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Chapter 1: Introduction

An introduction to the topic

This thesis involves a comprehensive study of the British National Party’s (BNP) three most recent election manifestos from the years of 2001, 2005, and 2010. Critical analysis will demonstrate the agency of the party in these three years, which adapts according to the specific context of the time. I am looking to establish what strategies and techniques were implemented within the manifestos in the attempt to gain electoral support, exploring why. Doing this for three independent election manifestos allows a historical development over time to be identified, and an explanation as to why these changes were effected offered.

What stimulated my interest in conducting research on the BNP was their success in the previous general election held in 2010. It should be noted that the 1980s saw a changing nature within the far right, and since this time these campaigners have aimed to preserve the British culture through tighter regulation relating to non-indigenous ethnic minorities and what they feel to be an excessive number of asylum seekers. Cas Mudde highlights three distinctive features of the extreme right: authoritarianism, ethnic nationalism, and xenophobia.\(^1\) Pippa Norris documents how between 1980 and 2000 there was a significant increase in the levels of support for extreme right parties across Europe, with support tripling, and forecasted that this trend would continue. She describes three key schools of thought that offer explanations for the increased support across Europe: social structure, supply side factors, and the political competence model.\(^2\)

Within the field, there is little historiographical debate surrounding the rise of the far right or the forces behind it. It is broadly recognised that each individual party needs to be considered with regards to a multitude of factors, each differing over space and time. While there has been much research on the successful right wing parties, those with limited success have received less attention. Elisabeth Carter has recognised this and sought to provide an explanation for the uneven electoral success of the right wing parties operating

---

\(^1\) C. Mudde, ‘The Ideology of the Extreme Right’ (Manchester 2000)  
in Western Europe, focusing on the specific ideology exhibited, organisation and leadership, patterns of party competition, and the institutional frameworks in which these parties operate. With Eatwell supporting Carter’s study in maintaining that different conditions and factors give birth to the success of the extreme right in different states. With Eatwell affirming that ‘there is no fixed, magic winning formula’ and Carter maintaining that to some extent these parties are ‘masters of their own success,’ I focus my research on one party: the BNP.

The UK general election of 2010 saw the BNP gain record support, and great media attention. Following this academics have attempted to explain the increased support for right wing groups in Britain, and have offered reasons as to why these voters chose to support these parties. Focusing on Britain, Matthew Goodwin explains support for the BNP through three models: the losers of the modernisation model, the racial threat model, and the political competence model. In the context of the 2010 general election, Goodwin holds that the increased support stems from ‘a belief that immigrants, minority groups and rising cultural diversity are threatening the national culture, community and way of life’ as opposed to ‘economic grievances, such as a competition over scarce goods like jobs and housing’.

Immigration has always been a prominent issue amongst right wing parties, while Islamophobia is a more recent phenomenon. A survey of 12,320 extreme right supporters across eleven different countries found that 37% of respondents ranked immigration and 25% of respondents ranked Islamic extremism as a top two concern facing their respective country. A 2013 study has shown how one quarter of young people in Britain not only

---

3 E. Carter, *The extreme right in Western Europe* (Manchester 2005)


distrust Muslims, but also think that the country would be better off without them. This is in the context of a recent report based on census analysis maintaining that in ten years Islam could be the dominant religion in the United Kingdom (UK). The rise of Islamophobia is demonstrated by the fact that anti-Muslim hate crimes in British society have ‘risen dramatically’ over the course of 2013. However, Islamophobia had long pre-existed in Britain, with Bulent Senay maintaining that Islamophobia is ‘deeply rooted in European orientalist anti-Semitic essentialism’ and that ‘anti-Islamic prejudice is almost a perennial, entrenched phenomenon in European history’, referencing how European powers have battled against Muslims throughout the Crusades – beginning in the High Middle Ages – right through to the colonial era.

In modern times, the Muslim reaction to Salman Rushdie’s 1988 work, ‘The Satanic Verses,’ exemplifies the perceived incompatibility of Islam and British society, with Rushdie conceding in 2013 that the contemporary climate of ‘fear and nervousness’ stemming from anti-Muslim prejudice would now render his novel unpublishable. Tension surrounding the compatibility and integration of Muslims in British society is still noticeable through outrage regarding Marks & Spencer’s proposal to allow their Muslim staff to refuse to sell pork and alcohol, with the multinational company backtracking the very next day in late December 2013.

---


the 52 pillars (one for every person killed in the attacks) at Hyde Park, London’s memorial site were vandalised with graffiti, each sprayed with the words: ‘Blair lied thousands died’, ‘Four innocent Muslims’ and ‘July 7 truth.’ Additionally, an 18 foot tall bronze statue of Achilles, also located in Hyde Park, was marked with ‘M15 did 7/7’. This premeditated criminal damage is the most recent and most relevant example of tension relating to Muslims in British society, regardless of the fact that the perpetrators’ identities remain currently unknown.

Though Islamophobia is an age-old phenomenon, it was only recently that it had played such a prominent role in British politics. The 1997 study ‘Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All’ was the first time the phenomenon had been formally addressed in Britain, though its watershed moment came later with the 7/7 bombings in London. The British Runnymede Trust defines the concept as the ‘dread or hatred of Islam and therefore, [the] fear and dislike of all Muslims’, which leads to their discrimination in economic and social settings. This is my working definition of Islamophobia, which incorporates the main elements that constitute alternative definitions.

Recognising the recent nature of Islamophobia, I was interested in analysing and comparing the strategies employed, the lines of argument followed and the literary devices used in the 2001, 2005, and 2010 election manifestos. My research differs from and adds to previous studies on the BNP by not primarily concerning itself with the history of the party, its electoral success, or the motivation of its voters. Instead, I concentrate specifically on how the party attempts to gain support through its election manifestos, rather than adding to the existing literature on why the party enjoyed greater success. Moreover, a heavy focus

---


on discourse sets my study further apart still from the pre-existing literature and enables me to offer explanations to questions unconsidered in other works.\footnote{Goodwin, ‘New British Fascism’; N, Copsey, \textit{Contemporary British Fascism: The British National Party and its Quest for Legitimacy} (Basingstoke 2004)} Before Islamophobia was such a prominent issue, what other methods were used to legitimise the BNP’s argumentation? How have these methods changed over time? Examining this reveals the agency – how and why the manifestos changed – and thus what the BNP reacted to in its discourse. 2001 is a logical starting point for me as it signals the first election manifesto since Nick Griffin assumed leadership in 1999 and began his efforts to break from the past and modernise the party’s image and direction. How to effectively and critically analyse narratives is outlined in the following sub-section.

**An explanation of ‘reading against the grain’**

Narratives need to be analysed diligently to reveal their true purpose, with a full appreciation of the context. They are interpreted differently depending on the individual’s context, giving a narrative multiple dimensions.\footnote{M. Booth, ‘The Egyptian Lives of Jeanne d’Arc’ in L. Abu-Lughod, \textit{Remaking Women, Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East} (New Jersey 1998), pp. 172-211.} Mieke Bal warns against a one-dimensional interpretation of a narrative as its interpreted meaning depends on the focalisor’s perspective.\footnote{M. Bal, ‘The Narrator’, \textit{Narratology: Introduction to the theory of narrative} (Toronto 1985), pp. 19-30.} When reading an election manifesto one individual may view it as a solution to their economic problems, while another might see it as a way to reduce crime and improve public safety. The wider the range of discourses engaged with the wider the appeal is likely to be, as different individuals are won over in different ways. Identities are also multi-layered and change according to the context, with Karim Willemse describing how identities are performed.\footnote{K. Willemse, ‘Landscapes of memories: Visual and spatial dimensions of Hajja’s Narrative of Self’, \textit{Narrative Works}, 2 (2012), p. 129-149.} The logic of other scholars, such as Katherine Borland and Marjorie Mbilinyi, reinforce the necessity of having a full awareness of the context in which a narrative is performed, or when a manifesto is compiled, in order to decipher the meaning.
of the narrative and its intention. The context is comprised of a multitude of considerations, including for instance the time a source was written or said, the audience, competing/alternative discourses, discourses which could be said to have informed the thinking of the narrator, and the meaning of the terms used specific to that area or individual. Due to the problematics of the fluid nature of discourses, referred to by Sara Mills, Willemse has highlighted the necessity of ‘reading against the grain’ these ‘texts-in-contexts’. Reading against the grain allows for insight and observations about the strategies implemented and techniques used in election manifestos. As my research centres around the study of three election manifestos from the years of 2001, 2005 and 2010, the technique of reading against the grain allows me to provide critical analysis on how the BNP’s election manifestos have developed over the period of almost a decade and why, making a historical development over time noticeable and describable.

In conducting discourse analysis self-reflexivity or self-reflection is necessary, as one needs to be aware that a researcher is influenced in his or her analysis and reading of the narrative. Therefore, one needs to follow regimented questioning of what the dominant discourses in the public sphere are, what the dominant discourses in the narrative are, what is being addressed, what topics are being introduced, and what is not being talked about, and so on. Having identified the dominant discourses, an analysis requires one to decipher the narrator’s argumentation and positioning. In order to do this it is necessary to note how the narrator defines terms or understands them. For example, the BNP holds that diversity is achieved by each ethnic group remaining in their ethnic land of origin, rather than through multiculturalism. Discourses and accepted understandings are negotiated, opposed or simply ignored. Michael Billig describes how common sense is reproduced through narratives, changing each time and adapting to the wants of that ideology’s particular

---


‘common sense’.\(^{24}\) This is insightful when examining how presented facts or common sense adapt over time. Therefore, the argumentation and positioning with regards to the dominant discourses at the time of the manifestos need to be interpreted in light of their respective contexts, revealing intentions and agency.

The focalisations, subject positions allocated, and identities constructed, as well as the argumentation of the manifestos, deserve attention, especially in relation to the intended audience. Considerations such as the grammar, the wording, motifs, and literary devices also need to be taken into account. How are the us and them divides crafted? What is done to encourage the audience to endorse their policies? Why does the BNP deserve your vote?

It is pertinent to elaborate on the use of us and them divides prior to analysis. The creation of an us and them divide, or an ‘us-them’ distinction, is regarded as central for populist radical right parties, like the BNP, who are engaged in identity politics. Enemies are identified largely on the basis of who is and who is not ‘native,’ and, additionally, who serves the interests of natives and who does not. Often the elite (the government) is the key internal enemy and depicted as a traitor to the nation, with allegiances to external enemies (such as the European Union - EU) further defiling the sanctity and safety of the homeland. For parties such as the BNP, foes greatly outnumber any friends and ‘the politics of fear’ helps distinguish between the ingroup and the outgroup, generating hostility. Moreover, this distinction is more pronounced through opposing characteristics; while outsiders may be portrayed as uncivilized and barbaric (e.g. Muslims), the insiders/natives are presented as civilized with an inherent moral superiority, solidifying a sense of incompatibility.\(^{25}\) Thus, the us and them divides constructed by the BNP throughout the manifestos are of great importance in this study.

---


Who wrote the manifestos?

The manifestos are ideal documents to analyse as they are very meticulously and deliberately crafted according to a specific purpose. The amount of planning and editing that goes into them makes them highly valuable for analysis, and reading these manifestos against the grain provides great insights. Parties generally seek advice during an election campaign, requesting assistance from outside agencies and often use spin doctors and image and marketing specialists for consultation. However, this is truer of more established parties, and a less mainstream party like the BNP may not follow the same path.

It was difficult to identify and research which individuals were involved, and their influence, in the crafting of the BNP’s election manifestos. Dr Phil Edwards, the former BNP National Press Officer, resigned in September 2007 and one can expect him to have played a part in the 2001 and 2005 election manifestos. Notably, there is a discrepancy in his accounts of how long he was affiliated with the party, indicating fifteen years in total in one account and just eight in another. Adding to the sense of secrecy is his use of an alternative alias, with Stuart Russell being his real name. This suggests that he does not want to be widely known or, rather, he does not want his association with the party to be widely known.

The 2005 election manifesto is described as ‘very much a working document,’ and in the concluding section it is announced that ‘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.’ This suggests that multiple individuals or self-professed BNP experts combined in the production of the manifesto, rather than a key individual or small number of individuals taking the reins. Moreover, the implication is that an external professional

---


expert or group was not drafted in, suggesting it was produced internally by the BNP, or at least by people sympathetic to the BNP.

In trying to find out information about the BNP’s spin doctors, it was relatively easy to find the names of people involved with the party who might have contributed to the 2010 election manifesto (those listed in the Communications Department), which I attribute to the party’s greater publicity and increased professionalism.\textsuperscript{29} The description of their Communications Department demonstrates the importance the BNP places on their ‘modern, technological advanced media handling machine’ which guards against ‘Britain’s lying, biased and politically correct media empire.’\textsuperscript{30} Therefore, with such a machine in place, it is clear that there is a certain protocol followed by representatives of the BNP when speaking publically or producing public material. Thus, one can infer that something as important as the composition of an election manifesto is subject to rigorous examination by a number of trusted and adept members of the party with the necessary political awareness that was referred to in the 2005 election manifesto.

Despite this, my research has revealed one influential individual. Simon Darby was appointed Deputy Leader of the BNP in mid-2005, as documented in the first post of his blog.\textsuperscript{31} He later became National Press Officer of the party, and in these roles added his own contribution to the 2010 election manifesto. His main effect was a change in the language towards Islam, which will be addressed later in my study.

I hold that the most important factors influencing the election manifestos of the BNP, and what accounts for their historical development over time, are developments within the party due to increased success and publicity, as well as the party’s reaction to and attempts to capitalise on developments, events or scandals both within Britain or internationally. Yet, the individual impact of Darby is pronounced, which becomes clear through my findings. However, it needs to be appreciated that one individual can only contribute as far as the context of the time allows. The context of the time dictates to a


\textsuperscript{30} The British National Party, ‘The Communications Department’

large extent the content of the election manifestos. What is integral to my study is: what is being argued; how the argument is constructed; and what the influencing factors effecting a change in emphasis, tactic, or approach within the election manifestos were.

Through analysing and comparing the BNP’s election manifestos from the years of 2001, 2005 and 2010, their agency is revealed, as well as the historical development over time and for what reasons.

Research questions

My thesis addresses four research questions: three sub-questions addressing a specific manifesto and the last providing an explanation of the historical development over time, constituting my main research question.

These questions constitute my study:

Sub-questions

- How does the British National Party attempt to gain support through its 2001 election manifesto, and for what reasons?
- How does the British National Party attempt to gain support through its 2005 election manifesto, and for what reasons?
- How does the British National Party attempt to gain support through its 2010 election manifesto, and for what reasons?

Research question

- What is the historical development over time observable in the British National Party’s election manifestos from the years of 2001, 2005, and 2010, and why is this so?

The questions are addressed in chronological order, with an explanation of the context provided for the time of each election manifesto. To strengthen and supplement my analysis I consulted contemporary, reputable newspaper articles, articles published on the BBC, reports from survey companies and other bodies, works produced by activist groups,
and more general background reading on right wing parties in Western Europe as a whole, as well as studies focusing more specifically on Britain and also the BNP.

I analysed the 2001 manifesto in its entirety, as it is a relatively small document (three A4 pages of text: 1281 words), identifying the key analyses. The larger manifests of 2005 and 2010 (accounting for fifty-four and ninety-four pages respectively) are also analysed in full, paying attention to the argumentation, subject positions, grammar, wording, us and them divides, identities, focalisation, and agency of each section within the manifests, also considering them as a complete narrative. However, in outlining my findings in this study, I focus on the sections within the manifests that are more central to the party’s core policies, provide key explanations of the rationale, and have importance in explaining the overall agency of the BNP.
Chapter 2: Understanding the British National Party

This chapter sets the context of the 2001 general election and details the changing nature of the BNP and its direction under Griffin, also outlining the significance of this.

The party’s ideal

To understand the ideology of the BNP it is first necessary to introduce the concept of a nation, to understand where such thinking originates from. Benedict Anderson’s well-referenced interpretation holds that the nation is an imagined political community, in which its members hold certain commonalities binding those individuals together, with their interests being represented through sovereign power.32 Ernst Bernard Haas elaborates on this in an important way by adding that not only do these shared characteristics and commonalities unite a nation, but they differentiate that society from those outside of it.33 Shared characteristics and commonalities arise from a shared culture. Nationalism is simply the affirmation that a cultural group is best represented by members from within that group, free from external influence and obligations to other peoples with divergent beliefs and customs. Ultimately, the ideal of the BNP is a state comprised of white native Britons, autonomous in its own rule and relations with other powers, and as self-sufficient as possible in terms of resources and industry in order to provide British jobs for British workers. This has been the ideal of the party since its foundation and fundamentally remains so to this day. What the party deems to constitute a ‘Briton,’ and what qualities and characteristics such an individual should exhibit, when provided, is clarified for each considered manifesto.


The British National Party under Tyndall

A short explanation of the creation of the party, and its electoral performance preluding Nick Griffin’s challenge for leadership will be outlined. A comprehensive account of the party’s history will not be provided as this is outside of the focus of this study. However, for an extensive account of the BNP’s history one should consult the work of Copsey or Goodwin.34 For an overview of the National Front (NF), with whom John Tyndall was affiliated with prior to the formation of the BNP, and detail on other right wing movements, extremism, and fascism in Britain since the twentieth century up to the formation of the BNP (1982), see the first chapter of Goodwin’s already referenced work.35

Under Tyndall’s leadership the NF put forth 303 candidates in the 1979 general election, which was a major achievement and a first for a right wing party in Britain. The NF stood against immigration, multiculturalism, and the decline of Britain’s sovereign power. However, this achievement was soon belittled as their candidates received an average vote of just 0.5%. As a consequence of this bad result, in 1980 the organisation split into three independent and opposed factions. This led to the formation of the BNP in 1982, which was composed of Tyndall and his ardent supporters. The early BNP was essentially a continuation of the NF, inheriting an amalgamated philosophy of ethnic nationalism, biological racism, xenophobia, neo-Nazism, anti-Semitism, and an anti-democratic distaste for the liberal parliamentary system, translating to a deliberate lack of engagement in an electoral campaign. The focus was on heightening publicity, drawing in new members, asserting itself across the country, and permeating into the consciousness of the average person: not elections.36

In the 1997 general election Tyndall committed his party to competing for 50 seats, which hindsight can judge as very optimistic. Only two seats were held: Tyndall’s own in the East End of London and another in Canning Town, London. The local elections in May 1998

34 Copsey, ‘Contemporary British Fascism’; Goodwin, ‘New British Fascism’


were also disappointing for the BNP, with their average vote falling from just over 12% to just 3.28% despite the fact that they put forth five more candidates than in the previous 1994 local elections. With only 1,100 members at the end of 1998, it was recognised throughout the party that they had not achieved the success they sought, resulting in the first ever leadership election within the BNP. 37

Tyndall’s longstanding association with Nazism, fascism and violence had prevented his party from gaining the levels of support it desired, and time and time again such accusations and allegations resurfaced to haunt the leader of the BNP. The legacy of the BNP, much like Tyndall’s own, would have to be left behind and a new image constructed in order for the organisation to progress.

**Nick Griffin and the British National Party**

Griffin challenged Tyndall for the leadership of the BNP in October 1999, having been a member of the party since 1995. Taking the majority of the votes while Tyndall managed 30% (411), Griffin assumed the role of Chairman of the BNP. Since Tyndall founded the BNP in 1982, he had limited success because, for many, ‘his brutal, streetfighting background and admiration for Hitler’s National Socialists (also) prevented his cause from acquiring the slightest veneer of political respectability.’ 38 Griffin had long advocated a modernisation project within the party in order to reinvent itself and negotiate its negative image. However, before detailing his approach to moving the party forward, it should be made clear that, like Tyndall, Griffin also had some skeletons in his political closet.

Born on 1 March 1959, Griffin joined the NF in 1974 at the age of fourteen, posing as a fifteen year old in order to be admitted. At Cambridge University he continued his affiliation and founded the Young NF student organisation. Following graduation he became more involved with the NF, operating in their headquarters. He climbed the ladder to


become national organiser for the party in 1978 and a member of the National Directorate (the NF’s governing body) two years later in 1980. Such was his prominence he contested the seat of Croydon North twice: in the 1981 by-election and the 1983 general election, though only gaining 1.2% and 0.9% of the vote respectively. The party itself was in decline in the early 1980s, which bred dissatisfaction in Griffin, combining with disillusionment about the progress and direction of the NF. In 1989 he left the organisation, with personal reasons keeping him out of politics for several years.39

Griffin joined Tyndall’s BNP in 1995. He came into controversy shortly after in early 1997, co-writing ‘The mind-bending power of the masters of the media: the media-power in Great Britain and elsewhere’. This claimed that ‘The mass media in Britain today have managed to implant into many people’s minds the idea that it is ‘anti-Semitic’ even to acknowledge that members of the Jewish community play a large part in controlling our news.’40 Griffin refers to ‘the liberal establishment conspiracy’ which sustains a multicultural society.41 In 1997 Griffin’s writing in ‘The Rune’ resulted in him being tried under section 19 of the Public Order Act 1986.42

A report states that ‘This case was the first time in which Holocaust revisionism, the historical argument that Nazi Germany did not carry out a policy of extermination against European Jewry, was, in part, the subject of a criminal prosecution in the United Kingdom.’43 Within this report Griffin faced accusations of affiliations with Nazism, fascism, separatism and violence. He was prosecuted and received a suspended prison sentence in 1998 and


42 ‘Publishing or distributing written material. 1) A person who publishes or distributes written material which is threatening, abusive or insulting is guilty of an offence if – (a) he intends thereby to stir up racial hatred, or (b) having regard to all the circumstances racial hatred is likely to be stirred up thereby’ Government Legislation, ‘Public Order Act 1986’: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1986/64/section/19. Accessed 29/03/2014

members of the BNP, Griffin among them, felt the organisation was losing its appeal and suffering from an identity crisis in terms of what their ideology was judged to actually consist of. If the party was judged to be hateful, racist, fascist and violent, its support base would be severely limited. Michael Newman puts it simply: ‘The fact that a party so disadvantaged by its own tactics and image could win a council seat pointed to an obvious conclusion. A properly run party free from Nazi cranks could do far better.’

In order for the party to progress, Griffin maintained it was imperative to sever all negative connections by committing to what he held as historical revisionism: the reinterpretation of traditional, accepted views and notions. Raymond Grew, drawing from the ideas of Michel Foucault and his critique of modern society, details how modernisation – and its accompanying multiculturalism stemming from globalisation and immigration – is essentially a process of classification in which society is divided between insiders and outsiders. Thus, for him multiculturalism does not translate to a diverse yet integrated and peaceful society of different groups coexisting, but rather detracts from the harmony attainable in a homogenous nation. Therefore, multiculturalism breeds internal us and them divides within society that are inescapable and, in the view of individuals and organisations like Griffin and the BNP, wholly undesirable. If the supposed merits of multiculturalism were challenged and the view that multiculturalism is damaging and harmful put forth, the accepted view could be revised: historical revisionism. Griffin holds that the BNP should take the approach of questioning accepted practices at the individual, societal and governmental level.

Moreover, Griffin felt it imperative to adapt the strategy of the party, and sought to break with the strategy of the past, through adopting a parliamentary approach. Ben Wellings describes English nationalism as a mood, rather than a movement, prior to and in the early years after Griffin’s ascension. However, he points towards the popular nationalism in Scotland and Wales that had brought about devolutionary constitutional

---

reform in explaining the BNP’s shift to a parliamentary approach. Duncan Watts also highlights Scotland gaining parliament in 1999 as a reason for the Griffin’s new direction, additionally noting the Good Friday Agreement of 1998 in which Northern Ireland (NI) re-established an elected assembly. To make the BNP an acceptable alternative to the competing parties, Griffin sought to displace the anti-democratic appeals and violent-prone marches with community politics and an effort to achieve electoral success. The value of Griffin’s electoral approach is demonstrated through the BNP’s comparatively greater success when compared to the NF, making an analysis of the election manifestos more intriguing.

Due to the past of the party, and Griffin’s own, many remained sceptical of the BNP’s ideology. Darren Wells, a former senior figure within Combat 18 (an openly neo-Nazi and violent group that provided security for the BNP at meetings and events from early 1992 until a decisive split in September 1993), told BBC Panorama ‘Your average BNP supporter isn’t as intellectual as Griffin. They would be just like ‘Okay, ship ‘em up, let’s get a boat off’ and that would be it. It would be as simple as that. But Griffin knows he’s not going to get elected by saying things like that.’

Now aware of the necessary history and values of the BNP, the legacy of its founder Tyndall, and the controversy surrounding Nick Griffin, how the party attempted to move forward under Griffin’s leadership and his new direction analysed.

---


Chapter 3: 2001 – ‘Where We Stand!’

This chapter addresses the how the BNP attempted to gain support through its 2001 election manifesto, and for what reasons.

The manifesto

The election was held on 7 June 2001. The BNP’s 2001 election manifesto is entitled ‘Where We Stand!’ and addresses fourteen issues in a small document equating to about three A4 pages of text (1281 words). It is a relatively basic document when compared to the later manifestos, and has no introduction or conclusion. Structurally, the most important or contentious issues are addressed first: with ‘Immigration’, ‘Europe’ and ‘Law and Order’ constituting the initial three. However, the order of the manifesto is not kept in the structure of the following analysis. Despite the restricted length of the manifesto, its analysis reveals interesting insights into the strategy pursued and tactics implemented in the party’s effort to gain votes.

Immigration

Due to the ideals of the BNP, immigration is a central part of its policy. Correspondingly, it is also the topic which provokes much of the hostility the party and its members suffer, with allegations of racism and fascism. The history of more recent immigration to the UK and an account of historical British immigration policy, including its pre-World War II considerations and the development after the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrations Act – which gave the citizens of British Commonwealth countries extensive rights regarding migration to the UK – is provided by Ian Spencer.51

The subject positions allocated within this section indicate the aim of the party: a homogeneous Britain for white natives. There is a call for ‘the British people’ to protect their

51 I. Spencer, British immigration policy since 1939: the making of multi-racial Britain (New York 1997)
homeland and identity through a rejection of immigration and multiculturalism. In extension, non-white immigrants settled in Britain are encouraged to return to their lands of ethnic origin. The argumentation, which relates to the target audience of the BNP, is that immigration – particularly non-white immigration – is damaging Britain’s homeland and identity. If the trend continues, the British people will not have a homeland. Therefore, ‘all further non-white immigration’ should be brought to a halt and non-whites encouraged to leave Britain through a voluntary resettlement scheme.

Such argumentation is justified by the identities constructed within the narrative by the BNP. An us and them divide is created through a pledge to ‘ensure that the British people retain their homeland and identity.’ Important here is the word ‘their.’ In wishing to stop non-white immigration and actually offering those non-white immigrants already settled financial incentives to leave the country, it is clear that such people are excluded in the BNP’s conception of ‘the British people’ and the nation. Of non-whites, in referring to ‘their lands of ethnic origin,’ it is made clear that ethnicity is an important consideration for the BNP and a dividing line.

Economy

Clearly the BNP’s immigration policy is influenced by racial thinking, but rather than presenting itself as opposed to or anti-something, the party is instead for the preservation of the British people, their homeland, and their identity. The commitment to defending British interests informs the thinking behind ‘Economy’. Holding a firmly nationalist outlook, it calls for the taking back of industry, commerce, land, and other assets from non-British actors. For the populist radical right the economy must serve the nation and its people the best it can; thus, their economic programs are based upon economic nationalism and

---
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welfare chauvinism. The argumentation is that foreign companies are taking over British national assets, with foreigner workers taking jobs from the British people. Thus, the British people should reclaim what is rightly theirs and solve the issue of unemployment for the white natives.

An analysis of the discourse shows how these subject positions opposing foreign influence are constructed. An us and them divide is created between the British workers and foreign workers. The BNP’s side is clear: they are committed to ‘getting our people back to work.’ The sentence ‘We deplore the degree to which Britain’s industry, commerce, land and other assets have been allowed to fall into the hands of foreign owners’ uses an idiom to create a feeling of danger and loss. The connotation, following The Free Dictionary’s definition, is that ‘if something falls into the hands of a dangerous person or an enemy, the dangerous person or enemy starts to own or control it.’ This harnesses the sense of an enemy, a threat to the native Britons. The sentence ‘We are pledged to ensure that all vital national assets are restored to British ownership’ exhibits nationalism, and contains a couple of almost archaic words in ‘pledge’ and ‘restore’. A pledge to restore British ownership sounds like it belongs in the imperial era, aiming to expel the foreign invaders. However, there is no direct reference to past imperialism. Contributing further to such a mission is reference to the ‘more than 4 million people in a hidden army of the unemployed,’ which conjures up notions of a battle, an on-going fight. Essentially, the message is that Britain is under attack and the British people need to stand against foreign influence.

---
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Through their policies on immigration and the economy, it is demonstrated how the essence of the British people is at risk. Immigration is positioned as damaging the British homeland and identity while foreign influence in the economy and the accompanying foreign workers are taking British jobs. Not only are concepts such as the British homeland and identity in danger, British people are suffering in terms of standard of living and quality of life due to unemployment. If one considers these presented facts, the BNP is not a hostile, hateful organisation; it is a noble defender of Britain and its indigenous white people.

The logic the BNP presents questions accepted notions in society. Whether or not globalisation is a good thing is considered. Should native Britons allow foreign businesses in their country? Also, it considers the desirability of multiculturalism, and the accompanying immigration. Do the native British people want their homeland and identity to disappear? This is the historical revisionism Griffin advocated: the questioning of accepted norms. If the common assumptions people have about the merits of globalisation and multiculturalism can be changed, then the negative perception of the BNP can be changed.

It is worth mentioning that typically the populist far right is opposed to globalisation, which is depicted as a multifaced/multifaceted enemy by Mudde due to its economic, cultural, and political impact on societies. These three subtypes – economic globalisation (and its accompanying immigration), cultural globalisation, and political globalisation – are all feared and opposed on the basis of their threat to the independence and purity of a state. While Mudde sees globalisation as a constant and irreversible process over two thousand years old, he renders this point irrelevant to those right wing parties to whom real political power is unattainable, such as the BNP. As long as political dominance is realistically unachievable, such parties can proclaim to be able to solve the portrayed problem of globalisation if they were to gain political authority. However, interestingly, in an interview conducted shortly after his appearance on the BBC’s ‘Question Time’ on 22 October 2009, Griffin presented globalisation as inescapably and inevitably reversible, due to its

---

fundamental basis on free transport and essentially free energy, which is inherently unsustainable due to finite energy resources.  

**Europe**

This section mainly addresses the EU. Watts provides an account of the evolution and character of the EU, focusing his attention on its role and impact within Britain. The minimum that needs to be noted is that in the minds of right wing parties across Europe the 1992 Maastricht Treaty confirmed their suspicions that the EU desired to federalise the continent, with Mudde describing the BNP as a Euroreject party due to the perceived threat to Britain’s independence and democracy. A withdrawal from the EU is called for in favour of greater self-sufficiency, with the argumentation being that the EU is forcing Britain into ‘a political and economic straightjacket.’ For the BNP ‘The £1.8 million per hour net contribution Britain at present makes to the European Union will fund many far more useful projects at home following our withdrawal from the EU.’ What is determined as useful relates to the nation-orientated outlook the BNP has. It is fully focused on native Britons, which is the image the party is trying to promote. They are presented as freeing Britain from the restrictive EU. Particularly interesting is the ‘political and economic straightjacket’ referred to. The notion of Britain being constrained, almost scared to stand up for its own rights – or unable to – due to political correctness is promoted. The BNP does not want people to adhere to political correctness; politically correct people support immigration and multiculturalism, not their party.

---
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Foreign affairs

This section calls for an independent foreign policy which protects ‘our own national interest’, as well as a policy of non-interference in the affairs of others unless threatened – rather than ‘a spineless subservience to that of the ‘international community’, the USA, or any other country.’\textsuperscript{69} That ‘international community’ is in inverted commas suggests that the party does not accept the concept of an international community. Instead, the party holds that Britain should act according to solely its own interests.

Foreign aid

The BNP adheres to strongly nationalist policies along ethnic lines, and so the national interest translates to the preservation of the homeland and its identity, as well as the well-being of white native Britons. This section further demonstrates the party’s rejection of globalisation and the concept of a global or international community. The position the BNP takes is that Britain should not be obliged ‘to subsidise the incompetence and corruption of Third World states by supplying them with financial aid.’\textsuperscript{70} The argumentation is that the billions invested year upon year could instead ‘be reallocated to vital services in Britain, including improvement to the Health Service and greater care of our old folk.’\textsuperscript{71} Again, the use of ‘our’ divides Britain from the rest of the world, and reaffirms a commitment to British interests. The legacy of colonialism is ignored here, instead criticising ‘the incompetence and corruption of Third World states.’ There is no obligation to provide assistance to those less powerful states requiring help. This silence demonstrates that the morality of the BNP relates only to Britain and the British people.

The argument to focus the money invested abroad inwards is supported by reference to a need to improve healthcare in Britain. This was a dominant discourse around the time of the 2001 general election, due to news stories surrounding Sharron Storer and
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her partner. Her cancer-suffering partner had to wait 24 hours for a bed in the wrong ward, potentially exposing him to harmful diseases and infections. At the doorstep of the hospital Ms. Storer confronted Prime Minister Tony Blair, generating much publicity surrounding the condition of the National Health Service (NHS) and medical services in general. Engaging with other discourses to support an argument is an important way in which to strengthen a position, and throughout the manifesto there is additional supporting evidence for the BNP’s main policies.

**Health**

The ‘Health’ section emulates ‘Foreign Aid’, in which the morality is the same: British people first. The subject position allocated is that Britain should not be helping anyone outside of its own borders while the NHS and medical services are not up to standard; here the aforementioned welfare chauvinism typical of the populist radical right is displayed. The party promises that there will be no foreign aid ‘while our own hospitals are short of beds and the staff to run them,’ also committing to ‘a free, fully funded National Health Service for all British citizens.’ This almost echoes Ms. Storer who said of hospitals ‘They need extra beds, extra equipment so they can treat patients and it’s just not there for them.’

The BNP creates a position whereby the solution to problems at home is only possible through adherence to strictly the national interest. This creates opposing sides: an us and a them – the British people and foreigners.

**Law and order**

It is necessary to provide some context regarding law and order in Britain in the build up to the 2001 general election (7 June). On 26 May 2001 in Oldham, Greater Manchester
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police in riot gear battled with 500 young Asian men for control of the streets. In April 2001 76 year old Walter Chamberlain was beaten by Asian youths after being told ‘get out of our area’. In 2000 60% if the victims of 600 racist incidents recorded by Oldham police were white, and 180 of these racial incidents were violent – with gangs of between six and twenty Asian youths usually targeting lone white males. On 5 June 2001 200 youths took part in overnight street violence in Harehills, Leeds, enacting premeditated attacks against the police. Assistant Chief Constable Steve Smith commented that ‘Any attempt to legitimise criminal behaviour by saying it is connected with racial tension or the style of policing is just an excuse for young males committing crime on the streets.’

It is in this context that in ‘Law and Order’ the BNP calls for a move away from the politically correct straight jacket that constrains police and promotes the rights of criminals over innocent people and victims. Interestingly within this section there is no identity or focalisation specific to the British people, or rather the BNP’s conception of what constitutes a British citizen. Instead, the more general grouping of ‘innocent people’ is used, stating ‘The left-wing fixation with the ‘rights’ of criminals must be replaced by concern for the rights of victims, and the right of innocent people not to become victims.’ In the context of racial tensions and rioting, with the media bringing attention to violent Asian youths in particular, it is not necessary for the BNP to create an enemy.

The implication is that this ethnic group is culpable of increasing crime and compromising public safety, and so there is no demarcation between British people and foreigners. Foreigners are assigned no identity, and have no focalisation here. This helps negotiate the perceptions of racism within the party. Furthering the explanation as to why...
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there is deliberately no mention of foreign ethnic groups is the fact that political parties do not exist in a vacuum, and thus are conditioned by and adhere to the ‘rules of the game’ of their respective political system or institutional environment.\(^\text{80}\) For the BNP to publically denounce a specific ethnic group would have been political suicide in 2001, resulting in confirmation of pre-existing accusations, a backlash of renewed and reinvigorated allegations, and a loss of political legitimacy. However, recently in March 2014 the Dutch far right politician Geert Wilders incited a crowd to chant ‘Fewer! Fewer!’ in response to whether they wanted fewer or more Moroccans in the Netherlands.\(^\text{81}\) Differences within the far right and between the political conditions and institutional environment of different countries demand an appreciation of the appropriate context and climate. Moreover, changes over time need to be recognised as in the later election manifestos Muslims are denounced by the BNP and presented as an unwelcome threat in British society.

Rather than bringing racial considerations or ethnicity into the matter, the ‘politically correct straightjacket’ is vilified in ‘Law and Order’ and shown as a hindrance not only to the police and courts but to innocent people and victims in Britain.\(^\text{82}\) Through a defiance of politically correctness the BNP pledges to lessen crime and improve public safety. This section of the manifesto serves to demonstrate that political correctness is not always a good thing, showing that some accepted notions by which British society operates should be reconsidered.

Environment

This is another particularly interesting part of the manifesto. The language and subtle implications within are very cleverly calculated, especially when bearing in mind that the environment’s wellbeing is not at all a central consideration for the BNP. The organisation’s environmental policy is negligible and definitely superseded by issues judged
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by the party and public to be far more important, such as the EU, the economy, immigration, public order, and medical services.

The view the BNP exhibits in the 2001 manifesto is that Britain and its resources should be for the white native Britons, with as much self-sufficiency as possible in order to minimise any foreign dependence and influence. That is the ideal to which it aspires, and this ideal directs the party’s conception of what constitutes their ‘clean, beautiful country, free of pollution in all its forms.’\(^83\) The implication is that foreigners are polluting Britain. Foreigners, whether inside (foreign businesses, foreign individuals) or outside (the EU) of Britain, are blamed for all of the domestic problems and the BNP pledges to ‘enforce standards to curb those practices’.\(^84\) What constitutes this polluting action is outlined elsewhere in the manifesto, with the other sections dedicated to explaining how foreigners are essentially destroying Britain’s homeland and identity, also disturbing the social and economic well-being of the native Britons.

So, the environmental policy should be viewed as a way to promote the central, core policies of the BNP. They commit to addressing environmental damage ‘whether by business or the individual,’ and in the ‘Economy’ and ‘Immigration’ sections how this would be done is already detailed.\(^85\) Through presenting foreign-owned business and non-white immigrants as polluting Britain, this is a further attempt to encourage a questioning of accepted norms. Instead of an imagined international community, ‘The polluter pays to clean up the mess.’\(^86\) However, if this same logic were applied with an acknowledgement of Britain’s colonial past, the ‘Foreign Aid’ section would read very differently. Here the ‘Environment’ section attempts to reinforce previously introduced ideas through the use of a metaphor.

---
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Northern Ireland

The Irish Republican Army (IRA) had long been involved in terrorism against England. However, a renewed campaign was initiated following Bloody Sunday in 1972, in which 26 civil rights protestors and bystanders were shot and killed by the British Army in NI. Particularly active throughout the 1990s, the IRA constituted the main terrorist threat to England over this period. Several incidents took place shortly before the 2001 general election, including a car bomb outside the BBC Television Centre in west London (4 March) and a two bomb explosions in Hendon, north London (15 April and 6 May).87

A hard stance is taken against the terrorist activities of the IRA, in stating ‘We must cancel the Good Friday Agreement, the Anglo-Irish Agreement and declare that Northern Ireland will remain British for all time.’88 The Good Friday Agreement of 1998 allowed for a devolved system of government in NI, establishing institutions to act as a bridge between NI and the Republic of Ireland, as well as between the Republic of Ireland and the UK.89 The Anglo-Irish Agreement of 1985 also related to a devolved government, additionally safeguarding the constitutional position of NI unless a majority desired to join the Republic of Ireland.90 A NI under British rule was politically impossible and this can be disregarded as a serious pillar of the BNP’s aims. Instead, what it serves to do is demonstrate that the BNP is uncompromising on public disorder, violence, and terror. What the party supports is ‘a non-sectarian parliament in Northern Ireland.’91 Such a parliament would be free from affiliation with any particular religious belief. This further serves to subtly compound the divide between native Britons and foreigners holding different religious beliefs.

89 Britannica, ‘Good Friday Agreement’
91 BNP, ‘Northern Ireland’, 2001
Overview

A divide between white native Britons and who the BNP considers as foreigners (essentially the non-natives) is created throughout the manifesto, in the words used, the identities constructed and the argumentation put forth. The concern of the party is for the white British people and ‘their homeland and identity’: something personal to the British people. It cares about those ‘at home’ who the BNP call ‘our people.’ Why money should be spent abroad when Britain needs internal investment is questioned, and an argument that British people would benefit if there were no foreign people or influence is constructed. Foreigners are presented as not belonging in Britain, and the notion of an international community is rejected.

With no international community, therefore, the interests of solely the British people should be served. To encourage this thinking, the focalisations throughout the manifesto fit accordingly; the British people are portrayed as victims of foreign influence and political correctness, with foreigners and past regimes shown to be the villains due to their adverse effect on British society and culture. Moreover, the concealed metaphor of pollution encourages support for the party’s policies. However, the BNP is presented as the much-needed hero of the people and the party that can solve all of Britain’s problems, regardless of the issue.

The argumentation within the manifesto is made on the basis of their morality, concerned only with the party’s target audience: white native Britons. The manifesto creates subject positions in which the reader is forced to question assumptions, such as the inherent benefits of processes such as immigration, multiculturalism, an international community and globalisation.

The aim of the BNP was to distance itself from its negative associations and allegations of Nazism, fascism, racism, etc. through committing to historical revisionism. By taking such a tough, hostile stance on NI – composed of a race of culturally similar white folk – they are seen as opponents of violence and unrest, rather than victimising a specific ethnic group; throughout the whole manifesto only one ethnic group is focused on: white native
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Britons. To reiterate, the rules of the political game and institutional environment need to be adhered to when seeking electoral success.

Thus, the BNP presents itself as operating on the basis of a pride and devotion towards its country and people, rather than according to hostility and hate. It is Britain and its native people who are under attack by foreigners and foreigner influence. In seeking electoral success, commonly accepted and politically correct practices such as immigration, multiculturalism and globalisation are challenged, and if they are judged to be negative the policies of the BNP become much more logical – provided you are a white native Briton. Negotiating politically correct inversely negotiates the negative view towards the BNP; this is attempted through creating a divide between white native Britons and foreigners.
Chapter 4: 2005 – ‘Rebuilding British Democracy’

This chapter sets the context of the 2005 general election and examines the second manifesto analysed – ‘Rebuilding British Democracy’ – in order to answer the main research question.

The context of 2005 general election

The UK general election of 2005 was held on 5 May, and since the 2001 general election there had been major world developments impacting upon the strategy implemented by the BNP in their election manifesto. Since the 11 September 2001 (9/11) attacks on the United States (US) terrorism propelled to a global issue, subsequently resulting in military campaigns to combat this growing threat. Heavy suspicions rested with the militant Islamist group Al Qaeda and evidence revealed their close ties with the Taliban government in Afghanistan. George W. Bush delivered his ‘War on Terror’ speech on 20 September 2001, with Blair signalling Britain’s support. Britain became embroiled in military and political involvement in Afghanistan that still lingers on today, with the British Army still not fully withdrawn. With Afghanistan remaining a contentious issue in Britain presently, this helps portray how large an issue it was for the electorate in 2005.

Accompanying Afghanistan was the Iraq War, initiated on 20 March 2003 following American and British allegations that Iraq was harbouring weapons of mass destruction, thus violating the resolutions of the United Nations and posing a security risk. The report used in large to justify the war against Iraq – ‘Iraq’s Security and Intelligence Network; A Guide and Analysis’ – came under attack as it emerged that a significant amount of what was presented as intelligence agencies’ assessments of Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction
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and briefings in fact came from a PhD thesis available online. This thesis received no attribution and the government’s report, labelled the ‘Dodgy Dossier’, prompted great criticism and outrage from the public who felt the government had deceived them.

The unpopularity of both wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and general disenchantment and hostility towards the government, are central considerations when analysing the BNP’s 2005 election manifesto. Moreover, the very legality of both wars is a controversial topic, which served to further entangle the government in accusations of corruption, brutality and deceit.

Jose Pedro Zuquete highlights how after 9/11 Pope Benedict XVI emphasised the need to ‘re-Christianize’ Europe, deploring the inherent violence of Islam. Mudde maintains that the sheer number of Muslims exacerbates the fear they induce and notes how since 9/11 and the rise of Islamophobia across Western Europe populist radical right parties have placed a new emphasis on the Christian essence of Europe. Zuquete describes how the need to defend a broader entity – Europe – is stressed by right wing groups to give their rationale a sense of higher purpose, emanating from Islam’s supposed desire to create a New World Order stemming from its militant globalist philosophy.

Important to consider is not only the military implications of the ‘War on Terror’, but also security measures and the effects on civil liberties. Increased police power relating to stop and search abilities, increased monitoring and gathering of data from telephone calls, texts and emails, and increased surveillance through CCTV cameras throughout Britain fostered uneasiness and opposition amongst the general public. While the average citizen with nothing to hide might welcome measures taken to protect them from terrorism and
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terrorist acts, that this increased governmental control and surveillance was forcibly implemented without public choice invited criticism in a democratic society. Legislation such as the ‘Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act’, later declared unlawful at the European Convention on Human Rights, compelled Lord Hoffman to declare ‘The real threat to the life of the nation, in the sense of a people living in accordance with its traditional laws and political values, comes not from terrorism but from laws such as these.’ The difficult faced by the government was how to fight terrorism ruthlessly without infringing on pre-existing rights, freedoms, and liberties – utilised by the BNP in their election campaign.

The context of the British National Party in the 2005 general election

Before moving onto an analysis of the 2005 manifesto, the context of the BNP needs to be outlined. Despite continued opposition from members of the public as well as their political rivals, the BNP had enjoyed a modest growth in support and enjoyed greater success in local elections, also attaining an increased vote in European elections, polling 4.9% of the vote which represented an increase of 4% points from the 1999 European elections. Though by no means a popular party, the BNP had demonstrated its staying power and remained an option for those looking to vote outside of the two main parties of Labour and the Conservatives. However, the same old allegations and accusations persisted prior to the 2005 election and this particular leopard was having difficulty proving it had changed its spots.

The journalist Jason Gwynne infiltrated the BNP where he operated undercover for a period of sixth months beginning in December 2003. The BBC and Searchlight launched the documentary ‘The Secret Agent’ on 15 July 2004, which exposed both racist behaviour and


criminal activity, with Griffin warning his supporters of the threat Muslims and ‘the Islamic dragon’ posed to their women. Other party members were also implicated.\textsuperscript{104} Barclays Bank responded by freezing the accounts held by the BNP, with their actions representing the hostility directed towards the political party by the general British public.\textsuperscript{105} So once again the BNP were fighting to preserve their political integrity, combatting allegations similar to those faced in the build up to the 2001 general election.

\textbf{The manifesto}

The party’s ideal, core arguments, and oppositions remain the same in this manifesto. Britain is still presented as being under attack, however the notion of a cultural war is introduced. The main enemy switches to being the government and other parties with hostile and evocative language used against them with the motif of death and destruction. Foreigners are still opposed, but with a focus on Islam, though the language against them is not greatly hostile. The metaphor of pollution is again utilised in the section relating to the environment. The concept of what it is to be British is introduced. Some statistics, facts, and demographic trends are referred to. The manifesto expands considerably in size and a structured argument building section by section is noticeable.

The 2005 manifesto is a much more comprehensive document than its 2001 equivalent. Entitled ‘Rebuilding British Democracy’ it is fifty-four pages long and addresses sixteen separate topics. Structurally the 2005 manifesto is very well crafted and, following the introduction, the next five sections set out the main argumentation of the party, with each section progressively building on the last. The rest of the manifesto – the other twelve sections (including the conclusion) – serves to supplement the arguments already put forth. Due to the centrality of these six sections and the progressive argument identifiable I will

\textsuperscript{104} Chris Kirby, a BNP councillor recently elected in June 2004, discussed plans to torch a van disseminating anti-BNP material. Local BNP council candidate Stewart Williams was caught saying ‘all I want to do is shoot Pakis’ and David Midgley talks of how he harassed a local Indian restaurant by putting dog faeces through its letter box for a period of three weeks. The Telegraph, ‘Undercover BBC film exposes BNP chiefs as ‘racists’’ (2004): http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1467037/Undercover-BBC-film-exposes-BNP-chiefs-as-racists.html. Accessed 08/04/2014

analyse them chronologically. Following this ‘The environment – Our ‘blessed plot’’ will demonstrate how the other topics addressed in the manifesto are used to provide supporting evidence and reasoning for the arguments already put forth.

**Introduction: Freedom; Security; Identity; Democracy**

The first section ‘Introduction: Freedom; Security; Identity; Democracy’ introduces the main lines of argument that are pursued by the BNP, maintaining that the government is disregarding the British people, their heritage and identity, and the core values of British society in favour of globalisation (or the notion of an international community) and multiculturalism, necessitating the reestablishment of British borders and sovereignty (including EU withdrawal). The subject positions allocated within this section derive from the morality of the BNP, again focused on white native Britons.

In defending the ‘social experiment’ that is multiculturalism, ‘A whole raft of repressive legislation’ has been implemented by past governments, with the effect meaning that ‘It is the “average” man and woman who suffers from the failings of our politicians to grasp the issue and restore genuine democracy’: the party’s main target group. The people are presented as involuntary guinea pigs for the government’s selfish and corrupt schemes. It is important to highlight the tension between the populist radical right’s conception of democracy and liberal democracy, with Mudde identifying the distinction between monism and pluralism as the crux of this difference in interpretation: homogeneity vs. heterogeneity. Thus, instead of democracy, the BNP perspective is that ‘in truth what exists is a sham and an illusion’. Diversity is a negotiated concept, achieved through each ethnic group remaining in their ethnic land of origin. However, this interpretation cannot be construed as racist or hostile, as it is stated that the same right should be afforded to all indigenous peoples, in order to maintain the celebrated human diversity.
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In professing to tell the truth, the BNP is playing on the sensitivities the public has toward the government regarding enacted legislation, Afghanistan, and Iraq. Additionally, the corruption and selfishness in politics is cited as a reason why the BNP should be voted for and the policies of globalisation and multiculturalism rejected, as ‘the corporate industrial and commercial giants have the money to buy and influence individuals, representatives and entire political parties’. Many discourses are engaged with to highlight the areas in which Britain is suffering owing to the government, including crime, employment, education, schoolchildren, pensioners, and the transport system. The BNP ‘exists to put an end to this injustice’.

Through conjuring the notion of a Britain under attack – as in 2001 – in a ‘long term cultural war being waged by a ruling regime which has abandoned the concept of “Britain” in pursuit of globalisation’, also listing the many different ways in which Britain is suffering, the BNP compels its audience to oppose the government, globalisation and multiculturalism. This incorporates all the main elements of the rationale presented. The next five sections support these notions, and follow a progressive argument.

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

The section ‘Leaving the European Union – The *sine qua non*’ is heavily critical of the EU and the government for supporting it due to attacks on ‘personal freedoms and our hard-won democracy’. The well-voiced opinion that membership in the EU brings economic benefits and is integral for prosperity is attacked through referring to the examples of non-members Switzerland and Norway. This ‘myth’ is fed to the public by ‘the Europhile scare-mongers’, and in actuality the EU has a ‘tendency to strangle business with
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unnecessary regulations’ and is ‘spectacularly corrupt’.\textsuperscript{113} Again, EU membership is shown as wasting money which would be better spent on and in Britain. It is said that the ‘Brussels superstate... wishes, for the purpose of aggrandising its own power, to rule Britain’.\textsuperscript{114} This draws comparisons with previous superstates, such as Germany during the Nazi period and the Soviet Union with language such as ‘tendency to strangle’ and ‘pursuit of an unworkable imperial fantasy’ accentuating barbarism and aggression.\textsuperscript{115}

What is identified as ‘the greatest single threat posed by the European Union’ are future plans to expand further into the countries of Bulgaria, Romania and Turkey.\textsuperscript{116} The figures provided estimate that 8 million Sinta gypsies would be free to move into Western Europe, while Turkish membership would involve more than 75 million Muslims. Of this, it is announced that it ‘would mark the end of Europe’s ancient and historic close identification with Christendom.’ Here is it important to remember Mudde’s assertion that Muslims are feared because of the enormity of their numbers, and the large figure of 75 million can be seen as scare-mongering in the favourable anti-Muslim environment of the time.\textsuperscript{117} The increased emphasis on Europe’s Christian essence within the far right needs to be acknowledged, as does the highlighting of Islam’s expansionist globalist ideology.\textsuperscript{118} Here an us and them between Christianity and Islam continues from 9/11 and is included in the 2005 election manifesto.

This is the starting point of an argument in which the BNP outlines a step-by-step rationale as to why the notions set out in the introduction warrant support. The dividing lines, or lines of demarcation, are presented as being the BNP and the British people vs. the governments of past and present and the EU, and Christianity vs. Islam. Essentially what the BNP is urging the people to choose between is the democratic values, freedom and well-
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being it can provide, or the continued oppression, lies, deceit and worsening conditions the current and past governments have brought.

Democracy – Resolving the crisis of our highest value

The argumentation that the government is stripping away democratic rights, freedom and civil liberties which demanding resistance continues. It is stated that ‘our dearly-bought birthright of freedom is under mortal threat once more’. Additionally, the ‘monstrous growth’ in the power and control of the state ‘threatens to subject us to the perpetual tyranny of Big Brother’, with ‘creeping totalitarianism’ festering in Britain. Furthermore, a ‘savage attack on free speech’ is referred to. Words like mortal threat, monster, savage, and the association of totalitarianism with figures such as Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, combined with the lack of privacy and peace Big Brother implies, create a negative, threatening and evil identity for the government.

A sense of national pride is encouraged through a reminder that ‘This country is the birthplace of modern democracy’ and that ‘personal freedom has deep and strong roots among the native people of our islands’. Historic events are cited to invigorate this pride, with references including the Norman Conquest, the Magna Carta, the Peasants’ Revolt and the suffragettes. Notably, however, there is no reference to empire or the imperial era; an aggressive and imposing force is not the image the BNP wants to promote of Britain: it better suits the party’s enemies. For personal freedoms and liberty, there is a reminder that ‘our people have always fought and even died to secure them again’. This creates a sense of impending doom, urgency, and obligation.


The BNP has a solution and mentions policies to restore democracy to Britain that are discussed later in the manifesto. These include neutrality in the Middle East and the ‘Clash of Civilizations’ led by the US, and a rejection of mass immigration. Important here is the mention of their immigration policy, while also noting they play on the unpopularity of the Afghanistan and Iraq wars. Additionally, it is noted how ‘hypocritically-enforced laws pertaining to race and religion, which are virtually never enforced against foreigners attacking the racial and religious groups indigenous to Britain’ threaten British culture, heritage and identity.\textsuperscript{124} Again religion and ethnicity are used to create diving lines within and outside of British society.

This section moves forth the progressive general argument in urging the native Britons to emulate their ancestors and fight back for their country. The following passage best represents the dual aim of invoking nationalism and besmirching its competing parties: ‘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’.\textsuperscript{125} Presented as criminal and destructive, the government and the EU’s aim to diminish Britain is likened to Humpty Dumpty, the protagonist in one of England’s best known nursery rhymes, also playing on the concept of ‘broken Britain’.

Important to note is how the ideas of the next section, which relates to immigration, are introduced within ‘Democracy’ as a prelude. After denouncing multiculturalism as a failed social experiment, fuelling nationalist feeling and sharpening the sense that Britain and its people are under attack, the necessity of rejecting of mass immigration to preserve Britain is declared.


\textsuperscript{125} BNP, ‘Democracy’, 2005, p. 10.
Immigration – A crisis without parallel

Central in the BNP’s explanation of how to restore freedom, liberty, and democracy, is their immigration policy, which remains essentially the same as in 2001. This ‘crisis without parallel’ necessitates a reversal of ‘positive discrimination’ schemes and a taking back of control of the borders. Terrorism is referred to here to elevate the importance of immigration from a social policy to a matter of National Security. This demands a hard stance, and the BNP creates an us and them in warning ‘On current demographic trends we, the native British people, will be an ethnic minority in our own country within sixty years’, emphasising a cultural war. The BNP highlights the need to ‘rebuild trust in the immigration system’, encouraging support for its policy.

This demographic warning has no reference to the source on which it is based, but a quick independent search easily reveals the expected origin. This prediction is based on the research of Professor David Coleman: a demographer at Oxford University and Chair for Migration Watch, who has been accused of stirring up racial hatred by his students, with his removal from the university called for. This demonstrates how the party manipulates and selectively uses statistics and studies for their own ends. Thus, one needs assess the legitimacy of their supposed evidence.

The detrimental effects of the government’s commitment to multiculturalism and globalisation are included within this section. We are informed of ‘inescapable statistical fact’ showing immigration to increase the crime rate, levels of violence, terror, unemployment, welfare dependency and educational failure, with this holding true not only in Britain but for other countries and states too. Immigration is portrayed as inherently

---


bad: not just for Britain but in all cases. Of these inescapable statistical facts, remarkably, the party provides just one ‘hard fact’ and assures the audience that the other aspects of society tell ‘a similar story for most other foreign ethnic groups’; it is detailed 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’. One unreferenced fact based upon supposedly official figures is used to provide evidence for the party’s broad criticism of immigration. Further evidence of the damaging effect of immigration is the ‘ruthless exploitation of the immigrants themselves’, and again government lies to protect the processes of multiculturalism and globalisation are emphasised to encourage a rejection of that government and its corresponding policies.

A chief concern was to negotiate allegations of racism and hostility, which is done through reference to Blair’s view that ‘it is “neither racist nor extremist” to raise “genuine concerns” about the flood of asylum seekers’. Political correctness tells us that such views are racist and extreme, which the BNP works to negotiate. To justify its stance on immigration, the BNP quotes from the man responsible for dragging Britain into Afghanistan and Iraq.

Again played upon is the shunning of democracy as ‘In any society claiming to be based on the rule of law... all illegal immigrants must be deported as soon as they are discovered’. Furthering this, and remembering that the BNP supports neutrality and non-intervention in the Middle East, the party offers the assurance that ‘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’. Here the BNP can rectify the failings of the government domestically through opposing immigration, and also internationally, through ending unwanted foreign wars that make Britain a terrorist target.

---

The focus of the BNP is clearly white native Britons, and the immigration policy advocated by the BNP is shown to be the way in which Britain can fight to ensure the continued existence of its essence, people and future in the face of a cultural war. This section builds on the last in outlining how and why the British people should fight to protect what the government and related processes are attacking.

Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving Britain

This section provides further justification for the party’s immigration policy. Immediately the audience is reminded that Britain is under attack in a cultural war waged by the government through the forces of multiculturalism and globalisation, legitimised through a false and repressive internationalist ideology. Human equality is a negotiated concept, presented as an ‘absurd superstition – propagated for different though sometimes overlapping reasons by capitalists, liberals, Marxists and theologians’, with democracy viewed ‘in an ethnic as well as a civic sense’.134

This ethnic sense does not derive from any perceived superiority or inferiority, but rather through scientific evidence. The new medical science of pharmacogenetics demonstrates that Western Europeans – the British in particular – possess a ‘historically established tendency’, that is ‘to some extent at least genetically pre-determined’, toward democracy, freedom, and equality.135 There is a deliberate silence here on the totalitarian history of Western Europe, notably in Germany and Italy for example.

Divergent evolutionary paths mean it is ‘fatally flawed’ to assume immigrants automatically adapt to the values of British society.136 The same applies to the government’s


135 Pharmacogenetics involves the study of genetic differences in metabolic pathways. It affirms that individuals respond differently to drugs and medicine depending upon their genes and, by extension, their race or ethnicity. This is referred to by the BNP to accentuate the supposed divisiveness of genetic and evolutionary differences not only in response to medicine and drugs, but also in terms of predispositions to different (and conflicting) ways of living, notions of how things should be done, and what is acceptable in society. BNP, ‘Multiculturalism’, 2005, p. 17.

efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq to ‘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’. Moreover, evolutionary differences between cultures results in a greater susceptibility to health concerns when in foreign lands; the ‘egalitarian dogma’ of human equality is damaging to both Britain and its natives, as well as the received immigrants. Globalisation and a misdirected desire for cheap labour are blamed for changing the course of a human history (diversity through geographical separation): the BNP maintains homogeneity is so ‘apparently unchallengeably natural that the political theorists and philosophers of past generations simply took it for granted’.

History show the ‘truly gruesome record of multi-ethnic societies breaking down into hatred and mass murder’ with Bosnia, Rwanda, Indonesia, and NI providing examples. Additionally, scientific studies of primates are referred to show that ‘murderous ‘wars’ against different groups of the same species’ are inherent not only in humans but our close relatives also. Hereby, racism is positioned as ‘part of human nature’, legitimising the policies of the BNP and negotiating allegations against them. On top of this, the inherent value of bio-diversity is accentuated, describing ‘an invisible but deadly poison which threatens every culture and distinct ethnic group in the world’. That poison is depicted as globalisation, harnessing a motif of death and disease. Thus, ‘a model of ‘multiculturalism’ which combines peaceful co-existence with the maintenance of cultural and biological separation,’ is imperative. This ‘must cease to be demonized as ‘racism’ and understood as a natural and laudable survival mechanism’.

The identities constructed, focalisations and language used within this section encourage the audience to adopt the subject positions allocated. The identity of the

government is a misguided and deceitful organisation disrupting the natural order of human
diversity in its profit-orientated schemes and social experiments, which ignores the welfare
of the British people and attacks the fundamentals of the very place they are meant to
represent. An us and them is created between the government and the BNP, as the latter’s
concern lies firmly with native Britons, yet with a tolerance and appreciation for all cultures
(provided they stay within their ethnic lands of origin) with their evolutionary particularisms
demanding preservation. The party presents itself as realist, not racist.

The BNP calls for support in the fight to preserve the democratic values and
freedoms historically and genetically subscribed to by Western Europeans. Historical and
scientific references are utilised, with the integral value of bio-diversity supplementing the
argument.144 Throughout are motifs of death, disease and violence, with depictions of these
government schemes described as being ‘fatally flawed’, inducing ‘mayhem and
bloodshed’.145 The effects will continue to worsen, as globalisation and multiculturalism
become ‘increasingly anti-human and even genocidal in practice’.146 Globalisation, described
as a ‘juggernaut’, fits the dictionary definition as something eliciting blind and destructive
devotion (through political correctness), as an overwhelming and advancing force crushing
what is in its path.147 The language used and haunting motifs serve to present globalisation
and multiculturalism as inherently evil and destructive forces that need to be opposed to
ensure the survival and existence of democracy and the native British people.

In short, the section ‘Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving democracy’ follows the
outlining of the BNP’s immigration policy, and serves to explain why the party is justified in
advocating such policies. It is an attempt to negotiate allegations of racism and hostility
launched at the BNP, and to negotiate the widely-accepted view that globalisation and
multiculturalism are beneficial to society. The BNP presents itself as operating according to
the aim of preserving Britain, calling for the same for other indigenous peoples.


Culture, traditions and the civil society

The argumentation within ‘Culture, traditions and the civil society’ is familiar in arguing that the government and their corresponding schemes of globalisation and multiculturalism need to be opposed in the cultural war they are waging against Britain. The sacrifices ‘our ancestors’ have historically made to protect Britain and its core is restated, accompanying a reminder that ‘Our national character and native institutions are a precious inheritance’.148 The motifs of death and destruction are maintained as it is said that ‘the character of daily life in Britain is being corroded’ in the ‘quasi-Marxist cultural war against all things white, European and male’.149 Despite the unnecessary gender reference, the us and them divide created between the government continues, as does the necessity of ethnic separation.

Through globalisation the government is portrayed as forcibly imposing foreign and unwanted cultures on Britain, demonstrating that ‘it despises our country and urgently wished to reshape it into something else’.150 The importance of tradition, heritage and civility is emphasised. What the BNP wants is for the British people ‘to be allowed to celebrate their identity and heritage with as much right as is accorded to other native peoples’.151

The point that Britain is under attack and that its native people are deprived of the right to be proud of and preserve their culture is demonstrated through engaging with several discourses, including British soap operas, religion and education. In this section the emphasis is on considerations within Britain, rather than those more general ideas and theories outlined in ‘Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving Britain’. The BNP supports ‘a return to traditional standards of civility and politeness in British life’, in which schools, government correspondence with the public, and the BBC have a responsibility to set the

---


Soap operas in particular are denounced for not portraying ‘slightly ‘higher’ than real-life behaviour as the norm’ and instead ‘setting out to show ordinary people – in particular the white working class – in the most negative and unattractive light possible’.

This engages with the then contemporary controversy surrounding ‘EastEnders’, which is aired on the BBC and one of the most famous and popular soaps. The Broadcasting Standards Commission reported that ‘the level of menace and violence shown in this episode and its repeat had exceeded that acceptable for a soap attracting a wide range of viewers and broadcast pre-watershed’. The EastEnders actor Shaun Williamson had announced he thought it was ‘frightening’ that parents allowed their young children to view the show, which had become increasingly ‘gritty’. In November 2005, just under six months after the general election took place, the BBC was attacked for harbouring ‘an anti-religious attitude’, while ‘its correspondents have little understanding of religious issues and soaps such as EastEnders ridicule religion’. Again, Christianity is emphasised.

The BNP also advocates the celebration of ancestral folk traditions, ancient festivals, and the reaffirmation of the beauty and meaning of Anglo-Saxon culture through school education. Thus, to stop Britain becoming barbaric and uncivilized society needs to stop this corrosion. However, just as the history of British imperialism and colonialism is ignored by the BNP, so too are the brutal, barbaric or violent traditions of Anglo-Saxon culture and society. Once again a selective account or interpretation of history is used to promote a sense of moral superiority within the native Britons.

In summary, this section contributes to the overall argument, building upon the previous section, through addressing apparent issues observable within Britain. It depicts a


154 The scene stimulating complaints shows Phil Mitchell handing out a vicious beating to Jamie Mitchell (both white working-class Englishmen), as he refused to reveal the whereabouts of Phil’s ex-girlfriend and daughter. BBC News, ‘BBC rapped over EastEnders’ (2003): http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/tv_and_radio/2712133.stm. Accessed 08/04/2014


loss of Britishness.\footnote{Britishness refers to what it means to be British: the characteristics and qualities binding together and distinguishing the British people, thus forming the basis of their unity and identity.} This is presented as civility, politeness, respect for ancestral folk traditions and Anglo-Saxon culture, as well as an affinity with Christianity. Nationalistic sentiment is aroused. Here, concerns are raised about education and religion in Britain, and the attack on the white natives represented through cases such as EastEnders: the loss of Britishness. Plenty of references to children and ancestors invite the population to question what sort of Britain they want for their children. It follows that if they want to re-establish and preserve Britain’s democracy, identity and freedoms, they must support the BNP.

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

Having now analysed the sections of the manifesto with great importance in terms of providing an evolving argument, the environment section will be addressed. It was asserted that the environment section of 2001 was merely a façade for promoting other ideas, and its 2005 counterpart confirms this observation. Exhibiting the same ideas as in 2001, notable additions include a direct mirroring of the immigration policy, ending further immigration and offering voluntary resettlement incentives, additionally ending ‘all intrusions of new development into Greenbelt areas, except in clear cases of genuine local need’.\footnote{The British National Party, ‘The environment – Our ‘blessed plot’’, ‘Rebuilding British Democracy’: 2005 General Election Manifesto: \url{http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/ge05/man/bnpmanifesto2005.pdf}. Accessed 10/11/2013, p. 48.} The BNP confirm their interest in the needs of the British people and indifference towards an international community and globalisation in declaring that only in cases of local need will they compromise. Moreover, ‘protecting the British environment must be done with respect for our national sovereignty’.\footnote{BNP, ‘Environment’, 2005, p. 48.} This offers a short example of how other issues and discourses engaged with serve to support and solidify the necessity of the BNP’s core policies in 2005 as well as in 2001.
Overview

The ideal for the party within the 2005 manifesto is a British government fully committed to strictly national interests and the welfare of the British people. The target audience, white native Britons, are presented as under attack by the corrupt and selfish government positioned against ‘all things white’ and ‘European’ in their cultural war.\textsuperscript{160} Demographic trends warn that they will be rendered a minority in their own homeland. Thus, throughout the manifesto the native Britons are shown to be victims of a villainous government’s policies, which are destroying the essence of Britain and its people and will continue to do so. Therefore, the target audience is urged to reject the government and its accompanying schemes, and positioned to support a homogenous Britain achievable through voting the hero of this narrative – the BNP – into government.

A negotiation of the party’s racist and generally negative image is attempted through references to history, science, medical evidence, wars and observable current issues in British society. The ruinous effect of government schemes in Britain consist of elements such as higher levels of crime, unemployment, welfare dependency, worsening education and societal standards, the transport system, and healthcare. All the problems faced by the ordinary people – the white native Britons – derive from the government’s false anti-human ideology. Moreover, the loss of Britishness in this cultural war is lamented and the importance of reaffirming it emphasised. The selective use of sources – or indeed the use of bias studies – substantiates their arguments, bringing their legitimacy into question.

The current government and those of the past are the main enemy in this manifesto. 9/11 had strengthened a sense of incompatibility between two different views of how to organise society. However, Muslims and Islam specifically do not receive great attention. A more powerful sentiment played upon is that the government had dragged the population into wars against Afghanistan and Iraq under false pretences, validated by misinformation. The effect had been two unpopular wars and the undebated enactment of oppressive legislation, in opposition to the values of freedom and liberty associated with a democracy and Britain’s history.

\textsuperscript{160} BNP, ‘Culture’, 2005, p. 22.
Reference to government lies, corruption and the described cultural war provide reasons to support the BNP. An us and them is created with the BNP and the British people on one side, and the government on the other. The chief concern of the BNP is presented as being the protection and preservation of the British people and their heritage, culture, identity, democracy, and liberties. Following this logic, other lines of demarcation are brought in to encourage an acceptance of the necessity of a homogeneous nation of white native Britons. Western Europe is set apart from other cultures due to its predisposition for democracy and the accompanying freedoms. This validates an ethnic divide, with the party speaking of democracy ‘in an ethnic as well as a civic sense’.\textsuperscript{161} Moreover, the proposed expansion of the EU is not opposed on grounds of Islamophobia or racism; instead the concern is the preservation of Christianity in Europe and secular democratic government in the West. Other religions, cultures and ethnicities are sparsely mentioned in the fifty-four page manifesto, which demonstrates the line of argument the BNP is following is that the government and the acceptance of globalisation and multiculturalism needs to be opposed. The language used throughout is hostile towards the government which is presented as deceitful, unconcerned with the native British public, and evil. Evocative language and imagery is utilised with the motifs of death and destruction encouraging opposition to the government.

The agency of the BNP is well reflected in the progressive argument observable in the initial seven sections of the manifesto, with other policies relating to issues outside of the party’s primary aims – such as the environment – used to supplement and substantiate the views already presented. The introduction sets out the main argumentation that Britain is under attack in a cultural war waged by the government which demands a response from the native people. ‘Leaving the European Union – The \textit{sine qua non}’ sets out the lines of demarcation, and presents a choice for the native people: either put up with the oppression, lies and worsening social conditions wrought by the current government, or support the taking back of Britain’s democratic values, freedom and welfare. ‘Democracy – Resolving the crisis of our highest value’ then uses historical references to support the restoration of values and concepts past ancestors gave their lives for. Neutrality in the Middle East is argued for, as is the necessity of self-determination through encouraging

\textsuperscript{161} BNP, ‘Multiculturalism’, 2005, p. 17.
nationalistic sentiment. This softens the shock of aiming to halt all further immigration, with this policy being mentioned in the same sentence that advocates neutrality in the Middle East.

That serves as a prelude to the next section, ‘Immigration – A crisis without parallel’, which sets out the way in which the British people need to fight back in this cultural war. Despite it being a cultural war, the BNP’s enemies are not other ethnicities or races: it is the government and its schemes. ‘Abolishing multiculturalism, preserving Britain’ offers historical, scientific and medical evidence, citing examples and theories formulated outside of Britain to demonstrate the necessity of their immigration policy. ‘Culture, traditions and the civil society’ serves the same purpose, but instead focuses on observable issues within Britain and the loss of Britishness to support their immigration policy. As ‘The environment – Our ‘blessed plot’’ demonstrates, with the concealed metaphor of pollution kept up, the rest of the manifesto substantiates the arguments outlined in the first six sections of the manifesto.

The way in which the BNP hopes to gain support in the 2005 general election is through attacking the government and its schemes of globalisation and multiculturalism, with evocative, negative language, and motifs of death and destruction. Statistics and demographic trends are also used. A homogenous nation is presented as integral to a democratic and well-functioning society. The party is portrayed as a defender of the people and the core values of Britain. The motivation is to capitalise on the general disenchantment with the government and distrust, aiming to attract voters looking to vote elsewhere.
Chapter 5: 2010 – ‘Democracy, Freedom, Culture and Identity’

This chapter sets the context of the 2010 general election and examines the third and final manifesto analysed: ‘Democracy, Freedom, Culture and Identity’.

The context of the 2010 general election

The UK general election of 2010 took place on 6 May, and since 2005 significant events had impacted upon the electorate and their concerns. A major event in modern Britain occurred just two months after the 2005 general election: the July 2005 bombings in London. The 7 July attacks occurred just a day after London was announced as the host of the 2012 Olympic Games. In these attacks 52 people were killed and in excess of 700 injured by four suicide bombers: three detonated aboard London Underground trains across the city in quick succession, and one on a double-decker bus in Tavistock Square. A second failed attempt on 21 July further intensified the terror. For the British public the militant nature of radical Islam was exemplified by quotes from one of the bombers, Mohammed Sidique Khan, who announced ‘Our words are dead until we give them life with our blood’. Highly critical of the British media and government, he forecasted that the ‘predictable propaganda machine will naturally try to put a spin on things to suit the government and to scare the masses into conforming to their power and wealth-obsessed agendas’. The justification for the act of terror was that ‘Your democratically elected governments continuously perpetuate atrocities against my people all over the world’. Like 9/11 in the US, the 7/7 bombings signalled the watershed moment for Islamophobia in Britain. In


February 2006 87% of respondents in a poll expected further Islamic terrorist attacks, and a 10-1 majority declared the recent events made them less tolerant of the Islam.  

Economic events of 2007/8 adversely affected Britain’s commercial and business sectors, with a knock-on effect on the public sector. The financial crisis was not limited to Britain, with the impacts being felt across Europe and a large part of the world. Paul Lewis’ insight provides a clear overview. Terry Smith, chief executive of Tullett Prebon (an inter-dealer money broker listed on the London Stock Exchange) and expert broker said ‘I don’t think anybody alive has seen events of this seriousness and magnitude affecting the financial markets’. The British government was forced to bail out certain banks including the Royal Bank of Scotland and the Lloyds Banking Group, at the price of ‘a staggering £850bn’ while ‘the eventual cost to taxpayers will not be known for years’ it was reported in December 2009. Exacerbating concerns for the public was a warning in November 2009 that ‘there is a danger Britain’s toxic mix of problems will come to a head as soon as next year’, with Britain the only Group of Twenty country remaining in recession. The state of the economy and the accompanying issues and problems resulted in the economic crisis being recorded ‘as by far the most important issue facing the country’ by Ipsos MORI.

---


168 The Group of Twenty (G20) is made up of 19 of the world’s largest economies plus a representation from the EU. This group represents more than 85% of the world’s capital. The Telegraph, ‘Morgan Stanley fears UK sovereign debt crisis in 2010’ (2009): http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/6693162/Morgan-Stanley-fears-UK-sovereign-debt-crisis-in-2010.html. Accessed 24/04/2014

Accompanying concerns included the effect the crisis would have on social mobility, unemployment and a downturn in family life. As always, immigration remained a key issue.

Consequently, cuts in public services were necessary and had to be addressed by political parties. The public was identified as having the strongest emotional attachment to the NHS, education, care for the elderly and the police; cuts in overseas aid, benefits payments, climate change and transport were much easier targets in terms of avoiding public opposition. However, combatting global warming was high on the political agenda for the major parties. Additionally, while the public felt less threatened by foreign affairs and terrorism, they were critical of the standard of equipment, resources, and facilities available to those serving the British Army in Afghanistan. A further related discourse was potential British involvement in Iran, where weapons of mass destruction were thought to be.

With public trust at its lowest levels, the Ipsos MORI report predicted ‘perhaps voters in 2010 will decide not so much on who they think will tax or cut, but on who they trust most to make the right decisions at the right time’. The MP expenses scandal emerged in May 2009, with MPs being guilty of unnecessary claims and tax avoidance. Moreover, ‘Smeargate’ in April 2009 revealed Damian McBride, one of Prime Minister Gordon Brown’s closest aides, had hatched a plan to post false allegations about four Conservative MPs on an internet blog, including David Cameron and Shadow Chancellor George Osborne. This created the impression that politicians were more concerned with besmirching the image of their opponents rather than focusing on the wants and needs of the public. ‘Bigotgate’ came closest to the election, in April 2010, with Brown captured responding to concerns raised by Mrs Duffy by labelling her ‘bigoted’, in the presumed

---

170 Ipsos MORI, ‘Context for the General Election 2010’

171 Ipsos MORI, ‘Context for the General Election 2010’

172 The claim MPs made ranged from mortgage interests payments (even after mortgages had been paid off) to an elaborate £1,645 ‘duck island’, and even a trouser press and Hob Nob biscuits were claimed for. The public condemnation was so fierce that even innocents considered resignation due to accusations of criminality. BBC News, ‘Q&A: MP expenses row explained’ (2009): [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/7840678.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/7840678.stm). Accessed 25/04/2014

safety of a car. The public felt she had raised legitimate concerns including immigration, benefits, the national debt, pensions, and crime. Brown later said in a BBC Radio 2 interview ‘It was a question about immigration that really I think was annoying’. As a result of instances like these, distrust combined with a feeling that the public view was being ignored.

In short, the main concerns for the British public in the build up to the 2010 general election centred around the economic crisis and the resulting issues, while there was a deep mistrust of politicians and their commitment to serving the interests of the people. Moreover, cuts in public services were an inescapable reality and where and how these cuts would be made was an important factor in the election campaign. Also, the 7/7 bombings were engrained in public consciousness.

**The context of the British National Party in the 2010 general election**

Griffin was acquitted of charges to incite racial hatred (from April 2005 following the aforementioned documentary ‘The Secret Agent’) in November 2006, declaring afterwards ‘they can take our taxes but they cannot take our hearts, they cannot take our tongues and they cannot take our freedom’ for ‘speaking nothing more than the truth’. The party immediately capitalised on 7/7 in displaying a photograph of the bombed bus in an election leaflet which Griffin felt ‘really sums up the cost of voting Labour’ also declaring ‘Maybe now it’s time to start listening to the BNP’. In the 2006 local elections the BNP fielded

---


over 350 candidates and won 46 seats in England, compared to holding just 20 out of 22,000 seats previously, more than doubling their number of councillors.\textsuperscript{178}

However, the party remained in the spotlight for controversial reasons, with another undercover journalist, Ian Cobain, infiltrating their ranks and revealing ‘The techniques of secrecy and deception employed by the BNP in its attempt to conceal activities and intentions from the public’ in late 2006.\textsuperscript{179} Moreover, in 2007 the party was investigated by the Electoral Commission after being accused of having a front organisation called Civil Liberty in an effort to raise money from sympathisers in the US; an audio tape of Griffin requesting financial support when speaking at a conference organised by an ex-Ku Klux Klan member in the US damaged the party’s image.\textsuperscript{180}

Despite all this, the BNP enjoyed increased support and success in 2009. A study revealed ‘that the BNP is gaining new support principally from older, less educated, white working-class men – voters from Labour’s historical base who feel they have benefitted little from the past decade of Labour government, and whose resentments the BNP has succeeded in articulating’. It continues that these voters share concerns about immigration in particular, ‘seeing demographic change as a threat not only to socio-economic resources such as jobs and housing, but also to cultural values and the national community’, before adding ‘Many of these voters are cynical about the main political parties’.\textsuperscript{181} Frustrated voters looked to alternative parties to address their concerns.

In the early hours of 8 June 2009 Griffin was elected to the European Parliament, with the party winning its first two seats there ever, also winning their first three county council seats in Lancashire, Leicestershire and Hertfordshire in local elections held the same


day.\textsuperscript{182} This triggered greater media attention and financial support. Increased support translated to an invitation for Griffin to appear on ‘Question Time’ on 22 October 2009. Despite opposition to allowing him to appear and protests outside BBC buildings across the country, the show went ahead and was watched by a record 7.9 million. Mark Thompson, Director-General of the BBC, had declared that ‘with some 6% of the vote and the election of two MEPs in this spring’s European elections – and with some success in local elections as well – the BNP has demonstrated a level of support that would normally lead to an occasional invitation to join the panel on ‘Question Time’.\textsuperscript{183} By noon the next day the BBC had received 416 calls about the show, with 243 – a majority – complaining about the bias Griffin faced.\textsuperscript{184} Speaking after the show Griffin expressed his intention to officially complain, also commenting ‘I thank the political class and their allies for being so stupid. The huge furore that the political class has created around it clearly gives us a whole new level of public recognition’.\textsuperscript{185}

By the end of 2009, the party’s membership was 12,632: its highest ever. Additionally, the financial resources of the party had grown from £726,455 in 2006 to £1,983,947, which helps give an idea of the party’s continued modernisation and progress.\textsuperscript{186}


The manifesto

Again, the party’s ideal and core arguments and oppositions remain the same in this manifesto. Britain is still presented as being under attack in a cultural war. The main enemy remains the government and other parties, though the language against them softens with a much heavier focus on statistics, facts, and demographic trends. Foreigners are still opposed, but there is a much greater focus on Islam, which is subjected to very hostile language and portrayed as a savage invading force. The motif of death and destruction is now directed against Islam, not the government. The concept of ‘Islamic colonisation’ is introduced. The metaphor of pollution is abandoned and replaced with an attack on the legitimacy of global warming. Again, the manifesto expands considerably in size with the most notable structural element being the ‘Key Pledges’ which are immediately set out even before the introduction, and summarises the core policies relating to each section of the manifesto.

The BNP’s growth in support and media attention is reflected in the growth of its election manifesto, now ninety-four pages long. This manifesto has twenty-five dedicated sections, and the initial ‘Key Pledges’ signals that the party is aware that it is performing in front of a much broader and greater number of interested individuals. Even those opposed to the BNP and their policies were compelled to learn about the organisation, and judge their key policies. The best way for the party to cater for this was to immediately present the crux and ethos of their philosophy in outlining how they feel Britain should move forward in the future. An increased and increasingly diverse audience impacted upon the structure of the manifesto, influencing the content and techniques used within.

Introduction

The ‘Introduction’ follows the ‘Key Pledges’ and is signed off by Griffin himself. It sets out the logic underpinning the organisation, its commitments and sets the party apart from its competitors. Griffin describes the document as ‘one of the most comprehensive and detailed manifestos in history’, and the main arguments include: Britain is under attack (in terms of sovereignty, democracy, culture, heritage, identity, and an indigenous race); the
BNP is the best party to bring the deficit under control; the government should be opposed and British interests put first; and the indigenous Britons have a right to defend their homeland. These assertions are what the policies of the BNP are based on, and detailed explanations of their rationale and intended actions are provided within the manifesto. Once again ‘lesser’ issues outside of the core policies are used to supplement the main arguments.

**Defending Britain: BNP Defence Policy**

The section after the ‘Introduction’ – ‘Defending Britain: BNP Defence Policy’ – immediately sets the BNP apart from other political groups through its opposition to the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and potential involvement in Iran. This is because ‘The purpose of Britain’s armed forces is to protect British interests at home and abroad – and nothing else’, which they judge was not the case in Afghanistan and Iraq. Consequently, they are wary of involvement in Iran and ‘deeply suspicious of “weapons of mass destruction” emanating from the same neo-con clique who lied about Iraq’s alleged bomb and WMDs’. Concerned about strictly the national interest, the party also favours withdrawal from the EU and a negotiation of Britain’s position in the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), to ensure they have the means and freedom to ‘act in defence of our national interests’ and ‘maintain independence and neutrality’. The importance of this is emphasised through reference to the two World Wars. Further accusing the government of not looking out for the British people through their ‘shameful deployment in the Tory/Labour war in Afghanistan’ in terms of equipment and kit, the BNP conforms to the public opinion and discourse that Britain should not be in these theatres, yet maintains that its soldiers should be better provided for.

---


189 Neo-con clique is used here to refer to neoconservatives willing to kill in pursuit of a New World Order. BNP, ‘Defending Britain’, 2010, p. 13.

Expressing deep suspicion towards the government and denouncing the lack of provisions for soldiers is as critical as the BNP gets within this section.

**Immigration – An Unparalleled Crisis Which Only the BNP Can Solve**

A comparatively large portion of the manifesto is dedicated to this section, with the policies remaining essentially the same as in 2001 and 2005. A wealth of statistical evidence, including levels of immigration and birth rates, support the assertion that Britain is in ‘grave peril’ and its people at risk of ‘extinction’. The BNP laments the ‘Orwellian knee-jerk response... that it is ‘racist’ to discuss immigration and population density’. This reaffirms their willingness to address public issues swept under the carpet by other parties: something winning them new supporters.

However, the statistics upon which these statements are based are not the most reliable. Yes, there are references to the Office for National Statistics regarding birth rates and the percentage of immigrants in England and Britain; however, the forecast that the British people are set to become a minority within fifty years originates from a less respected source – the same one used in 2005 for the same claim. Again the research of the bias and controversial Professor Coleman is referred to. This is an example of how the party manipulates and cherry-picks statistics and studies for their own ends: something done a lot more in this 2010 election manifesto.

Having created an ethnic divide, the negative impacts of immigration and multiculturalism are listed within the section, producing ‘a poorer, more violent, uncertain, disorientated, confused, politically correct, ill-education, dependent, fractured society’ as well as ‘social breakdown, the deterioration of community spirit and neighbourliness, the erosion of our Christian heritage, the dilution of our history and culture, the promulgation of totalitarian legislation alien to these islands, congestion on roads and railways, the erosion
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of the country, pressures on social services, and so on’. Additionally, 7/7 is used to dismiss the integration of settled immigrants. Again statistical evidence is used to support some of these claims, with one example being ‘immigrants have taken up more than 1.64 million of the 1.67 million jobs created since 1997’. That presented fact again comes without a reference: a recurring theme. Just as in 2005, a religious divide is utilised to support the party’s thinking, now with the added weight of 7/7.

It is also claimed that ‘immigration has been deceitfully and deliberately employed to dilute British identity and to gerrymander the UK electoral system’. So not only is the government ignoring public concerns relating to immigration, they are actively dismissing them. Immigrants are apparently brought to Britain ‘under false pretences’ and ‘have made native Britons second-class citizens’. Fuelling the racial divide is the announcement that ‘whites are overwhelmingly the victims of racially motivated crime, and not the perpetrators’ – confirmed by the study ‘Interracial Violence’, conducted by ‘well known researcher Tony Shell’. Shell’s website is dedicated to providing assistance to the indigenous Britons ‘in their struggle against betrayal, State treason, and genocide’. Again one can see how bias material is capitalised on in an attempt to back up the party’s arguments with factual evidence and studies.

The party is presented as worthy ‘trustees for future generations’ with the 7/7 bombings proving ‘a decades-long record of truthfully articulating our concerns, often with foresight’. Victims of the deceitful government schemes of immigration and multiculturalism, the British people are encouraged to save Britain from extinction through protecting their homeland and expelling immigrants, subsequently solving the attached
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social problems. In pushing this view though, again the language used against the
government is unaggressive, and most notable is a motif of death through ‘extinction’, ‘the
edge of disaster’, ‘grave peril’, also describing a repressive ‘Orwellian knee-jerk response’. 201

Environmental Protection and the “Climate Change” Theory

In the fifth section, ‘Environmental Protection and the “Climate Change” Theory’, the
metaphor of pollution used in 2001 and 2005 is abandoned, displaced by the issue of global
warming. The claim that climate change dictates ‘all western nations need to be stripped of
their manufacturing base and pay untold billions to the Third World to build up their
industries’ is falsified by ‘the fraud, deception and distortion used in promoting this
theory’. 202 The ‘sinister aspect’ of this ‘hoax’ is that the government is propagating this myth
to manipulate the British public for their own ends. 203 Considering the misuse of statistics
and studies to promote their own arguments detailed in the previous section on
immigration, the BNP’s argument could be considered hypocritical. Additionally, there is no
evidence provided to negate the government’s stance.

Immigration remains a central problem for the environment, with the Optimum
Population Trust judging Britain to be suitable for 30 million people. The problems with
having a population that will soon reach 70 million are linked ‘entirely to the demographic
change wrought by establishment politicians’. Issues are listed as being ‘More people equal
more roads, services, utilities, travel, noise, congestion and pollution’, but an extensive
account of the other more damaging effects of immigration have already been outlined in
the manifesto. 204 Also blamed on this global warming ‘scandal’ is the death of 40,000 elderly
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people due to hypothermia as a consequence of increased taxation included in utility bills, playing on the economic troubles faced by the public.205

In supporting the BNP’s environmental policy, a subject position in which immigration, the government, and the theory of global warming are to be rejected is called for. Again, the language is not particular hostile and the statistical evidence, demographical facts, and noticeable effects on the environment serve as the party’s weapons. Though switching strategy from a concealed metaphor to opposing the portrayed myth of global warming, the section on the environment is again used to promote and solidify other arguments more central to the BNP’s arguments.

Leaving the European Union

The sixth section ‘Leaving the European Union’ again points towards the EU’s intended ‘destruction of the nation states of Europe, including Britain’ having been ‘designed to strip indigenous peoples of their culture, heritage, history and traditions’, again referring to demographic trends.206 Reference to broken government promises that ‘there was no question of the UK losing “any essential sovereignty”’ when the Conservative government agreed to sign the Treaty of Rome in 1973 accompanies the statistic that ‘75 percent of our laws are made in the EU and over 120,000 directives and regulations are in force in Britain’.207 This not only highlights a broken government promise but also serves as a reminder of more recent controversies. The ‘collaborating agencies of the EU’ – the ‘old-gang parties’ – are again credited with allowing and even colluding in the destruction of Britain’s essence.208 Just as in 2001 and 2005, the government’s internationalist commitment is denounced: Britain suffers an ‘annual multibillion cash haemorrhage’ and
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even the money that the EU does allocate to Britain ‘is wasted on pointless projects’. As a consequence the British people are left suffering poverty, unemployment and the elderly are left vulnerable and without sufficient resources to live in comfort.

Continued involvement in the EU is presented as potentially catastrophic due to Turkey’s desire for membership, just as in 2005. That the Conservative Party, the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats support this attempt is cited as further reasoning to support the BNP. A sub-section entitled ‘Turkey: The EU’s Final Solution against all European Nations’ reinforces the view that the British people are embroiled in a cultural war, with the ‘Final Solution’ inviting comparisons to Nazi Germany. Statistics are referred to in warning that Turkey’s admittance in the EU would ‘increase the EU’s Muslim population by more than 75 million – and grant them total freedom of movement within its borders’. Moreover, the relaxation of Turkey’s visa restrictions on Middle Eastern nations would mean ‘mass immigration from all of the Middle East and would confirm the end of Europe’s ancient and historic identification with Christendom’. The necessity of preserving Christianity is again accentuated, but in this manifesto the terrorist threat Middle Eastern immigrants bring provides further justification for withdrawal from the EU. This plays on the increased Islamophobia resulting from 7/7.

Hostile language such as ‘destruction’, ‘The EU’s Final Solution’, ‘cash haemorrhage’ and an attempt to ‘balkanise the population’ are used to demonstrate the threat to Britain’s existence, again using motifs of death, destruction, and even extermination. However, the main focus of the language used is to highlight government lies and deception, coupled with statistical fact and demographical references in order to make clear the necessity of supporting the BNP.

---

**Counter-Jihad: Confronting the Islamic Colonisation of Britain**

Having introduced the threat posed by ‘The EU’s Final Solution’ involving Turkey’s Muslim population of 75 million, the seventh section ‘Counter Jihad: Confronting the Islamic Colonisation of Britain’ continues to describe the dangers of an increased Islamic presence in Britain and Europe. Already the title continues with the notion that Britain has to fight back in the cultural war waged against them. The section plays upon Islamophobic sentiments. A historical continuity in which Europe had been at war with Islam since its formation is presented, outlining Islam’s globalist expansionist ideology. The conflicts of old are described to reinforce this continuity, with ‘the threat of the scimitar, the cannon, and murderous activities’ referenced. However, a ‘renewed Muslim invasion’ has new weapons: ‘the passport, the visa stamp, corrupt liberal Western regimes who have allowed Third World immigration, and the baby’s crib’. Here the government is condemned for its immigration policy, and the audience is reminded of demographic fact.

The audience is informed of the increased number of Muslims in Western Europe, which was about 50,000 in 1990 based only in France, 3-4 million in 1970, and approximately 20 million in 2008. Increased Muslim immigration and higher birth rates mean this figure will continue to grow, with the effect ‘that many Western European nations will have Muslim populations of between 25 and 40 percent by 2035’. The potential of 75 million additional Muslims from Turkey with free reign across Europe is described as equating to ‘national demographic suicide’. These statistics are all unreferenced, bringing their legitimacy into question. It is important to note here that the focus is on protecting Western Europe as a whole, which relates to the protection of Christendom and Western democracy, rather than just wanting Muslims out of Britain. Resistance is encouraged through declaring ‘No Muslim nation on earth would tolerate

---
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millions of Christians entering and seizing demographic control of their lands’. As the ideology ‘seeks total Islamic domination’, the very essence of British life and customs are shown to be in great danger, demanding a response.

The discordance of these ideologies is given great emphasis as ‘The BNP believes that the historical record shows that Islam is by its very nature incompatible with modern secular western democracy’. Many reasons are given for this incompatibility, with ‘The Five Characteristics of Islam in European Nations’ outlined as being: increased anti-Semitism; Islamic extremism; the suppression of indigenous culture in a colonial process; large scale social unrest including violent street riots; and increased support for terrorism.

The London bombings are referred to and the statistic that ‘a Muslim terrorist has been locked up at the rate of one every two days since 2001’ reminds the audience of the events of 9/11.

Moreover, the Muslim sex grooming scandal is referred to through a Times article: ‘in parts of the country with large Asian communities white girls as young as 12 are being targeted for sex by older Asian men yet the authorities are unwilling to act because of fears of being labelled racist’. The BNP stacks up a wealth of evidence against Islamic immigration to defend its position on immigration and references unreported crimes relating to child sexual exploitation to show the necessity of a realist approach, without fear of being wrongly labelled racist. The party refers to a study by the Home Office and a published newspaper article, but this does not negate the fact that the great majority of its presented figures and statistics are unsourced and extremely likely to be biased – as shown elsewhere.
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The BNP sets itself apart from the other parties in declaring ‘The BNP is the only party to correctly identify the twin causes of Islamist terrorism in Britain: (a) mass immigration and (b) a biased British foreign policy which serves to incite Muslims living in Britain’. Putting ‘twin causes’ and ‘Islamist terrorism’ just one word apart again prompts one to recall the Twin Towers and 9/11. Also, with other parties allowing immigration and dragging Britain into Afghanistan and Iraq, they are blamed for the terrorist attacks in Britain. These wars, with the legality debated, are criticised with neutrality in the Middle East meaning ‘no more war for oil’, which accuses the government of deliberately conning the British public over Afghanistan and Iraq for selfish monetary gain.225

The subject positions allocated within this section relate to the cultural war that the BNP describes. The language used helps consolidate the notion of war and the threat posed by the government and Islam. The BNP is ‘implacably opposed’ to ‘corrupt liberal Western regimes’ allowing immigration, also denouncing the ‘blatantly illegal and immoral wars in Muslim parts of the world’ that were based on ‘patently transparent lies’.226 Throughout fearful language such as ‘Islamic colonisation’, ‘deadly threats’ and ‘total Islamic domination’ is used to warn against ‘The Demographic Facts’.227 The overview provides further reasoning as to why this may be, considering Darby’s influence. Islamophobia is encouraged and utilised in this section.

Culture, Traditions and Civil Society

This section of the manifesto keeps the same title as in 2005, and largely outlines the same ideas relating to a cultural war. Just as in 2005 it refers to a loss of identity and heritage, noting the corrosion of daily life in Britain and the effect of this on civility and politeness, essentially lamenting the loss of Britishness. The motif of death and destruction in describing this decline remains. The necessity of schools celebrating ‘an ancestral
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identity’, highlighting Britain’s ‘cultural origins’, and reinstating Christianity is again argued for, and similarly television is denounced for its ruinous effect on British society.\(^{228}\)

What is new relates to discourses of the time, with the protection of traditional town centres called for and their decline detailed by the New Economics Foundation.\(^{229}\) Celebrity culture is also denounced. While the negative impact of this is not described in the manifesto, it is recognised as adversely affecting schoolchildren through a lack of progress, limited career aspirations, underage drinking, and anti-social behaviour.\(^{230}\) The likes of Justin Bieber and Lindsay Lohan escape individual criticism, with this being a small sub-section. Much larger is the sub-section ‘Saving Britain’s Pubs’, which are described as ‘in many ways at the core of community life in Britain’ and ‘part of our cultural heritage’, having ‘become as symbolic of Britain as the red telephone box or Dover cliffs’.\(^{231}\) The government’s mishandling of the economy is blamed for the ‘shocking’ revelation ‘that pubs are closing at the rate of nearly three every week’.\(^{232}\)

However, this is not shocking and this is not accurate information. Data relating to the weekly closure of British pubs from 1980 to 2010 is available in an article from the Guardian.\(^{233}\) This shows that only once in thirty years have there been on average less than three British pubs shut down every week in a year (in 2001). While the BNP usually exaggerates and chooses statistics to support its arguments, here the closure of British pubs – something presented as having a deplorable effect on Britain and Britishness – is understated, in order to detract from the image of it being run and supported by a group of
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stereotypical racists who gather at a pub every night to discuss football and their loathing of immigrants.

To affirm what it is to be British, the unshakable associations with civility, politeness, and Christianity are described in 2005 as well as in 2010, while each manifesto also engages with dominant discourses of the time in their portrayed conception of Britishness.

**The Economy – Putting Britain Back on the Road to Recovery**

This section commands the largest portion, with the economic problems being the number one public concern. Immediately the BNP sets itself apart from other parties through its firm commitment to strictly national interests. The audience is informed that ‘The Lab/Lib/Con alliance long ago abandoned any attempt to run the British economy for the benefit of the nation and have surrendered it to the dead hand of EU regulation and a rootless, amorphous globalist philosophy’. The effect of this globalist agenda has meant ‘extraordinary damage to the British economy, our industry and technology’, which has forced ‘White flight’ or indigenous emigration’. Not only is the economy suffering badly but white natives have been forced to leave their homeland as a result, continuing this theme of a cultural war.

Again conspiracy is referred to in which Labour is taking advantage of its position in government and exploiting the people for its own gain. It is said that ‘Labour has directed increased public spending towards tiers of bureaucrats. It is no accident that these public administrators of the state are the core supporters of New Labour’. Bureaucratic measures are said to keep the poorest section of the community exactly that. Therefore, ‘The BNP will halt this double-edged spending madness by simply raising the personal allowance to £12,500 before any tax becomes payable’.

---


breadline the BNP is acting as a saviour, operating according to their and Britain’s interest. In conjunction with this, it is stated that ‘the average voter’, relating to the target audience, ‘is painfully aware that the quality of public services such as those in the NHS, educational sector and public transport has not improved’. So while Labour is abusing its power at the cost of the general public, the BNP pledges to oppose this through reallocating funds to providers of public services by eliminating bureaucratic positions.

To reinforce the notion that it is the BNP who should be supported in the forthcoming general election, schemes and policies pursued by the other parties are attacked. The ‘nonsense’ and ‘fraud’ implemented ‘by the three old gang parties in order to facilitate international governance and opportunistic corporate profit’ through the Climate Change Scam shows how their commitments lie outside Britain. Statistics are used to supplement arguments, with the imposition of a multicultural society without public debate costing around ‘£13 billion per annum, according to MigrationwatchUK’ – which has its own agenda regarding immigration and multiculturalism. Opposing immigration would be an easy way to cut the deficit. Membership in the EU is described as a ‘cash haemorrhage’, just as in 2005, with the Taxpayers’ Alliance estimating that withdrawal would save £118 billion with Open Europe estimating that ‘the expense of complying with EU rules cost each British household £4,912 over the past 11 years’, which again demonstrates the selective use of statistics. ‘The Foreign Aid Scandal’ is noted as costing £9.1 billion per year (without reference), with it apparently set to increase. Moreover, the ‘illegal and immoral foreign wars into which the Tory/Labour regime have plunged Britain’ would be ended by the BNP, with the Iraq campaign costing about £49 billion while the cost of Afghanistan ‘is set to rise from £3 billion to £5 billion per year’ – again with no reference to an external source.
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To alleviate the economic problems faced by Britain, the BNP calls for a rejection of the other political parties and their international focus. The schemes and policies they pursue are shown to cause difficulties for the British people, all for the benefit of those outside of these islands – except the politicians themselves and their collaborators. The cuts that the BNP propose would actually benefit the British people, as it is these international schemes and immigration that would be targeted. While the rival political parties are attacked for their lack of concern for Britain, the language used toward them is not particularly offensive as the party focuses on utilising facts and figures.

Overview

The heightened media attention paid to the BNP in the build-up to the 2010 general election – encapsulated by Griffin’s appearance on ‘Question Time’ – determined the strategy implemented within the manifesto in my view, again marking a change from that employed in 2005. With membership at its highest ever and political gains made both locally and in Europe, the people of Britain – regardless of their opinion of the party – were inclined to learn more about the BNP and their policies. The election manifesto itself again significantly expanded in terms of quantity, from a fifty-four page document in 2005 to ninety-four pages long in 2010. The ‘Key Pledges’ reflect that the BNP had recognised that the interest it had generated among the people, other parties and in the media meant that it had a much broader audience. This concise summary caters for those who may not be inclined to read the full manifesto, covering each section. I suggest that the tactic of heavily referencing and relying on ‘proven’ facts, statistical data and demography to supplement the party’s arguments stems from this increased interest.

So, the key aim of a homogenous Britain of white natives with an autonomous government operating in strictly the national interest and for the preservation of the Britain and its indigenous people remains the same. The target audience remains white native Britons. To appeal to this target audience Britishness is referred to, again, through stressing the importance of ancestral folk tradition, Anglo-Saxon culture, Christianity, civility and politeness – just as in 2005. However, new discourses relating to celebrity culture, the decline of the British high street and the closure of British pubs are engaged with to
strengthen the party’s position. The party firmly laments a loss of sovereignty to organisations such as the EU, immigration, multiculturalism, globalisation and thus its competing parties who are supporters of these damaging processes. The basis of the BNP’s opposition is that the loss of British autonomy, heritage, culture, and identity, with the native peoples further suffering in socioeconomic terms: all part of the cultural war seeking the eradication of Britain. The BNP assumes the role of the hero within the narrative of the manifesto, with the government and the EU portrayed as the villains, and the native Britons victims.

The main dividing line is the BNP and white native Britons against the government and the other political parties. With public trust in the government at its lowest ever, it is unsurprising that the BNP plays upon this in the manifesto. Global warming, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as underequipped soldiers, provide a few examples of how the government and other parties are willing to forsake the lives of Britons and other innocents for their own motives. It is argued that you cannot trust the other parties, whereas the BNP should be regarded as ‘trustees for future generations’.243

With the economic troubles being top of the political agenda and distrust of the government high, the BNP plays on both these concerns in addressing the financial woes of the country. Through its focus on white native Britons the party is able to offer improved public services for the natives as opposed to cuts, and positions itself against the other parties in this way. The cultural war is seen through provoked ‘white flight’, with immigrants brought in to gather election votes. The war is not only against the white native Britons but also Britain as an entity. Its very democracy, traditions and sovereignty are being usurped by the EU: an act in which the other parties are collaborators. Again utilised is the line of demarcation between Christianity and Islam. Here scare-mongering is implemented to play on prejudices and the increasing Islamophobia within Britain stemming from 7/7. A great deal of effort is made to accentuate the threat of Islam. The religious divide extends to Europe as all Christianity is threatened, with the ruinous effects of ‘Islamic colonisation’ well-detailed.

In considering this heightened hostility towards Islam, as mentioned in the sub-section ‘Who wrote the manifestos?’, the influence of not only external factors need to be considered, but also the internal influence of Darby. His blog entries in June and July 2014 talk of ‘systematic Islamic colonisation’ and state his opposition to ‘the establishment white exterminationist viewpoint’. These short excerpts are in keeping with the notions of Islam as an invading force and a cultural war waged by the government, seeking to destroy Britain and its native people. In an interview with BBC Leicester on 13 October 2009, he states ‘We’re not dealing with integration, we’re not dealing with migration, we’re dealing with colonisation’ and refers to ‘an increasingly aggressive Islamic community imposing itself’. Notably, this interview was conducted before Griffin’s appearance on ‘Question Time’ (22 October 2009), in which he makes no reference to Islamic colonisation at all throughout the entirety of the programme. This suggests that the term ‘Islamic colonisation’, as well as the concept of ‘The EU’s Final Solution against all European Nations’, within the 2010 election manifesto can be credited to the greater role of Darby within the BNP. While the rise in Islamophobia conditioned the party’s more hostile attitude, Darby certainly had a large role in determining the language used.

The language used and the line of attack within the manifesto goes some way to explaining the agency of the BNP in the 2010 general election. As has been said, the government and other political parties are the main opposition; they should be distrusted and the BNP trusted. Through the use of a wealth of statistics, facts, and demographical references, the white native Britons are faced with a cultural war in which the other parties are promoting immigration and EU membership, making ‘native Britons second-class citizens’. Britain is in ‘grave peril’ and on ‘the edge of disaster’, with the ‘extinction of the


245 9:31-10:06: ‘The Muslim population in this country is growing ten times faster than any other population. That’s what’s happening here, and you can dress it up any way you want, but the raw truth of it, and I’ll tell you the raw truth: neither the Conservatives nor the Lib Dems nor the Labour party – I mean, I’m in the BNP and I can tell the raw truth. We’re not dealing with integration, we’re not dealing with migration, we’re dealing with colonisation. Town after town in this country is having an increasingly aggressive Islamic community imposing itself on this country of ours, and it’s changing it for the worse.’ scp483 (2009) Simon Darby Interview – BBC Leicester (13-10-09) (Part 1 of 5), (YouTube) available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S1aWJb0Obaw. Accessed 11/07/2014
British people, culture, heritage and identity’ threatened: the decline of Britishness. Rather than using hostile, evocative language against the competing parties, their policies are attacked with language invoking a sense of panic and urgency through the motif of death and the threat of Islam. The audience is presented with statistic after statistic and fact after fact to provide solid, hard evidence. However, most of these statistics are unreferenced or come from individuals or organisations with vested interests, while those from reputable sources are carefully chosen to suit the party’s purpose. The same biased study of Professor Coleman used in 2005 informs the BNP’s arguments, as well as many other similarly questionable sources. The incidence of this is much greater in the 2010 manifesto. Immigration, multiculturalism, and globalisation are all discredited as government lies from corrupt officials, intended to deconstruct and eradicate Britain.

Sensitivities about the economic situation, past and potential wars, government distrust, as well as Islamophobia are played upon. Central to the argument is the necessity of opposing the ‘renewed Muslim invasion’ which attests to a new form of colonisation and a continuation of Islam’s historic war with Christendom. Demographic changes are shown to threaten native Britons becoming a minority, with Turkey’s proposed membership intended to be ‘The EU’s Final Solution against all European Nations’. This indicates a mission of total eradication, like Hitler’s, amongst those seeking ‘total Islamic domination’. Interestingly of the two main dividing lines (the BNP and the other parties, and Christendom and Islam) the other parties escape great levels of hostility, with only their lies and deceit referenced and policies opposed; Islam, however, is presented as a savage invading force.

When considering the motives of the BNP and the context of the time, the agency becomes clear. The party was experiencing its highest ever levels of support and media attention. Griffin had been the centre of ‘Question Time’, watched by 7.9 million people: more than twice the usual audience. Here was the party’s chance to make a real political impact: it had the nation listening. The subject positions within the manifesto call on Britain to oppose the other political parties and their cultural war against the country and its native
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people. Immigration, Islam, membership in the EU, foreign wars and general government corruption are all opposed. The people are urged to support the party’s economic plan and relieve the need for public cuts in supporting their immigration policy. However, to use aggressive and explicitly hostile language against the parties, rather than criticising previous scandals (Afghanistan, Iraq) or supporting their arguments through presented fact (‘British People Set to be a Minority within 30-50 Years: The Official Figures’) as they do, would merely leave the party criticised for mud-slinging; it learnt from the lesson of ‘Smeargate’.

The motive of the BNP was to gain votes. This was done through creating a dividing line between the internationalist and anti-British opposing parties and their own nationalistic organisation. Britain, Britishness, and Christianity are shown to be under attack in a cultural war through facts and figures, intended to rebuke any potential accusations of racism: indigenous people have a born right to defend their homeland. The BNP’s concerns are presented as emanating from a devotion to its country and people, and a realist view. The untrustworthiness of the other parties is indicated not through hostile language but reference to past errors, deception and presented fact. The argument is the policies of immigration and EU membership should not be trusted, and the Islamic colonisation should undisputedly be opposed if Britain and Christianity are to continue to exist. With an enlarged audience the BNP created a more sophisticated and comprehensive manifesto – despite the huge questionability of its facts and figures – to promote its key policies that have remained effectively the same as in the general elections back in 2001 and 2005.
Chapter 6: The historical development

The development of the British National Party’s election manifestos

In addressing my main research question – ‘What is the historical development over time observable in the British National Party’s election manifestos from the years of 2001, 2005, and 2010, and why is this so?’ – I use the assertions and analyses detailed within this study to offer an explanation.

Firstly, it is necessary to outline some historical continuity within the ideology and policies of the BNP, as well as factors that demanded attention in the manifestos. The ideal of the party and its vision for Britain remains essentially the same throughout the period of study, and this is unlikely to change in the future due to the nature of a staunchly nationalist organisation. This also determines the target audience of the BNP, with certain focalisations remaining constant throughout these manifestos, thereby encouraging support for the party.

The target audience for the BNP is white native Britons, particularly those disillusioned with government policies and schemes which they perceive as making life harder for that group. So, often it is less-economically advantaged, unemployed and working class citizens who the BNP concentrates on appealing to. The target audience stems from the dual commitments of the party: to Britain itself as an entity, and to the white native Britons who have historically occupied that territory. Therefore, the party firmly opposes anything detracting from British sovereignty, culture, heritage and identity or the welfare of their conception of the true British people. The ideal is a homogenous and autonomous Britain free from foreign influence and peoples, and in caring only for British interests the notion of an international community is dismissed. Foreigners and foreign influence are simply unwanted in Britain and anything outside of the national interest is irrelevant to the BNP. Through this focus, the BNP affirms that the essence of Britain and the well-being of its people can be best protected. Therefore, the party’s immigration policy remains constant, and presented as the core, fix-all solution to essentially every single

Necessary to note is that the BNP, due to its philosophy and accompanying policies, has constantly had to defend itself from accusations and allegations of racism, fascism, hostility and general bigotry. These constitute discourses that had to be engaged with in the manifestos, and negotiated in order for the party to appeal to a wider range of voters. Within all three of the manifestos there are recurring focalisations, with the BNP portrayed as a hero (or potential hero) with the British people and Britain itself the victims. The villains of the narrative change according to the context in which the manifestos were produced. The changes and developments within the elections manifestos of the BNP will now be outlined.

In 2001 the main dividing line drawn in the small, concise manifesto is foreigners vs. natives. This is at both the individual and business level, and throughout only the general term is used to describe foreigners. Foreigners and foreign businesses are presented as harmful to the essence of Britain and the socio-economic welfare of the British people. The subject positions allocated demand a re-evaluation of accepted societal norms and politically correct processes, with the notion that multiculturalism and globalisation are inherently good things under attack. Inversely, these processes constitute an attack against Britain and its native people. It is political correctness that is being questioned; politically correct processes relating to immigration, law and order, and foreign affairs are portrayed as hindering and suffocating British society. This originates from a desire to negotiate the image of the party as a racist and hostile organisation.

Further serving to negotiate this image is the fact that, amid racial tensions and race riots, the only ethnic group referred to are the white native Britons (including the Northern Irish). All outside of this group are termed foreigners, and thus there is no discrimination towards any race or religion. The concern of the party is only the white native Britons and it is shown that devotion towards them and Britain dictates their policies, rather than hostility and hate towards other groups. The extremely firm measures proposed for NI serve to demonstrate that it is disorder, crime, and terror the party opposes – regardless of whether a race of culturally similar white folk are the perpetrators or any other group. Moreover, in
encouraging an opposition to foreigners, a concealed metaphor of pollution is utilised in the ‘Environment’ section. The language used throughout the manifesto is not particularly harsh or aggressive towards the opponents and enemies of the party, but the short length of the manifesto should be held in consideration. The concise manifesto is not expansive in its arguments and the focus is on showing the policies to be born out the intention to preserve and protect Britain, uninfluenced by racism, fascism or any other negative sentiments.

The 2005 manifesto benefits from being a more comprehensive document, and at fifty-four pages there is space for the BNP to articulate a more detailed argument and intelligent structure. Firstly, though, a fundamental shift in strategy is made which reflects the discourses of the time. Rather than identifying foreigners and foreign influence as the main enemy to oppose (as in 2001), the 2005 election manifesto sets the BNP and the British people against the government and its associated schemes and alliances. The notion that the British people are under attack continues, but now a cultural war, waged by the government, is referred to and used to promote and legitimise the arguments and policies of the party. What it means to be British is introduced in this manifesto, and the loss of Britishness is presented as salvageable through the rejuvenation of civility and politeness, a renewed celebration of ancestral folk traditions and Anglo-Saxon culture, and a recommitment to Christianity. The processes of globalisation and multiculturalism are again attacked, as is membership in the EU – an organisation complicit in the government’s cultural war. Here an ethnic divide is introduced with all things European and all things white said to be under threat. A religious divide is also utilised, with the necessity of defending Western Europe’s historic association with Christianity against the threat of Islam pronounced. Again, the section relating to the environment utilises the metaphor of pollution.

In the 2001 manifesto effectively all problems within British society were accredited to foreigners, whereas in 2005 it is the government that is to blame for all the hardship and difficulties experienced by the white native Britons. Why is this so? The events of 9/11, the subsequently enforced repressive legislation, and the debatably illegal wars in Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003) had greatly damaged the government’s popularity and public trust: something the BNP sought to capitalise on. Harnessing accusations of immoral deceit, lies and brutality, a wholly negative image of the government is presented with evocative
language and motifs of death and destruction reinforcing this notion of a cultural war. The ‘War on Terror’, positioned against Islamic extremism, had made it more politically acceptable to express concerns about foreign groups such as Islam. The threat of Turkey joining the EU and facilitating Muslim migration is referenced. This is why a defence of Western democracy and Christianity are also called for by the BNP. However, there is not a great deal of attention paid to Muslims or other ethnicities; it is primarily the government that is denounced. These dividing lines are cleverly drawn by the party as they are justified and legitimised through reference to history, science, micro-evolutionary behavioural changes, medical evidence, and human nature. The weight of evidence stacked up against multiculturalism, made all the more crucial due to the central human necessity of preserving bio-diversity, is used by the BNP to refute any allegations of racism. However, some of the provided evidence comes from sources with their own agendas, and in this manifesto the party starts to use bias facts, unreferenced assertions, and makes arbitrary statements with no supporting evidence.

The 2005 manifesto greatly improves on 2001 in terms of supporting evidence and explanation. This is because of the modernising effort of Griffin, and the continued success and growth of the party demanding a comprehensive document. The structural development highlights the advancement of the party, with the initial six sections working in combination and conjunction to offer a progressive argument. This approach intends to first build up pride in Britain and nostalgia, before pointing towards the necessity of the immigration policy, which is carefully and extensively explained.

The 2010 general election marked an important event for the BNP, as it was enjoying its highest levels of support and a great deal of media attention, culminating in Griffin’s appearance on ‘Question Time’. Again, the 2010 manifesto is significantly expanded, to ninety-four pages. Islamophobia had had its watershed moment in Britain, after the London bombings in 2005. Moreover, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were still very fresh in the public consciousness. Most notably, public trust in the government was at an all-time low, following these largely unpopular foreign wars, the economic crisis, and scandals relating to politicians. Subsequently, just as in 2005, the main dividing line is between the BNP and the native white British people set against the government and its schemes and policies. Trust is referenced as a major issue by the BNP in determining which party should govern Britain.
In the manifesto the party highlights the differences between itself and its political opponents, emphasising their nationalist focus in setting itself apart from the others. The theme of a cultural war continues from 2005, and demographic trends, facts, and statistics are used extensively to demonstrate the threat posed to the white native Britons. Britishness is again emphasised, referring to the same considerations as in 2005 – ancestral folk traditions, Anglo-Saxon culture, Christianity, the damaging effect of television, and a decline of civility and politeness – as well as new discourses: celebrity culture, the decline of the British high street, and the closure of British pubs. A supplementary dividing line is between Christianity and Islam, with the EU working with the government in aiming to suppress and eventually extinguish the white Britons. Accordingly, multiculturalism and globalisation are also opposed and attacked.

The competing parties do not have hostile language directed against them; rather it is the policies they subscribe to and their effects that are attacked and negatively portrayed in using motifs of death and destruction. Islam comes under heavy fire in the 2010 manifesto and its demographic threat pronounced. Darby’s influence, already noted, is considerable as he can be credited with concepts such as ‘Islamic colonisation’ and ‘The EU’s Final Solution against all European Nations’. The threat of Turkey joining the EU is noted again, but in 2010 Islam is negatively portrayed as a savage invading force, using a motif of extermination. Islamophobia is greatly played upon, due widespread concern amongst the British public following 7/7. The main basis of the BNP’s attack against its opponents and their accompanying schemes are based on solid facts, demographical trends and statistics. Throughout portrayed government lies or the negative impact of government schemes and threats are exposed through presented fact – mostly unreferenced, from bias individuals or organisations, or cherry-picked – while hostile language capitalises on Islamophobia to urge a response to the cultural war waged on Britain. While in 2005 the party also used unreferenced ‘facts’, arbitrary statements, and biased sources, the frequency and incidence of this tactic is much greater in 2010.

Though the motif of death is once again utilised against Islam, it is interesting to consider why it is not concentrated on or directed specifically against the government and the other opposing parties. I hold that this is to give the BNP greater credibility. After the unpopularity of ‘Smeargate’ the public expressed a concern that politicians should be
focusing on their public policies rather than infighting. Rather than using hostile language against the other parties, a much stronger argument is to demand an opposition to them by showing them to be deceitful, selfish, and corrupt. In this instance and context, showing is more powerful than telling.

Also relating to this, it is why the ‘Key Pledges’ are at the start of the 2010 election manifesto. The broader range of people taking an interest in the party made it necessary to offer a succinct overview of the key policies and their basis. With the party’s staying power evident, it attempts a more professional approach to the manifesto in allowing supposedly hard evidence to prove the legitimacy of their arguments and the necessity of their policies.

Over time, how the BNP adapted to important events and dominant discourses to present their right-wing policies in the most acceptable and justifiable way possible is identifiable. Also observable is the general improvement in the professionalism and increased content within the manifestos. The 2001 document is very different to the later 2005 and 2010 manifestos in terms of length and expansiveness, but the line of argument is what is vitally important. The shift from focusing on foreigners to focusing on opposing the government is the most notable change from 2001 to 2005, and it reflects that the BNP felt it would appeal to more people in this way. Additionally, the decision to leave other ethnic groups unmentioned in 2001 demonstrates that it felt it would not be politically wise to denounce these groups specifically, instead using a general term to refer to all foreigners.

That a religious divide in opposition to Islam is used in both 2005 and 2010 demonstrates an appreciation of the discourses of the time, in which it was more acceptable to be critical of that particular ethnic group. However, the language used against Islam in 2010 is much more hostile than in 2005, and a whole section is dedicated to denouncing and accentuating the threat of Islam. After 7/7, just two months after the 2005 general election, the BNP immediately sought to capitalise on Islamophobia, demonstrated through their use of the image of a bombed London bus shortly after the act of terror. In 2010, five years after the event, the language against Islam is extremely inflammatory, introducing the concept of ‘Islamic colonisation’, a ‘Final Solution against all European Nations’, and presenting Islam as a savage invading force. Furthermore, the party’s growth in general support and success dictated that more and more ‘evidence’ be used, not just to justify their policies but also to
refute negative allegations against them. Some demographic trends and statistics are referred to in 2005, but the 2010 manifesto includes extensive references to studies, demography, and reports – albeit selected to support the party’s arguments. However, both the 2005 and 2010 election manifestos use unreferenced arbitrary statements.

In summary, while foreigners constituted the main enemy in 2001, this emphasis shifted towards the government in 2005. Public distrust and outrage over Afghanistan and Iraq compelled the BNP to direct its efforts on setting itself apart from and attacking the government and other parties. In doing so, the notion of a cultural war waged by the government was introduced. While Islam was presented as a threat to be opposed, in 2010 the hostility towards this group is greatly intensified, following 7/7. As public distrust in the government and politicians persisted, ‘factual’ evidence and statistics are increasingly used to prove the validity of the BNP’s arguments, and the necessity of fighting back through the party in the cultural war. Consistently the BNP is portrayed as the only party that can save Britain and the true British people from hostile, racial attack and extinction.

The historical development observable within the election manifestos shows the BNP’s discourse to present ‘radical but commonsense’ programs in accordance with the changing context over the studied period. The party’s arguments present its immigration policy as a fix-all solution to every societal issue, with its ‘commonsense’ based on claims from selective or unreferenced sources. Despite the debatable legitimacy of its claims, and the basis of its continuous rejection of politically correct processes, how the BNP constructs its arguments over time, and how they have evolved and reacted to developments both internal and external to Britain and the party itself, is of great interest and reveals the core, unchanging aim of the party. Essentially the same amalgamated philosophy of ethnic nationalism, biological racism, and xenophobia has remained since the BNP’s inception in 1982. However, under Griffin’s parliamentary approach, the presentation of this ideology has changed and adapted.
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