

The Alliance For Change

98 High Street, Knaresborough, N Yorks. HG5 0HN

info@AllianceForChange.co.uk +44 7930 519793 www.AllianceForChange.co.uk

PRESS RELEASE - 17 MAY 2005

UK GENERAL ELECTION WAS NOT "FREE AND FAIR"

Text of unpublished letter, offered to multiple British broadsheet newspapers on Wednesday 11 May 2005:

Dear Sir

The recent British general election wasn't free and fair. Apart from the absence of proportional representation, which others have been mentioning lately, there are multiple grounds for claiming that many an individual *constituency* election, within the *general* election as a whole, failed to meet the criteria published by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), in its Declaration on Criteria for Free and Fair Elections, as follows:

1 An IPU requirement, that "Every candidate for election ... shall have an equal opportunity of access to the media, particularly the mass communications media, in order to put forward their political views", was breached again and again, in the most grotesque manner, up and down the country, sometimes in the face of howls of protest from the candidates thus discriminated against.

2 The hard-coding of the three Lib Lab Con Trick party names into the publicly funded BBC's "Guidance for all BBC Programme Makers during the General Election Campaign", and into the rules for the allocation of party political broadcast slots used by the BBC, breached the requirement for "separation of party and state". (Showing such favouritism to *three* particular parties breaches the principle just as surely as does showing favouritism to only *one* party.)

3 The state did *nothing* to "ensure ... That the necessary steps are taken to guarantee non-partisan coverage in State and public-service media", as it is required to do by the IPU criteria. This election was "won" by the Lib Lab Con Trick, yet again, largely because, to all practical intents and purposes, the mass media, including the publicly funded BBC, spent several weeks relentlessly *campaigning for* the Lib Lab Con Trick, spending the public's own money on this partisan campaign in the BBC's case.

4 The state failed to "take the necessary measures to ensure that ... candidates enjoy reasonable opportunities to present their electoral platform". The state took *inadequate* measures to this end, if it took any at all. For example: Election address leaflets that were the *first* to arrive in one particular local Royal Mail sorting office were the *last* to be delivered. The candidate adversely affected was one of those already on the rough end of the virtual media blackout of candidates who weren't part of the Lib Lab Con Trick, so he was therefore one of those candidates most dependent on that thwarted "opportunity" to present his electoral platform. Moreover, perfectly lawfully, the host of the only hustings meeting in that candidate's home town invited along only three out of the six candidates standing in his constituency.

5 It is common knowledge that the UK's "state authorities" failed to "ensure that the ballot" was "conducted so as to avoid fraud".

6 Voters with postal votes did not have the mandatory "equal access to polling stations". They didn't have any access to polling stations, when they wished to override regretted postal votes they had cast prematurely for Lib Lab Con Trick candidates, before receiving the electoral addresses of other candidates, whom they realised too late that they preferred. Polling Day has been abolished, replaced with a polling *period* that commences well before the Royal Mail has got around to delivering many a candidate's electoral address.

7 The practice of numbering ballot papers, and cross-referencing the ballot paper numbers to electoral roll numbers of the voters who use the numbered ballot papers, prevents the UK from claiming that it has secret suffrage.

8 Although the IPU declaration says that, "Everyone ... has the right ... To campaign on an equal basis", there was harrassment during the campaign period of those working to have elected one particular candidate who wasn't part of the Lib Lab Con Trick.

I fear we can expect an upsurge in home-grown "terrorism" in the UK, now that an equally despised government and official loyal opposition have *both* been "re-elected", in an election that most citizens should be capable of realising wasn't "free and fair". I wish I was confident that innocent, ordinary people were not going to suffer because of this "terrorism", but I fear that many of them will, far more of them as a result of the illiberal measures we may expect that the Lib Lab Con Trick will now take, in an effort to clamp down on that "terrorism", than will be touched by the "terrorism" itself.

To fail to conduct promptly a *fresh* general election that is free and fair is to *invite* such home-grown terrorism.

Yours faithfully,

John Allman

Alliance For Change candidate for Harrogate and Knaresborough constituency, British general election, 5 May 2005
Convenor, AllianceForChange.co.uk, 98 High Street, Knaresborough, N Yorks. HG5 0HN.

+44 7930 519793 John.Allman@AllianceForChange.co.uk