

10th March 2018

May's Speech - Rebuttal

We would like to review certain areas of Theresa May's speech - as we did with Jeremy Corbyn's earlier speech. We begin with various trading options - taken from selected highlights (blue italics) of the speech:

Trading Options - Comparisons

"But these options would mean a significant reduction in our access to each other's markets compared to that which we currently enjoy. And this would mean customs and regulatory checks at the border that would damage the integrated supply chains that our industries depend on and be inconsistent with the commitments that both we and the EU have made in respect of Northern Ireland."

Trade is a two-way street and the EU does not want this any more than the UK does - so the only problem is the political EU, and we (the UK population) want to be free from the EU's political ambitions. We have been fully integrated into the EU for the past 45 years - by stealth - all the necessary systems are already in place via the EEC.

The solution is to trade outside the jurisdiction of the political EU - but abide by its trading regulations - this would ensure continued trade and would be enough. If it were not for the EU's ambition to control the Member State populations from "Cradle to Grave"; to trap them in a Neo-Communist Superstate with a single government, and ruling politburo in Brussels (Berlin).

It is precisely because the EU wants to keep its Member States under control - that most of the options have had political, rather than physical barriers erected to impede any progress by any Member State that wishes to EUexit through the Article 50 route.

Article 50 was designed to allow the EU to erect obstacles - real and imagined; in order, to block that exit route. The belligerent EU is far too terrified that anyone might escape to even negotiate any trade deal with any Member State.

In our case, they use threats, intimidation and scaremongering directly - and through their "assets" in the UK establishment - Labour (PLP), SNP, LibDems etc., and a majority on the Conservative Party, Peers, Judiciary and the BBC.

As for customs delays, barriers and border disruption - well that is a national sport in France and would continue anyway - the fact that we have decided to leave simply means that they have even more of an excuse - which would be used throughout the EU - even if we were forced back into the EU by our dishonourable politicians.

"But it is not good enough to say, 'We won't introduce a hard border; if the EU forces Ireland to do it, that's down to them'. We chose to leave; we have a responsibility to help find a solution. But we can't do it on our own. It is for all of us to work together. And the Taoiseach and I agreed when we met recently that our teams and the Commission should now do just that. I want to make one final point. Just as it would be unacceptable to go back to a hard border between Northern Ireland and Ireland, it would also be unacceptable to break up the United Kingdom's own common market by creating a customs and regulatory border down the Irish Sea"

The Irish border question is a distraction designed to stall talks on trade - nothing more - it may have been relevant in the past (just like the EEC (EU) was, but not any longer - the technology exists today to maintain intelligence led transparent borders - as far as day to day practises are concerned. Attempting to force a border in Ireland suits the EU negotiation stance, but they would prefer to break-up the UK and keep the whole of Ireland

under EU rule. The previous Irish border did not prevent terrorism only political capitulation to vested interests did that.

It is also the case that HMRC sees no reason for any border in Ireland - and they would not miss an opportunity for more revenue.

"But before I turn to what a new and better model might look like, I want to be straight with people – because the reality is that we all need to face up to some hard facts. We are leaving the single market. Life is going to be different. In certain ways, our access to each other's markets will be less than it is now."

Very much better in many other ways if we do actually leave the EU - the worst case scenario is a political "fudge" brought about by a Remain Leader with a Remain Cabinet, Remain Civil Service and a Remain Parliament and Judiciary in the UK who will do anything - but their duty to the British people.

EU Law

"And if, as part of our future partnership, Parliament passes an identical law to an EU law, it may make sense for our courts to look at the appropriate ECJ judgments so that we both interpret those laws consistently."

What a bizarre comment - the ECJ always interprets EU law in two ways - for consistency with the EU treaties and with a view to enhancing closer integration into the Militarised Totalitarian EU Police State - the ECJ is not an unbiased court - we do not need parity with any EU law except in the very limited sense, that is if it helps the UK's trading interests - not those of the EU.

The UK should not be participating in EU agencies such as the European Arrest Warrant (EAW) - which is part of EU Corpus Juris - an alien inquisitorial legal system which allows the courts and prosecutors to take charge of the investigations. It is without the safeguards of our Common Law "Habeas Corpus" and "Trial by Jury" in our adversarial system where a Judge acts as an impartial referee between Prosecution and Defence lawyers under strict rules of evidence.

Nor should we cooperate with the EU armed forces where that requires our armed soldiers to swear an "Oath of Allegiance" to the EU, Brussels (Berlin), Merkel or any other EU Dictator - see [The EuroProbe website \(theeuroprobe.org\)](http://theeuroprobe.org) - [Article \(2017 – 048\)](#) - *"The sinister EU Defense Union."* 11 October, 2017) and [Article \(2017 – 054\)](#) *"The very serious threat of the EU army having control in UK post Brexit"* 26 October, 2017) plus many other important EU articles.

Such alliances that May is seeking to maintain with the EU should cause alarm in the UK - we need to be an independent sovereign nation in terms of Defence - not an arms and personnel supplier, equipment manufacturer and intelligence gathering agency for the EU - under the EU's supervision and its beckon call.

"The next hard fact is this. If we want good access to each other's markets, it has to be on fair terms. As with any trade agreement, we must accept the need for binding commitments – for example, we may choose to commit some areas of our regulations like state aid and competition to remaining in step with the EU's."

If we are making the choices that is good - but this sounds like more unnecessary alignment - looking after the EU more than the UK - a slippery slope (how we started with the EEC(EU)) where the EU starts to make new rules which we have to follow.

"And in other areas like workers' rights or the environment, the EU should be confident that we will not engage in a race to the bottom in the standards and protections we set. There is no serious political constituency in the UK which would support this – quite the opposite."

We covered this in the previous article ([Corbyn's Speech - Rebuttal](#)) on this site - neither workers' rights nor the environment are safe in the hands of the EU see ([Diesel Scandal - EU Meddling](#)) and ([Poor Germans](#)) - we can do much better than the EU in all the matters of importance.

World Trade

"We want the freedom to negotiate trade agreements with other countries around the world. We want to take back control of our laws. We also want as frictionless a border as possible between us and the EU - so that we don't damage the integrated supply chains our industries depend on and don't have a hard border between Northern Ireland and Ireland."

- *"First, our agreement will need reciprocal binding commitments to ensure fair and open competition."*
- *"Second, we will need an arbitration mechanism that is completely independent – something which, again, is common to Free Trade Agreements. This will ensure that any disagreements about the purpose or scope of the agreement can be resolved fairly and promptly."*
- *"Third, given the close relationship we envisage, we will need to have an ongoing dialogue with the EU, and to ensure we have the means to consult each other regularly." "We start from the place where our regulators already have deep and long-standing relationships. So, the task is maintaining that trust; not building it in the first place."*
- *"Fourth, we will need an arrangement for data protection."*
- *"And fifth, we must maintain the links between our people."*

"We are clear that as we leave the EU, free movement of people will come to an end and we will control the number of people who come to live in our country."

It is worth noting that *"when the UK joined the EEC in the early Seventies, the bloc accounted for 30 per cent of global GDP but, that once the UK has left, it will be just 15 per cent, despite the EU now comprising over four times more members (<https://www.conservativewoman.co.uk/appeaser-may-left-brexite-britain-weaker-ever>)"*

In addition to the fact that the loss of control of the UK would be a disaster for the EU since it would no longer be able to force unfavourable trade agreements onto the UK's 70 million plus population on behalf of the EU's many lobbying multinational corporation clients and other vested interests. Thus. making the EU very much less attractive.

All of the proposed UK-EU links above need proper scrutiny on behalf of the British people - our current establishment cannot be trusted - we need regular updates in our new sovereign parliament (not the current one) regarding all contact between the UK and the EU - written into Hansard.

We need to also establish an independent committee to scrutinise parliament and its actions and an unbiased publicly funded media instead of the BBC.

Otherwise they will slip back into their default position where they cede the important matters related to Britain and its people to a foreign power - while they sit idly back and enjoy the rewards and privileges of political power - all paid for by the British people.

When it comes to mass migration and "Free Movement of people" - as far as the EU is concerned, it has 2 main purposes

- To dilute the identity of the EU Member States (*the late Peter Sutherland - UN Migration Chief - Stated that "The EU should undermine the homogeneity of its Member States and make them Multicultural" - i.e. population replacement) - see BBC report by Brian Wheeler, 2012*) and
- to allow the unemployed in one EU Member State to find work in other EU Member States - thereby providing a "pool" of cheap labour, (subsidised by UK taxpayers in our case) to be exploited by business. This programme has been in place, and it has been out of control since 1997 and continues today.

UK Fishing Grounds

"The EU itself is rightly taking a tailored approach in what it is seeking with the UK. For example, on fisheries, the Commission has been clear that no precedents exist for the sort of access it wants from the UK."

"But as part of our economic partnership we will want to continue to work together to manage shared stocks in a sustainable way and to agree reciprocal access to waters and a fairer allocation of fishing opportunities for the UK fishing industry."

What an outrageous comment - she knows or should know that the EU quite deliberately overexploits our fishing grounds, by registering their boats in the UK and using British quotas (thereby reducing ours) to sell our fish to the EU Member States - notably the Spanish. The EU also gives non-EU access to our waters (including Russia) and sells our fish outside the EU - this cannot be allowed to continue.

The EU is quite happy to destroy all of our fishing stock - just out of spite - and it seems that May is only prepared to try and obtain *"a fairer allocation of fishing opportunities for the UK fishing industry"* - how disgusting is that.

The UK fishing grounds are our birth right, which our parents and grandparents fought and died for in WWII - they were illegally given away by our so-called elected "Representatives" who also sold the UK population to the EEC (EU) by stealth - stealth that has been maintained ever since 1973 - and continued by the majority of UK political parties today.

Summary

Without going further, it looks like the government is attempting to avoid moving too far away from the EU and siding more with the EU's interests than with those of the UK. We understand that May is in a difficult position because of infighting in her own party, and the opposition benches mostly siding with the EU and its interests.

It must be worse because her heart is not reconciled to the idea of the UK leaving the control of the EU and we think that this shows in her latest speech.

The only way that the UK can get a deal with the EU is to run the Article 50 (TEU) clock down without a deal - revert to WTO under Most Favoured Nation (MFN) rules and let the EU approach the UK for a deal.

For Theresa May it seems to be more of a divorce than leaving a club - but she must put the UK's interests first or step aside for someone else, who will.