


## Is Nationalism Entering the (second) Bron's Age?



Thirty years ago this photo was taken at a National Front rally in Fulham. (left to right) Martin Webster, then national organiser of the NF, now a vicious opponent of both Brons & Griffin; Andrew Brons, then Chairman of the NF, now BNP MEP for Yorkshire & The Humber and challenging for the leadership of his party; Paul Lee, YNF (holding flag); Nick Griffin, then an NF Directorate member and editor of *Nationalism Today*, now BNP Chairman and MEP for NW England; Joe Pearce, then the soon to be jailed head of the Young NF and editor of *Bulldog*, now a Catholic academic in the USA.

**Annihilation**  
full report and analysis of the  
2011 Elections  
see pages 3-9

**Movement News**  
All the latest developments in  
the BNP leadership battle  
see pages 22-23



Editor: Mark Cotterill: Assistant Editors: Martin Kerr and Peter Rushton  
 Webmaster: Andy Ritchie: Sales Manager: Anne Wright  
 UK address: 40 Birkett Drive, Preston, Lancashire, PR2 6HE, Great Britain  
 U.S. address: P. O. Box 6501, Falls Church, Virginia 22046, USA  
 Tel: (44) 07833 677484: Website: [www.efp.org.uk](http://www.efp.org.uk)  
 ISSN 1741-8941: Electronic Mail: [heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com](mailto:heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com)

Opinions expressed in articles are the authors' own, and should not be taken to represent *H&D's* viewpoint



## Editorial

Welcome to issue 45 of *Heritage and Destiny*. Many of you will already have read Peter Rushton's excellent election article – *BNP's Electoral and Financial Annihilation* – which was first published online on the EFP website, then on various nationalist internet forums. We are publishing the full version here on pages 3-9, which reads about twice as long as the internet version. I'm sure you will find it very interesting.

As we go to press Nick Griffin is still hanging on as BNP leader, despite all his problems, both internal and external. Will he prove us all wrong and still be leader of a functioning political party by the end of this year? Well only time – and maybe Andrew Brons – can tell.

As most readers will know by now, Andrew Brons has announced that he will be standing against Griffin for the BNP leadership this autumn. Peter Rushton covers this fully in 'Movement News' on pages 22-23 and we will of course give a full and detailed report on the outcome in our next issue.

Andrew Brons is the BNP's MEP for the Yorkshire and Humberside region and has been a member of the party for about six years. It seems very odd to many in the movement that amongst his paid staff he employs two members of a rival political party (the English Democrats) Chris Beverley and Eddy Butler. Many in the movement view this as a very bad move by Brons – and one that Griffin will exploit and use against him during the leadership election campaign.

Chris Beverley, who defected from the BNP to the EDs in April stood as an ED candidate in Leeds, and thought he would actually win his old seat back! However his vote went down by 2% on what he polled for the BNP last year. Eddy Butler who was expelled from the BNP last year after an unsuccessful leadership challenge against Griffin, recently joined the ED's himself – although he has been working closely with ED leader Robin Tilbrook for the past eight or nine months, and encouraged a number of BNP activists to defect to the EDs shortly before the local elections, many of whom ended up standing as ED candidates – with two of them David Owens and Elliott Fountain – winning seats in Boston.



Loyalist drum corps on the march - No Surrender to Sinn Fein/IRA - and Steven Uncles!

Prior to the BNP defections, the EDs were having their own internal problems after it was discovered that the party's second in command – the very unpopular Steven Uncles – had made approaches to Sinn Fein (the political wing of the IRA) – whom he described as "Democratic Nationalists". Now Sinn Fein has been called many things in their time – but Democratic Nationalists is not one of them!

This of course incensed the majority of ED members, who are broadly, patriotic right wing types. Much pressure was brought on ED chairman Robin Tilbrook to ditch Uncles, which eventually he did. All well and good you may think? Well not quite. After barely two months of being suspended from the party, Uncles was back. First as an ED candidate in the local elections and then as a party spokesman on the BBC *Politics Show* – talking about an English Parliament!

This was just too much for many patriotic and loyalist ED members who are now leaving the party, just as fast as the BNP members were coming in before the election. What civic nationalists like Tilbrook and Uncles fail to understand, is that we hate Sinn Fein/IRA and all that they stand for. To us the Union Jack and the flags of St George, St Andrew, St Patrick and the Welsh Dragon, are viewed not as the heralds of Westminster tyranny, but as the visible symbols of the inward unity of the British family of nations.

At this summer's Loyalist parades we will watch our flags flutter beneath steely northern skies, and hear the drum corps start their pounding beat, whilst the tunes from the flutes strike to the very core of one's soul. What racial nationalist who has witnessed this sacred ritual, can say that he has not felt a profound emotion swelling in his breast? An emotion beyond material explanation, an emotion truly beyond expression. No Mr Uncles, we don't want to make deals or pacts with Sinn Fein – we want to smash them!

If you are an active Nationalist why not buy some extra copies of this issue to give out (or sell them!) at your next branch meeting – it's a great issue and should 'sell like hot cakes'! And as always we also need your regular donations – however large or small, every Dollar, Pound or even Euro counts. Please try and send in whatever you can afford. Thanks once again for your support, together we will win.

### *Heritage and Destiny*

*Heritage and Destiny* reflects a cross-section of 21st century racial nationalist opinion. It is independent of all political organisations and parties. Unless stated otherwise, views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Heritage and Destiny* are the sole responsibility of the writers concerned and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editor or other staff.

We welcome enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. However, the editor reserves the right to refuse to publish any advertisement submitted, without giving reasons. The appearance of any advertisement in *Heritage and Destiny* does not necessarily indicate that the editor knows anything about, endorses or is interested in the product, organisation, event or service being advertised.

Contributors and advertisers should bear in mind that *Heritage and Destiny* is subject to the laws of the United Kingdom, including our infamous race laws. Refusal to publish certain items should therefore not be taken as a personal or political affront!

The editor is pleased to receive articles for possible publication, preferably by disk or email. No payment is made for articles. Unless the writer specifically requests otherwise, articles become *Heritage and Destiny* copyright. The editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles submitted for publication. Those wishing to republish *Heritage and Destiny* items in other formats should be sure when doing so to give public acknowledgment to both the writer and *Heritage and Destiny* and to include in the acknowledgment the magazine's full address.



# BNP's Electoral and Financial Annihilation

The BNP has been in acute crisis since March 2010, complicated by the chronic conditions that afflict any movement, party or faction headed by Nick Griffin. This crisis has now produced electoral disaster. Outstanding local organisers and councillors such as Michael Coleman in **Stoke-on-Trent** have been turfed out of office, not by the usual ebb and flow of political fortune, but by a cataclysm which leaves their party facing electoral oblivion. Further resignations have now left the BNP with only nine borough councillors in the entire UK.

This cataclysm was evident at the very start of the local election campaign, when the party failed even to field candidates in numerous wards which were not only winnable, but had in the recent past actually elected BNP councillors.

These included:

The **Kirklees** wards of Heckmondwike and Dewsbury East; the **Bradford** wards of Keighley West, Worth Valley, Wibsey and Wyke; the **Burnley** wards of Briercliffe, Brunshaw, Cliviger with Worsthorne, Lanehead, Rosegrove with Lowerhouse, and Whittlefield with Ightenhill; the **Sandwell** wards of Tividale and Great Bridge; Mill Hill ward, **Blackburn with Darwen**; Brinsley ward, **Broxtowe**; Winyates ward, **Redditch**.

In addition, several current or former BNP councillors sought re-election as English Democrats, in wards which now had no BNP candidate: Chris Beverley in Morley South ward, **Leeds**; David Owens in Fenside ward, **Boston**; and Ray Johns in Cheshunt Central ward, **Broxbourne** (where his colleague Steve McCole contested ex-Cllr Johns' old ward of Rosedale).

In **Oldham**, where Nick Griffin made his name at the 2001 general election and where the BNP once seemed certain to win council seats, the party was unable to field a single candidate this year. Other areas where the BNP disappeared from the map included **Gateshead** and **Sunderland**, where last year the party had fielded slates of sixteen and twelve respectively.

Those nationalists temperamentally inclined to see a silver lining to every cloud might have hoped that the drastic reduction in the number of BNP candidates this year would at least allow the party to concentrate its resources and achieve improved results in those wards being contested. Moreover in one sense there was an ideal propaganda opportunity. Last year's council elections had coincided with a general election, boosting turnout and depressing the percentage poll of BNP candidates across the board. So it was logical to expect that – all other things being equal – there would in most cases be a slight improvement on the 2010 share of the vote for BNP council candidates.

In one or two cases this did indeed happen. Even the tiny national socialist British People's Party saw a slight increase in its poll in Todmorden ward, **Calderdale**, from 4.9% to 5.6%. A more substantial improvement was recorded by Mark Cotterill of the England First Party in Ribbleson ward, **Preston**, whose vote increased from 12.5% to 15.5%. While in Queensbury ward, **Bradford** (one of only two BNP successes nationwide) Cllr Mrs Lynda Cromie polled 34.8%, up from the 30.8% achieved by her husband Cllr Paul Cromie last year, though not quite back to the 36.6% and 38.5% polls the Cromies achieved when first elected in 2007 and 2006. Within six weeks of the election both of the Cromies resigned to sit as Independents, leaving the BNP without a single Bradford councillor.

The only other BNP success was in the Leicestershire borough of **Charnwood** where Cllr Cathy Duffy retained East Goscote ward. This is a village built on the site of a vast wartime arms depot. Mrs Duffy's victory (by a majority of just five votes) reflected a substantial personal vote built up over four years of effective council work. Her percentage vote increased from 36.9% in 2007 to 42.3% this year. Across Charnwood the BNP contested only three wards compared to a slate of fourteen candidates at the borough's previous election in 2007.

In the vast majority of council wards contested by the BNP in contrasting wards across England, whether no hope wards, realistic targets, or even former BNP controlled wards, the party saw a significant fall in its share of the poll – not only by comparison to its best years, but even by comparison to what was then seen as a very poor year in 2010.

The BNP's main target ward nationwide was Hapton with Park, **Burnley**, where between 2008 and 2010 the party held all three council seats. This year former Councillor Derek Dawson was heavily defeated, polling just 20.8%, down from last year's 24.2% and more significantly well down on the 38.6% achieved as recently as 2008. (Don't forget that even in 2009 the BNP also won the county council division which includes this ward.) At its peak the BNP was able to poll more than 40% here.

Indicative of the collapse of the BNP's campaigning resources was the fact that away from the main target ward, Burnley BNP's results were even worse. In Gannow ward, another where the BNP had won council seats in 2002, 2003 and 2006, David Shapcott polled 11.9%, less than half last year's already mediocre 24.0% and less than a third of the party's best performance in the ward, which was 38.6% in 2003.

While in Coalclough with Deerplay, a ward which Burnley BNP has never won but where BNP candidates have sometimes been a close second, Angela Vanns finished bottom of the poll with a mere 8.9%.

Burnley could be seen as a former BNP stronghold which has fallen on hard times, and therefore atypical. Yet a pattern of decline – even from the already poor though explicable 2010 results – is also evident elsewhere. In addition to long term target wards, there are numerous wards where BNP candidates (often the same candidate) have been doggedly campaigning for several elections, achieving solid though unspectacular results. Even in these wards, which are a long way off the radar of "anti-fascist" campaigners, the pattern of BNP decline is evident.


In Manor ward, **Stockport**, for example, Duncan Warner has contested every election since 2004, when he polled 14.8%. In the three succeeding elections Mr Warner went on to retain a fairly consistent vote of between 12.6% and 13.9%. Last year this fell to 7.3%, which might have been considered an anomaly because of the general election boosting major party turnout – but this year it fell again to 5.6%.

Nearby in Reddish North ward, **Stockport**, Paul Bennett was fighting his fourth successive election for the BNP. In 2007 he polled 13.0%, rising to 14.6% in 2008 but falling to 9.0% last year. Once again Mr Bennett's vote fell this year, even more substantially than Mr Warner's, to just 4.4%.


The neighbouring borough of **Tameside** again saw a collapse of the BNP vote. At five successive elections in the Hyde Newton ward before last year, the BNP had never polled below 24%. Last year their vote fell to 13.4%, and this year to a record low of 10.1%.

Nor was there any comfort to be found in **Manchester**, which in recent years has been one of the country's most Griffinite BNP branches. All five Manchester BNP candidates saw a lower percentage vote than last year, as did all five in next door **Salford**. Most notably arch-Griffinite Derek Adams polled just 10.4% in the party's main Manchester target ward Higher Blackley, where he had achieved 27.0% in 2008. The region's other Griffinite stronghold in Cumbria fared no better. In Ewanrigg ward, **Allerdale**, where Tina Wingfield polled 23.4% in 2007, the BNP chairman's daughter Jenny Matthys managed only 8.5% this year.

Across the Pennines the pattern of BNP decline continued. In Middleton Park ward, **Leeds**, where BNP candidate Kevin Meeson had consistently presented a serious challenge to Labour hegemony, reaching 37.4% in 2008, he could only manage 17.4% this year. Moreover Leeds BNP was able to field only two candidates in the entire city this year, compared to a



BNP Chairman Nick Griffin struggled to think up excuses for his party's annihilation at the May 2011 elections for English councils, the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh and Northern Ireland Assemblies.



Nationalists who came out best from a difficult 2011 election included (above left to right): Mrs Lynda Cromie, re-elected in Queensbury ward, Bradford, quit the BNP six weeks later; Mrs Cathy Duffy, re-elected as a BNP councillor in East Goscote ward, Charnwood; former BNP councillor David Owens, re-elected in Fenside ward, Boston, as an English Democrat; Elliott Fountain, who won a second seat for the English Democrats in the same Boston ward to register the only seat gained for nationalism this year; former BNP parliamentary candidate Mark Leat, who polled 19.2% for the England First Party in the new Stoke ward of Sandford Hill, up from 10.3% on last year's larger boundaries; Dr Jim Lewthwaite, who increased the Democratic Nationalist vote in Royds ward, Bradford, from 3.3% to 11.3%; and Bob Batten, who achieved the best National Front result this year by increasing his vote in Howdon ward, North Tyneside, from 8.0% to 11.3%.

slate of more than thirty candidates at each of the last three elections. Less dramatically, each of this year's BNP candidates in **Kirklees** polled a record low vote. In Golcar ward Skye Turner managed only 5.5%, a quarter of the BNP poll in 2006 and 2007. In Illingworth & Mixenden ward, **Calderdale**, considered one of the strongest BNP wards in the country and which still has a sitting BNP councillor elected in 2008, Jane Shooter finished third with 18.3%, less than half the BNP vote that elected Cllr Tom Bates in 2008.

One of the few BNP candidates who polled a higher vote than last year was Marlene Guest in Wingfield ward, **Rotherham**, but her 17.0% was still well down on the BNP votes here in 2007 (30.8%) and 2008 (29.2%). Elsewhere in Rotherham BNP candidate Michael Burke could only manage 12.2% in Maltby, the ward where Cllr Will Blair has the unenviable task of seeking re-election next year, while Terry Fieldhouse finished bottom of the poll with 17.1% in the Brinsworth & Catcliffe ward that elected a BNP councillor in 2008 with 40.7%.

Among the most notable BNP growth areas contributing substantially to the election of Andrew Brons to the European Parliament in 2009 was **Barnsley**, but even here there was a notable decline this year. Colin Porter in the town's Central ward polled 11.3%, less than half the BNP's vote in 2007 or 2008. In Darton West the local organiser Ian Sutton polled 13.4%, again less than half his 2008 vote of 28.7%, while in Monk Bretton where Jane Hubbard had polled 24.4% in 2008 and 21.3% as recently as last May, the same candidate could manage only 9.4%. Seventeen of the nineteen Barnsley BNP candidates saw a drop in their vote, often a very heavy one.

Ex-BNP strongholds in the West Midlands were decimated. In **Sandwell** the party had fielded a slate of 24 candidates last year, but this year only contested two wards. Former BNP councillor Russ Green failed to regain the Princes End ward that he lost last year, and saw his already declining vote collapse further from 26.5% to 14%. Fourteen of the fifteen **Birmingham** BNP candidates won lower votes this year, despite having no NF or other nationalist candidates splitting their vote. It was a similar story in Essex, where **Thurrock** BNP's slate fell from sixteen candidates to seven. In the Tilbury Riverside & Thurrock Park ward won for the BNP by Emma Colgate in 2008, this year's BNP candidate Mick Braun polled only 14.8%, down from 25% last year and less than half Cllr Colgate's winning vote three years ago.

England's most racially divided borough **Blackburn with Darwen** has only ever seen one BNP success, at the Mill Hill by-election in 2002, although the **England First Party** won two wards here in 2006. This year the BNP managed only 11.4% in Higher Croft, a ward where they finished runners-up with 29.6% in 2006, and 14.5% in Shadsworth, where Sue Grimshaw twice polled more than 30% for the BNP in 2006 and 2007. (One aspect of nationalism's problems in this borough is that several former BNP/ EFP members ended up joining the **For Darwen Party**, set up by a local millionaire and former Lib Dem to campaign for the rights of the formerly independent – and almost entirely White – town of Darwen, subsumed since 1974 by its multicultural neighbour Blackburn. As might be expected this project ended in tears, and For Darwen was crushed at this year's elections, but one peculiar legacy is that veteran nationalist and former BNP branch organiser Trevor Maxfield has now become a Labour councillor. Oddly enough there has been no whining about this from the media, usually so keen to "expose" former nationalists within mainstream parties.)

Sceptical readers may believe that I am playing statistical games, but the reality is that this year's election results can only be read one way. De-

tailed analysis shows that in almost every ward the BNP's vote was lower than last year. In **Newcastle** the BNP contested only ten wards compared to last year's slate of 24 candidates – and the party's vote declined in nine of the ten. Similarly in **South Tyneside** six of the seven BNP candidates had a lower vote, and the slate was reduced from eighteen last year. At the opposite end of the country BNP slates again collapsed. **Bristol** and **Swindon** branches each fielded just a single candidate, compared to twelve and six last year. Each remaining candidate saw a lower vote.

In fact across the whole of England only fourteen council wards saw a higher BNP vote this year than last year, despite the widespread assumption that last year's simultaneous general election had produced unusually poor BNP percentages. The only substantial increases were in Conisbrough & Denaby ward, **Doncaster**, where the BNP vote rose from 10.6% to 17.4% thanks to the English Democrats failing to field a candidate despite winning the mayoralty; Cllr Mrs Cromie's four point increase in Queensbury ward, Bradford, as mentioned above; and Ronnie Bage, the BNP's sole candidate in **Hartlepool**, whose vote rose from 10.3% to 13.5%, perhaps helped by contesting only that one ward as against five last year.

Predictably there have been feeble excuses for this electoral disaster from party chairman Nick Griffin, so perhaps we should begin by acknowledging the grains of truth behind his assertions. Like any other political party, the BNP has to operate in conditions which are not entirely of its own making. There can be no doubt that Nick Griffin took over the party leadership under near ideal conditions – a nationalist "perfect storm". A decade later, parts of the political climate have become less beneficial.

In 1999 New Labour held the commanding heights of British politics, but the Labour Party on the ground – in areas that nationalists might reasonably hope to target – was often feeble. The very approach which had brought a landslide victory to Tony Blair's party by winning over "Middle England" weakened Labour's appeal in some of its traditional heartlands. Blair often seemed embarrassed to be associated with the white working class, and showed little interest in the Left's former core policy of social equality. For Blair equality meant equal rights for every conceivable minority group, not the old-fashioned socialist nostrum of raising living standards for the (white) working class majority.

Labour's activist base in many of its former strongholds was already ageing. In 2001 the beginning of the "war on terror" – the explicit alliance between New Labour and American neoconservatism – accelerated the collapse of that activist base, with many younger leftists quitting and even parts of the ethnic gravy train becoming decoupled. New Labour paid an increasing electoral price after the invasion of Iraq in 2003, with many leftist or ethnic minority voters defecting either to the Liberal Democrats or to the new "Respect" party, a unlikely coalition between Trotskyists and Islamists.

Another effect of 9/11 was to increase the racial consciousness of many White British voters, though this can be overstated. I suspect that the anti-Islamist backlash only really helped the BNP in areas where there was already racial conflict between Whites and a new generation of Muslim youth prepared to engage in very un-Islamic street gang activity. (A glaring example being Oldham, where a new BNP branch fought its first council election in 2000 and achieved stunning results in 2001 and 2002.) Outside such areas the greatest electoral benefit of the "war on terror" was indirect – in weakening Labour.

This electoral impact of the neocon "clash of civilizations" was played out in the context of a Conservative Party that remained divided and shell-





Some of the most prominent nationalist electoral casualties of 2011 included (above left to right): Stoke BNP veteran Steve Batkin, heavily defeated in his home ward of Bentilee & Ubbertley on a night that saw his party wiped out on Stoke City Council; former Stoke BNP leader Alby Walker, who betrayed his comrades and grovelled to the mainstream media, but was humiliated in Meir Park ward, polling only 9% under his new "Community Voice" banner; ex-councillor Derek Dawson, who was hammered by Labour in what was once the strongest BNP ward in England; ex-councillor Russ Green, who failed to regain Princes End ward, Sandwell, polling 14% for the BNP in a ward he once won with 43.5%; ex-councillor Chris Beverley, who defected from the BNP to the English Democrats a month before the elections but was again pushed into third place in his former ward of Morley South, Leeds; and Alwyn Deacon, the BNP's West Midlands regional organiser, who polled only 10% in Barpool ward, Nuneaton & Bedworth, a ward that the BNP won in 2008.

shocked by its 1997 defeat. It could even be argued that the Tory Party took a generation to get over the trauma of Margaret Thatcher's removal in 1990. So the "wasted vote" argument that had eased the passage of many National Front voters into the fold of Thatcher's Tories in the late 1970s no longer applied. For most of the new millennium's first decade the Tories were not a potential party of government, so a Tory vote was just as much a "wasted vote" as a BNP vote, often more so.

Fertile ground was thus prepared for BNP election victories: in the former mill towns of East Lancashire and West Yorkshire; in the post-industrial wastelands of the Black Country; eventually in former coalfields in parts of Yorkshire and the Midlands; in the white flight zones of Essex, increasingly overtaken by new waves of immigration.

These ideal conditions have now expired, and to that extent there is a grain of truth in Nick Griffin's excuses: external circumstances are no longer so favourable to the BNP as they were for a few years after 2001. We used to have a feeble Conservative opposition and a New Labour government that preferred to ignore its White working class base. We now have Conservatives in power and a Labour Party heavily focused on reinvigorating that White working class support by exploiting welfare cuts.

Yet (not for the first time) Griffin needs reminding that the fault is not in our stars but in ourselves. The BNP had a foothold on power in several council areas, which it pitifully failed to exploit. So the most important lesson of Griffin's ultimate electoral failure is:

**Nationalist parties must prioritise training and support for councillors.** In fact this training and support system must identify winnable council seats in advance. The party's research and press units should focus less on promoting the cult of the leader and more on developing a handful of strong, locally relevant issues for candidates in each winnable area. Once elected, nationalist councillors must be helped to build a reputation as competent and effective activists, climbing the rungs of electability in their area from credible protest vote, to main opposition, to natural holders of office and acknowledged representatives of White voters.

There is no point complaining about our candidates being outgunned by unscrupulous "anti-fascist" campaigners. It was always likely that our opponents would learn campaigning lessons and sharpen their focus, and it is shameful that while "anti-fascists" were moving forward, the BNP was going backwards (at great expense). Even more shameful is that the BNP chairman's own closest cronies gave the best ammunition to the party's opponents. It has to be acknowledged that the problem was not our opponents' lies, but the fact that "anti-fascist" propaganda was often telling the truth about leading figures in the BNP. The second lesson from Griffin's failure is:

**Nationalist parties must demand the highest standards of behaviour from party officials and candidates for public office.** If individuals know that they cannot withstand media scrutiny, they should admit that they are unfit to represent the party. If the party leadership knows that such people have skeletons in the cupboard – or in too many instances skeletons actually displayed in their front windows – then they should not be appointed.

Nationalist parties cannot afford to be run by cronyism, and cannot afford to exclude our best activists for reasons of factional or personal spite. If the party chairman is so insecure that he cannot tolerate potential rivals

working within the party structure, then he is unfit to be chairman. It is a tragic reflection on the state of the BNP that such an obvious truth should have to be expressed. To take the most glaring example: it is farcical that the BNP should be depending on the likes of Clive Jefferson to run its election campaigning, while Eddy Butler – the most successful nationalist electoral campaigner in modern Britain – is marginalised.

**Nationalist parties must harness the talents of the best available individuals in our ranks.** The cult of the leader is far less important than the need to build a successful leadership team.

There has been much talk in recent months of divergent ideological trends within nationalism, with much bandying of terms such as civic nationalist, cultural nationalist and ethnic nationalist. Linked to (but not synonymous with) these supposed ideological splits have been varying options as to how ideology should be put into practice. What lessons can be learned from this year's elections? (Please note that for the moment I am mostly confining my analysis to the evidence that this year's elections offer in respect of the various alternatives available to nationalists.)

The most glaring failure has been among those who saw the BNP's crisis as an opportunity for ideological purification. The **British Freedom Party** sought to narrow the definition of "nationalist". Following the example of several splinter groups since the 1970s, the BFP believed that the movement should be purged of "Nazis". Yet far from offering a pragmatic alternative, the BFP has failed even to get off the ground, and it is unclear whether its leaders even believe in the electoral path. In this respect it has been even less successful than the most extreme of its polar opposites, the very small and explicitly national socialist **British People's Party**, which did at least manage to field a candidate for Calderdale Borough Council, and improved its percentage vote from last year.

A different form of ideological purity is offered by the **National Front**, which has been reinvigorated in recent years by a modest influx of activists from the John Tyndall wing of the BNP, including veteran nationalist Mike Easter. The NF has a few effective electoral units, though its West London activists, led by party chairman Ian Edward, had no election this year. In **North Tyneside** the NF's longstanding candidates Bob Batten and Mark Nicholls polled 11.3% and 7.5% respectively, up from 8.0% and 4.6% last year. It would be idle to pretend that these results were any sort of electoral breakthrough, but neither could they be described as "uniformly pathetic", the dismissive term used by Nick Griffin in the past to contrast the NF's supposed failure with his own party's supposedly unique formula for nationalist success.

Messrs Batten and Nicholls are among the loyal and able activists who should have a role in whatever nationalist force emerges from the wreckage of Griffinism. Another strong group of NF activists is in **Hull**, where a few BNP dissidents led by Nick Walsh joined the NF after Tess Culnane's parliamentary by-election campaign in nearby **Haltemprice & Howden** in 2008. This year's Hull NF candidates enjoyed mixed results, and perhaps overreached themselves by fielding a slate of five candidates, up from two last year. (Notably Hull BNP was only able to field a single candidate this year, and even he only managed 6.9%, compared to last year's NF result of 9.0% in the same ward.)

At least the increased number of candidates could be seen as a sign of NF progress in Hull, whereas in the North West the party will surely be



disappointed by the failure to recruit significantly, even after the defection of two prominent BNP activists (Kev Bryan and former regional organiser Chris Jackson) in December 2009. Chris Jackson polled a creditable 4.9% for the Front in **Rochdale** at last year's general election – the best ever nationalist vote in that constituency – but this year the NF's only council candidate in the borough (former BNP branch organiser Peter Greenwood) finished bottom of the poll with 7.0%.

The only other NF candidate in the North West was Kev Bryan, who polled 12.8% in Irwell ward, **Rossendale**, a slight increase from last year's 11.6% – but one should bear in mind that Mr Bryan has been contesting this ward regularly since 2006, when as a BNP candidate he polled 30.5%. Even at the 2008 election (by which time the BNP had begun to decline locally) he polled 23.9% here.

If the North West's NF performance was modest, the case against the NF as a credible future for nationalism is settled by the party's failure in two other areas. In **Leeds** and **Bradford** a group of veteran activists led by Eddy Morrison joined the Front a couple of years ago after decades of service to various nationalist parties. Mr Morrison was until a few weeks ago a prominent NF official and editor of several online and hard copy publications, and though he may regard himself as having fallen out with me I persist in viewing him as a good nationalist who at his best has made great contributions to our cause. Yet it has to be pointed out that despite the collapse of the BNP in Leeds and Bradford, not a single NF candidate contested this year's elections in either city. It's far too early to assess the likely consequences of Mr Morrison's purging: whether it is the beginning of a restructuring of the party or yet another symptom of the NF's decline.

Perhaps the worst of those symptoms is that there was not a single NF candidate in **Birmingham** this year, again despite the reduction in BNP competition. Even in the NF's worst years Birmingham had remained one of their few active branches. Its extinction is a sad day for nationalism and shows that while individual NF activists will have much to contribute towards a nationalist renaissance, there is no real case in favour of the post-Griffin movement regrouping under the NF banner.

Like the NF candidates in North Tyneside, **England First Party** candidates have demonstrated at successive elections that a BNP label is not a prerequisite for nationalist success. This year party chairman Mark Cotterill increased his vote in Ribbleson ward, **Preston**, from 12.5% to 15.5%, while the six EFP candidates in **Stoke** polled between 6.1% and 19.2% (the latter result for Mark Leat in Sandford Hill ward – an increase from 10.3% in the equivalent, larger ward in 2010 – was the second best vote for any nationalist party in any Stoke ward this year, beaten only by outgoing BNP group leader Michael Coleman's 24.3%). These results were achieved with virtually no financial resources.

One important aspect of the EFP's credible election results (which have included electing two councillors in **Blackburn with Darwen** and defeating the BNP on most of the occasions where the two parties have clashed in the past) is that English cultural identity and imagery can have an important role in enhancing nationalist electoral appeal. Both the BNP and the NF leadership have made a great fuss about rejecting English nationalism as part of a supposed commitment to the Union, even though in Nick Griffin's case this supposed commitment is meaningless and will be ditched as casually as changing his tie. This year's elections demonstrated conclusively that the BNP has no chance of winning seats in Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland.

In the latter case (despite or perhaps because of Nick Griffin's attempts to raise publicity) BNP candidates for the Northern Ireland Assembly each polled below 2%. Their best result was 1.8% in **East Antrim** for the BNP's Ulster organiser Steven Moore. The Stormont elections overall proved a disappointment for all radical challengers to the province's new DUP-Sinn Féin hegemony. Jim Allister was the only successful Assembly candidate for his **Traditional Unionist Voice**, which came out of the local council elections with just six seats. One of TUV's former candidates Ann Cooper had defected to the BNP and stood for East Belfast, but polled only 1.0%.

Nick Griffin endlessly talked up his party's chances in the **Welsh Assembly** elections, largely to solicit donations from gullible party supporters

who were told that one more fundraising appeal might make the difference, in elections where after all the PR system did favour smaller parties. Yet in four of the five Welsh regions the BNP list was defeated not only by the major parties but by Arthur Scargill's minuscule Socialist Labour Party! In all five regions the BNP lost to UKIP, having been ahead of UKIP in four of the five last time.

Similarly neither the National Front nor the BNP achieved significant votes in **Scotland**. Four of the six NF candidates north of the border polled less than 1%, as did seven of the eight BNP lists for the Scottish Parliament, despite a more favourable electoral system than in England. All of the BNP's Scottish results were worse than the last election in 2007. Their best result was 1.2% in Glasgow, down from 1.9% last time despite having no UKIP opposition, and they were beaten in every region by the Greens and the Scottish Senior Citizens Party. UKIP and Scargill's Socialist Labour also defeated the BNP in most Scottish regions. In purely electoral terms, those nationalists who target the entire United Kingdom have no advantage over English nationalists.

Another form of English nationalism is represented by the **English Democrats**, who after rejecting any association with racial politics for most of their existence recruited a number of the BNP's best candidates and activists this year. This move was applauded (and to an extent orchestrated) by Eddy Butler, who as mentioned above has been this country's most effective nationalist election strategist, but its electoral impact is not easy to assess.

The most high profile ED ex-BNP candidate was Chris Beverley, who still works in the office of BNP MEP Andrew Brons and was a BNP councillor for Morley South ward on **Leeds City Council** from 2006 until 2010. Mr Beverley clearly believed he could win back the ward that he lost last year, but it was a tall order to build a winning campaign under a new party label adopted just weeks before polling day. In the event he finished third with 19.6%, slightly down from the 21.2% he polled last year.


Mr Beverley faced unusual challenges in his ward due to the presence of the Morley Borough Independents (MBI). This is one of several such parties that have sprung up in different areas, reflecting

continued resentment at the effects of the 1974 local government reorganisation which forced many historically independent boroughs into being absorbed by larger neighbours. Morley was absorbed by Leeds, just as in Lancashire the historic resort of Morecambe was absorbed by Lancaster and Darwen was tagged onto Blackburn. All three cases spawned political parties, and in the case of the Morecambe Bay Independents and the For Darwen Party these groups actually took power for brief periods in their respective town halls.

The success of such parties (even if short-lived) tells us something about the resilience of local community spirit and local cultural identity: these cases should be studied carefully by nationalists, however much we may despise the opportunists and petty careerist politicians who lead some of these movements. So far as this year's elections were concerned, Chris Beverley and the EDs failed to win back the votes lost to the Morley Independents last year. MBI finished a close second to Labour in Morley South, again pushing Mr Beverley into third place, and held onto Morley North, where Mr Beverley's colleague Tom Redmond polled 8.3%, slightly down on the 11.3% he achieved as a BNP candidate last year.

Two conclusions can be drawn from these results. First: that the strong BNP results in these wards (including Mr Beverley's victory in 2006) were not part of some uniquely successful BNP brand. Second: that contrary to some of the arguments advanced by those who favoured mass defection to the EDs, this strategy did not amount to a successful escape from a "contaminated" BNP brand. Of course we will never know for certain, but I suspect that had Messrs Beverley and Redmond fought their wards again this year as BNP candidates, then they would have achieved about the same results this year as they did as EDs.

Strong support for this theory comes from the Ardsley and Robin Hood ward of Leeds, contested again by Mr Beverley's wife Joanna. Last year as a BNP candidate Mrs Beverley polled 13.8%. This year as an ED her vote improved slightly to 15.0%, but this improvement was entirely due to the collapse in turnout. Notably this year's ED campaign failed to dent



Cross-party celebrations in Todmorden ward, Calderdale. (left to right) Dave Jones of the BPP and Christian Jackson of the NF co-operated despite the enmity of their respective party leaderships.

the UKIP vote in the ward, which remained virtually steady numerically and increased from 3.9% to 6.6%. If there were to be any special benefit in escaping a "contaminated" BNP brand and standing under the more "respectable" ED ticket, then we should have seen it in this ward, where UKIP candidates have consistently been bottom of the poll. In 2008 the UKIP vote denied Mrs Beverley the chance of joining her husband as a BNP councillor, when she lost by just eleven votes.

Here there was an ideal opportunity to test the theory that nationalists could extend their appeal by trading in the "tainted" BNP label for a more voter-friendly ED label. Yet the result was that the UKIP vote – despite being quite clearly a wasted vote – remained far more solid than Mrs Beverley's BNP/ED vote. Predictably the Liberal Democrat vote collapsed, as it did across Leeds and indeed across most of the North of England, but the Conservatives comfortably held on to second place in the ward.

The only ED success this year came in **Boston**, where two ED councillors were elected in Fenside ward. Like Morley this is an area where politics has been complicated by the intervention of a strong independent group, in this case the "Boston Bypass Independents", a party that grew out of a local campaign for a new bypass road in the Lincolnshire town of Boston in 2006 and swept to power in the town in 2007. The BBI party failed in office, partly because of internal splits, and suffered heavy defeats at this year's elections, mostly to the Conservatives.

In November 2008 the BNP's David Owens benefited from the already evident decline of the BBI, gaining one of the Fenside ward seats at a by-election, though failing to make any gains in the area at the Lincolnshire County Council election the following May. This year he successfully defended his seat as an English Democrat, and was joined by fellow BNP defector Elliott Fountain. These were undoubtedly strong results for the EDs, and in fact they are the first borough councillors ever elected as English Democrats, but we should not overstate their national significance.

Several factors should be borne in mind when assessing these Boston results:

- David Owens was an incumbent councillor, and the other incumbent (a BBI councillor) had jumped ship to a neighbouring ward;
- The EDs' main opponents in the ward were the Boston Bypass Independents, whose votes collapsed across the board;
- There were no Conservative candidates in the ward;
- Fenside is a very small ward with around 4,900 electors compared to Chris Beverley's electorate in Morley South, for example, which is 16,660. Therefore the EDs faced a much easier task putting across their message during a three or four week election period.
- None of the other ED candidates in Boston were known to have any past BNP affiliation, but none of them were elected.

While the ED results were far from disastrous, they do not offer evidence that a mass defection to the EDs is the obviously attractive move for disenchanted BNP members. There are of course other problems with the ED route. A large faction within that party will undoubtedly resist the decision by party leader Robin Tilbrook to accept these new arrivals from a racial nationalist background, given that ED policy has always been determinedly non-racial.

Mr Tilbrook will have considerable ammunition from this year's results to fend off any internal revolt. He will be able to point not only to the two new Boston councillors but to strong results in other areas achieved by ex-BNP ED candidates, which compare very favourably to the votes won by longstanding English Democrats in other wards, "untainted" by any racial nationalist past.

The Leeds results have already been mentioned. In the Hertfordshire borough of **Broxbourne** a slate of four ex-BNP English Democrat candidates, including former councillor Ray Johns, polled between 11.6% and 28.1%. This latter result was in Cllr Johns's old ward of Rosedale, where the BNP had polled over 40% in the 2003 and 2006 elections. Meanwhile in Earby ward, **Pendle** another BNP defector to the EDs James Jackman polled 12.3% – only very slightly down on the 13.6% he received in the same ward last year as a BNP candidate. (Incidentally Mr Jackman was also elected unopposed as an ED parish councillor.) In **Solihull** two BNP defectors won modest votes standing as EDs, one slightly up on last year's

BNP vote in the same ward, the other polling only 3% compared to last year's BNP vote of 6.1%

Most of the BNP defectors' results however compare favourably with those achieved by longstanding English Democrats with no "racist" past in wards which have long been targeted by the party, in boroughs such as **Doncaster**, where the Mayor is an English Democrat but where there are still no ED councillors, the highest ED vote this year being 23.3%. In other ED target areas, their highest poll in **Rochford** was 22.9%, in **Medway** 13.9%, and in **Dartford** 21.2%.

(Meanwhile the various splinters provoked by ED factionalism over recent years produced a single candidate – Lee Ingram, who contested his home ward of Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields, **Leicester**. Mr Ingram was the only nationalist candidate this year for Leicester City Council, which in the 1970s was the highlight of the NF's electoral map. In 2007 as an ED candidate he had polled 449 votes (13.3%) despite BNP opposition. This year with no BNP but faced by UKIP opponents, Mr Ingram polled 354 votes (10.4%) for the **English People's Party**, more than double the UKIP result.)

The EDs will have been pleased to have beaten the BNP for the second time in Denby Dale ward, **Kirklees**, where the BNP candidate was the Kirklees branch organiser for her party, and to have beaten UKIP in two **Salford** wards as well as in their first ever **Tameside** campaign.


In **Liverpool** there was further evidence that a BNP past is no significant handicap for an ED candidate. Former BNP European parliamentary candidate and former Liverpool BNP organiser Steven Greenhalgh polled 4.3% as an ED in the city's Central ward, while the two ED candidates in other Liverpool wards with no former BNP association polled 0.7% and 1.4% respectively. Conversely in St Michael's ward, Liverpool, a former BNP candidate, Dr Paul Rimmer, polled 1.8% for the **UK Independence Party**, more than double the vote of an ED rival who had no BNP links.

Dr Rimmer was a curious recruit for UKIP, a party which has always insisted that it rejects all membership from anyone tainted by "racism", yet whose parliamentary candidates have included former NF (and now BNP) activist Andrew Moffat and former Northern League luminary Alastair Harper. UKIP has been increasing its councillor base, often through defections from the Conservatives, but had a disappointing election this year. Absurdly the *Daily Mail* suggested that UKIP "made political history after taking control of its first council" this year – but in fact this was just a parish council, Ramsey Town Council in Huntingdonshire.

On the main **Huntingdonshire** District Council UKIP only won one ward – Ramsey – with their candidates heavily defeated elsewhere. Party leader Nigel Farage had proudly announced a record number of 1,225 UKIP candidates nationwide, which was indeed an achievement as BNP candidate numbers were down to 258. 2011 had started well for UKIP, with the party saving its deposit and defeating the BNP at the **Oldham East & Saddleworth** by-election, then topping this by finishing second at the **Barnsley Central** by-election in March (see *H&D* 44). Senior UKIP officials joined Farage in boasting of potential victories in the Welsh and Northern Ireland Assembly elections.

None of this came to fruition. UKIP's performance was not a disaster on the BNP scale – the party actually gained a couple of seats from the Liberal Democrats in **Aylesbury Vale**. Moreover Cllr Henry Reilly (who defected to UKIP from the Ulster Unionist Party in 2007) was re-elected in first place in The Mournes ward, **Newry and Mourne**, an impressive result which contrasted with his party's failure elsewhere in the province. Another UKIP success was the re-election of Cllr Julien Parrott in Ella-combe ward, **Torbay**, where he had initially been elected as an Independent in 2007.

Yet all three of the defending UKIP councillors in **Newcastle-under-Lyme** lost to Labour; their only **South Ribble** councillor was defeated; and a seat held on **Tendring** council for just a few weeks following a defection was lost. Overall the results were seen as an embarrassment for Nigel Farage, and several of his former allies called for his resignation. Former UKIP leadership candidate David Campbell-Bannerman defected back to the Tories within days of the elections.



Former NF activist Matthew Collins (left) with his new ally, *Searchlight* editor Nick Lowles, targeted the "anti-fascist" campaign at former BNP strongholds such as Stoke-on-Trent.





Mixed fortunes for leftist challengers to the establishment (left to right): Bill Randall is the new leader of Brighton & Hove Council, the first Green to take control of an English council; Salma Yaqoob and George Galloway saw the continuing decline of their Respect party, which failed to take a Scottish Assembly seat or add to its tally of councillors; Dave Nellist, once a Militant Tendency MP expelled by Labour, remains a lone Socialist Party voice on Coventry City Council, with his ex-Militant cronies failing under various electoral labels; Michael Lavallette, who had been one of the most successful fringe left figures in local government, was ousted from his Preston City Council seat by a Labour landslide; Arthur Scargill remains a surviving dinosaur of the British far left, as his Socialist Labour Party came back from the dead to defeat the BNP in the Welsh Assembly and Scottish Parliament elections; England's most unlikely left wing winner this year was long-time nationalist Trevor Maxfield, former organiser of Blackburn with Darwen BNP, whose "road to Damascus" (as described by senior Labour Councillor Jim Smith) led him into the welcoming arms of Jack Straw's Blackburn Labour Party.

Regardless of the many serious ideological obstacles to racial nationalists thinking of an alliance with UKIP, the election results this year did not suggest this was a viable option. A final fragment of evidence as to the viability of the ED option comes from **Bradford**, where the collapse of the BNP left the field free for former party stalwarts who had defected either to the EDs or to the **Democratic Nationalists**, a group of former BNP activists including ex-councillor Dr Jim Lewthwaite and former Conservative and UKIP activist Ivan Winters. (As noted above neither the National Front nor the BPP put up candidates in Bradford, despite having some of their leading activists living in the city. Meanwhile the BNP concentrated all their resources on the successful defence of Cllr Mrs Lynda Cromie's Queensbury ward. In fact Mrs Cromie and her husband have been semi-detached from Nick Griffin's BNP for some time, and based their re-election campaigns largely on their personal records.)

Somewhat surprisingly given the modest electoral record of the Democratic Nationalists, they easily outstripped the EDs in Bradford, firstly by fielding three candidates compared to the single English Democrat, and second by achieving generally better votes. Andrew Clark was the ED candidate in Wibsey ward, which he had twice fought previously for the BNP, finishing runner-up with 30.4% in 2006 and 27.8% in 2007. This year he polled only 6.5% as an English Democrat and finished bottom of the poll – in a ward where seven years ago the BNP had managed to win one of the three seats in the all-out election of 2004. Neil Craig of the Democratic Nationalists was similarly contesting a ward that had elected a BNP councillor in that 2004 contest. Mr Craig polled 10.9% in Wyke ward, showing a slightly better relative performance to Mr Clark's for the EDs in Wibsey, though again well down on the votes of around 28% achieved by BNP candidates here in 2006 and 2007.

The other two Dem Nat candidates were Liam Haines Kernaghan, who polled 6% in Tong ward, and former councillor Dr Jim Lewthwaite, who achieved his party's best result: 11.3% in Royds, a ward where the BNP had polled over 30% in 2006 and 2007. Given the dramatic decline of the BNP in this city during the intervening years, both the Dem Nat and the ED results are broadly in line with what one might have expected had the BNP limped on rather than collapsing totally (outside Cromie territory). But they do indicate that the ED label alone brought no special advantage.

A final category of BNP defector was the handful of candidates resisting any of the alternative party labels on offer and standing as independents. They achieved mostly disappointing results. Former BNP parliamentary candidate Neil Whitelam achieved a respectable 543 votes in the SE Holderness ward of the **East Riding of Yorkshire**, but in Primrose ward, **South Tyneside**, the four-time BNP candidate Pete Hodgkinson managed only 4.3% as an independent in a ward where he had previously polled as high as 32.9% for the BNP. Similarly in Short Heath ward, **Walsall**, three-time BNP candidate Malcolm Moore polled only 4.9% as an independent in a ward where he had polled between 17.5% and 22.1% for the BNP. In a three-vacancy election for Ibstock and Heather ward, **NW Leicestershire**, Ivan Hammonds stood as an independent this year and finished seventh of ten candidates with 420 votes, 273 votes behind the lowest elected Labour candidate. By contrast in a December 2008 by-election for the same ward, which Mr Hammonds contested for the BNP, he had finished runner-up with 30.8%, only fifteen votes behind the winner.

The only candidates who achieved reasonably strong results as independents were two sitting councillors originally elected under BNP labels. Graham Partner in Hugglescote ward, **NW Leicestershire**, who had been elected top of the poll in 2007 with 449 votes (and who remains a Leicestershire county councillor) saw his vote fall to 270 this year as an independent, finishing fifth of ten candidates in a two-vacancy ward, though his share of the poll still works out at around 20%. Meanwhile the former deputy leader of the BNP group on **Stoke City Council**, Tony Simmonds, polled 30.9% and finished runner-up in the new Broadway & Longton East ward, though we should bear in mind that this is a small ward created after boundary changes, and it was therefore more practical for ex-Cllr Simmonds (who was to put it kindly a difficult colleague for fellow nationalists to work with) to get his message across to voters.

Other independent nationalist candidates included Harry Williams, former BNP general election candidate for Folkestone & Hythe, who polled 30 votes (1.3%) in Folkestone Foord ward, **Shepway**, and Brian Ravenscroft, former BNP parliamentary candidate for Gillingham & Rainham, who featured on one of England's most crowded ballot papers this year, finishing 15th out of 16 candidates in Gillingham South ward, **Medway**, with 150 votes (1.5%).

Although they fielded no candidates themselves this year, Pat Harrington's **National Liberal Party** (NLP) supported the **English Radical Alliance** (ERA) candidate Rick Heyse in **Torbay's** Roundham with Hyde ward. The ERA (who are against St. George and St. George's Day as they think they are "racist") polled 145 votes – 6.7%, coming 8th out of nine candidates. There were no other nationalist candidates at all in Torbay this year, with the former BNP branch splitting three ways – most to the British Freedom Party and the rest to the ERA and UKIP.

Meanwhile a variety of other anti-establishment candidates on the political left had mixed fortunes. Predictably the Green Party has been able to reap some rewards from the rapid decline of the Liberal Democrats, who were once their main competitors for the support of students and middle-class leftists disgusted by New Labour. With fourteen net gains this year, there are now 130 Green councillors. Ten new seats were gained in **Brighton & Hove**, where Greens are now the largest party on the council as well as holding a parliamentary seat. There was also a further gain in **Norwich**, where there are now 15 Greens out of 39 councillors. Further north the Greens sometimes struggled against a (perhaps temporarily) reinvigorated Labour Party, losing four seats to Labour in one of the few Green strongholds, **Lancaster City Council**. Nevertheless the relative success of the Greens gave the lie to Griffin's suggestion that all minor parties were squeezed out in 2011.

Elsewhere on the left the "**Independent Working Class Association**" formed by veterans of the "anti-fascist" Red Action gang still has a single councillor left in **Oxford** but has long since ceased to function as an effective electoral machine. Former members of Militant Tendency, now labelled as "**Socialist Party**" or "**Socialist Alternative**" had a few credible results, and their allies in the "**Trade Union & Socialist Coalition**" fielded 180 candidates nationwide, but following the imprisonment of former **Scottish Socialist Party** leader Tommy Sheridan and the collapse of his organisation, this post-Trotskyist chaos now has only one real political success, **Coventry** councillor and ex-MP Dave Nellist. The other electorally successful left-wing movement of course has been **Respect**, which



started out as a coalition between the Trotskyist **SWP**, a handful of Labour leftists around George Galloway, and certain Muslim opponents of the Iraq War, especially in East London and Birmingham. Respect has since fractured, and failed to take an extra seat in its strongest non-London ward – Sparkbrook, **Birmingham** – despite polling 38.6%.

So much for the electoral facts, which seem to offer no conclusive evidence to push nationalists in any direction. Smaller nationalist parties – even "extremist" ones – polled perfectly respectably in comparison to the BNP. In some cases, notably EFP chairman Mark Cotterill, their votes showed slight increases from 2010, compared to an almost universal BNP decline, both in numbers of candidates and average vote.

Those nationalists who defected to the English Democrats did not poll noticeably better than those who stayed with the BNP, but neither did they perform noticeably worse. While many internet wisecracks had predicted that the EDs would pay an electoral price for embracing "extremists", the reverse appears to have been the case. The new BNP recruits, no doubt because of their campaigning experience compared to some other EDs, achieved relatively good results and two of them were actually elected, becoming the first ever ED elected borough councillors.

Predictably the worst option for any nationalist candidate is to stand as an independent, since unless you are a sitting councillor with an established personal record and/or you are operating in a very small ward, it is much more difficult without any party label to get your message across to significant numbers of voters. What we can conclude from this year's elections is that the long decay of the BNP has clearly destroyed any hope of Nick Griffin's party winning back electoral credibility, but no other nationalist party can present itself as the most obvious and credible alternative.

One danger in such circumstances is that large numbers of activists will simply drift away and abandon electoral politics – in fact many have already done so. Another danger is that those who choose to remain politically active will allow shades of ideological difference, hobby horses or personal friendships to push them into as many as half a dozen rival parties or movements. Again this trend can already be discerned.

There is only one way to rescue the nationalist movement from the consequences of Griffin's implosion. A clear lead is required from the most senior and widely respected figures in our movement. The BNP leadership campaign of Andrew Brons has made a very good start in this direction. He has joined forces with Richard Edmonds, best known as the leading lieutenant of the late John Tyndall, in a campaign that has incorporated a broad church of leading figures in the party – some of whom are far distant from the Tyndallite tradition: relatively new converts to nationalism such as Michael Barnbrook, former Conservative academic Sam Swerling, NF defectors such as former North East regional organiser Ken Booth, and former Griffinites such as NF veteran and former East Midlands BNP regional organiser Geoff Dickens.

Such a broad coalition will have to face up to difficult choices regarding ideological direction and detailed policy proposals. I attempted a few signposts on these and other matters in an address to the New Right on June 11th. But we should remember that it is not ideological division or policy minutiae that have brought down Griffin's BNP. Rather that party has been destroyed by financial corruption, authoritarian factionalism and cronyism – familiar enough problems in politics, but seen at their very worst in Griffin's BNP.

As suggested earlier, a new nationalist coalition will need to adopt the following as absolute essentials, the *sine qua non* for nationalist success and the very opposite of the Griffin approach:

- **Nationalist parties must prioritise training and support for councillors;**
- **Nationalist parties must demand the highest standards of behaviour from party officials and candidates for public office;**
- **Nationalist parties must harness the talents of the best available individuals in our ranks. The cult of the leader is far less important than the need to build a successful leadership team.**

Richard Edmonds pointed the way forward, and Andrew Brons has now taken up the challenge. We shall see in the coming weeks whether Nick Griffin allows any form of genuine contest. I strongly suspect that the BNP is holed below the waterline, and that either constitutional finagling or financial collapse will intervene to prevent Andrew Brons and his team from completing their rescue operation.


Peter Rushton, Manchester, England

## JOIN GIDEON'S ELITE PREPARE FOR KINGDOM SERVICE

Hear Pastor Peter J. Peters daily on WWCR shortwave radio. For a FREE newsletter with complete broadcast schedule write to:

Scriptures for America,  
POB 766, LaPorte, CO 80535, USA.

**24 Hours, 7 Days a week -  
Daily internet streaming  
[www.scripturesforamerica.org](http://www.scripturesforamerica.org)**



### Latest Skrewdriver CD *Live at 100 Club 1983*

Includes the never before released cover version of Sham 69's *Red London* plus 17 other great tracks.  
Lyric booklet included.

**£10.00 post free.**

(Buyers from outside UK £12.00 including postage worldwide – CD without jewel case.)

A percentage of the profit from this CD will be going to the Nationalist Prisoners' Aid Association.

Cheques / Postal Orders made payable to **D. Ettridge**, and sent to -  
**Department 14, BCM Box 1783, London, WC1N 3XX, UK.**

## BROADSWORD

The quarterly magazine of  
the British Movement

One year subscription – £12.00

or for a sample copy of latest issue send £3.00 to:

The Sunwheel, P.O. Box 6, Heckmondwike, WF14 0XF,

[www.britishmovement.info](http://www.britishmovement.info)



**Nationalist Themed  
Decorative Shields**

*made to order*

**email: [meadowCP1@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:meadowCP1@hotmail.co.uk)**

**Tel: (01274) 604358 [landline]  
or 07876 383636 [mobile]**



# *The Affirmative Action Hoax - Diversity, the Importance of Character and Other Lies - by Steven Farron*

Published by New Century Books, 2010 (2nd edition)  
ISBN 978-0-9656383-8-8, 334pp, soft-back, Available for £20/\$30 + postage from American Renaissance, PO box 527, Oakton, VA 22124, USA. Or online at - [www.amren.com](http://www.amren.com)

“Affirmative Action” is at the centre of a raft of policies adopted, then obfuscated, later even denied, but in fact persisted with, first in the United States and then in other Western nations including Britain, to paper over the yawning crack between these societies’ prevailing ideology of universalist humanism and the fact that humans obdurately insist in harbouring in their midst innate and significant differences between embarrassingly visible population groups in abilities, such as intelligence, which are of undeniably overwhelming social importance.

In this incisive, exhaustively researched and documented work, South African academic Dr Steven Farron lays bare the nature, inherent hypocrisy and contradictions, fallacy and disastrous social consequences of this piece of semi-covert social engineering.

An ideology based on the non-existence of Race proves to be based entirely upon the acknowledgement in practice of its reality. A policy designed to “fight racial discrimination” is in fact based entirely and explicitly upon practising racial discrimination, mainly against Whites but also against North-East Asians. A policy promoted as fighting inner city poverty in fact discriminates against and disadvantages the inner city poor, of all races but especially Whites. A policy imposed by the law has been continued by systematically breaking the law. And, perhaps most ironically, a policy defended as the touchstone of “anti-racism” notably by Jews turns out to have been conceived originally for the express and deliberate purpose of excluding Jews on racial grounds from top US academic establishments.

These are the conclusions closely and rigorously argued and demonstrated by this redoubtable work of research. Mindful of the important dictum that extraordinary claims require to be supported by extraordinary evidence, Dr Farron advances relentlessly against the prevailing wisdom and doctrines of Western academia and society under a withering barrage of citations and references. Were this book to state that the Sun rose in the East, it would undoubtedly feel compelled to follow and support this statement with footnotes citing a dozen peer-reviewed papers to this effect in reputable academic publications! None of this makes this volume a light read. What it does make it is a formidable arsenal to be mined for those penning more popular polemics for a wider audience. Use any of the points Dr Farron so carefully buttresses, and you can be sure it will stand against opponents’ counterfire.

It is the depth of his research and his careful referencing thereof that rebuts the application against himself, given his own academic field is the Classics, of which he was Professor at the South African University of the Witwatersrand, of his own criticism of others: “Deniers of genetic determinism of intelligence ...support their position by citing a small group of ‘experts’. Although some of these experts are attained eminence in another, related field, all are amateurs in the field in question.” Dr Farron, by contrast, does not set himself up as an expert. Instead he carefully bases his case on the published findings of those who indubitably are.

Dr Farron starts by pointing out that the whole edifice of Affirmative Action was based on the great unexamined premise of modern Western society. That all human groups are and must be equal in the range and distribution of innate abilities amongst them, and that therefore if there are any differences in social outcome between such groups they must necessarily be the result of unfair social factors operating on the poorer


performing groups. Either explicit – discrimination, “racism” etc. Or implicit – poverty, culture, historical experience for example of having – some generations ago now – been enslaved etc. Therefore some sort of deliberate policy, originally called “Affirmative Action” but later going by a variety of euphemisms, needed to be imposed from above to “redress the balance”. As Dr Farron also points out, this idea sits uneasily with the other plank of universalism, that “races” do not really exist but are a purely social construct. In which case the basis for Affirmative Action does not exist, because Blacks, Whites etc do not exist as meaningful groups and therefore cannot be the basis of any policy of any sort. This remains the theoretical basis of the West’s ruling ideology even as it is completely disregarded by those professing it in practice. A practice based very firmly on the reality of races and the validity of classifying people into them.

Dr Farron traces the history of Affirmative Action back rather further than its proponents will be entirely comfortable with. To the unintended consequences of measures to open up the top American academic institutions to the brightest and best students who could most benefit from them. The obvious way was by the results of impartial and rigorous examinations from which the Ivy League colleges to pick the best performers. So in the late 19th Century they set up the College Entrance Examination Board to do this. However, this coincided with an invasion of the United States by Jews from Eastern Europe. The Jewish population of the US rose from 277,000 in 1877 to 3,389,000 forty years later. Whatever their other qualities, Jews tend to be intelligent. The same horrendously politically incorrect studies that obdurately persist in showing that the IQ’s of Whites in the US are on average 15 points (15%) higher than the average IQ of American Blacks also show that American Jews average 15 IQ points higher than non-Jewish Whites. This is hardly surprising given that for many centuries Jews had to be smart to survive, living by their wits

and cunning amongst a far more numerous host population which did not overly welcome them.

The importance of innate intellectual ability over and above environment and culture was rapidly demonstrated by the fact that, despite coming mainly from initially very poor and non-English-speaking households, Jews very soon started to be represented out of all proportion to their numbers in those scoring highest in the objective CEEB tests. By 1919, as a result, the proportion of Jews winning admission on the basis of these exam results to top universities was out of all proportion to their percentage of the general population. 20% at Brown and Harvard, nearly 25% at the University of Pennsylvania, and 40% at New York’s Columbia, and these proportions were rising rapidly.

In those Politically Incorrect days, this did not go down well. Dean Jones of Yale expostulated “A few years ago every scholarship of value was won by a Jew. I took it up with the Committee and said we could not allow that to go on. We must put a ban on the Jews”. Dean Koppel of Columbia bewailed the presence of so many “uncultured Jews” at his University and sought ways of replacing them by “Gentile boys of a desirable type”. In April 1922, Robert Corwin, Chairman of Yale’s Admissions Board, was told by the Dean of Freshmen that Jewish students averaged 11.5% higher than the class average in an intelligence test, but that many of said Jews were “personally and socially unacceptable”. Corwin responded with a “Memorandum on the Jewish Problem” to the Yale Corporation overseeing the university. In this he proposed that the proportion of “low-class Jews” be limited to 10% of Yale’s annual student intake by replacing selection on the basis of objective academic test results with selection also on the basis of “characteristics other than scholarship essential to success in college – manliness, uprightness, cleanliness, native refinement etc. – which are lacking in a large proportion of this race”.



In December 1917, also worried at the influx of Jews into his university, Nicholas Murray Butler, in his Annual Report, had introduced the fateful word, calling for an “affirmative process of selection and not merely a negative process of exclusion”. To that end he, followed by all but one of the other leading US universities, abandoned the indisputably fair and level playing field of selection of entrants to an academic institution solely on the basis of their measured academic ability demonstrated by objective testing, in favour of a subjective and covertly racially based policy of selection based on vague criteria of “character” and “background” (assisted by admissions forms which probed the precise ancestry of each applicant, place of birth, place of parents’ birth, surname, any previous surname of applicant or parents etc etc, without indelicately asking outright if they were Jews). The growth in the proportion of Jews was duly halted. Harvard stood alone against this subterfuge. Its President, Abbott Lowell, simply stated that he did not want his university beswarmed by loads of Jews and would simply and openly keep them out. Such lack of subtlety brought the wrath of the media down on his head in 1922 and Harvard fell into line behind a covert policy of affirmative action in favour of Gentile Whites, whilst, like all the other Ivy League colleges, officially denying that their policy was in any way anti-Semitic. What they did not do – although as Dr Farron pointed out it would have been fairer – was simply to set an explicit quota of Jews and then simply select the entry mark in the CEEB exams differently for Jews and Whites so as to admit the desired numbers. This would of course have meant that the Jews admitted would have had to get higher marks than most of the Whites, which would have led to overrepresentation of Jews further down the line in performance in terms of level of degree won etc.

Thus was laid the foundation of what was to follow to the present day. The beneficiaries and victims have changed – now Blacks are racially favoured and Whites discriminated against. But the principles of Affirmative Action have not changed. Any objective criterion for admission to education – or later, employment – was subordinated to a covert subjective process based on vague criteria, originally “character”, later “disadvantage” and the desirability – explicitly cited, as Dr. Farron demonstrates, to justify the unfair exclusion of academically qualified Jews in the 1920s in exactly the same way as it is now used to justify the unfair exclusion of academically qualified Whites – of “diversity”, and of reflecting the racial composition of the United States as a whole. For example the University of Chicago’s stated policy was “to keep the percentage of Jews in the university the same as the percentage of Jews in the city”. With exactly the same specious and clearly false denial that a policy is being followed based on covert racial discrimination. It is ironic as Dr Farron observes, in view of who now supports Affirmative Action, that it was originally drafted for exactly the same purpose as the NSDAP’s 1935 Nuremberg Laws. Expressed by Adolf Hitler thus: “this legislation is not anti-Jewish, but pro-German. The rights of Germans are thereby to be protected.... Jews, who formed less than one percent of the population, monopolized the cultural leadership of the people and flooded the intellectual professions, such as law and medicine”.

After the Americans joined in removing the German Chancellor from the scene, the process of Affirmative Action began to be redirected against those it had been set up to defend. Dr Farron traces the whole sorry process, from the Civil Rights Act of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society through the 1978 Bakke case which legalised racial discrimination in university admission in favour of minorities, its extension into the world of employment and entry to and promotion in the police, army and so on. Until the present situation is reached in which to enter university Whites have to score much more highly than Blacks in SATs. These were introduced to supplement the CEEB tests in 1926. “SATs” were origi-


nally “Scholastic Aptitude Tests”, then “Scholastic Assessment Tests”, but since Blacks continued to perform on them embarrassingly poorly relative to Whites but they were too useful just to be junked, now since 2005 the letters “SAT” officially stand for nothing at all!

He also shows, with much evidence, how rich young Blacks, whose parents are wealthy suburbanites, benefit from Affirmative Action at the expense of poor, in the British sense working class, Whites. He further points out that the excuse that this is “compensation for being enslaved by American Whites” wears thin when it turns out (an avalanche of figures is drilled and paraded forth to support this) that more Blacks thus benefiting today are descended from post-1965 African and West Indian Immigrants, whose ancestors never felt an American, and in many cases any, overseer’s lash rather than the inner city American Blacks who are cited as its beneficiaries. Indeed the children of Latin American millionaires whose ancestors owned slaves – the Empire of Brazil did not abolish slavery until the 1880s – benefit from policies designed to “compensate for the legacy of slavery”!

The plethora of Federal and local bureaucracies tasked with implementing this official programme of racial discrimination – in a completely non-racist way, of course – face the interesting challenge of defining which racial groups are to benefit when they do not officially believe races exist. This gets them into all sorts of muddles! As Dr Farron, in a quite hilarious chapter on “Defining Minorities and Race”, observes, “in programs supervised by some Federal agencies, white Argentineans of Spanish descent are eligible for affirmative action and increase the

diversity of organizations they join. But that is not true of white Brazilians of Spanish descent or of white Argentineans of Portuguese descent. If a business or government agency hires or promotes too many whites of Brazilian origin (who are simply whites), it can restore its diversity by hiring and promoting whites of Cuban origin (who are Hispanics)”. Were they both US citizens, blonde supermodel Gisele Bundchen would be classified as a member of the Hispanic ethnic minority because her German ancestors settled in Brazil but her fellow blonde supermodel Valeria Mazza would not because her Italian and Spanish forebears went to Argentina instead. The US Office of Management and Budget has now classified anyone with one minority parent as a minority community member, with the strange result that the US is now the only country in the world in which a White woman can officially give birth to a Black baby but a Black woman cannot give birth to a White baby. Exactly as the Klan always maintained of course – “one drop of Black blood makes you Black” (the result of that is that many American Blacks are classed as such even though they have much, sometimes even mostly, White ancestry, which is doubtless why although performing below American Whites on IQ tests they perform above pureblood African Blacks).

Dr Farron describes the logical end result of this farce in a case in which two fair-skinned red haired Boston Irish brothers called Malone failed, badly, the entrance exam for the Boston Fire Brigade. They took the same exam two years later, declaring themselves as “Blacks”. Again, they did very badly, gaining only 57%. This was, again, far below the White passing grade of 82%, but above the – much lower due to the Affirmative Action policy of the Fire Service – Black pass mark so they now got in. Ten years passed, then Philip Malone put himself up for Fire Lieutenant. He did by far the best in the promotion exam of any of the 39 Black candidates (being White may have helped here) but far below the worst White candidate. Promotion beckoned until the Fire Commissioner, seeing his name on the list of Black promotees, recalled that he knew Malone and his brother personally and thought they didn’t look very Black to him! The Malones were promptly fired for falsely claiming Negritude. Their counterclaim in a lawsuit that their granny looked pretty dark in an old sepia photo was unsportingly rejected by the judge.



**Spot the ethnic minority - each of these South American born models has European parents, but U.S. government regulations would label the one born in Brazil as White, the one born in Argentina as Hispanic (i.e. an ethnic minority qualifying for special employment privileges).**




This then triggered a programme of racial examination and reclassification throughout the public service sector of Boston, ordered by the city's Mayor Flynn, worthy of the good old days in South Africa. A number of firemen and others were fired for having insufficiently thick lips, frizzy hair and dusky skin hue. Dr Farron does not record whether cranial callipers were employed or Teutonic-accented racial science experts recalled from South American jungle hideouts to assist in this magnificent exercise in US official anti-racism. Note, once again, that the people doing this officially believe that "race" has no scientific reality and is purely a social construct, at the same time as firing red-haired Irishmen for not being Negroes on purely biological grounds.

However, such errors of racial classification cannot afflict the private sector, as the US Government has informed private employers explicitly that they may not override a candidate's self-assessment of their minority status with their own observation of what race they appear actually to belong to. In other words, you are whatever race you say you are. Had Boston Fire Brigade been privatised, the Malone brothers would have been fine – if they wanted to be Black, it would be racist to question this. That presumably means, in a further display of this reviewer's fascination with blonde supermodels that, again were she American, if Claudia Schiffer wished to claim to be Black so as to take advantage of lower entry or employment criteria mandated by US officialdom for employing Blacks an employer would have to accept her as a Negress.

The nature and extent of such lower entry and employment criteria across US factories, commerce, academia, law, medicine, the police etc. Dr Farron documents in alarming, painstaking detail. Basically Blacks and other minorities either need lower test scores, or tests are evaded or fudged, to get the same jobs and promotions as Whites. As a result of a complex of court cases and subsequent legislation, varying across the USA, this discrimination is denied by those who at the same time boast of doing it – Dr Farron gives several examples. It also has the bizarre result that in order to gain accreditation to the American Bar Association for their law degrees, allowing graduates to practice law, law schools in states prohibiting racial discrimination of the sort needed for Affirmative Action are obliged by the ABA to follow ABA Affirmative Action guidelines even where these conflict with such statutes. In other words, the foremost body of American lawyers requires law schools to break the law where it conflicts with their policy of anti-White racial discrimination. Not that, as Dr Farron shows, such local ordinances are effective in stopping the anti-White juggernaut in practice anyway. He cites numerous leading figures, including the Dean of Berkeley, boasting that they ignore or evade any such restrictions on them racially discriminating against Whites (although that is seldom how they describe it, that is what they do).

Some of the most alarming pages of this book detail how leading US medical schools, including Harvard Medical School, systematically admit, and, worse, fudge tests to pass, Black students whose abilities are demonstrably below those of their White counterparts. As Farron explains "For many decades the undergraduate grade average and scores

on all sections of the Medical College Admissions Test of minority students who have been accepted by American medical schools has been much lower than the averages of Whites who have been rejected." Dr Farron goes on to cite testimony and evidence to show how the minority students' lack of actual ability is got around by making exams easier so they don't fail and just letting them keep on resitting them until they scrape through. This, together with the fact that it is much harder for Whites to get into medical school so the ones that do get in are much more able on average than their Black fellow students, means that in America you can pretty reliably predict how good your doctor is by the colour of his



**Harvard Medical School has a systematic programme of anti-white discrimination. Affirmative action fudges the admission test results so as to allow more non-white students into this and other medical schools.**


or her skin. And indeed even Blacks understandably prefer to be treated by a White doctor. Were doctors admitted for training and graded and passed in qualifying exams purely on merit, with no benefit of race, then this would not be true. The same goes for all the other professions and jobs blighted by Affirmative Action. Instead, the ironic result of decades of this "anti-racist" policy has been to make the crudest "racist prejudice" – any Black person in almost any job is likely to be less able than any White one – verifiably and demonstrably no more than the truth!

Dr Farron takes us on a long and depressing, and in places utterly absurd, tour of the effects of this policy across American life. Some of it you could not make up – basic literacy requirements for teachers removed because too many Blacks could not meet them, the same for Policemen.

But, although it's about America, and Affirmative Action is not so explicit and all-pervasive here in Britain, Dr Farron covers topics that most certainly are relevant on this side of the Atlantic. He deals with educational issues such as exam grade inflation, and the Orwellian tyranny by which Political Correctness is enforced in academia and the teaching profession, which certainly do afflict us. As do the mendacity of media propaganda in favour of said Political Correctness, much of it, as Dr Farron ably documents, based on outrageous lies and factual errors. He also demonstrates that American ideas that have been imported to Britain, such as Project Head Start, which claimed that extra spending on teaching small children boosted their later IQs, did not in fact work and the American results cited to justify the spending of British taxpayers' money on emulating them proved to be illusory. Most importantly, he provides a battery of hard evidence that can be unleashed on those who believe racial differences in intelligence and attainment are illusory, or are the result of environmental factors justifying racial discrimination against Whites, on both sides of the Atlantic. Whilst of course his exposé of those who at one and the same time believe human races don't exist and must be the basis of detailed racial discrimination policies based on the most painstaking – if often in practice muddled – racial classification of humanity. Without which affirmative action in favour of "minorities" – who in the US and Britain will not much longer remain in the minority – is impossible.

This book is not light reading. But it is a massively detailed and impeccably argued case on which racial nationalists can base more popular expositions. Seldom has every stroke of the saw with which a society is sedulously cutting through the branch it is sitting on been so precisely documented. Reading all this it is amazing US society still functions at all. At this rate it will not much longer – they even have an Affirmative Action President now. If you are a leading cadre of the Chinese Communist Party, you will enjoy every page. Is there a version of "Tomorrow Belongs to Me" in Mandarin?

**Reviewed by Ian Freeman, Northwich, Cheshire**



**Dr Steven Farron, former Professor of Classics at the University of Witwatersrand**

# Aspects of Madhouse Britain

Some time ago, I chanced to read an article in which the author seriously suggested that disabled people should have “the right” to serve in the armed forces. The preposterous idea of disabled people serving in the ranks would surely reduce our fine services to a ragbag of valetudinarians.

Besides being an utterly ridiculous idea, such a policy, if enacted, would be extremely unfair on their able-bodied comrades, who, in times of war, would have to depend for their lives on the ability of such comrades. It would also result in the creation of two classes of service members: those who are required to achieve the highest standards of physical fitness and who are expected to kill or prepared to be killed; and those who would be excused “square bashing”, rigorous training, frontline service and many of the other onerous duties to which all servicemen are subjected.

They claim that the likes of Lord Nelson, Lord Raglan and Douglas Bader were disabled and yet proved successful despite their disabilities. This is a facile argument. What they fail to mention is that these men were able-bodied when recruited and trained. In any case, no one expects admirals, generals and air marshals, who are generally middle-aged, to be as physically fit as the young men who do the actual fighting. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that many disabled people would relish undergoing the trials and tribulations of today’s service personnel. The only exception to the employment of disabled people in the armed forces should be confined to those who have sustained injuries or disablement during the course of their service.

Of course, we all sympathise with the disabled; but this should not blind us to the fact that the inclusion of such people in the armed forces would severely hamper our services, whose primary function is the defence of our country, people and possessions. The fashionable concern with the disabled is symptomatic of the so-called “caring society”, the supporters of which seem to be completely divorced from commonsense and the requirements of the real world in which we live. This liberal agenda is a malaise that goes much deeper than military matters; it is a modern phenomenon that increasingly affects society at large. It is yet another facet of the counselling and compensation culture and its insidious corollary, the “Blame Game”.

The theory is that, as the *Daily Telegraph*’s fictional “Peter Simple” used to say, “We are all guilty” – that is, we are all collectively responsible for every personal misfortune, for every accident, mishap and even crime. Such reasoning has deprived large numbers of the populace of commonsense, and has decreed that reality and commonsense must be subordinated to altruism. Unfortunately, altruism does not make for a stable, compassionate and efficient society, any more than it safeguards our people. Altruism does not win wars.



**Douglas Bader (right)** who lost both his legs in a flying accident in 1931, helped an escape from Colditz by pausing as he was conducting the orchestra to indicate the coast was clear. Despite his fine example, Bader would certainly not have been recruited from day one as an amputee. In later years Bader was an NF supporter (like many RAF veterans) and certainly would not have favoured a “politically correct” approach to disability!

The substance of the article I alluded to above is typical of some of the crazier notions that seem to abound these days. Is there no end to this sort of lunacy? Not long ago I read a newspaper article about a do-gooder organisation suggesting that unfortunate people suffering from Down’s syndrome should be encouraged to marry and, if possible, to procreate. The author did not explain who would be responsible for the upbringing of the offspring of such unions, or what would be the likelihood of such offspring being similarly afflicted with their parents’ disease. The American William Gayley Simpson, in his great seminal work, *Which Way Western Man?*, addressed precisely this problem. He wrote, “...there is almost no record of two feeble-minded parents’ giving birth to any other than feeble-minded children”. Quoting Nietzsche, Simpson goes on to say that “Any organism that fails to excrete its waste products, dies”. In other words, if we continue to nurture the sickly, the diseased and the mentally deranged, we shall end up with a sickly, diseased and deranged society, a society that will eventually cease to exist.



**IQ pioneer Dr Cyril Burt (left) with Mr and Mrs Arthur Jensen**

In his book, Simpson also makes the following statement:

*...for the past half-century [there has been] ...for the most part almost maudlin concern for the poor, the botched, the defective and the retarded ... our whole welfare and social security program, intended primarily to raise the standard of living of the masses, tends actually to increase the birth rate of that part of the population which at best is only mediocre in its attainments, and whose procreation should be kept within limits.... Our good and best are being outbred by our mediocre and worst...*

More particularly relevant to Britain is the following observation:

*I was shocked to read, thirty five years ago [1946] ... that in England one person out of every ten was “too dull or sickly to earn a living unaided”. That is, he was constitutionally unable to carry his own load and was perforce a burden on the rest of society ... this was followed in 1947 by a report of the Royal Commission on Population, headed by Sir Cyril Burt, one of Britain’s foremost psychologists, that the average level of intelligence of the British people was declining at a disquieting rate, and that if this deterioration continued at its then estimated pace, in just over 50 years [i.e. 1996] the number of pupils of “scholarship” ability would be approximately halved and the number of the feeble-minded almost doubled.*

This prophecy of Burt’s has indeed come true, as any observant person knows. Have the politicians attempted to counter this sad decline in the quality of our people? Not at all! What they have done is camouflage the true state of affairs by “dumbing down” school examinations and university entry requirements. The increase in illiteracy and innumeracy in recent years, even among graduates, provides ample proof of the accuracy of Burt’s prognosis.

Instead of listening to what Burt had to say, or taking note of his research in which he claimed that the cognitive ability of humans depends mainly on inherited rather than environmental factors – the so-called “nature versus nurture” argument – Burt was posthumously denigrated, calumniated and accused of fraudulently fabricating his data. Fortunately, Burt’s reputation was ably defended by such eminent scientists as Hans Eysenck and Arthur Jensen.

The ensuing controversy, known as the “Burt Affair” became quite vicious. Some years ago, I wrote an article in which I mentioned Burt sympathetically, I must confess partly out of a sense of loyalty because, long before my time, he was a pupil at my *alma mater*. This resulted in my receiving several rude letters from those who disagreed with my views. The widespread vilification of Burt after his death was prompted mostly by left-wing academics and egalitarian educationists. They objected to his support for selective education, the eleven-plus examination (of which he was a pioneer) and his opposition to the replacement of grammar schools by comprehensive schools. These were contentious issues in those years.

Rather than disparaging Burt, what governments should have done was introduce an enlightened form of eugenics to improve the health and in-



telligence of our people. However, in Britain, "eugenics" is a dirty word. The science of eugenics is considered quite acceptable for breeding race-horses, cattle and dogs, but must never be applied to improve the stock of human beings. Indeed, the pioneer eugenicist, Sir Francis Galton, cousin of Charles Darwin, received a posthumous treatment very similar to that given to Cyril Burt. He, too, has become a non-person. How many people have heard of Galton today?

"Counselling" is another aspect of the madhouse society we are fast becoming under the aegis of the liberal ethos so prevalent today. Let me give an example of just how the counselling industry has expanded during my lifetime. As a nine-year-old at boarding school during the war, my classmates and I were involved in a horrifying accident. To punish us for a minor infringement of school rules, the deputy headmaster ordered us to report to the school sports ground to roll the cricket pitch. We duly went there but there was no responsible person to supervise us. We started to push the heavy roller towards the pitch with gathering speed. One of the boys had perched himself on the crossbar at the front of the roller. Suddenly he overbalanced and fell to the ground. We were going too fast to stop. The boy was completely flattened and died immediately.


Now imagine what would have happened today. Almost immediately, a cohort of "counsellors" would have arrived on the scene; the deputy headmaster would have been suspended and eventually sacked; droves of "social workers" and personnel from the Health and Safety Executive would have appeared from nowhere. TV crews and reporters would soon have got in on the act; and ambulance-chasing insurance agents and "no-win, no-fee" lawyers with an eye to a fat profit would shortly have been persuading the grieving parents to demand compensation – as though a monetary settlement could compensate them for the loss of a son. As it was, there was simply an inquest that recorded a verdict of misadventure, followed by the funeral that we all attended.

There was a poignant sequel to this tragedy. A couple of years ago I wrote a little piece about the accident, which appeared in the school magazine. Some weeks later, I received a letter from the unfortunate boy's younger brother, who has since died. He told me that before reading my piece he had often wondered if there were any witnesses who could recall the accident. How could we not remember such a horrific event? That dreadful day is etched on my memory for life.

However, I digress. Another problem prevalent today is the creeping culture of compensation. Almost every category of worker now seeks compensation for real or imaginary injuries suffered, however minor. Police, fire-fighters, postal workers, typists, health workers, civil servants, etc, demand compensation for every type of injury or malady sustained while they are going about their normal business. Ordinary members of the public seek compensation from councils when they trip over a loose paving stone or pothole. If this trend continues, no public organisation or individual in authority will be prepared to work at all for fear of being held responsible for any mishap that might occur. What surgeon will be prepared to perform a delicate operation if, should the patient die, he or she will be accused of negligence,

or even manslaughter, and the aggrieved relatives demand compensation? And the judges make matters worse by often awarding astronomical levels of compensation. In America, this phenomenon is known as "Legalism".

The main beneficiary of this system is the monstrous regiment of lawyers, epitomized here by the likes of Cherie Blair. That is why the lawyers are so keen to give yet more powers to the European Court of Justice, the European Court of Human Rights and similar bodies. Such outfits ensure that the lawyers do very well for themselves.



William Gayley Simpson, author of *Which Way Western Man?*



Ronald Rickcord argues that an increasingly litigious compensation culture has helped to weaken the fibre of our society.

One of the supposed maladies for which many now receive counselling as well as claiming compensation is the so-called "Post Traumatic Stress Disorder". For instance, cases have recently occurred of paramedics claiming to be suffering from PTSD, while railway workers claim the same for having to deal with irate and abusive passengers upset by the chaos on the railways. Even some soldiers claim to suffer from PTSD after being involved in warfare, however brief or minor. What would they claim if they had been made prisoners of war by the Japanese, or been Bomber Command aircrews flying night after night over Germany during WWII? Such men certainly deserved compensation. Eventually the British Government magnanimously granted the Japanese POWs the princely sum of £10,000, but, presumably, in the interests of financial prudence, the award was delayed for well over half a century, by which time most of those warriors were dead. As for the Bomber Command crews, they did not even get a campaign medal.

As readers may know, in an article of mine that appeared in Issue 44 of *Heritage and Destiny* I wrote about a great uncle of mine who served in the Royal Navy in the Crimean War when he was only fifteen. If that were to happen today what a cacophony of outrage would be heard from the wet liberal do-gooders who infest our land. Evidently, these busybodies are intent upon us breeding only effete and adipose youngsters, fit only for watching TV or playing computer games. What these people fail to understand is that if we are to safeguard our country we need to breed youngsters capable of facing danger, hardship and, if necessary, death. Fortunately, we still have such people in our armed forces, but there are too few.

My great uncle survived the Crimean War but was killed many years later when two battleships collided. Did his wife, the mother of his six children, get any compensation? Of course not! All she got was a minuscule pension of £220 per year to keep herself and her children.

Some things never change. Since I began writing this article, *The Daily Telegraph* has revealed that the MoD intends to accelerate the discharge of soldiers unfit as a result of injuries sustained in Iraq and Afghanistan. Apparently, the MoD is of the opinion that looking after injured and unfit service personnel should be undertaken by charities. No doubt, this idea is in keeping with David Cameron's Big Society nostrum designed to ameliorate our massive budget deficit. But why should service personnel have to rely on charities, excellent as they are, for the standard of treatment they need and deserve?

When I left the RAF nearly forty years ago, that service had at least four hospitals in the UK devoted solely to the treatment of airmen, and the other two services had a commensurate number of hospitals. Unfortunately, our clever, forward-thinking politicians, imagining there never again would be any need for service hospitals, sold them off or handed them over to the NHS. Would it not be a matter of simple justice to provide dedicated hospitals for injured service personnel, and to provide jobs for those fit enough to do light work in place of the chair-bound pen pushers who currently infest the MoD and civil service?

So it seems that in the madhouse Britain in which we live today, those who rule are far more concerned with the welfare of the lazy, feckless and improvident, and – to repeat William Simpson's words – "the botched, the defective, and the retarded", than they are with the welfare of our deserving patriotic countrymen and women.

Ronald G W Rickcord, Newport Pagnell, England




# Obituary: Les Andrews

## 1931 - 2011

Shortly before we went to press with our last issue, I heard the very sad news that England First activist and racial nationalist stalwart Leslie (Les) Andrews had died on Tuesday March 22nd 2011. Les was 80 years old. He was found dead in his flat in Bedford, by a neighbour who called me later that day. She said he had not been well for a while, but he was still getting out and about. Les had even phoned me on the Sunday night and said although he had not been well and had recently had several hospital visits he was feeling OK and looking forward to the next New Right meeting in London.

Although 80 years old, Les still tried to attend as many nationalist meetings and demos as he could. He was at the February New Right meeting in London selling *Heritage and Destiny* magazine (he sold 30 copies of every issue) and at the big EDL demo in Luton on February 5th (where he handed out England First literature), and in January he was at the BNP/England is Ours demo in Milton Keynes (protesting against the new Bletchley Mosque).

I last saw Les at the John Tyndall Memorial meeting in Preston in October last year. He stayed over at my house in Preston that weekend, along



**Les Andrews (left) on the campaign trail aged 78, with slightly younger EFP colleagues Mark Cotterill (centre) and Peter Rushton.**

with Martin Kerr – who was visiting from America. He had just turned 80 then, and travelled up the morning of the meeting from Bedford to Preston. I remember him saying how hungry he was as he had not eaten so far that day – and could he start on the buffet a bit early!

Les did his national service in the RAF, before emigrating to Rhodesia in the early 1950's. He returned to Blighty in the late 1970s just before Ian Smith sold the White population out – Les had seen the writing on the wall. On his return he joined the NF and campaigned for their local Bedford candidate Richard Stearns in the 1979 General Election (who polled 813 votes – 1.3%).

A year later after the NF split Les joined John Tyndall's New NF (which later became the BNP). Les stood as a BNP candidate in two General Elections – in 1983 for Manchester Gorton, against Labour's Shadow Home Secretary Gerald Kaufman (231 votes 0.5%) and in 1997 for Taunton (318 votes – 0.5%). Unlike Qassim Afzal, the recent Liberal Democrat candidate against Kaufman, Les was never accused of running a personal anti-Semitic campaign!

Les remained loyal to the BNP right up until 2005 when he finally realised it was no longer a racial nationalist party. He joined England First in 2006. Nationalists from at least five different groups, including *H&D's* deputy editor Peter Rushton, who represented the EFP, and his long standing racial-comrade Bert Leech attended his funeral in Bedford on April 4th.

Les was a real inspiration for today's new generation of racial nationalists. He was a real fighter right until the very end. Les was a good friend and comrade of mine and many nationalists up and down the country. He will be sadly missed.

Mark Cotterill, Preston, Lancashire

## THE CONSPIRACY BEHIND ALL CONSPIRACIES

THIS AD HAS BEEN  
CENSORED BY  
U.K. RACE LAWS

The diabolical plot to control the world has been preserved for you to read in the famous *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. We are making two editions of this book available: the Original Protocols with additional commentary (72 pages), and a Deluxe Version enhanced with extensive history and background proving the authenticity of this manuscript (299 pages). When ordering either edition, you will receive a free copy of *The Seed of the Serpent* (30 pages). Biblically documenting the origin of this evil conspiracy.

Protocols (72 pages) - \$6.00

Deluxe Protocols (299 pages) - \$15.00

**Kingdom Identity Ministries**

P.O. Box 1021, Harrison, Arkansas 72602 USA

[www.kingidentity.com](http://www.kingidentity.com)

## Nationalist Literature Sale

An elderly *H&D* subscriber is selling off his large collection of British & American nationalist literature – books/magazine/newspapers – as he is moving into a retirement home early in the New Year. He is generously donating half of all the profits to *H&D*.

To request a full price list write to:

**H&D literature Sale, c/o 40 Birkett Drive, Preston, PR2 6HE**  
enclosing a stamped addressed envelope.

## The Nationalist Times

The *Nationalist Times* is the monthly newspaper of Middle America. Each issue is packed with news and commentary on national and international events, politics, and the latest social trends.

A one year subscription to *The Nationalist Times* is available for only \$39.00 (or \$75.00 for two years). A one-year subscription for those living outside the U.S. is \$55.00. Or send \$5.00 for a sample copy to;  
**The Nationalist Times, 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150, Las Vegas, NV 89145, USA..** Check out *The Nationalist Times* website at [www.anu.org](http://www.anu.org) and email them at [mail@anu.org](mailto:mail@anu.org)



# Book Review - *Frontkämpfer: The Life of Et Wolsink* by S.L.F.

Published by NS Press UK, No ISBN – 2010. Paperback, 156pp., frontispiece, cover illustrated with seven photographs. Available for £12.00, from: NS Press, PO Box 6, Heckmondwike, Yorkshire, WF14 0XF. UK.

**F***rontkämpfer* is the story of Gerrit "Et" Wolsink, a Dutch National-Socialist and Waffen-SS officer, as told to his biographer, who is identified only as "S.L.F." (Internal evidence in the book suggests that he may be associated with the British Movement.) For those who do not speak any German at all, *Frontkämpfer* means "front fighter," and this is indeed a wartime memoir.


In recent issues of *Heritage and Destiny*, this reviewer has had several occasions to mention how the international or pan-Aryan aspect of National-Socialism comes to the fore in times of war. In issue 40 I reviewed Robert Best's monograph on Britons in the Waffen-SS, and in issue 41 I reviewed Richard Landwehr's book on the same subject. Also in issue 40, I told the little-known story of American National-Socialists who fought on the side of the White people of Rhodesia in that country's ill-fated struggle for racial and national freedom. *Frontkämpfer* is similar, in that it tells the story of a Dutch National-Socialist, who also put his loyalty to his race before all other loyalties in time of war. It is different, however, in that it focuses on the tale of one man, rather than being a general survey of the participation of a larger body of men.

Et was born in the Netherlands in December, 1924. His father was an active Dutch National-Socialist, and it was only natural that he would encourage his son to follow in his steps. The nationalist movement in that country was divided into at least six competing organizations, two of which claimed to represent National-Socialism. The larger of the two was the National Socialistische Beweging or NSB, which was led by Anton Mussert. Wolsink describes him as "brave and capable," but clearly finds Mussert's interpretation of National-Socialism to be shallow and second-rate. The NSB was solidly Roman Catholic, and looked to a future for the Netherlands based on a Dutch colonial empire. The Wolsinks, both father and son, supported the smaller but more hardline National-Socialistische Nederlandsche Arbeiderspartij (NSNAP – National Socialist Netherlands Workers Party), which favored the eventual union of the Netherlands into the Greater German Reich.



Et Wolsink attending a British Movement social event in London. During the 1980s and 1990s he was international liaison officer for the BM, which was revived by a small group of activists after Michael McLaughlin attempted to close down the organisation in 1983.

Et Wolsink, who died in 1995, was also a friend and political ally of veteran Dutch national socialist Florentine Rost van Tonnigen, who had many British political contacts. She died in 2007, aged 92.



Because the NSNAP did not have an organized youth section in his part of the country, young Wolsink enrolled in the young people's formation of the NSB, the *Jeudgstorm* (literally, "Youth Storm"). The elder Wolsink was also a secret member of Hitler's German party, the NSDAP, and when Et came of age he likewise became a secret or underground member of the German *Hitler Jugend*. As a member of the HJ (or Hitler Youth), the young lad took part in paramilitary summer training camps in Germany and (after 1938) Austria. These provided him with the basic military skills which he then put in the service of his Race and Movement for the rest of his life.

World War II broke out in September, 1939, and in May, 1940, the Netherlands was overrun by the German Army and occupied. Et was sixteen years old, and although he was just a teenager he was ready to do his part to build a New Europe. His first preference for

military service was the Waffen-SS, but the minimum age for service in that formation was 18. Through his father's political contacts, he was allowed to join the Brandenburg division of the German Army, an elite unit specializing in what are known today as "special operations." These included missions behind enemy lines, political sensitive operations, and anti-partisan warfare. Wolsink's prewar NS background did not go unnoticed by the Germans, and upon his enlistment into the Brandenburgers he was also sworn into the Allgemeine-SS, which was a non-military branch of the SS. By special arrangement, upon reaching his 18th birthday he would be appointed to a rank in the SS equivalent to that which he held in the Army.

The Brandenburg Division maintained a unit that served as an ordinary front line formation on the Eastern Front. New recruits would serve for a period of time in this unit to get practical combat experience and the "feel" of warfare. Wolsink was at the front for six gruel-

ing weeks, and it was then that he was wounded for the first time. He was hit in the leg by a bullet, just above the ankle. He recovered quickly enough, but the experience dispelled his teenage illusion of invulnerability.

Wolsink, now a junior noncommissioned officer, was assigned to a Brandenburg *kampfgruppe* (battle group) and took part in numerous missions, including one mysterious operation in the Caribbean Sea. Elite units such as the one he was in have a high casualty rate, especially among the junior officers, who are expected to lead from the front. In 1942 Wolsink was promoted to the rank of lieutenant to fill a vacant post, even though he was technically a foreigner and only 19 years old. He and his unit operated in high-risk actions on a variety of theaters. They fought behind Soviet lines in the east, and spent time hunting for the Yugoslavian communist guerrilla leader Josef Broz Tito. Brandenburg *kampfgruppe* troops were also committed to action in the Mediterranean, and were involved in an abortive German plan to seize the British military stronghold at Gibraltar.

In 1944, declining German military fortunes forced the Brandenburg Division to be stripped of its specialist units, and to be deployed only as an ordinary infantry formation. Wolsink was a captain in the German Army by that point, although he was barely 20 years old. He was reassigned to the SS commando school at Oranienburg, and appointed to the rank of SS-Hauptsturmführer (captain) in both the





A 1943 Dutch recruitment poster for the 49th SS Volunteer Panzer Grenadier Regiment, named after the 17th century Dutch Admiral de Ruyter, the greatest commander in the history of the Dutch Navy. De Ruyter inflicted the worst defeat ever suffered by the Royal Navy, when in 1667 he led a raid on the British naval base at Chatham, destroying several vessels and capturing the flagship of the English fleet. Alongside other European SS volunteers, the De Ruyter regiment was engaged in heavy fighting against the Red Army until May 1945. Aged 20, Et Wolsink was enrolled in a parallel Dutch SS unit, the *Landstorm Nederland*.

Waffen-SS and the Allgemeine-SS. Although he was granted German citizenship, because of his Dutch origin he was formally enrolled in the Dutch SS unit, *Landstorm Nederland*, although he never actually served in its ranks.

Wolsink, along with hundreds of thousands of other non-German Europeans, had the misfortune to be imprisoned in Allied concentration camps after the end of the fighting. Those in the SS were singled out for especially harsh treatment. Some were just shot outright, while others perished through torture, starvation and exposure. Members of elite SS units, in particular, were targeted for extermination. He was treated harshly, and once slated for execution. He incurred health problems as the result of his postwar incarceration which would plague him for the rest of his life.

Then, unexpectedly, his luck took a turn for the better. By the late 1940s, the Allies and the Soviets had ended their wartime alliance and were now bitter foes in the infamous Cold War. That was good news for Wolsink: his wartime experiences fighting the Soviets in Eastern Europe now made him an extremely valuable asset to the NATO forces. Instead of viewing him as a war criminal and a traitor, he was now looked upon as a treasured operative. And so a new phase of his life began: that of a NATO cold warrior in the struggle between East and West. He was back to doing what he did during the war, only for a different employer.

Yet despite the change in the political landscape, Wolsink's fundamental loyalty to National-Socialism was undiminished. He continued to work in the NS underground in his home country, where was active in the postwar NS "Werewolf" guerrilla movement. He also participated in legal, aboveground operations: he was co-founder of the Dutch section of the Viking Youth and second-in-command of the *Nederlands Volks-Unie*. Outside of his homeland, he served as a liaison officer to the German Action Front of National Socialists (ANS) and the British Movement. He was also a member of Gerhard Lauck's NSDAP/AO. Truly, he was a man who spent his whole life in the service of the National-Socialist movement!

Despite being wounded three times in World War II (once seriously), despite the abuse he suffered at the hands of the democrats after the war, and despite the many death-defying adventures in which he participated, Gerrit Wolsink died of natural causes on December 30, 1995, in the Netherlands.

*Frontkämpfer* is a biography that often reads like an action novel. It portrays National-Socialism in practice, as it was lived through the life of one man. For Et Wolsink, heroism was nothing exceptional – rather, for him, it was simply second-nature.

Reviewed by Martin Kerr, Falls Church, Virginia

## Subscribe to Heritage and Destiny

To make sure of your regular copy of *Heritage and Destiny* why not become a subscriber? The following rates are for the next six issues: USA/Canada \$35.00; British Isles £20.00; Worldwide £25.00/\$35.00.

## Bulk Rates

Discounts for bulk purchases are as follows: 10 copies - £15.00; 20 copies - £25.00; 30 copies - £30.00: Postage is free within the UK. For over 30 copies in the UK or US/ Worldwide rates please contact our office.

## Back Issues

All back issues (numbers 1-44) are also available at £4.00/\$6.00 each (post-paid).

## Enamel Pin Badges now available

We now have the following high quality Patriotic enamel pin badges for sale: Proud to be Anglo-Saxon; BNP; Union Jack; Enoch Powell was right; Kilroy was right; England - Love it or leave it; Keep St. George in my heart; English and Proud; England - No Surrender; 100% English; St. George cross English Flag; England flag shield; England - No Asylum Seekers; English Red Rose; English White Rose; English 3 lions; Scottish flag; Scottish Lion; Welsh Red Dragon flag; Northern Ireland flag; Ulster Loyalist; English Bulldog; English Lion; England-Stone Island; English Crusader; English White Rose; English Red Rose; White Pride Celtic Cross; Red, White & Blue Celtic Cross; Red & White Celtic Cross; Red, Black & White Celtic Cross; Red, White & Blue Odal Rune; White English Dragon; Crossed English & Union Jack flags, with 3 lions crest; and Crossed England & Confederate flags, crossed England and White Dragon flags, Phoenix and Sunwheel: £2.50 (\$5.00) each or any five (mixed) for £10.00 (\$20.00) (post-paid).

## Patriotic Flags now available

We now have the following good quality 3x5 flags for sale at £10.00/\$20.00 each: England Three Lions; English White Dragon; Isle of Man; Jersey; Guernsey; Ulster; St. George Cross; Welsh Red Dragon and Confederate Battle. For overseas orders please add another £2.00 (\$4.00) for postage.

## Donations

Income from sales and subscriptions of our magazine are not enough to cover the high cost of production, mailing and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so we can keep going. Every Dollar, Pound or even Euro counts, so please try and send in whatever you can afford.

## Payment Details

Checks or Money orders should be made payable to *Heritage and Destiny* and sent to either; 40 Birkett Drive, Preston, PR2 6HE, UK or PO Box 6501, Falls Church, VA 22046, USA. Please do not send cash, unless by recorded delivery. Or pay by paypal to - [heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com](mailto:heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com)

# David Irving in London - May 2011

David Irving's online bookstore is at:  
<http://www.irvingbooks.com>

David Irving gave some tantalising glimpses into the work that will be part of his forthcoming book, a biography of Heinrich Himmler, as well as other important historical issues.

Most historians read twelve books on a subject and then write a thirteenth from a slightly different slant. Not so David Irving. Irving conducts research in the true sense of the word and what makes Irving lectures so interesting is that he draws you into the hunt. You become a Dr Watson by the side of a Sherlock Holmes, a Lewis beside Inspector Morse. He uncovers new records, documents, photos. He tracks down and interviews people who were there when great historical events happened and who have never been interviewed before. He tracks them down, interviews them and wins their respect. He hunts for the truth and the hunt, with all its twists and turns, becomes as interesting as the new facts he uncovers. The new facts and information he unearths shed a dramatically different light on events than hitherto was thought, and the implications are dramatic.

During this lecture he gave us fascinating glimpses into the life of Heinrich Himmler. One example that stood out was his uncovering of two paintings of the beautiful Paula, who was the fiancée of Himmler's elder brother Gebhard. Heinrich (Heinie) did not approve of this girl and asked his brother not to marry her. When he refused, Heinie hired a private eye who uncovered evidence of an earlier passionate relationship between Paula and a young painter. The two paintings that Irving has tracked down are by this same young painter and would appear to validate Heinie's concerns. Irving also showed us a photograph of an unknown bewitching young woman that was tied into the back of Himmler's Memoirs. This photo will soon be on the Focal Point website as Irving is appealing for information about her.

Irving also gave us some insights into the developing knowledge of the Jews/"anti-semitism" of the young Heinie and how he threw himself into University life joining numerous Societies and Clubs and earning himself a duelling scar. This scar was well sewed up, so much so that it is not apparent in later life. He covered Himmler's political differences with Hitler and Himmler's efforts to thwart anti-Hitler plots. Himmler had these plots monitored to the last possible moment in order to catch the maximum number of plotters, however Stauffenberg was the one man that Himmler's organisation did not suspect.

Irving gave us an amazing account of how preposterous the official version of Heinrich Himmler's death is. The Official Establishment History is that Himmler committed suicide in British custody by hiding a cyanide capsule in his tooth. The Official version goes that Himmler while at a POW camp near Bremen he gave himself up to the authorities, was searched and then was taken to a house on Luneberg Heath, searched again and given a medical check up. The medical examiner took him to the window and spotted a hidden cyanide capsule at the back of his mouth. Himmler then rushed to the other side of the room and bit on the capsule. Irving showed us the regulation issue cyanide capsule that SS officers carried to gasps from the audience. The capsule was the size of cigar and kept in a case which was even larger than a cigar case. To hide this in one's mouth would be nigh impossible. The inconsistencies begin to pile up. Colonel Murphy who was put in charge of interrogating Himmler mentions in his diary that on driving to the Luneberg Heath house he chatted to Himmler on the backseat of a car, while Himmler ate a British Army sandwich (hardly easy to do with a cigar sized cyanide capsule there!). At the house, which by the way is referred to by the Allies as 'a house prepared for such purposes' (interrogation would be a kind word for it), Himmler was inspected so the official version goes by a medical examiner who only realised that Himmler had a concealed capsule in his mouth after marching Himmler over to the window to get extra light. Irving with a smile notes that the official time of this event is 11pm and that there were no street lamps or full moon! All the military personnel in any way involved with the Luneberg Heath house were vowed to secrecy about the event, so it is hard to piece together what happened to those senior cap-

tives who went there. However Irving does well. He looks at the notes to the sketches that war artist Terrence Cuneo made for his official painting of Himmler's body. These are notes that other historians have never examined – and what does Irving find? A reference to 'nose broken'. Himmler did not have a broken nose on arriving at the house. On showing Himmler's death mask to a Forensic friend what was Irving told? "Oh, he's been badly beaten hasn't he!" In short the Luneberg House was an interrogation, torture and execution house and many other prominent Axis officials met the same fate there often at the hands of fluent German speakers of Jewish extraction serving in the Allied Armies. Thus the Allied pompous moral hypocrisy is exposed.

Another issue that Irving illuminated was the Hess flight to Scotland, and concluded that in many respects it was a success. Hess after his capture was searched and a letter to the King was found on his person, this was given back to him. He was then held in the local police station. While being held there he was visited and had a long chat with the Duke of Hamilton. When Hess was taken to Glasgow police station he was again searched, but

no such letter was found. Two days later the Duke of Hamilton – who never usually made private visits to the King – visited the King. No one but David Irving seems to have seen the inference. Throughout 1940 the Queen Mother was plotting with British Admirals to overthrow Churchill, who was thoroughly disliked by the non-Jewish Aristocracy.


On other issues, Irving told us how he discovered that there was a survivor to the Sikorski plane crash (Sikorski was the leader of the Free Polish Forces). His death has always been attributed to the British, however proof is hard to come by. Irving once discovered that a pilot of the plane (a certain Charles Massey) was still alive in the 1960s. On further investigation he discovered he was living behind South Kensington

Tube Station. After going to visit him, Irving arranged an interview with him three days later. Two days later Charles Massey vanished – and was never heard of again by his wife and daughter. Thirteen years later Irving had a call from Massey's daughter asking for his help. Charles Massey had died and his newly-discovered flat in Cheltenham was covered with photos of his beloved daughter. A daughter he had never contacted in thirteen years. At his sparsely attended funeral there was an Air Chief Marshal of the RAF who arrived in a chauffeur driven car, placed a wreath and then left. As there are only six such ranks in the RAF, Irving soon found out who he was and phoned him. The RAF officer refused to talk to him. So what or who made Charles Massey flee his family and former life and live a secretive, reclusive life in Cheltenham two days after being contacted by David Irving? The obvious conclusion is that 'The Powers that Be' gave him a stark choice – no doubt the health of his family being used as an incentive.

Irving drove home the point by describing a similar air crash that happened to General De Gaulle while flying in a British crewed and owned plane to visit Free French troops. Miraculously surviving the crash, it was discovered that vital areas of the plane had been cut through with acid. De Gaulle vowed never to let the British or Americans near any plane that he flew ever again.

So to conclude, I would say that after attending a David Irving meeting, you come away with the feeling that you have been given an Orwellian glimpse into how the world **really** works and that the powers that rule in this country of ours and others of the White World are no 'Patriotic Gentleman in Shining Armour'. Instead one begins to realise that our real rulers are a secretive, closely knit band of alien parasites – ruthless, vicious predators who have no business being in our country, never mind ruling it. What they fear is that their presence and the extent of their power and influence become widely known as that will foreshadow their eventual fall, hence they ruthlessly oppress anyone who attempts to shine the spotlight on their doings. If proof of these assertions were needed one only has only to seriously consider the situation in which David Irving currently finds himself and one will reflect that there is no other reason why a historian of David Irving's stature should face the persecution he does.

J. B. Turner, London, England







# DVD Review: *Fr. Coughlin in Action*

Released U.K. 2011. Available from BM Candour, London, WC1N 3XX, England for £8 incl. p&p - cheques etc. payable to The A.K. Chesterton Trust. Outside U.K. please add 30% for airmail and send payment by secure post in pound notes, dollar bills, euro notes or International Money Orders in pound sterling. <http://www.candour.org.uk>

Since the early 1960s we have become used to regarding the Christian churches as part of the seemingly inexorable movement for the liberal transformation of Western societies into deracinated multiculturalism. While priests (and even archbishops) can always be relied on for vague nostrums about poverty, you will look in vain to any 21st century church leaders for a systematic assault on the causes of our decline, or for a clear stand against the depredations of international financial capital or the soul-rotting corruption of the mass entertainment media.

It was not always so. In 1930s America a Roman Catholic priest, Father Charles Coughlin, led a mass movement that could stage rallies of 150,000 people, while reaching an audience of 30 million Americans via his weekly radio broadcasts. In this pre-internet age, Fr. Coughlin still managed to distribute the most radical of political messages to a mass audience, calling *inter alia* for nationalisation of the Federal Reserve, monetary reform and for the U.S. to stay out of the incipient European war. While the White House plotted with Churchill to tilt American policy against the Axis and ultimately into war, Fr Coughlin's slogan remained consistent with the Jeffersonian ideal of the Constitution's Founding Fathers: "Less care for internationalism and more concern for national prosperity."

This DVD is transferred from a VHS tape produced many years ago by Dr Edward Fields, editor of *The Thunderbolt* and *The Truth At Last*. Consequently allowances have to be made both for the variable quality of the original 1930s newsreel material and for thirty-year old editing technology. Nevertheless the clarity of Fr. Coughlin's message shines through, and the sheer scale of the movement he was able to mobilise will astonish modern viewers.

Born in Canada to Irish immigrant parents in 1891, Fr Coughlin moved to the USA in 1923 and became a parish priest in the city of Royal Oak, a suburb of Detroit, Michigan. Within a few years his dynamic ministry enabled the construction of an enormous Art Deco church, the Church of the Little Flower (named after the French Carmelite nun St Thérèse of Lisieux and designated in 1998 by the U.S. Bishops' Conference as one of only five "National Shrines").

In 1926 he began broadcasting on the Detroit radio station WJR (which still exists today), and his show was soon nationally networked by CBS. When the network tried to bring him into line with corporate policy, Fr. Coughlin refused to toe the line and raised funds to build his own radio network. This quickly achieved an enormous nationwide audience, so large that a special post office had to be constructed in Royal Oak to cope with the volume of mail to Fr. Coughlin from his listeners.

Though his message now seems remarkably radical (given the abandonment of Catholic tradition by the Second Vatican Council in 1962-65), Fr. Coughlin's approach to political and financial questions was rooted in a papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, coincidentally issued in 1891, the year of his birth. Subtitled "Rights and Duties of Capital and Labour", *Rerum Novarum* was an attempt by Pope Leo XIII to address the dual challenges of capitalism and socialism. It was influenced by the Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Manning, who had supported the London dock strikers while resisting liberalism and Marxism, and the legacy of *Rerum Novarum* can be seen a century later in Catholic politicians as varied as American conservative Pat Buchanan and Labour leftwinger Jon Cruddas.

While condemning class conflict, *Rerum Novarum* taught that: "...the rich must religiously refrain from cutting down the workmen's earnings, whether by force, by fraud, or by usurious dealing; and with all the greater reason because the labouring man is, as a rule, weak and unprotected, and because his slender means should in proportion to their scantiness be accounted sacred."

As Fr. Coughlin was building his Michigan ministry, New York Governor Al Smith became the first ever Catholic candidate for the U.S. Presidency, gaining the Democratic nomination in 1928. Smith's rhetoric echoed *Rerum Novarum* and prefigured Fr. Coughlin's later campaigns for social justice, describing rampant capitalism as: "the caveman's law, the law of the sharpest tooth, the angriest brow, and the greediest maw."

This message was premature, and Smith suffered a landslide defeat at the hands of free market capitalism's champion, Republican President Herbert Hoover. Yet within a year capitalism's critics were vindicated by the Wall Street crash. Fr. Coughlin came to the fore, strongly endorsing the campaign of the 1932 Democratic candidate, Al Smith's successor as New York Governor Franklin Roosevelt. Coughlin's slogans "Roosevelt or Ruin" and "The New Deal is Christ's Deal" were eagerly taken up by Democratic Party leaders, and helped Roosevelt gain an estimated 86% of the Catholic vote in his 1932 landslide.

Yet Fr. Coughlin soon discovered that the new President was keen to accommodate finance capital rather than challenge its hegemony. Even Roosevelt's most prominent Catholic supporters, such as Joseph Kennedy (father of the future President) and Cardinal Spellman were essentially corrupt establishment figures. He was fortunate that for several years his own immediate superior, Bishop Gallagher of Detroit, refused to silence him, but after Gallagher's death in 1937 Fr. Coughlin's position became more difficult. The American Catholic hierarchy decided to raise Detroit's status, appointing the future Cardinal Edward Mooney as its first Archbishop.


Archbishop Mooney allied himself with Frank Murphy, the pro-Roosevelt Governor of Michigan, who was one of the most powerful Catholic politicians in America, and whose loyal service to the political establishment was rewarded by appointment as U.S. Attorney General in 1939, and to the U.S. Supreme Court in 1940. While Fr. Coughlin was often accused of anti-Semitism, Murphy was the ultimate philo-Semitic Catholic, pioneering Holocaustianity as founding chairman of the National Committee Against Nazi Persecution and Extermination of the Jews in 1944.

In 1935 Fr. Coughlin had seemed in a strong position to organise a challenge to Roosevelt, working to build the Union Party alongside two other radical leaders featured at the start of this DVD, Louisiana Governor Huey Long and fire-and-brimstone Protestant preacher Gerald L.K. Smith. Their political movement had the potential to transcend our facile notions of "left" and "right", but was derailed when Long was assassinated in the Baton Rouge Capitol building by a Jewish doctor, Carl Weiss.

Without Long's coordinating political strategy, and with Roosevelt craftily appropriating some of their ideas, the Union Party failed to make a decisive impact at the 1936 election. Roosevelt pressed on with his project to bind the U.S. into internationalist projects, including the coming world war. When Fr. Coughlin continued to denounce these moves, he found that radio stations that broadcast his phenomenally popular weekly show were targeted by a Jewish advertising boycott. A few days before the outbreak of World War II Fr. Coughlin's broadcast warned: "It is either Christian social justice or pagan social decay!"

During 1939-40 the pressure increased with investigations by the Justice Department that threatened to close down Fr. Coughlin's publication *Social Justice* and the arrest of some of his leading supporters in the Christian Front. Reluctantly Fr. Coughlin accepted the instructions of his Church hierarchy. He returned to parish life, though continuing to issue anti-communist tracts until his death aged 88 in 1979, and opposing the disaster that befell his Church during the 1960s. Soon after his retirement in 1966 Fr. Coughlin reflected in an interview: "I could have bucked the Government and won — the people would have supported me. But I didn't have the heart left, for my Church had spoken. It was my duty to follow, for disobedience is a great sin." Despite his ultimate obedience, this DVD allows Fr. Coughlin to speak again.

Reviewed by Peter Rushton, Manchester, England



# Letters From Readers



Sir – The article 'My Enemy's Enemy? Tough choices for nationalists' by Peter Rushton in *H&D* No 44, was a thought provoking one. In the book *Dreamer of the Day, Francis Parker Yockey and the Postwar Fascist International* by Kevin Coogan, it provides a great deal of background information on the Malmo International, New European Order, Natinform, European Liberation Front, etc. It is suggested that Yockey parted company from Sir Oswald Mosley after the latter refused to review or finance Yockey's monumental Spenglerian philosophical magnum opus *Imperium*, which like Mosley's earlier work *The Alternative* called for European Unity.

Nevertheless, the Mosleyite military strategist and expert on the occult Major-General J.F.C. Fuller praised Yockey's book and Guy Chesham, John Anthony Gannon and Peter J. Huxley-Blythe left Mosley's Union Movement together with Yockey in 1948, to form the European Liberation Front, as they considered Mosley to be "pro-Churchill ...compromising with American-Jewish interests ...pursuing an anti-Russian policy to the detriment of Europe". However, to be fair to Mosley he did declare in his speech in East London on 16th October 1948 that "European Russia freed from Communism" should be invited to join his "vision splendid" of "Europe a Nation".

Mosley's newspaper *Action* of July 1st, 1961 stated "The only way out of this deadlock is complete Soviet-American withdrawal from Europe, which the Russian leader Khrushchev has proposed 14 times in the past 4 years. It is clear no initiative will come from Kennedy. The only real hope for peace is for Europe to unite as a third force and thus come between the Soviets and Americans... We can regain our sovereignty from international finance by leading Europe in partnership with kindred Europeans, instead of being the tail of America". Furthermore, anyone reading back issues of the UM paper *Union* from 1948-1957, can see plenty of articles attacking certain alien Jewish interests detrimental to Britain and Europe, and defending patriots from Jewish anti-fascist thugs such as the 43 Group.

Mosley's General Secretary Alexander Raven Thomson wrote that Yockey was "a brilliant young intellectual American expatriate and no mean artist with a strong anti-American phobia... taking the view that the present American influence in Europe is most damaging to European culture than the direct and alien threat of Communism from the East".

Yockey's 1952 article 'What is Behind the Hanging of the Eleven Jews in Prague?' concerning the Slansky treason trial, is said to have inspired Colin Jordan to write 'Fraudulent Conversion: The Myth of Moscow's Change' in answer to Yockey's thesis that the Soviet Union under Stalin after the war, had divested itself of Jewish influence in favour of a form of National Collectivism or 'Socialism in One Country', as opposed to Trotskyite permanent World Revolution. Jordan argued that the struggle between Communism and Zionism was a Jewish family feud over the most favourable way to rule the world. The modern-day 'National Bolshevik' movement in Russia is opposed to Zionism and holds joint demonstrations with Russian Nationalists against Global Monopoly Capitalism, in a so-called 'brown-red' or 'black-red axis' reminiscent of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939-1940.

However, now that Communist regimes in Russia and Eastern Europe have collapsed European racial Nationalists can unite and put the old arguments behind them, and concentrate in the words of Yockey on the "Cleansing of the Soul of Europe from the ethical syphilis of Hollywood and the spiritual leprosy of New York". His contention that the Judaeo-American Establishment rather than Russia was the real enemy of Europe is now true.

A North American Nationalist Government freed from Zionist control could be an ally of a liberated Europe, Russia, South America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Southern Africa – the white man's Imperium of the future.

Yours in Comradeship,

**Robert Best, Sussex, England**



Sir – Permit me to suggest that Osama Bin Laden died around December 14th, 2001, of kidney failure in the Tora Bora mountains; after he put out several statements denying responsibility for 9/11. Yes this does mean that some three dozen posthumous OBL videos have been bogus. Yes it means



that the Bin Laden image has functioned exactly as the 'Emmanuel Goldstein' figure in Orwell's 1984, as the all-purpose bogeyman.

The following is a letter that Bin Laden wrote and sent to the Pakistani newspaper *Ummat*, 28 September 2001 (from americanfreepress.net).

*"I was not involved in the September 11 attacks in the United States nor did I have knowledge of the attacks. There exists a government within a government within the United States. The United States should try to trace the perpetrators of these attacks within itself; to the people who want to make the present century a century of conflict between Islam and Christianity. That secret government must be asked as to who carried out the attacks.... The American system is totally in control of the Jews, whose first priority is Israel, not the United States." . I have already said that we are not hostile to the United States. We are against the system, which makes other nations slaves of the United States, or forces them to mortgage their political and economic freedom."*

The recent claim of his death – reported in every British newspaper and media outlet without question – has no corpse anyone can look at, and the only photo of it was speedily exposed as a fake. No-one is claiming that there have been any sightings (or phone calls) of this 6' 4" man since his death in 2001, whereas prior to his death about four different intel agencies were monitoring every phone call he made. The Pakistani ISI are saying they had no idea he was living in the building that is now being claimed as his last place of residence: gosh, how surprising.

When the US was about to start bombing Afghanistan in the wake of 9/11, Colin Powell kept saying they were going to release the evidence for OBL as having been involved in perpetrating 9/11, but did not; then eventually, mere days before the war began, the British Foreign Office produced its paper, alleging that it had evidence for OBL as having 'done it.' I guess that's what they call the 'special relationship.'

Yours truly,

**Dr Nick Kollerstrom, London, England**

*Editor's reply: Prof. Kollerstrom makes some very interesting points, which I'm sure H&D readers will wish to debate in the next issue.*



Sir – Election time is come, and the politicians seek our votes to get into a fat-salaried job (with expenses) in the Edinburgh Parliament. But look at how they reward our loyalty. Nicola Sturgeon is a Member of the Scots Parliament. She is deputy leader in that talking shop for the Scottish National Party and has been quoted in the hatesheets down on the Central Quay (*Daily Record, Sunday Mail*, etc.) saying BNP members are not welcome in Scotland.

One BNP candidate was Walter Hamilton, who was in the Parachute Regiment as a regular soldier. Every time Walter got the command "stand in the door" he put his life at risk for his country. He never knew if he'd get a "streamer" as his chute failed to open, and he'd fall thousands of feet to his death. Even when the chute did open, lots of paratroops have awkward landings in high winds and break legs, etc. But to Nicola Sturgeon, unsung heroes like Walter Hamilton are not welcome. Their loyalty is forgotten.

I come from a family of working-class patriots. My father served all through World War I with the Black Watch and then the Royal Engineers. He told my mother he stood waiting to ascend the ladder out of the trenches, and his mates fell dead on top of him, as German machine guns zeroed in on that ladder.



He was discharged in 1919 into unemployment and a vermin-infested slum tenement home in Glasgow. He sired six sons who showed their loyalty by signing up for the armed forces. Three of them died as a consequence of military service, and one was discharged 100% disabled. That was how our governors rewarded our loyalty.

I spent twenty years unemployed with my name on a blacklist after three pages of hate speak reviled me in the *Sunday Mail*. It's a bruising experience to have your loyalty betrayed. I now conclude that I was a sucker, and would never do it again. Our governors frankly are not worthy of our loyalty. They are in my opinion a bunch of place-seeking, money-grubbing parasites and demand that we be prosecuted and even jailed.

Yours sincerely,

**Harry Mullin, Glasgow, Scotland, ex-Regular Army, Older and Wiser!**



Sir – In reply to various criticisms of the term National Socialism in the letters pages of *H&D* issue 44. May I point out here that any negative or demonized connotations anyone may have are purely the result of both wartime and post-war propaganda of the communist and capitalist materialist plutocracies. True, terrible and evil things happened in the second world war, but most of

these were perpetrated by the USA, UK and USSR. The point is it was WWII itself that was evil and that war was instigated and kept going by one principal man – Winston Churchill. He was indeed even the worst of all the wartime leaders in that Roosevelt was a fool and Stalin a monster but he was proud of that fact and never sought to hide it. But it was Churchill who was responsible for the war that cost the lives of over fifty million people purely because he thought that Germany posed some kind of threat to the continuance of the British Empire when in fact most members of the German government both in public and in private only expressed feelings of friendship and admiration for Britain. Poland – which was Britain's pretext for war – was hardly an innocent and certainly no democracy and would have reached a settlement if not goaded on by Britain and France.

Even after the war began Hitler tried to put a stop to this senseless slaughter. And two years into the war Rudolf Hess flew to Scotland on a mission of peace. But Churchill cared nothing for the suffering of the ordinary British people. He enjoyed this carnage so much that he even wanted to increase it. No all – and I mean all – the bad and evil things done in that war happened as a result of the actions of Churchill (and those between the years 1936 - 1945 prepared to go into alliance with him) and not national socialism.

Yours faithfully,

**Mr A.J. Chapman, London, England**



Sir – The stories behind 9/11 and 7/7 are unravelling just as fast as the JFK, Dr David Kelly and Osama Bin Laden stories did. This is why the British "patriot" movements who try to screech "it's all the muzzies fault," like the BNP and EDL are (whether they like it or not) part of the con. They are a small ingredient in the Neo-Con/Zionist/Liberal/Left Lobby recipe. Their job is to keep the White

working class (still a sizable proportion of the British population) bumbling along, blaming the Muslims for all their ills.

So when we were dragged into foreign wars. *Focus on the Muslims*; When the banks dragged us to the edge of total ruination. *Focus on the Muslims*; And when the politicians filled their pockets as we were taxed to the hilt. *Focus on the Muslims*.

The world is falling apart. The very many woes affecting us (including immigration) are the work of the Liberal-Zionist elite, and that same elite are playing the BNP/EDL (and whoever comes along next) so that we as nationalists never pose a risk to their policies.

Most Muslim communities have been here for forty odd years, give or take. They have been the government/media enemy for the last fifteen odd years, give or take. Do you, as a nationalist, really think we had no problems before this time? Do you think our people lived in freedom before this time? Wake up and smell the coffee (as David Duke would say!). The Muslim issue is just a very small part of a much bigger problem, and the elites behind those problems (the oligarchs, the fat cats, the media moguls, the big businessmen, the politicians etc.) are of

the same Liberal-Zionist elite; that is why the White working class, the traditional family, Christianity, nationalism etc. have been under attack for so long.

Keep up the good work you are doing with *H&D*, it's a quality publication. It's good that you keep an open mind and debate these important issues. Unlike Griffin, who still Twitters incessantly about the Muzzies. It is really boring. It is futile. And more importantly, it is treacherous. The Liberal-Zionist elite are pulling his (and the EDL's) strings. Watch the marionettes dance!

Best Racial Regards

**Paul Withermoore, Bradford, Yorkshire**



Sir – I am writing this as I am just a few weeks from the end of a lengthy sentence for publishing a comic book mocking Holocaust claims, and for other heresies against the Public Order Act. Heresy isn't actually illegal, but if you poke fun at the state quasi-religion they'll go out of their way to get you, using, to quote Rockwell's *Fable of the Ducks and the Hens*, 'lately made up laws.' The remaining half of my sentence is 'under licence' during which I can be recalled back to prison at any time.

Political philosophies have to be simple and I've come up with a new formula: 'Close the border!' The idea is that we should close the season completely, and stop trying to import out-of-season vegetables, half the World's nuclear waste and many other things we hardly need and export people instead. Britain's paramount problem is overpopulation, and repatriating people here illegally, those granted 'indefinite leave to remain' by the last government and the participants in sham marriages could quickly reduce Britain's swelled numbers by about 5 million, even without formal succession from the EU, or cancelling anyone's passport.

Think of the benefits of a closed border. It would end the trade deficit, currently £1 billion per week, and the crime would instantly fall by about 70% as heroin would no longer be around to motivate it. We would be spared the unedifying sight of gangs of drunken British men and women on drunken sprees abroad. On the minus side, oil, tobacco and especially tea would become scarce, so we might see the occasional riot about people being deprived of their cuppa. The captain will need a steady hand to steer the ship of state during these tumultuous days. However, necessity is the mother of invention, and tea and tobacco plantations would soon spring up in greenhouses across the land. Of course, anyone who insists on a diet of rice and bush meat will be at liberty to leave. We shall just have to do without our curries.

"Dream on" the sceptic may say, it will never happen. A regime which hasn't been able to keep its nose out of other people's business for decades isn't suddenly going to decide that indigenous welfare is its priority.

Close the border – an idea whose time may come. Likely I'll be released before another dramatic event unfolds, and I've been told that I'm to be installed at a hostel in York, completely prohibited from using the internet and closely monitored. In effect my sentence has been extended, but I actually feel flattered to be considered such a threat. When I can get going I'm going to try and apply my heretical instincts to technology and, if backing can be found, develop some very flattering ideas for new inventions. Wish me luck!

Yours sincerely,

**Simon Sheppard, Yorkshire, England**

*Editor's Note: Since we received this letter, Simon has been released from prison and is now living in a bail hostel in York. He is only out under licence, and has to sign in twice a day. He also has to be very careful politically and cannot use the internet.*



# Movement News Update

As is usual following local government elections, there have been a few delayed contests (technically "countermanded polls") due to the deaths of candidates during the campaign period. At one time these would have created one or two fresh opportunities for the BNP to keep a positive bandwagon rolling, boosted by victories at the May elections. This year it is more a question of whether a BNP in crisis can even find candidates and spare any cash or attention from its legal and internal factional problems to organise election campaigns, even in potential target areas.

There has also been a handful of by-elections in the normal course of events. The first was on 19th May in the St Johns & Brookwood division of **Surrey** County Council, and saw a very poor UKIP result – bottom of the poll with 5.6%, less than half the 11.8% UKIP polled here at the last county council elections in 2009.

UKIP also failed to make any impact in Queen's Gate ward, **Kensington & Chelsea** on 9th June, polling 54 votes (6.0%) in a ward that predictably delivered 74% to the Conservatives! A more interesting by-election for *H&D* readers was in the next door Brompton ward where Sir Oswald Mosley's grandson Louis Mosley was elected as a Conservative councillor with 79.6% of the poll. Louis (needless to say) has never been involved in nationalist politics, though his late father Alexander was a member of the Union Movement in the 1950s and early 1960s and used to bring Lady Mosley to blackshirt reunions as recently as the 1990s.

On 16th June the BNP faced their first elections since 5th May with a pair of delayed contests in **Newcastle-on-Tyne**. These obviously gave the party the opportunity to concentrate all of the BNP's campaigning resources on just two small wards, so all other things being equal one would expect improved results. Former BNP regional organiser Ken Booth (now a leading anti-Griffin rebel) finished runner-up to Labour in Byker ward, though a long way behind with 144 votes (8.7%), in a ward where his party polled 285 votes (12.8%) in 2008. Anita Cooper in Westerhope ward fared less well, sixth out of six candidates with 81 votes (2.4%), down from 311 votes (7.9%) in 2008.


On the same day a by-election in Hullbridge ward, **Rochford**, gave a snapshot of English civic nationalism's shifting sands. Just six weeks earlier the English Democrats finished second with 23.1% in the same ward, yet in the by-election the EDs failed to field a candidate, with UKIP taking the chance to contest this ward for the first time. There has been much speculation that this is related to internal ED divisions over the recruitment of numerous former BNP activists, including an entire branch in nearby Southend. It was inevitable that some longstanding EDs would be unhappy about this influx of people they would once have dismissed as "racists". The matter may well resolve itself, depending on the success of Andrew Brons in taking control of the BNP. (In the event UKIP failed to make any impact, finishing bottom of the poll with only 4.8%, less than a quarter of the ED vote a month earlier.)

Even more questions about the present state of the English Democrats (whose webmaster Steve Marsh quit several weeks ago) were raised by the party's failure to contest Cheshunt Central, **Broxbourne**, on 30th June in a by-election which followed the arrest of a Tory councillor charged with fraud. This is a ward that has been contested by nationalists at virtually every election since 2000, most recently by former BNP councillor Ray Johns, who polled 11.6% in this ward just a few weeks ago, standing as an English Democrat.

Mr Johns and his entire BNP branch had defected to the EDs earlier this year. Yet just as with the "mainstream" EDs in Rochford, these ex-BNP EDs have chosen to avoid this by-election opportunity, leaving the field clear for UKIP, who had never previously contested the ward.

A further test for UKIP (also on 16th June) was in the Burton Town division of **Staffordshire** County Council, which should have been considered winnable since UKIP had been a close third with 24.6% at the last county election in 2009. Yet in the by-election UKIP's Peter McGuigan finished a distant fourth of four candidates with only 6.4%.

For the time being of course most nationalist interest is focused on just one election – for the post of British National Party chairman, where Nick Griffin is facing a challenge from Andrew Brons, his fellow Member of the European Parliament (and fellow ex-chairman of the National Front), who is backed by a campaign team initially assembled for a leadership bid by former BNP national organiser Richard Edmonds. The Brons campaign is supported by a broad coalition of respected nationalists, including Mr Edmonds and his campaign manager Chris Roberts (former BNP London organiser) as well as longstanding campaigners of reform of the BNP such as Michael Barnbrook, noted "sleazebuster" and parliamentary candidate for Dagenham.



(from left to right) Richard Edmonds, Andrew Brons MEP and Michael Barnbrook, who have united to present a broadly based challenge to Nick Griffin's leadership of the BNP

As this issue went to press, the consummate charlatan Griffin pulled a constitutional rabbit out of his hat. In an effort to regain the initiative he proposed an extraordinary members' meeting, to be held on 26th June in Liverpool, one of his few remaining factional strongholds.

This is the latest stage in a process which dates back at least to the end of March 2010, when long serving BNP election strategist Eddy Butler and his allies were purged from the party for daring to raise questions about the BNP's financial affairs. The irony is that Butler has since been proved right and (to no-one's surprise) Griffin has been proved yet again to have been misleading his members. The party does indeed have unmanageable debts, many of them the consequence of Griffin's own actions.

In one of his many diversionary tactics to head off questions about his corrupt autocracy,

Griffin set up a constitutional review process during the summer of 2010, headed by Andrew Brons. This eventually led to proposals voted on by the BNP's members at a conference in December 2010. The members voted overwhelmingly to replace Griffin's autocracy with an indirectly elected National Executive, which would control the BNP's administration while the chairman (Griffin or his successor) controlled the party's political direction.

After this overwhelming mandate from the members – nothing happened for almost six months! Until the end of May 2011, when Nick Griffin again needed a diversionary strategy. He has now come up with a completely different set of constitutional provisions, which bear no relation to the earlier ones. Under these plans the majority of the National Executive will continue to be appointed by the chairman, with the minority elected by the membership acting merely as a democratic fig leaf.

As for leadership elections, Griffin appears to give with one hand while taking away much more with the other. In theory it will be made easier to stand for the leadership, since no signatures will be required, merely a £500 deposit. Yet once elected the party chairman will be in place for five years, with no constitutional means to remove him, even if he loses the confidence of the National Executive and the wider membership.

Perhaps the most serious flaw of the new constitutional proposals is that they will place severe restrictions on campaigning by any leadership candidate. The entire campaign will be compressed into a two-week period, with eleven hustings meetings across the regions, but no other campaign meetings of any kind allowed. Candidates will be allowed a brief campaign statement to be circulated to the membership, but no other publications in support of their candidature. Meanwhile of course Nick Griffin will continue to exploit every party publication and website to promote himself in a personal cult that would have shamed Stalin or Reverend Moon!

Griffin's opponents are divided as to how this EGM should be handled. Arthur Kemp (formerly one of Griffin's chief acolytes but now associating with the Brons faction) argues that the proposed constitutional proposals



should be voted down, as some of them (such as the fixed five-year leadership term and the proposed "contract" between the party and its candidates for public office) are clearly "mad", and in any case are utterly inconsistent with the decisions of last December's party conference. Kemp writes: "The proposed amendments to the British National Party's 12.2 constitution are a shocking and gross perversion of the intent, meaning and substance of the constitutional proposal as accepted at the party's conference in December 2010, and must be rejected."

Though I never imagined ever saying this, Arthur Kemp's arguments are correct in principle. However Eddy Butler argues precisely the opposite case, on the grounds of *realpolitik* rather than principle. He argues that Griffin would in any event seek to frustrate free campaigning activity and intimidate party officials, whatever the constitution said, so the new proposed restrictions make no practical difference. For Butler the key issue is the collection of signatures for a leadership candidate. Griffin's intimidation makes this a very difficult task under the existing constitution. By removing the signature requirement, Griffin at least seems to guarantee that Brons would be able to stand this year, though he is clearly gambling that other factors would ensure that the challenge would be defeated, leaving Griffin entrenched until 2016 (or the party's bankruptcy, whichever came sooner).

Eddy Butler's conclusion is that BNP reformists should support the main constitutional changes, taking their own gamble that Griffin can be defeated and a more sensible constitution agreed after his departure. However he also argues that the final Griffinite proposal, for a "contract" between the party and candidates for salaried public office, should be voted down as "it is not the sort of thing that would be in any normal political party's constitution". The Butler argument amounts to a "win or bust" strategy, and while in an ideal world one would prefer the Kemp argument based on sound democratic theory, BNP members are operating in a far from ideal environment.

One aspect of this environment is the BNP's mounting debt. As we go to press the judgment against Griffin in the so-called "Decembrist" case remains on hold pending a possible appeal, but it is overwhelmingly likely that by the time you read these words enforcement action will have begun to take not only the initial costs order of £45,000 but around another £40,000. Together with the Michaela Mackenzie employment tribunal and the Romac Press unpaid leaflet bill (both likely to be pressing for payment within the next few weeks) Griffin will have little change out of £150,000 even before considering his own legal costs. If (or when) these creditors press for bankruptcy, they will be joined by a so far unknown number of other unpaid tradesmen.

Andrew Brons and his campaign team will oppose Griffin's latest attempt to force an undemocratic constitution on the party – especially the ludicrous proposal to fix a five-year leadership term – and I understand that Arthur Kemp is likely to speak at the 26th June meeting to re-assert the constitutional proposals that were backed at last December's conference. Yet the Brons team might find that they have to accept any constitution that guarantees an election this summer and an opportunity for members to end the Griffin regime.

The increasingly desperate Griffinite efforts to prevent reform of the BNP would be comical if their consequences were not so tragic. This latest 26th June meeting – summoned to fix the constitution so that Griffin will be unchallengeable for the next five years – is to be held on a Sunday morning on Merseyside, with members required to reach a remote redirection point by 10 am! Needless to say there is at least a 50-50 chance that Griffin will simply expel his opponents (as he has done several times during his chequered nationalist career) but this year's challenge is on a different scale from the past factional divisions that Griffin has been able to brush aside.

There are of course several other nationalist parties currently in existence, and it is not yet apparent which of these would be prepared to unite in any future post-Griffin umbrella. Last autumn several BNP dissidents, including

the party's former legal officer Lee Barnes, webmaster Simon Bennett, SW regional organiser Peter Mullins and BNP youth leader Danny Lake, broke away to form the British Freedom Party. However the BFP split before it had even got off the ground. One faction including ex-BNP activists John Savage and Sue Bowen has now formed the Freedom Democrats, under the leadership of former Devon BNP candidate Gary Marshall.

Another splinter group registered last year – the National Alliance, headed by former BNP South East England regional organiser Roger Robertson – has remained dormant, and according to accounts recently filed with the Electoral Commission the NA undertook "no political activities" and "no financial activities" during 2010-2011. Yet another failing to carry out any activities was One England, the pro-immigration, ultra-liberal civic nationalist breakaway from the EDs. One England recruited former NF activist Nigel Bromage (now married to an Asian Muslim) but after repeated criticism of his political past Mr Bromage quit a few weeks ago.

Roger Robertson's successor as the BNP's SE regional organiser, Andy McBride, has joined the rush to exit Nick Griffin's party. Together with ex-BNP councillor Paul Golding and Griffin's former right-hand man, professional fundraiser Jim Dowson, McBride has set up Britain First, run from Dowson's HQ in Northern Ireland, and which appears to be more of a fundraising operation than a real political party.

As if to prove that they refuse to be outclassed in the splitting stakes by these new kids on the block, the National Front – Britain's longest established nationalist party – has also managed some more internal conflict, with Leeds veteran Eddy Morrison leaving to set up yet another new group, the British National Vanguard Front. So even aside from various ultra-radical national socialist groups and cultural organisations, there is a bewildering variety of nationalist parties – largely a symptom of the BNP's crisis, which now looks even worse than the problems that crippled the National Front after 1979.


On June 14th Cllr Cliff Roper, who represents Heanor East ward on **Amber Valley** council, resigned the party whip, though he remains a BNP member and is supporting the Andrew Brons leadership bid. Cllr Roper issued a statement describing his resignation as "a symbolic protest at recent events within the British National Party, both at a national and local level." He was followed the next day by **Bradford** councillors Paul and Lynda Cromie, who also now sit as independents. This now leaves the BNP with only nine borough councillors and one county councillor in the entire country. There is only one borough – Pendle – where the BNP has more than a lone councillor: a staggering collapse from the position just a year or two ago when the party also had teams of councillors in a dozen other councils.

Elsewhere in the movement the much-hyped English Defence League now has an effective north-south divide, with supposed EDL leader Stephen Yaxley-Lennon (alias Tommy Robinson) only exercising authority over southern members, while the far less philo-semitic John Shaw (known as 'Snowy') controls the north. Charges of financial malpractice levelled at Yaxley-Lennon and his cronies helped poison the run-up to the EDL's April 2011 demonstration in Blackburn, which was marked by violence between the rival factions. In mid-June 2011 the EDL had its Ebay and PayPal accounts closed down.

The EDL never has had a credible political agenda and offers no alternative for activists disillusioned by BNP splits. Electoral potential remains massive for a nationalist movement that can get its act together – the new alliance between Andrew Brons and Richard Edmonds offers our movement its best chance since the 1990s of building solid foundations for a broad church nationalist party.

**Peter Rushton, Manchester, England**

[www.jailingopinions.com](http://www.jailingopinions.com)



**Arthur Kemp (right) seen here with fellow South African police veteran Lance Stewart, has broken from Nick Griffin and is looking for new political allies. Kemp urged rejection of Griffin's new constitutional proposals, describing them as "a shocking and gross perversion" - while Eddy Butler argued the proposals should mostly be accepted to allow a quick contest.**



Released UK – May 2011; UK distribution by Paramount Pictures; director Kenneth Branagh; running time 114 minutes; Rated 12A; not yet available on DVD

# Movie Review - *Thor*

I first heard about *Thor the movie* about six months ago, when it's director, the very politically correct liberal Kenneth Branagh, caused all sorts of controversy by casting Idris Elba (an African-American) as Heimdall! A boycott the movie campaign was started up online by the Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC). However, as it was only an 'online campaign', it had little or no impact outside of 'Movement' circles, and the American masses flocked to see it anyway.

Surprisingly, my local cinema – the Preston Odeon – showed it. So rather than having to hop on the train to sunny Manchester, as is the norm rather than the exception these days, when I want to see a decent movie, it was only a short bus ride to Preston Docklands (where the Odeon is located).

Scholars of Norse mythology (like our American deputy editor Martin Kerr) will be surprised to learn that when Thor (Chris Hemsworth), son of Odin (Anthony Hopkins), wields his mighty hammer – Mjolnir, flinging it at his foes, he can get it to come back again like a boomerang. (The cheerful Hemsworth is Ozzie, which may help.)

High spirits, however, count for more than accuracy in Kenneth Branagh's take on the ancient Norse Sagas, and there is pleasure to be plundered from some of the battle scenes, especially when Thor is confronting ice monsters with blood-red eyes, and from the culture clash that resounds when he descends to present-day Earth and, as luck would have it, bumps into Jane (played by the very pretty Jewish actress Natalie Portman).

However, where the movie falters and slumps is in a galaxy far, far away, where the set designs have a tacky golden gleam, and where the quarrels of the Gods come across as an interminable snit. With Darcy Lewis (Kat Dennings) as Jane's assistant, who fires off a few smart lines and then almost fades from the picture.

So what of the plot? As Martin Kerr will surely know, in 965 A.D., Odin, king of Asgard, wages war against the Frost Giants of Jotunheim and their leader Laufey (Colm Feore), to prevent them from conquering the Nine Realms, starting with Earth. The Asgardian warriors defeat the Frost Giants and seize the source of their power, the Casket of Ancient Winters.

In the present, Odin's son Thor prepares to ascend to the throne of Asgard, but is interrupted when Frost Giants attempt to retrieve the Casket. Against Odin's order, Thor travels to Jotunheim to con-

front Laufey, accompanied by his mischievous brother Loki (Tom Hiddleston), childhood friend Sif (Jaimie Alexander) and the Warriors Three; Volstagg (Ray Stevenson), Fandral (Joshua Dallas) and Hogun (Tadanobu Asano). A battle ensues until Odin intervenes to save the Asgardians, destroying the fragile truce between the two races. For Thor's arrogance, Odin strips his son of his godly power and exiles him to Earth, accompanied by his hammer Mjolnir – the source of his power, now protected by a spell to allow only the worthy to wield it.

Thor lands in America (New Mexico to be exact) – as you would expect! – where scientist Jane Foster, her assistant Darcy Lewis and mentor Dr. Erik Selvig (Stellan Skarsgård), find him. The local populace finds Mjolnir, which S.H.I.E.L.D. agent Phil Coulson (Clark Gregg) soon commandeers before forcibly acquiring Jane's data about the wormhole that delivered Thor to Earth. Thor, having discovered Mjolnir's nearby location, seeks to retrieve it from the facility that S.H.I.E.L.D. quickly constructed but he finds himself unable to lift it, and is captured. But with Selvig's help, he is freed and resigns himself to exile on Earth as he develops a romance with Jane.

Loki discovers he is Laufey's son, adopted by Odin after the war ended. When Odin, overcome with stress, falls into the deep "Odinsleep" that allows him to recuperate, Loki becomes king and offers Laufey the chance to kill Odin and retrieve the Casket. Sif and the Warriors Three, unhappy with Loki's rule, attempt to return Thor from exile, convincing (the not very convincing African-American) Heimdall (Idris Elba), gatekeeper of the Bifröst – the means of traveling between worlds – to

allow them passage to Earth.


Aware of their plan, Loki sends the Destroyer, a seemingly indestructible automaton, to pursue them and kill Thor. The warriors find Thor, but the Destroyer attacks and defeats them, prompting Thor to offer himself instead. Struck by the Destroyer and near death, Thor finds his sacrifice has proven him worthy to wield Mjolnir. The hammer returns to him, restoring his powers and enabling him to defeat the Destroyer. Kissing Jane goodbye and vowing to return, he and his fellow Asgardians return to confront Loki.

In Asgard, Loki betrays and kills Laufey, revealing his true plan to use Laufey's attempt on Odin's life as an excuse to destroy Jotunheim with the Bifröst Bridge, and thus prove himself worthy. Thor arrives and fights Loki before destroying the Bifröst Bridge to stop Loki's plan, stranding himself in Asgard. Odin awakens and prevents the brothers from falling into the abyss created in the wake of the bridge's destruction, but Loki allows himself to fall to his apparent death. Thor makes amends with Odin, admitting he is not ready to be king, while on Earth, Jane and her team search for a way to open a portal to Asgard.

In a post-credits scene, Selvig has been taken to a S.H.I.E.L.D. facility, where Nick Fury (Samuel L. Jackson) asks him to study an unnamed device, which Fury says may hold untold power. Loki, invisible, whispers to Selvig to agree, which Selvig does – *Thor 2*?

So is it worth a tenner and a trip down to your local cinema? Well my date thought so – but then again I was paying! However, I was not convinced and I don't think I will be rushing out to see *Thor 2* – if there is one that is. My advice, wait until it comes out on DVD, or better still wait until it's on the telly.

Reviewed by Mark Cotterill, Preston, Lancashire



Thor (Chris Hemsworth) says his farewell to Jane (Natalie Portman) as he prepares to return to confront Loki