

## Deal or no deal?

Brian Mooney

The UK faces some challenging Brexit negotiations, aggravated by questions over Parliamentary stability. However best practice identified in a commercial negotiating manual provides many pointers that Britain will secure a deal with the EU.

\* Pre-election rhetoric suggests that the tone of the negotiation might be 'competitive' (i.e. hostile). Much of it will actually be about **co-operation** on matters of common interest like trade, travel, security, etc.

\* **Power** is more balanced than some would say. We might buy more from the EU than vice-versa, but proportionately have more to lose on trade. However needlessly damaging a major customer will harm supply chains, EU exporters and EU nationals working in the UK and sending money home.

Over 50% of UK shares are now owned by international investors. EU holdings in the UK are worth around £500bn. During last September's G20 meeting, Japanese businesses and government demanded Single Market-type access be maintained by both sides.

Some interests in the EU have been tempted to use the negotiations to seize business from the UK, for instance in aviation and Euro clearing. However various authorities have replied why this would be counter-productive.

\* Having previously outsourced trade negotiations to the EU, the UK government now has some **experienced negotiators** available. These include Peter Hill, who worked for former EU Trade Commissioner

Mandelson, and Crawford Falconer, who worked for the World Trade Organization (WTO).

\* **Policy** on both sides is for free trade. This is obviously not absolute - the EU won't suddenly complete the single market or open up sensitive defence procurement. However it is bound by various international agreements that commit towards trade liberalisation, stability and not raising barriers.

The EU is a keen supporter of the WTO whose rules allow regional unions (such as the EU) as a means of easing trade between members, but **not to raise barriers to trade**. In fact, they must avoid creating adverse effects upon other WTO members.

WTO Director-General Robert Azevedo predicted that the UK would not suffer trade setbacks during or after its negotiations with the EU.

\* There is plenty of **incentive** for both sides to reach an agreement – if just because they will have to live together as neighbours. The UK could be a major ally in defence and security, so long as its economy is not crashed. It could also be a substantial makeweight in future joint trade deals?

The global economy is so interlinked that failure to reach a viable deal will affect wider economic confidence and stock markets. In the EU, exposed economies like the Irish Republic and Spain would take a hit, with likely local backlash against EU interests – just before the 2019 European Parliament elections.

A botched deal could see the Euro and Sterling hit, with safe haven

currencies like the Yen suddenly soaring, hitting wider currency and export stability.

\* Another factor is the view of the EU's 'social partners'.

ETUC represents EU-wide trade unions. Employers' bodies include Business Europe ('a CBI'), UEAPME (representing SMEs) and CEEP (representing public service providers). Seen as **influential stakeholders**, they wish to avoid austerity and damage to Europe's workers and companies.

\* Some worry about the **European Parliament** suddenly rejecting the deal at the end of negotiations. However, it is represented in them and will have regular updates, just as the various EU institutions regularly confer with each other. The major political groups in the European Parliament (and the European Council) share the social partners' concern about promoting free trade and avoiding austerity. This makes a surprise at the end unlikely.

\* The EU and UK will start negotiations with some **diverging and conflicting positions**, but remember that demands tend to be padded so that **compromises** are seen to be made. Spain has already gone back on the EU 'demand' over Gibraltar. In practice, there will be a lot of **common ground** (e.g. on expat rights), so expect positions to **converge**.

\* Despite pre-election **rhetoric** to appear 'tough', it has long been seen that May will play safe and trim to a position that can be pushed through

Continued on page 2

# Deal or no deal?

Continued from page 1

Parliament under tight timescales. This indicates arrangements very similar to being in the Single Market (EEA) as a **fallback** while the **ideal** of moving to a bespoke Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (CFTA) is worked on as arrangements stabilise. In March, Michel Barnier, the EU's chief negotiator, appeared to be leading the UK in the direction of EEA membership as the Brexit option with the least disruption.

Threatening to walk-away was part of that rhetoric. However neither side wants **'Mutually Assured Destruction'** that **'no deal'** would provide. You can bet there *will* be a deal, even if it's part agreement, part provisionally keeping respective ships afloat while talks continue.

\* Negotiations are often about **saving face**, getting a deal that can be **sold** to key audiences. The UK might, for example, get better trade terms in exchange for saving the EU a budget shortfall before 2021. Except it wouldn't be billed as a cave-in, at least in the UK. It might be portrayed as a goodwill gesture to have a joint 'Brexit adjustment fund'?

Other areas of **'compromise'** short term might be over accepting EU standards and judgments (which the UK might do anyway in 'nationalising' EU laws), or free movement of people. Theresa May has refused to guarantee

less EU immigration, consistent with keeping EU citizens' 'acquired rights'.

\* Attitudes to paying the EU vary from 'they're getting nothing' (apart from for joining in specific programmes) to '£60bn is peanuts to pay for winning back our priceless democracy'. The EU is already preparing for economies after 2021 in its budget, which might reveal the real **expectation**. However with Germany's election coming, Angela Merkel and the EU will not want to be seen as saddling Germany with extra contributions. We can expect a harder line short-term.

As an alternative to direct payments, the UK might **gesture** on recycling saved payments into projects of common interest concerning defence or tackling irregular migration?

\* A successful negotiation is one where **both sides** can claim some **success** at the end, even if some concessions leave bruises! Experienced negotiators will recognise that the other party will need to **maintain its image** too, and they will not seek to humiliate.

Earlier perceptions that the EU might want to 'punish' the UK to deter it or others from leaving have been overplayed. Its luminaries might have been releasing tensions immediately after the referendum shock, and the line taken since has typically been more conciliatory as heads cool. The

FT's Wolfgang Münchau saw little evidence that any other member state currently wants to follow the UK out of the EU, and failed to see a single insurmountable obstacle to a deal.

European Council President Donald Tusk has quipped that Brexit is 'punishment enough' as the UK copes with some upheaval.

\* There are already outline solutions to some identified problems. The EU can give legal exceptions (derogations) on border measures which might ease the Irish situation. The WTO 'waiver' system might allow provisional preferential trade agreements to run for a couple of years should there be difficulties (e.g. time-wise) in finalising what is necessarily a complex deal. The experience of the EU deal with Canada (CETA) is that much of the wider agreement can be worked to provisionally while it is being ratified.

\* The Lisbon Treaty focuses the EU towards the vision of 'an area of prosperity' marked by cooperation with neighbouring countries.

Lord (Paddy) Ashdown sees the UK getting a tailored Norway-like deal with a work permit system. He's not just a Lib Dem peer, he's President of the European Movement federalists in the UK.

Source  
[www.new-alliance.org.uk/ref617.htm](http://www.new-alliance.org.uk/ref617.htm)

## UK business potential

According to the Lloyds Bank Business in Britain report, business confidence has jumped to an 18-month high, although companies have also said that they are having difficulties in recruiting skilled

workers.

The report's confidence index which measures the expected sales, orders and profits has doubled from the level it was following the EU referendum result to 24%.

Meanwhile the Chambers of Commerce - who recently replaced their eurosceptic chairman - have forecast weak economic growth for the next few years.

Interestingly both agree on growth.

## Spain's Catalan referendum

Despite the wishes of Spain and the EU the Catalan region of Spain is to hold an 'Independence Referendum' on the 1st October 2017.

The Catalan leader Carles Puigdemont has said nothing will stop this independence vote and that if it is a win for independence, the EU will

have to accept it.

Could this become the start of a further break-up of the EU, but this time from within?

# EU considers plans to raise money after Brexit

*Extract of an article in the euobserver by Aleksandra Eriksson*

**T**he European Commission has unveiled a reflection paper on the future EU budget, amid concerns that the departure of the UK - a net contributor - would stretch the current resources.

“We won’t have the UK with us any more, but they were net payers ... so we will have a gap of €10 billion to €11 billion a year,” EU budget chief Gunther Oettinger told a news conference in Brussels on the 28th June, referring to the fact that Britain paid more into the budget than it got back.

At €150 billion, the EU budget is relatively small if compared to the US federal one, where 2016 spending was \$3.9 trillion (€3.4 trillion).

Member states send roughly one per cent of their general national income to Brussels, whereas Washington gets roughly 20 per cent of the income of federal states.

Government contributions account for about 80 per cent of the total budget. The rest comes from customs duties and a carbon emissions trading system.

Brexit comes just as the EU has been tasked with extra work by its member states: stronger border control, combating terrorism, and forming a defence union.

“We can either spend less or find new revenues,” Oettinger said.

He put forward ideas for what such streams could be;

That UK holiday makers could have to pay €5 each time they travel to the EU after their country leaves the bloc.

The EU could also introduce a tax on financial transactions, electricity, motor fuel or corporations, if member states agree..

But the EU will also have to make cuts and shift priorities to make ends meet, Oettinger warned.

In order to stimulate a broader discussion on what to keep and what to slash, the commission set out five possible scenarios for the future budget, with options ranging from carrying on as usual to far-reaching changes with less support to agriculture and cohesion policy, which currently take more than 70 per cent of the money.

While member states are generally unwilling to pay more into the budget, it is likely that proposals to cut funding to agriculture or other programmes will turn out to be controversial.

The paper also questions the length of the budget period, which is currently runs over a seven-year span. This could be shortened to five years, to coincide with the mandates of the European Parliament and the commission.

Another proposal on the table is whether one should introduce

conditionality on EU funds, so as to stop them from going to countries that violate the rule of law or refuse to take refugees.

When asked if he would support linking funds with such democratic conditions, Oettinger said he was “entirely open to the result to be achieved”, and welcomed a discussion on the matter.

Member states, the European Parliament and civil society will now be asked to discuss the five scenarios.

Their views will feed into the proposal for the next long-term budget, which will start running in 2021. The commission will present this budget bill in the middle of next year.

Brexit would already eliminate the rebates enjoyed by member states such as Denmark and Sweden, Oettinger said.

The budget could also be augmented by fines, such as the recent ones against Apple and Google (€22.4 billion), who were found to be in breach of EU antitrust rules and charged with paying billions in fines.

But these fines would take many years to end up in the EU coffers, because of lengthy appeal processes and Oettinger said it was not possible to count on such income to finance EU policies.

## EU budget for 2018

**T**he European Commission’s draft budget for 2018 has been announced by Guenther Oettinger in which he said is “the last normal budget at 28”, referring again to the UK leaving the bloc.

The EU executive proposed a 1.4% increase of commitments (promises to pay) and an 8.1% increase in payments, compared to this year.

“This is realistic and will meet challenges faced by [the] EU,” said Oettinger. He insisted that his budget proposal was tailored to “fulfil traditional tasks”, such as the structural funds, research, or agriculture, while taking up new tasks, for instance: border security or funds to keep refugees in their countries or in Turkey.

The commission increased the

budget for Erasmus+, the student exchange programme, by 9.5% to €2.3 billion, and the budget for the Horizon 2020 research programme by 7.3%, to over €11 billion, as part of an effort to help spur growth and reduce unemployment.

It also added for the first time a €40-million budget line for cooperation on defence research.

# Future world trade opportunities

*Extract of Global Britain briefing Note No 124 dated 21st April 2017*

Over the next 60 years population growth and therefore world trade opportunities will increase substantially outside the narrow area of the EU.

will account for almost a third of global population by 2020, rising to almost 40% by 2080. (Table 1)

\* Asian Commonwealth countries, principally India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, will continue to account for more than half of total

Commonwealth population. (Table 2)

\* African Commonwealth countries' population will grow significantly as a proportion of total Commonwealth population, from 23% in 2020 to 40% in 2080. (Table 3)

\* The 53 Commonwealth countries

**Table 1: Global population by main region in billions**

Region	2020	2050	2080	Growth 2080/2020
Asia	4.60	5.27	5.14	+ 12%
Africa	1.34	2.48	3.72	2.78 times
Europe	0.74	0.71	0.66	Shrinkage by 11%
Latin America/Caribbean	0.67	0.78	0.78	+16%
North America	0.37	0.43	0.48	+ 30%
Oceania (inc. Australia/NZ)	0.04	0.06	0.07	+60%
<b>World</b>	<b>7.76</b>	<b>9.73</b>	<b>10.85</b>	<b>+40.96</b>
<b>Of which Commonwealth C'tries</b>	<b>2.58</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>+66%</b>
<b>Commonwealth as % of World</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>39%</b>	

**Table 2: The nine Commonwealth countries: population in millions**

Country	2020	2050	2080	Growth 2080/2020
India	1388.9	1705.3	1737.2	+ 25%
Pakistan	208.4	309.6	359.8	+ 73%
Bangladesh	170.5	202.2	189.3	+ 11%
Malaysia	32.4	40.7	42.1	+ 30%
<i>Sri Lanka</i>	<i>21.2</i>	<i>20.1</i>	<i>17.4</i>	<i>negative</i>
Papua New Guinea	7.1	7.1	7.1	zero
Singapore	6.0	6.7	6.1	+ 2%
Brunei Darasalaam	0.4	0.5	0.5	+ 25%
Maldives	0.4	0.5	0.5	+ 25%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>1835.3</b>	<b>2292.7</b>	<b>2360.0</b>	<b>+ 29%</b>

**Table 3: The eighteen African Commonwealth countries: population in millions**

Country	2020	2050	2080	Growth 2080/2020
Nigeria	206.8	398.5	622.7	3.0 times
Tanzania	62.3	137.1	236.2	3.8 times
South Africa	56.7	65.5	67.7	+ 19%
Kenya	52.2	95.5	138.0	2.6 times
Uganda	45.9	101.9	167.5	3.6 times
Mozambique	32.0	65.5	105.8	3.3 times
Ghana	30.5	50.1	66.5	2.2 times
Cameroon	26.3	48.4	71.3	2.7 times
Malawi	20.0	43.2	71.2	3.6 times
Zambia	18.9	43.0	78.7	4.2 times
Zimbabwe*	17.5	29.6	38.1	2.2 times
Rwanda	13.0	21.2	25.7	2.0 times
Sierra Leone	7.2	11.4	14.1	2.0 times
Nambia	2.7	4.3	5.4	2.0 times
Botswana	2.5	3.4	3.7	1.5 times
Lesotho	2.3	3.0	3.5	1.3 times
Swaziland	1.4	1.8	2.1	1.5 times
<i>Mauritius</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>1.2</i>	<i>1.1</i>	<i>negative</i>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>595.6</b>	<b>1119.4</b>	<b>1713.5</b>	<b>2.9 times</b>

\* Currently suspended from the Commonwealth

# Future world trade opportunities

\* Between 2020 and 2080 projected figures:

In Africa, the population of a number of large non-Commonwealth countries will grow rapidly.

In Asia, the population of China and

Japan will shrink significantly while those of Indonesia and the Phillipines will grow.

The population of the USA to grow by almost 100 million.

Russia's population to shrink by

17% - 24 million, while that of Ukraine to shrink by 36%.

The aggregate population of EU 27 (excluding the UK) to shrink by almost 50 million. (Table 7)

**Table 7: Selected Non-Commonwealth Countries: population in millions**

Country	2020	2050	2080	Growth 2080/2020
<b>Africa</b>				
Ethiopia	112	188	237	2.1 times
Congo(Dem.Rep)	90	195	321	3.6 times
Egypt	101	151	188	1.9 times
Sudan	45	80	113	2.5 times
Niger	24	72	152	6.3 times
<b>East Asia</b>				
<i>China</i>	<i>1403</i>	<i>1348</i>	<i>1123</i>	<i>Shrinkage 20%</i>
Indonesia	272	322	324	+ 19%
<i>Japan</i>	<i>125</i>	<i>107</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>Shrinkage 28%</i>
Philippines	108	148	167	+ 55%
Vietnam	98	113	110	+ 12%
<b>Middle East</b>				
<i>Iran</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>92</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>Shrinkage 5%</i>
Iraq	42	84	134	3.2 times
<b>Latin America</b>				
Brazil	216	238	220	+ 2%
Mexico	135	164	161	+ 8%
<b>North America</b>				
USA	334	389	431	+ 29%
<b>Europe/Near Europe</b>				
<i>Russia</i>	<i>143</i>	<i>129</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>Shrinkage 17%</i>
Turkey	83	96	94	+ 13%
<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>35</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>Shrinkage 36%</i>
Switzerland	9	10	11	+ 22%
Norway	5	7	7	+ 40%
<i>EU-27*</i>	<i>442</i>	<i>424</i>	<i>392</i>	<i>Shrinkage 11%</i>

\* see Global Britain Briefing Note No 123: *Post Brexit, Remaining EU to lose 49 million of population by 2080*

Data Source:

1. United Nations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs,

Population Divisions:- *World Tables: 2020 - 2100: Medium Variant. Population Prospects: The 2015 Revision, Volume 1: Comprehensive*

2. [www.global-britain.org](http://www.global-britain.org)

# EU harmonisation to continue 7/17

The EU has now turned its attention to harmonisation of e-charging for the hopeful rise of electric vehicles.

The EU in October 2014 promised to reduce energy use and energy savings in the building sector by 27% is part of implementing the EU's pledge to reduce energy use through energy efficiency by "at least 27 percent". This was reaffirmed in the global climate agreement in Paris in 2015.

The European Commission has recently failed to convince ministers to adopt its November 2016 proposal to require one in ten parking spaces to have a charging station for electric cars by 2025. The plan would apply to parking built for new buildings such as offices and shopping malls, so-called non-residential and also to any major

renovation work carried out on such existing building.

Major renovation is defined as work that costs at least 25 percent of the building's value, or if it affects more than 25 percent of the building's envelope, which includes walls, roof, doors, foundation.

The remain reasons used against such a proposal is that;

Energy efficiency is dealt with by energy ministers.

E-mobility, charging stations are dealt with by the transport ministers of the member states.

The total cost, which according to the EU commission, was estimated at €3,500 per charging station.

Member states wish to decide themselves on how they would increase the number of charging

stations for electric vehicles, instead of committing to a pan-EU target.

Malta, which is hosting the rotating six-month EU presidency until the end of the 1st July has tried to water down the proposal by numerous suggestions but most notably the idea of a requirement to install "ducting infrastructure, that is to say the conduits for electric cables, to enable the installation at a later stage of recharging points for electric vehicles.

Others may consider that is a way to enable the proposals to be brought forward at a later date.

What is clear is that the EU wish to harmonise every aspect of the way of life of the national governments of its member states including how and what they invest their hard earned taxpayers money in.

## How to raise money German style

Social media companies in Germany face fines of up to €50 million (£43.9 million) if they fail to remove "obviously illegal" content in time.

From October, Facebook, YouTube and other sites with more than 2 million users in Germany must take down posts containing hate speech or other criminal matters within 24 hours.

Material which is not obviously unlawful must be assessed within 7 days.

The new law is one of the toughest of its kind in the world.

## EU economic integration continues 6/17

We now hear that the German Chancellor Angela Merkel is agreeing with the new French President Emmanuel Macron that the time is ripe for the economic integration of the eurozone.

In spite of the German public being concerned about the billions spent on

bailing out Greece, Merkel has said she would support the idea of a eurozone finance minister and a eurozone budget if the circumstances were right. This is what Macron called for in his presidential battle in order to reform the 19-members of the eurozone.

However, Germany is wary of any

move that might lead to a "transfer union" - a common budget used to support the financial problems in the other members of the eurozone.

How this would affect the other 9 current members (including the UK) of the EU does not appear to be a consideration.

## Defence agenda

How the EU interferes with UK defence.

The only reason the UK is permitted to build its own aircraft carriers is by using an exemption to the EU Procurement Directive. The exemption is known as the security clause (Article 346) and is permitted when a member state feels there is a national security reason to reserve production for its

domestic market. The European Commission is tightening application of the clause following a review in 2016 and has gained the consent of member states to do so. (EU Council Conclusions, 14 November 2016).

The EU refers to EU defence industrial strategy as the European Defence Technology and Industrial Base (EDTIB) and has more recently

started using the term 'Single Market for Defence'. With the objective of 'reducing duplication, the EU intends to integrate this market under coordinated joint projects and an EU-controlled policy environment. The aim is for the resulting combined EU defence industrial strategy to serve the needs of the EU's 'new level of ambition' in a military context.

## BOOK REVIEW

Derek Sterling

# Where there is a will there is a way

In this substantial report by the Bruges Group, all the main concerns of the route to a fair and workable exit from the EU are discussed.

The report is broken down into 10 main issues namely

1. The EU will refuse to give us a deal' (or delay it).
2. The UK will have no input in EU decision meeting.
3. The EU will impose punishing tariffs.
4. Exporting to the EU from outside is not bureaucracy free.
5. There will be complex new 'rules of origin' and additional paperwork for British goods.
6. UK businesses will face barriers from accessing EU financial markets.
7. The EU will try to stop the UK accessing EU-third country trade deals.
8. The EU will demand access to our fishing waters.
9. Security co-operation and cross-border Crime prevention.
10. Agriculture and the EU protectionism and environmental matters.

All these issues are broken down into sub-heading and explained in greater detail.

This is a pamphlet for all those

---

### What it Will Look Like

How leaving the EU and the Single Market can be made to work for Britain

by Robert Oulds, Gary Robinson and Dr Lee Rotherham

Bruges Group Pamphlet 54pp 2017

Available from  
*The June Press*  
Price £5.00 + 10% p&p  
(see back cover)

---

ISBN 978-0-956461476

interested in obtaining a sensible workable and relatively quick introduction of Brexit.

Regardless of how you voted in the EU referendum this publication is a useful guide to the way forward for the negotiations that are currently under way.

It sets out a bold vision on how exiting the EU and even the single market and the customs union, can be turned into a successful advantage for Britain's future development.

Furthermore, it looks into the World Trade Organization (WTO) especially in reference to the 'Rules of Origin'

In conclusion it thinks that having a more liberal regulatory regime and

tariff free access to the EU's single market (reasons for tariff free explained), Britain will be able to become a regional value added production hub. Britain's economy will therefore not only benefit from the additional bilateral trade with other territories but will also capture a number of benefits:-

1. Increased trade.
2. Increased freight and haulage through the UK as a pass through onto its final destination.
3. Increased assembly and manufacturing within the UK ( to meet the rules of origin that require a declaration to be made that at least partial reworking has occurred to the produce).
4. Increased economic activity and employment and the resulting fiscal benefits.
5. Increased use of a made in Britain mark makes the UK's regulatory regime more internationally relevant.

After reading this report one can be in doubt that the UK is in a position to become a good neighbour to the EU instead of a thorn in its side. Therefore, allowing the EU to continue on its desired direction of ever-closer union with full political union and control of the economy of all its members.

## Fishing rules may change

The announcement by the UK government that the London Convention on fishing is to be stopped that upset the EU's Michel Barnier, who claims that the EU law/Common Fisheries Policy has superseded this Convention. He is of course representing the remaining 27 EU members who benefit from the Common Fisheries Policy and one of his priorities in the upcoming Brexit negotiations.

The London Convention was signed in 1964 before the UK joined the EU and Barnier's argument is that the CFP which allows EU fishing vessels from all EU countries to fish beyond the 12-mile limit has superseded the Convention and is now the law.

British fishermen have been complaining that when the UK joined the European Community in 1973, their interests were sidelined.

Ireland's agriculture minister,

Michael Creed, however criticised Britain's decision as "unwelcome and unhelpful."

According to official data, 10,000 tonnes of fish – worth an estimated £17 million (€19 million) – were caught by vessels from other countries in 2015. However, the overall UK fisheries sector, with over 6,000 vessels, landed 708,000 tonnes of fish under the agreement – worth £775 million (€883 million).

# Suggested way forward for UKIP

Hugh Williams

The paradox of the result of the 2017 general election is that it has seen the near annihilation of UKIP, and yet it has also demonstrated the clear need for UKIP to continue its work. As I write this Mrs May is still our prime minister but she now has a clearly weakened hand to play at the EU negotiating table; a development that has been noted with glee by senior politicians on the other side of the Channel.

So, in the first instance, UKIP must keep going in order to exert pressure on the Tories; to ensure that they produce a favourable Brexit. This need is as vital now as it has ever been, and those of us who had thought that UKIP had done its work and we could put our feet up and enjoy a smooth ride to the finishing line, need to think again.

That is for now, but, beyond the day of our hoped-for departure from the EU, what role should UKIP play?

One of the most striking things that has been seen during the aftermath of the general election is how so many, on both sides of the political divide, are calling for MPs of all parties to work together. What they are saying, in effect, is that politicians should forget the party labels that they have hanging round their necks like nooses; stop being political adversaries and start working alongside each other for what one might call “the common good”.

While this thinking may be ‘pie in the sky’, I entirely endorse it and believe that UKIP is ideally placed and, of all the parties, best suited to make a significant contribution to the development and fulfilment of this sudden and widespread wish.

## What is wrong with the way this country is currently governed?

Please don't take this personally (don't anyone in UKIP take this personally) but I think political parties, as they

currently operate, are simply dreadful organisations. The two-party system polarises people. It makes those on one side hold their political opponents on the other side to be beyond the pale. A quite illogical and damaging state of affairs, since no party has any right to claim that it possesses the only truths on which, and principles by which, a country should be governed.

## Political parties divide a nation.

Because of the ding-dong battle that one always sees going on between them, political parties make a mockery of reasoned argument.

Despite the very different labels that have been stuck onto political parties, in the main, they are all so similar in what they stand for that, in reality, there is precious little difference between them – Indeed I'd like to ask, “What IS the point of putting people into such opposing groups?”

All of which means that: Political parties make for bad government.

I would like to suggest a better way, and it is the very one that is already being called for. Indeed, it is one that UKIP is ideally suited to champion.

Before I describe what UKIP should do, I need to make a confession: I have never cared one fig for any of UKIP's policies, other than its wish for the UK to leave the EU. Indeed, I went on local TV in 2014 and said that I felt we should indeed be considered a single-issue party.

I apologise to all those who worked so hard on our manifestoes but I had better be honest.

However, think of this: While others may not care to admit this, in my view what won us the holding of the referendum, and then what helped us play such a strong part in winning the actual vote, was the one single issue that we had always striven for. That one single issue that has done us all so very proud; none of our other policies

have ever mattered. Indeed, their very existence has often caused us trouble.

Additionally, two of our party leaders admitted in public that they hadn't even read our general election manifesto. Doesn't that just show how we didn't, and don't, need a quiverful of policies? Let's face it, few people are interested in them.

I strongly maintain that, if UKIP is ever to succeed again, it needs to be different from the rest; we need to create clear water between us and the other parties. And if we are to do this then we have to be *really* different from the rest of the parties. And the way I think we should achieve this is that our sole purpose should be that of supporting and encouraging the election of *independent* Members of Parliament. This is, in effect exactly what we hear and see a great many commentators now calling for

To put a little meat onto the bones of this suggestion, let me briefly describe how I have seen independent politicians working successfully in exactly this way: For six years (1987 – 1993) I served on the Dartmoor National Park Committee (DNP). While there have been changes in local government since then, at that stage this was the largest sub-committee in Devon County Council (we had a multi-million-pound budget thirty years ago) and, from my personal observation, I would strongly maintain that it was a microcosm of good government. It was “good” because there were no party politics involved.

Yes, there were members of all three main parties who served on it, and they were joined by independent members appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment (of whom I was one); but we all worked together using common sense, and not party whips, to reach our decisions. As a result, it was a very happy and effective ship of government.

# Suggested way forward for UKIP

The way I decided to vote was to use what I call the CCCP principle – Don't worry, it has nothing to do with the former Soviet Union. The letters stand for the following, and please note the order. I would vote:

First according to my own Conscience.

Next according to my Constituents' wishes.

Then according to my Country's needs.

And lastly (though this never applied to me since I didn't belong to a political party) according to my Party's diktats.

And I think I can claim that this was how everybody voted. This did not mean that we always voted unanimously but we were an extremely harmonious tier of government that did its job very efficiently. If that system could work so well in the way it ran the national park, there is no logical reason why we could not have something similar to run the nation? The scale may be different but the principle is the same.

So, the point I am trying to promote is that, if more MP's were encouraged to vote according to the CCCP principle, the country would enjoy far better government – exactly the one that is now being asked for. If UKIP can help independent MPs get elected – people who then always vote according to the CCCP principle – we would have made a valuable start.

If UKIP were to adopt this philosophy, I would suggest that it changes its name, but only very slightly, to the U K Independents Party; a subtle but telling change.

Our role then would be to field candidates who not only believe that we must leave and never re-join the EU, but also who subscribe to the CCCP philosophy. My hunch is that the CCCP principle has always been the political and philosophical make-up of most of UKIP's candidates over the years, in any event. In other words, maybe what I am suggesting is not as

radical, or laughable, as others may initially think.

Our party manifesto could then be terribly short. It would simply say something like, "Your UKIP candidate has just one job to do: to represent your interests. He, or she, will do what you want him, or her, to do so long as it doesn't offend his or her own conscience. While our candidate will bring his own ideas to the table, and tell you what they are, in principle, if elected, his job will be to do *your* bidding, and not that of any party official or whip."

For the sake of such elected UKIP MPs, as well as those elected to other tiers of UK government, I would strongly suggest that UKIP has a properly funded research department that issues quality papers on a wide range of subjects, with proposals for and against, and through these documents the party would offer guidance where an elected UKIP MP (sic) is undecided how to vote, but UKIP must never give an order on how an MP should vote.

Before I conclude, readers will have already raised the question of how, under this system, a government would get its proposals through Parliament. My simple answer is that, if it fails to get them passed then, frankly, toughers. That is what democracy is all about.

But how much better to have an honest system to replace the present one where, for far too long, voters have, in effect, elected washing machines to the House of Commons. Each party member may look a bit different but, in reality, they are all the same behind their outward appearance. Just like washing machines, they only work when their owners (the party bosses – the whips) come along and press the button for them to do the work they have been pre-programmed to do.

Currently there is no room for independent thought in Westminster. Indeed, anyone who shows any initiative is usually side-lined and kept under control on the back-benches.

No wonder we have been so badly served at Westminster for all these years. This has to change and UKIP could be the force that puts humans, and not Hotpoint's, into the chamber of the House of Commons.

In conclusion I believe this is a laudable proposal. At last it would give us honest government.

And, please always remember: UKIP has done it before.

Just think how, by working together, UKIP has caused this country to vote to leave the EU. This is a simply staggering achievement. It has been won over many years of very hard pounding. It has been won against unthinkable odds. UKIP has caused a *huge*, and fundamental, difference to UK politics – we have created a veritable political earthquake! This is something we can all be extremely proud of. If we have done it once; we can do it again.

If we could introduce whip-free independently-minded MPs to the House, that would make a second, and just as fundamental, difference to the way this country is governed. In other words, creating an honest House of Commons is every bit as important as getting us out of the EU's clutches.

By adopting this totally new and honest approach to British politics, UKIP would put clear water between itself and the other "washing machine" parties.

After everything that UKIP has achieved for our country, I believe that those who live in our country not only need us to create a more honest system of government; they seem to be asking for it, and in significant numbers We must not let them down.

Hugh Williams was a UKIP candidate 8 times; deputy and later UKIP National Treasurer 2010-2015.

Author of *101 Reasons why we should leave the EU*

Publisher of: *Brussels Laid Bare* by Marta Andreasen and

*Europe on 387 Million Euros a Day* by Olly Figg.

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Time for a positive view

Dear Sir,

Why is it that all we ever are told about by the BBC and the business lobby is about how much Brexit will cost the UK taxpayers?

The financial savings of not paying huge sums into the ever growing costs of EU membership are ignored.

The ability to acquire cheaper food and products from outside the EU.

The trading opportunities from making deals with the largest market and population in the world that market is outside the EU.

The ability to change laws which are not in the interest of the UK taxpayers.

The ability to make the UK supreme court actually supreme for the citizens of the UK.

The ability to make voting in the UK actually mean that the government can implement the will of the people without the interference the the European institutions and courts.

Let the positive view of leaving the undemocratic European Union actually be heard properly. It is not Europe that we are leaving just the area under the control of the undemocratic EU.

DOREEN SANDERSON  
Coventry

## The rise of the pro-EU lobby

Dear Sir,

Yet again the very cunning pro-EU lobby are making sure that they are heard above those who legally voted for leaving the EU.

The result of the EU referendum is slowly being watered down by those determined to prevent the wishes of the electorate. The idea that the voters don't understand the issue is being constantly promoted and that really it was a vote against the powers that be.

This is nonsense as the issues were clearly put and the threats of total disaster if we left the control of the EU

were thrown up every day before the vote was taken.

Should the public be ignored then the future of democracy and individual liberty will be lost. Future turn-out and therefore legitimacy of government to govern for the people will be lost.

RICHARD EVANS  
Manchester

## Pay rises and taxation

Dear Sir,

We all agree that pay rises in the public or private sector are always a goal for those employed. But what is often forgotten is that pay rises have to be paid for with increased productivity and/or finance from somewhere.

The private sector needs increased profits while the public sector needs increased tax take from companies or the public at large. Increased taxes on companies drives away jobs while increased tax on the public puts up inflation.

Furthermore as a member of an expensive club the EU, the increasing cost of membership directly and indirectly has to be paid for first.

Until the country can balance its income with its expenditure just like any household then the cost of the interest payments on the overspend will preclude any serious attempt to afford wage rises.

MALCOLM GREEN  
Swindon

## EU hard-line tactics

Dear Sir,

I have recently read an article about the EU Brexit negotiations that I think should be shared with others.

In the EU's hard-line tactics about Brexit it has pointed out that it expects that "[Any free trade agreement] must ensure a level playing field in terms of competition and state-aid, and must encompass safeguards against unfair

competitive advantages".

This is ridiculous and is, in effect, an attempt to ensure that the UK becomes harmonised to European Court and Commission decisions, even after the UK leaves them.

To stipulate that any deal is contingent on the UK not using its competitive advantage is completely unacceptable. The UK is a sovereign state and should be able to act independently after it leaves the EU. To tie the UK to the EU in such a manner in matters of trade would undermine the UK's position in the world for years to come.

KATHY MILLER  
London

## Students and reality

Dear Sir,

We should all remember that we were young and students once and that is why Labour offered them carrots knowing they would jump at them as we once would.

In the original vote regarding our Common Market membership those voting 'Yes' believed the propaganda they were fed by the government machine. Yet these same people after years of membership have now understood the reality of membership and with experience voted 'No more'.

The idea that there is know world worth living in outside the narrow margins of the EU is unreal.

Students have always travelled in Europe and will continue to do so but as travel has become easier the whole world is now easily available for students not just Europe.

Free education is a myth as eventually it has to be paid for by all, the only difference is that the higher the cost now the greater the levels of taxation to be paid later.

CAROLINE STEVENS  
Bristol

**Wishing you a happy summer recess, next eurofacts 15th September**

# MEETINGS

## The Economic Research Council

Thursday **14th September**, 6.30 pm

*“The Inadequacies of Stress Testing Methods on Banks”*

**Professor Kevin Dowd**, *Senior fellow with the Cobden Centre and long-standing free market economist*

Tuesday **3rd October**, 6.30 pm

*“Title - to be announced”*

**Dr Graham Gudgin**, *University of Cambridge*

Thursday **5th October**, 6.30 pm

*“Central Bank Engagement with Society”*

**Andrew Haldane**, *Chief Economist, Bank of England and a member of the Bank’s Monetary Policy Committee*

### 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) via: [www.ercouncil.org](http://www.ercouncil.org)

**Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

During **November**

**Further details and speakers to be announced**

### INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James’s Street, London SW1A 1LR

**Admission charge to be announced**

### FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations.

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175**

**or**

**Email: [eurofacts@juneypress.com](mailto:eurofacts@juneypress.com)**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **7th June**, 6.00 pm

*“Fifty Years of Conservation Areas”*

**Professor Simon Thurley with Desmond Fitzpatrick and Lester Hillman**

### PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

**Admission Free**

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2017

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

UK Government **20th July**  
Recess starts

UK Government **5th September**  
Recess ends

UK Government ??? **15th September**  
Conference Recess starts

Lib-Dems **16th-19th September**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Bournemouth  
Bournemouth International Centre

German Election **24th September**

Labour **24th-27th September**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Brighton  
The Brighton Centre

UKIP **29th-30th September**  
Party National Conference  
Torquay  
Riveria Conference Centre

Conservative **1st-4th October**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Manchester  
Manchester Central Conference Centre

UK Government ??? **10th October**  
Conference Recess ends

## USEFUL WEB SITES

### British Constitution Group

[www.britishconstitutiongroup.com](http://www.britishconstitutiongroup.com)

### British Future

[www.britishfuture.org](http://www.britishfuture.org)

### British Weights & Measures Assoc.

[www.bwmaonline.com](http://www.bwmaonline.com)

### Bruges Group

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

### Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

### Campaign for an Independent Britain

[www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk](http://www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk)

### Change Britain

[www.changebritain.org](http://www.changebritain.org)

### Conservatives for Britain

[www.conservativesforbritain.org](http://www.conservativesforbritain.org)

### Democracy Movement

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

### English Constitution Group

[www.englishconstitutiongroup.org](http://www.englishconstitutiongroup.org)

### EU Observer

[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

### EU Truth

[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

### European Commission (London)

[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

### European Foundation

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

### Freedom Association

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

### Futurus

[www.futurus-thinktank.com](http://www.futurus-thinktank.com)

### Get Britain Out

[www.getbritainout.org](http://www.getbritainout.org)

### Global Britain

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

### Global Vision

[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

### GrassRootsOut

[www.grassrootsout.co.uk](http://www.grassrootsout.co.uk)

### June Press (Publications)

[www.juneypress.com](http://www.juneypress.com)

### Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

### Leave.eu

[www.Leave.eu](http://www.Leave.eu)

### New Alliance

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

### Open Europe

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

### Sovereignty

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

### Statawatch

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

### The Taxpayers’ Alliance

[www.taxpayersalliance.com](http://www.taxpayersalliance.com)

### United Kingdom Independence Party

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

**Seizing the moment**

by *John Ashworth*. **£4.00**

The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200nm/midline resources zone.

**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.

**Britain's Referendum Decision and its Effects**

by *Stephen Bush*. **£8.99**

Clear facts that explain the dangers we face inside or outside the EU.

**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.

**Brave New Europe?**

by *Mick Greenhough*. **£10.00**

A comprehensive account of the origins of the EU and what they intend to do in the future with or without the UK.

**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.

**Britain Votes To Leave, What Happens Next**

by *Ian Milne*. **£2.50**

A fictional letter from the UK Prime Minister to the EU after a referendum decision to leave with detailed ideas.

**Brexit Revolt: How The UK Voted To Leave The EU**

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

How the idea of leaving the EU took root and the battle of ideas and egos that went on 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.

**What it Will Look Like**

How leaving the EU and the Single Market can be made to work for Britain

by *the Bruges Group*. **£5.00**

Addressing the main concerns this report shows a clear route out of the EU.

**The Dark Side of European Integration**

Edited by *Anton Shekhovtsov*. **£22.99**

How social and cultural issues form radical right movements in the EU.

**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.

**Send payment to**

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

Tel: 08456 120 175  
Email: [info@junepress.com](mailto:info@junepress.com)

**WEB SALES [www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)**

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

## 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](http://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	<a href="http://www.britishfuture.org">www.britishfuture.org</a>
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	<a href="http://www.globalbritain.org">www.globalbritain.org</a>
Global Vision	<a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a>
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
Leader - To be announced	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Leader - To be announced	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006