselves - is also well documented.

We are the only political party that is pledged to take action on illegal immigration. We do not dodge the issue by using vacuous sound bites and shallow headlines, as the old parties do with their 'promises to do something' but intentions of doing next to nothing. We will do what it is required and we have firm plans as regards our policy on ending illegal immigration immediately, and reversing the tide of immigration in the longer term:

1. Our first step will be to shut the door. A BNP government would accept no further immigration from any of the parts of the world which present the prospect of an almost limitless flow of immigration: Africa, Asia, China, Eastern and South Eastern Europe, the Middle East and South America would all be placed on an immediate 'stop' list. This would later be subject to review in the case of genuine students accepted for training as part of our long-term policy of helping to build up Third World economies in order to facilitate the voluntary return of their nationals or their descendants under our long-term resettlement programme.
2. Inform the general public of a BNP government's immigration policy. This Primary Information Phase will consist of a full year of information and education publicity campaigns to explain to all sections of the British public exactly what the policy is going to be, and why it is needed. These high-profile information campaigns will be community-based and will use the languages of all the ethnic communities resident in the country, as well as English. This will also create the time to prepare the necessary state structures and resources that will be used to actively enact the policy once it is in operation.

The intention of the BNP Immigration Policy is to remove all illegal immigrants present within the United Kingdom in an orderly, lawful and humane manner through a planned Two Phase procedure. The First Phase will be dealt with by the Civil Courts and regarded as a civil matter, whilst the Second Phase will be dealt with by the Criminal Courts and regarded as a matter of National Security.

### **The First Phase: Voluntary Registration**

Those illegal immigrants who truthfully declare their illegal status to the authorities during the registration period will be able to claim, in the case of skilled and key workers, extended leave to remain in the United Kingdom as long as they are benefiting the UK economy and stay as residents until such time as we have had time to train British personnel to replace them.

During this period we would also strive to provide these regularized illegal key workers with extra training intended to increase their value to their home countries on their return.

All other illegal immigrants, including visa over-stayers, casual workers and ex-students will have one year to register their presence and assets they wish to liquidate and take with them. Upon registration they will become entitled to free flights home, and time before they leave to put their affairs here in order, including selling property and other legally acquired assets so as to be able to take the full value of their property (less any unpaid taxes and medical bills) with them when they and their families return home. This voluntary registration policy will last for a year. There will be no extensions.

Voluntary Registration cases will be dealt with by the Home Office through the Civil Courts in the event of any disputes arising over asset liquidation.

### **The Second Phase: Assisted Registration**

Those illegal immigrants resident in the UK who fail to register with the authorities and

declare their illegal status when the First Phase of the policy ends, will be dealt with solely by the Ministry for National Border Security and the Criminal Courts.

Registration will be an issue of National Security as regards those who, for whatever reason, do not declare their illegal entrant status to the authorities before the First Phase deadline expires. Those assisting illegal immigrants to stay in the UK will also be dealt with under the criminal law. Those who have failed to declare their illegal status will be immediately arrested and held in police custody until they are deported. Those illegal immigrants arrested with children born in the UK will be able to apply to be tagged in their own homes until a hearing in court as to the citizenship status of the children. No appeals on decisions of the Courts on matters of national security will be allowed.

The lack of registration status also involves the withdrawal of access to all civil legal remedies and procedures available to those with Registered Status and also withdrawal of the right to use State welfare provisions and institutions. All persons resident in UK territory from the expiry date of the First Phase who cannot provide a legitimate and verified National Insurance number on demand and provide full citizenship status or registered status documentation will be liable for immediate arrest and to be held in custody until proof of citizenship is proved.

Those who have been arrested will not be allowed to remove any assets from the country when they are deported.

### **Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving Britain**

The present regime is engaged in a profound cultural war against the British people, motivated by the desire to create a new ethnic power base to replace the working class which they have abandoned in pursuit of their enthusiasm for globalisation, justified by a quasi-Marxist ideology of the equality of all cultures. We intend to rebuild the basis of democracy in Britain, which is the right of all free-born Britons to debate in public the facts as they see them by restoring true freedom of speech to Britain.

Furthermore, when we speak of 'British democracy' we do so in an ethnic as well as a civic sense. We do not accept the absurd superstition – propagated for different though sometimes overlapping reasons by capitalists, liberals, Marxists and theologians – of human equality. Whether the now totally discredited feminist argument that men and women are innately the same, to the partly refuted egalitarian claim that everyone within a given population is born as a blank slate with the same innate potential, or to the still dominant Politically Correct denial of the existence of differences on average between members of different races – we reject all these irrational myths.

This must not be taken to mean or imply that we believe that any particular ethnic group or race is 'superior' or 'inferior'; we simply recognise that – as any biologist would be able to predict, and the new medical science of pharmacogenetics is now confirming – human populations which have undergone micro-evolutionary changes while being separated for many thousands of years have developed differences in many fields of endeavour, susceptibility to health problems, behavioural tendencies and such like.

To deny such differences on the grounds of egalitarian dogma has always been wrong, but to continue to do so in the light of the latest medical evidence is to condemn people to unnecessary suffering on account of racially specific health problems. We therefore believe that the myth that "we are all the same under the skin" will soon be as discredited as its feminist equivalent, and that all political parties will have to drastically amend their thinking to reflect the new reality in the not too distant future.

Taking these facts into account, we believe that it is far more likely than not that the historically established tendency (and we do not claim that it is any more than that) of the peoples of Western Europe in general – and of these islands in particular – to create and sustain social and political structures in which individual freedom, equality before the law, private property and popular participation in decision-making, is to some extent at least genetically pre-determined. Such tendencies would, naturally, both shape our culture around such institutions, and in turn tend to be reinforced by that culture.

If this is the case, then the idea that it is possible to allow large numbers of people from very different ethnic groups and cultures to settle here, on the assumption that it is just something about our bracing sea air that tends to make us natural born democrats, is fatally flawed. Just as is the idea that we can export our enthusiasm for representative government to other peoples, either by example or by carpet-bombing their countries into giving up their penchant for strong government or theocracy.

Hence, in order to guarantee the continued existence of our British democracy, we also intend to take long-term steps to guarantee the continued existence, as the clearly dominant ethnic, cultural and political group, of the native peoples of these islands – the English, Scots, Irish and Welsh – together with the limited numbers of peoples of European descent, who arrived as refugees or economic immigrants centuries or decades ago, and who have fully integrated into our society.

### **Multi-racialism – a recipe for disaster**

We are further encouraged to see this as essential by two other factors. The first is the truly gruesome record of multi-ethnic societies breaking down into hatred and mass murder. From Bosnia to Rwanda, Indonesia to Northern Ireland, one only has to scratch most of the conflicts in the world – ranging from low-level loathing to outright genocide – to find that at the root of the problem is the juxtaposition by past migration or strategic decision by a ruling class of two or more different peoples in the same piece of territory.

Again, this is no surprise. Scientists studying various primates have now discovered that murderous ‘wars’ against different groups of the same species are as frequent among our non-human relatives as they are among us. The tendency to conceive of our relationships with other human populations in terms of ‘in-groups’ and ‘out-groups’, is older than humanity itself. ‘Racism’, in other words, is not a consequence of ‘false consciousness’, economics, imperialism or the work of evil agitators, it is part of human nature.

The last idealistic egalitarian attempt to ignore and override human nature, Marxist economic determinism, led to disaster and human misery on an almost unimaginable scale. The lessons of history, and the growing tensions in the multi-ethnic society that the left-liberal elite have imposed on us in recent decades, all point to the likelihood that the closely-related egalitarian ‘multi-racial experiment’ will end in the same way. Our determination to avoid such a human tragedy is what drives us to risk imprisonment and persecution, and it is what allows us to say with confidence and sincerity that we are not ‘racists’, but realists.

### **Multi-culturalism – the enemy of human diversity**

Even if, against most prior historical experience, it proved to be possible to assimilate and integrate huge numbers of immigrants from other ethnic and cultural groups into Western societies without mayhem and bloodshed, we would still oppose it. This is because we believe that the principle that bio-diversity is an innate good – accepted by liberals for every form of life on this planet except Man – also applies to human cultures and populations.

There is clearly a deeply ingrained human need to ‘belong’ and to identify with people with whom one shares special things in common; we all have a need to feel ‘at home’. While this is generally met at one level by membership of a family, this is clearly not enough. But the idea that this need can be fulfilled by identification with the entire human race is an intellectual fantasy.

The human need to belong is best met at a ‘tribal’ level, and the best way to avoid such tribalism leading in turn to clashes with other tribes is to encourage its realization at the level of a genuine nation-state, particularly one whose dominant political elite regard their primary duty as being to mind their own nation’s business and looking after their own people. This half-way house between the expansionist Empire and the nihilistic football gang is the best hope for peace.

This is not something we desire only for ourselves, we recognise the right of all people to belong to a specific culture and to preserve the local particularisms which make us truly and fully human.

For most of human history, the existence of such ethnic and cultural diversity among humanity was so obvious and apparently unchallengeably natural that the political theorists and philosophers of past generations simply took it for granted. Only in the last few decades has this been changed forever by the advent of mass passenger travel, the insatiable desire of the globalised capitalist economy for cheap labour, and the worldwide reach of US consumerist culture through film and television.

As a result the entire world – or at least every nation of predominantly European descent – is now in the grip of a set of assumptions and prejudices about race, culture and integration that, however well-meaning in theory, are increasingly anti-human and even genocidal in practice.

While the often subtle differences between similar cultures make it hard for an outsider to tell where one ends and another starts, it is generally easier to distinguish between languages. Hence these are a very good indicator for the health or otherwise of human cultural and biological diversity.

So it should be deeply worrying to anyone who values traditional cultures and the rich patchwork of human variety to read what Prof. Bill Sutherland, Population Biologist at the University of East Anglia, has discovered about the status of the 6,800 languages of the world: Over the last five hundred years, they have been disappearing faster than species - 4.5% of total number have been lost over the last 500 years, compared with 1.3% of bird species and 1.9% of mammals.

None of which sounds too drastic. The real problem, however, is from here onwards. According to Prof. Sutherland at least half of mankind's 6,800 living languages will be dead by 2050, and 90% of them will be extinct by 2100. Every one of those extinctions will mean another group of people who are cut off from their roots and their ancestors by an unbridgeable chasm. Every single one diminishes the variety which makes our world such an interesting and wonderful place.

Among those at gravest risk are Welsh, Scots Gaelic and Irish Gaelic. And although English is one of the 10% of 'safe' languages, the fact remains that all the vanishing tongues should alert us, like so many miners' canaries, to the existence of an invisible but deadly poison which threatens every culture and distinct ethnic group in the world.

That poison is in large measure the blind economic force of global capitalism, with its insistence on the unrestricted flow of goods, capital and labour to wherever in the world they will make the maximum short-term profit. This, rather than a misty-eyed post-Christian fantasy about 'equality', post-Marxist fixation on turning refugees and immigrants into a surrogate proletariat, or post-Holocaust suspicion of European consciousness, is the real driving force behind multi-culturalism. It is not about 'love' and 'tolerance', it is about profit.

There is no conspiracy of wicked plutocrats or sinister Elders of Zion at work here, the unique cultural and ethnic groups that are being destroyed are not so much specifically targeted for elimination, they are just in the way of a conscience-free global money-making machine.

If this juggernaut is to be resisted, and the diversity which does so much to make us fully human preserved, then politicians of all hues have to rethink their attitudes to culture and identity. The natural resistance of all native peoples to the arrival of huge numbers of outsiders in their territory – whether loggers in the Amazon jungle or Third World settlers in Europe – must cease to be demonized as 'racism' and understood as a natural and laudable survival mechanism.

We must learn to avoid the temptation to allow arguments about short-term economic expediency to prevail over the rights of indigenous cultures and peoples to preserve their territorial and cultural integrity.

These considerations, rather than intolerance and bigotry are what informs the British National Party's determination not simply to stop any further mass immigration into the British Isles, but also to reverse the tide which has transformed vast areas of our country out of all recognition over the last fifty years. We, as the sole political representatives of the Silent Majority of the English, Scots, Irish and Welsh who

formed and were formed by our island home, have one overriding demand: We want our country back!

The proposals outlined below represent the only practical way to move towards that long-term goal. We recognise that a reversal of the tide of immigration can only be secured by negotiation and consent, and that it is probably now too late to anticipate a return to the status quo ante 1948.

On account of that, and also in the understanding that genocide through integration is a threat to all peoples across the world, we also intend to develop a model of 'multi-culturalism' which combines peaceful co-existence with the maintenance of cultural and biological separation. In parts of the world where mass immigration is irreversible, the only thing that can prevent human diversity vanishing into an antheap of rootless coffee-coloured consumerism is the celebration of difference.

Simply put, relationships between different ethnic and cultural groups sharing the same places need to settle down on lines closer to those practiced for centuries in Persia or India, than to those preached in Hollywood and on MTV. Different groups can live side-by-side and at peace for generations. They can even enjoy each other's cultures, but they must stick to their own, or 'diversity' will be but a short-lived stepping stone to nothingness.

### **Our proposals:**

1. We would repeal the Race Relations Acts and all other restrictions on free speech in Britain.
2. We would abolish all targets and quotas for ethnic representation in all areas of employment, public and private.
3. We would abolish all politically-correct indoctrination of the police, teachers, and other public employees.
4. We would abolish all government-sponsored ethnicity-specific professional bodies, housing associations, and other organisations.
5. We would abolish all departments, agencies, or other units of government whose sole and specific purpose is to deal with ethnic issues, grievances, or crimes. Such organisations deliberately seek out the maximum quantity of "racism" in order to justify their own existence and expand their power and budgets. The law is the law and must be enforced equally upon all without being politicised over ethnic differences.
6. We would abolish all laws against racial discrimination in employment and the government bodies associated with enforcing them.
7. Except for purposes of teaching foreign languages to native speakers of English, the only languages permitted in official documents, government business, and schools will be English, Scots, and Welsh. The use of other languages by ethnic minorities in their own homes, school and institutions will also be encouraged.
8. A Clause 28-style proscription against the promotion of racial integration in schools and the media would be introduced.
9. In order to make it clear that the "celebration of diversity" is something in which the native peoples of our islands can share, each of our traditional Saints Days would be made Public Holidays in the nations in question, with Trafalgar Day being an additional Public Holiday throughout the entire UK.
10. A massively-funded and permanent programme, using and doubling Britain's current foreign aid budget, will aim to reduce, by voluntary resettlement to their lands of ethnic origin, the proportion of ethnic minorities living in Britain, for as

long as the majority of the electorate are willing to fund such expenditure. Since the chief impact of such a programme would be the assistance it would render to Developing Countries in the Third World, this is described further in Section 16 – Britain and the World.

11. While accepting the right of law-abiding minorities, in our country because they or their ancestors came here legally, to remain here and to enjoy the full protection of the law against any form of harassment or hostility, we will also seek to emphasise the importance of the prior status of the aboriginal people. This would be a national extension of the 'Sons and Daughters' policy in priority on housing and school places lists which BNP councils seek to implement at local level.

We will publish a list of these British nationals preference proposals before the next major election.

### Culture, traditions and the civil society

We believe that the character of daily life in Britain is being corroded by the gradual but inexorable loss of many of the things that make Britain civilized. We believe that these things cannot be reduced, as the fake-conservative Thatcherite ideology fatally supposes, simply to economics. Nor can these things be provided, as Labour and the left imagine, by the expensive meddling of a socialist nanny-state. Tradition, heritage, and civility must be understood as goods in themselves, to be defended for their own sake.

This entails the following:

1. We demand the right to be proud of Britain again, and for the English, Scots, Welsh, Irish and Ulster peoples to be allowed to celebrate their identity and heritage with as much right as is accorded to other native peoples. We are entitled to a government that does not show, with everything it says and does, that it despises our country and urgently wishes to reshape it into something else.
2. We demand the right to preserve our culture, heritage, and identity. Our national character and native institutions are a precious inheritance, for which our ancestors have paid a high price over the centuries. They are not to be casually thrown away in the name of a "modernisation" that is often no more than a thinly-veiled cover for a quasi-Marxist cultural war against all things white, European and male.
3. We reject the idea that culture is just something to be bought and sold by corporations. Such a view, while pretending to evince the mere operation of free public choice in a free market, in fact imposes upon us whatever culture - frequently of low quality and alien provenance - multinational media corporations wish to impose, whether we like it or not.
4. We support a return to traditional standards of civility and politeness in British life. Standards of politeness must be taught in school, demanded of government employees in their interactions with the public and exemplified on the BBC. Soap operas, for instance, should seek to portray slightly 'higher' than real-life behaviour as the norm, rather than setting out to show ordinary people - in particular the white working class - in the most negative and unattractive light possible.
5. We support the restoration of our town centres and a return to traditional architecture. Broadly speaking, we are in agreement with the views expressed by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in his book *A Vision of Britain*. We will aim at the gradual elimination of tower blocks and the development of wasteland in our urban centres, according to traditional British urban forms. We will not allow the proliferation of out-of-town shopping centres to destroy traditional high street shopping areas. We will impose a special tax on the supermarkets, the proceeds of which will be used to help small businesses resist their efforts to monopolise the retail trade, and to keep our town centres alive.
6. We will ensure that appropriate areas of public life, including school assemblies, are based on a commitment to the values of traditional Westernised Christianity. Levels of religiosity have always fluctuated in Britain, and while our great inheritance of cathedrals, churches and liturgies has less resonance with the broad mass of the population at present, the wheel of faith will one day turn again and they will be fully valued once more.

### Art and Culture

Schools in England will be encouraged to celebrate May Day and other ancient festivals, whilst the other folk nations of the British Isles will be encouraged to resurrect their ancestral folk traditions.

We will introduce the requirement that all children will be taught English as their first language in Britain, but also learn about their local ancestral language as well. This will apply to Welsh, Cornish, Manx, Scots Gaelic, Doric or Lallans in Great Britain, and Ulster Lallans and Gaelic in Northern Ireland. English children will also be given an appreciation of the language of the Anglo-Saxon folk and to appreciate the beauty of Anglo-Saxon culture, such as its poetry, art and the meaning of citizenship.

Those from foreign ethnic backgrounds resident in Britain will be given the choice of either having their children educated in Faith or Folk schools that will teach them the traditions and heritage of their ancestral cultures, or of attending classes in schools that educate them about their ancestral heritage. We believe that all children suffer when deprived of their right to an ancestral identity and contact with their cultural roots.

We will encourage black and ethnic minority schools and religious schools run by parents and staff that educate those children as to their ancestral heritage and instil pride in their culture and ethnicity.

The handing out of National Lottery funds to so-called 'modern art' projects that insult and degrade (as of course they are intended to) the very name of art, has become a minor national scandal, almost as bad as the way in which money from the same fund is repeatedly handed to politically correct rather than popular causes. The boards which decide on lottery grant applications should be picked by ballot from lists of individuals who have raised significant sums of money for local charities, not appointed by the government or other members of the out-of-touch liberal elite.

Music, including training to play a musical instrument, should be compulsory in schools between the ages of five and fourteen. From fourteen upwards, every effort should be made to encourage those children who have shown musical talent to play for their own and their peers' entertainment.

## **Tough on the causes of crime – Criminals**

Despite the unprecedented sums being spent on the police, Britain today faces record crime rates. Traditional and effective bobby-on-the-beat policing has been abandoned in favour of expensive and intrusive technological toys, such as CCTV cameras and over-reliance on patrol cars. Police management has lost its focus on preventing crime and has become a variety of politically-correct social work more concerned with the rights of criminals than with those of their victims.

We intend to rebuild the social contract where the criminal was afraid of the police and decent citizens were protected by the law. The liberal consensus which sees the criminal as the victim and the victim as the criminal will be abolished, and Politically Correct senior police officers, who clearly prefer helping the Exchequer squeeze extra stealth taxes out of Middle Britain to catching burglars, will be replaced.

1. We will ensure that the main priority of the police be returned to that of the prevention and punishment of crime, and we will abolish all politically-correct distractions from this mission.
2. We will return, so far as conditions permit, to traditional foot and bicycle patrol policing and reduce reliance on police cars.
3. We will end the legal system's harassment of fathers by means of the Child Support Agency and change the outdated presumption in favour of maternal custody in divorce cases to one of joint custody.
4. We support the re-introduction of corporal punishment for petty criminals and vandals, and the restoration of capital punishment for paedophiles, terrorists and murderers as an option for judges in cases where their guilt is proven beyond dispute, as by DNA evidence or being caught red-handed.
5. We believe in 'Restorative Justice' - all fines imposed by the Courts will be given to the victims not the government. Criminals will be forced to repair any damage they have done in the community.
6. We will abolish the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) rules, whereby the last Conservative government placed the handcuffs of bureaucracy on the police. We pay police officers to deter crime and catch criminals, not to fill in forms or act as uniformed social workers.
7. We believe that there is a strong argument for making entire families financially responsible for the cost of crimes committed by one of their members. This was the ancient Anglo-Saxon system, and would apply a huge amount of pressure on young tearaways in particular to mend their ways. Would it be unfair? Sometimes, perhaps, but not as unfair as the present shambles where millions live in fear of crime, most of which is committed by a relatively small number of serial offenders who have very little fear of the present weak criminal justice system.
8. We will return to traditional police uniforms, as opposed to the militarised and pseudo-hi-tech costumes that have undermined this powerful symbol of traditional unarmed civil authority. It must be remembered that the police are the servants of the people, not of the State.
9. Directly linked to point 8, we will reverse the trend of recent decades whereby the State has sought to grant to the police a total monopoly on the enforcement of the law and acceptable standards of behaviour. This will entail changes in the law and the 'culture' of law enforcement.

Such changes will range from accepting that adults in a community may, on rare occasions, clip badly behaved kids around the ear (subject, of course, as they always were, to commonsense interpretations of Common Law restrictions and obligations) through to the introduction of a 'Tony Martin' law permitting householders to use any force they deem necessary to deal with a burglar in their own homes.

10. Criminals should be made to serve their full sentences, with time added for bad behaviour. The only way out of prison 'early' should be a maximum 20% reduction in return for a clear demonstration of the acquisition of genuinely useful skills, or full rehabilitation in the case of drug addicts, whereupon Parole Boards should have the power to release such model prisoners, tagged and under tight restrictions doing restorative work within the community.
11. Given the role of drugs and addiction involved in so much crime, the present pitiful provision of a mere 2,500 drug rehabilitation places nationwide is a false economy, as well as a national shame. We would oversee a one hundred-fold increase in this figure, to be in place within six months of coming to office. The staff and money for this vital social service and anti-crime measure will be provided from cuts made in various of the parasitic and useless public sector jobs identified later in this Manifesto.
12. While every effort will be made to help addicts to recover, individuals convicted of the importation and large-scale dealing of hard drugs will face the death penalty.

### Social inclusion – One healthy nation

As nationalists we are committed to caring for and nurturing all sections of our national community. We also oppose the tendency of the other, non-nationalist, parties to set different sections of the community against each other over problems for which they themselves as politicians are largely responsible. The creation and maintenance of an undercurrent of national solidarity is one of the cornerstones of a true national democracy.

### The NHS

We are wholly committed to a free, fully funded National Health Service for all British citizens. Contrary to popular political and 'right-wing' myth, the British NHS is actually very good value for money – the problem is that we do not put enough money into 'front-end' staff. The key reason that our health service is in many ways inferior to those of other leading industrial nations is that we spend less on it than they do.

In 2001, for example, we spent 7.6% of GDP on health. The figure in France was 9.5%, in Germany 10.7% and in the 'privatised' USA a mind-boggling 13.9%. ([www.gao.gov/cghome/hccrisis/img11.html](http://www.gao.gov/cghome/hccrisis/img11.html))

It is clear that the American system of privatised health care is extremely wasteful in terms of the cost of fragmented administration and paying for a vast system of private health insurance companies.

The figures above give the lie to the efforts of assorted old party politicians and monetarist ideologues to 'talk-down' the NHS and push us towards a national switch to private health care. The real reason for such efforts is that such people have already made their minds up to be opposed to the NHS in principle.

This position is also widely spread within both the Labour and Conservative parties. Since they know, however, that open talk of dismantling the NHS would lead to catastrophic election defeat, they dare not advocate it openly. Instead, the plan is to run down the existing health service until it is in such a state that the public themselves demand radical change – at which the privatisation 'option' will be brought out into the open.

"How hard is it to keep a hospital clean?" Very hard, when the last Tory government replaced ward-based staff cleaners with contract cleaning staff as part of their disastrous 'marketisation' policy, and the Blair regime continued with the same dangerous system in order to keep down costs.

Once again, however, it is necessary to remind ourselves that the driving force behind such partial privatization and cynical exploitation of problems to impose desired solutions, is not any actual financial need, but the complete commitment of the entire Westminster political Establishment to globalisation in general, and the World Trade Organisation rules in particular. Under these, all signatories (including Britain) agree to ensure a 'level economic playing field' between different countries by removing all 'subsidies' on labour in their own countries. Many of the social welfare provisions won for the working class by social democratic parties in the last century – council housing and state-funded healthcare in particular – fall foul of this agreement.

In addition, of course, the giant for-profit corporations which are poised to move into such potentially lucrative 'markets' have their own ways of persuading previously 'principled' politicians and media pundits to come round to their way of thinking and start to promote the bogus case for such services.

Our belief is that dealing with sickness is not something that can either morally or economically be done for a profit. As the only serious party in Britain to oppose

globalisation, the BNP utterly rejects such chicanery, and gives the British people a real choice by putting the case for a fully-funded NHS, while dealing with the genuine problems that will otherwise give the globalist politicians the opportunity they are looking for to do away with it. We will ensure that Britain has an effective, sustainable and free National Health Service by enacting legislation to ensure that

1. There is an immediate end to the counter-productive 'culture' of targets in healthcare. All these achieve is to push staff and administrators to cut corners, find ways to fiddle the statistics and to deal with insignificant but easily dealt with health problems while leaving the smaller numbers of the chronically sick to wait for even longer. All health care should revert to being assessed on the grounds of patient need, not bureaucratic targets.
2. Staff numbers are boosted, slashing unnecessary bureaucracy and by addressing the root cause of low recruitment and retention - low pay. There is no shortage of beds in the NHS, only of staff to look after the patients who should be in them.
3. Doctors and nurses are given interest free mortgages from the government to buy houses in areas where their services are needed.
4. The hospital crèches which were done away with under the last Conservative government are re-established, making it much easier for nurses to return to work after taking time off to have children.
5. Experiments are carried out into the opening of 'term-time' wards, run mainly by staff with school-age children. This would be used to clear backlogs of minor operations.
6. The asset stripping of the doctors and nurses of the developing world ends, and all future British doctors and nurses – except for rare experts required to teach new skills and techniques - are recruited and trained within Britain.
7. Abolish the bursary system for student nurses and pay them a decent wage during their training.
8. More emphasis is placed on healthy living with greater understanding of sickness prevention through physical exercise, a healthier environment and improved diets. All multi-choice school canteens should be closed down as soon as enough catering staff have been trained to return to traditional school meals eaten in properly supervised dining halls. Hospitals should wherever possible buy locally produced food, which will be fresher and healthier as well as supporting local businesses and strengthening the links between hospitals and their communities.
9. Introduce a programme whereby sophisticated new equipment comes automatically with proper training for sufficient operators to make the best use of it. At present it is common for items such as MRI Scanners, often bought thanks to great efforts by League of Friends groups, lie unused because there are no staff available to them.
10. We extend the 'polluter pays' principle from environmental damage to the impact of processed foods as well. The link between highly processed products such as white sugar and flour and a wide variety of degenerative diseases is so well proven as to make it entirely reasonable to insist that the producers and vendors of such junk should pay extra tax to help society as a whole cover the cost of the damage that goes hand in hand with their profits.
11. An effective fight against MRSA by the immediate replacement of contract cleaners with ward-based auxiliaries. Also a return to in-hospital laundries for all

staff uniforms, which are rarely washed at a sufficiently hot temperature now that staff are forced to take their dirty uniforms home and wash them themselves as part of yet another short-sighted cost-cutting exercise which typifies what happens when health services are run by bureaucrats rather than experienced medical staff.

12. The burden imposed on our NHS by treating imported diseases such as TB and the new wave of heterosexual AIDS is removed forthwith. In addition to refusing to allow their carriers entry into Britain, or deporting those already here, we would also introduce a massive public health awareness campaign on the danger of choosing high-risk groups as sexual partners. This may be Politically Incorrect, but it would save many innocent lives and save huge amounts of money which are needed for other patients.
13. We support wholeheartedly the nursing unions' campaign for Zero Tolerance for violence directed against NHS staff. Such incidents should carry an automatic prison sentence, and the withdrawal of all medical care from the culprits for a period which should vary according to the severity of their attack on NHS staff.
14. Medical research facilities researching the potential for global pandemics of deadly viruses, and ways in which to combat them, must receive immediate and massive increases in funding.

Finally, there clearly is a problem building up in the long-term as a result of new medical technologies making it possible to keep people alive well beyond previously realistic expectations – albeit at huge cost and often with very limited quality of life. To state that this issue needs to be debated and addressed is not to propose euthanasia in any way, but merely to recognise that death is a natural and unavoidable end for us all, and that there comes a point at which fighting it is neither humane nor affordable for society as a whole. This, however, is not a matter for political manifestos or parties, but for a full and informed national debate and decision by referendum.

### **A fair deal for our pensioners**

It is a national disgrace that people who have worked all their lives, paid in to the system and raised families forced to live on the lowest state pension of any Western European nation except Portugal. There is also a potential danger in that, if unresolved, the growing pensions crisis and the steady ageing of the population could lead to damaging friction between pensioners and people of working age. This would be particularly dangerous if the pensioners are overwhelmingly native Britons and the workers are immigrants with no ties of blood or sentiment to the older generation. The long-term solution to this problem is the recreation of a manufacturing base capable of generating the national wealth required to pay for the social benefits which are a mark of a civilised society and a united nation.

1. We pledge to ensure that all our pensioners receive a minimum £10 increase on the current (April 2005) weekly basic of £79.60 and to rebuild the national housing stock so as to enable them to live in comfortable, adequately heated homes. A major part of this increase could come from the £2–3 billion annual cost of the asylum system.
2. We would also restore the link between pensions and the rise in national earnings – abolished by the last Tory government and not restored under Labour – as the current system whereby annual pension increases linked to the cost of living index has meant that our pensioners' quality of life has fallen further and further behind.

3. We would ensure that no-one has to sell their home to pay for nursing care. This would also remove a source of discontent among those pensioners who have saved during their working life to look after themselves in old age and feel that under the present system “they need not have bothered”. To be forced to sell the family home is yet another disincentive to work hard and save for the future.

In 2004, £4.26 billion was spent by Social Services for residential/nursing home provision. However, £1.63 billion was recovered from pensioners who had to pay all or part of the charges. Therefore, this is the very maximum amount that it would cost to implement the BNP policy of eliminating the requirement that pensioners are liable to sell their home for residential care. It is expected that those pensioners with adequate private pensions would be expected to make a contribution to residential care or nursing home costs. The extra cost to Social Services that ensuring the continuity of the family home would entail could well come out of the £8 billion Britain would save annually by withdrawing from the EU.

4. In implementing the above new deal for pensioners we would eliminate the present means-tested Pensions Credit system. This involves an expensive bureaucracy to implement and is felt to be degrading by many proud elderly people. Means testing also hits medium income people the hardest, as the rich do not need pensions and benefits such as winter fuel allowance – which the BNP would continue.
5. In order to help to alleviate the alleged labour and skills shortage which is used by Establishment politicians as a propaganda excuse for continued mass immigration, we would allow active pensioners to continue working beyond retirement age without paying any income tax on their earnings, while that tax is being phased out.

Once the reduced burden of taxation on ordinary people has been shifted from falling on their income to their expenditure, it will obviously be necessary to compensate pensioners by giving them very substantial increases in their pensions. These will be financed with some of the savings made by not having to operate the massively expensive system required to collect income tax.

### Education for a British future

We are against the 'trendy' teaching methods that have made Britain one of the most poorly educated nations in Europe. These are based upon neo-Marxist egalitarianism, which has done untold damage both to the fabric of our nation and to an entire generation whose average level of attainment is now lower than before the introduction of universal state education.

We reject egalitarianism, and base our plans for the education system on the scientific fact that different individuals are born with different abilities and potentials. All are entitled to the same chance of realizing their own potential, but this cannot be done by forcing them all into a low-grade 'one-size-fits-all' education system.

Under the present regime Britain is rapidly becoming the worst-educated major nation in Europe. This threatens us with economic decline, a barbaric culture, and a citizenry that cannot think well enough to govern itself. We intend to rebuild the entire British educational system in order that future generations of British children are not lost to illiteracy and selfish ill-discipline.

This has not come about by accident or due to mysterious forces like "permissiveness" or "the 60's." It has been the result of deliberate attempts by the left to abandon the traditional purpose of schools – to educate – in favour of using them as instruments of social levelling and politically-correct indoctrination, combined with the right's economics-obsessed lack of interest in the problem.

We will end the practice of politically correct indoctrination in all its guises and restore discipline in the classroom, give authority back to teachers and put far greater emphasis on training young people in the industrial and technological skills necessary in the modern world. We will abolish student tuition fees – which are a stealth tax upon education, and create apprenticeships in our rebuilt manufacturing industry.

We will also seek to instil in our young people knowledge of and pride in the history, cultures, and heritage of the native peoples of Britain.

Prior to our forming a government, we will fight tooth and nail against the looming catastrophe of forced integration within secondary schools. As a result of the recommendations in the New Labour-sponsored reports into the riots in northern English towns in 2001, a massive programme of social engineering is about to begin. This will involve the demolition of dozens – in due course probably hundreds – of perfectly good schools, and their replacement with brand new premises in which pupils from different ethnic minorities are mixed through bussing schemes which will rightly be resented and resisted by all communities.

We are opposed to this entire scheme on three grounds: The huge sums of money involved would be far better spent upgrading existing schools; it will add to the racial tensions, hatred and violence that various other old party policies have fostered in these areas, and it is based on the destructive and anti-human extermination through integration model of community relations we have already condemned in our section on multi-culturalism.

### Key Policies on Primary & Secondary Schooling

1. All staff at teacher training colleges will face compulsory re-evaluation and re-training. The egalitarian and anti-British dogmas that have betrayed a generation will be rooted out and replaced with a commitment to competition, excellence and British culture.
2. We will reopen every closed grammar school, and will allow every community that wants such a school to open one.

3. We will restore all of the old exams that have been abolished, starting with the "A" and "O" Levels, and will reverse the dumbing down of those that have not been dumbed down.
4. We will reverse the dumbing down of school curricula and teaching aids, and raise expectations back to the levels of the past.
5. We will replace the study of world history and cultures with a predominant emphasis on the history of the British Isles, English, Welsh, Scottish and Irish culture, and their relation to Western Civilization as a whole. We will prohibit all curricular pandering to the cultures of immigrants.
6. PSE lessons, which are nothing more than left-liberal indoctrination sessions, will be scrapped. When it comes to decisions about civic matters, children should be taught how to think, rather than what to think.
7. We will systematically eliminate bureaucratic positions in the schools and reallocate their salaries to hiring actual teachers, buying textbooks, and other direct needs.
8. We will eliminate nonsense subjects and reallocate funding and the time of pupils to traditional subjects like reading, writing, and maths.
9. We will inculcate a meritocratic attitude in the education system so that pupils of all class backgrounds can rise as far as their abilities will take them. We will prohibit the promotion of an expectation of failure for working-class pupils.
10. We recognise that the Labour policy of closing special needs schools and forcing their pupils through the mainstream education system is a policy imposed for reasons of egalitarian dogma and short-sighted cost-cutting. It is harmful both to the special needs children who are unable to cope in conventional schools, and to normal children whose education is disrupted or held back by the extra strain imposed on teachers by having to cope with such mixed abilities. We would therefore reverse the closure of special needs schools.
11. We recognise that especially gifted children also have special needs, and would make extra resources available to enable them to reach their outstanding potential.
12. We will end the dumping of anti-social expelled students on other districts. Exclusion policies should be in the hands of head teachers and governors, not bureaucrats.
13. Council education authorities should be abolished and the money swallowed up by their bureaucracies given instead to each individual school. Co-ordination between schools should be organized on a county basis by the head teachers.
14. Competitive sport must be reintroduced and encouraged at all levels of the education system.
15. In order to combat unhealthy eating, including eating disorders and the consumption of over-processed junk food, all schools will be required to provide proper traditional meals, using locally-sourced ingredients wherever possible. This is an ideal use for the less than aesthetically perfect fruit and vegetables produced by organic farmers which supermarkets claim are unsaleable.
16. We will aim to make a good high-school education sufficient for many professions, eliminating the need for expensive university degrees where they are not called for.
17. We will re-introduce assemblies based on traditional Christian values and worship.

### Key Policies on University Education

1. We reject the idea that the left is entitled to institutionalised control of higher education and through this means impose its ideas on the rest of the nation. We will require ideological balance on university faculties.
2. We will abolish the Access Regulator and all other politically-correct attempts to undermine university standards in the name of social leveling.
3. On satisfactory completion of their period of National Service, all suitably qualified youngsters will become eligible to receive a university education (just as the less academic will be entitled to proper paid apprenticeships or training and aid in running their own businesses) without fees or debts.
4. We will systematically de-fund nonsense disciplines and will not provide grants or loans for such studies.
5. We will increase funding for areas of value to the nation, like high technology and traditional culture. We believe higher education must serve both our economy and the maintenance of our culture and national identity.
6. We will use bursaries to encourage students to study difficult, unpopular, or long-course subjects that are in the national interest, such as science, technology and medicine.
7. We will fund industrial-incubator laboratories and other means by which university research is made useful to industry.

### Britain-first economics – The antidote to globalism

The BNP stands for a British national economy and is opposed to globalism, international socialism, laissez-faire capitalism and economic liberalism. We stand for rebuilding a strong national economy operating solely in the national interest. We favour as much national self sufficiency as is practicably possible. We will trade with other nations when it is the best interests of our people and nation to do so.

Although Britain in 2005 enjoys a fragile prosperity redolent of the "you never had it so good" years of the 1950s, thoughtful citizens realize that this is built upon a foundation of rising debt and record trade deficits and is therefore unsustainable. The present regime and its Establishment opponents have without exception abandoned the attempt to run the economy for the benefit of Britain, surrendering simultaneously to the strangling statism of Euro-regulations and to an international free market that has no loyalty to this country.

We are economic nationalists, and we believe it is the duty of the government to proactively run the economy for the benefit of the nation. We reject the current myth that this is impossible, and point out that there are many examples of nations who follow precisely such a policy. Economics is a highly-structured body of thought, and this can be achieved by systematically thinking through what economic nationalism means and how it differs from the policies of the current regime. Therefore we present the following Twelve Axioms of Economic Nationalism as the core of our thinking:

**Axiom 1:** Economic policy is not a matter of inevitabilities; there is room for choices and the right choices can be effective.

The reigning myth of economics – which goes under names like "Thatcherism," "neo-liberalism," "the Washington Consensus," and "laissez-faire," is that there is very little a government can do about its economy other than submit to the dictates of the international marketplace and its one-size-fits-all model. We observe, however, that in truth many nations around the world have thrived economically while defying this model, the most brilliant examples being the tiger states of East Asia like Japan, South Korea, and Singapore. No sane nation simply accepts the hand dealt to it by the forces of international capitalism, but rather seeks to play the game of the world economy to its own advantage.

**Axiom 2:** The fundamental concern of the government's economic policy-making must be the material well-being of the British people.

This sounds obvious, but recent governments have not believed this. The Tories have simply surrendered to an international free market that doesn't care a whit about Britain over Timbuktu, and Labour is primarily interested in preparing Britain's economy to be soldered into a European super state.

**Axiom 3:** The material well-being of the British people is similar to, but not identical with, Britain's economic well-being.

The key point here is that not all aspects of material well-being are part of the economy. For example, a home-cooked meal may be superior to one eaten out, but the economic statistics record the labour of preparing this meal in a café but not at home. The same is true of a child cared for at home rather than in a day-care center. This creates the illusion that we have a higher material standard of living when we purchase things that used to be produced within the traditional family, which illusion has been a key part of the attack on the traditional family.

There are other examples of how the fetish for GNP misrepresents our material well-being. The fact that environmental degradation doesn't show up in the figures is one. Another is the fact that a safe neighborhood that needs no private security guards shows a lower level of economic output than a dangerous neighborhood where every business has to hire them. Hordes of lawyers settling disputes by expensive litigation are another.

We reject the mistake the current economic establishment makes of confusing economic output with material well-being.

**Axiom 4:** The economic well-being of Britain is more-or-less a function of per-capita GNP, not aggregate GNP.

This little point undoes a huge amount of sophistry that is currently being put about in economic policy, principally with regards to immigration. The current Establishment keeps yapping about how immigration is supposedly good for the economy. All this means is that immigration increases Britain 's aggregate GNP, a natural consequence of increasing the number of persons working here. It does not mean that immigration increases per-capita GNP. In fact, because immigrants tend to be cheap laborers who are less productive than the average Briton, immigration actually decreases per-capita GNP. Furthermore, because productivity is a function of capitalisation-per-worker, immigration dilutes productivity by increasing the number of workers dependent on the given capital stock. We will not try to expand our economy by dumping foreign labor into it.

**Axiom 5:** The economic well-being of Britain is more precisely a function of the income of the average British family.

It is no secret that since Thatcher, economic growth in this country has tended to flow to the top of the income scale. While this does increase per-capita income, it means that the beneficiaries of this income do not include a large portion of this country. Britain has a much higher level of economic inequality than comparable countries, and this is inexcusable.

Of course, it is no secret that the old-style socialist methods of redistributing income down the scale turned out to have harmful effects, so unfortunately it is not just a matter of taxing income away from the rich and towards the working class. But there are other policy tools that can be used to reduce income inequality. The BNP will use all non-destructive means to reduce income inequality.

**Axiom 6:** Economic well-being must take inflation accurately into account.

Rising incomes mean nothing if the cost of living is rising just as fast. The present government is lying about inflation by excluding housing costs, which are a significant part of the average family's budget, from the inflation rate. House prices in Britain, particularly in the southeast, have been allowed to skyrocket in recent years to the point where many ordinary people who don't own houses cannot afford to acquire them and those who pay rent must spend an excessive portion of their income. Can this possibly have something to do with the fact that over 300,000 foreigners have moved into the southeast since 1990? Of course it can. Immigration also drives up the cost of everything else in the economy that has a real-estate component -- everything from shop rents to car prices -- as our supply of land is finite. The BNP will fight these immigration-driven rises in the cost of living and report a truthful inflation figure.

**Axiom 7:** The income of British workers is a function of how big the “profit pie” is at the companies where they work and how big a “slice of the pie” workers get compared with management and owners.

This sounds obvious, but the major parties have tended to forget this. Tories and New Labour only care about the first, and old-fashioned socialists care about the second and take the first for granted. Unions, for example, can fight to extract a bigger share of the pie for their members at the expense of management, but they generally don’t do much to make the pie itself larger. The BNP supports strong unions and strong industries, and the kind of unions that work for the health of their industries.

**Axiom 8:** Sustainable income is what counts.

Unlike the old parties, the BNP wants Britain to still be here for our children and grandchildren. Economic “quick fixes” abound, but they all exact a price in the long run. For example, unions that exact wage increases which their employers can’t afford, just produce corporate bankruptcies and redundancies. Governments that spend borrowed money just saddle future taxpayers with the need to pay interest. The BNP will not pursue quick fixes, unlike Labour leftists like Gordon Brown, who wants to borrow his way to better public services.

**Axiom 9:** Wages are set by the supply and demand for labour, so immigration drives down wages by increasing supply.

Establishment economists have this odd quirk: they teach all day that the price of any given commodity is determined by its supply and demand, and then they conveniently forget this when it comes to labour. Why? Because obviously the establishment wants labour to be as cheap as possible. It is in the interest of the average British worker to minimize the supply and maximize the demand for his labor. The BNP will not allow immigration to Britain and will implement the orderly repatriation of past immigrants.

**Axiom 10:** Sustainable income is a product of the investment in British industry

What makes Britain a first-world country, rather than an economic basket-case, is the fact that British workers have hundreds of years of accumulated capital equipment to work with. This means the long-term prosperity of this country is a matter of having the highest possible level of capitalisation. Unless the capital flows in from abroad, which just means that the profits must flow out again, the capitalisation of British industry is a function of how much money Britons save. Furthermore, a high savings rate is a good thing because it helps provide for people in their retirement. The BNP will support policies designed to raise the national savings rate, like the replacement of income tax with a progressive consumption tax.

**Axiom 11:** Owners should work, and workers should own.

If ordinary Britons increase their savings rate and invest the money in British industry, it will over time transpire that they are the owners of British industry. This has been called “pension-fund socialism,” and it combines the efficiency of capitalist private ownership with socialism’s ideal of worker ownership of the means of production. It also gives workers an incentive to care about the long-term health of the companies

they work for, as they are part owners. It is also a pro-nationalist policy, as it tends to bring the ownership of British industry into British hands. The BNP supports the gradual assumption of worker ownership through their pension funds.

**Axiom 12:** Well-educated workers get better paid.

No serious person disputes this, but Britain's education system still doesn't reflect this insight very well. Britain suffers from a class-based bias in favor of impractical education and against technology education that is absent in more prosperous nations like Germany, Japan, and the United States. The BNP supports better education, particularly in those disciplines and institutions most relevant to the bulk of British industry, like the polytechnics. We support the systematic rebuilding of the pure and applied scientific prowess that supports industrial research.

## **Extending ownership and responsibility**

The current pensions crisis was created largely by Gordon Brown's smash-and-grab tax raids on pension funds. But even without that it is clear that the cost of providing for a steadily ageing population is a major concern that responsible politicians must address. The facile UKIP or Sun answer that all such difficulties can be addressed by spending and re-spending the massive but finite amounts of money at presented wasted on EU membership or asylum seekers is no real solution.

In the end, decent pension provision can only be financed from the productive capacity of the generation which is working at that moment. Money saved during a worker's employed life has to be invested somewhere, and the return which pays the pension comes from the extra wealth that money generates now.

The provision of long-term sustainable pensions therefore depends on the rebuilding of profitable and sustainable British industry. This in turn cannot be achieved simply by assuming that our foreign competitors will concentrate on traditional manufacturing and leave the high-tech computer for us to use as our passport to prosperity. The idea - implicit in the old parties' tunnel vision on this sector as the source of future employment and profit - that people in the Far East are incapable of seeing and acting on the same opportunity is, curiously, fundamentally racist.

The truth is that Britain will only be able to sustain the social welfare benefits that are recognised by all parties as the hallmarks of a stable and civilized society if we rebuild a broad-based manufacturing economy.

The starting point for this must be the election of a nationalist government that has not bought in to globalist dogma and which recognises that it is a primary responsibility of government to create, preserve and strengthen the overall framework within which individuals and companies working in a general atmosphere of private enterprise competition can thrive.

In calling for a nation in which responsibility is prized, we begin with the fact that the government itself must accept responsibility for the overall well-being and direction of the economy, rather than hiding behind the decisions of independent banks, currency speculators and the people running other nations' economies.

In the run-up to this General Election, the loss under New Labour of one million manufacturing jobs has been compounded by the shattering blow of the collapse of one hundred years of British car-manufacturing at Rover. Foreign competition from companies with good designs, excellent products, supportive governments and often lower wages than ours is the obvious reason, but the real reasons for the slow death of British manufacturing is to be found at home:

Bad management; high taxation; workforces without a real stake in their companies; chronic under-investment (largely as a result of a taxation system that penalizes productivity and saving, and rewards spending); an education system and salary differentials that push most of the nation's best brains into essentially parasitic professions such as the law, the management of bureaucracies and advertising, and a succession of governments with a positive aversion to anything which smacks of a patriotic procurement policy or even national pride in general.

Turning these problems around and reviving the industrial and technological base on which our survival as a First World country depends will require an enormous effort. The resources required can only be mobilized by a government that sets out to play the guiding role in our national revival, rather than managing our continued decline and pretending that tourism and selling each other imported consumer goods will allow us to keep ourselves in careless luxury.

There is a great deal for us to learn in the way in which the Japanese Ministry of Finance has overseen and helped to create the conditions which enabled the tiny, over-crowded and almost resource-free island of Japan to recover from being utterly crushed in 1945 to being the global economic super-power which she is today.

Obviously there are many differences between our situations, our peoples and our cultures, so we do not envisage a direct carbon copy of the Japanese system, rather the creation of a Westernised version of it. As nationalists we expect to “do things our way”, but we are not too proud to learn from others who have enjoyed success in areas where our Masters have delivered us only demoralizing failure.

In keeping with our commitment to parliamentary democracy, it will of course be necessary for the British National Bank (based on the Bank of England) to be directly responsible to the pan-British parliament. Further details of how this system will work will be published before the next major election, once our Economic Strategy Group has had the time to research this crucial matter much more thoroughly.

### **Britain? Whose Britain?**

Past nationalist proposals for reviving British industry have tended to begin and end with a plan to protect British industry by erecting tariff barriers, and then leaving conventional capitalist businesses to take advantage of the newly favourable trading conditions to rebuild our manufacturing base while making themselves huge profits.

We, however, are acutely aware that tariffs on foreign manufactured goods are also an added tax on the ordinary families who buy those goods. And as radical nationalists we do not intend to tax our own people white in order to benefit the self-same companies and businessmen who have spent the last few decades maximizing profits by shipping in cheap labour and shipping out British jobs. Our new industrial and technological revolution must benefit the Many, not just the few.

Since we are not egalitarian socialists, it is not our intention to run around expropriating existing businesses, but we are determined to ensure that social justice is done, and the incentive value of personal ownership is built-in to as much of our rebuilt manufacturing economy as possible.

Wherever new industries are created, therefore, worker-ownership schemes will be implemented as far as is practical. In smaller concerns the presumption will be in favour of workers' co-operatives; in larger ones for share-ownership, profit-sharing and management board places.

This plan to extend personal private ownership is not an optional whim, but an integral part of our entire vision for Britain. Nor is it confined to the means of industrial production. The fresh food sections of supermarkets, in particular, are a prime target for conversion into owner-run ‘urban markets’. And in view of their bosses' long record of exploiting British consumers and farmers, and of financing political parties and unhealthy technologies guaranteed to give them even more clout and profits, the supermarkets are entirely legitimate targets for radical and legally enforced change.

The same is true of land ownership, particularly arable land. As noted in our section on Agriculture, the creation of an entire new class of independent family farms is at the core of our plans for Britain's countryside, food production and increased health.

We have no intention of setting the disastrous precedent of expropriation of existing landowners – with the exception of speculators and such like who are actually guilty of crimes such as tax evasion and fraud against present laws. But we will undertake a series of measures intended to create the circumstances in which large numbers of young people can obtain the training, experience, land, homes and capital they need to return to the land of their ancestors as productive owner-farmers.

Apart from the many health, long-term economic and environmental arguments in favour of such moves to expand the ranks of the owners of productive property, there is one very important political reason: This is the fact that the assumption by the government of the responsibility of directing (though not running) the commanding heights of the economy will inevitably lead to a very significant growth in the power of the State.

In order to keep under control the State's inherent tendency to add more power to existing power (yes, even our State, for it is the nature of the beast), it is necessary to look for ways to balance an increase in the power of central government with an increase in some other area in the power of ordinary people.

Turning growing numbers of 'hands', 'wage slaves', 'workers by hand or brain' or middle class contract workers – call them what you will – into the personal owners of their own tiny share of our national productive capacity, is one such way to increase the average level of independence and hence freedom among our people.

### **A return of pride and purpose**

In deciding where to locate new industries, the Ministry of Finance and the other government agencies and private investors with which it will work will do their best to 'match' the new developments to the traditional industrial roles of specific areas. Thus, for example, a plant to build the structure of off-shore wind and ocean current power rigs would be set up in a community once known for its shipbuilding yards, while the turbines for the same system would be built in one of the cities which used to turn out engines when British cars, bikes and planes were the best in the world.

Such developments must of course be economically viable, but there is much more to our vision than simple economics. As ordinary people, not members of the left-liberal elite or the tired remnants of the old ruling class, we know all too well the terrible damage done by the old parties' decision to allow British industry to wither and die. We see it in the health problems of redundant workers, in the divorce and crime rate in their communities, in the hurt and bitter eyes of hopeless young men who turn to crime and drugs in a desperate attempt to give their lives meaning, and in communities where old ladies once scrubbed their doorsteps sinking into decay and dereliction in their own squalor.

In our burning passion to undo that wrong, our greatest motivation is not to see Britain climbing back up the world tables for GDP or balance of payments' surpluses or for harnessing genius to productivity. More than anything, we want to see men and women who can hold their heads up high and say to the highest and mightiest people it is their misfortune to meet: "Well, I've got a proper job."

### Abolition of income tax

Under the present regime, the state's total take in taxes from the British people has risen by approximately 50%, and now stands at more than one third of our entire GDP. We are not a Thatcherite party and do not propose deep cuts in government spending, although we would massively reallocate it, eliminating entire national and local government departments which gobble taxpayers' money to finance Politically Correct social engineering schemes and State interference in matter which are not its proper concern.

We nonetheless believe that the present level of taxation is roughly the limit the economy can bear and we pledge not to increase total taxes, as a percentage of GDP, above this level. Naturally, we may alter the mix of taxes so that some activities are taxed more than they are now and some less, but the total will not be allowed to increase.

The only exception we must make to this rule is if there is a recession, which naturally diminishes tax receipts and forces tax increases to satisfy rising demands for social benefits due to increased unemployment, or an international emergency beyond our control similarly impacting the British economy. To keep our pledge on taxes, we embrace a similar pledge on total spending levels.

However, within this framework of a constant percentage level of taxation, we propose several key reforms in the mix and manner of taxes. Any reforms we introduce will be imposed gradually, not precipitately, in order to allow evidence of their consequences to correct any defects in the initial scheme. Having seen the fiascoes of the present and past government, we are not going to rush into untried schemes.

### Income tax – the 'temporary' solution that became a menace

One such scheme rushed into by a previous administration is income tax. This was first introduced in 1799 to finance the war against revolutionary France. After being abolished and reintroduced, it was finally imposed in 1842, again as a 'temporary' measure.

When it was first introduced, the burden fell largely on the unearned income of the very wealthy, and thereby had some moral justification. As it was extended by successive governments, however, more and more people fell victim to what is in general a tax on the hard work or ingenuity of each individual. Today we have the ridiculous situation when even people below the official poverty line pay income tax.

Such obvious injustice, however, conceals far deeper moral and practical problems with income tax:

The moral point is precisely that it is a tax on people's labour. There is actually very little difference between the feudal mediaeval serf, who was compelled on pain of eviction or violence to work one day in three for the Lord of the Manor in order to be entitled to till his own patch of land and to pay for the lifestyle of his 'Lord', and the position of the modern wage slave who must work half the entire year before reaching his 'tax freedom day'.

It is one thing entirely to tax people for the use of facilities built by the wider community, or for taking advantage of opportunities to profit which are generated by the fact that they belong to a community. Such taxes are morally entirely justified, for no man is an island and all should contribute to the commonweal.

The practical problems with income tax, meanwhile, are even greater.

The first is that it can be – and very often is – evaded. The feudal serf could take the

risk of running away and hoping not to be caught within the year and a day in which he could be dragged back to his Lord's village, whipped and mutilated, and set back to work. The modern wage slave simply slips into the black economy. Of course, the risk of fines and possibly a term in prison is not as much of a deterrent as used to exist, but that does not excuse breaking the law.

Tax evasion is not a victimless crime. If Person A dodges paying tax, then Persons B & C have to pay more tax. Tax evasion robs our neighbours and undermines the national cohesion that underpins our democracy. Perhaps most corrosive of all, it inculcates a contempt for the law and a resentment against legitimate authority.

If income tax evasion was a minor problem, none of this would matter too much. But Britain now has one of the largest black economies in Western Europe. It is estimated to involved between 5% and 13% of our total GDP (Professional Oversight Board for Accountancy, Feb 2005).

According to the Construction Confederation, citing the last available figures (2001) black economy work in the building industry alone cost the Exchequer – and hence other taxpayers - £500m in lost tax revenue. By its very nature the true figure is impossible to obtain, but Prof Colin Talbot of Nottingham University suggests (February 2004) that the black economy is worth between £53 billion and £137 billion a year. That involves somewhere between 1.4 and 3.6 million workers evading £27 billion in taxes.

In addition to this staggering cost, the collection, and legitimate avoidance, of income tax is also a huge burden on the productive economy and the opportunity to do something better with our time and money. The Inland Revenue employs 82,180 people. Of course, some of these spend their time collecting other taxes, such as Corporation Tax, with which we do not take issue, but a huge number are employed to collect income tax.

On the other side of the line there are 252,000 chartered accountants, plus a further 140,000 student members of professional accountancy bodies. There are even more ancillary office staff and book-keepers working for them, and on top of all that there are the untold millions of man-hours wasted by individual small businessmen struggling with the accountancy records. A massive proportion of all this work is generated by the need to pay – and efforts to avoid paying – income tax.

Finally, there is the problem that to tax peoples' work and productivity is the biggest disincentive possible to hard work and economic efficiency. To allow workers of all levels to keep the fruits of their own labour would in itself spark an unprecedented productivity upsurge which would dovetail with and help to finance the massive economic rebuilding programme which our overall plan for the reconstruction of Britain requires.

The reforms we propose are:

1. We will introduce, phased in over five years, a consumption tax on non-essential goods in place of the income tax. The purpose of this is to raise Britain 's savings rate, which is the basis of our capital formation and thus investment in economic growth. This consumption tax would be very similar to the present income tax, except that the basis for taxation would be income spent, not income earned, during the year. It would be collected by the present VAT authorities, who could do the relatively limited extra work with only a small proportion of the workforce currently employed one way or another by the income tax monster.
2. We are aware that a consumption tax, unless adjusted to compensate for this fact, favors the rich because they save a higher percentage of their incomes. Therefore we will alter the tax code to maintain present levels of progressivism in

taxation by income bracket. In essence, this means that the spendthrift rich (who spend most of their income) will pay more tax than they do today, the thrifty rich (who save most of their income) will pay less, but that the rich as a group will pay the same as today, and similarly for other income brackets.

3. A relatively small number of the bureaucrats freed from shuffling tax forms would be redeployed as Customs Officers to guard all points of entry into the UK. These would primarily prevent attempts to evade consumption tax through smuggling, but they would incidentally provide us – at no extra cost – with the proper security on our borders to protect us from illegal immigration and international terrorists.
4. The hundreds of thousands of professionals and office workers released by this reform from essentially unproductive income tax-related jobs would be systematically redeployed to more productive areas of the economy.

We are aware of the theoretical and practical complexities of the consumption tax, but given the complexity of the present tax system, we believe they are no greater and we will address them in a forthcoming document on our tax policies.

### Other tax policies

1. While the present Council Tax system (introduced by the Tories and increased by 76% under New Labour) is far from perfect, the same is certainly true of the other likely alternatives, including the unworkable Poll Tax and the Liberal Democrats proposals for a Local Income Tax which would be subject to all the criticisms of its national big brother. We believe that the key to making council tax bearable is simply to eliminate at a stroke the vastly expensive network of Politically Correct social engineering projects and unnecessary (and often EU-imposed) bureaucracy which all councils maintain.

Such operations are the mechanism for both New Labour patronage and for the long-term development of what Hilaire Belloc rightly termed the “ Servile State ”. As well as their abolition allowing us to slash council tax, our country would be a better place without them.

No one minds paying a fair price for essential council services; the problem is not the tax itself, but the amount of tax being levied by councils which have expanded into areas which it is not the business of government, national or local, to interfere. We will conduct a full audit of the extent and cost of such operations once we take control of our first Unitary Authority council and so have proper and ready access to the information required to begin to make a proper assessment.

2. In order to strengthen the traditional family, we will restore the married man’s tax allowance, which we will raise to £20,000.
3. We will abolish nuisance taxes such as the BBC license fee and car licence discs.
4. We will introduce a special ‘level playing field’ super tax on companies that evade paying other taxes in Britain by out-sourcing jobs to factories and call centres overseas. If they want to do business here, they must pay their full share of taxes here.
5. A further major source of central government tax revenue would be the tariffs placed on foreign-manufactured goods of types which the Ministry of Finance identifies as being suitable targets for replacement by items made in British factories. This money would be ploughed into the rebuilding of our manufacturing base.

### Public service, not corporate profit

The present regime has increased public spending by approximately 50% since 1997, and yet the average citizen is painfully aware that the quality of public services like the NHS, schools, and public transport has not improved.

We believe the answer to this paradox lies in the fact that Labour has spent the additional money, not upon direct providers of services like teachers, policemen, and nurses, but upon tiers of bureaucrats. It is no accident that these middle-class public administrators are the core supporters of New Labour.

The present regime has engaged in a ridiculous pantomime of pseudo-management in its empty attempts to duplicate the management techniques of the private sector, such as quantitative targets in public sector fields where they are not appropriate.

Therefore, our primary programme for the reform of public services will be to eliminate bureaucratic positions and reallocate the funds to direct providers of services. We believe in the leanest feasible bureaucracy and the allocation of funds as close to the end-users, the British people, as possible.

Furthermore:

1. We will not engage in pointless privatisation of services such as public transport out of a misunderstood admiration for the successful privatisations of the 1980s. The decision as to whether a certain needed service should be provided by the public or private sector is not something to be made on abstract ideological grounds, but must be made upon considerations of the feasibility of real competition, the public's right to universal service and other unprofitable provisions, and accompanying factors.
2. We believe that it is absurd that 38% of voters are now recipients of means-tested benefits while public services languish. While we do not believe in cutting the welfare state as an end in itself, we will reduce the number of people receiving benefits and reallocate the funds to the truly needy (especially pensioners) and to public services like the NHS, schools, and public transport.
3. As already noted in the section on the NHS (see Social Inclusion), we recognise that the underlying motives of Labour and Tory moves to privatise every single institution they can lay their destructive hands on, are globalist dogma and corporate greed.

In the next few years, it will become clear that this privatization drive extends way beyond targets which have already been clearly signaled, such as council housing, the health service and the Post Office.

From July 2005, for instance, Europe's largest media company, the German firm Bertelsmann AG, is to run the council administration of the East Riding of Yorkshire. 500 council employees, providing services to some 350,000 inhabitants, will henceforth be employed and directed not by elected representatives of the people, but by a profit-hungry multi-national company.

The takeover plan set out a timetable which shows the company would, within months be making a profit from running services, collecting council tax and paying wages and social benefits.

Not surprisingly, Bertelmann and its subsidiary Arvato regard the East Riding experiment as "a pilot project of strategic importance." They believe that the potential British 'market' in this field is £6 billion per year. The Arvato board has stated that it was in "substantive discussions" for the takeover of other local administrations in Britain.

This begs the question as to why at least one of the thousands of old party local councilors, who must have had advance notice of this outrageous scheme, have not explained what is going on to their constituents and begun a campaign to stop it. The British National Party is different, and we will expose and lead the popular fight against such attempts to turn public services into corporate milch-cows whenever we find them.

## **Transport – Life’s too short to spend in a traffic jam**

Britain’s overall transport policy will inevitably be shaped over the next few decades by the growing worldwide energy crisis caused by the peaking and subsequent decline of oil production coinciding with increasing demand in the rapidly industrialising economies of Asia.

This subject is dealt with in more detail in the section on the Environment (Section 15, Our Blessed Plot ) although the problem is so vast and all-encompassing that it will take several years of further work to finalise and perfect our proposals for dealing with it.

Increased investment is needed in Britain ‘s public transport system to bring it up to the highest standards in the world. The fiasco of rail privatisation, with different companies running services and tracks, has led to higher fares and lower safety standards. The BNP would end the nonsense of private transport companies making huge profits through public subsidies. Those private services which are unable to operate profitably in the “free market” will have those subsidies reduced and removed and operations brought back into public ownership. The British taxpayer will no longer be fleeced to boost profits for private companies.

Passenger safety and the safe carriage of freight are paramount and Britain should once again have a world-leading railway industry and railway infrastructure. We will seek to bring about the electrification of all existing and re-laid rail lines. We will phase out diesel locos unless fuel can be obtained cheaply and efficiently from bio-renewable sources. The introduction of super-efficient Maglev trains is a national transport priority. Transport projects must be in sympathy with the landscape and historical townscapes, and therefore we will introduce legislation to ensure the use of road tunnels rather than overland roads through areas of beauty and close to historic sensitive areas.

The traffic congestion that makes life so hard for millions, especially in south East England, is partly the result of over-crowding and immigration, and partly because British membership of the EU tends to suck business and investment down into one corner of the country. Our policies on stopping immigration and encouraging a gradual fall in the overall population will, over the long-term, reduce congestion. At the same time, ending the distortion of our national economy by withdrawal from the European Union will reverse thirty years of over-concentration of business, people and traffic in the South East.

### **Proposals**

1. A BNP administration would abolish the road fund tax on all private and commercial vehicles. We view this as an over-bureaucratic and unnecessary method of tax collection, inherently expensive to collect and easy for the lawless to evade. In addition, it provides a spurious justification for the maintenance and extension of the surveillance state. We would replace the funding acquired from the road tax with an element built into taxation of the purchase of non-renewable fuels.
2. Congestion of our towns and cities must be eased by the provision of greater incentives to use rail, bus, tram and Urban Light Transport (ULTRA) scheme transport instead of private cars. The first step is to end the crime and squalor that puts so many people off public transport.
3. Our building plans for human-sized cities will also see a general ban on out-of-town retail/leisure developments. They encourage car dependence and socially disadvantage pensioners, single mothers and non-car (poorer) families. Such

projects need to make use of brownfield sites within towns, linked by public transport networks.

4. Motorists will be freed from repressive and restrictive legislation; we want to see overall motorway speed limits raised, and made subject to variable speed limits depending on surface/weather conditions and volume of traffic. A motorway may, for example, have a 40mph limit during heavy rain, but a 90 mph limit during a summer's night.
5. We are committed to the maintenance of toll free motorways.
6. Speeding and careless driving kills and injures but we seek to save lives by making drivers more responsible. A tougher driving test is needed as well as the introduction of refresher driving tests for those drivers who have held a licence for 25 years and again after holding a licence for 50 years.
7. Hidden speed cameras will be prohibited. Speed cameras in places other than documented accident black spots will be made illegal, in order to prevent motorists being used as cash cows. Local authorities and highway agencies will be encouraged to engineer solutions to deal with accident black spots.
8. Far more must be done to encourage the development and use of cleaner fuels. An integrated transport system and the creation of new transport technologies such as hydrogen fuel cells are essential to the development of our environmental transport policy.
9. Our education system must be reconstructed with the emphasis on mathematics, science and hands-on experience to prepare the new generation of engineers and technicians needed to design, build and maintain new breeds of environmentally friendly, safe and efficient transport.
10. As a maritime nation we are pledged to keep our busy waterways moving, safe and environmentally sound. We are pledged to bring the RNLI into public sponsorship. The generous and courageous efforts of those lifeboat volunteers perform a valuable service for marine safety and should not be left to the vagaries of charity giving.

## **Food production – A radical shift**

A healthy nation depends on a healthy environment and on healthy food. We see a strong, healthy agriculture sector and vibrant farming communities as vital to the country 's wellbeing. Britain 's farming industry will be encouraged to produce a much greater part of the nation's need in food products. Priority will be switched from quantity to quality, as we move from competing in a global economy to maximum self-sufficiency for Britain , sustainable agriculture, decreased reliance on petro-chemical products and more organic production.

In particular:

1. CAP subsidies will be phased out following our withdrawal from the EU. The New Zealand experience will be studied closely and we will work on the principle that if anything is to be subsidized, it will be increases in food quality (nutritional quality) rather than the quantity produced as well as environmental sustainability and rural communities.
2. The first five years of BNP government will see extensive effort put into researching, running pilot schemes and establishing training facilities designed to facilitate a massive and irreversible long-term shift away from giant, mono-cultural agribusiness land-holdings. A graduated land-tax related to the size of holdings and the quality of land involved, incentives to new young farmers, and the extensive use of National Service labour will all be employed to transform the south and east of England in particular.

The current unsustainable practice of 'mining' our soil for what little remains of its fertility in the industrial production of low quality arable food will be replaced by sustainable, mixed agriculture based on family farms employing high technology as well as sound husbandry.

3. We will ensure a major shift to healthier and more sustainable organic farming. Local farms will supply local schools with fresh produce for free school meals.
4. Urgent research work will be carried out into the potential benefits of a massive remineralisation scheme, carried out with National Service labour.
5. The work of the Countryside Restoration Trust will be publicized and studied and used as lessons which are more widely applicable in our pursuit of more sustainable, healthier food production and a more beautiful Britain.
6. Factory farming and related agricultural practices will be phased out.
7. Halal and Kosher slaughter, will be banned, following the lead against animal cruelty given by Switzerland.
8. Animal cruelty and abuse of the land will be punished with severe prison sentences.
9. We are pledged to ensure the restoration of Britain 's once great fishing industry with the re - imposition of the former exclusion zones around our coast. The Royal Navy will police the territorial limit and prevent all foreign fishing fleets entering British waters by force if required.
10. We will fund urgent research into the replacement of environmentally disastrous river, loch and estuary fish farms with off-shore deepwater fish farms, possibly built in conjunction with wave, ocean current and wind power generation units.

### **The environment – Our ‘blessed plot’**

Our ideal for Britain is that of a clean, beautiful country, free of pollution in all its forms. We will enforce standards to curb those practices which pollute the environment, whether by business or individuals, and which cause environmental damage. "The polluter pays to clean up the mess" must become a fact of life, not an electioneering slogan. We will restore damaged environments and rebuild local pride in local environments.

In towns, we will work to replace the brutalist modernism of 1960s-style-architecture with a blend of traditional local styles and materials and ensure that developments take place on a more human scale. We will balance utility with beauty and make our communities more aesthetic and accessible.

The BNP is committed to a policy of National Energy Independence based on, as far as possible, renewable energy sources supplying our national energy needs. This must be achieved within a decade of the BNP taking power. We cannot rely on foreign energy sources such as Middle East oil and Russian gas supplies, and still pretend that we are an ‘independent’ nation.

We are the only true ‘Green Party’ in Britain as only the BNP intends to end mass immigration into Britain and thereby remove at a stroke the need for an extra 4 million homes in the green belts of the South East and elsewhere, which are required to house the influx of 5 million immigrants expected to enter the country under present trends over the next twenty years.

The environmental policy of the current regime is an utter fraud, as the number-one threat to the British environment is the population growth driven by the mass immigration that they support. At present rates, immigration requires the equivalent of a city the size of Birmingham to be built every five years, and implies that by 2050, Britain will have a population of 90 million people, reducing our country to a tarmac desert.

We will ensure that the traditional crafts and trades which are needed to preserve the unique building styles and landscapes of our country receive all the financial and infrastructure support we as a Government can provide. The living treasures of thatchers, dry wall stone builders, masons, carpenters, farriers and gamekeepers will be seen as key people in our society. Courses will be available in many more vocational colleges and livelihoods in these crafts and trades will be made more appealing than moribund university courses which lead to a degree but no worthwhile employment. Our programme for restoring diverse family farms to the agribusiness prairies of much of rural England will provide greatly increased employment prospects for many trades connected with re creating an environment and landscape which is recognisably ‘English’.

### **Our Key Environment Policies**

1. We will end immigration to the UK and reduce our land's population burden by creating firm but voluntary incentives for immigrants and their descendants to return home.
2. We will implement "polluter pays" legislation designed to bring the costs of repairing environmental damage like toxic waste dumps to the creators of this damage. We will set up an national ‘Environmental Court’ with powers to investigate and prosecute all those (flytippers, bush meat importers, factories which pump dioxins into the environment and so on) who damage the national environment.

3. We will end all intrusions of new development into Greenbelt areas, except in clear cases of genuine local need.
4. We will support inner-city and suburban infill development to supply the needs for new housing and commercial space.
5. We will maintain, though not increase, current high taxes on petrol to encourage conservation of energy. We will, however, compensate the traveling public by ensuring that this money is spent specifically on improving our transport network, and does not vanish into a taxation black hole.
6. We will implement a "feebate" system in which low-mileage cars are taxed at purchase and the resulting revenue applied as a subsidy to high-mileage cars.
7. We will fund research into renewable and quasi-renewable energy sources and transmission systems, such wind power, solar power, wave power, hydrogen fuel, and the pebble-bed nuclear reactor.
8. We will end the current government's policy of meeting Britain's Kyoto Protocol obligations by building gas-fired power stations, which are dangerously dependent on a non-renewable fuel imported from unstable and hostile nations, and will promote genuinely-renewable power sources instead, insofar as feasible.
9. We will properly fund and upgrade Britain's public-transport facilities to get people out of their cars.
10. We will not permit the growing of GM crops.

### **Green, but hard green**

We are a "green" party, but we are a "hard green" party, meaning that our environmentalism, though as vigorous as the irrational left, differs from it in a number of ways, the main ones being these:

1. We believe in environmentalism based on sound science.
2. We believe environmentalism must centre ultimately on the good of human beings.
3. We believe in economically-sensible environmental solutions. We accept the need to count costs and make rational trade-offs.
4. We believe in respect for property rights, subject to the understanding that property owners have duties, too.
5. We believe protecting the British environment must be done with respect for our national sovereignty. We reject handing control over our environmental protection to international bodies.
6. We care about the urban as well as the rural environment. People habitats matter, too!

### Britain and the world – Good fences, good neighbours

Britain's foreign relations should be determined by the protection of our own national interest and not by our like or dislike of other nations' internal politics. We will be neither slave to the Euro or the dollar but remain a free nation by keeping the pound.

We would have no quarrel with any nation that does not threaten British interests. We will not act as the world's policeman either for the UN, the EU or the United States. We will maintain an independent foreign policy of our own, and not a spineless subservience to the USA, the 'international community', or any other country.

### Post-EU Foreign Policy

Planning to withdraw from the European Union naturally raises the question of what Britain's post-EU foreign policy would look like. We believe that the present regime, despite posturing to the contrary, has essentially forgotten the very purpose of having a foreign policy: to safeguard the nation's security, independence, and interests.

The primary fact which will remain in a post-EU Britain is that the UK is, despite its superpower past, a medium-sized nation with a number of key vulnerabilities. Fortunately, these vulnerabilities are easily identifiable and tractable to feasible policy options.

The number one threat to Britain's national independence remains what it has been since the Romans launched their full occupation of Britain in 43 AD: a united Europe. Since the Norman Conquest, European imperialists or aspiring imperialists have threatened to invade this country, or otherwise extend their rule over it. The long list includes the Hapsburgs, Louis XIV, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and now, the EU. We must assume the pattern will continue as long as continental Europe remains a large centre of demographic, economic, and political power. Therefore we need a long-term means by which to resist the "gravitational pull" of the Continent if we are to remain an independent and self-governing nation. The prosperous nations of Norway and Switzerland have shown that we can trade and maintain good relations with our fellow Europeans without being part of the EU.

From the post-Napoleonic era to WWI, the British Empire largely fulfilled this role, by giving Britain overseas connections that enabled us to largely ignore the Continental powers. The sole exceptions were the mistake of the Crimean War and the 1839 Treaty of London, which committed us to defend Belgian neutrality in order to preserve a split balance of power on the continent and thus prevent the emergence of a hegemonic power capable of threatening us.

Starting in 1917, however, Britain had to resort to an external counter-weight not under her sovereignty, the United States, in order to preserve her independence against a dominant continental power. This became doubly true in 1941, and the whole of Europe fell into our position vis-à-vis the USSR in 1945.

Therefore, however much we may dislike the present American regime, and see the need to resist American cultural imperialism, we still need the USA as a counterweight against a European super state. Therefore, while we should politely but firmly refuse to fight America's wars, we would give serious consideration to allowing the Americans to keep their bases in the UK so long as they refrain from interfering with our nationalist political agenda along the lines of what they (and others) did recently in Ukraine.

Under this policy American bases would be essentially hostages to America's good behaviour. (If the Philippines can expel its American bases, it would certainly be possible for us to do so.) As long as Britain allows American bases, the American

government will have every incentive to cooperate with a future BNP regime. If Britain threw them out, they would have every incentive to try to overthrow such a government to get back in.

Such a policy would, of course, be subject to immediate review if it was felt that aggressive action or threatened intervention by the USA anywhere else in the world was turning us into a target at risk of becoming collateral damage in other peoples' quarrels.

Returning to our relationship with our former EU partners, we do envisage certain areas, such as the development of massively expensive technologies such nuclear fusion and space exploitation, in which we would engage in joint ventures with other European nations. This however, would be as sovereign partners on specific projects, and would involve no diminution of our political, economic or military sovereignty.

### The 'Clash of Civilisations'

The BNP is widely known as the only British political party warning of the danger posed to our democracy, traditions and freedoms by the creeping Islamification and dhimmitude of Britain.

This does not, however, mean that we are against Islam per se. As far as we are concerned it is simply another foreign mindset whose adherents are welcome to do whatever it instructs them to do – in their own countries.

We are utterly opposed to attempts by American imperialists, the Zionist lobby, the neo-con movement and the US's British puppets in the Labour and Tory parties to drag us into a 'Clash of Civilisations' with the Islamic world.

We insist on our right to resist and reverse the Islamification of Britain, and to oppose the 'Eurabia' project of the French and Italian liberal elites. But we also uphold the right of the people of the Islamic world to resist the attempts by the political elite to democratise or Westernise the Middle East.

### Assisting the Developing World

We reject the idea that Britain must forever be obliged to subsidise the incompetence and corruption of Third World states by supplying them with financial aid. We also reject the policy of 'asset stripping' the Developing World of its doctors and nurses due to under investment in the NHS.

The Developing World has been robbed of its essential services staff by decades of 'people plundering' by the West. It is time that those doctors and nurses returned home to take care of their own suffering people with all the knowledge, training and financial support that Britain can offer. Mass immigration into Britain is triggered by suffering abroad. If we can help end the suffering of those people in their own countries without them coming to Britain and claiming asylum or refugee status, then it clearly benefits us to support the rebuilding of the Developing World.

1. We will link foreign aid with our voluntary resettlement policy, whereby those nations taking significant numbers of people back to their homelands will need cash to help absorb those returning. The billions of pounds saved every year by this policy will also be reallocated to vital services in Britain.
2. The biggest assistance we can possibly give is to produce a phased and financially assisted – to both the individuals and countries concerned – programme under which their skilled people now being exploited as cheap labour in this country return to take up vital positions in their home economies.
3. In the case of countries capable of producing imports which we cannot produce

ourselves – such as tropical farm produce - we would conclude 25-year preferential trade agreements with such nations, guaranteeing to buy as much as they want to sell us at 10% above the market rate. Such agreements, together with foreign aid money being pumped into improving their national infrastructure, would make returning home to thriving economies an increasingly attractive option to many immigrants and their descendants.

4. All members of ethnic minorities taking advantage of our voluntary assisted Homeward Bound schemes would be entitled to receive a British pension in their own homelands on reaching retirement age. This would be graded according to how many years they had worked and paid taxes in Britain.
5. All Homeward Bound settlers would be allowed to take with them all the legally acquired proceeds of their time in Britain, including the full profits from any investment in property here.

### National Defence

We would have no quarrel with any nation that does not threaten British interests. We will not act as the world's policeman either for the UN, the EU or the US. We will maintain an independent foreign policy of our own, and not a spineless subservience to the USA, the 'international community', or any other country. We will restore the county regimental system and also withdraw from the European Union plans for an European Army. We will invest in creating an integrated defence structure that can respond to all 21st Century threats.

Successive cuts in defence spending have left Britain's armed forces perilously weak. We will boost Britain's armed forces to ensure that they are able to deal with any emergency, and defend our homeland and our independence.

1. We will bring our troops back from Germany and withdraw from NATO, since recent political developments make both commitments obsolete.
2. We will also withdraw all British troops with immediate effect from Iraq. We will never again involve British troops in any more American 'wars for oil' or neo-con adventures on behalf of the Zionist government of Israel.
3. We will refuse to risk British lives in meddling 'peace-keeping' missions in parts of the world where no British interests are at stake - a position of armed neutrality.
4. We will restore the county regimental system and withdraw from the European Union plans for an European Army.
5. We will invest in creating an integrated defence structure that can respond to all 21st Century threats.
6. If Britain is attacked by rogue states or terrorists then we will respond with maximum force until the threat is eradicated.
7. The compulsory National Service system discussed elsewhere in this Manifesto would begin at the age of 18 with a period of basic training in the army. This would include full training with the citizens' assault rifle. Conscientious objectors who refuse to undertake military service would be allocated other constructive work for the community, but would not receive the citizen's right to be armed, or the right to vote.
8. Individuals would be free to refuse to undertake any form of National Service, but such a refusal to serve the community for the common good would result in their not being entitled to free places at university, on training courses or self-employment schemes. Whereas some other politicians mouth platitudes about there being "no rights without responsibilities", we mean it.

## **Conclusion: Popular nationalism – The idea whose time will come**

The material contained in this document has been written by a team of highly qualified experts in their own fields who support the BNP and who have the political awareness to create and develop a solution to the problems in our society. The manifesto you have read is very much a working document. As political, economic and social changes occur, or as new technological advances are implemented and new knowledge is uncovered, the material which fleshes out our fundamental core values may change.

We will however never betray nor change our fundamental core values which call for national and cultural regeneration. Those values are our commitment to the principle of national sovereignty, our commitment to ensure that these islands in the North Atlantic remain our homeland for all time and that all economic and social structures, institutions and legislation must be built or developed around the fundamentals of ensuring the freedom and security of our people and maintaining our unique cultural and ethnic identity.

We believe that the material contained in our manifesto will strike a chord with ordinary British folk who are deeply concerned about the future of their country and the way it is being run today.

Never before are so many Britons awaking to the idea that they are being betrayed and short-changed; fleeced to pay for public services which do not deliver, lied to by politicians and ministers, strangled by bureaucracy and gagged by the repression of political correctness.

Never before have so many Britons contemplated the notion that the mere acquisition of material goods at great cost to health and family life is not enough; that the quality of life in their communities is deteriorating and that the imponderables such as a good education, clean streets, safe parks for the children to play as well as a green and clean environment are vital for life and that the quest for happiness in gadgets and consumer tat is futile, costly and destructive.

Those Britons who feel this way are ready for our radical but commonsense program for change.

So despairing of the status quo are the majority of Britons, that time for a radical change in political thinking is being demanded and actively sought. The British National Party with its comprehensive, articulated and common sense approach seeks to be the vehicle for that change.

Our time is approaching.

