

Q&A

What exactly is the definition of integralism?

The definition of integralism is to perceive the world and society as a whole as an organic unity, like one big machine wherein all parts must work if it is to work at all, is the basic fundamental principle. It is the new iron reformist creed of the modern era simply means a Britain which is more balanced, comprehensive, interconnected, and whole. By using an Integralist approach--whether it's in business, personal development, politics, art, education, society (or any of dozens of other fields)--we include reality, realism and our humanity, in order to become fully awake and effective in anything we do... "Integralism" is not only a "theory of everything," but involves new ways of governing, working, creating, guiding, educating and interacting in a complex and evolving world--it's a worldview for the 21st Century

What is the Aim and Purpose of the Integralist Party?

In our struggle are vested various irrevocable functions which will be carried out. The first is to function as a political movement, even though electoral success will be a hard task under the tyranny of liberalism, at the moment our greatest task is to create an organisation that can maintain our high ideals, an attempt at establishing a culture in the United Kingdom which will preserve the British spirit, uplift society for the better, stamp out individualism and instil in society the mentality that a healthy cohesive collective society working for one common goal can only bring positive gain to society . In this time of social and economic decay, we need a rebirth of our former strong British society. Which is driven by something deeper than greed and personal gain, we are going rebuild a Britain worthy of it's past so that Britain may once again be called great.

Who can join the party?

There are a few prerequisite conditions, firstly you must be a British subject ideally living in the United Kingdom, over the age of 16 and in your own heart be keen to absorb our knowledge and ideas. Beyond that anyone is entitled to join regardless of race, gender, or class, and will not be subject to any form of prejudice.

Who do you ideally appeal to?

In our task we speak not just for ourselves but for but the hundreds of thousands who fundamentally long for the same thing, but lack a unifying political force and ability to put into words their inner longing. From the outset we must appeal to the strongest element of this, the politically aware, dispossessed and betrayed, to fill a niche of dedicated and active party workers. We are appealing to radicals on all areas of the political spectrum, or outside politics altogether who can be bound to our ideals, we are not planning on selling ourselves out to the ignorant and wrongly contented masses as of yet

What is the party make up?

Already the party membership is incredibly diverse containing students, workers, all social classes, the old and the young. And people from all ethnic and social, religious backgrounds.

In short what would you do if you ever came to power?

Establish a unified national community with a restored sense of duty, patriotism and nobility. Form the corporate state to govern the economy, and make Britain strong independent and free. Heal our sick culture and build a great society based on British tradition for a greater future. Get tougher on crime and start long term solutions to the problems Britain will face in the future.

What are the roots of integralism?

Our ideological and philosophical influences come from many key stains of thought which emerged during the late 19th, and early 20th centuries and to an extent still continue today. Our earliest conception dates back to the pioneering ideas of the founder of sociology and functionality ideologue Emile Durkheim. For he saw society as an organic unity held together by civilizing institutions, believed that every aspect of human life was ultimately a product of society as a whole. We combine this with the existentialist philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, who conceived the idea of the 'Übermensch' or 'superman' as a solution to the failures of religion, the death of god he believed would hail in a new age of great men built around great civilizations. We thus fuse these two philosophies as a union in which the individual is one of self abdegnation to the service of the national community to become strong, empowered civilized and great. Politically we admire some of the social, ideological, political philosophies and regimes during the 20's and 30's, people like Giovanni Gentile, Gabriele D'Annunzio, Mussolini, Plínio Salgado, Oswald Mosley, António de Oliveira Salazar's ("New State"), government that presided over and controlled Portugal's social, economic, cultural and political life from 1932 to 1974. Austrian Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuß (*Vaterländische Front*) assassinated by Nazi agents in 1934 also José Antonio Primo de Rivera's pre war Spanish Falange, not forgetting Ioannis Metaxas Prime Minister of Greece during the 4th of August Regime, from 1936 until his death in 1941. We accept that there were some deviations within these regimes; we are however, honest in evaluating them, in order to learn and progress. Whatever their mistakes, we acknowledge their contribution to our modern philosophy. As well as fusing ourselves with economic corporativism we also have taken influences from intelligent philosophical ultra conservatism, social communitarianism and populism of 'integral traditionalism'. It is on these great ideals and traditions we are categorically resolved to found our movement.

Why do you not mention Brazilian integralism as an influence?

Because we are not influenced directly by them, but the leader of the Ação Integralista Brasileira, Plínio Salgado is an inspiration to us. Any similarities are a coincidence and we basically only share a common name which we use as well.

How can you possibly defend fascistic regimes?

We fully acknowledge the setbacks and moral, physical atrocities committed by some of these governments, even Italy, the only true fascist state we cannot endorse because of its racial laws introduced in July 1938 which was a blatant attempt to appease Hitler. People do not take into account what a destabilising force Hitler was, the standards of the time and not to mention the disgusting levels of post war propaganda and falsehood surrounding fascism. What most people understand of this is more than often misguided fallacy. We do however do what most modern communists by contrast do not, that is accept the past as our own so the same mistakes may never again be repeated.

Are you connected to National Socialism in anyway?

No, absolutely not.

What about Democracy?

What Democracy? At present the people have no Democracy, Democracy rests in the hands of vested interests and International Finance. We intend to change that. Where is the 'Democracy' in having to vote between a shortlist of two or three candidates, all of whom are more or less the same, all corrupt, lie through their teeth for your vote and are debased to the lowest common denominator. Further more when the party comes to power they are utterly stifled and unable to enact the policies they were voted in to carry out. Liberal democracy is a system of unlimited talk and inaction. We advocate a pure form of democracy based around the leadership and policy of individual candidates, whereby power is given to the people by arming the government the power to act! The only way in which the will of the people can be carried out is through a Leadership which they choose for the purpose of governing the nation, a leadership through which the will of the people can be effective. This may sound like dictatorship but this would be a far better replacement to the present Dictatorship of Vested

Interests. In addition the high rate of apathy today demonstrates the failures of democracy, not all Britons are philosophers, and the same can be said for politicians themselves. We need to end party politics, end sectional interest, and unite Britain under a common goal. At the lowest level, you would in many cases have more say in how your daily life is run. In addition to still being represented by your local mp, the corporate state would give a democratic choice on things relevant to you and your job, i.e. all the workers of the steel corporation would be able to amend bureaucratic problems concerning work wear, pay, breaks, and how things are run, ect. Within the corporate state all would be represented, giving voices to otherwise silent 'working' groups such as housewives ect.

What about Freedom?

The fundamental ideal of liberty has allowed a few irresponsible individuals the 'liberty' to acquire most of the nation's resources and create a financial globalist tyranny. True Freedom we believe can only be won when chaos will end and for freedom to exist there need to be the set conditions for it to exist. We believe that freedom can only be preserved through the regulation of freedom. Freedom itself is in itself a fixed set of values to try and ensure the fundamental basics of a happy human life decent living standards, employment, fair pay and hours, leisure, security, family, are all ideas we fundamentally believe to be the right of all Britons, so by safeguarding those by cutting down that which masquerades as freedom. When we talk of freedoms we are talking on two levels civil freedoms and economic freedoms. The latter we have made ourselves clear on.

What about civil freedoms?

It is our fundamental belief that in private the individual is free to believe in and express whatever they want to, that is within in reason (nothing criminal) and your ideas may be expressed through the single party. What people want to think, feel and do in their own homes on a personal level is entirely up to them and they are given full liberty in private. It is expected that in the public domain people conform to the core principle of endorsing our high civilization, have absolute loyalty to the nation, and put the needs of the community before the needs of themselves. In public there will be only state sanctioned demonstrations and no civil disobedience, just because it has the word 'civil' in the front does not change the fact its disobedience. In a court of law we continue to use the British system wherein the individual is innocent until proven guilty and maintains his/her full liberty. Political prisoners would be treated with the level of justice required.

And freedom of the press?

It is the same story with Britain's media, the news networks and gutter press; here liberty has translated into tyranny over the minds of our people, a tyranny which seeks to degrade civilization and the human spirit. The media though 'free' would be a part of the corporate state and subject to scrutiny by the civil service, running on the same standards as the BBC to educate and inform, void of bias, the latter of which we will reaffirm.

What about freedom of the arts?

The 'arts' in this country are a sad and appalling testament as well as the single greatest analogy to the failures of liberalism and the dangers of postmodernism. We once had great artists and art in this nation, a high culture, overtime some were given the freedom to deviate, this is sometimes necessary otherwise there is stagnation, but what happened is the lowest denominator became the norm, the entire purpose of art itself is no longer to enrich and inspire but to shock and offend, and that is all new artists can draw from,. Nobody has the right to corrupt the fabric of civilization at the expense of community. It is also a testament to liberalism itself, the power of the brand, the art itself is of no value, it is who spawned it what is being exchanged is an idea, as synergy an association, nothing of depth. We seek to once again reaffirm what is great and worthless, to have arts worthy of our people.

What about consumerism?

Another aspect is "consumerism" and the empty vacuous ignorant society that Britain has become. Our values within the Integralist creed are of promotion of culture, the arts and philosophy. Wealth should not be measured just by what you have in your bank balance, but in the wealth of your Society, cultural enrichment, duty to nation and loyalty. These will only be engrained when our history is properly explained, and citizens realise collective responsibility to nation. Individualism has only bred selfish, weak and cowardly citizens who walk by when they see someone attacked on the street, for fear of becoming a victim themselves. What use are so-called "luxury items" if they are to be taken by burglars anyway, would you not rather be able to walk down the street safely and take your children to the park without fear of meeting muggers or drug-addicts. Integralism will empower our nation, and challenge this selfish, ignorant, alien, money grabbing individualistic, Me Me Me society, that consumerism promotes and in doing so develop Society worthy of the name!.

What about the monarchy?

We seek to uphold the monarchy for its historical traditions and symbolic representation of British civilization which has awed the world and embeds itself deeply in our laws. Over the years the monarchy has been an invaluable asset at home and abroad so in recognition of this we also seek to return to it its dignity. It is in Britain's interests that the head of state remain a non political and untarnished body and we seek to stifle the mercenary and degenerate media from preventing the royalty from doing its job. It however must be seen that we do not consider the queen to be holy as such; in our vision for society she merely performs a function as noble as the lowest artisan, pulling her bit in the first amongst equals. As such the royal family, their assets and privileges would be fairly scrutinised by the civil service, in place of the trial by media which the royals currently endure, in our character of fairness, pride and unity.

What will you do with the House of Lords?

The present House of Lords is an anachronism that testaments the failures of liberal democracy. It was originally intended that the House of Lords broadly represent industry and culture as a professional and experienced institution to assess the feasibility of policy. In early days the Peers owned the land, which was the only industry, Today the House of Lords is full of mewling career politicians and financial bandits who have paid their way in. we favour replacing the party appointed lords with technical experts and professionals capable of doing the job they are give, captains of industry, union leaders, scientists, judges, doctors, ect encompassing the technical aspects of all policy respectively. A system that runs effectively without pandering to the tired ancient ideas of classical liberalism and social democracy

How can the British people ever be united politically?

Whatever preconceived values any given person may have they are still inexorably tied to human values that go beyond concepts of left and right. It is only the silly traditions of failed ideologies which have split the country into pieces, remove these sectionalist ideas, and that's how you unite a nation politically. We of course may never be able to appeal to everyone; the political classes, indoctrinated career politicians perhaps may have to suffer a functional state but for most people they will see a vast improvement they did not know they were entitled too.

British people are not patriotic any more

It does not matter how much the flag is dragged through the mud, to have a pride and a calling is an integral part of human nature. This is reflected in the fact that British nationalism, has been replaced by identity politics, pride in petty factors which make you think you're more special than others. Such pride is weak and wretched and lacks the vast wealth of the British tradition, the latter prevails only because liberalism removes the notion of the superior and inferior and markets the lowest denominator.

Are you concerned about the racial makeup of this country?

We are but only from an empirical approach, that is, we acknowledge the problems caused by racial tensions and multiculturalism in society as a product of liberalism and reverse racism. That will end under us, but we have no particular fetish towards any specific group. So long as a group conforms to the reasonable tenants of our vision for society, there is no problem. However this is the United Kingdom and as with any other nation in the world the indigenous peoples should always remain a clear and unquestionable majority.

What about multiculturalism?

Multiculturalism, a fairly popular and modern notion from the school of postmodernism is the single greatest threat to the western world. It is in essence doctrine of intrinsic values that the free exchange equal values with no understanding of superior an inferior. This means that the core values of Britain is that we accept all values, which really means we have no core values no civilization, multiculturalism denies us the basic right of a national community. It should therefore be understood that this has little or nothing to do with race and ethnicity, that's multi racialism, so we cannot be said to be racist. One of the problems with a large immigrant population is that it is harder for that group to feel part of our nation if their ancestors had no making in the nation itself, as opposed to the blood of the indigenous population whose blood has been spilt across the earth, the way to unify a nation in this way is therefore the willingness to fight and die for our nation and ideals, Britain has not been static and new legacies must be built for its continued survival.

What are your views on immigration?

All British immigrants we believe must be entirely loyal to Britain, and must be willing to endorse, at the very least the traditions, standards and values of the European tradition and British civilization. We see great social problems bought by conflicting cultures and nationalities, and oppose all self serving multi nationals who wall themselves in ghettos. When we can all truly start to see each other as British, we can progress as a nation. With the exception of few instances when Britain is indebted to the individual i.e. a Gurkha who has fought for Britain, we believe that before even being considered, all potential immigrants of all colours and creeds must want to conform to that ideal, we utterly deny the globalist ideal of moving large numbers of humans around the world like cattle for their own short term profit, whilst immigration itself is permanent, so in short do we support mass immigration absolutely not.

What are you going to do with those immigrants who do not comply?

Those who would insult us by throwing membership of the one of the greatest nations in the world back in our face would be expected to leave. Our request is entirely reasonable and does not infringe on religious beliefs or human dignity, they up to this point have certainly been happy to embrace the socio economic benefits of a wealthy and advanced country for which our ancestors worked for and died. They will be given a simple choice to be loyal to Britain and accept our way of life, or return to their old homelands to which they feel more connected, this is certainly a kinder fate than the one given to ethnic Britons who refuse this, they have nowhere else to go and we have a duty to save them. Those who do wish to stay will be given all the help required and finally embraced by the rest of the new national community.

What is your view on religion?

We believe Religion can have a place coexist with the interests of the nation so long as they do not go against the national interest. Though we do however acknowledge the historical context, continuity and identity, offered by our Pagan and Christian heritage, and whose retrospective achievements and aesthetics will be integral to our national rebirth. We are distrusting of any organisation that claims a higher authority and loyalty to that of ones country. Such organisations not only deny the national community and seek to divide and humiliate us. When a religious organisation or sect, like the current strands of radical Islam, become a sectional group in its own right, it poses the same threat as any form of Marxism and operates in the same way, an international sectional interest that directly opposes the

state and can physically attack it. We believe that to create a unified society, we respect people right to belief but your loyalty to your country must come above all, religious beliefs must come second. This is a view held by most religious people and has how our secular nation has worked for hundreds of years we are simply re affirming this. As we are concerned with the education and invigoration of our people we are also distrusting of any organisation which denies that which is proven fact by science and as in the case of the question of allegiance, seeks to impose its own moral code and truths.

What are your views regarding homosexuality?

We are not 'anti-gay' our philosophy is cohesion in public, liberty in private, so it is not so much 'the act' that we find wrong but the culture which seems to surround it. The identity politics and subculture which have been added to homosexuality are both a neo liberal and neo Marxist constructions (i.e. a combination of consumer culture and sectionalist internationalism). We would never outright ban the practice we simply do not wish pander to the 'needs' of self serving interest groups.

What will you do with the welfare state?

We are above all committed to the well being of our people, will promise to uphold and maintain those institutions which ensure the well being of our people, the NHS, pensions, ect. However we have another fundamental belief and that is the right to employment, work is the greatest claim to civil dignity and nothing deserves more attention from the state than the welfare and well being of our workers.

So what do you actually mean by Equality?

We believe in an equality where no group is persecuted or favoured above another, fully incorporated into the 'host civilization' and representation within the corporate state, so rather than submitting ones self to self serving identity politic, should try instead to adapt to the rest of society rather than demanding society adapt to them, where we believe they are far more likely to be accepted.

Are you Left or Right Wing?

We are neither. Notions of 'left' and 'right' are stale and irrelevant concepts and as we understand them we are utterly opposed to both. Left/right means economic liberalism vs economic socialism, of which we are neither. The left preaches social justice, the right moral justice, centralism or localism, the interests of the people or the interests of the state, we have devised a way in which we can have the best of both. A combination of the social justice, meritocracy, economics, and social unity of the left, combined with the nationalism, statist, social policy and work ethic of the right, qualities we are seeing less and less of. If terms of left and right are outdated then a better term would be centre an anti-centre. Modern political parties are (because of liberal democracy) increasingly debased into a 'serve all' third way system which serves nobody, optimizing the eventual outcome of liberalism; post modern politics, void of all values, to fit an increasingly globalizing world in which Britain is to be enveloped to its eventual doom and the destruction of humanity. We stand on the opposite, the anti-center, for human values and all that is noble and good in politics, right and left, a third way system in our own right.

But don't you think people are happier today because of liberalism?

You think liberalism has made people more happy today? Take a look around. the benefits of the nationally aware and collective mindset are gone, today people are isolated and told to consume until they are content, but they will never be happy, the forces of market capitalism dictate that the lowest common denominator always win out. Feeding this lizard part of our brain is in fact dangerous and unhealthy. And the price of liberalism we have yet to pay, we have merely been taken out at our own expense and literally handed the bill of the second largest public debt on the planet.

Isn't to be self interest just human nature?

People 'can' be self-serving, but this is not a natural or indeed a positive quality. Humans are naturally collective, and the individual only attains significance through that collective. If you look only the crudest and most wretched forms of primitive life survive through serving their interests alone, throughout the evolutionary chain more advanced animals extend this sense of duty to its mate and its young. Those who were altruistic survived, the latter either died out or was especially hardy, this evolution of integral altruism was then extended to the pack, the hunter gatherer tribes, to a kingdom and finally to the nation, the highest calling and in the future we may even go further. We only exist today because of collective thought and society and you as a human being only attain significance through your past, the way in which you are socialised. Genetically there is little that separates you from a human 3000 years ago, but you can clearly read and speak a language, whilst your ancestor in all probability was mostly savage and uncultured.

So you would stamp out individualism?

Quite the opposite, it is plain to see that it is liberalism which has stamped out individualism with its postmodern consumer culture, what is really meant by individuality are lots of weak, isolated people who think they are individuals because of what they wear. What we really mean by 'Individuality' is in fact character. Individual character is the by-product of the predominant cultural conditions and character of a nation's culture, culminated by each person's self betterment to become a greater person. So rather than surrendering sense of self the individual he/ she is merely being empowered with something far greater than themselves and what most prize as our 'individuality' is actually the product of 3000 years of European civilization. What we seek to remove is the way in which individuality is expressed through pure materialism, for instance the inward drive to conform to a counterculture fashion trend such as 'emo', or 'chav' and so forth, in which we see no 'individualism' as this is a negative outward force acting upon the individual. This lowest common denominator damages the greater culture of British civilization which must be protected at all costs to ensure individuality. What we alone can achieve is the balancing of the needs of civilization and the needs of the individual so that they may thrive in unison.

Isn't the corporate state just state socialism?

The corporate state is not run like a national industry, it is a network of local businesses, management firms, Guilds, and national cartels, accountable to and regulated by the state so it serves the national interest. A system put in place to prevent undercutting, extortion and to enforce guidelines that work in the interest of the nation and the people. This is to prevent problems such as undercutting, outsourcing, extortion, corruption etc. The service sector would be run at the lowest level, we believe in small beautiful businesses which benefit the local community, whilst having all the benefits of a chain store.

So you hate capitalists?

No, but it all depends what sort of 'capitalists' you are talking about. To say all businessmen are post modern, self interested, anti nationals who have earned their place through exploitation and swindle at the cost of public life would be utterly wrong. We very much admire those who of their own initiative and for the benefit of the community have built for themselves a business which benefits Britain. It is only those who worship the international money system, are willing to sell their countrymen down the line and denigrate them through exploitation, those who sit idle leeching off the work of others. It is that attitude to business we despise.

How can you claim to bring meritocracy when you are opening up the industrial sector again

It is our fundamental belief that all working Britons no matter how humble their livelihood should be entitled to a decent standard of living. We would in fact see living standards rise. We have lost faith in our own abilities, we who once led the world in quality still have that

genius and ingenuity, we can with the right raw materials, make virtually everything ourselves for little manpower and the high quality our people deserve, our vision for Britain would offer immediate employment for those who are not overqualified and just wish to work. This frees up our strained universities allowing the working class who do wish to study a free education. What you would call meritocracy.

But isn't the outsourcing of jobs in modern Britain necessity?

The ethos today is that there is no point in making or mining or owning things when those things can be bought for a fraction of the price abroad, but the reality is that instead of exploiting this 'advantage' we have become decadent. A laid off factory worker loses the right to a self serving basic existence, he is instead forced into the private sector there they are lost as they are only promoting the decadent standards promoted by consumerism. Now the problem with a bloated service sector it makes Britain criminally vulnerable because it cannot come close to sustaining itself therefore dependent on other countries. There are also long term and ethical considerations to this practice, buying mass produced plastic junk from china made by beaten wage slaves under the yoke of their communist oppressors has not only seen the lives of developing nations around the world but greatly increased the power and influence of rogue states; our dependency on oil has turned Saudi Arabia into one of the richest countries in the world and communist china into the fastest growing economy. Because of the immediate short term nature on which international finance develops the nation it does not take into account the long term problems it brings. The west until recently survived because of its strong service sector which in global terms we have a monopoly on. A strong middle class professional who could render a service to the rest of the world. In particular Britain has benefited from having English as a first language as English is the language of business. Consider then what happens when we grow the economies of developing nations, they will have their own big business and middle class, and we will thus lose significance and with it our only source of income. This process is well under way, in the last few years we have seen key British industries like rover, and the pride of Britain bought out by the Chinese so we have nothing to fall back on. We have grown decadent and weak, even the English language will eventually lose as powers like the US fall and Britain is absorbed into Europe, the language of business will be Chinese and German. Having a bloated service sector is not a benefit either, those with money are more likely to buy into consumerism and spend money like its going out of fashion. Those who don't have enough (which is most of us) have gone into debt adding to our exploding public debt. In international finance you win, you lose (lose in the case of our fake economy), with a home market; you win, no matter what.

So how does an isolated economy work?

Not isolated, an isolated economy is impossible, but to be our own masters, self sustainable so far as we are able and produce our own luxuries would be a huge improvement. So long as we can get the raw materials from abroad at a cheap price we can produce virtually all of our own material goods for little manpower, a greener energy cost, and most importantly at a higher quality which our people deserve. We will acquire these materials by strengthening our ties with the commonwealth which has all the raw materials one could wish for, just because these nations are independent does not mean they have ceased to become colonies. Though we will continue to but some things from abroad we will at the least have an industry to call our own and be proud of again. As for agriculture we will double the size of Britain's arable land and promote a small level of self sustainability in individual families, this should in theory account for 120% of Britain's food needs minus exports and imports of things we cannot produce. We therefore will put tariffs on foreign produce we do not need so that is cannot harm our industries

How are you different to International Socialism (i.e.; SWP, Socialist Alternative, and RESPECT)?

We are vastly different. For an obvious start they are Marxist swine of the worst kind who subscribe to class warfare and sectional interest. It is in particular the Marxist element we are opposed to the internationalism, anti-statism, postmodernism, reckless spending, identity

politics, all the pathetic mewling they do and most of all the hate that breaks the bond between men of the same nation. We refute these idiots who advocate the break up of society, postmodernism ect which we utterly reject, and we also could never accept their socially liberal and ideas and postmodern values. Though we are critics of the capitalist system we should not be confused with socialists just as being adverse to Marxism does not make us conservatives. Beyond the values of the old honest socialism of the early part of the twentieth century which demanded only the conditions to which the workers were entitled by the laws of iron justice, it was sad that their cause was corrupted by conniving literati. These groups have been hijacked by the bourgeoisie and as such are bourgeoisie parties, very much in league with the current dominating force of liberalism.

How are Marxism and Liberalism in league with each other?

Ever since the end of the war there has been a consensus of values between Marxists and Liberals in the form of opposition to all aspects of integral thought and a sort of co existence whereby the center parties agree on cultural Marxism and economic liberalism as the foundation of all politics and is the order of the entire modern world. Like liberalism Marxism is a materialist creed which ignores human values, to see human civilization itself, thus the two degenerate into sectionalist ideals, of only at polar opposites, the staunchest capitalist believes in punishing the under classes for their failure to accumulate wealth just as the staunchest Marxist believes in punishing the rich for accumulating wealth, neither believe in a unified society and short of fighting each other, view any form of order as the greatest threat to their existence as neither would be in a position to corrupt humanity. This consensus they form on is the chaotic postwar ideal of post-modernism, in Marxism its rebirth as identity politics and disengagement from the collective, whilst liberalism focused on the free self made 'individual' in society. Though there are some decent libertarian and classical Marxist elements which reject postmodern ideas by and large it has engulfed these already decadent and corrupt vassals of inhumanity.

What's your view on China

China has always been a bit of a conundrum, even for sections of the left! We believe that we have to be clear that it is a tyrannical, dangerous and exploitative oppressive regime, with a despotic ruling elite who under the guise of the Communist Party are every way as self serving as ruling elites everywhere. China today is an integral part of world capitalism, providing cheap goods and labour for international multi-nationals. Vast profits are made by these companies making everything from toys, domestic products to clothing. Much of this work done by impoverished child-labour. This is always conveniently ignored when these products are imported. So much of our domestic industry has been lost to this global "outsourcing". It is sad that only lip service is made by western governments with regards to human rights abuses, because at the end of the day the profits of the multi-nationals are more important than the rights of Chinese child labour! You only need to look at the Beijing Olympics to realise what an excellent opportunity is being given to China's elite to promote their oppressive state. The Olympics will still be used to promote under the usual brand names Nike, McDonalds etc all of the products peddled by the multi-nationals to line their unprincipled pockets! We must therefore, expose the regime for what it is, while at the same time, expose the hypocrisy of international money interest who continue to invest in this politically vile country. Our Integralist principles are based upon a higher ethos than grubby profiteering from child sweat shops, and our Nation should not trade with such a discredited regime, for by doing so, we only validate its very existence!

What is the new man?

The new man (and woman if the latter is to be taken literally) in society will be the model citizen; rich in character, will, integrity, wisdom and stability, and uphold of the nation through duty, self-abnegation, and even self-sacrifice in its cause.

How are you different to other Nationalist parties (i.e.: BNP, NF, BPP)?

We differ from the prevalent strand of British nationalism on several key principles. The first being our ideological depth, our conviction and our creed which drives us, whilst the BNP for example favours 'white nationalism' a degenerate, sub-cultural, corrosive ideology which buys into liberalism, believing the liberties taken by immigrants can only be matched with greater privileges for the ethnic Britons the whites, without questioning the system itself, it can be seen that ex National Front, BNP leader Nick Griffin has renounced the Ideology of Otto Strasser in favour of the tactics of the Church of Scientology. The BNP refutes the idea that we can make 'black Britons' for example, and that the problems in Britain are not due to the hows and whys of immigration itself but the racial stock of the immigrants they believe that races are naturally brought into conflict and cannot co exist whatsoever.

Isn't your ideology dead? British nationalism has clearly had to evolve

In the immediate post war world it was impossible to espouse our ideas as most of the public was understandably suspicious, not to mention brainwashed by propaganda. Post war national politics had to renounce all its ideological depth, its core values and its genius, in favor of perusing single issue ideas like immigration, with the unspoken motive of those ideals. In quite a short space of time those single issues and ideas became the driving force itself and a new reasoning was found in the form of white nationalism, thus the nationalists today splutter as gormlessly, shallow bigots smitten with liberalism. This is because modern nationalism is more inclined towards Nazism, which arguably shadowed fascism itself in the thirties as a center of political power and from which all modern nationalist politics can be boiled down to. For 50 years the national parties of Britain have not only achieved nothing whatsoever and failed to prevent the horrors that have befallen our country. But they have if anything empowered the enemy by giving them legitimacy by tarnishing the opposing argument. No, the time has come again we must establish the creed Britain has sought ever since the first world war, the lies will not matter, such a parody has been made of fascism that it is completely unrecognizable, now people will be forced to consider the written truth so only on those great ideas can we establish ourselves.