

Genocide - Eliminating The English

Tony Shell

Introduction

The true purpose for promoting multiculturalism in England – of achieving genocidal population change by stealth – is, of course, never admitted. It is the indigenous people (the native English) who are the victims of that process; whilst at the same an authoritarian political elite cynically manipulates the rapidly increasing immigrant/settler population.

It is therefore the engineering of substantial demographic change, over the last sixty years, that has been used by ‘progressives’ to justify the effective destruction (or expropriation) by the political aristocracy of those social institutions created by the ordinary, native people. The principles of government by consent, and of the right to self-determination are contemptuously ignored. The UK State therefore no longer serves the people, but acts as local administrators to a global oligarchy whilst asset-stripping the country. The ultimate intention is to be effectively rid of a disobedient, native population.

Such behaviour is entirely consistent with a State that is a servant of global finance, engages in warmongering and unlawful foreign wars, is institutionally corrupt, promotes degenerate and socio-pathological forms of behavior, and commits fundamental acts of betrayal (including High Treason).

This report describes and examines that (on-going) process.

Population Replacement by Stealth

The term ‘progressive migration’ is (as we will see later) a political euphemism for population replacement. It is a process that lies at the heart of present-day ‘progressive’ political ideology – as implemented by the ‘modernizers’ and ‘change agents’.

In February 2011 research by the independent body Migration Watch used official ONS data to show that: “*Under Labour 3.2 million foreign citizens arrived in Britain, about 80 per cent from outside the EU, whilst nearly one million (941,000) British citizens left*”.¹ This is effectively equivalent to a population replacement within the UK of some 4 million people – in just 13 years.

Observations on past census records, plus other data, can put the effects of this ‘progressive migration’ into an informative, historical perspective.

In 1851 approximately ninety-six percent of the population of England were native indigenous people (the English).² One hundred years later (1951) the proportion of English people in England was almost exactly the same – despite a huge influx of refugees fleeing from famine, revolution, pogroms, the upheavals of two devastating World Wars, and a brutal partitioning of Europe.³

It was the natural increase of the native population over that one hundred year period (from 16.03 million English people in 1851, to 39.50 million in 1951) that played a major part in the maintenance of a relatively stable, cohesive society.

However the recent imposition of ‘progressive migration’ has been unprecedented in scale – and with potentially catastrophic consequences.

In the last sixty years there has been a massive growth of non-native population with no corresponding increase in the native English. It is calculated that between 1951 and 2011 the number of non-native people in England was *purposefully* increased from 1.5 million to more than 10.4 million.^{4 5 6 7 8}

This extraordinary and unprecedented growth in mass immigration (and settlement) is driven by covert, genocidal intent – to create a situation that will eventually deny the English any possibility of determining their own future. This is a necessary precursor to the final elimination of the English as a distinct, native group.

As a direct result of political action, by 2001 the English had been reduced to less than eighty-five percent of the population.⁹ On the assumption that future UK governments will continue to support ‘progressive migration’ (the most likely scenario) it is projected that within the next fifty years the English people will constitute less than half of the population – and will have become a minority within their own land.¹⁰ That is the true, intended purpose behind ‘progressive’ UK politics.

Inevitably, well before such a situation is reached, the local governments of many of our towns and cities will fall under the control of members elected by the majority immigrant/settler population - who (quite understandably) will put the interests of their own section of the immigrant/settler population over and above that of any local, minority groups (including, and especially, any native English people).

In April 2011 the Prime Minister David Cameron MP gave a speech in which he boasted of the Coalition Government’s plans for managing migration.¹¹ Notably he stated that: “*between 1997 and 2009, 2.2 million more people came to live in this country than left to live abroad*”. The peculiar choice of wording is most significant – it reveals the manner in which the Coalition Government intended to mislead the public and conceal a continuation of the State’s real agenda.

In his speech the Prime Minister repeatedly asserted the need to reduce (only) net migration – the process of population replacement was to continue unabated.

This demonstrates the extent to which the political elite (and their subordinates) are prepared to deceive the public. The focus on only controlling net migration provides the means for the effective total replacement of the native (English) population, by a population of immigrant/settler origin, before the end of this century.

It is therefore long-term population replacement numbers that reveals the real and potential impact (demographic, social, and cultural) of a politically directed mass immigration policy. This is especially true for England, where the native population is already in rapid decline (with an overall birth-rate approximately 17 per cent below replacement level).¹²

This leads to the rather obvious question – why has there been almost no proper public debate (by the ‘progressives’) with regard to the projected decline in the number of ethnic English? Instead of which, we find either a bizarre denial of the existence of a native people, or a belief that such a decline is of no importance (or, even, to be welcomed as an opportunity to further increase immigration).¹³

Direct Population Control

The most direct procedures for the implementation of ‘progressive’ genocide combine the politically contrived import of large numbers of immigrant settlers, together with efforts to stop the native people having children. This part of the study therefore examines these procedures – as applied to the English.

The argument that mass immigration is necessary for addressing the problems of a declining and ageing native population, is fatuously presented by those who expect us not to notice (for example) the techniques also being used to considerably lower the birthrate of that same, native people.

The procedures being implemented (to stop English people from having children) includes a variety of extreme social engineering practices, including: discouragement of traditional family life; cultural propaganda promoting childless marriages and divorce; the promotion of sexual depravity (enforced by the arrest and punishment of those who dare to express disgust, dissent or opposition); the inculcation of degenerate behaviour in young children and infants (from extreme anti-social, to suicide cultism); and the political support of the abortion industry as a provider of a vital ‘social need’.

This, therefore, leads to a consideration of the highly lucrative, so called, family planning industry.

The ‘progressive’ pro-abortion stance is essentially a re-branding of the eugenics movement of the 1930s and 1940s.¹⁴ Since 1968 the lives of 4.9 million unborn babies, of English parentage, have been abruptly ended.¹⁵

The justification for this – which is aggressively flaunted – is essentially political, with such abortions being disingenuously presented as “*reproductive justice*” and feminist “*empowerment*”.^{16 17} It is a political ideology, presented as an issue of the freedom of fundamental ‘rights’ for woman – in which the unborn child, with no voice to be heard, has no ‘rights’ whatsoever.

The argument that the Abortion Act 1967 was introduced (in part) as a response to the huge numbers of illegal (so called ‘back street’) abortions is a myth propagated by the pro-abortion industry. In 1965, out of a total of 1,013,575 pregnancies in the UK, there were 16,300 miscarriages or stillbirths, 19,500 legal abortions, and just 173 illegal abortions (albeit 173 too many).¹⁸

The ‘progressives’ have vigorously promoted the abortion industry in the certain knowledge the greatest impact will be upon the English, given that the native population is already in sharp decline (with an overall birth rate significantly below replacement level, as noted previously).^{19 20}

The fact that this disposal of unborn English children is driven by political extremism is made all-too-obvious by the manner in which the ‘pro-life’ movement has been subject to hate-fomenting lies and calculated disinformation – by both the political State and the corporate media industry (and by the lying BBC, in particular). The intention has always been to make issues concerning abortion (in addition to mass immigration) taboo areas for any serious investigation or debate.

In the 1997 Parliamentary Elections candidates stood on a single-issue ‘pro-life’ platform, in an attempt to present their concerns directly to the UK public. The response of the ‘progressives’ was to use the mainstream media to stir-up unjustifiable fears and extreme hatred against pro-life campaigners.

Over the following three years numerous newspaper articles appeared alleging widespread infiltration of the pro-life movement by “*secret Nazis*” – whose existence and activities appear to have been known only to main-stream newspaper journalists.^{21 22 23 24} An extreme hate narrative was being vigorously promulgated against the UK pro-life movement, by the UK corporate (business) media.

Subsequently the BBC transmitted a number of ‘real life’ TV dramas that sought to portray pro-life campaigners as terrorists, and (most perversely) as psychopathic child murderers. Notably all of the perpetrators were shown as ‘white’ Christian people (and predominantly women) – indicating a clear racist position of the BBC.^{25 26}

The BBC chose to adopt such a stance (on abortion), despite the fact that the genuine, UK-based, pro-life movement never used nor supported violence to further its cause – and campaigned on behalf of all sections of UK society (including the non-English immigrant community).

The BBC was using its considerable hate-fomenting skills to exploit public sensitivities on a very important issue - and to destroy any possible opposition to the ‘progressive’ agenda. It is therefore difficult not to conclude that the BBC was deliberately stirring up extreme hate against those who did not hold it’s own ‘progressive’ views (on abortion, for political ends).

Increasingly ‘progressive’ activists are insisting that those critical of the abortion industry – including “*human beings who do not have uteruses*” – should not be allowed to express their opinions.²⁷

Such agitprop political tactics are part of a more general effort to separate sexuality from the act of procreation – and instead to make sexuality an issue of “*contested identities*”, social conflict, shallow self-gratification, and political control.

Obviously the effect of such extreme propaganda will have been anticipated. It will have made many members of the public extremely wary of joining pro-life groups – or even fearful of expressing support. It will have done much to help stop the emergence within England of any popular, and effective, pro-life movement. And quite clearly this was the intention.

It is also of no surprise that the demand for ‘progressive’ abortions is to be found across the whole of Europe. A researcher, investigating into the activities of organizations such as The Open Society (George Soros), has observed: “ ... accordingly his [Soros] Public Health Program has focused on the introduction of easily available abortion all over the region, and the introduction of manual vacuum aspiration (MVA) abortion in Macedonia, Moldova, and Russia. Why is Soros so keen to promote more abortions? Overpopulation cannot be the reason: the region is experiencing a huge demographic collapse and has some of the lowest fertility rates in the world. Unavailability of abortions cannot be the answer either: only five European countries had more abortions than live births in 2000: the Russian Federation, Bulgaria, Belarus, Romania and Ukraine.”²⁸

This provides compelling evidence of a racist, genocidal agenda (anti-white, anti-European) behind the ‘progressive’ politics of pro-abortion – with the principal agents of that agenda being immensely powerful organizations such as the OSF and the BBC.

UK State Culpability

A genocidal elimination of the English people is made seemingly acceptable through the academic discipline of Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) – a racist hate ideology that attempts to conceal extreme anti-white malevolence beneath a cloak of supposedly intellectual respectability.

The fundamental political purpose of CWS “*academic activism*” is to make those who are designated “*people of colour*” despise those who are designated “*people of whiteness*”. In addition, an important part of this process is to persuade “*people of whiteness*” to accept the yoke of collective guilt and self-loathing – on the basis of a politically contrived (and highly selective, neo-Marxist) historical narrative.

Complimentary research has shown the direct links between those who teach CWS within our colleges and universities, and the ‘no borders, no nations’ anarchist movement – and (for example) those have wished to see a genocidal onslaught against “*the white race*”.²⁹

It is links between such extremist ideologies, and agencies of the State, that are of special interest.

One of the most powerful of those agencies is the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). It is the State prosecution authority for both England and Wales, and operates an integral part of the UK Criminal Justice System (CJS). Extensive research has shown that the CPS has repeatedly deceived the general public in regard to the true nature of violent racist crime (including murder) within the UK.³⁰ In particular the CPS has promulgated the lie that it is native English people who commit all racial and religious ‘hate crime’.

There is an aggressive political agenda for use by agencies and staff of the CJS as State-enforcers of ‘progressivism’. Therefore CJS officials (including judges, prosecutors, court ancillary staff, prison staff, and the police) have been required to undergo various forms of political indoctrination, including “*diversity and race training*”.³¹ The purpose is to assist agencies within the CJS (such as the CPS) enforce extreme, and un-consented, social change. Notably the concern is only for “*the safety and well being of ethnic minority communities*” – clearly implying that the perceived threat comes *only* from the majority, native population. The “*safety and well being*” of the English is of little concern to a racist, anti-nativist CJS.³²

Local investigations have revealed links between various State agencies (such as The Criminal Justice Board, Police Constabularies, and the Crown Prosecution Service) and extremist political groups.³³ The political agenda for such organizations includes: (1) support for a 'no borders, no nations' anarchism throughout Europe; (2) support for unlimited/uncontrolled immigration; (2) opposition to any efforts towards assimilation or integration of migrant communities into host nations, and the promotion of ghetto-ism; and (3) the political radicalization of members and descendants of immigrant communities (using real and manufactured grievances) into supporting extreme social change – including the destruction of sovereign nations, and the elimination of an identifiable native population (in effect, of ethnic genocide).^{34 35 36}

International Law

The indigenous rights of a native population (that by definition must include the native populations of the British Isles) are recognized and stipulated by the member states of the United Nations.³⁷ On the 13th September 2007 the Declaration On The Rights Of Indigenous Peoples was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. Of particular interest are the following solemn proclamations, that:

Article 8(1) : *“Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subject to forced assimilation or destruction of their culture.”*;

Article 9 : *“Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right to belong to an indigenous community or nation, in accordance with the traditions and customs of the community or nation concerned ... no discrimination of any kind may arise from the exercise of such a right”*;

Article 26(1) : *“Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, develop and control the lands, territories and resources that they possess by reason of traditional ownership or other traditional occupation or use, as well as those which they have otherwise acquired.”*

Therefore the indigenous people of the British Isles (including, of course, the native English) are entitled to demand support from the United Nations in defending their rights against enforced multiculturalism and the catastrophically adverse effects of mass immigrant/settler colonization.

It is notable that the UK representative stressed the UK Government's recognition of the rights of 'a people' in occupation of their land (the example she gave was the Falkland Islanders).³⁸ She went on to state the UK Government's recognition of a collective right to self-determination in international law, and also that the UK Government recognized that the particular declaration to be a statement of the rights of indigenous individuals to have their human rights (specifically their indigenous rights) to be recognized on an equal basis to the rights of all other individuals. In other words, their (indigenous) rights could not be subordinate to the rights of any other (non-indigenous) individual or group.³⁹

These are the rights of indigenous people, as recognised by agreement of the member states of the United Nations. An indigenous (native) person is defined as follows: *“A person of aboriginal descent, albeit possibly mixed descent, is someone who identifies themselves a aboriginal as such and who is recognised by the aboriginal community as an aborigine.”* The indigenous English are the aboriginal (native) people of that part of the British Isles customarily called England.⁴⁰

The English cannot be lawfully excluded from the international recognition of native entitlement.

According to the United Nations Convention on Genocide [1] genocide is a crime under international law, where the prescribed punishment is not subject to the limitations of time and place. The UN Convention defines genocide as:

*“Any of a number of acts committed with the intent to: destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.”*⁴¹

Awareness of the historical context is vital.

In April 1945, Dr. Raphael Lemkin (the originator of the word ‘genocide’, and a former adviser on international law to the League of Nations) described genocide in the following way: *“More often it refers to a coordinated plan aimed at destruction of the essential foundations of the life of national groups so that these groups wither and die like plants that have suffered a blight. The end may be accomplished by the forced disintegration of political and social institutions, of the culture of the people, of their language, their national feelings and their religion. It may be accomplished by wiping out all basis of personal security, liberty, health and dignity.”*⁴²

Dr. Lemkin’s report also provided an important review of the primary techniques of genocide as: the partitioning of previously unified countries into administrative regions to destroy political cohesion; attacking the existing cultural structure so as to weaken national resolve and obliterate former cultural patterns; the use of schools for the political indoctrination of children and infants; the undermining of the spiritual power of the established Church; the promotion of pornography, alcohol and gambling so as to create moral debasement within the national group; the destruction of the industrial infrastructure and economic independence of the country; and the use of various means to reduce the birthrate of the targeted people.⁴³

Most importantly, there are seen to be extraordinarily close similarities between those techniques formally recognized by the late 1940s, and the contemporary policies of ‘progressivism’ directed against the native English people.

This ‘progressive’, genocidal agenda will be vigorously pursued regardless of which political party is able (or is permitted) to take power within Westminster.

The Powers Behind The Process

An understanding of the political and economic forces behind the recent emergence of ‘progressive’ mass migration is therefore of crucial importance. It is an integral part of globalization, planned and executed behind the closed doors of organizations such as the IMF, WTO and the EU – at the behest (and for the benefit) of the global debt industry and major trans-national corporations (for example through secret ‘Mode 4’ trade deals to exploit the movement of cheap, migrant labour).⁴⁴

A key part of that process is to encourage the transfer of many millions of immigrant settlers into Europe (from Africa, in particular) by means of secret deals between African states and agencies of the EU (such as the European Commission).^{45 46 47 48}

The ideology of ‘progressivism’ is used to give globalization the appearance of a noble endeavour, committed to the creation of a utopian new world order. In reality it is an exercise in re-engineering the global population that includes (in effect) genocide against particular, targeted native populations.

The origins for this authoritarian ‘progressivism’ can be traced to early last century, with a change from a tradition of the people changing their governments – to that of governments changing the people. And broadly speaking, the agencies engaged in implementing this agenda can be divided into the local (UK), and global power groups.

In regard to the local (UK) groups, these include: the Parliamentary cabal at Westminster (of all major political parties); the Home Office; the Foreign and Commonwealth Office; the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC); the numerous political ‘charities’; the major business associations (i.e. the CBI); and various affiliates to the Trades Union Congress (TUC).

International groups include: the European Commission; the European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR); the Open Society Foundations (OSF); the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE); NATO; and the UN-supported Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD).

The local (UK) groups and the global groups are also intimately interconnected. It is through such complex, incestuous arrangements that the ‘progressives’ are able to impose their will on all (supposedly sovereign) countries. For example, in June 2012 the head of the GFMD, Peter Denis William Sutherland KCMG, declared that the EU should be doing its best to encourage mass migration “*to undermine the national homogeneity of European countries.*”⁴⁹ However, his assertion that “*an ageing or declining native population ... was the key argument*” is totally disingenuous given that the rapid decline of native European populations has been deliberately encouraged and assisted by ‘progressive’ political means.⁵⁰

Peter Sutherland is the UN Special Representative for Migration. He is also: Chairman of Goldman Sachs International; Vice-Chairman of The European Round Table of Industrialists; Steering Committee Member of The Bilderberg Group; Chairman of the LSE; International Board Member of US/Middle East Project Inc. (Council on Foreign Relations); and Chairman of the Trilateral Commission (Europe).^{51 52}

One of the most powerful organizations behind population replacement in Europe (genocide) is the Council of Europe and its subsidiary, the European Commission on Racism and Intolerance (ECRI). Examination of ECRI reports show considerable efforts to demonize the indigenous people of Europe through biased reporting, plus attempts to incite conflict and division within sections of the European population. The ESCRI contempt for any notion of a right of self-determination for the indigenous Europeans is illustrated by the comment: “*European countries need to come to terms with their multicultural identity and acknowledge the important role that immigration plays in the economy.*”⁵³ However the true beneficiaries are to be the all-powerful, global business conglomerates.

Of the international groups, it is the activities of the OSCE and GFMD (and their ancillary sub-groups) that are of particular significance. Most notably, there are organizations such as the military-orientated Centre for Foreign Policy Analysis (CFPA – UK-based, but also linked to the OSCE) that are seen to be engaged in giving support to such activities as: efforts by the State in “*propaganda, power and persuasion*”; to the work of propaganda organizations such as the BBC; and to providing for further expansion and empowerment of the global armaments industries.^{54 55}

A major part of this process (of ethnocide) is that of a powerful, global elite fomenting regional conflicts - through the instigating of violent insurrections, and of wars against (and between) sovereign nations. Apart from the material and pecuniary benefits this gives to the criminal instigators; this warmongering helps to create massive numbers of refugees (both civilians and combatants) – who are then encouraged to seek permanent refuge in Western Europe (in particular). Examples include: Serbia/Albania; Sri Lanka; Chechnya; Iraq; Georgia; Iraq; Afghanistan; Syria and Ukraine.

The Anti-White Politics of Deracination

A core part of ‘progressive’ political ideology is anti-white racism. It is a hatred of un-cowed native Europeans that provides the impetus behind such superficially innocuous State initiatives of multiculturalism and diversifism. The intention is to radically (and irreversibly) alter the physical demographics of the population.

Of particular relevance (to the European nations) are ideas strongly promoted in the mid 1920s by the philo-Semitic racist and racial supremacist, Count Nikolas Coudenhove-Kalergi – a ‘well-connected’ aristocrat, widely recognized as the founding father of the European Union (EU).

Count Coudenhove-Kalergi’s views were, in principle, very similar to those of the Nazism/Hitlerism of the 1930s and 1940s – albeit with a very different notion as to who should constitute the ‘master race’ (the “*Führerrasse*”, an aristocratic elite based upon the supposed inevitable emergence of a ‘superior bloodline’). His views included a desire to see the eradication (genocide) of all native European people.⁵⁶ Coudenhove-Kalergi therefore hoped (and expected) that the native European people would in due course be replaced by a “*Eurasian-Negroid*” race, under the direction and absolute control of an all-powerful “*Herrenmenschen*”.⁵⁷

His views on capitalism and Bolshevism are particularly illuminating. “*The struggle between capitalism and communism for the legacy of the defeated aristocracy is bloody fratricidal wars of the victorious intellectual aristocracy, a fight between individualistic and socialist, selfish and altruistic, pagan and Christian spirit. The general staff of both parties is recruited from the spiritual leader-race [Führerrasse] in Europe: the Jews. ... Strength of character combined with mental acuity predestined the Jews in his finest specimens to be the leader of urban humanity, at the wrong as to the genuine spirit aristocrats, the protagonist of capitalism as the revolution.*”

Clearly Count Coudenhove-Kalergi shared similar beliefs as that of his eminent contemporary, the political philosopher Leo Strauss – that the “*vulgar many*” were destined to be ruled by an aristocracy of ruthless “*philosophers*”, and controlled through the manipulation of ideological conflict, religion, and perpetual war.

Those supporting Count Coudenhove-Kalergi's early work included powerful US bankers such as Max Warburg (with direct financial assistance), Baron Louis de Rothschild, and Bernard Baruch.

Importantly, references to Coudenhove-Kalergi's extraordinarily powerful influence (within early 20th Century European politics) can be found within mainstream research groups. For example there are these observations from a researcher within the NATO and OSCE organizations: "*His social prominence naturally smoothed the way for personal contacts with conservative figures, but he was also active in seeking out individuals from other social circles. He cultivated, in particular, two French socialists, Albert Thomas, President of the International Labor Office, and Aristide Briand, a prominent Socialist politician who served his country as both Premier and Foreign Minister. In England, the Count worked closely with Winston Churchill and other conservatives but cultivated political contacts among Liberals and Labourites also.*" The researcher subsequently adds this especially significant comment: "*Adolph Hitler's New Order, although derived from principles totally antagonistic to Kalergi, shared some of the same conceptions.*"⁵⁸

However Coudenhove-Kalergi's predilection for anti-white genocide, throughout Europe, is omitted from this NATO/OSCE report.

In 1950 Count Coudenhove-Kalergi was awarded the highly prestigious Charlemagne Prize. Notably, more recent recipients have included the Chancellor of The Federal Republic of Germany, Angela Merkel (in 2010), and the President of The European Council, Herman Van Rompuy (in 2012).⁵⁹ It is also very apparent the political aristocracy wishes to avoid detailed scrutiny of the Count's views on population replacement in European (i.e. anti-white/anti-nativist genocide).

Increasingly we therefore see miscegenation being promoted through State propaganda as a preferred 'improvement' to society – as one of the ways in which a native, mainly homogenous, mono-cultural population can be replaced by a population more obedient to the State. It is an ideology vigorously supported by big business (by, in particular, the promotion of mass-consumption 'popular culture').

This is from the prominent BBC journalist Andrew Marr: "*Their [white, working class] self-pity may be smaller in scale than the grievance of black people, but it is, as it were, similarly shaped. What then can be done? (Apart, of course, from widespread and vigorous miscegenation, which is the best answer, but perhaps tricky to arrange as public policy.) ... And the final answer, frankly, is the vigorous use of state power to coerce and repress. It may be my Presbyterian background, but I firmly believe that repression can be a great, civilizing instrument for good. Stamp hard on certain 'natural' beliefs for long enough and you can almost kill them off. The police are first in line to be burdened further, but a new Race Relations Act will impose the will of the state on millions of other lives too.*"⁶⁰

An ideological basis for such views (on a 'new Europe') can be found in the emergence of a genocidal common purpose between seemingly disparate individuals and groups, and conflating the ideas of such 'luminaries' as: György Lukács (1885 to 1971 – cultural-Marxism); Count Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894 to 1972 – anti-white racism); Leo Strauss (1899 to 1973 – state authoritarianism); and Ayman al-Zawahiri (1951 to the present – global Islamic jihad, Islamic neo-colonialism).^{61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73}

The ultimate ambition of the 'progressive' elite is to have total dominion over a population both docile and obedient – and made so (in part) by the effective elimination of non-compliant native communities.

‘Progressive’ Genocide – State Enforcement

The response of the State to any signs of a growing public awareness, or resistance to, anti-English (anti-white) genocide will entail a ruthless application of various stratagems. Some of these are described below. Many of these stratagems are already in place, and are being rigorously applied.

The possible emergence of a broad-based alliance between the European indigenous population (including Russia) and the many and various ethnic/native groups in other parts of the World is seen as a particular threat. The State response is to emphasize and distort (in a negative, racist fashion) European colonial history as that of “*white supremacists*” against “*people of colour*” – and to highlight supposed “*white privilege*” and inequities of wealth (whilst studiously ignoring the plight of the very many impoverished white people). It is the very, very old stratagem of ‘divide and rule’.

The State has special concerns regarding possible emergence of organized resistance to State sponsored genocide. Counter-measures taken by the State will increasingly include the creation of bogus groups, and the infiltration of existing groups, to demonize such developments.

The State will also continue to use legislation to criminalize supposed acts of ‘terrorism’, including the following: a lawful right to bear arms; a lawful right to protest; any preparations by native English people to prepare for civil conflict; and any preparations by native English people to defend themselves against State tyranny and High Treason, or defend themselves against activities by State proxies (including hostile foreign groups).

It will be seen that the anti-English genocide project will be relentlessly pursued by the State, to ensure that no defence against that process can ever arise. To prevent such developments, the State will promote a climate of resignation and defeatism – a general belief that such changes are inevitable and irreversible, and that it is too late to stop the final objective (the effective elimination of the English, and the destruction of England) from being achieved.

Those driven to take action, through anger at the destruction of England, will be (and are being) ruthlessly dealt with by the State. Tactics now regularly used by the State include efforts by the CJS to force confessions of ‘guilt’ (such as by gratuitously extending court procedures, or by threats to seize a defendant’s children, or by actions to destroy a defendant’s means of livelihood) – or by using provisions contained within the Mental Health Act, to section such people as being ‘mentally ill’.

Summary and Conclusions

The elimination of the English is an important part of the global, ‘progressive’ agenda. It is recognized that unless the native inhabitants can be totally subdued (and preferably eliminated as a distinct, and assertive, native group) then the ‘progressive’ project will itself be under severe threat.

Given the historical rejection by the English of tyrannical forms of control, the ‘progressives’ will see the innate conservatism of a native population as a serious challenge to their globalist ambitions - and hence the need for a covert programme of genocide against the English.

The challenge facing the English people is ultimately the prospect of their own demise as a 'people'. Any effective form of resistance would need to go beyond simple anger, dissent and protest, and would have to include all actions (both allowed, and required by, Law) necessary to halt such diabolical behaviour.

END

Figure 1 – Major Organizations Behind Population Replacement In England and Europe (Genocide)



The **GFMD** (top); the **European Commission** (middle); and the **OSCE** (bottom).

REFERENCES and NOTES

¹ 'Mass Immigration – Labour's Enduring Legacy to Britain', Migration Watch UK, 22nd February 2011

² Based on 'A Vision of Britain: 1861 Census, General Report', [which includes data from the 1851 Census], source: http://www.visionofbritain.org.uk/text/chap_page.jsp; and 'A Nation of Immigrants? – A Brief Demographic History of Britain', by David Conway, The Institute for Civil Society, London 2007. For 1851 the (approximate) population numbers are: 16.03 million English; 0.67 million other British (mostly Irish); and 0.06 million Eastern Europe (mostly German, French and Italian ethnies).

³ Based on 1951 Census data – see Office for National Statistics data; and also data given within 'A Nation of Immigrants? – A Brief Demographic History of Britain', by David Conway, The Institute for Civil Society, London 2007. For 1951 the (approximate) population numbers are: 39.5 million English; 0.8 million other British (mostly Irish); 80 thousand Asian; 100 thousand Black Caribbean; and 0.56 million Eastern Europe (mostly Jewish, Polish, and Baltic ethnies).

⁴ Population (demographic) figures for 1951 based (in part) on data contained within the report: 'A Nation of Immigrants? – A Brief Demographic History of Britain', The Institute for The Study of Civil Society, 2007

⁵ Population (demographic) figures for 2001 based (in part) on data contained within the report: 'Estimates of The Population By Ethnic Group For Areas Within England', P Large and K Ghosh, Office for National Statistics, January 2006.

⁶ The demographic numbers (in millions), for the years 1951 and 2001, are as follows: native English (39.50m for 1951, 42.15m for 2001); non-English Britons (0.80m for 1951, 0.80m for 2001); Asian (0.08m for 1951, 2.76m for 2001); Afro/Caribbean Black (0.10m for 1951, 1.17m for 2001); and European (0.56m for 1951, 2.57m for 2001).

⁷ Calculated as an increase of: 5.76 million between 1951 and 2001, and a further increase of 3.14 million between 2001 and 2011 (using official ONS data). These are conservative numbers and do not include estimates for illegal migrants.

⁸ 'Migration Statistics Quarterly Report May 2012', Office for National Statistics, 24th May 2012 – and, in particular, figure 2.12 and accompanying text

⁹ From calculations based on data given in: 'Estimates of The Population by Ethnic Group for Areas Within England', by Pete Large and Kamak Ghosh, Office for National Statistics, January 2006

¹⁰ Based on population modelling given in: 'Projections of The Ethnic Minority Populations of The United Kingdom 2006-2056', The Oxford Centre for Population Research, 2010 (also published in *Population and Development Review* N° 36, 3, pages 441 to 486, 2010)

¹¹ 'David Cameron on Immigration: Full Text of The Speech', The Guardian, Thursday 14th April 2011, source: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/apr/14/david-cameron-immigration-speech-full-text>

¹² From data given in: 'Estimates of The Population by Ethnic Group for Areas Within England', by Pete Large and Kamak Ghosh, Office for National Statistics, January 2006, page 11 (Table 3)

¹³ For example, the native English being referred to (only) as: "*the settled white community*".

¹⁴ See, for example, the chapter 'Liberal Racism: The Eugenics Ghost In The Fascist Machine', in: 'Liberal Fascism – The Secret History Of The Left From Mussolini To The Politics Of Meaning', by Jonah Goldberg, Penguin Books, London 2007, pages 243 to 283, and (most especially) the corresponding source references given in pages 445 to 452.

¹⁵ 'Statistical Bulletin – Abortion Statistics, England and Wales', reports for 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011 and 2012, Department of Health. The abortion numbers given are those under categories C and D of The Abortion Act 1967, as amended, section 1(1)(C)/(D) where the risk of the pregnancy to the woman or to the family is greater than the risk of termination to the mother. An estimated 4.87 million terminations of unwanted English children, under that category, occurred between 1968 and 2012. This is based on a figure of 68% of all abortions, calculated from: 98% of all abortions being categories (C) and (D); 98% of 'White British' (of England and Wales) being ethnic English; and 85% of those (relatively few) listed as 'unknown ethnic group' being ethnic English (from official ONS data). The model used is a simplified first-order (straight line fit) – which means that the number of abortions (for the first 3 decades, especially) is likely to be on the conservative (i.e. low) side. The best straight line fit, based on ONS and NHS data, was found to be of the form: $0.8 - 0.0026x(\text{year} - 1968)$. This was found to agree very well with recent data (subject to the previous proviso).

¹⁶ See, for example, 'Continued Threats to Reproductive Rights', The Public Eye, a publication for the Political Research Associates, Fall 2009, Volume XXIV, N° 3, pages 3 and 6, reference: [pe-fall-09.pdf](http://www.publiceye.org/ark/reproductive-justice/new-overview.php)

¹⁷ 'Polished Lenses and Focused Targets: Defending Reproductive Justice', by Pam Chamberlain, Political Research Associates, 2009, source: <http://www.publiceye.org/ark/reproductive-justice/new-overview.php>

¹⁸ The argument that the Abortion Act 1967 was introduced (in part) as a response to the huge numbers of illegal (so called 'back street') abortions is another myth propagated by the pro-abortion lobby. In 1965, out of a total of 1,013,575 pregnancies in the UK, there were 16,300 miscarriages or stillbirths, 19,500 legal abortions, and 173 illegal abortions. Source: 'Historical Abortion Statistics, United Kingdom', Wm. Robert Johnston, 11th March 2012, <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/policy/abortion/ab-unitedkingdom.html>

¹⁹ From data given in: 'Estimates of The Population by Ethnic Group for Areas Within England', by Pete Large and Kamak Ghosh, Office for National Statistics, January 2006, page 11 (Table 3)

²⁰ 'Estimates of the Population by Ethnic Group for Areas Within England', Office for National Statistics (ONS), January 2006, reference ONS_ethnic_2003.pdf It is the English who have historically provided the largest number of emigrants leaving the UK, and those that now remain have a birth rate in excess of 17 per cent below the sustainable replacement level.

²¹ See, for example: 'Hack – Sex, Drugs, and Scandal From Inside The Tabloid Jungle', by Graham Johnson, Simon and Schuster, 2012, page 261. In his autobiography, journalist Graham Johnson admits to having fabricated totally untrue stories, which were subsequently published by the national (UK) press.

²² For example, in newspaper articles in The Sunday Mercury (Birmingham) on the 18th October 1998, and in The Sunday Mirror on the 7th May 2000 (by journalist Graham Johnson).

²³ Quite clearly (and unsurprisingly) the police have no information on the existence of such groups – this is in reference to specific requests for information, by letter, to: the West Midlands Police (the 14th June 2012; response received on the 7th September 2012 - ref. 2303-ack); the Greater Manchester Police (the 14th June 2012; response received in the 8th July GSA/3106/12); and the Nottingham Police (also the 14th June 2012; response received on the 11th July 2012 - ref. 003476/12); the Metropolitan Police Service (response received on the 22nd October 2012 - ref. 2012080003499 - ref. Graham Johnson of the NOTW and the fictitious report on the neo-Nazi gang 'Wansee Directive', published on the 25th February 1996).

²⁴ On the 17th August 2012 the following communication was sent to the MPS at New Scotland Yard: *On the 25th February 1996 the News of The World [NOTW] newspaper carried an article describing the criminal activities, in the London area, of a white-supremacist neo-Nazi gang, the 'Wansee Directive'. That article described in detail the gang's extreme racist hatermongering, its involvement in drugs and weapons trafficking, and its connections to "fascist mercenary" groups in Bosnia. The article concludes by saying "Our [NOTW] dossier on Nodder and his vile pals [the Wansee gang] is being passed to Scotland Yard." Obviously – and notwithstanding receipt of the NOTW 'dossier' – the agencies MPS, NSY, MPSB, and NPOIU etc. will have been very aware of the NOTW article. Therefore could you please provide me with the following information: (1) was any investigation of the 'Wansee Directive' gang ever carried out, as a consequence of the NOTW article; (2) if not, then why not; (3) if such an investigation was carried out, what was the outcome? Any help on this matter would be greatly appreciated.* The author of the NOTW article, journalist Graham Johnson, was lying. In his recent autobiography Johnson brags: *"The whole story was a complete fabrication from start to finish. Millions of readers had been totally duped. It's what's known in the trade as a 'stunt-up'. Not one word or picture is true. I made it all up. Nodder wasn't a neo-Nazi. In real life, he was my flat mate Gav, to whom I had promised £400 to play the role for a day.* ('Hack – Sex, Drugs, and Scandal From Inside The Tabloid Jungle', by Graham Johnson, Simon and Schuster, 2012, page 66). Unfortunately it was a lie that also duped many millions of people – which Mr Johnson and his associates were content to leave to fester for a further 16 years. In its response of the 22nd October 2012 (reference 2012080003499) the MPS refused the request concluding that: *The areas of police interest is a sensitive issue that reveals local intelligence therefore it is our opinion that for these issues the balancing test for confirming or denying whether there has been an investigation following on from the publication in the NOTW is not made out. However, this should not be taken as necessarily indicating that any information that would meet your request exists or does not exist.* However, the only possible information the MPS might hold on this matter must relate to the fact that the NOTW article was pure invention. The MPS response can only be seen as totally astonishing. A formal request to the MPS to conduct a criminal investigation into the actions of Mr Johnson and others (including former editors and commissioning editors of the NOTW) in regard to the publication of the 25th February 1996 article was ignored.

²⁵ 'Spooks', Season 1, Episode 1, BBC TV, broadcast: Monday 13th May 2002. The programme plot concerns the setting up of anti-abortionist terrorist cells within the UK, with the help of an extremist from the USA. The script for the programme includes that of a family planning doctor, and her young daughter, being killed by a bomb planted by the anti-abortionists.

²⁶ For example: 'Hunter', BBC TV, 18th and 19th January 2009. The programme plot of this 'real life' drama concerns the kidnapping of two 7-year-old boys by "pro-lifers" (anti-abortionists) who threaten to kill them if the BBC refuses to broadcast an anti-abortion video. One of the boys is subsequently killed by one of the anti-abortionists, by lethal injection.

²⁷ 'Students of Dogma', Brendan O'Neill, The Spectator, 22nd November 2014, pages 14 to 15

²⁸ 'Eastern Europe Versus The Open Society', by Srdja Trifkovic, H L Mencken Club, Baltimore, 23rd October 2010, source: <http://www.pravoslavie.ru/english/42713.htm>

²⁹ 'Native Europeans as The New 'Class-Enemy': [1] Stockholm and London', TS_research_2.pdf, 1st January 2015

³⁰ Published as: 'Racism – Not Just The MET?', in UK Column, May 2012, pages 14 to 15. Document reference: special_projects_09.pdf

³¹ 'Report of The Race For Justice Taskforce', The Criminal Justice System – Attorney General's Office, June 2006. For example, see page 10, under 'Recommendations'.

³² 'Race For Justice – A Review of CPS Decision Making For Possible Bias At Each Stage of The Prosecution Process', Published by The Crown Prosecution Service – paragraph 141, first sentence.

³³ Published as: 'The Justice System and "No Borders" Anarchism - In Common Purpose?', in UK Column, Issue 2, 2014

³⁴ For example, see: <http://www.desk.org:8080/ASU2/UltraRedPlaysKanakAttak>.

³⁵ For example, see: <http://www.ultrared.org/ps07a.html>

³⁶ “Writing in THE WIRE magazine, British cultural critic Mark Fisher describes Ultra-red's practice as a ‘quest to build a version of the public that does not have homogenising and normative connotations.’”
http://www.visibleproject.org/projects/Ultra_Red.php - Google cache snapshot of the page as it appeared on 1 Oct 2013 22:16:28 GMT.

³⁷ UN General Assembly, Declaration on The Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 7th September 2007, ref. A/61/L.67

³⁸ UN General Assembly, GA/10612, 13th September 2007, vote on the Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples paragraph 39

³⁹ UN General Assembly, GA/10612, 13th September 2007, vote on the Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples paragraph 86

⁴⁰ Dr. Stephen Oppenheimer, from: ‘The Origins of The British’, Constable & Robinson Ltd., London, 2007

⁴¹ UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, New York, 9th December 1948

⁴² ‘Genocide – A Modern Crime’, by Dr. Raphael Lemkin, Free World magazine, Vol.4, April 1945, pages 39-43

⁴³ ‘Genocide – A Modern Crime’, by Dr. Raphael Lemkin, Free World magazine, Vol.4, April 1945, pages 39-43, ‘Techniques of Genocide’

⁴⁴ See, for example: ‘Comment: The Secret Immigration Policy They Try To Hide’, by Linda Kaucher, politics.co.uk, Thursday 1st September 2011, source: <http://www.politics.co.uk/comment-analysis/2011/09/01/comment-the-secret-immigration-policy-they-tr>

⁴⁵ ‘50 Million Invited To Europe’, The Daily Express, undated, source: <http://www.express.co.uk/news/world/78180/50million-invited-to-Europe>

⁴⁶ ‘Secret plot to let 50million African workers into EU’, undated, source: <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/65628/Secret-plot-to-let-50million-African-workers-into-EU>

⁴⁷ ‘Reaching Out To Migrants – 02/10/2008’, The European Commission, source: http://ec.europa.eu/news/justice/081002_1_en.htm

⁴⁸ ‘The Africa-EU Partnership – A Joint EU Strategy, Lisbon, Portugal, 9th December 2007, source: <http://www.commit4africa.org/content/africa-eu-partnership-joint-eu-strategy-lisbon-2007>

⁴⁹ EU should ‘undermine national homogeneity’ says UN migration chief, by Brian Wheeler, Political reporter, BBC News, 21st June 2012, source: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-18519395>

⁵⁰ In fact it is only on rare occasions do the true long-term plans of the above organisations appear within the public domain. In 2008 the EU statistical agency Eurostat published a report advancing the idea that Europe would need an additional 56 million immigrants by 2050 - to make up for falling birth rates and rising death rates. This was just one year after, in Portugal, the European Partnership Agreement with Africa was signed. A year later (2008) the EU began the process of opening job/immigration centres within various Sub-Saharan African countries.

⁵¹ The US/Middle East Project Inc. was established by the US-based Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) in 1994. Peter Sutherland is listed as an International Board Member. See: <http://www.usmep.us> and <http://www.usmep.us/usmep/international-board/peter-sutherland>

⁵² Peter Sutherland KCMG SC is a former Chairman of the Allied Irish Banks, a former Director of GATT, a former Director General of the World Trade Organisation; a former Chairman of British Petroleum plc; and a former Director of the Royal Bank of Scotland. He is also: a Consultor of The Extraordinary Section of The Administration of the Patrimony of the Holy See, and a holder of the following: the Grand Cross Order of Leopold II (Belgium); the Grand Cross of Civil Merit (Spain); the Chevalier of the Legion d'Honneur (France); the Centenary Medal (NZ); the European Parliament Gold Medal; the Commandeur du Wissam (Morocco); the Order of Rio Branco (Brazil); the Grand Cross of the Order of Infante Dom Henrique (Portugal). Source: Debrett's, <http://www.debretts.com/people/biographies/browse/s/3821/Peter+Denis.aspx>

⁵³ ‘Annual Report On The ECRI's Activities – Covering The Period From 1 January to 31 december 2012’, ECRI Secretariat, Strasbourg, October 2013, ref. CRI(2013)42

⁵⁴ ‘Propaganda, Power and Persuasion – A Conference in Memory of Philip M Taylor’, source: <http://www.kent.ac.uk/history/events/documents/PMTconferenceProgramme.pdf>

⁵⁵ ‘UKTI Defence & Security Organisation Symposium 2009 – Exporting In A Challenging Global Environment’, source: <http://www.caat.org.uk/issues/ukti/FOI/Programme2009.pdf>

⁵⁶ ‘Praktische Idealismus’ [Practical Idealism], Count Nikolas Eijiro Graf Coudenhove-Kalergi, 1925

⁵⁷ Count Nikolas Coudenhove-Kalergi called for the native European people to be replaced by a socially engineered “*Eurasian-Negroid*” race under the direction of the “*Herrenmenschen*”. The new Europe was therefore to be ruled by this “*Fuhrerrasse*” aristocratic elite.

⁵⁸ ‘NATO and OSCE, Partners or Rivals?’, Edward L Killham, NATO Research Fellowship Final Report, 12th March 1997

⁵⁹ ‘Blairs Charlemagne Prize Created By The Nazis’, by Rodney Atkinson, source: <http://www.freenations.freeuk.com/news-2003-12-11.html>

⁶⁰ ‘Poor? Stupid? Racist? Then Don't Listen To A Pampered White Liberal Like Me’, Andrew Marr, The Guardian, 28th February

1999, source: <http://www.theguardian.com/uk/1999/feb/28/lawrence.ukcrime4>

⁶¹ Raehn, Raymond V: 'The Historical Roots of Political Correctness'

⁶² Howe, Irving: 'Lukacs and Solzhenitsyn – a review of Solzhenitsyn by George Lukacs, translated by William David Graf, Cambridge, Mass MIT Press

⁶³ Lukacs, Georg: 'Reification and The Consciousness of The Proletariat', History and Class Consciousness; Merlin Press, 1967; transcribed by Andy Blunden

⁶⁴ Morgan, John W: 'George Lukacs – Cultural Policy, Stalinism and The Communist International; Routledge, International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 12, No 3, 2006

⁶⁵ Drury, Shadia B: 'Saving America – Leo Strauss and The Neoconservatives; Evatt Foundation, 2005. Professor Drury holds the Canada Research Chair in Social Justice at the University of Regina, Canada

⁶⁶ Steinberg, Jeffrey: 'Leo Strauss, Fascist Godfather of the Neo-Cons'; Executive Intelligence Review; 21st March 2003

⁶⁷ Xenos, Nicholas: 'Leo Strauss and The Rhetoric of The War On Terror'; Logos Journal, Issue No 3.2, Spring 2004. Nicholas Xenos is a professor of political science at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst

⁶⁸ Atwan, Abdel Bari: 'After Bin Laden – Al-Qa'ida, The Next Generation', Saqi Books, London 2012

⁶⁹ Burke, Jason: 'Al-Qaeda', Penguin Books, London 2007

⁷⁰ Centre For Peace in The Balkans: 'Balkan-Albania-Kosovo-Heroin-Jihad'; Research Analysis, May 2000; reference to Muhammed al-Zawahiri, the brother of Ayman Zawahiri, as the leader of an elite unit of the KLA (Kosovo)

⁷¹ Militant Islam Monitor; 'Yusuf Islam and Muslim Council of Britain's Terrorism Ties – Muslim Aid "Charity" Funds Al-Qaeda and Sent Mujahedeen to Bosnia'; 24th September 2004. This also refers to Muhammed al-Zawahiri as being employed by the IIRO organization in Albania.

⁷² Schindler, John R: 'Unholy Terror – Bosnia, Al-Qa'ida and The Rise of Global Jihad', Zenith Press, St. Paul USA, 2007. This work also mentions the presence in Bosnia in the early 1990s of Ayman Zawahiri, his brother Muhammed al-Zawahiri (working for the 'charity' IIRO, and also using the alias Muhammed Ibrahim) and also Bin Laden. See page 123

⁷³ Shahzad, Syed Saleem: 'Inside Al-Qaeda and The Taliban – Beyond Bin Laden and 9/11', Pluto Press, London 2011