



BBC MEANS BLATANT BIAS CORPORATION part 2

You cannot talk for long to a group of Welsh nationalist without becoming aware that at least one of their motivations is that, in what was the Kingdom of Mercia there are now more coloured people than there are Welshmen in Wales, and this is not what they joined when union with England was declared. With real Scottish nationalists, not the socialist variety, it is not just unemployment: Scotland has had unemployment for more than half a century. It is the disgust the Scotsman feels when he journeys to London, in terms of decadence, race-mixing, pornography, anti-patriotism, and a general abuse of the concept of Britain itself, which has fired him to no small degree. Which much to his disgust, the BBC has taken the greatest pains to emphasise and nourish.

It is however at the political extremes that bias becomes the most blatant, particularly in regard to the International Socialists and Trotskyites on the one hand and the National Front on the other. They should each be given air-time in proportion to their support in the country. It is a fact that whenever they have stood in the same election, the National Front has achieved between three and five times the poll of the International Socialists. Do you imagine they have had three to five times the coverage; or that they have been covered so sympathetically? Moving from the political to the social realm, the same sort of situation applies.

In discussing the economic failure of this country, it is quite ridiculous to pretend that we are not grossly over-populated, and have further exacerbated this problem by massive immigration since the end of the Second World War. It is dishonest and thoroughly dangerous to ignore its effects in causing unemployment in this tiny island, which has one viable acre for every two and a half acres the Frenchman has, not only in terms of farming but in mineral wealth as well.

How often have you heard the BBC mention that at the turn of the century this country was putting in place subsidies to enable people to emigrate because our population, which stood at thirty million, was considered too large to accommodate. Between the 1920's and 1970's up to 150,000 British children over the age of three were deported to the colonies. This was sometimes done without the consent or even the knowledge of their families. This movement started at a time when Britain was a major manufacturing country, and both industry and farming were both labour intensive. Today immigration has pushed that figure to around 60 million. It is absolutely mandatory, when considering unemployment, and indeed, the economic failure of the country as a whole, to see it in the geo-political terms inherent within it. Why has this never been detailed? The answer of course, is that it might "offend the racial minorities" or might "lead to racial tension". Hence this constant application of soothing ointment to what is, and has long been known to be a cancer in our country.

It may appear very humane to let in Ugandan Asians, Somalis, Jamaicans, Nigerians and people from all over the earth's surface who happen to want to come here for one reason or another; but how humane is it to import them into a country which can never absorb them? Where is the humanity shown towards the British? Immigrants and their children have no conceivable future other than at the expense of the destruction of the indigenous population. This is a point of view well backed by all historical precedent, and for which a clear case can be made. It is entitled to be heard every bit as the opposite case.

In the nineteenth century public bodies were allowed complete freedom of expression except in regard to sex, atheism and sedition. Over years the BBC has become obsessed with the once taboo subjects of sex, perversion, atheism and sedition. It is precisely the line of least resistance, always adopted by the compassionate man of the centre that in thirty years has prevented this country from taking any hard decisions which were absolutely crucial if it was to survive. The BBC bans the transmission of the most crucial facts of the day. One is alarmed that small groups of people with their own political agenda are able to dictate what the BBC is allowed to produce and broadcast. Censorship by this corporation which only permits the transmission of viewpoints which are already rejected by a massive proportion of the populace would in a dictatorship be as impracticable as it would unacceptable. It is indeed a sad fact that no dictator could ever hope to get away with what the BBC has been getting away with for decades.

During the summer of 2017 the BBC was promoting the "queer-gay" agenda every day to a tremendous degree. Although it is supposed to be the **British** Broadcasting Corporation, politically it primarily serves the interest of Zionists, communists and queers.

What the BBC board seems totally unable to grasp at any level, is that it is not its function to have a position or a viewpoint about anything. It should broadcast an honest and fair assessment of whatever it is reporting. Quite apart from the morality of the question, it is very doubtful whether it has personnel in quantity of the calibre to form judgements for the Nation State. However distasteful the BBC may find the fact, they are the servants of the Nation, not there to censor popular views or act as spokesmen for some would-be World Government consortium. If this sinister World Government nightmare becomes a reality, the BBC will have played no small part in its fulfilment. In the meantime let it earn its corn as what it is - the servant of the British people, bound and severely limited by its Charter.

BBC history and political programmes are often made to twist the truth to show events how they would like them to be and not how they are. As for fictional historical drama we simply shouldn't allow it. History is no longer taught in schools as it once was. All that is taught is a distorted version of the second-world-war. It is bad enough that most of our people know little of our history from the Saxons to the Victorians, so confusing them with pure fiction of our past simply shouldn't be allowed.

During the summer of 2017 the BBC was promoting the "queer-gay" agenda almost every day to a tremendous degree. Although it is supposed to be the British Broadcasting Corporation, politically it primarily serves the interest of Zionists, communists and queers. There are many African countries that insist on keeping to their traditional beliefs and rejecting homosexuality due to it being undesirable. The US based money power is putting pressure on them by withholding loans and preventing them from marketing their produce to try and force them to comply.

When Donald Trump talks about "fake news" no organisation is more guilty of transmitting it than the B.B.C! Over the years it has been known as "The Blatant Bias Corporation" and the "Bum Boys Club".