

TREASON, GENOCIDE and RESISTANCE

Tony Shell

Treason

Parliament is a treasonous assembly that dispenses an internationalist form of Hitlerism.

It is a Parliament motivated by hate, arrogance, greed, and contempt for the Law. Total subservience is required to a regime that incorporates: State-socialism; State-capitalism; racialist politics; anti-Christian sentiment; and a 'progressive' ideology pursued with religious fanaticism.

The end goal is the destruction of the ancient nations of the British Isles – the incorporation of the native people (those who survive) and their homelands (that which is not destroyed) into a fascist EU super-State, under the control of a malfeasant cabal.

The indigenous people of Britain have never consented to this surrender of native entitlement. It is a breach of the Constitution, of Common Law, and of the law of *jus sanguinis*. Our Constitution and Common Law are a record of our collective wisdom and our historical journey as a people – entrusted to us to pass on to future generations as their birthright. We cannot ignore or refuse obligations placed upon us by our ancestors. Our sovereignty is simply *not* negotiable.

It is High Treason for anyone to take actions with the intention of surrendering any part of our sovereignty. We therefore find ourselves burdened with a Parliament that is acting treasonably, contrary to Common Law, and contrary to the Treason Act of 1351 and the Treason Felony Act of 1848.

Parliament is making unlawful Statute (that is, State regulations) for the purpose of enforcing its treason. And Parliament expects people to obey those Statutes as a demonstration of approval of, and submission to, its treasonous behaviour. The Government compels others to enforce that treason – and increasingly so, by the application of psychological intimidation, by its own law breaking, and by inciting violence.

The present Government pursues and cultivates links with political and religious groups that have a history of hostility to this country – and of acts of terrorism, war crimes and genocide.

The one and a half million British people who, over the last 100 years, have sacrificed their lives to keep our country free have been betrayed. Everything they fought and died for is being destroyed by the criminals who now inhabit the Palace of Westminster.

These are the preliminary steps by which a 'progressive' State (of a treasonous and violent Parliament, and a corrupt political elite) believes it can pursue its Hitlerist agenda and be rid of a troublesome native people. Parliament is instigating a future war against the English.

Hidden History

For the British people any narrative on 'modern history' *must* include the Great War – a conflict that led to the Second World War and, in the space of just 30 years, resulted in the death of nearly one and a half million Britons, the loss of an Empire, crippling war debt, the ruination of much of our cultural heritage, and the exhaustion of a people.

Actually, we need to go back to events preceding the Great War, and examine the political changes that were already underway – and which are largely responsible for our present dire circumstances.

One highly important issue is the rise of nationalism, and of the close relationship between revolutionary socialism, nationalism, and inter-nationalism. The Oxford Historian Sir Michael Howard has pointed out that social theorists such as Marx and Engels were well aware that the rise of popular militaristic

nationalism within the European states was beneficial to socialist revolution – and a considerable threat to the ruling classes.

However, in 1870, whilst living in London, Karl Marx sent a secret message to the *Internationale* in Geneva to say that the English would never make their own (violent) revolution, and that foreigners would have to make it for them. Arguably this could be seen as rather insightful given that the use of terrorist violence for forcing political or social change (rather than rebellion to stop abuses of power) has *not* been a feature of native (English) behaviour for many hundreds of years. The uncomfortable truth is that this sort of violence has tended to be of that introduced by foreigners as attempts to impose their own political agenda upon the native inhabitants of these islands.

In 19th Century Britain the politics of nationalism was looked upon with deep suspicion – and across all classes of society. The British people had only to look across the Channel to see how popular nationalistic revolutions could rapidly descend into anarchy and tyranny – and subsequently be expropriated by despots with a particular taste for inter-national military adventures and vain Imperialist ambition.

Likewise, Marxist-based socialism (and its various revolutionary creeds such as communism, libertarianism, anarchism, nihilism, ... *ad infinitum*) was an anathema to the British people. It was the opposite of the English tradition (of that expounded by R H Tawney, for example) – of a step-wise change of social structure based on Christian moral values, economic development, and fair remedy under Common Law.

The English tradition was evolving towards the principle of seeking ‘equality of opportunity’, whereas the *revolutionary* socialist ethos was substantially that of a *promise* of ‘equality of outcome’ (by use of violence, if necessary).

It is apparent that, towards the end of the 19th Century, the ‘progressives’ within Britain (as revolutionary socialists) had resolved, instead, to engage in a subversive approach to the seizure of total, authoritarian control.

A major milestone on the path to Parliamentary dictatorship is to be found in the 1911 Parliament Act, when Marxists, Socialists, Fabians, Sinn Fein, and the Liberal Government (under Herbert Asquith) used threats and deceit to unlawfully seize power. Their action was a direct challenge to Law and to the Constitution. It was an action intended to circumvent the constitutional arrangements that had been developed over a period of seven hundred years – arrangements made to ensure no one part of the State (the Executive, the Legislative, the Judiciary, or the Church) could take absolute or disproportionate power.

The significance of the 1911 Parliament Act is that it demonstrates a wilful desire by a political elite to seize dictatorial power, to put themselves above Common Law, and to gain control of our country. It acted as a precedent for the later (unlawful) dismantling of our Constitution, the surrender of our sovereignty, and the forced imposition (without consent) of State-directed social change.

The ideological ‘pedigree’ of those involved in this coup therefore requires examination. And this should begin with an examination of those political forces behind this treason – the same political forces that have driven Europe (and Britain) into two catastrophic wars, and which are now hard at work creating the conditions for a future, third war in Europe.

Cause of War

At the beginning of the 20th Century the revolutionary movement in Russia saw advantage in initiating race/ethnic divisions within a society. This was seen as a powerful addition to the efforts to instigate ‘class war’ for the purpose of destabilising that society. It was an idea vigorously promoted, and adopted, in various parts of Europe – especially the Baltic region, Eastern Europe, and the Balkans.

A crucial part of this strategy was to advance the notion of a dominant (ruling) group, against which the ethnic/racial group must ‘struggle’. This was an overtly racist form of revolutionary socialism, where grievance, hatred and contempt could be engendered, and manipulatively directed against ‘the other’. And, of course, it was also essential to promote a sense of subjugation and/or injustice (actual, or perceived) to encourage this form of political activism.

Any aspiration of ‘a people’ for true self-determination was never realised. Once they served their purpose (to destabilise the host society) those people were effectively neutralised or destroyed. The ‘end game’ was (and always is) that of subjugation to a totalitarian state – to quote Lenin: “*separation precedes federation*”.

Therefore, one hundred years ago, the disciples of Marx – the adherents to revolutionary socialism – saw nationalism based on racial/ethnic identity as a powerful way of propagating their political ideology. It was seen as a way of destabilising the existing social structure, and of instigating the violent overthrow of the established European states. Starting with the Jewish Bund in 1897, this racist form of national socialism soon appeared in other groups, and in other parts of Europe. This was evident in the emergence of such movements as the Polish Socialist Party, the Ukrainian Socialist Revolutionaries, the Dashak (Armenian) socialists, and the Finnish Socialist Party.

The Russian Marxists saw the failure of the 1905 Revolution as a failure of the ‘class struggle’. Therefore it was widely felt that a harnessing of nationalist movements was required. It was certainly the case that the revolutionists saw the exploitation of nationalism as vital for the success of any future revolutionary struggle – irrespective of whether national identity was considered an objective reality, or nothing more than a ‘social construct’. Importantly, it was seen as a strategy that could not only be applied to Russia, but also to other European powers – especially to Germany, and to the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

This was therefore seen as an effective way of destabilising the major European powers. It was also recognised that such a strategy could ignite war in Europe – a prospect looked upon with relish by some (at least) of the Russian revolutionaries. Therefore we find, for example, Lenin telling Gorky in 1913 that “*A war between Russia and Austria would be a very useful thing for the revolution, but the chances are small that Franz Josef and Nicky [Nicholas II] will give us this pleasure.*” Their hope was that in a war Russia would suffer such a catastrophic defeat (of immense loss of life and destruction of social infrastructure) that anarchy would erupt – paving the way for a popular uprising against the Russian ruling class.

Such talk was entirely in character. At the 1905 Congress in London Lenin called for “*bloodshed on a colossal scale throughout Europe*”. There seemed little concern at the carnage and human misery that would ensue. The exiled Russian revolutionaries were highly intelligent, very knowledgeable and very determined. They were also warmongers. They knew, for example, of the long history of suspicion and enmity between the Teutonic and the Slavic peoples of central Europe. It is without doubt they would have been very aware of the opportunity this presented – in terms of the use of racist politics to destabilise that part of Europe (of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian Empires).

Pulling The Trigger

It was therefore extreme political agitation, by promotion of a politics of hate and conflict, which was to provide the trigger for a Europe-wide conflagration. And it was that conflagration that led to Russia’s defeat and the 1917 Revolution. Clearly, some ‘forensic’ analysis is required. So, let us examine the ‘trigger’ in a little detail.

On the morning of the 28th June 1914 a young man by the name of Gavrilo Princip, acting in collaboration with fellow members of a Serbian nationalist gang, assassinated the heir apparent to the Austrian Empire. It is this event, the murder of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife Sophie Chotek, in Sarajevo the capital city of an Austrian-annexed Bosnia, which tipped Europe into war.

There was a close relationship between the various Serbian nationalist movements, and the revolutionary socialism being promulgated by Russian émigrés. This was, in particular, a local (Balkan) manifestation of the racist national socialism being used by communist and anarchist agitators throughout central and eastern Europe – for the purpose (as mentioned previously) of accelerating the destruction of the European Imperial states.

A mentor to Princip and his fellow conspirators was a person by the name of Vladimir Gacinovic. It is recorded that Gacinovic was behind the nationalist movement Young Bosnians, as well as being involved with other groups including The Black Hand, and Narodna Odbrana. He is known to have been in regular contact with émigré Russian revolutionaries in Austria and Switzerland – as well as direct, personal contact with Leon Trotsky whom he met in Serbia and in Paris. He was also closely connected to a previous plot to assassinate the Austrian Emperor Franz Josef in 1910 (by another Serbian nationalist by the name of Bogdan Zerajic – a fanatical follower of the Russian anarchist Prince Peter Kropotkin).

In January 1914 a close personal friend of Princip by the name of Danilo Ilic made the hazardous journey to Switzerland to talk of assassination plans with Gacinovic. Accompanying Gacinovic were a number of prominent (but unidentified) Russian revolutionaries. After the meeting Gacinovic travelled to Toulouse in southern France where (in the Hotel St. Gerome) he met with other members of The Young Bosnian movement, including another of Princip’s co-conspirators by the name of Mehmed Mehmedbasic. It was

at this meeting that assassination weapons were given to members of the assassination gang (although not the weapons that were actually used to kill the Archduke).

Just a few days before the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand two of the co-conspirators, Gavrilo Princip and Danilo Ilic, wrote a letter to Vladimir Gacinovic, briefing him in regard to the progress of the assassination plot. An account of this correspondence was sent by Gacinovic to Leon Trotsky in 1915.

In the subsequent trial one of the principle conspirators (Nedjo Cabrinovic) told the court how he had been inspired into being an assassin by the “*socialism and anarchism*” of Russian revolutionaries.

The consequence of the assassins’ action was the “*bloodshed on a colossal scale*” that (presumably) will have delighted Lenin. What followed was a war that resulted in the deaths of more than 13 million Europeans (including one million Britons), the obscene horrors of the Red Terror and, perhaps rather inevitably, the growth and entrenchment of the evils of Stalinism and Hitlerism – and the horrors of a second war in Europe some 20 years later.

Between Two Evils

In Britain, at the beginning of the 20th Century, there was never any realistic prospect of the revolutionary socialists creating a ‘peoples’ revolution’. There was little likelihood of foreign revolutionaries stirring-up feelings of either class enmity or of racial/ethnic divisions – certainly not within mainland Britain.

That does not mean to say, however, that political movements, based on exploiting class or ethnic difference, were absent from the domestic political scene. However, again, those movements had very little relevance to the history or circumstances of the native British people.

However, British politics was not totally uninfluenced by the growth of racialist national socialism within continental Europe. The Poale Zion organisation was introduced into Britain in 1906 by Russian émigrés, following the failure of the 1905 revolution. This particular political organisation became highly influential in the development of the British Labour Party and Trade Unions movement, and was largely instrumental in the introduction of racialist political ideology into the UK.

Other attempts were subsequently made to introduce party-political representation of the Fascist and Communist movements into Britain – but only with limited, transitory success.

It is in this context that it is especially insightful to examine the general reaction of the ‘ordinary’ British people, in the period following the end of The Great War, to developments of political ideology occurring within continental Europe. These particular ideologies, and the reasons why they received such minimal support from the general British population, clearly requires some examination.

In the years following the Great War the racialist content of revolutionary socialism expanded to form the basis for the eugenics movement – of the interventionist social strategies intended to ‘improve’ the human race. The principles of eugenics were to find strong support within Marxist intellectual elite within Britain (and especially within the Fabian movement). The interests of the early 20th century Marxists in the eugenics movement illustrates the close connection between their views of society to that later developed by the Nazis.

A parallel development saw a more aggressive approach to racialist national socialism – of the assumed moral right of ‘a people’ to acquire territory (or a ‘homeland’) or to expand territory already held.

The rise of Hitlerist national socialism incorporated extreme versions of both of these political philosophies – of the supposed racial improvement of the population by the removal of ‘inferior races’; and of a *Lebensraum* policy to justify the seizure of territory for population migration and expansion.

Most significantly these were people of the same elitist intellectual class that were later to be in utter contempt of any demonstrations of British patriotism by the working-class – especially when that working-class patriotism took the form of rejecting Communism, or fighting Nazism.

Those historians working *within* the English working class have found a people in possession of a powerful sense of patriotism. For example the writer Michael Collins notes that, in the inter-war years, native Londoners (the Cockney, costermonger community especially) would respond to the marches and rallies across the full spectrum of the revolutionary socialist movement (from fascism to anarchism, and anything in between) with resounding choruses of “*Rule Britannia, and Land of Hope and Glory*”.

The British working class had little time (or patience) for these funny ‘foreign’ ideas on politics – they had a love of tradition and were intuitively suspicious of the contrived theatrical posturing, and the

intellectual arrogance, associated with such ‘foreign’ nonsense. However the truth of the matter did not seem apparent to the ‘intellectual’ political elite. Michael Collins observes: “*The champions of communism and fascism appeared to be oblivious to the ‘Englishness’ of the English working class*”.

Even in the late 1930s, when there was growing alarm at Germany’s militarization and bellicose politics, the communists in Britain were hard at work undermining our defences. There were reports, for example, of the sabotage of Royal Navy ships in the dockyards of Plymouth, Portsmouth and Gibraltar. In 1936 the committed communist John Salisbury was dismissed from the Dockyard at Devonport, Plymouth for his involvement in the sabotage of Royal Navy warships.

Therefore observations made at the time, in particular at the start of the Second World War, reveal the reality behind the public face of these imported political ideologies (of the various branches of revolutionary socialism). For example the essayist and journalist George Orwell noted that the “*pro-Fascists – those to whom the idea of a Hitler victory had great appeal – included not only Mosley’s followers, but also the Communists*”.

Such historical truth effectively gives lie to the mythology created by the present day Marxist propagandists where, almost invariably, a fabricated history is used to conceal the treachery, the venomous hatred, and the Anglophobia that underpinned much of the historical development of revolutionary socialism.

It is this historical truth that contemporary ‘progressives’ are so uncomfortable with – that the 450,000 British men, women and children who gave their lives in the Second World War were engaged in a patriotic cause. They sacrificed their lives for *their* country and for *their* people. They most certainly did not die fighting for, or against, any imported political belief. It was a desperate fight to defend our country and to keep us free – a grim war of survival against a foe driven by a most terrible and evil purpose.

The situation at the beginning of the war is summed up in an especially insightful way by the writer and historian Nick Cohen: “*When the Second World War began, Britain faced a hot war against Nazi Germany and its supporters, and a cold war against the communist Soviet Union and its supporters. On Moscow’s orders, British communists tried to rally as many people as possible from the wider left to the new cause of going along with Hitler. ... The communists instructed their fellow travellers that the ‘real enemy’ was Churchill and his Labour colleagues in the wartime coalition cabinet. It was against them that the public meetings, propaganda, strikes and demonstrations were directed as the communists and their allies pushed their support for Stalin’s alliance with Hitler as far as they dared.*”

In January 1941 The British Communist Party sponsored a ‘people’s convention’ at the Royal Hotel in London, in which the 2,000 delegates voted for a ‘People’s Peace’ with Germany. In that same month the communist newspaper, The Daily Worker, boldly proclaimed that: “*The legend of an anti-fascist war is dying*”. Therefore for the communists in Britain it was an opportunity for defeatism, appeasement and sabotage. It is difficult not to see such defeatist behaviour as giving encouragement to Hitler to launch his attack against Russia.

Nick Cohen was clearly appalled to observe the attitude of the intellectual elite: “*Strikes and protests followed. Eric Hobsbawm and Raymond Williams, the two most respected left-wing intellectuals of my [Cohen’s] youth, accepted the accommodation with Nazism and produced a pamphlet that defended the Soviet invasion of Finland which the Hitler-Stalin pact had authorised.*”

It is interesting to note the claim by the journalist Stephen Glover of the response that the same Eric Hobsbawm gave in an interview by Michael Ignatieff on BBC2’s Late Show in 1994, when asked whether the ‘radiant tomorrow’ promised by Stalin would have justified the loss of 15 to 20 million people. His chilling reply was (reportedly) a simple “yes”.

In 1998 Eric Hobsbawm was made a Companion of Honour by the New Labour government.

The irony is that the Nazi ideological view of nationalism – including the seizure of territory for ‘a people’ – is rooted in the same political strategy developed by Russian revolutionary socialists some thirty years previously. There is the same reference to racialist national socialism, the same subordination of the individual to the State, the same brutal obsession with modernism and ‘progress’, and the same enthusiasm to use extreme (murderous) violence against political opponents.

The ideological links between Marxism and Nazism are fundamental. The political philosopher Freidrich August von Hayek examined those persons (mostly philosophers and politicians) whose work in the immediate period following The Great War is generally credited as providing a rationale for the

emergence of Nazism. In particular he observed the close connection with Marxists' thinking (of, for example, Werner Sombart, Johann Plenge, Paul Lensch, and Friedrich Naumann) and of authoritarian state socialism (of, for example, Oswald Spengler, and A Moeller van den Bruck).

For the British communist elite, the war was not a matter of defending the people but, instead, an opportunity to exasperate class divisions, frustrate the war effort and indulge in various seditious activities – comforted by the knowledge that, with the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact in place, Stalinism (at least) was safe.

It was in these dark times (for Britain) that the British communist movement was working hard to undermine the war effort. For example, Cyril Russell, a worker for the aircraft manufacturing company Supermarine, whilst advising on production problems at the Spitfire factory in Castle Bromwich, reported on bottlenecks on the aircraft assembly lines being orchestrated by left-wing extremists to delay the output of vitally needed aircraft – adding that he believed such action “bordered on treason”. This was certainly not an isolated incident.

It was only after Russia was forced into the war, by the Nazi invasion (in June 1941) that the communists, *en bloc*, decided the war was not, after all, a war between ‘Capitalists’. It was simply redefined as a struggle to decide which particular brand of national socialism (Stalinism or Hitlerism) should triumph in Europe. The primary concern was the defence of Stalinist Russia, not England.

The English Problem

It is therefore in terms of ‘the English problem’ that the development of politics in Europe, in the aftermath of The Great War, needs to be examined.

In his analysis of the origins of Nazism, Hayek reveals a crucial observation: that not only were the origins of Nazism that of Marxism and socialism, but that much of the initial development of Nazism was built upon a particular loathing of English people and of English political culture (of 19th Century liberalism, in particular). Two important aspects of this political history must therefore be recognised: firstly the origins of Nazism to be found in the ideology (and the application) of Marxism; and secondly the contempt for the English that is to be found in *both* Nazism and Marxist revolutionary socialism.

In the particular case of Britain, the revolutionary socialists have historically faced something of a dilemma. Not only were the indigenous working class disinclined to engage in ‘class war’ but Britain was constituted in such a way that made efforts to promote racial/ethnic divisions (with the possible exception of Ireland) effectively impossible. The British mainland, with its settled indigenous population, and an absence of territorial disputes, was simply not susceptible to such forms of political agitation. The British working class were far more interested in self-improvement – albeit with help from the more enlightened (and altruistic) members of the other classes. As Roger Scruton has pointed out, it was: “... *the churches, chapels, schools, institutes, friendly societies, youth clubs, cadets, brass bands and temperance societies which did the job without the condescending help of intellectuals*”.

This meant that there was no realistic prospect of Marxist intellectuals inciting either class or racial/ethnic conflict. However things were to dramatically change in the decades following the Second World War. The encouragement of open-ended mass immigration into Britain provided the ‘progressives’ with the opportunity they craved. It was taken as an opportunity to incite and exploit a sense of victim-hood and grievance – to destabilise and destroy a society, and to dispossess a loathed people of their land.

That this is, in fact, the true political purpose of ‘managed’ mass immigration has now been substantiated by testimony from former Government advisers to both the Prime Minister and to two Home Office Ministers. The claim of the net economic benefit of mass immigration has been exposed as the lie it always was. Instead we learn of a Government abandoning its primary role of protecting our borders and allowing people to freely enter the country – with some of those people having the most appalling of histories (including terrorism in parts of Europe and the Near East, and genocide in sub-Saharan Africa).

It is therefore no surprise to see the far-left ‘following the script’ – of presenting the recent history of the British Isles as a struggle of the ‘minority ethnic communities’ against a supposedly threatening native (English) majority. The emphasis is portrayed as a need for a mobilisation of people from a small (but rapidly increasing) ethnic minority against what it vigorously portrays as a violent, malevolent, and degenerate native population.

In the latter half of the 20th Century, and especially in the last ten years of the Labour Government, we have seen the ‘progressives’ (revolutionary socialists) introducing a variant of Hitlerism into British

politics. This is racist politics based not on a hatred of Jewish or Slavic people but on a particular hatred of the ‘white’ people (the pejorative term used for the English) – and hence with a historical link to the political philosophy of a Marxist-originated, racist-based form of revolutionary socialism.

The Government’s mass immigration programme is a form of racist politics that has the purpose of imposing racial ‘enrichment’, whilst surreptitiously laying the institutional foundations for genocide against the native aboriginal population.

We have therefore seen the ‘critical whiteness studies’ of the US being metamorphosed within the UK into a ‘progressive’ ideology that generates comments on the “*unhealthily white*” parts of the country, of the “*mongrel*” English being referred to as “*knuckle-draggers*”, “*Neanderthals*” and “*gorillas*”. The dehumanising of a people makes the eventual disposal of those people (as an ‘inferior race’) seem not only acceptable, but desirable.

This demonisation of the ‘white’ people (the English) has been a feature of political discourse within this country for the last fifty years. This racist agenda is now an entrenched part of government, of law enforcement, and of the hatemongering activities of the vast (and highly lucrative) social engineering industry. It is now thirty times more likely for members of the ethnic-minority population to commit violent racist attacks against a ‘white’ person than vice-versa. This is *not* the fault of ethnic minority people – it is the disturbing consequence of the fear and loathing being deliberately whipped-up within the ethnic minority communities by the constant anti-white propaganda of the political elite.

The ‘progressive’ politics, that now rules 21st Century Britain, is fundamentally that of an internationalised version of 1930s Hitlerist socialism. The demonisation of the native population is intense and relentless. The State policy is that of reverse-*Lebensraum* – of the dispossession of a native people of their land, by means of mass immigration, and by the effective destruction of all indigenous culture and native institutions.

Genocide

Genocide is defined as: “the deliberate extermination of a people or nation”.

The progressives’ loathing of the native British is a visceral (but well concealed) hatred of an independently minded people – a people who have been stubbornly resistant to demands for engagement in ‘class war’, and unwilling to be subjugated to either European, or global, totalitarianism.

The question is this: how in less than a half a century did the perceptions of the native, British working class (in particular) change from charitable understanding to that of hostile loathing? The historian and writer Michael Collins asks specifically: how did “*the ‘natural goodness’ of most of the inhabitants*” become turned around in the latter half of the 20th Century into a demonisation of the white working class?

One part of the answer is quite straightforward. It is a strategy with a purpose. The purpose is that of disconnecting a people from their land, of destroying the indigenous culture, and of destroying any sense of nationhood or sovereign identity. The political purpose is to destroy those long-established homogenous communities that stand in the way of an authoritarian ‘new order’, ‘modernism’ and ‘progress’.

The fundamental long-term goal of ‘progressive politics’ is therefore to make the native British people the subject of hate – to portray those people as ‘sub-human’ and therefore more easily disposed of (and replaced). It provides an *a-priori*, ‘politically correct’ rationale for genocide-by-stealth, ably assisted by traitors drawn from the victims’ own group. Resistance to this process is countered by the conditioning of the native mind (especially that of young English people) into believing that they deserve to be hated, and are fully deserving of this particular fate.

The Trotskyite vision of a *supra*-national world has this racist agenda. It is a political device, *selectively* used to ‘fictionalise’ ethnic identity and native entitlements of the English, so that those native entitlements can be denied and the people can (without protest) be eliminated.

The *supra*-national socialists are not merely wishing to be rid of the stubborn, independently minded English, but are already engaged in preliminaries to that objective. The method is that of gradualism – of the introduction of social change that has one very clear objective. That objective is the effective destruction of the English nation and of the English people.

The political elite is using mass immigration with the particular purpose of making the English a minority in their own land. In 2001 the native English comprised approximately 84 percent of the total population. It is estimated that by 2029 this will have fallen to less than 60 percent. This will be as a consequence of an additional 7 million non-native people arising from net immigration (equivalent to seven new cities the size of Birmingham). This process is augmented by a below-replacement birth rate for the English, and substantial emigration of English people seeking refuge in other countries.

It is very clear from current trends that by the middle of the century the native English will have become a minority in their own land. The English nation, as 'a people' in occupation of their land since at least the late Bronze Age, will have effectively ceased to exist.

It is vitally important to consider the circumstances of an English minority, in the context of a projection of current developments within the political State. What are the English people likely to be faced with?

A reasonable approach is to extrapolate on current trends. We can therefore expect a highly authoritarian State to exist, where the protections against State tyranny provided by an ancient Constitution have been effectively abolished. These protections will have been replaced by an assumption of the supremacy of the State, by the State. The police service will have become a heavily armed paramilitary force, with the primary purpose of protecting the State. There will be total and continuous State surveillance of the population. And all *effective* means of expressing dissent will have been outlawed.

The question is – what then? What will happen when a non-native majority find they have been granted the absolute power of a fascist State? How will they dispense that power, having been subjected to decades of political indoctrination that not only denies the English people the rights of native entitlement (or even an identity) but also caricatures the English as being a threat to social stability and to 'progress'?

Perhaps we should look at contemporary events for answers – to examine those cases where a settled majority (native) population have found themselves reduced to a minority, following politically or religiously motivated mass migration. What do we see of the circumstances of the Palestinians or the South Sudanese (of Darfur) for example, after the seizure and occupation of their lands? What lessons are to be learnt?

No doubt the present political elite will, in their treasonous deliberations, have given this matter a great deal of careful consideration.

Resistance by Lawful Rebellion

On the 15th June 1215 the Great Charter of Liberties (*'magna carta communium libertatum Angliae'*) was agreed between King John and the rebellious Barons of England. This Charter effectively ratified the supreme constitutional principles of: firstly, that the State exercised governance only with the full consent of those it governed; secondly, the right of the governed to invoke lawful rebellion was conceded formally by the State; and thirdly, that these fundamental rights extended *for all time to all* of the English (the *'communa tocius terre'*).

The Great Charter, codified by us, the English people, gave the principles upon which the Resistance may be pursued. Article 61 of the Charter provides for the action of lawful rebellion. It refers to "*communa tocius terre*" (all the people of the land, the English) - and does so in terms of Article 1 of the document, with specific reference to "*all freemen of the realm*". This Charter is still Law. It has *not* been repealed since it is not within the power of Parliament to set aside agreements between the people and the Monarch.

Our present system of government (of Parliament) is the consequence of this ancient and exemplary act of *lawful rebellion*. Parliament cannot therefore undo or deny to us our Customs and Constitution – and it cannot lawfully destroy the sovereign *Community of England* without committing the ultimate act of treason and betrayal.

Not only must The Great Treason be opposed and stopped - it must also be *undone*. The United Kingdom Government has, over the last one hundred years, conspired to become a treasonous assembly and Parliamentary dictatorship. Parliament has acted with malice towards the English. It makes unlawful Statute for the purpose of giving life to its treason – and to suppress dissent. The members of this wretched assembly are oath breakers. Parliament has betrayed those English people who have given their lives to defend this sovereign *Community of England*. This is The Great Treason.

As members of ‘a people’ – of the descendents of the first people of this Island – we have a natural entitlement to self-determination. And, as descendents of those that gave us, a free people, our Constitution and Law, we have also an irrevocable right to declare *lawful rebellion* against a malevolent and authoritarian State. The State must be answerable to the English people – to the people of the *Community of England* – or suffer the consequences as a treasonous assembly.

The Magna Carta is unambiguously a Charter for the freedom of English people. Clearly it does *not* provide a warrant for *anyone* resident in England to engage in rebellion (Magna Carta, Article 51). It does not extend to the traitors (obviously), nor to the traitors' collaborationists and auxiliaries.

The right of self-determination – of the native entitlement of the people of Britain – is reflected in Constitutional Law. And not just in Magna Carta. For example, the Act of Settlement 1700 (section 3) states: “*That after the said limitation [of succession] shall take effect as aforesaid no person born out of the kingdoms of England Scotland or Ireland or the dominions thereunto belonging (although he be made a denizen) (except such as are born of English parents) shall be capable to be of the privy council or a member of either House of Parliament or to enjoy any office or place of trust either civil or military or to have any grant of land tenements or hereditaments from the Crown to himself or to any other or others in trust to him*”. This is still Law.

The objective of the Lawful Rebellion is therefore to end the Great Treason; to bring the traitors to account; and to undo the harm done to us by those people.

Lawful Rebellion has the authority of native entitlement; of precedent set in ancient Constitutional agreement; of Natural Law; and of a powerful moral argument. Lawful Rebellion is an act of lawful resistance against an unlawful and treasonous State.

END

Abbreviated Bibliography

- Barrett, Hilaire 'Constitutional and Administrative Law', Routledge-Cavendish, Abingdon 2009
- Burleigh, Michael 'Blood and Rage – A Cultural History of Terrorism', Harper Collins, London 2008
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) World Fact Book 'The United Kingdom'
- Cohen, Nick 'What's Left – How The Left Lost Its Way', Harper Perennial, London 2007
- Collins, Michael 'The Likes Of Us – A Biography Of The White Working Class', Granta Publications 2005
- Cracknell, D G 'Constitutional and Administrative Law', Routledge-Cavendish, London 2009
- Figes, Orlando 'A People's Tragedy – The Russian Revolution 1891-1924', Pimlico, London 1997
- Glover, Stephen 'Why Do We Honour Those Who Loathe Britain?', The Daily Mail, 7th March 2009
- Goldberg, Jonah 'Liberal Fascism', Penguin Books, London 2009
- Hayek, F A 'The Road to Serfdom' – essay on 'The Socialist Roots of Nazism'
- Hindley, Geoffrey, 'The Magna Carta – The Story of The Origins of Liberty', Constable & Robinson, London 2008
- Home Office reports on 'Race and Crime' (2000 to 2007) published under sect. 95 of the Criminal Justice Act 1991
- Howard, Michael 'War in European History', Oxford University Press, 2009
- MI5 archive files, ref. KV 2/2497-2501
- Migration Watch, 'briefing paper 3rd February 2009'
- Orwell, George 'The Lion and The Unicorn', 1940-1941
- Porter, Bernard 'The Absent-Minded Imperialists', Oxford University Press, 2004
- Rappaport, Helen 'Conspirator – Lenin in Exile', Hutchinson, London 2009
- Scruton, Roger 'England – an Elegy', Pimlico 2001
- Smith, David James 'One Morning in Sarajevo', Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London 2009
- Thomas, Donald 'Freedom's Frontier', pub. 2007, and in particular Chapter: Total War – The Home Front.
- Treason Act 1351 (25 Edw. 3 St. 5 c.2)
- Treason Felony Act 1848 (11 & 12 Vict. c.12)
- Ziegler, Philip 'London at War', 2002