

T H E  
F I R S T  
E X C A L I B U R  
P A R T Y  
M A N I F E S T O

---

1 s t J U N E 2 0 0 5



For the people of Britain

E X C A L I B U R

---



**E X C A L I B U R**  
**DEFINING A MANIFESTO**

**What is a manifesto supposed to be?**

By definition: *a public declaration of principles, policies, or intentions, especially of a political nature.*

We attend to those three aspects within our document.

A principle: *a basic truth, law, or assumption: e.g. the principles of democracy.*  
Basic truths are those which none may put asunder.

Make the truths obvious and inviolable, and you have a basis for consensus.

Policies: *a plan or course of action, as of a government, or political party, intended to influence and determine decisions, actions, and other matters.*  
What are the facts as things stand? We don't know - but based on the different figures put forward by the three main parties (all apparently correct) there's obviously some room for interpretation. But is there - really? We can make our strategic plans, but implementation requires the actual figures.

Fundamentally information is less important than intention. After all, there is a precedent for having all the information to hand, and as much time as is required to consider that information, and yet to still reach the wrong conclusion. It's called the Hutton Effect.

Intention: *a course of action that one intends to follow.*  
*An aim that guides action; an objective.*

*E.G. intentions, purpose with respect to marriage: honourable intentions.*  
The absolutes which include honour and honesty have become unfashionable, and to use an equally unfashionable word, misbegotten.

Not within **EXCALIBUR**.



**E X C A L I B U R**  
**A DEFINING MANIFESTO**

We acknowledge that the manifesto of a party is not actionable until at least one member becomes an elected official. However, it is not responsible to make controversial statements simply in order to attract attention. It is even more irresponsible that incumbent Governments persistently shirk making 'hard' decisions or 'long term' strategy, in favour of short-term initiatives.

If a decision will not reflect well on a minister or politician 'on their watch' they don't consider it a priority. Then, after 3 years in government, their main priority becomes securing their next term. These 'leapfrog' government precedents result in all the fragmented policies that threaten to undermine our society today.

The purpose of our manifesto is to define and demonstrate a 'way of thinking', a party philosophy, so that you, the reader, may judge whether these are views that you can share. Is this a party you can support? Are these views which will serve you well? Would **EXCALIBUR** really work 'For the people of Britain'?

In each topic covered by the manifesto, we shall set the scene with some background and, by necessity, true insight - for if we can't see 'a way' how can we improve the situation? Doubtless detractors will say that we're not fully informed, and/or dispute figures, but as you will see, our trains of thought and arguments are grounded - based on common sense, and accepted knowledge.

We will also establish that we have real vision, and new relevant ideas for Government in the 21st century.

We tackle the environment first, for without an environment to live in and sustain us, everything else becomes academic. Then we tackle Government because most manifestos don't tackle the main political problem - the parties themselves, and the antiquated political system itself. As we see time and time again, once elected, the Shadow Party which criticised while outside, all too quickly settles within. Obviously, no elected official ever seeks to change the system which promoted them. How soon they forget.

We don't. We won't.



## EXCALIBUR FUNDAMENTALS

### What do we stand for?

The people of Britain and the UK.  
Their respect, dignity and integrity.

Economic stability balanced with  
social and environmental sustainability.

Freedom. Democracy demands choice.  
3 parties sporting one-size-fits-all  
policies do not represent choice.

The restoration of common sense,  
common courtesy and uncommon valour.

A sense of nationality unbound by  
ethnicity; a true sense of belonging that  
transcends race, creed and colour.

Responsibility for, and pride in the  
privilege of, being British.



### What won't we stand for?

The stupidity of political obfuscation  
disguised as endless discussion of  
'complex' issues.

People who have worked all their lives  
worrying about how they'll live our  
their lives. Pension thieves will pay.

Threatening or anti-social behaviour at  
any stage of life, or in any walk of life.

Unscrupulous companies or individuals  
who take advantage of those who are  
weaker or more vulnerable.

Usury posing as an APR.

Diversity being used as a divisive  
measure.

Here's a demonstration of original thinking to encourage you to read on.

One simple effective idea to resolve antipathy towards 'the vote'.

*"Switch to a system where a non-vote is a vote for the party with a majority, currently Labour. A non-vote therefore ceases to be a 'protest' and is exposed for what it really is - apathy."*

The incumbent government can't object to that - can they?



## I N D E X

<b>DEFINING A MANIFESTO</b>	2
<b>A DEFINING MANIFESTO</b>	3
<b>FUNDAMENTALS</b>	4
<b>INDEX</b>	5
<b>ENI MEANI MINI MOE: the Ministry of Environment</b>	6
<b>WASTED: Opportunities to stop the rot</b>	7
<b>Ministry of Fossil Fuel Conservation and Energy: Nuked if you do, nuked if you don't</b>	8
<b>GOVERNMENT: who will guard the guards?</b>	9
<b>EDUCATION: new tricks for young dogs</b>	10
<b>PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY: people in glass houses <i>are</i> throwing stones</b>	11
<b>The MORSE Code: Ministry for Responsibility in Society and Education</b>	12
<b>PENSIONS: Will you still need me, will you still feed me, when I'm... 65?</b>	13
<b>Resource-fuel: Human Resources: Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs</b>	14
<b>ISIS: Individual Social Insurance Scheme</b>	15
<b>The Ministry of Health: How much rope do you give any organisation?</b>	16
<b>Sick and tired of stakeholders?: Welcome to the 'careholders'</b>	17
<b>DRUGS: can we fix the fix culture?</b>	18
<b>PRISONS: When does Liberty become a Liability?</b>	19
<b>MOJO: Ministry of Judicial Ordination</b>	20
<b>Integrated Solutions: Ministry of Transport and Communications</b>	21
<b>Do you DIG?: Divergent Growth: Ministry of Trade and Industry</b>	22
<b>MORFA: Ministry of Realty, Food and Agriculture</b>	23
<b>KILL OR CURE: Preventative Measures</b>	24
<b>CONSCIENCE ISSUES: Individual Recognisance</b>	25
<b>MOD: The ability to identify the indefensible</b>	26
<b>EXCALIBUR: The right calibre people where you need them</b>	27

### Why EXCALIBUR?

We can tell you everything will be alright.  
We can tell you we've got all the answers.

But that wouldn't be true.

Can we tell you what will happen in our country and across the world over the next 4-5 years?  
No, but who would have believed the last five?

What we can tell you, is that the 'decision' you made on May 5th, and the consequent decisions made over the next 4-5 years, will affect you and your family for decades.

We can tell you the truth. You may not like it, but that's the way it is.  
We stand for what could be, and what should be.

## ENI MEANI MINI MOE: the Ministry of Environment

To see the present Government in action you'd think no-one had given us the 'heads-up'. Their Eni Meani Mini Mo selection process in prioritising *aspects* of environmental policy will leave us up the creek - if there's a creek left.

We would create a solus MOE with immediate effect.

The primary role of the ministry would be Environmental Impact Assessment across the board, with the objective being to make Britain the lowest greenhouse gas emitting society. We would consult international environmental organizations that promotes solutions to environmental issues - the target being to decrease national emissions of greenhouse gases by 75% by 2050.

Key topics:

**Sustainable Consumption and Production:** we must review what we consume and produce and how. In today's global economy, this means looking beyond national borders, and examining the true cost and effects of our imports and exports. An absolute scale of 'environmental hostility' would be derived. This scale would factor in the cost of resources, transport, as they apply to all products regardless of their point of origin (see also WASTE, next page).

**The Right to Environmental Information Act:** we would table a bill immediately. The aim would be to provide all citizens with a legal right to obtain environmental information, both from public authorities and from public and private enterprises.

**The role of environment in conflict and peaceful development:** Wangari Maathai was awarded 2004's Nobel Peace Prize. Her holistic approach to sustainable development and environment has proven to be groundbreaking in establishing environment as an integrated element of peace and development. We would invite her to assist in creating our British blueprint.

**Environmental budget:** rises are set at 3.5% through to 2010 - our target for the total budget for conservation of the environment would be £3bn by 2010. Immediate target areas would be outdoor recreation, cultural heritage, rural conservation and international cross-border implications e.g. avian flu.

Each topic shifts from B.A.D.:  
Background, Assessment, Direction  
to G.O.O.D.:  
Generate Opinions; Offer Direction.



## **WASTED: Opportunities to stop the rot B.A.D.**

The concept of planned obsolescence introduced by Harley J. Earl in America in the 50s created the 'scrap' mentality. Products aren't designed to last, and the whole marketing circus is designed to create a consumer frenzy for the next great thing.

Last year we scrapped 2.5m fridges, 2m TVs and 1m computers. Non-recyclable products squander precious resources and poison the environment unnecessarily.

Consider also the packaging of all products. Our food and drink packaging is 80% plastic which takes 500 years to degrade. That process releases methane amongst other things, which adds to climate change.

The average home in the UK produces 1 tonne of waste per year, which contributes to a total 400m tonnes per year. Where does it all go? Into 2,000 landfills across the country AND we export waste to China - thus adding transport pollution. We are quite simply storing problems for the future. Political leadership is about persuading the people to support those policies which are for the greater public good - that responsibility has thus far been abdicated insofar as it affects our environment.

More locally people are concerned about longer refuse collection intervals, and while they welcome all and any recycling opportunities it seems crazy that no initiatives exist to tackle the problem at source - over-packaging.



## **G.O.O.D.**

We don't accept the euphemism 'environmentally friendly' - the UK is actively environmentally hostile.

We've been told that there's a serious storm brewing, as the weather machine is destabilised, but we didn't effectively criticise the USA for leaving and effectively undermining the Kyoto Agreement.

The  $E=mt^2$  initiative is an antidote to the empty rhetoric of incumbent Government - recumbent as far as the environment goes.  $E=mt^2$  is an unambiguous push to 'make them (the retailers), make them (the products) last longer'. All consumer durables (using the term loosely) would be returned to the retailer for exchange when buying a new product. By shifting responsibility for recycling back to the retailer, the cost, and down-right inconvenience would spur a change in perspective. No more cookers and fridges in rural lay-byes.

This programme would force a reevaluation of the whole supply chain. All products and produce would be assigned our absolute 3E rating in terms of their impact on the environment, factoring in energy consumption, ecological cost of resources, raw materials, and transport.

There's no doubt that an ecological shift will be inconvenient - but it's a correction for decades of a decadent convenience culture. We intend to make sure that the true culprits - the past beneficiaries of cavalier environmental policies - will absorb most of the cost.

# $E=mt^2$

Each topic shifts from B.A.D.:  
Background, Assessment, Direction  
to G.O.O.D.:  
Generate Opinions; Offer Direction.



## Ministry of Fossil Fuel Conservation and Energy:

Nuked if you do, nuked if you don't.

### B.A.D.

Climate change is irreversible.

70% of our electricity is currently derived from oil, gas and coal, and by 2020 we will be importing 90% of those fuels. Consequent 'carbon footprints' are extremely detrimental to the environment.

Nuclear power is clean, and yet while we will augment our electricity supplies from France (largely nuclear powered) we shy away from this source. One-third of the population cite Chernobyl, the Windscale leak, and nuclear waste as fear factors that fuel the huge protests against a nuclear source.

Nuclear science has progressed since we first built power stations in the UK. The B-movie Godzilla scenario which irradiated everything in site is out-dated.

And yet the Government are working to reduced the number of nuclear power stations in the UK from 12 down to 3 by 2023. That's a 23% reduction in output - when in fact, to meet their target to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> output by 60% by 2050 we need to *build* 35 new nuclear stations.

Clean renewable energy sources like wind and solar power are currently marginal, and yet a template exists to harness both of these sources domestically.

Compare that to the 8 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> output per home per annum presently.

### G.O.O.D.

We would adopt a nuclear-friendly position, as there are minimal greenhouse gas emissions. What are the options?

Our options are minimal risk versus the absolute certainty of climate change. In any event, other nations around the world will pursue the benefits of this relatively clean energy source. We would support a programme to build nuclear power stations as befits the 21st century.

The real danger isn't nuclear power - it's procrastination. Whoever is in power has to make some serious decisions about how we power the UK, and secure the future supply of electricity. You want scaremongering? The real risk is that the lights *could* go out.

Ironically, there are areas of the country 'mining ghost towns' which would welcome the benefits of a new construction programme (imagine the irony).

We will also turn new build homes into self-sufficient energy sources - mini power stations that supply their surplus back to the grid. A model exists already that costs £5,000, but the economies of scale will make this cost effective. Precedent already exists, with gas boilers which use latent heat to power a small turbine. In much the same way our grandmothers might have poured boiled water into a Thermos. The lost art of conservation is being refound.



Each topic shifts from B.A.D.:  
Background, Assessment, Direction  
to G.O.O.D.:  
Generate Opinions; Offer Direction.



**GOVERNMENT:** who will guard the guards?

### B.A.D.

Set your watches back 400 years as you enter the Houses of Parliament. Last year the cracks of these archaic practices were seen by all when men dressed in fancy dress, carrying ceremonial swords, struggled to deal with interlopers.

The Houses of Pantomime are best misbegotten. The Punch and Judy exchanges at the dispatch boxes are sometimes witty, but The Herr Blair Bunch and Dame Howard exchanges do become tiresome. Isn't it possible to roll their sleeves up, and actually do something?

But no, the Government way is to insist that everything is complex, and that each component within that complexity demands enough discussion in order to render it utterly impenetrable - eventually even to themselves.

If an MP or candidate from one party has a good idea why can't the members have the good sense and grace to another acknowledge it? Why is the default reaction to criticise? A good idea is a good idea regardless of the point of origin. Why not graciously acknowledge and embrace them? (Witness this sentiment in action on pages 16-17).



### G.O.O.D.

We will bring Government up to date, reborn kicking and screaming in the 21st century. Make it central, by population mass rather than geography, ensuring accessibility by the nation, to their seat of power - rather than featuring as a tourist attraction. 'Build it and they, the people, will come'. We will support the physical, with a virtual extranet which keeps elected officials across the country in the loop real-time. Many industries have compliance mechanisms - why not government?

Limit the debate, expand the vote (avoiding the comi-tragic Dr. Strangelove scenario obviously). Our proposal code-name, PR2P1: Forget the term PR. Proportional Representation has become mired in negative association as 'something which will never happen.

Revitalise the basis of democracy as P1: 'The power of one - each and every-one'. The promise is that 'YOU', the voter, can make a difference.

This shift may take time. In the meantime, switch immediately to a system where a non-vote is a vote for the incumbent party, i.e. Labour. A non-vote, therefore, ceases to be a 'protest' and is exposed for what it really is - apathy.



Each topic shifts from B.A.D.:  
Background, Assessment, Direction  
to G.O.O.D.:  
Generate Opinions; Offer Direction.



**EDUCATION:** new tricks for young dogs

### **B.A.D.**

Education like Government is centuries past its sell-by-date.

In 1937 HG Wells recorded a series of American lectures in a book called *World Brain*. In this book he predicted the Internet, and berated the Great Universities for being frozen in aspic. The 16th century sausage machine model for academia was, he argued, redundant.

And yet, here we are, two thirds of a century later, still promoting an education system which is based upon, and measures memory. We regurgitate facts rather than using learned knowledge to engender solutions. There are moves towards vocational qualifications, but the stigmas that 'those who can't do, do teach' remains, and those that 'can do' tend to get on with it without worrying about whether or not they are 'qualified'.

The state education system does not stretch children, hence the demand for private schools amongst the financially privileged. We currently sustain a system of underachievement, and single-faith schools which ghettoise education are becoming established. There are now 7,000 state and 523 private single-faith schools, but they have been identified as socially 'detrimental'. Don't we want to produce a next generation who are comfortable mixing and interacting with other cultures, and creeds? A ghettoised society only creates more racial friction.

### **G.O.O.D.**

We will reengage disillusioned children. We must reject any tendency to 'accept failures' in education, and engender an 'active learning' system which empowers every child, enabling them to reach their greatest potential.

We will reintroduce competitive sport with alternative activities available for those who really don't want to participate. Thus, children can choose but they can't opt out completely. Every child has the capacity to improve physically. Fitness obviously assists study.

There is a learning capacity beyond measurement by exams. Syllabuses that move beyond the classroom create an awareness and experience of the world. Bring the world alive to children, and you bring them alive.

We would extend the summer school initiatives which are proven to improve literacy and numeracy. These schemes make better use of exist facilities and exploit them positively during otherwise dormant periods. The focus on conventional academic skills limits children, and at a time when people question the validity of grades a broader education reduces the impact of curriculum metrics.

We will phase out single-faith schools as they can only serve to confirm those prejudices that we all wish removed from our multicultural society.

