

22nd February, 2017

Double-Dutch

Reports today in the press indicate that, for the second time since 2007, it looks like the Dutch will have their Referendum results overturned by their own Parliament in favour of the EU. Though this is not certain at this moment, it appears that it will take place - the result will be that the Dutch government will overturn a Referendum which the Dutch population petitioned for, and decisively won by a 2/3rd majority.

That Referendum, last year, was about whether the EU should give visa-free access to approximately 41 million Ukrainians, and which the majority of the Dutch population were against - the EU had already stated that it would ignore the Referendum result - the EU *modus operandi*.

Earlier, in 2005, the Dutch and French populations decisively rejected the Constitution for Europe Treaty (2004), which incidentally, Blair and Straw had previously signed - that treaty was temporarily shelved, and reappeared by stealth, hidden within the texts of the Lisbon Treaty (2007)

Gordon Brown used the Royal Prerogative to Ratify that treaty without Parliamentary scrutiny. The same Royal Prerogative that May was not allowed to use to invoke Article 50 (TEU) because of Blair's "Supreme Court" final ruling.

We are in the current situation because of, what amounts to an establishment (EU) stitch-up, which gave Parliament (the EU) the right to interfere in the triggering of Article 50. The Lords are making a meal of the opportunity it was clearly manipulated to achieve

Blair's recent appearance was the starting pistol for a coordinated, establishment fight-back against the UK leaving the EU, by those most likely to profit from the UK's demise.

By all means, the Lords should debate matters affecting the UK on the domestic agenda, not (yet) controlled by the EU, but it must be noted that those who are arguing to block the Article 50 Bill, are fully aware that it is not in the best interests of the UK to stay in the EU.

Should they vote to block the Bill, they are, quite simply acting deliberately against Britain's best interests - in the best traditions of another "Lord" who was anti-British, at the time that Britain was fighting for its survival.

The evidence that many of those speaking, and voting, against the Article 50 Bill are knowingly acting against Britain's true interests, can be deduced from examples.

Take Mandelson's claim that he is not voting against leaving the EU for the sake of his pension, and he claims that he is a patriot - he may well be an EU patriot, but he is not a UK patriot.

For example, at the time of the signing of the Lisbon Treaty he stated that: ***"There is no constitutional change that would justify holding a referendum"***. - Peter Mandelson, Trade Commissioner, 2007. - clearly Mandelson was aware of the contents of the Lisbon Treaty (2007), and that such a claim is simply disingenuous - and he still seeks to keep the British people under the thumb of the EU.

Each member state ratified the Lisbon Treaty (2007) and thereby accepted, on behalf of their populations, that they would, in future live under the rejected Constitution for Europe (2004) - which came into effect in each member state in 2009.

(New) Labour were well aware of the ramifications of the treaty; indeed they forced it upon the UK population by stealth. Blair, Brown, Mandelson, members of the PLP (though

perhaps not all), and others, some in the Civil Service and anyone, in either the Lower or Upper Houses of Parliament, who had previously worked, or currently works, within the EU hierarchy or other senior positions are complicit in attempts to "sell" the UK, wholesale, to the EU, over the heads of the UK population. That is to say, if they speak out and vote against the triggering of Article 50 (TEU).

The simple truth is that, if the establishment manage to keep the UK in the EU,

- then the UK will be broken up into regions to be administered by EU appointed governors, who would report directly to Brussels;
- EU paramilitary police would replace our police on our streets, and EU prosecutors, located in the regions would ensure that the UK populations were kept under control, and on message.
- All aspects of our former sovereignty would be under full control of the EU.
- Our political parties would be subsumed within larger EU parties representing at least 10 member states, and we would therefore never again be able to escape from the EU through our Parliament;
- only through armed conflict;
- but our armed forces, will also be required to swear an Oath of Allegiance to the EU as part of UK's, EU defence commitments.

Britain would effectively not exist, and those in the House of Lords who support Remaining in the EU - and who also know the consequences of staying in the EU, are not speaking the truth when they claim that they want the best for the UK.

Total control by the EU is not in the best interest of any EU member state - as Greece, Spain Portugal, Italy and, more recently, Poland, Hungary and Holland have discovered to their "apparent" surprise. The only member states that would benefit (albeit temporarily) would be the newcomers - until their loans are called-in.

Farron's Intervention

Yesterday, Tim Farron, apparently, told the EU parliament "to stay silent over their potential plans to force a second Brexit referendum on any final deal" since he believes that it could hurt the cause of the Remain camp - those loyal to the EU.

Could there be any better evidence that the Remoaners are working against the interests of the UK, on behalf of the interests of the EU - and that the actions of the Lords are more likely to be orchestrated and coordinated through EU loyalists like Farron?

If Farron, and the rest, believe that those who want to Leave can't see through the devious manipulation of our Parliamentary system by Remain, in order to help the EU to keep a strangle hold on the UK population, then they have a lower opinion of the British people than they have previously demonstrated.

Certainly, the EU could not guarantee that a 2nd vote would give them a turnaround in their fortunes; they would simply be deliberately creating more uncertainty, delaying the UK departure from the EU, and damaging the UK economy.

Their only strategy would be to offer "Reform" or other worthless gestures, which have previously been shown to be little better than "dodgy dealer assurances."

On Reflection

Looking a bit deeper into Farron's latest comment, it seems that there was a plan by Remain in the UK (by the Lords), and a backup plan from the EU Parliament, and probably more alternatives, in order to bring about further EU Referenda until the EU gets its own way.

Perhaps these plans were developed when Blair went to the EU for a hugging session with Juncker, after which Blair suddenly appeared, back in the UK with his latest plan to keep Britain, in the EU with a Referendum re-run.

The Farron comment about keeping the EU plan quiet for fear of upsetting the Remain camp plan, illustrates the contempt that some Remain Lords hold for our country, after all, if the Lords could convince the British public that they were acting in the interests of the UK then they may get support.

Whereas if it became clear that there is a conspiracy between the EU and the Remain Lords - with the EU and the Lords, plotting, all along, to engineer another EU Referendum at the end of the Brexit negotiations, just in case the Lords failed.

That would get the Brexiteers backs-up, and have precisely the opposite effect to that intended.

What this seems to illustrate is that there is a distinct lack of honesty and honour within the House of Lords, that is only surpassed by that within the EU, but perhaps, we should reserve judgement until after next week's vote - reading between the lines though, Theresa May might want to have a large number of Brexit backing, temporary Peers in the Lords, ready for a flanking manoeuvre to secure that vote for the Leave supporters.

24th Feb 2017

Update*

In the Guardian today Blair came up with a plan to have a Parliamentary debate on Brexit, this, despite the fact that there have already been two such debates, one in 2015 during the EU Referendum Bill, and one in February 2017; debating the Article 50 (TEU) Bill.

Not satisfied that he has already had a number of attempts through the courts, by proxy - designed precisely to stop Brexit - he wants to continue the EU tradition of Referendums with only one "option".

Blair's behaviour is rapidly approaching that of Dictators with Referendums - perhaps we will see a Referendum sheet in future with an arrow on the ballot paper pointing to the correct response.

In response to such an outrageous suggestion by Blair, which involve the deliberate undermining of the principles of Democracy, we should respond by requiring that we have a full Parliamentary debate on the Lisbon Treaty (2007) - which escaped scrutiny during the entire 2016 Referendum.

But, since this is the basis for the Remain camp future relationship between the UK and the EU, it must also be debated, at length.

During such debate we would witness not only the true nature of the EU, but also the faces of the quislings in our midst; this last comment is based on the fact that, no person, with

even a modicum of loyalty to Britain, and with any self-respect could possibly vote in favour of such a treaty.

The EU is a giant corporate "Ponzi" scheme designed for the benefit of Germany and France, and their Bilderberg backers.

The rest of the member states are destined to become trapped in an endless cycle of subjugation and poverty; part of the mass movement of cheap labour, a policy which is already being actively pursued in Greece, Spain, Portugal, and Italy.

The basis for the requirement to have the Lisbon Treaty (2007) debated is that it was ratified by Brown, using the Royal Prerogative to avoid Parliamentary scrutiny (such irony)

The treaty has never been subjected to proper scrutiny nor open, public discussion, and New Labour won the 2005 General Election after pledging a Referendum on that Treaty, then reneging on the promise two years later.

A call for an open debate on the Lisbon Treaty (2007) has a great deal more validity than Blair's (PLP) plans to disrupt a real Democratic act that took place in the UK wide Referendum on the EU in 2016.