

The BNP

Racist Extremist Fanatics

in their own words

**Green Party press office briefing
May 2009**

**Contact Dr Spencer Fitz-Gibbon
media@greenparty.org.uk
020 7561 0282**

Introduction

During the 2009 election campaign, the BNP has sought to present itself as mainstream and respectable. It says it has changed. It has openly stated it is neither racist nor extremist.

Some media outlets have given the BNP space to deny its racism without adequately challenging it on this.

One national newspaper has gone as far as describing the BNP as “a party whose only real, substantive issue is an immediate halt to immigration.” This, as extreme as it sounds, in fact grossly understates the BNP’s extremism. Its “substantive issues” include:

- Not merely stopping immigration, but “voluntary repatriation” of non-white people, including those born in UK.
- Dismantling race discrimination legislation so that non-white people can be actively disadvantaged with impunity, thus adding an element of coercion to “voluntary” repatriation. As BNP leader Nick Griffin says, “We make no bones about the fact that the British National Party will put OUR people [ie white people] first, EVERY TIME when it comes to jobs, housing and anything else.”
- Discouraging intermarriage, on the grounds that white British people are committing “self-inflicted genocide through race-mixing.”

Perhaps the best way to assess whether the BNP are racist, extremist fanatics or not is to consult their own official website and their own leader’s campaign bulletins. The answer is unequivocal: the BNP is racist, extremist and fanatical. And this is only taking into account official policy and pronouncements.

Almost all the references in this report were researched from the BNP website during May 2009 and from 2009 election campaign bulletins issued by Chairman Nick Griffin, leader of the BNP.

They're not racist... just "ethno-nationalist"

Is the BNP racist? The BNP says no. But what kind of political party needs to brief its members that they must never call themselves racist?

The *BNP Language & Concepts Discipline Manual* (BNP Policy Research, updated April 2009) says this:

"Rule #1: The BNP is not a 'racist' or 'racial' party. It should never be referred to as such by BNP activists..."

The *Manual* officially defines the BNP as "ethno-nationalist" and as a "patriotic party."

But then, if we look on the BNP website's Ideology page, where there are just four documents – two election manifestos and two articles – we find in the article *Fallacies of Integration* this:

"...what is the major constituent part of a nation? Race."

And this:

"...race... is the bedrock of nationhood."

And this:

"Like it or not, there is a racial basis for nationality."

The BNP routinely refers to white British people as "the indigenous people" – because they have been living in Britain for a thousand years – and regards others holding UK passports as "racial foreigners" or "foreign residents."¹

The BNP clearly regards being white as an essential aspect of being truly British. In what sense, therefore, is an "ethno-nationalist party" not by definition a racist party?

The BNP's line on its being a "patriotic party" rather than a racist party is equally unequivocal. *Fallacies of Integration* states:

"...patriotism without race (which is the bedrock of nationhood) is surely meaningless."

That is, patriotism can only be patriotism if it's based on race. In what sense, therefore, is a "patriotic party" not by definition a racist party?

¹ Incidentally, one may wonder which race forms the basis of Australian, Canadian, US or New Zealand nationality, in the BNP imagination. If race is the basis of nationality, presumably Maoris, Australian aboriginals and native Americans are the true nationals of those countries (having been living there the longest), and George W Bush is as much a "foreign resident" of the USA as Barack Obama is.

They're not racist... they just see immigration as "bloodless genocide"

What kind of political party would regard the merger of different racial groups as analogous to mass murder?

"You can't say that especially large numbers of people can come from the rest of the world and assume an English identity without denying the English their own identity... In a very subtle way, it's a sort of bloodless genocide."

"BNP leader defends policy on race"

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/politics/8011878.stm>

They're not racist... they just don't want white people to marry non-white people

The BNP clearly sees the maintenance of a white British race as its main political imperative. As *Fallacies of Integration* says:

"...unless halted and reversed [the] forced imposition of a multi-racial society will lead to the decline and eventual disappearance of the British as a distinct ethnic group."

And clearly the BNP takes this possibility seriously:

"Those who think this prediction is alarmist should reflect on the fact that decades of immigration and asylum, combined with a higher non-white birth rate, have already resulted in indigenous British people becoming a minority in many cities. In addition to this, Britain has the highest rate of inter-racial relationships. Based upon the above trends, what is the prognosis for our people? "

One of the four items on the BNP website Ideology page is an article based on an imaginary interview between the BBC's Jeremy Paxman and a fictitious BNP leader called John Bull (*I Have a Dream by John Bull*).² In this article John Bull explains:

"I don't approve of mixed marriages in principle, as this destroys the separate genetic identity and lineage of both partners, and nor is it good for the mixed-race children, who suffer from cultural confusion and a lack of sense of belonging to one group or the other."

Fallacies of Integration puts it more strongly:

² Whoever wrote *I Have a Dream, by John Bull* claims in the article that he isn't a BNP member. However, the article is one of only four items displayed on the BNP website's Ideology page <http://bnp.org.uk:80/organisers-guides/ideology/> - the other three being the local election and Scottish Parliament manifestos of 2007 and the article *Fallacies of Integration* by Dave Baxter. It seems reasonable therefore to assume that it's intended to be seen as part of the BNP's ideology, not someone else's ideology. In any case, John Bull is dreaming that he's the leader of the BNP.

“Interracial relationships are increasing. Our youth are being indoctrinated with a message that is leading them to commit self-inflicted genocide through race-mixing.”

The notion that Britons (described by the BNP as descended from English, Irish, Scots and Welsh) have a “separate genetic identity” is ludicrous. Recent research based on DNA has established that all non-African people are descended from the same tribe, which originally came from Africa.

They’re not a racist party... they just don’t let non-whites join

John Bull defends the BNP’s whites-only rule thus:

“The BNP exists to promote Britain’s traditional culture and character as a European country, and to protect the native population of European descent from daily politically-correct persecution, so it would be bizarre to say that people who are not of European descent can join the party.”

He adds:

“We are very happy, however, for decent and patriotic non-whites who feel and wish to be British to affiliate to us through our Ethnic Liaison Committee.”

In view of the earlier assertion that “patriotism without race ... is surely meaningless,” how can the BNP acknowledge the existence of “patriotic non-whites”?

Unless of course the Ethnic Liaison Committee is racist window-dressing. John Bull says they may “feel... British” - but the feeling must be misplaced, because as far as the BNP is concerned, by definition they cannot *be* British. John Bull will allow them to “wish to be British” - but the BNP will not allow them to be. As the *BNP Language & Concepts Discipline Manual* says, they are “racial foreigners.” And as BNP chairman Nick Griffin said recently (e-bulletin 17.4.09):

“The immigrants or ‘foreign invaders’ have no right to claim our country as theirs.”

They’re not racist... they just want non-whites to have fewer rights

Rule #13 of the *BNP Language & Concepts Discipline Manual* says:

“The BNP defines British people in both civic and ethnic terms. Immigrants, and descendants of immigrants who have settled here from non-European countries, are British in the fullest civic sense of the word, and entitled to the rights of all British subjects.”

However, this is sharply contradicted by the BNP’s insistence that white people must in practice be given preference:

“We make no bones about the fact that the British National Party will put OUR people first, EVERY TIME when it comes to jobs, housing and anything else.”
Nick Griffin, campaign bulletins 17.4.09 and 24.4.09

The term “our people” in BNP usage of course means white people. As Nick Griffin said on BBC TV on the day he launched his Euro-election campaign:

“We are here primarily for the English, the Irish, the Scots and the Welsh.”

They’re not racist... they just want non-white people to go away

The BNP’s flagship policy is that of “voluntary repatriation” of non-white people. According to John Bull, all non-white people in the UK would be offered £30-50,000 to go back to where their ancestors came from.

The “voluntary” nature of this is of course open to question. Nick Griffin has made it clear that under a BNP government, non-white people would suffer from racial discrimination in terms of “jobs, housing and anything else.”

John Bull speculates regarding the “acceptable” level of ethnic minority population in any given area:

“...broadly speaking I think that an ethnic minority population of 1-2% in any given area would not affect the essential character of the area and would therefore be perfectly acceptable.”

I Have a Dream by John Bull

It is, therefore, implicitly unacceptable to the BNP that any area should have an ethnic minority population above 1-2%. It is “unacceptable” on the grounds that the BNP’s view of the “essential character” of an area is defined by having a 98-99% white population. In what sense is this not racist?

Conclusion: yes, the BNP is undeniably racist

Apart from the fact that it explicitly denies it’s racist, the BNP’s own statements, from its website and its 2009 campaign bulletins, including the words of its chairman Nick Griffin, make clear that **the BNP is undeniably racist.**

Now let’s look at how fanatical and extremist the BNP is.

They're not extremists... it's just that immigration is evil

Rule #5 of the *BNP Language & Concepts Discipline Manual* is this:

“Always remember that the BNP’s policies are basic common sense, and mainstream.”

It instructs members to explicitly deny that the BNP is extremist. It even instructs members to deny that the BNP is far right:

“...the extremists are the establishment politicians. Do not let interviewers or opponents get away with using the words ‘extreme’ or ‘far right’ or such terms. Challenge such statements immediately...”

Yet pronouncements by Nick Griffin and others clearly display a high degree of fanaticism. Nick Griffin has explicitly and repeatedly said that he regards the 2009 European election campaign as a battle between good and evil:

“Let us not forget, this is no ordinary political campaign, this is an epic battle between Good and Evil.”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletins 4.5.09, 8.5.09, 15.5.09, 18.5.09

Fallacies of Integration says:

“...we most certainly are in a war. A war without uniforms, perhaps, but a war nevertheless – a war – for our survival as a people... In Britain, the indigenous people are set to be a minority in our own country sometime this century. Interracial relationships are increasing. Our youth are being indoctrinated with a message that is leading them to commit self-inflicted genocide through race-mixing.”

Unless Nick Griffin gets elected to the European Parliament, terrifying things will happen, including “the complete annihilation of all things British”:

“Have you thought of what will happen to this country, your family, and your loved ones if the British National Party doesn’t win a seat on June 4th? I have, and it scares me rigid. Our people, this island race, will be left to the mercy of the Eurocrats, PC fanatics and the multicultural extremists, all of whom have one goal in mind, the complete annihilation of all things British.”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletins 4.5.09, 6.5.09, 13.5.09, 18.5.09 and 22.5.09

And:

“...we're not just fighting an election, we're fighting for the future of our children and the very survival of this country... the fact is that the future freedom, safety, prosperity and happiness of our loved ones and our nation is, quite literally, in our own hands.”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletin 9.4.09

And:

“A BNP victory on June 4th will lead to a massive awakening amongst the British public, which will ensure that our nation is pulled back from the brink of destruction.”

Campaign bulletin 4.5.09

The BNP leader isn't an extremist... it's just his destiny to personally destroy the European Parliament

Nick Griffin's personal mission is about destiny:

"Today we stand at the gates of history. Our destiny, and that of our beloved nation, hangs in the balance."

Campaign bulletins 9.4.09 and 17.4.09

But it's also very much about himself:

"I intend to win this election and to lead this party into the rotten heart of the European Parliament. My task there? To expose and destroy it from within and free our people from the yoke of bondage the Eurocrats have used to enslave our people for a generation, but I need you to help me achieve this... I need you to help me make it the year the British National Party storms Europe. But if you don't help me... *Who will?* ... I am depending on you to help me make history on June 4th."

Campaign bulletins 9.4.09, 17.4.09 and 24.4.09

Note it's the party that "storms Europe" but the task of destroying the European Parliament is personal: "My task..." And it's Nick Griffin himself who will "make history."

"It is crucial that we win a seat. What you do now may well decide our fate on June 4th!"

Campaign bulletin 15.5.09

Note it's "our" fate, but it's Nick Griffin's seat.

"It really is now or never my friend and fellow British patriot. Will you come once more with me to the battle front? Will you give all you can to free our nation from the traitors' iron grip? Will you once again sacrifice for your country and our people? *I need you to be strong to win this fight.*"

Campaign bulletins 4.5.09 and 22.5.09, emphasis in original

"This great land is ours and it's time we took it back!! Will you help me reclaim our country? To rescue our country from the clutches of the traitors and foreigners who are destroying it.."

Campaign bulletin 9.4.09

Note it's Nick Griffin who is "reclaiming our country" - his party is only helping him.

"If we fail to win on June 4th the whole anti-British, multicultural nightmare will accelerate and become even more dangerous and powerful... I cannot and will not allow this to happen."

Campaign bulletin 15.5.09

So he's not only going to destroy the European Parliament ("My task there"), he's going to *personally* prevent further migration of non-white people to Britain.

They're not extremists... it's just that their political opponents are all traitors

In Nick Griffin's *Weltanschauung*, there are traitors everywhere. The BNP must:

“...rescue our country from the clutches of the traitors and foreigners who are destroying it.”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletins 17.4.09 and 24.4.09

Nick Griffin's political opponents are nothing less than the enemies of Britain:

“...it's time we challenged the enemies of our country and race.”

Campaign bulletin 9.4.09

“The enemies of this country are terrified at the prospect of the BNP making a breakthrough into national mainstream politics on June 4th.”

Campaign bulletins 23.4.09, 3.5.09, 23.5.09 and 24.5.09

His opponents are liberals, Marxists and fascists – words that in BNP language appear to be practically interchangeable. For example, “the institution of the EU... is a liberal/fascist monstrosity” but it's also a “European empire ruled by unaccountable Marxist elites.” (Rule #6 of the *BNP Language & Concepts Discipline Manual*; Nick Griffin, campaign bulletin of 23.4.09.)

Nick Griffin speaks of the “Labour fascism” of the “Marxist thugs at Manchester City Council” - on this occasion describing the “Marxist oppression” of a compulsory purchase order issued by the council on a pub in a regeneration area. But as well as “the Bolsheviks at Manchester Council” he also warns that there are Marxists “throughout the political-media establishment” (campaign bulletin 14.4.09). He speaks of “The crooked, corrupt, anti-British traitors in the media” (campaign bulletin 30.4.09) and he singles out the “liberal-left liars at *The Sun*” (campaign bulletin 18.5.09). He notes that:

“...the vast bulk of Britain's media is either foreign owned or dominated by liberal-left cranks and traitors.”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletin 30.4.09

They're not extremists... they're just crusaders defending Christianity against... well, against Christians

Nick Griffin insists that “the Christian church leaders” are assisting Muslims “to destroy Christianity...” In fact, “all the other political parties” are helping the Christian church leaders help the Muslims. Therefore the BNP:

“...will fight to the bitter end, just like our Crusader ancestors, to preserve our Christian culture and heritage. The spirit of the Medieval Knights lives on in all of us!”

Nick Griffin, campaign bulletin 11.4.09

The crusaders, of course, were people who invaded another country in the name of a holy war.