

RUNNYMEDE

GAZETTE

EUROPEAN PLEBISCITE

SPECIAL; MAY 2016

EDITORIAL

**A LONG JOURNEY
THE IMPERIAL MINDSET
REFERENDUM OR PLEBISCITE?
BREXIT; THE MOVIE**

CONTENTS

**PRIME MINISTERS MUST STOP LISTENING SO MUCH TO THEIR VOTERS -
JEAN-CLAUDE JUNCKER**

Vote Leave

BREXIT: THE MOVIE IS NOW AVAILABLE ONLINE:

Rory Broomfield; Better Off Out

IF VOTE IS FOR LEAVE, POLITICAL LEADERS WILL GET EU TO INTERVENE

Brian Reece Blog; via Dave Barnby, Sonya Porter and others

A FIGHT WE LOST

Wiebke Schroede; SumOfUs.org

IT IS NOW AGAINST THE EUROPEAN LAW TO CRITICISE THE EU

The Euro Probe

CALLS FOR SACKING AFTER EU ANTI-FRAUD OFFICE 'MISLED' COURTS

Bruno Waterfield; Daily Telegraph

EUROCRATS DISMISS DUTCH VOTE

Euro Guido

EU DEMOCRACY DEAD: EU IGNORES DUTCH REFERENDUM TO PUSH THROUGH UKRAINE DEAL

Nick Gutteridge; Express

HOW REFERENDA THREATEN THE EU

Stratfor; via Sonya Porter

KILLING DISSENT IN EUROPE: NIGEL FARAGE WON'T BE THE LAST VICTIM

Robin Shepherd; The Commentator

THE KILMUIR LETTER

Campaign for Independent Britain, John Timbrell and other sources.

PETITIONS ; UK GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT

John Timbrell

NOT IMPERIALIST? THE EU JUST STARTED A BIT LATE

David Cottle; Wall Street Journal

THE EUROPEAN UNION ALWAYS WAS A CIA PROJECT, AS BREXITEERS DISCOVER

Novorossia Today; via Michael Morton

THE FATE OF MODERN NATIONS: ACCEPT AMERICAN HEGEMONY OR PREPARE FOR WAR

Paul Craig Roberts; Sputnik; Sott.net; via Dave Barnby

THE FIVE PRESIDENTS REPORT AND THE NEXT EU TREATY

Caroline Stephens

EDITORIAL

A LONG JOURNEY

I must begin on a personal note. What I am about to say will be familiar to many.

Like many people I have travelled a long road over four decades in my attitude to the European Union. From initially naïve support (at least in principle; there was always concern over the practice.) to acceptance, then to acquiescence followed by increasingly reluctant acquiescence; then progressively to concern, through dislike, to anger and finally rage as both the European project developed and as I learned ever more about it.

As must be apparent already, this Journal is very firmly in the 'Leave' camp. Unlike a few (at least in theory, of which ... room permitting ... more later), there is no

obligation towards impartiality, and there will be none. These Special editions on the European plebiscite, will be distillation of the best argued items for 'Leave' gleaned, as usual, from sources running right across the spectrum.

With the polls (and there are always caveats attached to opinion polls), point to a very close result, this plebiscite is unlikely settle anything in our relationship with the EU. Indeed it is a charade.

If we vote to Remain by a narrow margin, massive pressure will be applied to 'integrate' (i.e. become a province of a pan-European megastate) fully by 2025, as laid out in the Five Presidents' report ... the latest of a long line of statements promoting a single European state ... but will further excite a future Leave campaign, perhaps (and hopefully) leading to the sort of groundswell we have seen in Scotland.

A SECOND PLEBISCITE?

If, however we vote to Leave, no effort will be spared both here and in Brussels to ignore or circumvent the result. The EU has a long form book on that ... it does not take 'no' for an answer. In France, Denmark, Ireland and Holland referenda against entering the Eurozone and/or the Lisbon Treaty were all nullified. Some items in these pages are intended to jog those memories.

That scenario is obvious. If we vote for Brexit, consequent negotiations will be dragged on endlessly and for as long as it takes. In the meantime an even more ferocious barrage FUD (fear, uncertainty and doubt) tactics will be unleashed. There will be threats of disinvestment ... with Euro-corporations such as BMW, Siemens and Airbus doubtless leading the charge ... in effect threats by the global corporate elite of a declaration of economic warfare against this country should we depart the European Empire.

When this renewed Project Fear appears to be striking the desired targets we will then have to vote again, ostensibly on the Brexit terms. Those who build empires do not willingly relinquish them.

THE IMPERIAL MINDSET

THE ONE AND ONLY ISSUE

Forget the tsunami of yap about the economy. 'security', agriculture, immigration, red tape, fisheries, live animal exports, inward investment, employment, rights of residence or whatever. All that is, to a considerable degree, flummery ... bricks in the wall. Let's look at the wall itself.

There is one issue in this plebiscite, and one only. Is the future government of mankind to be conducted by a handful of continental megastates, of which Europe is the operational prototype?

Looking back over the years virtually every European leader of significance from Monnet to Rumpouy, Spaak and Schuman to Kohl and Mitterand, Delors and Giscard D'Estaing to Barroso and Merkel ... the list is very long and we can go back to Coudenhove-Kalergi himself ... have spoken unambiguously and mostly in glowing terms that the destination of this entire project is a single European megastate, and that will happen by hook or by crook (mostly the latter), regardless of the views of us plebeian hoi poloi.

So those numerous EU-philes who attempt to belittle or deny this central objective, are either fools or liars. Mostly, and sadly, it is this latter.

Such denials have now become wholly threadbare in light of the Five President's Report which is intended to complete the process of 'integration' (one of the common euphemisms for the single megastate) by 2025.

But what of the outlook and mindset of these people? Some years ago an off-guard comment by Barroso likened the EU to an empire.

Still fresh in the memory is the EU reaction to adverse referenda on the adoption of the Euro and on the Lisbon Treaty, and, more recently, the Dutch referendum on the Ukrainian visa policy. If your democratic choice is not to the liking of Brussels it will be ignored, circumvented, or you will have to vote again until the Brussels nomenklatura get the 'right' result.

Then there is the secrecy and corruption at the centre of the EU and its reaction to whistleblowers ... Tillack, Andreasen and Connolly. In the latter case the EU's Chief prosecutor likened criticism of the EU to blasphemy. A few years before President Ciampi of Italy likened it to treason. All this tells us much about the way these people think.

Rafts of EU nomenklatura, commissioners, judges and officials are immune to prosecution. This Napoleonic concept strikes right at the heart of our own Common Law tradition ... that the state is subject to law and not above law. Since the Norman Conquest we have endured several civil wars, and a number of rebellions or near-rebellions over exactly this issue.

Several items in this edition are intended to give a taste of the mindset of those in charge of the European project ... the arrogance, the elitism, the innumerable gravy trains, the aloof contempt for the ballot box, the sense that the EU, as some commentators have rightly said, more resembles a secular papacy than any system of democratic governance.

Much in this edition, therefore, speaks for itself. *The question is; - Do we want such people in charge of our affairs?* Indeed are such people fit to govern anyone?

REFERENDUM OR PLEBISCITE?

This journal steps deliberately out of line in describing the forthcoming vote as a 'plebiscite' rather than a 'referendum'. This distinction would probably be more familiar to a Swiss rather than a British constitutionalist.

In a number of countries. Denmark and Ireland being two examples, referenda (in the true sense) may be triggered automatically by a proposition with constitutional implications. In others, Switzerland being a prime example, there is referenda on demand underpinned by constitutional guarantee. In this country, in the other hand, such votes have never had any constitutional status at all.

Thus the difference between a 'referendum' and a 'plebiscite', is that the former is beyond government control, being triggered either by petition or by an actual or possible change to the constitution, whereas the latter will only occur at the behest of the powers-that-be, and at a time when those powers think they can gerrymander a result in their favour. A referendum takes place to decide policy, a plebiscite takes place to confirm and entrench policy.

It is essential to keep that crucial difference in mind.

BREXIT; THE MOVIE

This is a superb film and an absolute must see for everybody. I defy anyone voting to Remain after having seen it.

If there are any inclined to Remain reading this. I would certainly wish to argue with you!

Indeed I hope these pages will stimulate some direct argument and reasoned contradiction, and any response is more than welcome, indeed encouraged.

Frank Taylor

PRIME MINISTERS MUST STOP LISTENING SO MUCH TO THEIR VOTERS - JEAN-CLAUDE JUNCKER

Vote Leave

What the EU thinks of Democracy

Anyone still considering voting 'Remain' in the forthcoming referendum should consider the recent comments of the President of the European Commission, Jean-Claude Juncker.

He said: "Prime Ministers must stop listening so much to their voters and instead act as full time Europeans". He complained that elected leaders are making life "difficult" because they spend too much time bowing to public opinion. Mr Juncker added, "Too many politicians are listening exclusively to their national opinion. And if you are listening to your national opinion you are not developing what should be a common European sense" (Daily Telegraph, 5 May).

In other words, Mr Juncker is berating European leaders for having the temerity to listen to their electorates. This is an extraordinary statement and shows the complete disregard that the Brussels elite has for the democratic process.

This is not the first time the mask has slipped from Jean-Claude Juncker, who has dismissed previous referendum results and has said that "there can be no democratic choice against the European treaties" (BBC News, February 2015). The Commission's contempt for democracy is staggering. If we vote to leave the EU on 23 June, we can end the unelected Commission's ability to make our laws, and put a stop to its attempted erosion of democracy in the UK.

BREXIT: THE MOVIE IS NOW AVAILABLE ONLINE:

Rory Broomfield; Better Off Out

Help spread the message

Brexit: The Movie was launched at its premier in Leicester Square, London.

It has now been put online for people across the UK (and the world) to watch. Produced by Martin Durkin and his company, WagTV, it is a fantastic film that's packed full of useful information which will help spread the positive message as to why the UK is Better Off Out the

European Union.

A link to the full-length feature film is underneath; however, the website also has a number of separate clips taken from the film that illustrate, in bite-sized chunks, a range of reasons why we should vote to leave the EU.

Please do share the film and clips with your friends. We need to ensure that the positive messages get out about why we are Better Off Out.

However, there is more that you can do to help get the message out. Why not book your regional cinema to show the film? Or show it at your village hall? Or get the DVD and ask your friends around?

Please do watch, enjoy and share. We have to do as much as we possibly can to convince people to vote to leave on June 23rd. As Claire Fox, who is featured in the film, asks: "At what price freedom?".

- ▶ INTRO
- ▶ BRUSSELS
- ▶ KAFKA'S EU
- ▶ NAME THAT EUROCRAT
- ▶ POWERLESS YOU
- ▶ GRAVY TRAIN
- ▶ THE FISH STORY
- ▶ FREE BRITAIN VS REGULATED BRITAIN
- ▶ THE GERMAN MIRACLE
- ▶ ENTER THE E.U.
- ▶ REGULATED PEOPLE LIVING REGULATED LIVES
- ▶ CRONY CAPITALISM
- ▶ FORTRESS EUROPE PT.1
- ▶ FORTRESS EUROPE PT.2
- ▶ FORTRESS EUROPE PT.3
- ▶ FORTRESS EUROPE PT.4
- ▶ HOW THE E.U. WRECKED EUROPE'S ECONOMY
- ▶ THE E.U. DESTROYS JOBS
- ▶ SCARY UNCERTAIN EUROPE
- ▶ LIFE OUTSIDE THE E.U...SWITZERLAND
- ▶ THE TRUTH ABOUT TRADE DEALS
- ▶ TRADING REGULATIONS
- ▶ ESCAPING FORTRESS EUROPE
- ▶ THE NEW INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION
- ▶ LOOKING DOWN ON THE PLEBS
- ▶ FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

<http://www.brexitthemovie.com/>

IF VOTE IS FOR LEAVE, POLITICAL LEADERS WILL GET EU TO INTERVENE

Brian Reece Blog; via Dave Barnby, Sonya Porter and others

<https://brianreeceblog.wordpress.com/2016/04/16/betrayed-by-liars/>

Prime Minister David Cameron and Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn have both agreed to join together to ask the EU Commission to intervene and challenge the decision legally if the UK vote to

leave the European Union, the Stronger In movement are now in alarm at the sudden shift towards Brexit support. Both the Prime Minister and the Labour leader are at the forefront of the plan to stop any vote to leave the EU and will try to secure a second referendum or make the vote void. The EU have also indicated to David Cameron that if one party overspends within their allocated budget the UK electoral commission could enforce the second referendum due to rules being broken.

Both leaders are fighting for their political lives by joining the remain campaign, but victory for Brexit would surely put their creditability in the limelight and certainly would mean the end of David Cameron, the German Chancellor Angela Merkel has given David Cameron her personal assurance that the EU will fight any Brexit victory through the courts which could take years with no time limit to reach a decision.

The Prime Minister seems to be prepared to fall to uncharted depths in his aim to secure the UK's future within the EU, Jeremy Corbyn has gone from left wing terrorist supporter to an EU pimp within days, he has betrayed the loyal labour voters and hoodwinked the new members who paid their membership fee to get him into the position only to be made into an utter fool.

We are in a new Battle of Britain and we must encourage everyone to see the facts hidden behind a web of lies by the Stronger In movement, we must stop our nation being dictated to by German and Brussels who's motivation is total control of the UK.

In the Battle of Britain our heroes were brave young men in spitfires, today our heroes will be those who use a pen not a bullet, VOTE LEAVE and become a modern day hero.

A FIGHT WE LOST

Wiebke Schroede; SumOfUs.org

The European Parliament just gave corporations alarming new superpowers to harshly punish whistleblowers. We have to stop this to protect people who speak out against corporate abuses.

Terrible news: the European Parliament just granted corporations a blanket right to secrecy.

I'm not going to sugar-coat it: this is really hard to stomach. The Parliament voted in favour of the "Trade Secrets Protection Directive" -- a law that gives corporations alarming new superpowers to prosecute and criminalise whistleblowers, journalists, and news organisations that publish leaked internal documents. This law will deter people from speaking out so corporations can keep getting away with things like corporate tax avoidance, human rights breaches, and environmental ruin.

But fight against this dangerous trade agenda is not over -- especially if we give it everything we've got.

The Council of the European Union still has to approve the Directive. Nation states have to implement it -- and they have considerable discretion in deciding the penalties for breach of this law.

Corporations claim that the law is about protecting their trade secrets. But the Directive defines "trade secrets" so broadly that it covers almost any information inside a company. So what does this mean?

Leaks like the "Panama Papers", which shockingly revealed the mammoth scale of corporate tax avoidance, could be a thing of the past. Corporations will have the licence to silence people who are brave enough to speak out. They will be beyond the reach of justice and democracy.

The SumOfUs community has worked very hard so far to stop the Trade Secrets Protection Directive and the bigger trade agenda of which it is a part. We teamed up with an alliance of amazing European campaigning groups that led the fight. Together, we collected more than 280,000 signatures protesting the Directive. It was so powerful that days before the vote it looked like Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) would postpone it.

Thousands of SumOfUs members also directly contacted MEPs. Although we lost the vote in the end, we put the spotlight on this sneaky Directive, which would have otherwise silently slipped through.

But we have to keep fighting. There's only one thing that politicians fear more than huge corporations, and that's us -- ordinary people taking a stand.

IT IS NOW AGAINST THE EUROPEAN LAW TO CRITICISE THE EU

The Euro Probe

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1325398/Euro-court-outlaws-criticism-of-EU.html>

(At first glance this item might appear self-contradictory. In fact the court, whilst rejecting the specific terms of the Colomer submission, found that as a general principle political speech critical of the EU may be suppressed - Ed)

THE European Court of Justice ruled yesterday that the European Union can lawfully suppress political criticism of its institutions and of leading figures, sweeping aside English Common Law and 50 years of European precedents on civil liberties. The EU's top court found that the European Commission was entitled to sack Bernard Connolly, a British economist dismissed in 1995 for writing a critique of European monetary integration entitled *The Rotten Heart of Europe*.

The ruling stated that the commission could restrict dissent in order to "protect the rights of others" and punish individuals who "damaged the institution's image and reputation". The case has wider implications for free speech that could extend to EU citizens who do not work for the Brussels bureaucracy.

The court called the Connolly book "aggressive, derogatory and insulting", taking particular umbrage at the author's suggestion that Economic and Monetary Union was a threat to democracy, freedom and "ultimately peace".

However, it dropped an argument put forward three months ago by the advocate-general, Damaso Ruiz-Jarabo Colomer, which implied that Mr Connolly's criticism of the EU was akin to extreme blasphemy, and therefore not protected speech.

Mr Connolly, who has been told to pay the European Commission's legal costs, said the proceedings did not amount to a fair hearing. He said: "We're back to the Star Chamber and Acts of Attainder: the rights of defendants are not respected or guaranteed in any way; the offence of seditious libel has been resurrected."

Mr Colomer wrote in his opinion last November that a landmark British case on free speech had "no foundation or relevance" in European law, suggesting that the European Court was unwilling to give much consideration to British legal tradition.

Mr Connolly now intends to take his case to Europe's other court, the non-EU European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg.

Case 274/99 of the European Court of Justice

RUIZ-JARABO COLOMER the Advocate-General of the European Court of Justice gave a legal opinion (in case C-274/99) in 19 October 2000 that criticism of the EU, its institutions or its leading figures was akin to blasphemy. Further, that, because laws against blasphemy were acceptable both under the common law of England and the existing European Human Rights Convention, it then followed that punishing someone for allegedly criticizing the EU was not an infringement of free speech. This opinion was given as a result of a case against a British European Commission official Bernard Connolly, who had written 'The Rotten Heart Of Europe', a book critical of the EU.

The European Court of First Instance found against him, ruling that the EU may restrict political speech to protect its interests.

Initially Mr. Connolly had argued that a landmark British case, *Wingrove VS. United Kingdom*, had established that political speech could not be limited except in extreme circumstances of blasphemy. The *Wingrove* case concerned a pornographic video showing St.

Teresa of Avila engaged in various sexual acts.

The advocate general turned that argument upside down and argued that the blasphemy ruling implied a broader protection for the 'rights of others'. It was the cornerstone of his argument that the EU can legitimately punish dissent.

The meat of the issue is in sections 15 to 20 where the advocate general refers to the Wingrove case in the UK

Section 15 gives some of the Wingrove case background basically saying that "It appears from the judgment that English law defined the offence of blasphemy in the following terms: 'Every publication is said to be blasphemous which contains any contemptuous, reviling, scurrilous or ludicrous matter relating to God, Jesus Christ or the Bible, or the formularies of the Church of England as by law established. ... the Court of Human Rights ... acknowledged that the national authorities needed sufficient flexibility to enable them to assess whether certain facts fell within the definition of the offence.'

Section 17 states affirms that censorship is fine in the case of 'the protection of the reputation or the rights of others, which, without any doubt, encompasses a Community institution's rights in relation to the reputation of its members'

20 concludes "To put it in positive terms, the decision dismissing Mr Connolly for having contravened that provision satisfies the requirement of proportionality in that it finds that the work which was published caused serious prejudice to the Communities' interests"

The full text can be obtained from the Court of Justice of the European Communities website (<http://curia.eu.int/jurisp/cgi-bin/form.pl?ng=en&Submit=Submit&docrequire=alldocs&numaff=C-274%2F99&datefs=&datefe=&nomusuel=&domaine=&mots=&resmax=100>) – incidentally it is very hard to find using the site search engine – perhaps they are not proud of this one?!

CALLS FOR SACKING AFTER EU ANTI-FRAUD OFFICE 'MISLED' COURTS

Bruno Waterfield; Daily Telegraph

The European Union's anti-fraud office is under pressure to sack its most senior official amid allegations that the body misled the European Courts.

After four years of denials, the EU's anti-fraud office, known as Olaf, has finally admitted that evidence given to the European Courts concerning the controversial arrest of an investigative journalist "was not factually correct".

Marta Andreasen, the European Commission's former chief accountant who was sacked in 2005 for revealing irregularities in the EU accounting system, has called for immediate action. She believes that Franz-Hermann Brüner, Olaf's Director General and the man responsible for fighting corruption in the EU, should be dismissed by the Commission for alleged misconduct. "I think that the Commission should fire Brüner. It is their responsibility," she said, "He should be fired immediately. He has hurt the reputation of the institutions, something they have accused others of doing when sacking them."

Mrs Andreasen has herself fought the Commission in the Courts and has attacked a culture of "lies" throughout the EU institutions. "Brüner puts into question not only the word of Olaf but the word of the European Commission and the European Court of Justice. But it does not surprise me, I went to court and the Commission said what it wanted and the tribunal did not verify what they were saying," she said, "These institutions are not reliable."

Hans-Martin Tillack, a German journalist, was arrested in March 2004 and his offices raided by Belgian police acting on information supplied by Olaf. Olaf and Commission officials were furious because Tillack was publishing leaks concerning fraud worth millions of pounds at the EU's Eurostat statistics agency and accused him of corruption.

Following legal action by Tillack, the Commission, acting on behalf of Olaf, insisted that officials had not used the police raids to get access to his files and information on his informants. As head of Olaf, Mr Bruner in the past repeatedly denied any connection to the case.

A submission to the European Court of First Instance (ECFI) in August 2004 - and seen by The Daily Telegraph - stated: "Neither OLAF nor any other Commission staff have ever contacted [the Belgian prosecutor handling the case]".

A spokesman for Olaf confirmed that an apology would be made for "factual inaccuracies that were made in a number of public statements". "There is an ongoing internal inquiry to establish the facts that led to this situation," he said, "But we do not think there is any indication the Court was misled."

Tillack is demanding a "thorough inquiry" into the affair carried out by officials from outside the EU anti-fraud agency. "Olaf has lied to the public and misled the European Court of Justice. It is clear that Olaf can not investigate itself," he said.

Following hearings during which Olaf made "inaccurate" statements, Tillack failed to persuade the EU courts to declare his arrest and the raids illegal in an October 2006 ruling. But in November the European Court of Human Rights ruled that the Belgian authorities had infringed his right to freedom of expression and awarded him over £30,000 in costs and damages.

EUROCRATS DISMISS DUTCH VOTE

Euro Guido

61% of Dutch voters voted against the government and against the EU last night, in a referendum seen as a vote of confidence in Brussels. This is how Eurocrats have responded to the will of the people being democratic expressed:

Carl Bildt;-

Agreement EU/Ukraine already approved by 29 democratic EU parliaments. Those voting No in Netherlands today are 0,006% of electorate in EU.

How will they respond to 8.6% of the EU's population voting on June 23...

EU DEMOCRACY DEAD: EU IGNORES DUTCH REFERENDUM TO PUSH THROUGH UKRAINE DEAL

Nick Gutteridge; Express

EUROPE'S autocratic elite attempted to sweep the result of the Dutch referendum under the carpet today by "airbrushing" out public feeling and railroading through visa-free travel for 45 million Ukrainians.

The EU is railroading through a visa-free travel for Ukrainians despite the Dutch referendum result. In a breathtaking act, the unelected European Commission announced it will push through the controversial deal, despite being rejected by two-thirds of Dutch voters earlier this month.

The Ukraine-European Union Association Agreement is a political and economic treaty between the EU, its 28 member states and Ukraine giving the country access to the European Investment Bank and steps towards visa-free travel for the Ukrainian population.

The issue of visa-free travel for 45 million Ukrainians, whose country is war-torn and impoverished, was one of the key reasons Dutch voters overwhelmingly rejected the EU's deal. But crowing Eurocrat Dimitris Avramopoulos, whose bungled handling of the migrant crisis has let at least 5,000 Islamic State (ISIS) jihadis into Europe, said: "Today we follow up on our commitment to propose short-stay visa-free travel to the EU for Ukrainian citizens with biometric passports - facilitating

people-to-people contacts and strengthening business, social and cultural ties between the EU and Ukraine. "This is the result of the success of the Ukrainian government in achieving far-reaching and difficult reforms in the Justice and Home Affairs area and beyond, impacting on areas such as the rule of law and justice reform. I am very satisfied with the progress achieved, it is an important achievement for the citizens of Ukraine, and I hope that the European Parliament and the Council will adopt our proposal very soon."

The latest development proves the EU has no respect for democracy, critics said, adding it cannot ever be reformed because unelected bureaucrats have contempt for European citizens and their representatives. It comes after a bombshell report revealed how Britain is the most ignored nation in the EU, with Brussels pen-pushers routinely overriding our elected politicians on important issues.

Pro-EU campaigners have consistently argued we should stay in the 28-nation bloc so that David Cameron and his ministers can work from within to reform it. Today's announcement shows how utterly hopeless that cause is, according to eurosceptics, with Brussels demonstrating astonishing gall and simply ignoring the result of a free and fair election.

Britain and Ireland will be the only two nations exempt from the visa-free travel arrangement.

Dutch bloggers GeenPeil, who organised the petition which brought about the historic referendum, today tweeted in disgust: "Look! Juncker and Rutte have completely airbrushed the referendum result."

Brexit campaigners have previously said the sheer arrogance and autocracy of the EU Commission demonstrates beyond doubt the Brussels project can never be reformed.

Yesterday EU chief Jean-Claude Juncker admitted that voters all over Europe have lost faith in the EU because of its meddling in their lives. In an astonishing confession of failure, he said: "We are no longer respected in our countries when we emphasise the need to give priority to the EU."

HOW REFERENDA THREATEN THE EU

Stratfor; via Sonya Porter

<https://www.stratfor.com/analysis/how-referenda-threaten-eu> How Referenda Threaten the EU

Forecast

■ In the coming years, national governments, opposition groups and civil society organizations will increasingly turn to popular votes to decide a broad range of EU-related debates.

■ National governments will probably use referenda (or, more likely, the threat of them) to demand concessions from the European Union, to justify domestic decisions or to increase their own popularity.

■ Votes will take place against a backdrop of growing nationalism and fear of globalization, and the results will likely freeze or reverse the process of EU integration.

Analysis

Europe seems to be in a referendum frenzy these days. In early May, the Hungarian government confirmed its decision to hold a referendum on the European Commission's plan to distribute asylum seekers among member states. In April, Dutch citizens voted against the European Union Association Agreement with Ukraine in a referendum organized by a Euroskeptic organization. In June, the United Kingdom will hold a crucial vote on whether to leave the European Union altogether. The three votes have a common denominator: EU citizens are essentially being asked to decide on issues connected to the process of Continental integration.

Considering the European Union's political and economic predicament, referenda are a very attractive tool to win the loyalty of voters. The democratic legitimacy of the European Union is being questioned, and moderate governments and their Euroskeptic opposition alike are turning to the voters for their own political gain. In the coming years, referenda will be proposed by three main sources — national governments, opposition groups and civil society organizations — and they will touch upon a broad range of EU-related questions.

An Interesting Paradox

The European Union has a tempestuous history with referenda. European governments have made many crucial decisions affecting national sovereignty without consulting the populace. The founding members of the European Economic Community (the European Union's predecessor) did not hold referenda when the supranational organization was created in 1957. Four decades later, the initial members of the eurozone did not ask voters their opinion before creating the currency union. Only Denmark and Sweden held referenda on whether to enter the eurozone, and people voted not to join it. The United Kingdom, in turn, negotiated an opt-out with its EU peers.

When nations have consulted their citizens, the results have many times tended against European integration. The Irish initially voted against the treaties of Nice (2001) and Lisbon (2008), which transferred more power from the national government to EU institutions. In both cases, Dublin negotiated concessions from the European Union before holding second referenda, which resulted in favorable votes for the treaties. In Denmark the treaty of Maastricht, which created the European Union, required a second referendum to pass in 1993 after people voted against it a year earlier. Perhaps the most notorious EU referenda were held in France and the Netherlands in 2005, when people voted against a plan to establish an EU constitution. Such strong popular rejection in two founding EU members caused the bloc to abort the project.

Whether the European Union is democratically legitimate has been a matter of debate for decades. Aware that transferring national sovereignty to unelected technocrats in Brussels could alienate voters, national governments decided to enhance the role of the EU Parliament, the only international organization whose members are elected by universal suffrage. The idea was that, by giving the European Parliament a greater participation in the Continent's decision-making process, the European Union would become more democratic.

But Europe's economic and political crises have exacerbated the debate over the bloc's democratic legitimacy, and governments are becoming increasingly nationalistic in response. With its impending referendum on whether to stay in the union, the United Kingdom is the most extreme example of this trend. But other countries are likely to make similar demands in the future. The referendum issue poses an interesting paradox: Asking voters to weigh in on European issues seems to be the most democratic way to reform the European Union — an arguably undemocratic institution. But as is usually the case, things are not as simple as they initially seem, and the practice could in fact weaken the bloc beyond repair.

Layers of Complexity

On the surface, referenda are the most formidable tool of democracy, giving voters a direct say on political, economic and social issues. They allow people to re-engage with the political process and give governments a popular mandate for major decisions that require a broad consensus. This explains why referenda are often used to reform constitutions or to make decisions on socially and politically sensitive issues (such as abortion or the death penalty).

But critics of referenda argue that they force voters to make decisions on complex issues about which they may not have complete knowledge. Referenda tend to create the illusion that complex issues can be presented in simple terms; the vote is often reduced to a binary "yes" or "no" answer. Referenda are also intimately linked to domestic political situations. Many citizens and political parties tend to see referenda as a vote on the government rather than on the issue under discussion, and the outcome is often determined by the economic situation or the popularity of the government at the time.

The European supranational government creates an additional layer of complexity. EU-related issues tend to be harder for voters to understand than national issues, and voters tend to more closely identify with and care about national rather than supranational issues. This means that voters often decide on EU referenda according to domestic political and economic conditions. Many of the French votes against the European Constitution, for example, were actually a vote against former President Jacques Chirac. The same happens with elections for the EU parliament; most political

parties tend to campaign on domestic issues rather than on European issues. Thus, European Parliament election results are widely perceived as a barometer of the popularity of national governments.

EU-related referenda are also complex because of their impact on decision-making in Europe. Treaties need to be ratified by all member states before they become take effect, which means that in those countries where referenda are needed to ratify a treaty (such as in Ireland and Denmark), the entire process could be stalled because of the decision of voters in a single country. This creates enormous uncertainty about the feasibility of passing treaties, but it also gives countries temporary albeit notable leverage to negotiate concessions when voters vote no. Denmark, for example, received several exemptions from EU requirements after people initially voted against the Maastricht Treaty.

A Powerful Negotiating Tool

To a large extent, the current spate of referenda in Europe is a result of the upcoming British vote. London proved that referenda can be used to extract concessions from Brussels, but it also that the process of Continental integration can be frozen or even reversed with a popular vote. In the coming years, governments will probably use referenda (or, more likely, the threat of referenda) to demand concessions from the European Union, to justify domestic decisions, or to increase their own popularity. The net result of this situation will be to further distance EU member states from the centralized core in Brussels.

Naturally, not every country is in the same position to make demands. In 2015 the Greek government used a referendum against austerity to pressure its lenders to soften the terms of its bailout agreement with little success. In Hungary's case, the government will use popular opposition to the relocation scheme to justify its rejection of the plan in Brussels and to improve its popularity at home. But Hungary's position will be stronger if it coordinates its actions with other like-minded countries in the region. Larger EU members may feel more tempted than their smaller peers to threaten referenda, since they can inflict more damage on the European Union.

Euroskeptic political parties will also use referenda as a part of their electoral campaigns. The leader of the nationalist Freedom Party of Austria recently said Austria should be "governed via referenda" as Switzerland is. France's National Front has promised to hold a vote on the country's EU membership if it wins the presidential election in 2017. Italy's Five Star Movement has said it would hold a referendum on the country's membership in the eurozone if elected. Considering that France and Italy are the second- and third-largest economies in the eurozone, respectively, such referenda could finally doom the European Union. Promising to put EU-related issues to a vote helps these parties to soften their image, because a referendum looks less threatening (and more democratic) than the promise of unilateral action. Finally, interest groups or nongovernmental organizations may try to push their agendas in a similar way. But their options are more limited; only a handful of EU members have mechanisms that allow for citizens to organize referenda.

In Italy, referenda organized by citizens are binding, but only if voter turnout is above 50 percent. Most of the citizen-backed referenda in the past two decades were declared void because of low voter turnout. In the Netherlands, the threshold for voter turnout is much lower (30 percent), but the referenda organized by the public are not binding. However, even non-binding votes can put governments in awkward situations. The Dutch government is currently looking for ways to honor its promise to respect the result of a referendum in which people asked The Hague not to sign an association agreement between the European Union and Ukraine. Countries such as Croatia, Lithuania and Hungary also have mechanisms that enable citizens to propose a referendum.

Some countries have other mechanisms of direct democracy. In Austria and Finland, for example, people can force their parliaments to discuss a certain topic if they collect enough signatures. In late April, the Finnish parliament held a debate on the country's membership in the eurozone after a group of citizens collected signatures to force the topic. While the debate was not binding, citizens sent their government a clear signal that they are worried about the effect of the common currency on the Finnish economy. These discussions can be particularly awkward when,

like in Finland, a Euroskeptical party is actually a member of the government and has to find a balance between its political manifesto and its coalition commitments.

The Upcoming Votes

There are plenty of issues in Europe that could be decided by a referendum in the coming years. Though a new EU treaty is very unlikely in the current political environment, any attempts to modify the bloc's legal framework would trigger an avalanche of referenda across the Continent. Euroskeptical political parties and organizations in Southern Europe, as well as more moderate governments, could threaten to put their membership in the European Union or the eurozone to a vote so as to demand concessions from Brussels on varied topics, including fiscal targets and debt restructuring. Euroskeptical forces in Northern Europe could push for referenda to resist measures that undermine their national wealth.

Separatist movements in places such as Catalonia, Scotland and Flanders will continue to push for referenda for more autonomy or for outright independence. Regional or municipal governments can resist EU plans to allocate asylum seekers in their territories by putting the issue to a vote. Cyprus' Greek south and its Turkish north are once again negotiating to reunify the island, but any agreement will have to be ratified by both sides in a referendum. (In 2004, Greek Cypriots rejected a U.N.-backed plan in a referendum.)

Referenda can also affect international affairs beyond the European Union. Popular pressure could force governments in several EU nations to hold a referendum on trade agreements such as the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Countries like Finland and Sweden are unlikely to join NATO without a referendum, and Austria and Ireland are not planning to join the military alliance any time soon, but if they did, a referendum would be difficult to avoid.

These votes will probably be held against the backdrop of growing nationalism and fear of globalization. They will almost certainly be influenced by the political and economic situation at the time of the vote and will be subject to populist manipulation from both the organizers and their opponents (something true of most elections). The alleged attempts to solve the European Union's crisis of representation could therefore contribute to the bloc's weakening.

KILLING DISSENT IN EUROPE: NIGEL FARAGE WON'T BE THE LAST VICTIM

Robin Shepherd; The Commentator

The modern EU is not run by people who are committed to a pluralistic democratic political culture, and these days you don't need to be a traditional eurosceptic to see that.

The shocking tale of UKIP (UK Independence Party) leader Nigel Farage's grossly inappropriate fine for his sardonic remarks about European Council President Herman Van Rompuy appears to be drawing to an unhappy and worrying conclusion. As Guido Fawkes, Britain's leading Westminster media outlet, pointed out on Tuesday, Farage has lost his appeal against the 3,000 euro (\$4,000) penalty and will also have to pay costs.

Farage, a highly articulate eurosceptic, got himself into trouble back in early 2010 in the context of a typically withering assault in the European Parliament on the EU's complete lack of democratic legitimacy. Van Rompuy had just been appointed to his new position which was created in the wake of the Lisbon Treaty – the most anti-democratic venture in the post-Cold War history of western Europe – and Farage was, rightly, in no mood to take prisoners.

“You have the charisma of a damp rag, and the appearance of a low-grade bank clerk,” he told a somewhat bemused looking Van Rompuy. To be sure, that's not a quotation from Virgil. But neither is it an assault composed of vulgarities.

Given that Van Rompuy acquired his position – a position of considerable power -- without facing the ballot box, he must have expected some pretty robust scrutiny including over his fitness to be one of the

most important public faces of the European Union. Perhaps Farage took that concept just a little too literally.

But surely, anyone subjected to such a critique who was committed to a pluralistic democratic political culture would simply shake their head, shrug their shoulders move on and ignore it. But here's the rub. The modern EU is not run by people who are committed to a pluralistic democratic political culture. They aren't used to being held to account in the manner that people like Nigel Farage at UKIP, and Daniel Hannan and many other Conservative MEPs are.

Neither is Van Rompuy an elected representative who can claim the kind of prerogatives that ministers might claim in a chamber such as the House of Commons. In such a setting, the Speaker would object to personalised remarks not simply to uphold standards but also because to insult a member of parliament is also to insult the voters who put him or her there in the first place. That is a central principle of representative democracy. In the end, the fact that the EU hierarchy could not just laugh this one off says far more about them than it does about Nigel Farage. Their approach smacks of a kind of vindictive opportunism.

The moment one of their critics said something that could be construed as crossing a red line, unable to believe their luck they came down on him like a tonne of bricks.

Maybe the eurocrats no longer care, but they need to be aware that across the political spectrum there is widespread concern in Britain (and increasingly across Europe) about the EU's attitude towards democracy and dissent. The way things are going, it would not be surprising in the coming years if moves were made to make "misrepresentation" of the European project a sanctionable offence in itself.

Efforts to institute propaganda classes in schools on the benefits of the EU are already afoot. So, the mooted trajectory is frighteningly clear.

Among democratically minded people, even those who do not hold a candle for Nigel Farage and UKIP will still feel uncomfortable about the treatment of an elected British representative at the hands of an unelected clique in Brussels. In the context of moves towards a European superstate as a response to the crisis in the Eurozone, it is anybody's guess where we go from here.

THE KILMUIR LETTER

Campaign for Independent Britain; John Timbrell and other sources.

(Lord Kilmuir was Lord Chancellor under Edward Heath and the time of the accession negotiations to the (then) Common Market. The following is the text of his letter of advice to Heath on the constitutional implications of accession.

In their annotation a number of sources mention Praemunire. This is a fourteenth century concept which forbids the passing of any sovereignty or self-determination outside of national control. To all intents and purposes it is a form of treason..

Two controversies emerge from this letter. Firstly that accession was, and remains, illegal, treasonous in the sense of Praemunire, according to the fundamental tenets of the constitution ... the 1351 Treason Act, the 1392 Act of Praemunire, the 1559 Act of Supremacy, and the 1688/9 Declaration and Bill of Rights, and the Coronation Oath

Secondly that, despite countless assurances to the contrary prior to 1973 and again during the 1975 plebiscite, both Conservative and Labour governments were fully aware of those implications - Ed)

My Dear Ted,

You wrote to me on the 30th November about the constitutional implications of our becoming a party to the Treaty of Rome. I have now had an opportunity of considering what you say in your letter and have studied the memoranda you sent me. I agree with you that there are important constitutional issues involved.

I have no doubt that if we do sign the Treaty, we shall suffer some loss of sovereignty, but before

attempting to define or evaluate the loss I wish to make one general observation. At the end of the day, the issue whether or not to join the European Economic Community must be decided on broad political grounds and if it appears from what follows in this letter that I find the constitutional objections serious that does not mean that I consider them conclusive. I do, however, think it important that we should appreciate clearly from the outset exactly what, from the constitutional point of view, is involved if we sign the treaty, and it is with that consideration in mind that I have addressed myself to the questions you have raised.

Adherence to the Treaty of Rome would, in my opinion, affect our sovereignty in three ways:-

Parliament would be required to surrender some of its functions to the organs of the community; The Crown would be called on to transfer part of its treaty-making power to those organs of the community; Our courts of law would sacrifice some degree of independence by becoming subordinate in certain respects to the European Court of Justice.

The position of Parliament

It is clear that the memorandum prepared by your Legal Advisers that the Council of could eventually (after the system of qualified majority voting had come into force) make regulations which would be binding on us even against our wishes, and which would in fact become for us part of the law of the land.

There are two ways in which this requirement of the Treaty could in practice be implemented:- s or regulations not made by the Sovereign in parliament to take effect as law in England.

Parliament could legislate ad hoc on each occasion that the Council make regulations requiring action by us. The difficulty would be that, since Parliament can bind neither itself nor its successors, we could only comply with our obligations under the Treaty if Parliament abandoned its right of passing independent judgement on the legislative proposals put before it. A parallel is the constitutional convention whereby Parliament passes British North American Bills without question at the request of the Parliament of Canada, in this respect Parliament here has substance, if not in form, abdicated its sovereign position, and it would have pro tanto, to do the same for the Community.

It would in theory be possible for parliament to enact at the outset legislation which would give automatic force of law to any existing or future regulations made by the appropriate organs of the Community. For Parliament to do this would go far beyond the most extensive delegation of powers even in wartime that we have ever experienced and I do not think there is any likelihood of this being acceptable to the House of Commons. Whichever course were adopted, Parliament would retain in theory the liberty to repeal the relevant Act or Acts, but I would agree with you that we must act on the assumption that entry into the Community would be irrevocable, we should therefore to accept a position where Parliament had no more power to repeal us own enactments than it has in practice to abrogate the statute of Westminster. In short. Parliament would have to transfer to the Council, or other appropriate organ of the Community, its substantive powers of legislating over the whole of a very important field.

Treaty-making Powers

The proposition that every treaty entered into by the United Kingdom does to some extent fetter our freedom of action is plainly true. Some treaties such as GATT and O.E.E.C. restrict severely our liberty to make agreements with third parties and I should not regard it as detrimental to our sovereign that, by signing the Treaty of Rome, we undertook not to make tariff or trade agreements without the Council's approval. But to transfer to the council or the Commission the power to make such treaties on our behalf, and even against our will, is an entirely different proposition. There seems to me to be a clear distinction between the exercise of sovereignty involved in the conscious acceptance by us of obligations under treaty-making powers and the total or partial surrender of sovereignty involved in our cession of these powers to some other body. To confer a sovereign state's treaty-making powers on an international organisation is the first step on the road which leads by way of confederation to the fully federal state. I do not suggest that what is involved would necessarily carry us very far in this direction, but it would be a most significant step and one for which there is no precedent in our case. Moreover, a further surrender of sovereignty of parliamentary supremacy would necessarily be involved: as you know although the treaty-making power is vested in the Crown. Parliamentary sanction is required for any treaty which involves a change in the law or the imposition

of taxation to take two examples and we cannot ratify such a treaty unless Parliament consents. But if binding treaties are to be entered into on our behalf, Parliament must surrender this function and either resign itself to becoming a rubber stamp or give the Community, in effect, the power to amend our domestic laws.

Independence of the Courts

There is no precedent for our final appellate tribunal being required to refer questions of law (even in a limited field) to another court and as I assume to be the implication of 'refer'- to accept that court's decision. You will remember that when a similar proposal was considered in connection with the Council of Europe we felt strong objection to it. I have no doubt that the whole of the legal profession in this country would share my dislike for such a proposal which must inevitably detract from the independence and authority of our courts.

Of those three objections, the first two are by far the more important. I must emphasise that in my view the surrenders of sovereignty involved are serious ones and I think that as a matter of practical politics, it will not be easy to persuade Parliament or the public to accept them. I am sure that it would be a great mistake to under-estimate the force of objections to them. But these objections ought to be brought out into the open now because, if we attempt to gloss over them at this stage those who are opposed to the whole idea of our joining the Community will certainly seize on them with more damaging effect later on. Having said this, I would emphasise once again that, although those constitutional considerations must be given their full weight when we come to balance the arguments on either side, I do not for one moment wish to convey the impression that they must necessarily tip the scale. In the long run we shall have to decide whether economic factors require us to make some sacrifices of sovereignty: my concern is to ensure that we should see exactly what it is that we are being called on to sacrifice, and how serious our loss would be.

<http://www.parliament.uk/briefingpapers/commons/lib/research/rp2010/RP10-079.pdf>

PETITIONS ; UK GOVERNMENT AND PARLIAMENT

John Timbrell

We require parliament to debate Lord Kilmuir's letter to Edward Heath

In this time of the future referendum the public knowledge of the letter should be discussed because although the evidence of the letter exists the content has never been debated in parliament.

(NB; To sign the petition go to the UK Government and Parliament website - Ed)

NOT IMPERIALIST? THE EU JUST STARTED A BIT LATE

David Cottle; Wall Street Journal

The European Union's leaders don't often use the word "empire" in connection with their vast project, at least not in public. There's good reason for this, of course. It's a term 21st-century Europe would much rather forget in its quest to do business with now-powerful countries once humiliated or exploited in the name of, well, empire.

Militarism, colonialism and racism are all bound up with it, and, even if they weren't, the word would still be redolent of the past. The E.U. would rather see itself as the future, thanks very much, a liberal blueprint for co-operation, peace and letting even the darkest by-gones be by-gones.

However, an objective observer might still wonder; the union has many of the trappings of empire, whether it admits to them or not.

It is supranational, obviously, with its own executive and legislature. It asserts the primacy of its law over the national laws of member states, makes trade deals and is steadily groping for a distinct and powerful diplomatic service. It mints currency, even if not all members have to use it.

This list goes on. If the E.U. isn't quite an empire, it can certainly look a lot like one. And, don't forget that once, in 2007, the mask slipped. In July of that year, President of the European Commission Jose Manuel Barroso said the following...

"Sometimes I like to compare the E.U. as a creation to the organisation of empires. We have the dimension of Empire but there is a great difference. Empires were usually made with force with a centre imposing diktat, a will on the others. Now what we have is the first non-Imperial empire... I believe it is a great construction and we should be proud of it."

(Presumably the old E.U. trope of allowing referendum after referendum until the "correct" result is achieved, at which point the process abruptly comes to an end, is completely different from "the centre imposing a diktat.")

Anyway, there you are; the European Union is an empire, just one you join out of self-interest rather than at gunpoint. And, as such, it had a problem built into it from its inception. Because, you see, empires usually go through two distinct stages.

When they are growing they can become extremely powerful—and profitable—as examples from Ancient Rome in the Mediterranean, Portugal and Spain in South America and France or Britain just about everywhere demonstrate. A growing empire acquires new land, resources and workers, all of which swell the coffers. This can take empires to the top locally, regionally and, eventually, globally; the U.S. is the first non-imperialist top dog for centuries.

But then we come to the second stage; what we might call the maintenance stage.

At some point those new assets need defending and conquered people, in return for loyalty, want the same rights and living standards as their conquerors. This is when all empires start to crumble and fall. Keeping them intact always becomes too expensive. Always.

We know a bit about this in the U.K., having spent the latter half of the 20th century handing back more than 20 million square miles of imperial real estate to the people who lived on them. In our more self-deluding moments we like to think we did this in a fit of remorse and egalitarianism, expiating past colonial sins. And we did, a bit. But mostly we did it because, bankrupted by war, we could no longer afford the cost of imperial maintenance

This is how it always goes in the end. Go back 1,500 years. The Roman legions didn't withdraw from their outposts because the Eternal City suddenly felt awful about subjugating them. They withdrew because Rome needed the troops close to home and couldn't afford to fund replacements.

History, to be sure; but, in the present, Europe is arguably an empire that was forced to start at stage two. In the perfectly admirable ambition of avoiding another bloody attempt at stage one in Europe, it went straight to the maintenance phase of the imperial game of Monopoly without passing Go or collecting €200.

The bailout costs that Europe's richer citizens clearly don't want to pay, and the austerity measures its poorer ones just as clearly don't want to endure, are just deepening cracks in this "non-imperial empire." (In passing, this mess also looks a lot like "coercion by central diktat," Mr.Barroso, whether that coercion be to gut state spending or stump up bailout cash.)

These cracks emerged with the constant setting aside of the Stability and Growth Pact, an agreement designed to get around Europe's lack of political union by making spendthrift governments be good. But, widely ignored by just about every state at one point or another, enforcing it was perhaps the first cost of maintenance that proved too high for this non-imperial empire.

Now the cracks seem certain to get deeper and, even if they are repaired, history doesn't merely suggest there will be others, it loudly insists.

THE EUROPEAN UNION ALWAYS WAS A CIA PROJECT, AS BREXITEERS DISCOVER

Novorossia Today; via Michael Morton

Brexiteers should have been prepared for the shattering intervention of the US. The European Union always was an American project.

It was Washington that drove European integration in the late 1940s, and funded it covertly under the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. While irritated at times, the US has relied on the EU ever since as the anchor to American regional interests alongside NATO.

There has never been a divide-and-rule strategy. The eurosceptic camp has been strangely blind to this, somehow supposing that powerful forces across the Atlantic are egging on British secession, and will hail them as liberators. The anti-Brussels movement in France – and to a lesser extent in Italy and Germany, and among the Nordic Left – works from the opposite premise, that the EU is essentially an instrument of Anglo-Saxon power and ‘capitalisme sauvage’.

France’s Marine Le Pen is trenchantly anti-American. She rails against dollar supremacy. Her Front National relies on funding from Russian banks linked to Vladimir Putin. Like it or not, this is at least strategically coherent.

The Schuman Declaration that set the tone of Franco-German reconciliation – and would lead by stages to the European Community – was cooked up by the US Secretary of State Dean Acheson at a meeting in Foggy Bottom. “It all began in Washington,” said Robert Schuman’s chief of staff.

It was the Truman administration that browbeat the French to reach a modus vivendi with Germany in the early post-War years, even threatening to cut off US Marshall aid at a furious meeting with recalcitrant French leaders they resisted in September 1950.

Truman’s motive was obvious. The Yalta settlement with the Soviet Union was breaking down. He wanted a united front to deter the Kremlin from further aggrandizement after Stalin gobbled up Czechoslovakia, doubly so after Communist North Korea crossed the 38th Parallel and invaded the South.

For British eurosceptics, Jean Monnet looms large in the federalist pantheon, the eminence grise of supranational villainy. Few are aware that he spent much of his life in America, and served as war-time eyes and ears of Franklin Roosevelt. General Charles de Gaulle thought him an American agent, as indeed he was in a loose sense. Eric Roussel’s biography of Monnet reveals how he worked hand in glove with successive administrations.

It is odd that this magisterial 1000-page study has never been translated into English since it is the best work ever written about the origins of the EU.

Nor are many aware of declassified documents from the State Department archives showing that US intelligence funded the European movement secretly for decades, and worked aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into the project.

As this newspaper first reported when the treasure became available, one memorandum dated July 26, 1950, reveals a campaign to promote a full-fledged European parliament. It is signed by Gen William J Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency.

The key CIA front was the American Committee for a United Europe (ACUE), chaired by Donovan. Another document shows that it provided 53.5 per cent of the European movement’s funds in 1958. The board included Walter Bedell Smith and Allen Dulles, CIA directors in the Fifties, and a caste of ex-OSS officials who moved in and out of the CIA. Papers show that it treated some of the EU’s ‘founding fathers’ as hired hands, and actively prevented them finding alternative funding that would have broken reliance on Washington.

There is nothing particularly wicked about this. The US acted astutely in the context of the Cold War. The political reconstruction of Europe was a roaring success.

There were horrible misjudgements along the way, of course. A memo dated June 11, 1965, instructs the vice-president of the European Community to pursue monetary union by stealth, suppressing debate until the “adoption of such proposals would become virtually inescapable”. This

was too clever by half, as we can see today from debt-deflation traps and mass unemployment across southern Europe.

In a sense these papers are ancient history. What they show is that the American 'deep state' was in up to its neck. We can argue over whether Boris Johnson crossed a line last week by dredging up President Barack Obama's "part-Kenyan ancestry", but the cardinal error was to suppose that Mr Obama's trade threat had anything to do with the ordeals of his grandfather in a Mau Mau prison camp. It was American foreign policy boilerplate.

As it happens, Mr Obama might understandably feel rancour after the abuses that have come to light lately from the Mau Mau repression. It was a shameful breakdown of colonial police discipline, to the disgust of veteran officials who served in other parts of Africa. But the message from his extraordinary book – 'Dreams From My Father' – is that he strives to rise above historic grudges.

Brexiteers take comfort that Republican hopeful Ted Cruz wants a post-Brexit Britain to jump to the "front of the line for a free trade deal", but he is merely making campaign hay. Mr Cruz will conform to Washington's Palmerstonian imperatives – whatever they may be at that moment – if he ever enters the White House.

It is true that America had second thoughts about the EU once the ideological fanatics gained ascendancy in the late 1980s, recasting the union as a rival superpower with ambitions to challenge and surpass the US.

John Kornblum, the State Department's chief of European affairs in the 1990s, says it was a nightmare trying deal with Brussels. "I ended up totally frustrated. In the areas of military, security and defence, it is totally dysfunctional." Mr Kornblum argues that the EU "left NATO psychologically" when it tried to set up its own military command structure, and did so with its usual posturing and incompetence. "Both Britain and the West would be in much better shape if Britain was not in the EU," he said.

This is interesting but it is a minority view in US policy circles. The frustration passed when Poland and the first wave of East European states joined the EU in 2004, bringing in a troupe of Atlanticist governments.

We know it is hardly a love-affair. A top US official was caught two years ago on a telephone intercept dismissing Brussels during the Ukraine crisis with the lapidary words, "fuck the EU". Yet the all-pervading view is that the Western liberal order is under triple assault, and the EU must be propped, much as Britain and France propped up the tottering Ottoman Empire in the 19th – and wisely so given that its slow collapse led directly to the First World War.

Today's combined threats comes from Jihadi terror and a string of failed states across the Maghreb and the Levant; from a highly-militarized pariah regime in Moscow that will soon run out of money but has a window of opportunity before Europe rearms; and from an extremely dangerous crisis in the South China Sea that is escalating by the day as Beijing tests the US alliance structure.

The dangers from Russia and China are of course interlinked. It is likely – pessimists say certain – that Vladimir Putin would seize on a serious blow-up on Pacific rim to try his luck in Europe. In the eyes of Washington, Ottawa, Canberra, and those capitals around the world that broadly view Pax Americana as a plus, this is not the time for Britain to lob a stick of dynamite into Europe's rickety edifice.

The awful truth for the Leave campaign is that the governing establishment of the entire Western world views Brexit as strategic vandalism. Whether fair or not, Brexiteers must answer this reproach. A few such as Lord Owen grasp the scale of the problem. Most seemed blithely unaware until Mr Obama blew into town last week.

In my view, the Brexit camp should be laying out plans to increase UK defence spending by half to 3pc of GDP, pledging to propel Britain into the lead as the undisputed military power of Europe. They should aim to bind this country closer to France in an even more intimate security alliance. These sorts of moves would at least spike one of Project Fear's biggest guns.

The Brexiteers should squelch any suggestion that EU withdrawal means resiling from global responsibility, or tearing up the European Convention (that British-drafted, non-EU, Magna Carta of freedom), or turning our backs on the COP21 climate accords, or any other of the febrile flirtations of the movement.

It is perhaps too much to expect a coherent plan from a disparate group, thrown together artificially by events. Yet many of us who are sympathetic to the Brexit camp, who also want to take back our sovereign self-government and escape the bogus and usurped supremacy of the European

Court of Justice, have yet to hear how Brexiteers think this extraction can occur without colossal collateral damage and in a manner consistent with the honour of this country.

You can quarrel with Europe, or you can quarrel with the US, but it is courting fate to quarrel with the whole democratic world at the same time.

THE FATE OF MODERN NATIONS: ACCEPT AMERICAN HEGEMONY OR PREPARE FOR WAR

Paul Craig Roberts; Sputnik; Sott.net; via Dave Barnby

On September 19, 2000, going on 16 years ago, Ambrose Evans-Pritchard of the London Telegraph reported:

"Declassified American government documents show that the US intelligence community ran a campaign in the Fifties and Sixties to build momentum for a united Europe. It funded and directed the European federalist movement. The documents confirm suspicions voiced at the time that America was working aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into a European state. One memorandum, dated July 26, 1950, gives instructions for a campaign to promote a fully fledged European parliament. It is signed by Gen. William J. Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, precursor of the CIA."

The documents show that the European Union was a creature of the CIA.

As I have previously written, Washington believes that it is easier to control one government, the EU, than to control many separate European governments. As Washington has a long term investment in orchestrating the European Union, Washington is totally opposed to any country exiting the arrangement. That is why President Obama recently went to London to tell his lapdog, the British Prime Minister, that there could be no British exit.

Like other European nations, the British people were never allowed to vote on whether they were in favour of their country ceasing to exist and them becoming Europeans. British history would become the history of a bygone people like the Romans and Babylonians.

The oppressive nature of unaccountable EU laws and regulations and the EU requirement to accept massive numbers of third world immigrants have created a popular demand for a British vote on whether to remain a sovereign country or to dissolve and submit to Brussels and its dictatorial edicts. The vote is scheduled for June 23.

Washington's position is that the British people must not be permitted to decide against the EU, because such a decision is not in Washington's interest.

The prime minister's job is to scare the British people with alleged dire consequences of "going it alone." The claim is that "little England" cannot stand alone. The British people are being told that isolation will spell their end, and their country will become a backwater bypassed by progress. Everything great will happen elsewhere, and they will be left out.

If the fear campaign does not succeed and the British vote to exit the EU, the open question is whether Washington will permit the British government to accept the democratic outcome.

Alternatively, the British government will deceive the British people, as it routinely does, and declare that Britain has negotiated concessions from Brussels that dispose of the problems that concern the British people.

Washington's position shows that Washington is a firm believer that only Washington's interests are important. If other peoples wish to retain national sovereignty, they are simply being selfish. Moreover, they are out of compliance with Washington, which means they can be declared a "threat to American national security." The British people are not to be permitted to make decisions that do not comply with Washington's interest.

My prediction is that the British people will either be deceived or overridden.

It is Washington's self-centeredness, the self-absorption, the extraordinary hubris and arrogance, that explains the orchestrated "Russian threat." Russia has not presented herself to the West as a military threat. Yet, Washington is confronting Russia with a US/NATO naval buildup in the Black Sea, a naval, troop and tankbuildup in the Baltics and Poland, missile bases on Russia's borders, and plans to incorporate the

former Russian provinces of Georgia and Ukraine in US defense pacts against Russia. When Washington, its generals and European vassals declare Russia to be a threat, they mean that Russia has an independent foreign policy and acts in her own interest rather than in Washington's interest. Russia is a threat, because Russia demonstrated the capability of blocking Washington's intended invasion of Syria and bombing of Iran. Russia blunted one purpose of Washington's coup in the Ukraine by peacefully and democratically reuniting with Crimea, the site of Russia's Black Sea naval base and a Russian province for several centuries.

Perhaps you have wondered how it was possible for small countries such as Iraq, Libya, Syria, Yemen, and Venezuela to be threats to the US superpower. On its face Washington's claim is absurd. Do US presidents, Pentagon officials, national security advisors, and chairmen of the Joint Chiefs of Staff really regard countries of so little capability as military threats to the United States and NATO countries?

No, they do not. The countries were declared threats, because they have, or had prior to their destruction, independent foreign and economic policies. Their policy independence means that they do not or did not accept US hegemony. They were attacked in order to bring them under US hegemony. In Washington's view, any country with an independent policy is outside Washington's umbrella and, therefore, is a threat.

Venezuela became, in the words of US President Obama, an "unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States," necessitating a "national emergency" to contain the "Venezuelan threat" when the Venezuelan government put the interests of the Venezuelan people above those of American corporations.

Russia became a threat when the Russian government demonstrated the ability to block Washington's intended military attacks on Syria and Iran and when Washington's coup in the Ukraine failed to deliver to Washington the Russian Black Sea naval base. Clearly Venezuela cannot possibly pose a military threat to the US, so Venezuela cannot possibly pose an "unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security of the US." Venezuela is a "threat" because the Venezuelan government does not comply with Washington's orders.

It is absolutely certain that Russia has made no threats whatsoever against the Baltics, Poland, Romania, Europe, or the United States. It is absolutely certain that Russia has not invaded the Ukraine. How do we know? If Russia had invaded Ukraine, the Ukraine would no longer be there. It would again be a Russian province where until 20 years ago Ukraine resided for centuries, for longer than the US has existed. Indeed, the Ukraine belongs in Russia more than Hawaii and the deracinated southern states belong in the US. Yet, these fantastic lies from the highest ranks of the US government, from NATO, from Washington's British lackeys, from the bought-and-paid-for Western media, and from the bought-and-paid-for EU are repeated endlessly as if they are God's revealed truth.

Syria still exists because it is under Russian protection. That is the only reason Syria still exists, and it is also another reason that Washington wants Russia out of the way.

Do Russia and China realize their extreme danger? I don't think even Iran realizes its ongoing danger despite its close call.

If Russia and China realize their danger, would the Russian government permit one-fifth of its media to be foreign owned? Does Russia understand that "foreign owned" means CIA owned? If not, why not? If so, why does the Russian government permit its own destabilization at the hands of Washington's intelligence service?

China is even more careless. There are 7,000 US-funded NGOs (non-governmental organizations) operating in China. Only last month did the Chinese government finally move, very belatedly, to put some restrictions on these foreign agents who are working to destabilize China. The members of these treasonous organizations have not been arrested. They have merely been put under police watch, an almost useless restriction as Washington can provide endless money with which to bribe the Chinese police.

Why do Russia and China think that their police are less susceptible to bribes than Mexico's or American police? Despite the multi-decade "war on drugs," the drug flow from Mexico to the US is unimpeded. Indeed, the police forces of both countries have a huge interest in the "war on drugs" as the war brings them riches in the form of bribes. Indeed, as the crucified reporter for the San Jose Mercury newspaper proved many years ago, the CIA itself is in the drug-running business.

In the United States truth-tellers are persecuted and imprisoned, or they are dismissed as "conspiracy theorists," "anti-semites," and "domestic extremists." The entire Western World consists of a dystopia far

worse than the one described by George Orwell in his famous book, 1984.

That Russia and China permit Washington to operate in their media, in their universities, in their financial system, and in "do-good" NGOs that infiltrate every aspect of their societies demonstrates that both governments have no interest in their survival as independent states. They are too scared of being called "authoritarian" by the Western prostitute media to protect their own independence. My prediction is that Russia and China will soon be confronted with an unwelcome decision: accept American hegemony or go to war.

THE FIVE PRESIDENTS REPORT AND THE NEXT EU TREATY

Caroline Stephens

The UK's relationship with the EU is going to change radically over the next few years regardless of the vote in the referendum. If we vote 'leave' and take back control, our relationship will change. If we vote to 'remain', then the EU will keep taking more power and money every year as it has for decades. Further, the EU has its official timetable for another Treaty soon after our referendum which will transfer more power to Brussels. There is no status quo.

On 22 June 2015, the Commission gave the first insight into what new powers it wants when it published a key report: 'Completing Europe's Economic and Monetary Union'. Dubbed the 'Five Presidents' Report', this document commits the EU to the creation of a 'genuine Economic Union', a 'Financial Union', a 'Fiscal Union' and a 'Political Union' by 2025.

Before the EU makes a bid for more powers it always sets out its agenda in a similar document. In 1989 the Commission published the Delors Report, which led to the Maastricht Treaty. In the early 2000s, the 'Penelope Report' provided the basis for the European Constitution (and then the Lisbon Treaty). The Five Presidents' Report is an explicit milestone for a new Treaty.

The Report makes clear that fiscal union will 'be developed within the framework of the European Union', meaning that the UK will be dragged in. It also argues that that 'much can be achieved through a deepening of the Single Market'. The Government says that this process simply means promoting competitiveness, but the report reveals that, once again, this is just another disguised power grab, aiming for the 'deeper integration of national labour markets', greater 'coordination of social security systems', and harmonising 'insolvency law', 'company law' and 'property rights'.

The Report's plans for Eurozone integration have big dangers for Britain. As the Eurozone 'political union' is created, the 19 euro countries, which now have a permanent qualified majority in the Council of Ministers, will increasingly vote as a bloc and push through legislation which suits their interests. This means that however many times the UK votes against proposals the Eurozone will always win and will always have control over the laws that are introduced here. This is already happening as George Osborne admitted in 2014. The 'Five Presidents' Report' accelerates this process.

The document also proposes abolishing the UK's representation on key international bodies where global regulations and standards are increasingly set. The Five Presidents argue that the EU must act 'with one voice on the global stage'. In particular, it complains that 'in the international financial institutions, the EU and the euro area are still not represented as one.' It singles out the IMF as one such example.

Once again, the European Commission is claiming that the only solution to the Eurozone crisis is 'more Europe'. Nowhere does the report acknowledge the contribution of the euro to the present crisis - it even claims that the euro 'is a successful and stable currency'. The Five Presidents' Report makes clear that the Commission hasn't learnt anything and plans more of the same.

It is possible that a combination of the EU's crises (the euro, migration, stagnation) and this timetable for a new Treaty could become entangled with the UK renegotiation. For example, all 28

EU states may announce both a) a process for a new EU Treaty and b) a promise that this new Treaty will give Britain some things back in the future if we vote to remain in the EU in our referendum. On 25 October, the Sunday Telegraph reported that Cameron is planning something like this, perhaps using a smokescreen such as depositing the document with the UN which, according to the UN itself, would not have any legal effect.

Whatever the politicians claim, the best thing to do is to Vote Leave and force the politicians to start negotiating. This is much safer than to vote 'remain' and trust that politicians might change things years in the future. Don't trust them. A 'leave' vote is our best bet to avoid being cheated.

There is no status quo. Voting to 'remain' is the truly risky option. Vote Leave and take control - it's the safer choice.

For more: http://www.voteleavetakecontrol.org/the_five_presidents_report_and_the_next_eu_treaty

**RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY:- FRANK TAYLOR,
2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE, CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG**

Tel; (01746) 789326

frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk