

Is the UK part of the EU, at law

Michael Clark

The *European Communities Act* received Royal Assent on 17th October 1972. This Act resulted in the UK joining the European Economic Community (EEC), which had been established by the *Treaty of Rome*, signed on 25th March 1957. The UK officially became a member of the EEC on 1st January 1973. This state of constitutional illegality was ultimately entrenched on 19th June 2008, when Royal Assent was given to the *Constitutional Treaty of Lisbon*. This final Treaty of the now political European Union was ratified by all member states of the EU on 13th November 2009.

When he signed the *Treaty of Accession* to the *Treaty of Rome* in Brussels on 22nd January 1972, the then Prime Minister, Edward Heath, knowingly and wilfully tricked, deceived and betrayed the British people into foreign rule by the EEC/EU under the pretence that they would be joining a European common trading agreement, known then as the Common Market. The true intention was to surrender Britain's sovereignty. He deliberately lied to the country. For that reason alone under English Law, the ECA 1972 is void and of no effect.

At law his was the most calculating and grievous High Treason in British history. He gave away his country. Upon signing, his treason instantly removed him from lawful office and his treasonous act failed to become lawfully binding because treason has no legitimacy. It is not possible to make law by breaking the law. Edward Heath's then treasonous administration

immediately became an unlawful assembly as a treasonous government is not lawful and has no legitimacy.

No parliament can bind its successor, yet no following parliament has ever reversed Heath's actions. Instead, every following prime minister and parliament has consciously and deliberately acted to reinforce Heath's outrageous pretence that Britain had knowingly and willingly consented to foreign rule. As public servants, neither he nor they ever had such authority and their actions are highly treasonous contrary to English law for acting against the nation's known interests, intending to surrender its sovereignty, using wilful deception to deliberately betray the nation and for acting in the political interests of a foreign power. It is effectively to declare war on the British Crown and the nation and is treason contrary to the *Treason Act* 1351 and the *Treason Felony Act* 1848.

Every United Kingdom parliament since 1972 therefore, is and has been at law, an unlawful assembly. With no legitimacy and in knowingly committing an act of treason against their own people, each has invited and imposed foreign rule over their own country....

No law or other binding obligation can result from treason or intent by an unlawful assembly. English law, therefore, stands as it was prior to the signing of the 1972 Act. Thus Britain is not and can never have been part of the EU as every Act, EU Treaty and every statute since 1972 whether or not given Royal Assent, is treasonous,

unlawful, null and void. Not one has the force of law. In any case, the *Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties* 1969 provides that a signatory power may abrogate any treaty unilaterally where corruption can be demonstrated in respect of procuring the treaty in the first place or in any respect of any dimension of its implementation. This means that the known and proven treason by Heath and his successors and the widely recognised and often reported deep corruption within the EU render every EU Treaty "signed" by Britain, invalid.

The EU has no legitimate influence in Britain, whatsoever. Neither does its (Napoleonic) European Civil Law. Their authority exists only in the minds of certain politicians in furtherance of the political agenda of the EU....

What about the Queen?

The Queen's most solemn Coronation Oath of the 2nd June 1953, made before Almighty God with the world as witness declared that she would uphold the "laws and customs" of the Realm and this for her entire reign. Over the past 44 years the Queen has been betrayed, known at law as being "deceived in her grant" for she has been made a 'citizen' of Europe, her courts made subservient to European courts and most serious of all, the Constitution having being undermined.

The seal and symbol of this covenant, the Stone of Destiny (and of Jacob), has been torn from its spiritual and constitutional setting and returned to Scotland.

INSIDE: A life-line for the Scottish fishing fleet p 2 – EU city mayors speak out p 2 - High Court judgement and Autumn Statement p 2 – Book Review "The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the EU" p 3 - An amicable divorce p 4 – Scotland possible bleak future p 7 - Change Britain organisation p 7 – From Churchill to Trump p 8 - Brexit a good move for the UK p 9 – Letters p 10

A life-line for the Scottish fishing fleet

Scotland's Tory spokesman Peter Chapman used a visit to Europe's busiest white-fish port to call for a united front to secure a good Brexit outcome for the Scottish fishing fleet.

He was in Peterhead in August, accompanied by Conservatives, Ian Duncan MEP and Finlay Carson MEP, to meet fishing industry leaders.

Mr Chapman said the Brexit vote was top of the agenda during discussions.

The north-east regional list MSP added; "We know from speaking to industry leaders here in the north-east that leaving the EU provides a huge opportunity for this sector.

"We know the negotiations won't be easy but we need a united approach across the UK.

"The current SNP stance is not helping, and the first minister's refusal to accept the outcome of the democratic vote is creating further

uncertainty.

"We have heard loud and clear from the prime minister Brexit means Brexit. We now have to do everything we can to secure the best possible terms in the upcoming negotiations."

Urging the Scottish Government to co-operate with Westminster to "make sure we get the kind of deal our fishing communities want", Mr Chapman said it was crucial to avoid the industry becoming a bargaining chip in breakaway talks.

He added: "At the moment, all we are hearing from the SNP are the negatives of Brexit and more talk of another independence referendum - that is the last thing that Scotland needs right now".

Mr Duncan, a member of the European Parliament fisheries committee, said: "For too long the Scottish fishing industry has faced more and more unnecessary and burdensome EU regulation.

"We now have the opportunity to negotiate a system that best represents the needs of fisherman. I am confident that we can strike the best deal possible for fisherman."

According to a Scottish Government spokeswoman: "The cabinet secretary (Fergus Ewing) has already made clear his intention to champion the interests of Scotland's fishing industry and to work to get the best deal for our fishing and coastal communities.

"Key to that is maintaining tariff-free access to trade with the EU to safeguard thousands of jobs in the wider fishing sector, as well as vital funding for infrastructure investment.

"Fishing is only at risk of becoming expendable by the UK Government in its negotiations with the EU, just as it has done before."

This article by Keith Findlay, first appeared in *The Press and Journal (Inverness)* 27th August.

EU city mayors speak out

Mayors of some of Europe's largest cities in an open letter to EU leaders in November - 135 mayors, members of the Eurocities network - have committed themselves to good

relations with British cities after Brexit.

They wrote in their letter that: "Despite the Brexit vote, we see a future for UK cities in [the European

project]. Like other European cities, they are economic drivers, centres of knowledge, innovation and excellence, and examples of how diversity and integration can thrive".

High Court judgement and Autumn Statement

How the voters decision is being ignored.

The Independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon, has described the ruling by the High Court that the decision to trigger Article 50 must be voted on by Parliament as "a body blow to Brexit which confirms that the United Kingdom is no longer a democracy of the people because their decisions can be overruled by an arrogant, self-serving elite."

He added: "If the decision of the British people had been to remain in the European Union, I am certain there would have been squeals of horror and outrage from this same arrogant elite, if the leavers had gone to the courts to set

aside a clear decision of the electorate.

The legislation that prepared the way for the referendum passed both Houses and on the 23rd June the British people gave the Government unambiguous instructions to withdraw our country from the EU. This could now be ignored. Our democracy is in serious trouble."

With regard to the Autumn Statement Lord Stoddart has strongly criticised the Chancellor's Autumn Statement, characterising it as a "budget to punish the people for voting for Brexit."

He said: "There is no doubt in my mind that this is going to be a

justification budget. The Government advised the people not to vote to leave the EU and they were ignored. Therefore, the next budget will be a punishment for their disobedience and a justification for the Government's original advice. The evidence is there for all to see. The Treasury has re-run the gloomy economic predictions it made before 23rd June, despite the fact that many of them are being proven wrong with each passing day.

"It is time to ignore the bleating of these doom-mongers whose predictions have so often proved to be misplaced, inaccurate and self-serving and to proceed with all speed to leave the EU."

BOOK REVIEW

Robert Oulds

The UK is still on the hook for the EU's debts

This exposure to the European Union is over £80 billion and may indeed prove to be even greater. This is not theoretical. The EU, using Qualified Majority Voting, as well as the IMF, have between them already taken nearly £30 billion to bail out the problems caused by the Eurozone crisis. These costs are above and beyond the EU's multi-billion cost to the taxpayer in regular financial contributions. And even above the EU's all too frequent overspends charged back to the British taxpayer.

The Bruges Group, commissioned an Independent research project, from an acknowledged expert in this field Bob Lyddon. This shows that the true extent of the UK's potential exposure to the European Investment Bank (EIB), European Central Bank (ECB) and European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism (EFSM) is over £80 billion. If the crisis in the Eurozone continues this already high figure could increase massively. This is mainly in the form of bad EU loans which are made to support the EU's political objectives.

The Brexit team are taking a small gamble on tariffs. EU membership still poses the biggest risk to the British taxpayer. *Remoaners* need to understand that the biggest risk to the UK economy is EU membership, not Brexit.

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union by Bob Lyddon

Bruges Group Pbk 88 pp 2016

Available from
The June Press
Price £8.00 + 10% p&p)
(see back cover)

ISBN 978-0-956461-46-9

The UK carries huge financial liabilities as an EU Member State, liabilities that could translate into calls for cash far higher than our annual Member cash contribution. These are created through various funds and facilities of the EU itself, and through shareholdings in the European Investment Bank and the European Central Bank. Each of these bodies engages in financial dealings on a large scale, with the Member States acting as guarantors for sums borrowed. The main recipients of funds are the Eurozone periphery states: Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal and Ireland.

The UK, being one of the largest and most creditworthy of the Member States, is looked at as one of the guarantors most able to stump up extra cash as and when demanded,

demanding, that is, by a Qualified Majority of Member States with no unilateral right of refusal. Such calls can be expected if, and when, another crisis blows up in the Eurozone.

Disaster is inevitable. The European Union has no capacity to significantly increase fiscal spending to ward off another downturn. The ECB cannot continue to artificially pump printed money into the Eurozone's already on life support economy. The ECB's already has a massive credibility deficit. Next they will have to again come knocking on our door. When this crisis hits the EU and international lenders would expect us to stump up the money. There is no right of refusal. That is until we leave, may that day soon come.

Jim Mellon, billionaire investor and well known specialist in sovereign risk, described this research as, "An excellent, incisive and important work. The European Union is a millstone and we have a once in a life time opportunity to be free of it."

Losses would be claimed by the EU institutions and added to the UK PSBR and therefore to the national debt, except that our current paid-in capital in EIB (€3.5 bn) and the ECB (€0.1 bn) have already been paid in and are already part of the UK's national debt.

Event	UK cost in £	Cost per household
UK loses its capital in the European Investment Bank and the ECB	32,560,000,000	£1,185
Loses through the European Financial Stabilisation Mechanism	48,000,000,000	£1,747
TOTAL	80,560,000,000	£2,932

Number of UK households = 27,468,000

An amicable divorce

Brexit Seminar - All Souls College 9th September by Peter Lilley MP

My main focus is trade but I want to put it in the context of expediting Brexit.

Project Fear did not become a self-fulfilling process. But Remain made the legitimate point that a prolonged period of uncertainty could damage the economy. So, while taking sufficient time to prepare properly, we should aim to complete Brexit as rapidly as possible.

Unfortunately, the impression has taken hold that Brexit is an interminable process. The haunting last couplet of the Eagle's hit 'Hotel California' has been likened to leaving the EU: "You can check out any time you like, but you can never leave!". Gus O'Donnell suggested that negotiations could go on for a lifetime; John Major predicted it will take over a decade.

But there is another line in Hotel California which describes their mental predicament: "We are all just prisoners here, of our own device".

As long as we don't devise our own obstacles to leaving there is no reason Brexit should be interminable.

In fact, it need not take even the two years arbitrarily specified in Article 50.

Joining the EC was far more complex than leaving: we had to introduce Value Added Tax, transform our farm support, implement all existing EU laws, replace Commonwealth Preference by EU tariffs and much else. That took barely 2 years.

I asked President Klaus whether splitting Czechoslovakia in two was long and difficult. He replied: "Simpler than you think - dividing our monetary union took a weekend, separating our countries, a bit longer".

To shorten the process, we need to be very clear about what it involves.

We must distinguish between issues which are matters for decision by the UK and those which are matters for negotiation with the EU. There has been a widespread but erroneous presumption that everything

is a matter for negotiation and, consequently, before we can begin doing anything we must laboriously assess what can be traded off against what in a multi-dimensional game of Diplomacy. Once we have identified the issues which are matters for our own decision Ministers can start taking those *decisions* immediately. That immediately reduces uncertainty. It also narrows the focus for negotiations which will render them simpler.

The first decision we should take is to convert all EU legislation and regulations into UK law. It might seem paradoxical that Eurosceptics should propose this. But it has several benefits.

It provides business with certainty: they will be able to run their businesses in the same way the day after Brexit as the day before.

It means Parliament can amend, repeal or improve any law subsequently – as it can any of our existing laws.

It will also ease the Parliamentary passage of leaving legislation by depriving die-hard 'Remainers' of excuses to oppose the Brexit legislation.

The idea promoted by Gus O'Donnell *et al* that we need to go through the entire *acquis communautaire* item by item and reject, amend or incorporate it before we can exit - is absurd. But it is widespread and the source of much of the concern about Brexit not just in business but among environmentalists and the general public.

The Secretary of State for Exiting the EU has said that this is not straightforward. Maybe it will require more than a single clause – but by definition it must be possible. It is after all more or less what countries like India, Canada, Australia (and even the North American colonies!) did when they became independent – they simply adopted British laws as their own.

Another issue we should resolve

by our own decision rather than as part of a negotiation is to reassure EU residents already here that they will be allowed to remain. That will end uncertainty for them and their employers. Using them as bargaining counters in case EU member states threaten to expel UK residents – which none has and they would face international obloquy if they did - is abhorrent and unprecedented. When Uganda expelled British passport holders we did not even contemplate expelling Ugandan citizens.

On the other hand, to prevent a 'closing down sale' influx from the EU, we need to announce that EU citizens arriving henceforth will face the same limits on work as apply to citizens of other friendly countries. (Incidentally, should such action be ruled out by the ECJ while we are still members of the EU we could, under the Vienna Convention, resile from the EU Treaties without going through the Article 50 process.)

The first rule of negotiation is to narrow your focus: or as Lynton Crosby said in another context: "Scrape the barnacles off the boat"! The more such decisions we take, the clearer it will be to our partners what remains to be negotiated. The main item for negotiation will then be the terms on which the EU and UK will trade with each other.

By ruling out free movement of labour we have closed off the unattractive option of joining the EEA. The EEA was devised for countries whose governments wanted to join the EU but whose people were reluctant. It is an ante-room, not a departure lounge. The EU has free trade agreements covering over 50 countries – only four (the EEA and Switzerland) involve free movement and a budgetary contribution to the EU.

So there are only two realistic outcomes for the future trading relationship between the UK and the EU. Either the UK and the EU27 agree to continue to trade freely with

An amicable divorce

each other without tariffs. Or the UK and the EU27 apply to imports from each other the WTO tariffs which we currently apply to the EU's biggest trading partners - USA, Russia, China. (In either scenario the UK post Brexit could reduce its tariffs below the present level either unilaterally across the board as some advocate or as a result of free trade agreements with new partners. If we did so while retaining tariff free trade with the EU they would naturally want to introduce Rules of Origin.)

Both options are pretty simple. Unlike negotiations to remove complex tariffs between countries, retaining zero tariffs is simplicity itself. Likewise, the EU has a common external tariff which we will inherit. That is the highest tariff we could apply to each other. Applying that to each other is less desirable but equally simple and requires no negotiation at all.

Moreover, both are acceptable to the UK and preferable to the present situation. The greatest mistake of all is the belief in some quarters that a 'favourable' trade agreement with the EU is essential. Any one with experience of negotiating – which excludes most of those who comment on the issue – knows that a successful outcome to any negotiation is only possible if you are prepared to walk away with no deal. Moreover, those you are negotiating with must know that is the case.

Fortunately for the UK, no deal – i.e. trading on WTO tariffs – is perfectly acceptable. The tariffs our exporters to the EU would face average about 4% - small beer compared with the 12% improvement in their competitiveness from the post Brexit exchange rate change. Even car exporters, facing a 10% tariff will be better off. By contrast, EU exporters would face a similar tariff burden *on top of the 12% loss of currency competitiveness.*

Moreover, we would be able to negotiate free trade deals to reduce the

far higher barriers our exporters face in the fast growing markets of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

And because we have a large trade deficit, the Treasury would reap estimated tariff revenues of £12 billion – hopefully used to cut tax burdens on UK firms – whereas EU governments would collect only £6.5 billion.

Some argue that we should go straight to trading on WTO terms.

They believe there is no prospect of a trade agreement with the EU.

Announcing a swift move to WTO tariffs will avoid prolonged uncertainty and enable business to plan for the future.

If the EU then offer something better this will be seen as a UK success, whereas if we ask for continued free trade and don't get it, it will be seen as a defeat.

On the other hand it is argued:

The prospect of a deal to continue free trade cannot be ruled out, given that it is as much in their interests as ours.

The power of the status quo should not be underestimated.

It is politically important that the onus should be on the EU27 to continue zero tariffs and the blame will fall on them if tariffs are imposed.

In the event that continental governments prevaricate on reaching a trade deal we should simply announce that for the time being we will maintain our zero tariffs on imports from the EU – unless they choose to impose WTO tariffs on us, in which case we will reciprocate. (We need not worry whether retaining the status quo without a formal agreement after we have left the EU is compatible with WTO rules. Objectors would have to prove not merely that the rules have been infringed – which is debatable - but that they have been harmed. And that would take a long time.) It is important to let continental governments face the wrath of German car makers, French wine growers, Dutch cut flower growers et. for

initiating an unnecessary tariff battle in which they lose more than we do.

Tariff free trade with the EU, though desirable, is relatively unimportant because the maximum tariffs the EU could impose are mostly so low. The free trade deals that are really worth while are those with fast growing but still highly protected markets of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Remain campaigners claimed that no-one would want to do deals with us. Now countries are queuing up. So the sooner Brexit is complete, the sooner we can complete such deals. That will increase pressure on the EU to agree tariff free trade with the UK. For example, at present wine from Australia bears a tariff whereas French wine enters duty free. French wine producers would hate to see that advantage reversed.

The claim that we need to retain "access" to the single market is misleading. It implies that our exporters risk being excluded from it. In fact, every member of the WTO – including over 160 countries which are not part of the EU - has guaranteed access to the single market and most are doing good business with it, a lot of them rather better than we are .

This is because the main feature of the Single Market Programme was to standardise product requirements so that manufacturers need only produce a single range for all 28 countries – which benefits American and Japanese companies exporting to the EU as much as German or British companies exporting within the EU.

It would be more accurate to refer to *tariff free* access for goods (there are no tariffs on services) and *passporting rights* for some financial service companies – mainly in the retail sector, enabling them to sell their financial services/products either directly or via a branch regulated by the UK regulator. Without a passport companies must operate through a local subsidiary authorised and regulated by the national regulator.

Continued on page 6

An amicable divorce

The value of passporting rights, though worth keeping, should not be exaggerated. I say that as the Minister who negotiated the first passporting directive and later implemented the Single Market programme.

UK based financial services firms have passporting rights as a member of the EU.

But so too under the MIFID2 Directive will financial services companies from countries like the US, Hong Kong and Singapore whose financial regulatory systems are deemed to have 'regulatory equivalence' as would the UK's.

Most British UCITS funds choose to operate via companies set up in Luxembourg and Dublin rather than using their passport from London. (This has not caused an exodus of jobs from London.) Moreover, they clearly find the value of low tax in these countries more than offsets the extra cost of setting up companies. This puts a pretty modest value on passporting.

The growth in UK financial services exports to the EU does not show any marked change since passports were introduced.

British financial companies seem to export very successfully *without passports* to countries like the USA and Switzerland – our two largest markets.

Most of British financial services business is wholesale whereas passports are largely designed to facilitate retail business.

New trade agreements with Rest of World - We should initiate discussions immediately with: China and India, USA and Canada, Australia and New Zealand, Switzerland and EFTA. There have been indications from several of these countries of an interest in trade ties with the UK.

Where relevant, we should seek some quick fixes – e.g. simple deals covering the top priorities on each side, leaving the less important issues to be completed in a second phase. This

could be important in boosting economic confidence and have internal political benefits.

For example, a deal with India reducing their punitive duties on whisky would be important for Scotland and impossible for Scotland to do if Scotland (in or out of the UK) remained in the EU because India has broken of trade discussions with the EU.

In the case of the USA we should not try to replicate the full TTIP negotiations, which in any case may well founder. The primary UK interests are;

a) to remove the remaining tariffs between the UK and USA.

b) to minimise regulatory barriers (if any) to trade in financial and related services.

c) to prevent discrimination between suppliers by nationality in procurement. Given that the USA is the largest investor in the UK and America is the largest destination for UK foreign investment there is no need to establish ISDS tribunals which are intended to give assurance to investors in countries where there are doubts about governance and legal protections.

With Canada, although there may be no need to replicate the full CET agreement, given that that is now complete, it may be worth taking it as the pro forma basis of negotiations to speed them up. CET also includes the unnecessary ISDS tribunals but they are of less significance given that, unlike some US multinationals, few Canadian companies would be likely to use them in the UK.

Existing EU trade agreements with Rest of World - Normally when a federation which is party to a trade treaty splits up, the successor states can and do inherit the treaty (cf break up of the USSR).

The EU has a series of Preferential Trade Agreements – mostly with former colonies and nearby states. We should ask these countries to

'novate' the treaty terms to us so that we can continue trading with them on the same basis. It is hard to think of any reason why they should be unwilling to do so.

The most significant EU PTAs are with South Korea and Mexico. Britain is a signatory of the former since it also covers investment which, unlike trade, is not an exclusive EU competence.

A third of these EU treaties do not include services. In due course, for those countries where there is a significant potential market in services, we should explore the possibility of extending the agreement to cover services.

Trade policy towards developing countries - The EU gives tariff-free, quota-free access to goods from the 42 Least Developed Countries under the Everything But Arms (EBA) agreement. However, the EU's complex and unnecessarily strict rules of origin have meant this has failed to boost imports from these countries as much as has the US Africa Growth and Opportunities Agreement (AGOA), which has far less onerous rules. Canadian policy to boost trade with poor countries has been even more effective.

The EU also offers preferential access to a number of other developing countries. But its highest tariffs still tend to be on labour intensive manufactures (like clothing) and agricultural products – precisely the goods countries in the earliest stages of development tend to export.

The UK should set an example to the rest of the EU and OECD countries by adopting a pro-development trade policy incorporating the best features of EBA, AGOA and Canadian policies and reducing or eliminating tariffs on goods typically imported from developing countries.

This could begin immediately if the EU opt to trade with us on WTO terms. If we continue current tariff free arrangements on an ad hoc basis while the UK retains the Common External

An amicable divorce

Tariff it will not be possible to reduce tariffs vis a vis developing countries until a formal UK/EU trade agreement is concluded.

UK external tariff - Initially the UK should offer to retain the Common External Tariff until a formal UK/EU trade agreement is reached. However, if the EU opts to trade with us on a WTO basis we will be free to alter our external tariffs – not just by negotiating new trade agreements with third countries but also by making unilateral reductions.

One option is the Economists for Brexit proposal to abolish all our

tariffs and move to unilateral free trade across with all countries. This has many attractions but is unlikely to be politically possible because it means:

i) foregoing several billion pounds tariff revenue.

ii) loss of bargaining power to leverage reductions in tariffs on UK exports.

iii) resistance from domestic sectors protected by tariffs.

The UK should nonetheless reduce or remove, in particular, the highest tariffs on food and other sectors where the UK produces little. This will reduce the cost of living, and mean

British consumers are no longer subsidising inefficient industries elsewhere in the EU. This was an invisible but nonetheless onerous cost of EU membership particularly to low income households.

Footnotes:

UK exports to other 11 founder members of the EU single market grew at 3.09% pa from 1993- 2012; insignificantly less than 3.11% pa growth in UK exports to 8 OECD countries; but significantly slower than the 4.11% pa growth exports from those 8 OECD countries to the EU12. *Myth and Paradox of the Single market*, Burridge, Civitas 2016.

Scotlands possible bleak future

Should Scotland decide to stay in the SEU after the UK leaves then it must be prepared for an economic shock.

Firstly, the UK taxpayer will no longer wish to subsidise the Scottish people.

Secondly, should the EU wish to impose a trading tariff on all goods from the UK, then the UK will be forced to reciprocate and Scottish goods to its largest customer the UK will be subject to a tariff.

Thirdly, Scotland will have to stump up the cost of NATO membership.

Fourthly, its dwindling reserves of North Sea oil could become a common EU resource like the fish in the North sea.

Fifthly, its influence over the EU Parliament will be considerably less than its current influence over the UK Parliament. The UK currently has a 10% influence in the EU - (73 MEPs out of 751 MEPs) the future so-called

independent Scotland will be lucky if it gets a 1% share, currently Scotland has 6 MEPs equivalent to a 0.008% influence in EU affairs, a truly bleak situation for a once proud nation. So much for Scottish independence.

Added to this is the very likelihood that they will have adopted the euro, including all the attached commitments to the European Central Bank bailout schemes.

Change Britain organisation

What does the new “Change Britain” organisation stand for? According to its web site (www.changebritain.org) among other significant statements, Brexit means:

* People who voted Leave and people who voted Remain coming together to find the best way forward.

* Using all our people and resources to help us navigate through the most significant change to the UK’s economic, diplomatic and democratic arrangements in 40 years.

* Engaging individuals and communities across the country with the Brexit process

* Improving how our politics works so that the divide between voters and politicians – something the referendum

exposed so starkly – is bridged, and the bond between the people and their government is irreversibly strengthened

* Ending the free movement of people from the EU without denying our businesses with the skills and talent they need to grow.

* As free movement ends, enabling EU nationals living and working in Britain to stay here and feel valued, and ensuring the same for UK nationals in EU countries.

* Amending and incorporating large areas of EU regulation into UK law as UK legal supremacy is restored.

* Identifying effective new funding formulas for agriculture, science, research and poorer regions and

agreeing priorities for additional investment when the UK’s financial contribution to the EU budget ends.

* Getting British businesses the best possible deal to sell goods and services into the Single Market

* Negotiating new trade agreements with the world’s fastest growing markets

* Redefining and strengthening our defence and security relationship with European nations and our NATO allies

* Supporting EU nations to strengthen the European economy, meet environmental challenges together and manage migration flows on the EU’s borders

* Learning to think globally, not just regionally.

From Churchill to Trump

Extract of an article in the 14th Nov. Spear's magazine by Professor Tim Congdon CBE

After being the first European politician to be granted an audience with President-elect Donald Trump, Nigel Farage made a striking suggestion. He said that the bust of Churchill moved by President Obama (there were two) should be returned to the Oval Office. It seems that Trump reacted very positively, although not making a definite commitment.

The future US relationship with Europe (and NATO) now comes under special scrutiny. Indeed, the EU even had a special summit this is a time to pause for reflection and to remember the lessons of history.

Winston Churchill was the greatest historian of the English-speaking peoples, by which he of course meant above all the people of Britain and the USA. What did he really have in mind when he advocated 'a kind of United States of Europe' in his Zurich speech of 19th September 1946? Would he be the champion of the EU project today as some – including his Europhile grandson, Sir Nicholas Soames – would have us believe? I don't think so.

True, Churchill even prefaced his remarks by saying that he knew the idea of a pan-European alliance would 'astonish' his listeners. Specifically, 'The first step in the re-creation of the European family must be a partnership between France and Germany.' It is on the basis of the Zurich speech that Churchill is regarded by the European Commission as one of the founding fathers of the European Union.

But Churchill also emphasised in that speech that he did *not* see Britain as part of the United States of Europe. In his words, 'there is already a natural grouping in the Western Hemisphere. We British have our own Commonwealth of Nations.' In November 1951, after the Conservatives' return to power following the second general election of that year, Churchill was again Prime Minister. Jean Monnet, even more definitely an EU founding father than

Churchill, visited him to persuade him that Britain should participate in European integration. Monnet's goals were ambitious, to forge a United States of Europe with one European army and defence force so that war between Europe's nations could never return.

Their discussion continued late into the night and was evidently cordial. But Churchill was not persuaded. Churchill wrote a note for the Cabinet in which he clarified that 'he had never thought that Britain should become part of a European Federation'. According to Jock Colville, who had been his secretary during the Second World War, in Churchill's eyes Britain's 'true destiny' was 'the moral leadership of the English-speaking peoples'.

Monnet made no secret, then or later, that he envisaged a European federation in which national parliaments would be subordinate to a bureaucratically-run authority that was to evolve into a full-scale federal government. In the establishment of the European Community for Steel and Coal Community in 1952 he defended the supranational power of the proposed 'High Authority' over the community. He insisted there could be no national veto and no majority voting.

Churchill was dismayed by Monnet's suggestions. He loved parliamentary democracy and believed in the defence of British sovereignty. In the subsequent 65 years the ECSC has evolved into the European Economic Community and then the European Union, while Britain has joined the EU, and 'our own' Commonwealth has lost geopolitical substance and meaning. Power in Europe has shifted on a massive scale from national parliaments to the EU's supranational and bureaucratically-run High Authority now in the form of the European Commission. The elite Franco-German bureaucracy has been the driver of European integration by the stealth method envisaged by Jean

Monnet, of incremental steps, with no public announcement and outside the headlines, and regardless of democratic consent at the national level.

But the EU's member states remain sovereign in two key respects. They have not surrendered to EU institutions the right to raise taxes or to spend money, and they still do have undoubtedly national chains of command in their armed forces. If the British had voted to remain in the EU, two forecasts could have been made with some confidence. The first is that the EU bureaucracy would have urged that EU institutions be given the power to raise taxes and to spend money. This was already foreshadowed in the Five Presidents' report for the Eurozone, published last year. Sure enough, that report was superficially intended to be a prescription only for the Eurozone, but it is likely that an attempt would have been made to trap Britain inside the federal structure.

Secondly, the European Commission would again have urged the merits of a European defence force, just as Monnet did in his talks with Churchill in late 1951. The Commission's eventual aim, like that of many people in influential positions in German, French and Italian politics, is to end the separate existence of national armies, navies and air forces. If the UK had remained in the EU, that would have meant the disappearance, over time, of the British Army, Royal Navy and Royal Air Force.

By leaving the EU, Britain will be able to maintain both an independent voice in the world, and to defend the open world order that it built up with the USA in the closing phases of the Second World War and subsequently. Let it be noted that Churchill had his occasional gripes with President Roosevelt. But he never doubted the overriding importance to Britain of close ties with the US President to promote friendship between nations, and international trade and economic cooperation.

Brexit a good move for the UK

Extract of an article by a concerned UK citizen

What about the future, Iceland a country of 300,000 people whose economy is so small it does not even figure in The Economist Pocket Book World in Figures, has just concluded a free trade deal with China! So we have nothing to fear in Brexit.

The UK is the most connected nation on earth with our membership of the G8, G20, NATO, UN Security Council, the Commonwealth of Nations etc., this will not change following Brexit.

David Cameron, went 'cap in hand' to Brussels asking for concessions and in nothing of any substance at all. That in itself proves how impotent we are as a nation as a member of the EU. He had vague positions on a no to 'ever closer union' with absolutely no substantive discussions about this fundamental issue and his seeking assurances that the UK would not be required to join the disastrous Euro, carry no weight at all.

All of his bluster has come down to asking (note: asking not telling) the EU that migrants will have to wait 4 years before claiming benefit. That's it! The migrants who come here are not generally here to claim benefits. They are here to work, so such a change will not reduce the level of unskilled and undocumented cheap labour.

One thing I learned in buying and selling businesses over the years (Golden Rule no.1) is that when entering a negotiation the side that is prepared to walk away from the negotiating table is the side that gets the best deal and everyone knows that Cameron was not prepared to do that. (Golden Rule no 2), you NEVER tell the other side what your default position is, but Cameron was forever doing that!

The biggest argument however was about who governs Britain. Is it the duly elected government in Westminster or the unelected bureaucrats in Brussels.

For me, it is about democracy and in

the words of the late Tony Benn, someone who I do not agree with politically but someone whom I have immense respect for intellectually, famously said,

"If one meets a powerful person - Rupert Murdoch, perhaps, or Joe Stalin or Hitler - one can ask five questions: what power do you have; where did you get it; in whose interests do you exercise it; to whom are you accountable; and, how can we get rid of you? Anyone who cannot answer the last of those questions does not live in a democratic system."

It is a fact that we cannot get rid of the European Commission or the thousands of other petty bureaucrats beavering away making rules that govern you and I. They work away in their committees running our lives without ever having to face an electorate.

If we refer right back to the Treaty of Rome the basic vision was "ever closer union" or federalism, in essence, a United States of Europe. Such an outcome is not for Britain.

I want the UK to be good friends with our continental neighbours, to trade with them, to establish bi-lateral agreements with them on matters of mutual interest, but not to be governed by this supranational entity that, at every turn undermines and weakens nation states.

Already 75% of our laws come from Brussels (one way or another), we have lost 80% of our fish stocks under the Common Fisheries Policy, steel works and aluminum smelting have gone abroad, Fords closed the Transit factory in Southampton and relocated it in Turkey after receiving €180 million of taxpayers money from the interfering European Commission with not so much as a whimper from our weak and spineless political class.

A fundamental right of everyone in this country, which we have had for 800 years was undermined by the acceptance in 2014 of the European

Arrest Warrant. This procedure goes contrary to that most valuable right; the protection of the individual from the overreaching power of the state, afforded by one key principle of the Magna Carta, namely, Habeas Corpus. The Magna Carta gave us this protection which means that under UK law no one can be arrested and held for more than a few hours without evidence of guilt being presented to a court of law.

Every English speaking country in the world has inherited under English Common Law the protection afforded by this most fundamental of human rights. But we now have a situation that a British citizen can be arrested in the UK under the EAW and committed to a prison in France or anywhere else in the EU on the basis of a piece of paper purporting to show that an individual has committed a crime on the continent that might not even be a crime in the UK. And the British courts are now powerless to prevent arrest and deportation with no 'due process' to protect that individual. Such an individual can be committed to prison for an indefinite period with no requirement on the part of the state to show evidence of guilt before a court. Such protections does not exist in European law!

The choice we faced in the referendum was not just about voting to leave the EU or the status quo, but about whether we gave a green light to the EU for more federalism, the break up of the UK into EU regions, already in the works, the loss of the pound, the loss of our armed forces and the British parliament being relegated to little more than local authority council chamber.

We must inact Brexit by triggering Article 50, leave the EU and face a future with confidence in our time tested institutions and our ability to make our way in the world as a free sovereign nation proud of our traditions and our history.

The UK economy needs this now.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Correction

Dear Sir,

Rodney Atkinson's round-up of the insults that the EU establishment have heaped upon the heads of the peoples of Europe would be laughable were it not so sad. However, there are a couple of errors in the article which must be corrected.

First, the British people as a whole were never asked their opinion of membership of the euro only of the common market. Mr Atkinson's mention of "80%" presumably refers to the result of the internal poll of members of the Conservative Party conducted by William Hague.

Secondly, Greece did not join the euro in 1999 (when the founders of that ill-starred club did), but on the 1st January, 2001.

JOSEPH FOX
Surrey

Problems

Dear Sir,

Ken Worthy shows in his letter (*eurofacts* November) that he, along with far too many others, has not yet grasped the distinctions between the 27 members of the political EU, the 31 countries in the EEA or Single Market and the 51 countries (not 58 that was a typo!) on the continent of Europe.

Yes we voted to leave the EU on the 23rd June but we didn't vote to ruin our trade within the Single Market which, while I accept does need to be reformed and enlarged, still happens to be the most complex, sophisticated and yes successful trading market in the world of its type and size.

Finally he compounds his confusion by listing four problem areas, namely the immigration crisis, anti-terrorism measures, failing euro and EU

unemployment, which have nothing whatsoever to do with the EEA and everything to do with the undemocratic, corrupt, unaudited and moribund EU which we of course both want to leave.

It really would help if people, commenting on the manner of our Brexit, could get the basics right.

NIAL WARRY
Somerset

Time for action

Dear Sir,

Looking at recent events I am puzzled that it appears acceptable for an American president to tell the British how to vote; but not for the American President (elect) to express an opinion on who he would like as British Ambassador to America.

I would be interested in learned opinion.

Despite David Cameron's promise to abide by the referendum results and Mrs May's Brexit means Brexit I fear that triggering Article 50 and repealing the 1972 Communities bill may not happen. I agree with Mr Juncker both should have taken place immediately say in July then everyone would know where they were headed. [good for business and investment just assume no special deals].

Those farmers and fishermen who rely on so called EU money' should continue to be supported, but I see no reason for continuing payments to exclusive golf courses and wealthy landowners especially the 'slipper' farmers [landowners who rent out their land to tenant farmers but the landowners get the 'EU money' not the body doing the work and taking the risks with money, time and health].

The Navy should be increased to cope with the future safe guarding of

our fishing waters; increasing the armed services is not to be seen as aggression to others but as trained support for emergencies such as the recent floods. The armed services are trained to react and get on with it, not form a committee to discuss what can be done while people drown or die of exposure.

I cannot understand why the chancellor cannot see that borrowing a bit more money every year increases the outstanding debt and eventually we could be borrowing to pay the interest charge. This would leave nothing to invest in roads or hospitals and that could also mean no money to pay Civil Servants and Members of Parliament. How many would work for love?

One last thought. If Mr Corbyn took a course in basic bookkeeping he could be as good as any other prime minister and I do not think calls for an election are a good idea. [I am not a Labour supporter].

JULIE RUMBLE
North Devon

Referendum result

Dear Sir,

Why did the government supported by all political parties in the House of Commons waste taxpayers money by calling for a referendum on EU membership? Especially as it now appears that it did not intend to be bound by the result.

JOHN REYNOLDS
Coventry

Financial Support

We at *eurofacts* wish to thank all those who have provided financial support in order to keep up our work including the IPPR.

eurofacts wishes its readers the compliments of the season.

Our next issue will be published on 10th February 2017.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **12th January**, 6.00 pm

"Something in the Air: The Insidious Challenge of Air Pollution"

Carolyn Roberts, *Jackson Professor of Environment*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **17th January**, 1.00 pm

"Did Walter Scott Invent Scotland?"

Dr Juliet Shields, *University of Washington, Seattle and National Library of Scotland*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

The Economic Research Council

Wednesday **18th January**, 6.30 pm

"India and China: Partners or Rivals"

Dr Jonathan Ward

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London

Admission by ticket

(Non-ERC members £15

(Students £10) please contact www.ercouncil.org

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details:

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **7th February**, 6.00 pm

"The Dilemmas of Privacy and Surveillance"

Martyn Thomas, *IT Livery Company Professor of Information Technology*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Friday - Sunday

17th -19th March 2017

For all those who care about Freedom and Liberty

Further details including full list of speakers to be announced

FREEDOM FESTIVAL

Marsham Court Hotel, 3 Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth BH1 3AB

Admission - Information details contact Freedom Association

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Government **20th December**
Start of Christmas Recess

2017

Malta takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

UK Government **9th January**
End of Christmas Recess

UK Prime Minister suggested final date to implement Article 50 **March**

Estonia takes over **1st July**
EU Council Presidency

2018

Bugaria takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

British Future

www.britishfuture.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaonline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk

Change Britain

www.changebritain.org

Conservatives for Britain

www.conservativesforbritain.org

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

English Constitution Group

www.englishconstitutiongroup.org

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruith.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Futurus

www.futurus-thinktank.com

Get Britain Out

www.getbritainout.org

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

GrassRootsOut

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Stawatch

www.stawatch.org

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste. That's the strap line.

The EU: A Corporatist Racket

by *David Barnby*. **£9.99**

How the EU was created by global corporatism, he includes details about Edward Heath's real involvement.

The Road to Freedom

by *Gerard Batten MEP*. **£8.99**

A 2016 version following the vote leave result. How to exit the EU and regain a proper future for an independent UK.

Germany's Fourth Reich

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£8.00**

Code-breaker and spy explains the real drive by Germany for control over Europe without war.

Elephant in the Room

by *David Challice*. **£6.50**

Bite-sized nuggets of information regarding the UK/EU problem, covering the last 8 years.

The Democratic Imperative

by *Robert Corfe*. **£12.99**

The reality of power relations in the nation state and why democracy is only possible in a nation state.

A Doomed Marriage

Why Britain Should Leave the EU

by *Daniel Hannan*. **£8.99**

Without EU membership, the UK can become the most successful nation.

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union

by *Bob Lyddon*. **£8.00**

Lyddon explains how the UK's exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and could easily be more.

Brexit Revolt: How The UK Voted To Leave The EU

by *Michael Mosbacher & Oliver Wiseman*. **£10.00**

This is an account of how the idea of leaving the EU took root and the battle of ideas and egos that took place before and during the campaign.

The Market Solution

FLEXCIT - Flexible Exit and Continuous Development

by *Dr Richard E, North*. **£5.00**

How the UK can leave the EU, through an orderly, plausible and practical way, that is practically risk-free.

Mayhem In France

by *Cy Charles Ross*. **£6.99**

A World War 11 adventure about life with the French resistance based on real experience in occupied France.

Spyhunter

by *Michael Shrimpton*. **£25.00**

A fascinating alternative view of history, including the EU, exposes the secret world of German intelligence.

A Life Most Ordinary

by *Ken Wight*. **£7.99**

A UKIP activist reveals how his life in Slough has changed over the last 60 years, especially with the rise of the EU.

British History

by *Hugh Williams*. **£15.00**

An illustrated guide to a history of Britain from before Roman times to the present day House of Windsor.

DVD - The Norway Option

by *Bruges Group*. **£12.99**

Full analysis, run time 34 mins.

Send payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175
Email: info@juneypress.com

WEB SALES www.juneypress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£30
Europe (Airmail)	£42/€50
Rest of World	£55/\$95
Reduced rate (UK only)	£20

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *eurofacts* and the occasional papers.

I enclose my annual payment of £.....
to *eurofacts*: PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020 7973 1992
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	020 7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	01738 783936
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	
www.conservativesforbritain.org	
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

British Future	www.britishfuture.org
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	www.globalbritain.org
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Caroline Lucas MP and Jonathan Bartley	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Tim Farron MP	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Paul Nuttall MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

