



## **British Democrats Policy Statement**

### **The Party of British Identity**

We recognise that the unique character and enormous achievements of the British people can be attributed, to a large extent, to their ancestry. Distinctive peoples are not the product of distinctive cultures; distinctive cultures are the product of distinctive peoples. The very existence of the indigenous population is under unprecedented threat. The destruction of our people will lead to the destruction of our heritage.

Nationality is acquired by descent and unlike citizenship cannot be acquired by legal contrivance. Citizenship should be based on Nationality but it has, quite wrongly, been bestowed on people who are not British Nationals. Since 1948 there have been enormous demographic changes without any consultation of the electorate.

The British Democratic Party is committed to ending all immigration. Talking about reducing *net immigration* is to connive at the replacement of the indigenous population. Illegal immigrants and immigrants who have committed serious criminal offences would be repatriated immediately. Other immigrants, especially the unassimilable ones, would be provided with incentives to return to their countries of origin and those countries would be provided with incentives to welcome them.

Our brand of Nationalism is certainly a commodity for export; it can also be imparted to the ethnic minorities in our midst. Why should they settle for being second-class ersatz Britons when they can become proud members of their own peoples.

Laws that provide immigrants and ethnic minorities with preferential treatment would be repealed.

Asylum seekers would be accepted only if they had been singled out for ill treatment and if Britain were the first safe country they encountered. Asylum seekers who travel through or over several safe countries before arriving in Britain become migrants of choice. Successful applicants for asylum status would be permitted to stay until a safe country in their own part of the world could accommodate them.

### **Sovereignty of the United Kingdom**

The United Kingdom must withdraw from all international organisations that encroach on our sovereignty, by taking executive legislative or judicial decisions on

behalf of Britain. We would therefore withdraw the United Kingdom from membership of the European Union completely. Our membership of all other international organisations must be considered carefully and, if necessary, renegotiated to prevent any undermining of our sovereignty.

We support our continued membership of the United Nations and we would resist any attempt to give up or take away our permanent seat on the Security Council. We should seek to use that seat to protect the interests of Britain and our friends and to promote international peace and good will. We would oppose the use of that seat to promote the partisan policies of other states.

## **The Territorial Integrity of the United Kingdom**

We would oppose absolutely any move to break up the United Kingdom by independence for Scotland or the ceding of Northern Ireland to the Republic of Ireland.

We accept the current devolution arrangements for Northern Ireland. However, we view with dismay the inclusion of unrepentant IRA gunmen in the governance of the Province.

The fact that Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have devolved Assemblies or Parliaments, means that it would be appropriate for England, too, to have a devolved Parliament, provided that there were electoral support for it expressed in a referendum.

## **The European Union**

We cannot tolerate membership of an international organisation that can legislate for the United Kingdom directly (in the case of regulations) and indirectly (in the case of directives). Still less can we accept that EU legislation takes precedence over our Common Law and Acts of Parliament. We cannot accept its executive decisions affecting us and we cannot tolerate the decisions of the European Court of Justice overriding those of our courts.

We are concerned to reverse its intrusions on our immigration and asylum policy, our home affairs and justice systems, our foreign policy and our defence policy. In the meanwhile, we must resist all attempts to promote greater integration.

However, the European Union is not only a constitutional threat. It is also economically, fiscally and commercially disastrous for Britain.

We are one of the highest net contributors to the EU. Our gross contribution costs us over £50 million for *each day of the year*. We have little control over how money received back from the EU is spent.

It is not acceptable for the United Kingdom to be part of a Single Market, regulated by the EU and over which we exercise no control. It is for our elected Parliament to determine our trading arrangements.

Our industry and commerce must be free from the minute regulations about goods and services produced and people employed.

The Common Fisheries Policy has all but destroyed our fishing industry. Whilst we supplied most of the fishing grounds, our fishermen have suffered under minimal quotas and crippling reductions in the number of days they are allowed to fish.

The Common Agricultural Policy with its intervention policy has led to high food prices for all.

The European Union is not content with the powers it already has: it is continually seeking more. It has already intruded into civil and criminal procedural law (including the unjust European Arrest Warrant) and has ambitions to harmonise substantive civil and criminal law. In particular it wants to stifle what is left of our freedom of expression on immigration, asylum and ethnicity.

We have, quite rightly, remained outside the Euro-zone. A single external currency value and a common interest rate cannot be appropriate for seventeen different economies – still less twenty-seven (soon to be twenty-eight).

Whilst we are opposed to the European Union, we are not Anti-European. We recognise and value the overlapping ancestral, cultural and historical ties of all of the European peoples, both inside and outside the present EU. We would seek to strengthen our friendly relations with our neighbours on our Continent but we are not prepared to pool our sovereignty.

## **Our System of Government**

We support the system of Constitutional Monarchy and believe that the person who succeeds by law to be our monarch should occupy the position of Head of State of the United Kingdom. The monarch must, of course, be capable of resisting attempts by party politicians to use the monarchy for its own purposes.

We believe in Parliamentary Democracy and in Cabinet Government responsible to the United Kingdom Parliament. The Head of Government would of course continue to be the Prime Minister. However, we believe in the use of a referendum to consider every question of major national importance.

Democracy is too delicate a flower to be left to the free market. Parties must not be capable of being bought and sold to the highest or most powerful bidder. Indeed they must be free from those who support, financially, all parties but the unfavoured ones.

Corporate donations from companies, trade unions and pressure groups must be prohibited. Individual donations must be limited in size and frequency.

Unlike the other parties, we believe in freedom of expression for all: for our opponents as well as our friends. This freedom of expression must be guaranteed by law. The only exceptions, in the political sphere, should be advocacy of violence, breach of official secrets legislation and civil remedies for defamation.

We believe in freedom of the press and broadcasting media. However, that freedom must not be a freedom to lie, defame and support the media's friends. There must be prohibitions on the press acting as an election sponsor that is exempt from limits on electoral expenditure. There must be affordable and effective means of challenging untruths, especially during an election campaign. There must be a statutory right of reply.

Freedom *of* the press and broadcasting media is not enough. There must be freedom of *access to* the press and broadcasting media for all parties – particularly at election time. In particular, there must be a statutory right of reply to allegations and slurs in the press and broadcasting media.

Local government boundaries must reflect local identifications and loyalties.

## **Law and Justice**

We are determined that England and Wales should continue to use their Common Law System, with judicial precedent and its adversarial form of trial. Scotland and Northern Ireland would remain free to continue to use their own systems that are guaranteed by law.

The strength of our criminal justice system lies in regulated police procedure, an independent prosecution service and trial by jury.

The civil actions for the recovery of debts by individuals and small and medium sized business must be made more efficient. Small businesses must be protected from vexatious claims.

Our criminal law must provide strong deterrent and preventative sentences for repeat offenders and those convicted of the worst crimes. Whilst some first time offenders react favourably to rehabilitative sentences, there are others who require strong specific deterrent sentences to dissuade them from committing further offences. Furthermore, it is necessary to have dissuasive general deterrent sentences for potential offenders. A significant minority of offenders are irredeemable recidivists from whom society needs protection for a long, indefinite period.

The question of whether or not a sentence of capital punishment should be available to the courts for people convicted on conclusive evidence of the worst categories of murder should be decided by a referendum.

## **Individual Freedoms**

The Human Rights Act (a codification of the European Convention on Human Rights) would need to be repealed and replaced by a British Fundamental Freedoms Act that would concentrate on the freedoms essential to a democratic and civilised society. We would seek inspiration from our own Common Law, historic charters and statutes for the preservation of our rights rather than less than perfect continental role models.

Our priority must be to protect and extend those freedoms that are essential to a civilised and democratic society: freedom from torture, ill treatment, cruel and unusual punishments; freedom of expression; freedom of association; freedom of assembly; and freedom to contest and to campaign in elections

Freedom of expression must be subject to the fewest exceptions (such as clear advocacy of violence). Freedom of association must include the freedom to form and shape parties and groups without any interference from the state.

All race relations legislation must be repealed. It is either undesirable, unnecessary or both.

We believe that employees must have protection from unfair dismissal, for example when carried out on account of the employee's political beliefs or affiliations. However, the concept of unfairness does not need to be reinforced by discrimination legislation.

We do not believe that the recipients of goods and services from the private sector need to be protected by discrimination legislation.

We do not accept that there should be restrictions on freedom of expression to accommodate a supposed freedom not to be offended.

We recognise that the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 is one of the most necessary pieces of legislation, protecting suspects and investigating officers from false accusations. It matches the provision of necessary investigative powers to the police with safeguards for the rights of suspects.

## **Foreign Policy and Defence**

We must first of all assert our complete control over our own foreign policy. Our withdrawal from the European Union would immediately free us from whatever involvement we might have in an EU common foreign policy, with the High Representative and the European External Action Service.

We must not allow our foreign policy to be hijacked by other states. In particular, we must avoid any partisan involvement in the Middle East or exploitation by the United States administration of our supposed special relationship with that country.

We do not want Britain to carry out the role of the world's policeman. Our service personnel must not be sent to die in foreign wars in which we have no vital interests at stake.

We are not indifferent to the need to maintain world peace and we would use our permanent position on the UN Security Council to that end but we would not send our servicemen to die in other nations' conflicts.

Our foreign policy must be dictated by the need to protect our people, our territory and our vital interests.

We have no animosity towards any state or people and we would endeavour to maintain peaceful relations with all. However, we would defend ourselves against any aggressor with vigour and determination.

Our opposition to sending our troops to die in foreign wars should not be understood to mean that our present level of service personnel is too high. We are aware that real threats to our people, our territory and our vital interests can occur at any time without being predicted by the security services. We must have the men ready to meet any threat to our nation, at a moment's notice.

Even in peacetime troops can be, and are, deployed to deal with civil emergencies, including intentional disorder. They will also be needed to help to guard our borders against mass immigration.

Our troops must be in a permanent state of readiness and protected by life-defending equipment of the highest quality.

Britain must neither be a warmonger intent on pointless wars, nor a nation of pacifists and appeasers. We should enjoy peace as a legacy of the strength and resolution to defend what is ours. Our forces have sometimes been weakened by ill-considered defence cuts which has then resulted in huge unnecessary expenditure. This is best exemplified by the removal of HMS Endurance from patrols around the Falklands Islands in 1981. This was seen by Argentina as an invitation to invade.

We are determined that Britain must retain an independent nuclear deterrent. A nuclear war would be a nightmare but the way to prevent it is for responsible nations like ours to retain our power of ultimate resistance.

## **Education**

We alone among the parties acknowledge that observed differences in academic ability are attributable to differences in heredity to a greater extent than to differences in nurture. However, we see these as differences in kind of ability as

much as differences in level of ability. It is therefore important that the type of schooling received depends on the abilities of the children concerned.

We are in favour of selection but we do not favour the old style of selection that condemned many children, often unfairly, to an inferior form of secondary education. There was lack of uniformity in the method of selection and even in the percentages of pupils allowed to pass. Secondary moderns were often starved of resources.

We should see future selection as being on the basis of vertical divisions between types of ability rather than horizontal divisions between levels of ability. However, all selection must be uniform, flexible and subject to regular reviews. Schools (or streams within the same school) for the less academic should not be allowed to provide an inferior quality of education. Schools for all pupils must receive equivalent funding.

Primary education must ensure that all capable children, without exception, are functionally literate, numerate and capable of using information technology. Early diagnosis of impediments to learning is essential to the provision of a fair educational system.

There are many other qualities, apart from academic ability that need to be recognised and nurtured in children: a spirit of inquiry; honesty; reliability; sporting ability and teamwork. These qualities are just as important.

Religious education in ordinary state schools would be taught from a non-denominational Christian perspective. However, it would not be unduly prescriptive. Parents would continue to have a right to withdraw their children from such classes.

Discipline must be restored to our schools. Those whose disruptive behaviour does not respond to the corrective policies of the school must be removed and taught in separate institutions.

In our view, university education has expanded beyond need and beyond the ability of the economy to absorb graduates in positions commensurate with their expectations, degrees and educational outlay. This expansion led inexorably to the end of maintenance grants and the charging of students with tuition fees. The result of all of this is that nearly all graduates, apart from those from very rich families, leave university with enormous debts. Furthermore, they often have to accept jobs that would have been available to them as school leavers. We should explain to those who wish to join the professions, including the law and accountancy, that there are alternative routes, without the need to go to university.

We believe that those with the finest intellects, whose intelligence is matched by conscientiousness and a need for their field of study, should be able to earn the right to have their tuition fees to be paid and even to receive a maintenance grant.

The United Kingdom needs to have the benefits of a new industrial revolution. This would require an education system that pushes education in science and technology to the head of its priorities.

## Economic Policy

We believe in private enterprise but we do not subscribe to the view that there should be no economic regulation by the state. We would pursue a policy of *Economic Nationalism*.

In particular, we do not believe in unrestricted international trade, when it has plainly destroyed much of our manufacturing industry. We would seek the rebuilding of our manufacturing industry with state assistance if necessary. Globalisation – the free movement of goods, services and even people around the world can have only one result: that all wage levels throughout the world will approximate to the same level.

Macro-economic policy must be based on the principle that *what is physically possible must be financially possible, otherwise there is something wrong with the financial system*. This means that if there are unemployed workers and unsatisfied needs that they could fulfil, the financial system must facilitate the satisfaction of those needs.

The current financial system is one in which much of the money supply is created by private banks on the basis of the banks' need to make a profit, rather than the needs of the economy. The quantity and form of money in circulation must be under the control of the Bank of England, which must be independent of the government of the day.

The ways in which governments of different political persuasions try to reduce unemployment and restore business activity are many and varied. Both the *Keynesian* and *Friedmanite* approaches are flawed. We need a system that quickly causes activity to return without causing inflation by precipitate increases in demand. *We need to produce deflation without inflation*.

## The Structure of Business

We favour private enterprise for most areas of the economy. However, we believe that natural monopolies such as the postal system and eventually the railways should be publicly-owned, in the form of public corporations.

We believe that private enterprise should be extended to as many people as possible by encouraging: self employment; small and medium sized businesses; employee share ownership schemes, such as those provided by Marks & Spencer; and full employee partnership, such as the John Lewis Partnership/ Waitrose.

We do not approve of the process of Globalisation or the political and economic ideology of Globalism, which advocates the process. However, global and multi-national companies are a fact in the modern world. If it were not for Honda

and Nissan plants in the UK, we should have a much depleted car manufacturing industry.

If global or multi-national companies wish to sell their products in Britain, the assumption is that they should manufacture their goods in Britain, employing British people.

We would review carefully such practices as transfer pricing, whereby global corporations seek to transfer their profits overseas to avoid paying taxes to the Exchequer.

In the longer term, of course we should like to re-establish British manufacturing industry, owned by British companies. We believe that British utilities should be controlled by British companies.

## **Social Welfare and Housing**

When suitable jobs are available, claimants must be expected to seek them. Neither the state nor the claimants can be complacent about the problem of the long-term unemployed. However, it serves no purpose for state officials to harass claimants to apply for jobs that do not exist. The state has a duty to ensure that work is provided to satisfy real needs, so there are no long term unemployed.

The present perceived need to build more and more houses on precious green field sites is fuelled by endless large scale immigration. If we were to stop immigration and put the process into reverse, the housing crisis would disappear.

In the meanwhile, people with local roots must receive statutory preference over recent arrivals.

## **Health**

We are completely committed to the National Health Service. However, we are concerned that the National Health Service has become international, both in its service providers and in patients.

Medical practitioners and nurses are often looted from Third World countries that can ill afford to train them. It is utterly immoral for the developed world to recruit health care staff from poor countries, when those workers are needed to care for their compatriots at home.

We need to help poor countries to train their brightest and best to become medical practitioners and nurses, with distance learning packages managed by volunteers – especially by those with ties to the countries in question. The beneficiaries of this

help would be contractually bound to devote their careers to the care of their own people.

Britain has talented and conscientious people within our own populations who can easily be educated and trained to provide the full range of medical services. The GMC has revealed that doctors trained abroad are disproportionately likely to be struck off or suspended for misconduct or incompetence.

The National Health Service was established on the assumption that it would provide care for the British people and not the peoples of the whole world. Health tourists must not be allowed to use the services of the NHS.

The administrative costs of the health service are disproportionately high. There must be a shift of funding towards those providing health services directly to the patient.

## **Agriculture**

Agriculture and stock keeping constitute a sector of the economy that, more than any other, cannot be left to the vagaries of the free market. Government intervention is essential. The survival of our agricultural sector is more important than any other.

Firstly our very survival might depend, in emergencies, on our ability to feed ourselves. Secondly if any further agricultural land were to be lost to urbanisation, we should be saying good bye to rural Britain.

The sector must be supported because the market conditions are quite different. Demand is price inelastic and supply is also inelastic in the short term because it is dependent on forces outside of the control of the producer. Prices must not be left to market forces.

Our preference would be for deficiency payments that keep prices low rather than the EU system of intervention which pushes prices up.

## **The Environment**

We extend our concern for the indigenous British people to the welfare of the environment of our national homeland, the British Isles. We regard the principal threat to our environment as lying in the excessive and ever rising overcrowding of our islands.

Our homeland is not just full up. It is bursting at the seams. England and Wales in particular, where the overwhelming majority of our people live, has become one of the most densely peopled areas of its size in the world, far more crowded than our major European neighbours. The cause of that is Immigration.

Most of the unprecedented 3.7 million increase in the population of England and Wales in the ten years to the last, 2011, Census is officially admitted to be the result of ongoing Immigration. The rest is due to higher birth rates amongst ethnic groups of post-1948 Immigrant origin.

In our view overcrowding causes almost all the other problems afflicting our environment. Urban sprawl, the unrelenting pressure to build ever more houses on what remains of our countryside to house ever more people, and to use ever more intensive farming methods to try to feed them. These intensive farming methods are recognised as the main threat to our native wildlife, notably wild birds. Overcrowding also strains our transport system, resulting in jam-packed motorways and commuter trains.

Worse in the long run, the fact that our islands now have far more people jammed onto them than they can sustainably support or feed means we are ever more dangerously dependent on an ever more complex, ever more fragile web of global trade for food, fuel, energy and vital raw materials.

We would therefore protect the environment of the British Isles and the quality of life of the British people by stopping all further Immigration completely. Our islands are full up and cannot take any more people settling on them. We would further, as already stated, encourage Immigrant communities to return to their countries of origin.

Given that the birth rate amongst the native British population has fallen substantially below replacement levels, if our land were inhabited only by its own people the population of our islands would stabilise at an environmentally sustainable level giving a much improved quality of life for all. That is our aim.

## **Culture**

We maintain that the settlement of our country by large numbers of foreign people from around the world does not enrich our culture or promote multi-culturalism and diversity. On the contrary – the effect, here and around the world, of mass migration is, we believe, to impoverish everyone's culture, destroying diversity and replacing it with a commercialised homogenised global lowest-common-denominator pop planet-wide monoculture which benefits no-one except for the giant multinational corporations whose worldwide marketing this makes easier.

In contrast as Nationalists we support real diversity. We want a sustainable multi-cultural world of diverse nations rather than the destruction of every culture – and the diverse ethnicities that uniquely created it – everywhere in the name of Big Business-driven global pop monoculture.

We would therefore maintain and enhance our nation, with its ancient ethno-cultural identities, Scots, Ulster, Welsh, Cornish, Manx and last but not least English, our traditional folk cultures and musical heritages, and the languages underlying them, as a hotspot of rich indigenous cultural diversity.

We would encourage other peoples and nations around the world to do likewise. Thus the world will not lose everyone's culture in a homogenised mass mess but instead celebrate and preserve the rich cultural diversity, heritage and ethnicities of the World.

On a global level, and in the long run, we Nationalists are the only true friends of multiculturalism and diversity, which those who parrot those Politically Correct catch-phrases would in fact destroy, for everyone everywhere.