

23rd September 2018

Setting the EU Trap

It might be difficult to believe but the British people are being played by Theresa May - taken into a trap which has been carefully laid by the vested interests in the UK and the EU. Mrs May is an EU "puppet" partaking in a giant confidence trick in order to keep the UK in the EU at any price - and Merkel is "pulling the strings".

The reason that that conclusion has been reached comes from a number of incidents that have taken place since she was appointed Prime Minister and: just like there was a time when all (or most) of the Remainers claimed that they "Respected the Referendum result"; she stated that "Brexit means Brexit" and in the same way both were downright falsehoods which gave time for this trap to be set - although she is still trying to claim, disingenuously that Chequers means "Brexit", whereas, in fact, it means the subjugation of the British population within the EU.

The first incident occurred when she stated she would not call a general election - until after she was told by Juncker that the Conservatives did not have a large enough majority (17) to see "Brexit" through and, notoriously, she went on a walking holiday to Wales and returned to announce that she would call a General Election (2017).

That election was a disaster for the Conservatives (if the country really believed that the Conservatives were genuinely interested in leaving the EU) - they were humiliated through a combination of undeliverable "land of milk and honey" (money) promises from the Labour Party - and what could only be described as the worst campaign by any Prime Minister - attacking her core voters with a Manifesto from Hell - although that was blamed on her advisers.

Theresa May rarely even mentioned "Brexit"; avoided debates at every opportunity and refused (in the Paxman interview) to say that she backed the very reason (we thought) for calling the election - strengthening Britain's negotiating and make leaving the EU more likely. The Conservative losses were entirely predictable and led us to believe that it was deliberately sabotaged by our Politicians in order to reduce Britain's negotiating position - if so, it worked - but perhaps it would have been better for the EU if the result had been a "Hung Parliament".

As things turned out it ended up not being far from that scenario in any event; since we were then "treated" to the disgraceful and humiliating displays of open EU "fawning" from opposition politicians Labour, LibDems ..."Uncle Tom Cobly and all" visiting the EU negotiating team members for secret meetings (not available to public scrutiny); all in attempts to undermine the British position in the negotiations. Then returning to the UK to spread the EU's propaganda through the compliant Media in the UK and undermine all attempts to form a strong UK position - taking sides with the EU.

From Brexit to Remain

Where did Chequers come from?

In her Florence speech (22nd September 2017) Mrs May stated ...

Under *Economic Partnership*:

"In fact, we start from an unprecedented position. For we have the same rules and regulations as the EU - and our EU Withdrawal Bill will ensure they are carried over into our domestic law at the moment we leave the EU. So the question for us now in building a new economic partnership is not how we bring our rules and regulations closer together, but what we do when one of us wants to make changes."

"...Options..."

- **"European Economic Area membership would mean the UK having to adopt at home - automatically and in their entirety - new EU rules. Rules over which, in future, we will have little influence and no vote. Such a loss of democratic control could not work for the British people. I fear it would inevitably lead to friction and then a damaging re-opening of the nature of our relationship in the near future: the very last thing that anyone on either side of the Channel wants."**

"...or..."

- **"As for a Canadian style free trade agreement, we should recognise that this is the most advanced free trade agreement the EU has yet concluded and a breakthrough in trade between Canada and the EU. But compared with what exists between Britain and the EU today, it would nevertheless represent such a restriction on our mutual market access that it would benefit neither of our economies."**

"To make this partnership work, because disagreements inevitably arise, we will need a strong and appropriate dispute resolution mechanism. This could not mean the European Court of Justice – or indeed UK courts - being the arbiter of disputes about the implementation of the agreement between the UK and the EU however."

"Security relationship"

- **"We are proposing a bold new strategic agreement that provides a comprehensive framework for future security, law enforcement and criminal justice co-operation: a treaty between the UK and the EU." (i.e. Corpus Juris: A Police State)**
- **"We are also proposing a far-reaching partnership on how we protect Europe together from the threats we face in the world today; how we work together to promote our shared values and interests abroad; whether security, spreading the rule of law, dealing with emerging threats, handling the migration crisis or helping countries out of poverty." (All under EU control)**
- **"The United Kingdom is unconditionally committed to maintaining Europe's security. And the UK will continue to offer aid and assistance to EU member states that are the victims of armed aggression, terrorism and natural or manmade disasters." (we do this already through NATO)**

"Implementation Period" (Updated)*

- **"It is also the case that people and businesses – both in the UK and in the EU – would benefit from a period to adjust to the new arrangements in a smooth and orderly way."**
- **"As I said in my speech at Lancaster House a period of implementation would be in our mutual interest. That is why I am proposing that there should be such a period after the UK leaves the EU. Clearly, people, businesses and public services should only have to plan for one set of changes in the relationship between the UK and the EU."**

"So, during the implementation period access to one another's markets should continue on current terms and Britain also should continue to take part in existing security measures. And I know businesses, in particular, would welcome the certainty this would provide."

We note that an implementation period is not requested by the EU - But promoted by the EU funded CBI and even our Unions have accepted money from the EU.

Please read: *"Draft Withdrawal and Implementation Agreement"* under ["Empress's New Clothes"](#) on this site

How Long?

- *"How long the period is should be determined simply by how long it will take to prepare and implement the new processes and new systems that will underpin that future partnership. For example, it will take time to put in place the new immigration system required to re-take control of the UK's borders."* (Blair and the Labour Party agreed to the EU having Competence over Immigration and Asylum when they signed the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997 - the UK has not been able to control immigration since that time - and HMG was just protecting the EU by claiming they could control immigration into the UK)
- *"So during the implementation period, people will continue to be able to come and live and work in the UK; but there will be a registration system – an essential preparation for the new regime."*
- *"As of today, these considerations point to an implementation period of around two years."*

This speech is clearly where Chequers evolved from. The EU did not request an "Implementation Period", only Theresa May did that. Apparently, British Business requires "around" two years to adjust - but during which time the EU would reorganise its regulations, methods and practises; some businesses may be excluded or required to follow new regulations that would put them out of business.

British business would keep wanting more and more time to adjust - as another excuse to keep the "Status Quo" - in a never-ending Implementation Period. Even after the implementation period the businesses could then just up-sticks and move to a cheaper labour are of the EU - that is what the EU is all about making money - it is not about protecting jobs in any Member State!

The Merkel-May Trap

"Chequers" has been thoroughly discredited, literally, "by just about everyone but the Pope" - it is designed to ensure that it could not possibly be accepted by any UK Parliament - but it still exists - it exists for three reasons:-

- Merkel already agreed to (80%) of the proposal and
- Chequers effectively changes "Brexit" into "Remain" through sleight-of-hand - *(make no mistake, the Labour Party would do a similar "dirty deal")*
- Chequers could not possibly be voted through by the UK Parliament - or could it?

The Parliamentary impasse would lead to either, a General Election or a new Referendum, and bringing about a new EU Referendum (the EU's Modus Operandi) is precisely what the Chequers "Agreement" is designed to accomplish.

Merkel and the EU have always stated that whatever proposal was put forward it must contain the compliance with the Treaty of Rome (1957)'s "Four Freedoms" - the essence of the Single Market - Capital, Goods, Services and Workers plus ECJ control. Services are not included in Chequers - but Workers are included, implicitly (though the UK would

comply with EU's Freedom of Movement of "People" rules through the use of stealth and sophistry - as they have been doing for the past 45 years)

In addition, the other terms must also be resolved (20%), in particular, the Irish Border - which is just a diversion - kept by the EU as a preventative measure to stop the Article 50 process and to attempt to keep Northern Ireland in the EU; and lately (Nov 2018) as a negotiating "chip" to keep the EU fishing our fish.

May has already unilaterally agreed to preserve the right of existing EU citizens to stay in the UK, and she claims that we would not be under ECJ rules (which is not true - as was exposed by [Lawyers for Britain](#))

The talk now, after months of propaganda, is for a 2nd Referendum which the Labour is gearing up to support - in concert with a major project fear campaign to scare the British people into abject surrender rather than go for a switch to WTO rules, which would take us out of the Single Market Tariff regime; and EU control.

The WTO option is labelled "No Deal" to make it so scary that we would all run into the arms of Communist Mrs "Mutti" Merkel in the EU for protection - even though it would be Germany that felt the greatest pain; because of its dominance in car manufacturing and sales to the UK - should we adopt a programme of tariffs. The reality is though, whether we are in the EU or not, our EU "friends" will try to make life as difficult as possible - including a WWII style "blockade" because we dared to vote to leave the EU.

Any new Referendum would not even be contemplated by the EU-UK if they thought that they could lose again - and there is no real expectation that if the vote was "Yes" or "No" to staying in the EU, that the first answer would be reversed. They would probably lose with a bigger margin - even if they changed the franchise and reduced the voting age.

They will only agree to a second Referendum vote that they could not lose - a vote for "Chequers" or "to Remain" - which provides one and the same outcome but with more EU control - they would not allow any vote on "No Deal" because they would lose by their biggest margin; and they won't include the Canada deal or CETA +++ because that would give the British people a way out of the clutches of the EU - CETA is the UK's best option after WTO and the EU have previously offered the UK a CETA deal.

Of course, they could just as easily sign a secret treaty and place it under the 30-year rule - as Heath did with FCO:30/1048 (1971) advice to Ministers - after it warned of the dangers of joining the "Common Market" which turned out to be a deliberately constructed "Economically Entangled Community" (EEC) through the European Communities Act (1972) designed only for "Ever Closer Union" - or alternatively claim "Brexit" is too difficult and stop the process.

We have seen from the Florence speech, Theresa May's actions at the Munich Security Conference and pictures of our troops displaying EU insignia on their British uniforms that she is happy for the British people to be trapped inside the rapidly developing Militarised Totalitarian EU Police State. Just imagine what "warmonger" Blair could do as President of the EU - where he would be immune from prosecution; working in secret and no electorate to worry about.

What most British people want, is what we thought that we were signed-up to in 1972 - a "Common Market" where Sovereign Nations trade freely for their mutual benefit: where their traditions, cultures and histories were respected. A Confederation of independent Nation States working together: not a top-down Federal State where the members become Provinces without any real power of their own (not at all like the USA); controlled and subjugated under a Police State by a single government in a foreign country; required to

pay Vassal homage and men and arms to an unworthy and undeserving overlord class of bureaucratic non-entities and failed politicians.