

11th December 2018

The Establishment against its People

To be more precise what we are witnessing is the UK establishment acting against the British people on behalf of a Foreign Power, a part-formed supranational state centred in Brussels, and controlled from Berlin. In the latest move, Theresa May has postponed the vote on the Withdrawal and Implementation Bill that the government had given to Parliament for "faux scrutiny" - since the Bill cannot be amended; as was stated by the EU - in the same way that Parliament was given the European Communities Bill in 1972, which was "scrutinised", but no amendments were allowed.

In a choreographed response to the expected defeat of the Bill today; the European Court of Justice (ECJ) ruled that Article 50 could be unilaterally revoked by the UK - though this would require time which is not available for new legislation, which is not available under the Article 50 schedule; unless the end date is delayed.

The real difference this time was that in 1972 the Labour Party was more anti-EEC (on the grounds of loss of sovereignty) than the Conservative Party is currently; and the debates in 1972 were not broadcast - only the result was announced; a majority of 112 in favour of joining the EEC. In contrast, to the ECA (1972), the current 585 page, draft agreement, has been widely circulated and roundly condemned - and that has caused May to delay the vote.

It is, incidentally, why we were not allowed a Referendum on the Lisbon Treaty (2007) - the EU's Constitutional Treaty by another name - since the EU's Constitution had already been rejected by the French and Dutch in 2005 - and was subsequently hidden in the Lisbon Treaty (2007), and the EU did not want the populations of Europe to realise what they had been signed into. The EU's position was though, that:

- *"The rejection of the Constitutional treaty by voters in France was a mistake that should be corrected. Speaking at the London School of Economics, quoted on EurActiv.com, "Giscard: France's rejection of the Constitution was a 'mistake'", March 2, 2006."*

and

- *"Public opinion will be led to adopt, without knowing it, the proposals we dare not present to them directly. (...) This approach of 'divide and ratify' is clearly unacceptable. Perhaps it is a good exercise in presentation. But it would confirm to European citizens the notion that European construction is a procedure organised behind their backs by lawyers and diplomats. On the Lisbon Treaty, Le Monde, 15 June 2007"*

The implications of this cannot be overestimated: The Constitution is the fundamental law of a country, the basic overarching laws which are required to change the EU from a group of individual Member States - into a new single Nation (let's call it Europa) with a single government and all aspects of life and the economy under central control.

This requires that all of Member States' institutional associations and sovereign powers - that are recognised in International Law - are given over to the EU - leaving only their own domestic powers under their own control - except all of those will also be regulated and dictated from the EU centre.

The Constitution defines the rights and privileges of its citizens; its institutions and form of governance; its legal system and its military ambitions. It was rejected by the citizens of France and Holland; so the EU simply ignored the rejection and through deception by its political leaders and heads of state of 28 countries agreed to be bound by it (Eire initially voted against it, but then accepted)

This is the true nature of the EU, whose ambitions know no bounds.

By their own words EU leaders betray their true feelings towards Democracy - the Lisbon Treaty (2007) exposes real EU - and it is no coincidence that the EU is working with Theresa May in order to dupe the British people. The Remainder's within our political parties; former politicians and those pushing for a 2nd EU Referendum vote are no better than Charlatans who have entered into Faustian pacts with the EU.

We also note the actions of the ECJ, in ruling, with miraculous timing, that Article 50 can be unilaterally revoked by the UK reveals that the European Court of Justice (ECJ) is a political organisation working with the European Commission and the EU negotiators - it is not an independent court; which exposes that fact that there is no real separation of power in the EU.

2nd EU Referendum

Whilst the ratification of the "deal" by our UK Parliament would be a deal beyond the wildest dreams of Merkel and Juncker (a "deal" given to May by Merkel in Berlin, and padded out by Barnier et al., in Brussels); the real prize, as far as the EU is concerned, would be a vote by the British people - a true capitulation to the EU in a 2nd Referendum; as with the Irish - and this is what we are being manipulated into participating in through the actions of our government, parliament and civil service.

Having a second Referendum also means that our MP's will not have to make a decision which could come back to haunt them in a future General Elections - so they can continue to enjoy their taxpayer funded lifestyle while they squander their time on "jollies" at our expense and luxuriate in their perks, gongs and privileges - while they simultaneously sell-us-out to foreign investors and the EU.

Further: they can look forward to being elevated to the House of Lords; then move to lucrative positions in business or Brussels where they can practically double their salaries through expenses for which they do not even have to account; and, if that was not enough, they can then see out their time looking after the EU's interests while they wallow in their EU pension - all paid for by the UK taxpayers that they have betrayed - how could they possibly resist the lure of the EU?

The Withdrawal Agreement (WA) is just part of that corralling of the British people into a complete surrender to the EU through a rigged 2nd Referendum; as is Corbyn and all the rest of the political leaders who are calling for a new Referendum vote - all sponsored through the back door by the EU. The plan is clearly a culmination of ~ two and a half years of coordinated scheming (visits to the EU negotiators by our political leaders from all parties - and numerous EU activists and odd celebrities (some very odd)) and orbits around the following scenario - although numerous scenarios would have been worked through:

- Offer a pretend deal which appears to give the Leave voters what they want but they have to wait for their freedom (and be humiliated first) which will always be "adjusted" to make sure that it cannot ever be achieved. *(the EU has "form" for this kind of deception - as above)*
- To ensure that it cannot be accepted by Parliament the deal must be the worst possible deal that could have ever been agreed in the history of the entire world. *(and if it is accepted by some fluke, then the EU wins anyway)*
- Make WA the only option.

- Add to the mix the "bogeyman" Corbyn threatening to turn the UK into a Socialist Dystopia - with threats of a general election which, as with the last one, will be manipulated through coordinated action between the political parties - remember that General Election Manifestos are not legally binding (e.g. Corbyn's offer of "sweets" for the masses - as long as the Labour Party owns the sweet shop; or should that be sweatshop)
- As with every confidence trick in History bring in the time element to scare the population witless.
- Demonise the WTO option as being worse than Armageddon

This has all the hallmarks of someone who used to work in Soviet Agitation and Propaganda (AgitProp) units.

The Withdrawal and Implementation Agreement 2018 and the Repeal of the European Communities Act (1972)

The latest nuance is to propose that the only problem with WA is **the backstop** - which is obviously the greatest potential problem - **but the entire WA would be a disaster for the people of the UK and all the businesses.**

It is total nonsense to have a "Transition Period" which claims to be for businesses to adjust to the new regime when the EU can keep changing the terms and conditions at will for an undefined period - and the end date is up for debate after we sign up!

What most people do not seem to appreciate is that the European Communities Act (1972) has not been completely (properly) repealed by our disreputable Parliament - the most important part Clause 2 - which overrules the UK Parliament on laws (Directives and Regulations) passed from the EU is only repealed (automatically) at the end date (29th March 2019) - but only if the end date is not extended to the end of the undefined "Transition Period".

We would be totally vulnerable to the whims of the EU and its individual Member States (the other 27) - how could this be accepted by the Prime Minister of any country?

The only way to protect the UK is to repeal the European Communities Act (ECA) (1972) and not sign the Withdrawal and Implementation Agreement (WA) - because the WA (which has no exit clause) is being used to replace the European Communities Act (1972) and keep us trapped in the EU in perpetuity - which is why they will not give a fixed date for the end of the "Transition Period".

The other main problem is that when this "deal" is signed we do not any "deal" on trade - that only comes at the end of the "Transition Period" - which is why we have always referred to the Withdrawal Agreement as a "hoax" deal that was part of a plot for a 2nd Referendum because it could never possibly be accepted by our Parliament - or could it?

Note: Other Close EU Referendum Votes

Much has been made of the closeness of the 23rd June 2016 EU Referendum result - particularly by Theresa May as justification for her actions in trying to please both sides of the Referendum divide - which is total nonsense - she is supposed to be acting on the result not manipulating the result so that the losing side is actually the only side that benefits.

That would be the same as the Labour Party winning an election and having to instigate Tory policies or vice versa - which is absurd.

We include two examples of close and a very close Referendum results that were nevertheless properly acted upon:

- **Norway:** A quick search revealed that Norway had two EU Referendums; one on joining the EEC, in 1972 where the No vote won by 53.5 to 46.5 and in 1994 a Referendum resulted in a rejection to joining the EU 52.2% to 47.8% a majority of 4.4 % - the Norwegian people voted No against their government - there were no arguments about how close the result was and no attempts by the government to turn the result for the losing side - the result stands
- According to a 2010 poll, the majority of the voters of every Norwegian party were against EU membership. On average, Norwegian voters are strongly opposed to Norwegian membership in the European Union. In a December 2015 poll, 18% were for, and 72% were against.

and

- **Switzerland:** In 2014: the federal popular initiative "against mass immigration", which would limit the free movement of people from EU member states, is accepted by 50.3% to 49.7% a majority of 0.6%

The EU and their respective governments accepted the decisions in each of these cases - Norway 4.4% and Switzerland 0.6% - but neither the EU nor our government have accepted the 2016 EU Referendum vote with a majority of 3.8% Clearly there are some democratic countries associated with the EU - but Britain is not one of them.

Options

There are clearly no options to Leave that have been properly explored:

"Withdrawal Agreement" means: that we only leave when the EU agrees: it allows supremacy of the European Court of Justice (ECJ) over the UK; it removes our unilaterally Article 50 right to leave the EU and it prevents the UK from forming free-trade agreements with countries outside the EU - except with the EU acting as "middleman"; it effectively replaces the European Communities Act (1972) and keeps the UK trapped in the EU - the EU's assurances about the faux "Backstop" are entirely meaningless. The EU and our political class have "form" when it comes to deception - in particular with the Lisbon Treaty (2007) WA does not give any certainty for business or governmental and local level planning and FOM can be hidden by the Home Office.

"Remain" cannot be an option since the first EU Referendum defeated it as an option - and the EU have shown that they will not negotiate any terms that would be acceptable to the leave voters.

"WTO" Rules actually solve all of the problems related to the Referendum result - the faux "Backstop" remains but is easier to deal with if we are outside the EU with Northern Ireland - the only real problem is that our political class are in bed with the EU and the EU wants our money and all our assets - which they can't get if we leave without any other deal on the 29th March 2019.

"Norway" includes FOM without any negotiations.; CETA +++ has fewer problems than the Norway option as far as the 2016 Referendum result.