

## Proscribing National Action:

Allen, Chris

DOI:

[10.1111/1467-923X.12368](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12368)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Allen, C 2017, 'Proscribing National Action: considering the impact of banning the British far-right group', *The Political Quarterly*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12368>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: Allen, C. (2017), Proscribing National Action: Considering the Impact of Banning the British Far-Right Group. *The Political Quarterly*., which has been published in final form at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12368>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## **PROSCRIBING NATIONAL ACTION: considering the impact of banning the British far-right group**

In a landmark decision, the British far-right group National Action has been labelled an extremist organisation and subsequently banned by the British Government. Following an order laid before Parliament in December 2016, it is the first time in British history that membership of a far-right group has been outlawed. Proscribed under the Terrorism Act 2000, the legislation enables an extremist organisation to be banned if it: commits or participates in acts of terrorism; prepares for terrorism; promotes or encourages terrorism (including the unlawful glorification of terrorism); or is otherwise concerned in terrorism<sup>i</sup>. In a Governmental statement, the Home Secretary Amber Rudd said National Action was proscribed on the basis that it was 'concerned in terrorism': "[National Action] is a racist, antisemitic and homophobic organisation which stirs up hatred, glorifies violence and promotes a vile ideology. It has absolutely no place in a Britain that works for everyone...proscribing it will prevent its membership from growing, stop the spread of poisonous propaganda and protect vulnerable young people at risk of radicalisation from its toxic views"<sup>ii</sup>. Consequently, it is a criminal offence to be a member of National Action, invite support for it or help organise any meetings connected with it. If found guilty of doing so, the maximum sentence is up to ten years in prison which can also attract or be replaced by a suitable fine. Six months in prison and a fine of up to £5,000 can also be given for wearing clothing, carrying symbols or displaying articles which suggest support for the group.

Prior to the group's proscription, the British media widely reported that the catalyst for the ban was a link between National Action and Thomas Mair, a long time far-right sympathiser who was given a whole-life sentence in November 2016 for murdering the former Labour Member of Parliament (MP) for Batley and Spen, Jo Cox. Shooting her twice in the head twice and once in the chest, Mair stabbed the MP 15 times while shouting "This is for Britain", "keep Britain independent" and "Britain first"<sup>iii</sup>. While the latter led some to link Mair to another British far-right group, Britain First, his link to National Action emerged following the group's decision to alter its listing on Google to "Death to traitors, freedom for Britain". This was the statement Mair made when first appearing in court. The *Sunday Times* newspaper also cited a number of tweets as evidence of the link between National Action and Mair including "#VoteLeave, don't let this man's sacrifice go in vain. Jo Cox would have filled Yorkshire with more subhumans" and "Only 649 MPs to go"<sup>iv</sup>. The Government however explained that the impetus for proscription was that National Action's online propaganda and social media content frequently contained extremely violent imagery and language adding that the decision was made before Mair's trial.

Unsurprisingly, National Action refutes any claims of being an extremist organisation. Self-identifying as Britain's premier Nationalist Socialist street movement, it argued that it merely sought to create a space for young nationalists "to network, engage socially and be creative"<sup>v</sup>. Stating that it neither sanctions nor condones terrorism, National Action described any claims which sought to link it to terrorism as an act of "extreme ignorance and retardation". It explained that any tweets being referred to were deliberately and maliciously misrepresented suggesting that "even the cutting edge humour regularly employed by members of our youth group...may go over the heads of some people". While so, it is difficult to ascertain how accurate such statements might be given how little is known about National Action. This article responds to this lack of knowledge by providing an

overview of National Action's origins, its ideology and activities before concluding with an analysis of the potential impacts of the group's proscription.

## National Action's Origins

Like much of Britain's far-right, National Action's origins are rooted in the *British National Party* (BNP). Having unexpectedly made relatively significant mainstream political inroads in the mid-2000s, the BNP's former leader Nick Griffin believed this to be the result of his positioning the party to take advantage of the wave of public hostility shown towards Muslims and Islam<sup>vi</sup>. However as the group went into decline – noting how the fledgling far-right street movement, the *English Defence League* (EDL) sought to capture the anti-Islamic zeitgeist - Griffin was known to lament the decline in traditional nationalism in preference of populism especially among Britain's youth. With his leadership increasingly tenuous, Griffin gave impetus to the Party's youth activists within the *Young British National Party* (YBNP) in the hope someone emerged to take control in order to halt the decline of the BNP's popularity as also its disappearance from the political landscape. Constrained by the BNP's old guard however, a number of those young activists began to look at alternative outlets for their political ideology and aspirations. One such group was *Resistance*, a new nationalist group that was established by former YBNP leader Kieran Trent and activist friend, Matthew Tait. Despite subsequently failing, *Resistance* came to the attention of another former member of YBNP, Alex Davies and Bognor Regis-based Ben Raymond, both of whom became acquainted via social media and their respective bemoaning of the failings of the BNP. They, like Trent, Tait and Griffin agreed that Britain's nationalist youth movement needed revitalising.

According to *Hope Not Hate* (HNN), Raymond was influenced by the British far-right's intelligentsia or *New Right*<sup>vii</sup>. Exploring the writings of the *New Right*, Raymond in conjunction with Davies believed that for a nationalist youth movement to be successful in Britain, so it would be necessary to de-stabilise the existing old guard. As a first step, Raymond and Davies began to differentiate between what they deemed 'good' and 'bad' forms of nationalism. In the 'good' they placed far-right stalwarts such as the *British Democratic Party* alongside those Raymond and Davies believed were slightly more 'flawed' including the *National Front*, *Blood & Honour* and Oswald Mosley. The *New Right* were also classified as good. In the 'bad' were the BNP and EDL among others. As regards the latter, it is interesting that Raymond and Davies saw them as inherently flawed in that they were perceived to be pro-Zionist and damaging to the nationalist cause because of the drunken and loutish behaviour of their supporters<sup>viii</sup>. National Action emerged soon after in 2012 with a manifesto boasting the goal of establishing a white homeland in Britain alongside the need to be antagonistic towards 'bad' nationalists.

Despite having originally positioned the group within the intellectual tradition of the far-right, National Action increasingly drifted towards direct action. According to HNN, this saw Raymond and Davies demand its membership become increasingly engaged in provocative and violent activities<sup>ix</sup>. HNN suggest this began with the group's targeting of university campuses (Cardiff, Manchester and Wolverhampton were referred to on the group's website) before shifting its focus to city centres where greater social impact and media attention was likely. This shift also coincided with National Action adopting an increasingly confrontational approach towards other far-right groups. An example

of this occurred in Rotherham in 2014 when a group of National Action's supporters came into conflict with a group of EDL supporters they saw the latter carrying Israeli flags. Claiming other far-right groups to be 'an embarrassing memory', Raymond claimed around the time of the EDL conflict that "in the six months since our first public demonstration National Action has succeeded in turning a web based idea into an authentic real world organisation"<sup>x</sup>. Indeed, National Action's support continued to grow. Some of this was down to Davies' recruitment of the YBNP's remnants but the reality was that it was primarily down to the increased media attention the group was receiving. To this extent, HNH suggest that National Action are today the most dominant force within the British far-right.

## Traditionalism over Populism

National Action claimed on its website that "there is nothing clandestine about our operation or intentions as everything we do is public and publicised". As it states therefore, ideologically it is a National Socialist movement. Such a declaration breaks with trends evident within the British far-right over the past decade or so. Take for instance the EDL and Britain First. Despite both being charged by observers that are neo-Nazi inspired, the leadership of each categorically refute such claims. It is because both would be perceived to err towards populism over traditional nationalism that National Action confronts as also demarcates itself from the EDL. To this extent National Action represents a far more traditionalist expression of Nazi ideology than many of its peers within the British far-right milieu. In fact, National Action actively distances itself from all forms of populism showing a particular distaste for those who vote for the *UK Independence Party* (UKIP). Stating that UKIP is as cowardly as other mainstream political parties, National Action openly state that the only way to ensure racist or nationalist views are brought into the political mainstream is to support those "not afraid to swing the bat at the enemy"<sup>xi</sup>. Being those not afraid to swing the bat, National Action's ideology can be positioned within traditional Nazism here elements of ultra-nationalism, racism, Anti-Semitism, disablism, homophobia, anti-liberalism and anti-capitalism are all readily apparent. Unsurprisingly, they also incorporate traditional symbols of Nazism within their publicity and demonstration materials while also glorify Hitler and the achievement of the Third Reich. To better understand this, some of the more prominent elements of National Action's ideological positioning are considered below.

Traditional nationalist notions of race are readily evident within the ideology of National Action. Hinting towards Aryanism and white supremacy, the group routinely speak about the need to 'save' Britain, 'our' race and 'our' generation if they are to establish a 'white Britain'. Resonating with Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, National Action argues that there can be few objections to advocating the rights of Britain's 'own' (a substitute for 'white') to reclaim their soil and purify their blood to become strong again. For them, this is necessary to reverse history's humiliation of Britain's forgotten white victims, exacted upon them by other races and validated by 'white' traitors. For them, this is generally evident in the abuse experienced by all white Brits and more specifically, in the rape and murder of white women. Using 'our' to speak on behalf of those perceived victims, National Action claim they are the only ones prepared to fight and overcome this humiliation. While violence or at least struggle is undoubtedly inferred, National Action is quick to distance itself from inciting hatred or encouraging violence against minority or racially-identifiable groups. Focusing on

whites as victims is a useful tool in this respect; focusing on whites as opposed any racial group enables the group to go some way towards rhetorically navigating the legislation relating to race hate and incitement. While this may be so on National Action's website, the materials it distributes at demonstrations – which can be easily disposed of – are at times somewhat more explicit. One example is a leaflet stating: "Cleanse Britain of parasites. The white man is on the march – white power"<sup>xii</sup>.

Jews and Judaism feature significantly in the ideology and rhetoric of National Action. This was evident in an interview by Davies: "I don't want to say what I'd like to do to Jews – it's too extreme". In line with traditional Nazi ideology, Jews are seen to be a mixed race that has infiltrated multiple level of contemporary society through which they exploit and oppress Aryans. Demarcating National Action's penchant for traditionalist rather than populist expressions of nationalism, the group's focus on Jews is again exceptional in that over the past decade and a half in Britain, the far-right's ire has largely been directed at Muslims and Islam and the threat posed by them. While National Action has participated in some counter-jihad demonstrations, there is hardly any evidence of a distinguishable Islamophobia within its ideology. Not only does this further demarcate National Action from those such as the EDL for instance but so too does it give some insight into how it believes that elements within the far-right milieu have become corrupted. Responding to the fact the EDL had a Jewish division, National Action's leadership assert that "weakness on the Jewish question is simply unforgivable, ignorance is inexcusable"<sup>xiii</sup>.

Traditionalist understandings about homosexuality are also evident within National Action's ideological positioning. While less explicit and voracious than its overt anti-Semitism, an extremely distasteful banner on the group's website gives some insight into its view towards homosexuals. Featuring a cartoon image of two men having anal sex, the banner has the rainbow flag routinely associated with LGBTQ communities and causes superimposed over it. This is flanked by two posters: one of *Stonewall's* employing the strapline, 'Some People Are Gay, Get Over It'; the other, a National Action poster emblazoned with the phrase 'No Tolerance'. Stamped across this is the statement "100% Anti-Pederast Action". While clearly expressing a lack of tolerance for homosexuality – Davies has called for re-introducing Section 28 legislation which prohibited teaching about homosexuality in schools – the poster juxtaposes pederasty with homosexuality to unfoundedly infer the two are indeterminably linked. Doing so resonates with a theme that has become something of a cause celebre within the British far-right, notably the organising of demonstrations and protests in locations where there have been 'paedophile' and 'grooming gang' scandals. Popular with the EDL's support as also those such as the *North West Infidels*, it is possible that this juxtaposition was intended to attract a wider, nationalist appeal.

In the same way homosexuality is seen to be undesirable within traditional Nazi ideology, so too is disability. While there are no overt references to the extreme ideological views or measures evident say in Nazi Germany, National Action does still express a clear rhetorical distaste for different mental and physical conditions. In this respect, throughout National Action's website the group repeatedly use offensive terms relating to various conditions and impairments to insult its critics and opponents; slurs such as 'retard', 'nature's rejects' and 'fucktard' being just some examples. In another example, National Action described its opponents at one demonstration as being 'autistic'. Such disablist insults were also routinely used in conjunction with an appellation which stressed notions of abnormality. For example, having referred to its opponents as 'retards', it went on to

clarify that the opponents were in fact 'hysterical retards'. Another term that was regularly deployed was that of 'subhuman'. Whilst it has connotations relating to disability and impairment, it was also a term that was deployed as a catch-all for all those not deemed to be included in the 'our' or the 'normal'. The term subhuman also has a long and deplorable history within traditionalist Nazi ideologies.

Finally, National Action's view of gender also resonates with traditionalist Nazism. Typically advocating women be confined to the public and private spaces in preference of the political, traditional expressions emphasise the reproductive role of women as exemplified by a 1935 speech by Hitler: "with every child [a woman] brings into the world, she fights her battle for the nation. The man stands up for the Volk, exactly as the woman stands up for the family"<sup>xiv</sup>. As regards National Action, while it espouses the desire to recruit women into the movement a very traditionalist ideological position is also clearly evident albeit in a somewhat bizarre form. This was most apparent in a competition it ran that was titled, Miss Hitler. Young women who wanted to enter were required to submit photos of themselves along with answers to a handful of questions. It was in these answers traditionalist ideological expressions became clear. For example, A\_BUS\_FULL\_OF\_RETARDS said that "without women who share our beliefs, we wouldn't be able to bring up the next generation of National Socialists"; EVA BIN GASSIN wrote how "The survival of our race depends on women like me"; LADY OF THE LOLOCAUST declared that women needed to have "lots of children"; and GALLOPING GESTAPO added, "I'm pretty old fashioned when it comes to women's values, I believe a woman's role is at home raising children". Despite being unclear whether these views were common across all of the entrants or whether they had been selectively identified by National Action's hierarchy, it is true to say that while the group sought to promote a progressive public face in terms of the recruitment of women, underpinning this would appear to be an unashamedly traditionalist ideology.

## **Demonstrations and Stunts**

National Action self-refers to itself as carrying "out demonstrations, publicity stunts, and other activities in order to grow and spread our message, that of National Socialism". Similar to the EDL in this respect, both would see their supporters congregate and march through a certain location while carrying banners and flags bearing slogans and symbols related to their organisation. Where some difference would be evident would be in terms of numbers of participants; while the EDL regularly attracted low thousands to its demonstrations at the height of its popularity, National Action rarely attracts more than 50. Nonetheless, these activities can be intimidating to those around them especially when they culminate in violence either between different far-right groups or with anti-fascist protesters. There is some distinctivity to National Action's demonstrations however. Most notable is how its supporters typically wear all black streetwear-type clothing. Reflecting its youth demographic, one image on its website shows a group of its supporters at a demonstration carrying banners and flags while wearing Nike branded clothing. Alongside this is the company's swoosh logo and marketing phrase, 'Just Do It'. Aside from its obvious youth fashion appeal, National Action's penchant for all black clothing also alludes to the autonomist nationalist subculture, one which seeks to replicate the aesthetics and tactics of the far-left. Also distinct is how National Action asks its supporters to refrain from drinking and taking drugs. Differentiating itself from the 'sheepdom' it attributes to other far-right groups, National Action argues that given its demonstrations are serious any socialising should come after. With both the clothing and request for sobriety, it is also evident

to see National Action wanting to differentiate from the flawed elements of the British far-right milieu.

In terms of publicity stunts, one of National Action's earliest saw 20 activists protest outside the South African embassy in London after which the group marched to Westminster's Parliament Square to put bananas in the mouth and hands of Nelson Mandela's statue. Similar stunts have included organising 'White Man' marches in Liverpool and Newcastle and taking selfies doing 'Seig Heil' salutes in the Buchenwald concentration camp. Undeniably, the most important function of these stunts is the publicity they attract. National Action acknowledged the value of this: "if you are seeing this website for the first time it is probably because you have read or seen our activities [in the media]". One stunt which attracted significant attention was what the media dubbed 'Soup Kitchens of Hate'. With historical comparisons being made with Nazi-run soup kitchens in 1930s Germany, National Action's activists collaborated with British-based supporters of the fascist National Review of Poland to distribute food and drinks to whites-only homeless people in Yorkshire and Glasgow. On its website, National Action stated that through 'whites helping whites' so they were providing forgotten homeless white people with the merest glimmer of hope. Davies explained the inspiration and rationale for this: "the charity work, activism and social work [undertaken by Golden Dawn in Greece] has brought them a respect, some credibility in the eyes of the Greek people..." before adding, "...We want to replicate that here in the UK. That's exactly what we want to do"<sup>xv</sup>. As before, this would also offer some resonance with autonomist nationalist subculture.

A propensity for violence would also appear to be evident within some of National Action's less overt activities. To this extent, HNH argues that the greatest threat posed by it is a physical rather than a political one. This is because, it adds, its supporters are increasingly provocative, ever more erratic and wholly unpredictable citing Garron Helm and Joshua Bonehill-Paine among others as evidence. Both alleged to be National Action sympathisers, Helm was originally sentenced to four weeks imprisonment for sending anti-Semitic tweets to the Labour MP for Wavertree, Luciana Berger including a photo of Berger's face with a Star of David on her forehead alongside "#Hitler was right". Deeming the sentence to be unfair, Bonehill-Paine subsequently posted a series of articles about Berger on the Daily Bale website (Bale standing for *Britain Against Left-wing Extremism*), referring to her as a 'rodent' and 'money grabber'. Soon after, a Twitter campaign was launched deploying the hashtag #filthyjewbitch and National Action staged a demonstration outside Berger's constituency office. According to HNH, this prompted the police to arrest 12 National Action supporters and raid ten of their homes. Another alleged supporter to be indicative of the group's propensity for violence as per HNH was Stephen Dumont who was imprisoned following a vicious attack on anti-fascist protesters in Liverpool.

National Action unequivocally stresses itself to be non-violent however this message can be easily obfuscated. Noting at times that violence has been necessary, it stresses that this has always been on the basis of 'self-defence' against the anti-fascist 'red rent-a-mob'. National Action also states that it does not train or encourage its supporters to be violent. Somewhat contradictorily however, it does add that some combat training may be necessary albeit as a deterrent to other groups thinking of attacking them. It refers to this in terms of patriots being attacked by state-backed anarchists. Positioning itself as radical and at the extreme of the political right wing, National Action states that it is far from being extremist and only ever advocates for legal violence, that which is possible

through the law. Of course, this needs to be contextualised by National Action's own assertion that they 'are not afraid to swing the bat at the enemy'.

## What will Proscription achieve?

Prior to proscription, National Action used its website to argue that it was not an extremist organisation not least because of the lack of legislative clarity about what constitutes such a group. Citing the legislation, it suggested that an extremist organisation might be best defined as one which uses or encourages illegal violence or terrorism to achieve its goals. It adds that environmental, leftist and anarchist extremist groups all emanate from mainstream political positions. Echoing the British Governmental position, National Action notes that the greatest threat of extremism is Islamist-inspired. Diverging from that view however, National Action claims that numerous Islamist views are state-sanctioned through the British Government's unfounded appropriation of various 'moderate Muslim' organisations. Seeking to assert radicalism over extremism, National Action argued that its goal of establishing a white Britain will only be achieved through state power and thereby full complicity of its institutions including the police, army and intelligence services among others. In this respect, it asserts the need for state co-operation rather than opposition. Given the rapidity of the Government's action to proscribe National Action, it would appear that the official Governmental position is somewhat contrary and oppositional.

As regards proscription, given its unprecedented nature so it is difficult to know what the specific and general long term impacts might be. Nonetheless, banning the group under the Terrorism Act 2000 still raises a number of interesting questions from which comparisons can be drawn with other proscribed groups albeit none of which were nationalist or far-right. The first of these is whether the ban has the potential to catalyse greater support for National Action or the far-right more widely. If National Action is perceived to be being oppressed by the state, so the potential is there to strengthen the widely held view among far-right sympathisers of the need for war against 'the system'. Similar too, if it is perceived that the state is gerrymandering to the left. This position was evident in National Action's rhetoric: "our disagreement is with the government, the new aristocracy, global capitalism, and all other white race traitors". It is possible therefore that one outcome will be for the far-right to present itself as the sole revolutionary alternative to the political mainstream thereby having the potential for greater appeal to the politically disaffected. Proscription could therefore make the far-right in all its manifestations ever more appealing.

The second relates to the fact that it is highly unlikely National Action's members and supporters will be arrested and charged given this did not happen with *Al-Muhajiroun*, an Islamist group proscribed in Britain since 2005. Instead, and like *Al-Muhajiroun* before it, National Action will likely adapt in order to work around the existing legislation. In illustration, the legislation does not account for proscribed groups merely dissolving and subsequently relaunching themselves with a new name so those behind *Al-Muhajiroun* have repeatedly relaunched new groups with new names. Since 2005 therefore, proscription orders have had to have been issued for the *Saved Sect*, *Call to Submission*, *Islam4UK*, *Islamic Path* and the *London School of Sharia*, all of which were incarnations of *Al-Muhajiroun*. The most recent, *Need4Khilafah* was proscribed in 2014, nine years after the Terrorism Act 2000 was used to proscribe the group. It should be very easy for National Action to do much the



same. Noting the group was already aware of its imminent proscription, it is highly likely the group's hierarchy was already beginning to reformulate a replacement vehicle through which to spread its ideology.

Similarly, to comply with the law in terms of public demonstrations all National Action would need to do is refrain from wearing any branded attire and remove the group's name and logos from banners and posters. Given the group's penchant for wearing black streetwear, so the former of these would be far from problematic: Nike clothing could not be construed as being National Action clothing. As regards banners and posters, this too would present few challenges: activists could continue displaying Nazi icons and symbols as indeed the same messages as long as these were not used alongside the name or logo of National Action. Negotiating the legislation as regards its online activities would also present few obstacles. For instance, National Action could insist its supporters switch to encrypted email services and refrain from using social media platforms such as Facebook which collaborates with the British Government. To this extent, National Action had begun using the Russian social media platform *Vkontakte* prior to its ban. Similar too its website, having made it password protected shortly after its proscription National Action would only need to relocate the site's hosting to a location that sits the control of UK legislature for it to continue to exist. Being critical, it could be argued that the proscription is therefore somewhat impotent in that it will ban little more than the mere name National Action.

## Conclusion

Despite the legislation's impotence, it might be right to speculate that similar banning orders will be made against *North West Infidels* and *Britain First* among others. While both different from National Action, at the very least it is likely that both groups are being keenly watched by Government as indeed others outside it. Given the proscription's impotence, it could be argued that the ban should be seen to be rather more symbolic; a one-off response to Jo Cox's murder for instance. Symbolic or not, it is likely that the far-right will become increasingly autonomous, connected and organised online in preference of any offline equivalent. Such an approach can be seen with Germany's Anti-Kapitalist Kollektive, a movement previously deemed to have had links with National Action. Ideologically neo-Nazi, the Kollektive brings autonomous sympathisers together albeit without any centralised leadership, membership or structure. Consequently, the Kollektive has little that reflects a traditional 'movement' or group and thereby, very little any government could seek to ban. It is worth noting how Cox's convicted murderer perfectly fits the profile of an autonomous far-right sympathiser. Yet despite having no formal links to any one group or movement, he was still able to enact his extremist views; more so than any of the group's referred to in this article it has to be stressed. Similarities also exist with Norway's Anders Behring Breivik who killed 77 in 2011. Banning National Action therefore may not prompt the outcome the British Government was seeking to achieve. What is certain is that while the name National Action is likely to disappear from the British political lexicon, the dangerous and insidious ideology which underpins and informs it will not similarly disappear from the British political landscape.

---

<sup>i</sup> Home Office, *Proscribed Terrorist Organisations*, London: Home Office, 2016.

---

<sup>ii</sup> For the Government statement about proscribing National Action see, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/national-action-becomes-first-extreme-right-wing-group-to-be-banned-in-uk>

<sup>iii</sup> Ian Cobain & Matthew Taylor, 'Far-right terrorist Thomas Mair jailed for life for Jo Cox murder', *The Guardian*, 23 November 2016.

<sup>iv</sup> James Lyons, 'UK to issue first ban on far right', *Sunday Times*, 11 December 2016.

<sup>v</sup> Shortly after being proscribed, National Action removed its website (<https://national-action.info>). This was later relaunched but with password protection thereby making it inaccessible for anyone except members. All references to the group's website in this article therefore precede the group's proscription, various pages being accessed and subsequently downloaded during the period the 24-30 November 2016. See National Action, *Statement*, <https://national-action.info/statement/>.

<sup>vi</sup> Chris Allen, 'Opposing Islamification or promoting Islamophobia? Understanding the English Defence League', *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 45, no. 4, 2011, pp. 279–94.

<sup>vii</sup> For Hope Not Hate's investigation into National Action, see <http://www.hopenothate.org.uk/get-hope/issue18/young-nazi-and-dangerous/>

<sup>viii</sup> Hope Not Hate, *ibid.*

<sup>ix</sup> Hope Not Hate, *ibid.*

<sup>x</sup> Hope Not Hate, *ibid.*

<sup>xi</sup> National Action, *ibid.*

<sup>xii</sup> Simon Wright, Ben Glaze & Colin Cortbus, 'Rise of Hitler-loving National Action group who want to 'ethnically cleanse' the UK', *Daily Mirror*, 7 June 2014.

<sup>xiii</sup> Lucy Sheriff, 'Meet New Neo-Nazi Group National Action Which Just Wants To 'Piss People Off' ', *Huffington Post*, 6 March 2014.

<sup>xiv</sup> George Mosse, *Nazi Culture: intellectual, cultural and social life in the Third Reich*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003, p.40.

<sup>xv</sup> James Poulter & Simon Childs, 'Neo-Nazis are using a white-only homeless charity to spread race hate', *Vice*, 15 September 2016 [http://www.vice.com/en\\_uk/read/neo-nazis-homeless-outreach-race-hate](http://www.vice.com/en_uk/read/neo-nazis-homeless-outreach-race-hate)