



British Democratic Alliance

Your Nation, Your Choice, Your Future

info@britishdemocracy.co.uk
Membership support:
membership@britishdemocracy.co.uk
www.britishdemocracy.co.uk

Public Statement

Purpose and Context

The paper, published by [Restore Britain](#) (a political movement founded by Rupert Lowe MP), presents a detailed policy framework advocating the mass deportation of all people living illegally in the UK. It aims to demonstrate that such a programme is both *legally achievable* and *operationally deliverable* if existing domestic and international legal constraints are amended or repealed.

Part 1: Overview.

Structure

The document runs to over 100 pages and is split into two main sections:

1. Part I – Legal Obstacles

- Reviews the laws and treaties that currently limit mass deportation.
- Argues for their amendment or repeal.

2. Part II – Practical Logistics

- Details how deportations would be conducted at scale within two to three years.
- Sets out estimated numbers, infrastructure requirements, and cost projections.

Key Legal Proposals

The authors assert that mass deportations are blocked primarily by “man-made” legal mechanisms and therefore *can be changed by Parliament*. They recommend:

- (a) Repealing or amending major UK laws such as the Immigration and Asylum Acts (1999 & 2002), Borders Acts (2007 & 2009), the *Equality Act (2010)*, and sections of the *Illegal Migration Act (2023)*.
- (b) Withdrawing from the *European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)* and repealing the *Human Rights Act (1998)*.

- (c) Removing references to the *UN 1951/1967 Refugee Convention* from UK legislation and restricting asylum to people arriving *directly* from bordering safe countries, effectively scrapping the current asylum system.
- (d) Creating a “*Great Clarification Act*” to override judicial interpretations viewed as blocking removals.
- (e) Re-empowering the *Lord Chancellor* to control judicial appointments and discipline judges seen as “activist”.

Operational and Logistical Plan

Part II outlines an intensive deportation programme:

- (a) Estimates 1.8–2 million people living in the UK illegally.
- (b) Proposes 150,000 to 200,000 forced deportations per year, combined with a “hostile environment” to drive voluntary self-deportations at a 3 or 4-to-1 ratio.
- (c) Predicts the removal of all illegal migrants within two to three years.
- (d) Calls for a seven-fold expansion of immigration-detention capacity to about 15,000 beds, at an estimated cost of £5.7 billion.
- (e) Recommends using RAF aircraft, chartered and scheduled flights for deportations.
- (f) Suggests *biometric e-visas*, data-sharing across government, expanded *Right-to-Work* and *Right-to-Rent* checks, and closure of bank accounts lacking valid immigration status.
- (g) Proposes ending “safe surgeries” in the NHS, requiring proof of status for treatment, and denying homeless services to illegal residents.

Foreign and Diplomatic Measures

- (a) Introduces the concept of “*Deportation NATO*” – a coalition of willing States to accept third-country transfers.
- (b) Revives offshore processing similar to the Rwanda scheme.
- (c) Suggests visa or remittance sanctions on countries refusing to repatriate nationals.

Tone and Framing

The paper’s tone is *technocratic and combative*. It repeatedly describes illegal migration as an “unarmed invasion” and a “catastrophe” undermining national sovereignty. While it presents detailed logistical modelling, it adopts highly assertive language about “restoring Britain’s borders” and reclaiming “national survival”. The authors

acknowledge the scale of political and legal upheaval required, arguing that these are “trade-offs” Parliament must make in the national interest.

Conclusion

The document concludes that:

- (a) Parliament has the full constitutional authority to legislate for mass removals if it chooses.
- (b) With sufficient investment, coordination, and “political will”, the entire illegal-migrant population could be removed within a single parliamentary term.
- (c) This would, in the authors’ view, restore “public confidence” and be the first step in a wider campaign to “restore Britain”.

Part 2. Balanced Assessment

- (a) **Analytical merit:** The paper is highly detailed in legal and logistical structure; it reads like a white paper rather than a manifesto leaflet.
- (b) **Political character:** Despite its academic tone, it is ideologically firm, advocating systemic legal repeal and a nationalist realignment of UK migration law.
- (c) **Practicality and proportionality:** Implementation would entail major constitutional reform, international treaty withdrawal, and unprecedented operational capacity, all contentious and unlikely to gain consensus support.

In summary:

The *Restore Britain* paper is a meticulously argued yet deeply radical proposal to make the UK’s immigration framework wholly domestic, remove international legal restraints, and carry out mass deportations within a few years. Its legal reasoning is detailed, its operational planning extensive, but its assumptions about legality, diplomacy, and feasibility are highly contestable and politically polarising.

While the document is written in legalistic and administrative language, its underlying purpose is unmistakably *ideological rather than pragmatic*. It frames illegal migration not as a policy failure to be resolved through better governance, but as a *national emergency* demanding exceptional powers and the suspension of long-standing legal norms.

Several features reveal its more *far-Right orientation*:

1. **Collective blame and scapegoating.**

The tone repeatedly conflates individual illegality with a wider “invasion” narrative. Migrants are portrayed less as people subject to law and

circumstance, and more as a homogeneous existential threat. That rhetorical shift converts administrative failure into an imagined act of aggression, which justifies extreme remedies.

2. Authoritarian legal reform.

The call to withdraw from the ECHR, repeal the Human Rights Act, and curb judicial independence is not simply administrative streamlining, it is an attempt to remove institutional checks on State power. History shows that when such safeguards are dismantled, they seldom stop with one group; *everyone's* Rights become contingent on political mood.

3. Moral absolutism and emotional appeal.

The paper dresses outrage as principle, insisting that its measures are a moral necessity to “save Britain”. Yet it offers little evidence of proportionality, feasibility, or humanity. It substitutes rhetoric for fact, appealing to sentiment rather than sober policy analysis.

4. Deflection of political culpability.

By depicting migrants as the root cause of social and economic strain, the paper conveniently obscures decades of mismanagement by successive governments of all parties. Infrastructure shortfalls, weak enforcement, and inconsistent asylum processing are bureaucratic failures, not migrant conspiracies.

It is a technically structured but politically radical text - a manifesto for State overreach wrapped in the language of restoration. It proposes equality only in the sense that everyone would lose protection from arbitrary power, and it uses migrants as the emotional vehicle to achieve that end.

The paper does not offer a practical or sustainable solution to the underlying issues of migration, integration, and governance. It identifies some genuine problems, such as weak enforcement, poor data coordination, and public frustration at government inconsistency, but it then applies doctrinaire, punitive measures that would create far greater problems than they solve.

Its central failings can be summarised as follows:

1. Policy Myopia.

The proposals treat migration as an isolated problem rather than a symptom of wider global, economic, and political factors. It ignores the EU's labour market demands, climate migration, post-colonial obligations, and the UK's own dependence on migrant labour in essential sectors such as health, logistics, and agriculture.

2. Ethical Erosion.

By normalising mass deportation and legislative withdrawal from international law, it abandons Britain's long-standing commitment to human Rights and

humanitarian responsibility. The paper fails to reconcile its proposals with the UK's historical role as an architect of the very conventions it now seeks to discard.

3. Operational Fantasy.

The logistics, deporting millions within two or three years, are beyond the practical capacity of any modern democracy. It underestimates costs, overestimates compliance from foreign States, and disregards legal appeals, public resistance, and international backlash.

4. Social Consequences.

The approach would deepen alienation among immigrant and minority communities, entrench xenophobia, and further corrode civil discourse. Instead of restoring confidence, it risks fuelling instability and division across an already fragile society.

5. Political Misdiagnosis.

The paper diverts public anger from government ineptitude toward a powerless scapegoat. It ignores the administrative chaos, inconsistent legislation, and chronic under-investment in border management that successive governments have allowed to fester.

In short, the document represents *rhetorical nationalism disguised as reform*. It would neither fix the migration system nor strengthen the nation. Instead, it would erode Britain's moral authority, deepen social fractures, and amplify the very extremism it claims to counter.

What the paper represents is indeed a form of *Right-wing moral absolutism*, a belief that the State can and must take extreme action to "restore" a perceived moral or national order, regardless of legal, ethical, or humanitarian limits. This worldview does not emerge from sound governance but from *ideological certainty*, where moral conviction is used to justify the erosion of liberty.

Part 3: Social Fascism and Moral Absolutism.

We must distinguish this from the much overused "Nazi" label. While the term has become a political shorthand, it obscures the much broader tradition of *authoritarian conservatism and exclusionary nationalism* that ran through the twentieth century to the modern day. The document's tone and reasoning share traits common to those regimes:

1. Moral absolutism.

It treats dissent as weakness or betrayal. The proposed measures are presented as the *only* Righteous path, and opposition is framed as moral corruption or national treason.

2. **Legal instrumentalism.**

Law is viewed not as a framework to protect all citizens equally but as a tool to enforce ideological purity. This mirrors the logic of many regimes that saw constitutional Rights as obstacles to “national renewal.”

3. **Collective vilification.**

Instead of targeting specific offenders or policy failures, it defines a broad social group, in this case, migrants, as the source of decline, moral decay, or insecurity. This is the same mechanism used by countless authoritarian movements to forge unity through exclusion.

4. **Centralised authority and judicial subordination.**

The call to re-empower the Lord Chancellor over the judiciary and to remove external legal checks is textbook authoritarianism. Once legal independence is gone, every citizen becomes vulnerable to arbitrary State power.

5. **Emotive restoration narrative.**

The rhetoric of “restoring” a lost greatness or moral clarity has been a hallmark of authoritarian propaganda throughout the twentieth century. It replaces constructive reform with nostalgia and fear.

So, while not “Nazi” in the historical sense, it belongs to the same *continuum* of authoritarian political culture: one that sanctifies State dominance, erases nuance, and defines morality through obedience.

In essence, it is the politics of certainty without conscience, the belief that the end justifies the means, even if those means corrode the very civilisation they claim to protect.

Addendum 1:

Left and Right are opposites of the same entrenched narcissism and fear.

Moral absolutism and social fascism are not confined to one end of the political spectrum. They are methods of control, not ideologies in themselves. Both the far Right and the far Left, when untethered from restraint and accountability, converge on remarkably similar behavioural and structural patterns.

The outward narratives differ, one speaks of *national purity*, the other of *social justice*, but the machinery underneath is identical.

Here are the shared traits:

1. **Centralised moral authority.**

Whether it’s the “will of the people” or “the revolution of the workers,” both extremes claim exclusive moral legitimacy. Anyone who questions the doctrine becomes an enemy, of the nation on the Right, or of the people on the Left.

2. **Suppression of dissent.**

Both see freedom of expression as dangerous unless it aligns with their ideology. The Right brands critics as traitors; the Left labels them as reactionaries or bigots. In both cases, dissent is pathologised rather than debated.

3. **Control of language and thought.**

Authoritarian movements, Right or Left, attempt to regulate what can be said or even thought. The Right does it through censorship and nationalism; the Left does it through linguistic policing and ideological purity tests. Both rely on social intimidation.

4. **Erosion of individuality.**

Both extremes subordinate personal freedom to collective dogma. The Right demands loyalty to the State; the Left demands conformity to the collective good. Either way, the individual becomes expendable.

5. **Instrumental use of fear.**

The Right cultivates fear of outsiders; the Left cultivates fear of oppressors. Both manipulate insecurity to mobilise obedience.

6. **Moral absolutism.**

Each side believes it holds the sole moral truth. This eliminates empathy, compromise, or self-reflection, the very qualities that sustain a democratic society.

In short, *authoritarianism wears many colours but speaks one language — certainty.*

The ideological polarity is superficial; the deeper reality is the pursuit of control through moral coercion. Whether it marches beneath the banner of nationalism or equality, once it begins to punish thought and demand obedience, it has crossed into the same dark territory.

Addendum 2: Left, or Right?

The Left and the Right are not as far apart politically as many claim, they just attack social problems from opposite ends of a morality string that ultimately meets in the middle, removing the Rights, freedoms and soul of a nation. neither have moral high ground to cling to, both attack anyone who does not agree with or follow their dogma. Both demand obedience to the State, both require absolute loyalty with draconian punishment for those who do not adhere to their "view" of obedience. The only practical difference is that Right wing regimes allow free enterprise, in fact encourage it, as long as it works within their world view, whereas the Left believe the State is the only one who can control everything properly and thus bans free enterprise, for the most part, and demands all profits from any enterprise go the State. Neither system benefits any society, as history has shown. Both create paranoid government systems and paranoid

societies, both suffer economic fragmentation and invariably collapse, and in many instances, internal violence. Both are systems of governance to avoid.

The political extremes of Left and Right *ultimately circle back toward one another*, forming not a line but a loop. At their farthest points, they are ideologically indistinguishable in practice, regardless of the slogans they use. What differs is *the language of justification*, not the result.

Your description of the “morality string” is particularly apt. Both claim to embody virtue, one through moral purity, the other through social justice, yet both end up weaponising morality to silence dissent and centralise control.

To unpack this point further:

1. Two routes to the same destination.

The far Right demands obedience to the State for the sake of national strength; the far Left demands obedience for the sake of collective equality. In both cases, individuality is sacrificed for the “greater good”, and those who question authority are condemned as traitors or reactionaries.

2. Economic illusion.

- As noted, the Right permits enterprise only when it serves the State’s agenda, a form of corporatist capitalism where business and government become partners in control. The Left, conversely, replaces enterprise with bureaucracy, redistributing control through central planning rather than market dynamics. The outcome is the same: *power concentrated in the hands of a few*.

3. Erosion of liberty and trust.

Both systems breed fear and conformity. Surveillance, censorship, propaganda, and punishment become tools of stability. Citizens learn to self-censor; institutions become instruments of dogmatic ideology rather than guardians of truth.

4. Psychological consequences.

Paranoia becomes endemic. People distrust their neighbours, their press, their police, even their own words. When truth becomes a political commodity, reality itself fractures - and society soon follows.

5. Historical consistency.

From Franco to Stalin, from Mao to Mussolini, the pattern repeats. Each begins with promises of renewal, justice, or strength, each ends with repression, corruption, and decline. The banners differ, but the wreckage is the same.

Both systems are to be avoided. Real civilisation must live in the space between - where principle and pragmatism balance each other, where dissent is valued as a civic duty rather than condemned as heresy, and where the law serves the people, not the ruling ideology.

It takes enormous maturity and restraint for a society to hold that middle ground. Extremes are easy; balance is hard. Yet only balance preserves freedom.

Addendum 3: The Psychology

The tragedy lies in our psychology. Humanity is drawn to certainty, belonging, and moral validation, all of which extreme systems promise in abundance. Both far Left and far Right ideologies thrive on *moral absolutism*, the comforting illusion that there is one correct way to live, think, and govern. It satisfies emotional needs but crushes intellectual humility.

Here are the key reflections this point touches:

1. The illusion of moral superiority.

Every authoritarian regime believes it is acting for the “greater good”. Whether cleansing the nation or liberating the people, the end is always noble, at least in theory. The horror begins when morality is no longer a compass but a weapon. Once leaders see themselves as moral saviours, cruelty becomes virtue, and repression becomes protection.

2. The death of individuality.

Both extremes reject the idea that individuals should think, act, or choose for themselves. The citizen becomes a tool for ideological fulfilment. Yet, true civilisation depends on the freedom to err, to dissent, and to differ, precisely the freedoms these systems eradicate.

3. Fear disguised as virtue.

Much of what appears as moral conviction in such systems is actually fear: fear of chaos, difference, or loss of control. People trade liberty for security, truth for comfort, and conscience for conformity.

4. Self-destruction of the State.

By enforcing purity, these systems eventually devour themselves. Bureaucracy becomes paranoid, leaders lose touch with reality, and citizens either rebel or disengage. The result is social decay, not strength, not unity.

5. The failure to learn.

Humanity’s greatest tragedy is its short memory. Each generation inherits the wreckage of ideological extremism, swears it will never repeat it, then builds the same machinery with different slogans.

It is an indictment of the human condition that we still fall for these illusions. Perhaps the only moral high ground worth claiming is the refusal to stand on any ideological mountain at all, and instead to walk steadily on the plain of reason, compassion, and humility. That is where freedom truly lives, not in dogma, but in pragmatic balance.