

3rd January, 2018

EU-UK Entanglement (An illustration)

On the 9th March 2016 the Sun newspaper published an article suggesting that our Queen Elizabeth II supported "Brexit", as allegedly revealed at a meeting of the Privy Council. *"The Sun quotes anonymous sources, one of whom claims to have witnessed a "bust-up" between the Queen and pro-EU former Deputy PM Nick Clegg in 2011. The palace insisted the Queen was "politically neutral" while Mr Clegg called the story "nonsense".*

"Buckingham Palace complained to the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) that The Sun breached Clause 1 (Accuracy) of the Editors' Code of Practice, in an article headlined "Queen Backs Brexit" published on 9 March 2016. IPSO upheld the complaint, and has ordered The Sun to publish its decision as a remedy."

According to IPSO *"The article reported that two unnamed sources had claimed that the Queen made critical comments about the EU at two private functions: a lunch for Privy Counsellors at Windsor Castle in 2011, and a reception for Members of Parliament at Buckingham Palace said to have taken place "a few years ago". The headline was not supported by the text. It was significantly misleading: given that it suggested a fundamental breach of the Queen's constitutional obligations – and represented a failure to take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information in breach of Clause 1 (i). The complaint under Clause 1 was upheld."*

Comments In Parliament

The original story continued with an urgent question from Deputy Labour Leader Tom Watson on the 14th March, 2016 - as reported in the Hansard (Transcripts of Parliamentary Debates) which provides an even more interesting insight into the workings of the British Establishment and how entangled it is since we were taken into the EEC. The following quotations from the Hansard 14th March 2018 (EU Referendum - Privy Council) are quite revealing:

- **Mr Speaker:** *Before I call the hon. Member for West Bromwich East (Mr Watson) to ask the urgent question, which I am allowing him to ask, I remind all Members of the House that, and I quote from "Erskine May": "Her Majesty cannot be supposed to have a private opinion, apart from that of her responsible advisers; and any attempt to use her name in debate to influence the judgment of Parliament is immediately checked and censured...A Minister is, however, permitted to make a statement of facts in which the Sovereign's name may be concerned." I earnestly hope that hon. Members will spare me the embarrassment of having to stop them in their tracks if they seek to draw to the House's attention any alleged views of the monarch on the EU or, indeed, anything else. The urgent question has been carefully drafted by the hon. Member for West Bromwich East to cover process and not substance. I hope that colleagues will frame their questions accordingly.*
- **Mr Tom Watson (West Bromwich East) (Lab): (Urgent Question):** *I seek not to embarrass you in any way, Mr Speaker, but to ask the Lord President of the Council if he will make a statement on the adherence to the rules and conventions of the Privy Council in the light of the suspension of collective responsibility in connection with the European Union referendum.*
- **The Lord President of the Council (Chris Grayling):** *The Privy Council provides support to Her Majesty in the implementation of the functions of the Crown. The members of the Council also have access to confidential national information and documentation related to national security, and receive briefings about secrets related to these matters. They swear an oath to maintain the confidentiality of these briefings. None of that has changed because of the current circumstances.*

- Mr Watson:** *Last Wednesday, The Sun published a front-page story relating to the EU referendum, which it said was based on two “impeccably placed” sources. The right hon. Gentleman will know that every member of the Privy Council swears a solemn and binding oath to the Queen that they will, in the words of the oath, “keep secret all Matters committed and revealed unto you”. My hon. Friend the Member for Rhondda (Chris Bryant) has written to the right hon. Gentleman asking for an investigation. Will he please confirm that that will take place? Will he also confirm that the Privy Council rules have not been suspended as a result of the referendum? Three members have categorically denied that they are the source, yet the Justice Secretary has only said: “I don’t know how The Sun got all its information” That is hardly categorical. The sovereign’s constitutional impartiality is an established principle of our democracy, and it is incumbent on those in political office to ensure that that remains the case. Such a breach would be particularly serious and significant. Had the Justice Secretary disclosed this information, he would have breached the principle of confidentiality and prayed in aid the monarch in a politically controversial manner, but he would also have undermined his role as the Minister responsible for upholding the rule of law. Does the Lord President of the Council and Leader of the House therefore agree that the public have a right to know whether the Justice Secretary was a source of this story, and will he now urge his colleague to confirm or deny such allegations? There has been a referral to the Independent Press Standards Organisation to investigate a complaint about the story, but IPSO cannot investigate whether a Privy Counsellor has broken his oath. Only the Minister or the Prime Minister can order that investigation. A cover-up will not do. Surely any member of the Privy Council who was a source of this story, or whose special adviser or ally was, stands in contempt of his Privy Council oath, and should be removed from office if he will not honourably resign himself.*
- Chris Grayling:** *As the hon. Gentleman said, last week a national newspaper published a story that was allegedly based on a conversation that had taken place at a lunch following a Privy Council meeting. However, my predecessor as Lord President, the right hon. Member for Sheffield, Hallam (Mr Clegg), has said very clearly that the story is categorically untrue. As the House is aware, Buckingham Palace has referred the matter to IPSO, the new press complaints body, which is now investigating. Given all those facts, I do not believe that there is any need for further action here.*
- Mr Jacob Rees-Mogg (North East Somerset) (Con):** *As the Lord High Chancellor is the keeper of the Queen’s conscience, is it not inconceivable that he could misapply his conscience to Her Majesty? In the Privy Council oath, Privy Counsellors are asked to swear*
- “You will to your uttermost bear Faith and Allegiance to the Queen’s Majesty; and will assist and defend all civil and temporal Jurisdictions, Pre-eminences, and Authorities, granted to Her Majesty and annexed to the Crown by Acts of Parliament, or otherwise, against all Foreign Princes, Persons, Prelates, States, or Potentates.”*

”How, therefore, can members of the Privy Council go off and be European Commissioners swearing allegiance to the European Union?”

- Mr Speaker:** *That is an interesting point—some would say a fascinating point—but it is perhaps mildly tangential to the urgent question that I have selected. But we all*

savour the observations of the hon. Member for North East Somerset (Mr Rees-Mogg), so let us savour the reply.

These were just a selection of contributions to the debate on whether or not someone had broken their Privy Council Oath (the last part of which was quoted above) and revealed private communication between the Queen and member(s) of the Privy Council to the Press - the full text of the debate is available in the Hansard - online.

Conflict of Interest

We find the last comment by Jacob Rees-Mogg particularly instructive regarding the relationship between the EU and the highest levels of the British establishment. There are currently 400 members of the Privy Council, which is a formal body of advisers to the Sovereign of the United Kingdom. Its membership mainly comprises senior politicians, who are current or former members of either the House of Commons or the House of Lords.

The Privy Council formally advises the sovereign on the exercise of the Royal Prerogative, and corporately (as Queen-in-Council) it issues executive instruments known as Orders in Council, which among other powers enact Acts of Parliament. ([Wikipedia](#))

However, courtesy of the Maastricht Treaty (1992) and under EU law (Article 20, Paragraph Two of the Treaty of Rome, 1957) our Queen is an EU citizen - with rights and responsibilities to the EU. She is 'subject to the duties' required by the EU whenever they decide to enforce them - which is more likely the longer we remain trapped within the EU and subject to its laws.

As such, her Majesty has only a ceremonial role in the process of governance in the UK - not just because of our English Revolution; the execution of Charles I on January 30th 1649 and the abolition of the Monarchy - but because the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg is the final arbiter of law in our country and our Parliament and 'Supreme Court' are subject to its rulings and oversight (whims)

Since joining the EEC, we have long been an artificial country with a pretend Monarchy, Parliament and more recently Supreme Court - just as all the other EU Member States have equivalently become - en route to becoming Regions of an EU (German) Empire.

The comments by Jacob Rees-Mogg were relevant before we came under EU occupation and, of course, they still are, out of courtesy - but their relevance has been taken away with the connivance of our elected Representatives: most noticeably (after Heath) by Blair and the Labour Party (PLP); but they can be recovered and made relevant once more - should that be desired.

EU Loyalty and EU Law Making

Does it really matter if Nick Clegg and others in the Privy Council have sworn an Oath of Allegiance to the EU and have access to confidential British national information and documentation related to national security, and receive briefings about secrets related to these matters?

Yes, because they cannot be trusted if their true allegiance is to a foreign power - an Atheist enterprise attempting to subjugate the Nation States of Europe.

The problem with Oaths of Allegiance and Citizenship is that no-one can be loyal to two masters - and the EU's versions will hold primacy - those who prostitute themselves to the EU have no place in our establishment, Parliament or Judiciary.

Which brings into focus the fundamental method of EU law making.

EU Commissioners meet (in secret) and propose laws to regulate and control the Member States in order to increase integration onto a single government state, together with those laws that lobbyists want enacted as Directives and Regulations to enhance their own financial and / or ideological ambitions within the Member States. The Commissioners have all sworn an Oath of Allegiance to the EU – so, all proposed laws guarantee the EU's position and extend its control and entanglement of the Member States - without regard for the affects upon those Member States.

The EU Parliament simply agrees or adds amendments (which the Commission can ignore)

The EU Council or Council vote on the laws by Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) which is how Member States have laws imposed them, even if they are not relevant to, or are damaging to particular Member States, or against the interests of their populations e.g. Hungary and Poland.

Generally, power is always with the unelected and unaccountable Commissioners working with the ECJ - which is mandated to interpret laws with regard to the EU's integration policy (ever closer union) - for more about how the ECJ operates please visit (lawyersforbritain.com)

But, we have also seen with Merkel opening the EU outer borders in 2015 to allow transit of unregulated immigration into the Member States without any consultation or approval by any of those states - how easily a Dictator can take over control of the EU and cause havoc and devastation without any real opposition.

The Way Forward

We have reached a position after 44 years where it should be a simple matter for the UK to escape from the political EU and still work with it as a truly Sovereign country which abides by all the requirements of trade, but does not abide by those of a political nature designed to bring about a single government in Europe - after all we were told all along that is was only a trading arrangement by our Politicians and Peers, and the Judiciary largely kept the change from UK to EU legal supremacy their little secret.

Everything related to trade is already well established between the UK and EU, so we only require the EU to remove its legal framework from control of our society, and for them to rule over only those Member States, which are happy to be subjugated within a Militarised Totalitarian EU Police State.

While we (UK) treat new trade regulations / rules on a case - by - case basis - decided by a Parliament loyal only to the UK.

Our elected Representatives, Peers and Judiciary are the only barrier to our leaving the political EU and regaining our freedom.

The nonsense of a UK punishment programme designed to threaten and intimidate the other 25 members (if we exclude Germany and France) into obeying EU laws without question has no place in the negotiations (no matter how much it pleases those in our Parliament and Judiciary - who are about to betray us once again). The other 25 signatories of the Lisbon Treaty (2007) can decide for themselves whether they would prefer to stay under EU rule and domination as their influence diminishes through its use of ECJ Case Law and enhanced QMV, or join us in the wider world, as Sovereign partners with mutual interests.