

RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE

EUROPEAN PLEBISCITE SPECIAL No 3

EDITORIAL

**THE MONKEY'S PAW AND THE OPINION POLLS
FROM OWEN JONES TO NIGEL FARAGE
*METROPOLIS TO OCEANIA***

CONTENTS

64 REASONS WHY WE SHOULD LEAVE THE EU.

Hugh Williams and many other sources

GISELA STUART EXPOSES THE RISKS OF STAYING IN THE EU

Vote Leave

**BREXIT WILL BREAK-UP EU: LEAVE VOTE TO SPARK DOMINO EFFECT
ACROSS BLOC, SAYS GOVE**

Greg Heffer; Express

THE POSITIVE CASE FOR A NEW EUROPE WITHOUT THE EU

Euroscepticism

THE LEFT MUST PUT BRITAIN'S EU WITHDRAWAL ON THE AGENDA

Owen Jones

NIGEL FARAGE ON EUROPEAN DISUNION

Alexandra Wolfe; Wall Street Journal

**BRADFORD AND DISTRICT GREEN PARTY UNDERSTAND WHY WE MUST
VOTE TO LEAVE**

Joshua Bastow; Bradford Green Party; via several sources

IRISH STATEMENT ON THE "BREXIT" REFERENDUM...

*Anthony Coughlan; National Platform EU Research and Information Centre, Dublin;
via Dave Barnby*

JIM SILLARS TO CAMPAIGN FOR EUROPEAN UNION EXIT

Edinburgh News

ENOCH POWELL AND TONY BENN WERE RIGHT ON EUROPE – IT WAS A GREAT DECEPTION

Christopher Booker; The Telegraph

THE MYTH OF 'PEACE IN EUROPE'

Frank Taylor

HISTORY OF THE EU'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE OVER UK CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Torquil Dick-Erikson; UKIP Daily.

EDITORIAL

THE MONKEY'S PAW AND THE OPINION POLLS

It is said both that we have three wishes on the Monkey's Paw, and that the outcome of those wishes is unlikely to be favourable.

For two decades at least there has been an undercurrent of calls ... sometimes stronger, sometimes weaker ... for a plebiscite on our membership of the European Union.

During that time some wiser heads have often argued that any consensus to do so was at least doubtful, and (often together with such arguments), and that in any event any anti - EU consensus would be bludgeoned into submission by a barrage of FUD (Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt) tactics. As an alternative to the plebiscite route, many have argued that the accession to the EU (then the EEC) was (and remains) in the first place illegal, treasonous and unconstitutional and, in any event, engineered by deception on a grand scale.

Probably the best argued account of the case for treason comes from Kenn D'Oudney of *Democracy Defined*. Unusually, and because of the length of the document, this has been attached separately. Despite its length it is well worth taking time to study in detail and this is highly recommended.

D'Oudney presents an authoritative thesis on Common Law, and how the current legal and political status quo ... included our membership of the EU ... constitutes treason against our Common Law Constitution. Common Law is entirely contrary to the Roman Law/*Aquis Communautaire* of the EU (which places the state above the law and where juries are entirely absent in many jurisdictions). If our Constitution were functioning correctly (and he argues that it is very far from doing) the jury, with the citizen power to strike down law which is contrary to natural justice and ethics is absolutely central.

As regards deception the now-published records speak for themselves. The previously published Kilmuir letter, describes Praemunire (a form of treason involving the surrender of self governance) but without actually using the word and the now well established fact that this and much else was withheld and/or lied about at the

time is intended to serve as a doorway to further research by readers.

Leaving aside ... at least for the moment ... the constitutional questions, the plebiscite for which so many have hoped and campaigned for so long, is now on us. It is looking likely that the outcome predicted by those wiser heads and the opinion polls, will prevail. I hope I am wrong, but even there is a Brexit vote it remains to be seen how that will be circumvented or annulled.

It is now longer necessary to send armies and tanks to frighten the people. The corporate spin doctors now do the job without firing a shot. As Allister Heath said in a recent Telegraph article, "*Goliath wants to annihilate David, and do it in style. Day after day, the massed forces of the global establishment are delivering their blood-curdling warnings, ...*". Project Fear is going into overdrive will almost certainly succeed. FUD will prevail.

A word regarding the polls themselves. Overall, they show a small but persistent lead for remain. But there are some caveats to attach. It must be remembered that the polls underestimated Tory support at the last General Election (as they did in 1992 and 1970). Although much less polling was carried out during the North East assembly plebiscite in 2004, that polling was badly awry. And there is the persistent and unexplained discrepancy between telephone and online polls running at around 5-8%. Another major unknown may be differential turnout.

Against that, the Scottish plebiscite polling was mostly pretty near the mark.

It must be wondered what the other two wishes will be asked of the Monkey's Paw?

FROM OWEN JONES TO NIGEL FARAGE

The lead item *60 Reasons Why We Should Leave The EU* was inspired by a correspondent, Hugh Williams. Parts of his text was perhaps something of a rant ... it's raw tone venting many of the frustrations of ordinary people. At 10 pages it was, in any case, far too long for these special editions.

But why not use the idea to create a distillation of the reasons to leave the EU from a spectrum of other sources? Thus the theme of this edition arose ... taking voices from right across the contemporary orthodox political spectrum from Owen Jones to Nigel Farage. and including at least a mention of a former generation of opposites united in their opposition to the then EEC... Tony Benn and Enoch Powell.

So the 64 reasons has likewise become a condensate from many sources. Doubtless many items will could be added to the list, and contributions are invited.

METROPOLIS TO OCEANIA

When people talk of a 'United Europe' they see it in terms of a federation such as the USA, India or Canada. But treaties such as Lisbon tell a different story. EU powers (as usual a euphemism is used ... 'competences') already go way, way beyond what Washington, Delhi or Ottawa would be able to impose on their constituent states. Thus, the model is for a unitary rather than federal European super-state.

For all the incessant yap about 'localism', 'democracy' and 'empowerment', the entire trend of the age is powerfully centripetal. Public services such as health and police are increasingly pooled or merged; districts are agglomerated into unitaries, and now unitaries are, in turn, to be agglomerated into 'city regions'. Presumably the

eventual *reductio ad absurdum* would be to merge all local authorities and functions into one enormous Ministry of the Interior!

At the international level we see this trend running on steroids. Everything trends towards institutional gigantism. Meanwhile, the franchise, even in fairly large states, is degraded to a flea auction.

Corporations merge into ever bigger entities, decision making bleeds ever upwards into a range of transnational and supranational agencies far beyond the reach of national mandates, governments and courts; received wisdom is that important business can only be done on the basis of continental power blocks. How Coudenhove-Kalergi must be laughing in his grave!

Yet all this, whilst we are talking of Kalergi, is prophecy manifest. In the 1920's Fritz Lang's *Metropolis*, depicted humans as helpless ants caught up in a gigantic world far beyond their comprehension or control. A generation later came Orwell's monstrous state of *Oceania*.

As power runs uphill so, inevitably, does the money, and with that an ever more desperate divide between haves and have-nots. To all intents and purposes government lies with oligarchs. By definition an oligarchy is tiny, wealthy and powerful, well organised, and where there is a high level of mutual acquaintance and knowledge amongst the oligarchs.

In recent weeks, with the fear of losing one of their pet projects, we have seen this oligarchy close ranks with a vengeance. The threats become more blood curdling with every day. In effect, these threats amount to a declaration of economic warfare should we have the temerity to upset the plans of the high and mighty..

Indeed, listen carefully at the Remain case. At its core it is saying that the EU is a pretty bad deal, but we are now stuck ... trapped inside it. Forget any of the alleged 'benefits' of the EU ... of which very little mention at all ... heed the fist which is being waved right in your face.

It may well be that such punishment comes upon us. But we also have a long tradition of facing down continental empires and having to make sacrifices to do so. Those empires have usually been far bigger than we, but persistence eventually won the day.

The deeper question is therefore whether we still have it in us to deliver to this corrupt, greedy, arrogant, kleptocratic, and anti-democratic oligarchy a long overdue and very necessary shock.

Frank Taylor

64 REASONS WHY WE SHOULD LEAVE THE EU.

Hugh Williams and many other sources

1. The EU is an oligarchy run by unelected bureaucrats in the European Commission.
2. These people regard democracy with contempt. Any vote not to their liking will be circumvented or ignored.
3. There is no way of dismissing those who govern us.
4. The effective government of the EU, the Commission, does not depend on any parliamentary majority.
5. Whole rafts of officials and institutions, MEP's, judges, commissioners, the ESM and ECB are immune from legal process which thus places state above law. A condition by which the state places itself above law is, by definition, tyranny.

6. The EU is supranational. Law is created top-down and placed outside the control of the parliaments, governments and courts of member states.
7. The EU was designed from the outset to create a single European mega state.
8. The states of the Eurozone are being reduced to shell entities, like the states of Bismarck's Germany. They have lost much of their legislative autonomy, their monetary independence, and are now set to lose their fiscal, military and diplomatic independence,
9. The EU already controls, or has a central and growing role, in the following areas:

Foreign affairs
Economic affairs
Monetary policy
Public health
Energy
Justice
Environment
Employment
Farming
Police
Fisheries
Social affairs
Law enforcement
Immigration
Trade
Transport

10. Our accession to the EU in 1973 and the 1975 'referendum' was brought about by a highly organised campaign of deception.
11. Our accession was also treasonous. The sovereignty of the country does not belong to parliament but to the people.
12. David Cameron's 'renegotiation' is not a treaty, will not result in a treaty, and has no binding force whatever. Treaties such as Lisbon, Nice and Maastricht take precedence.
13. This means that at some stage we will be required to make a choice between full commitment to the pan-European megastate or leave.
14. The European Assembly is a faux parliament. Its MEPs cannot initiate, amend or repeal legislation. Only the unelected European Commission can do that.
15. Debates in this assembly are often absurdly truncated. MEPs often vote on hundreds of items in a day.
16. *Acquis Communautaire* is the Brussels Ratchet which says that, once a national power has been ceded to Brussels, it will never be returned.
17. The *Acquis Communautaire* is also a Roman Law concept and works in an entirely contrary manner to our own Common Law. It places the state above law, has no intrinsic principle of innocence or *habeous corpus*, and eschews the jury system.
18. The EU works by a system called *engrenage* ... sometimes called 'sausage slicing' ... which means it grabs power by a deliberate strategy of stealth and deceit over time.
19. The three main political parties are catspaws of the EU. There is very little electoral choice.
20. No law passed in Brussels has ever been overturned by the UK Parliament.
21. We can no longer ban live animal exports.
22. The European Arrest Warrant is a monstrosity which allows deportation without a *prima facie* case. (even American states have to prove a *prima facie* case before an accused person can be transferred to another state), often at the behest of an official, not even a court.
23. Thousands of Post Offices have closed thanks to EU regulation.
24. The EU has two parliament buildings costing over £100 million extra a year.
25. The EU is highly intolerant of criticism and comes down hard on critics and whistleblowers such as Bernard Connolly, Nigel Farage, Marta Andreasen, or Martin Tillack.
26. In the Connolly case the Advocate General of the European Court of Justice gave it as his formal opinion

in case C274/99P that “Criticism of the EU is akin to blasphemy and could be restricted without violating freedom of speech”. Other senior figures in Europe have likened criticism to 'terrorism'.

27. For almost 2 decades the EU has failed to produce audited accounts. If it was a company it would have been wound up and its directors prosecuted many years ago.

28. The Common Fisheries Policy has been a wasteful lunacy resulting in the most depleted fish stocks and the fattest seagulls of any continental shelf in the world.

29. The CFP has resulted in the decimation of our own fishing industry.

30. In May 2004 the European Assembly voted not to punish those guilty of corruption.

31. The Treaty of Lisbon is self-amending which means the EU can now do whatever it wants. No further treaties will be needed.

32. Three European countries that are not part of the EU, Iceland, Norway and Switzerland, are among the richest per capita in the world.

33. The Common Agricultural Policy is probably the most corrupt slush fund in history. It gobbles up £65 billion per annum, yet farm incomes continue to fall, and sectors of agriculture such as dairy continue to be hollowed out.

34. The CAP adds almost £1000 per annum to an average family food budget, because we cannot trade food openly. New Zealand butter, which is virtually subsidy-free and, after being shipped half-way around the world, is cheaper than EU brands.

35. The EU does much of its business in secret, through so-called 'trilogues'.

36. The EU is dominated by corporate and banking lobbyists.

37. Renationalisation of the railways would not be permitted by the EU.

39. Quantitative Easing for the people would not be permitted by the EU.

40. De-privatisation of Health and public services would not be permitted by the EU.

41. Renationalisation of public utilities ... water, energy, transport ... would not be permitted by the EU.

42. There is a growing clamour from Germany, France and Jean-Claude Juncker for Europe to have its own armed forces ... for which there is provision in the Lisbon Treaty.

43. The Euro, as predicted by many economists at the time of its inception, has been a disaster for the countries of southern Europe.

44. The Euro always was a political, not an economic project, which must be ruthlessly pursued regardless of the cost to the countries for which it is unsuitable such as Greece, Spain, Portugal, Cyprus and Italy. No amount of suffering in those countries is allowed to deflect from the Grand Project.

45. The Treaty of Lisbon says that the currency of the EU shall be the Euro; so using the Euro is now a condition of EU membership. It is unlikely we will be able to remain outside the Euro for much longer.

46. TTIP negotiations have been conducted in secret.

47. EU-inspired Money Laundering Regulations destroy the Principle of Innocence by assuming all people to be criminals, whilst involving many people in onerous, invasive and hassle.

48. VAT is an unnecessarily cumbersome and complex sales tax.

49. The EU costs us about £54 million every working day (an average of £14 billion every year between 2013/14 to 2019/20) just to belong. It is reckoned to cost a further £220 million every day (£80 billion a year) complying with EU regulations.

50. We only get back about half of what we pay in, and have little control as to how even that is spent.

51. One of the great EU plans is to balkanise member states into 'regions' as part of a longer-term plan of *divide et imperia*.

52. Jose Barosso has likened the EU to empire. Empires tend to do imperial things.

53. The EU is anti-Christian. Baroness Ashton, the (then) EU's High Representative for Foreign Affairs, announced in February 2011 that it is no longer politically correct to use the word “Christian”.

54. The EU already has most of the trappings of a state ... a constitution, currency, central bank, embassies, supreme court, flag, anthem, central government, civil service, and elected assembly.

55. Much of our gold and currency reserves (have been) transferred to the European Central Bank.

56. The costs of translating the proceedings of the institutions has escalated exponentially from £200 million when there were 15 members to close to £1 billion per year.

57. Aid will be given to political parties in the European Assembly only so long as the parties form cross-border entities.

58. Pensions paid to retired European nomenklatura (including a number of our own parliamentarians) are

conditional upon that person saying nothing deeply critical of the European project, thus turning such payments into *de facto* bribes.

59. In the past 5 years the BBC has received from the EU direct financing of over £22 million, and 'soft' loans of around £140 million. So although technically giving each side equal time, night after night, the BBC is leading with the claims of the Remain camp. Strange isn't that?

60. Through its aid and financing policies the EU has a powerful ability to buy the loyalty of corporations, NGO's, organisations and individuals, which it exploits to the full.

61. Massive and unpredictable flows of mass migration, putting severe strain on services and resources.

62. Uncontrollable inflows of cheap low-skill labour depressing wages at a time of general wage stagnation.

63. The EU's neo-imperial meddling in the Balkans, the Middle East and the Ukraine.

64. The EU's devotion to neo-liberal economic orthodoxy and austerity.

GISELA STUART EXPOSES THE RISKS OF STAYING IN THE EU

Vote Leave

(Of German birth, Gisela Stuart offers a paradigm example of a personal and political journey from EU-phile to EU-sceptic – Ed)

Speaking just days before the beginning of the official campaign, Gisela Stuart MP - Chair of the Vote Leave campaign - delivered a keynote speech arguing that staying in an unreformed EU represents the real risk facing the UK. To coincide with the speech, Vote Leave has published new research showing that the Eurozone faces a daunting demographic and fiscal crunch that future generations will struggle to cope with.

The research shows that public spending on pensions in the Eurozone is forecast to rise by 2.1% of GDP by 2050, while debt interest payments are set to go up by more than double that rate. The combined effect is a conservative estimate that taxes in the single currency bloc will have to rise by 17.6% by 2050 as the shrinking working-age population pays to support a swelling army of the retired. Referring to the research, Ms Stuart said:

'This daunting demographic reality just goes to show that the Eurozone is a ticking time bomb - an alarming reality that all EU members will inevitably be affected by.'

Drawing on her experience of negotiating the EU Constitution, Ms Stuart delivered a damning assessment of the European Union and argued that it is not only institutionally resistant to reform, but incapable of responding to fast changing political and demographic realities. She said:

'Seeing Europe's power politics operating up close was not pretty. It was in the worst traditions of the EU - a mule-like refusal to listen to democratic concerns or accept any suggestions of deviation from the orthodoxy of political integration.'

'Questions like democratic accountability and economic competitiveness, which are so central for us in Britain, are downgraded in case they become a diversion from the European Project. I call it integration at whatever the cost or consequences.'

'This referendum is our opportunity to set ourselves free from an organisation that only serves its own interests. That is why I am proud to chair the Vote Leave campaign.'

'We would also regain control over the £350m subscription we pay Brussels every week. We could spend it on schools, the NHS, the environment, cutting the deficit-- the choice will become ours again.'

As well as arguing for the opportunities and benefits presented by throwing off the shackles of the EU, she spoke of the risks of staying in - cautioning that:

'Voting to remain on 23 June is not just about staying in the EU as it is today, but also about staying in as it will look in 2025 or 2035.'

'Immigration is placing the NHS under huge strain and undermining patient safety, and our ability to control the NHS could be further undermined by the way the pressure that could be made worse by the TTIP agreement the EU is negotiating with the US.'

She argued that the future is highly uncertain, but pointed to the "Five Presidents' report" as presenting a clear indication of the direction of travel if we choose to remain. That report, published last summer, mapped out a clear path to be completed by 2025: a political union including ideas such as a euro-area treasury and unified external EU representation. She characterised this as:

'An EU where the priorities of the eurozone will gradually and inevitably take over Brussels institutions. If we don't want to be part of this we must Vote Leave.'

Although withering about the the Prime Minister's "non-reform package", she agreed with at least one aspect of his prognosis for the future:

'I agree with what the Prime Minister said a few months ago: 'My argument is not going to be in any way that Britain can't succeed outside the EU. Of course we could. We're a great country.'

She concluded by urging the British people to consider what is in their - and their country's - best interests:

Full Text.

For years, British governments have tried to be pragmatic about Europe. They have taken the view that you can always kick the big decisions down the road. That we can be inside the EU without being part of the "State building project". But to be in both camps became impossible when the Euro created.

Now the time has come to decide what is in the best long term interest of this country.

If the EU were an energy supplier or a bank, you would long ago have stopped believing its marketing, you would have seen it was hopeless value for money and never listened to its customers. You would just move your account.

It is time for Britain to recognise that Brussels has had enough chances. And that the only safe option is to Vote Leave.

I can pinpoint the exact moment when it became clear to me that the EU was incapable of changing and that ultimately Britain's days inside it were numbered. It was on Thursday, July 10th, 2003 at the signing ceremony closing the European Constitutional Convention. I had spent 15 months almost full time in Brussels on behalf of Britain to negotiate the document that eventually turned into the Lisbon treaty. Everyone was standing around sipping champagne to the strains of Beethoven's Ninth. But I was in no mood for self-congratulation. I grumpily scribbled my name, declined the drink and headed straight for the airport.

Seeing Europe's power politics operating up close had not been pretty. It was in the worst traditions of the EU--a mule-like refusal to listen to democratic concerns or accept any suggestions of deviation from the orthodoxy of political integration. Giscard d'Estaing did a masterly job of managing the whole event on behalf of the people who in his opinion mattered. For the rest of us, apparent progress turned out to be an illusion. Until the last 48 hours, we thought we had agreement on a whole range of issues – and it all unravelled.

During the Convention, whenever I typed Giscard's name the spell-checker prompted me to put Discard. Now that is what I call artificial intelligence.

Time to break free

I shouldn't have been surprised. The EU is an institution that keeps to a single trajectory, incapable of critical self-examination.

Questions like democratic accountability and economic competitiveness, which are so central for us in Britain, are downgraded in case they divert from the European Project. It is integration at whatever cost or consequence.

This referendum is the opportunity to set ourselves free from an organisation that only serves its own interests. That is why I am proud to chair the Vote Leave campaign.

In saying this, I have to acknowledge that it is the culmination of a sometimes difficult journey. All my instincts for most of my life have led me towards wanting close cooperation between European countries.

I am the child of a refugee from eastern Europe. I grew up with the recollections of the horror not just of war itself, but the painful efforts to rebuild a country. I also grew up in a Federal state. So I count myself as one of the few British politicians for whom federalism is not an "F" word.

But after more than 40 years living in the UK and 20 years in British politics I have also learnt to appreciate the basic building blocks of modern democracies. The rule of law determined by a

government elected by and accountable to a free people—a demos.

The EU does not and never will be built like that. Leaving will allow us to return real democratic control to important areas of national life; from international trade, the right to work and live in Britain to business regulation.

We would also regain control over the £350m subscription we pay Brussels every week. We could spend it on schools, the NHS, the environment, cutting the deficit-- the choice will become ours again.

The last referendum

When I moved here from Germany in 1974, a year after the UK joined the Common Market, membership seemed to make sense. The country was in the throes of the “three day week”. The miners were on strike and national politicians seemed to have lost control. Germany was at the height of the Wirtschaftswunder – or economic miracle - and it was hoped that some continental vigour and glitz might rub off on a tired country.

Economics drove British interest in the EEC. That was as true for the government as it was true for the voters. Let’s not forget that the words Common Market appeared on the ballot paper in the 1975 membership referendum.

Roy Jenkins, then Labour’s loudest pro-European voice, campaigned for a Yes because he believed the EEC had changed--dropping its goal of economic and monetary union and shedding its federalist ambitions.

But Europe did not reform after 1975, or after the 2003 convention. And it is not going to now. As someone once said.... insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and hoping for a different result. There are still people who think Europe will change. But the EU has broken its pledges over and over again.

The Maastricht Treaty promised no bailout of the euro. But as soon as the 2008 crisis hit, the promise was discarded – and Britain was told it had to chip in.

We were promised the EU’s Charter of Fundamental Rights would have no more legal effect than the Sun or the Beano.

But that pretence was soon dropped after the European Court of Justice ruled that the charter has legal effect in Britain and our Supreme Court confirmed the decision. This charter has already been used to interfere in our attempts to monitor suspected terrorists and deport criminals like the daughter of Abu Hamza, the hate preacher.

Of course Europe has its own definition of reform, and that is More Europe. There was a big push for deeper integration in the 1990s. That was after German reunification when the decision was made to create Economic and Monetary Union with a single currency; followed by the pulling down of borders with the Schengen agreement.

Britain secured opt-outs from both initiatives. With hindsight, it feels as if that was the start of a 20-year process of Britain peeling away from the European project, which is culminating now.

Dangers of staying in

Voting to remain on 23rd June is not just about staying in the EU as it is today, but staying in the EU as it will look in 2025 or 2035.

The difference now compared with 2003 is that the EU knows exactly what its next stage of development should look like. We can read it in the so-called Five Presidents’ report published last summer.

It details a three-stage plan to be completed by 2025 for a political union including ideas such as a euro-area treasury and a single representative on international bodies like the IMF.

The Five Presidents’ Report-- its title alone is a reminder that we are not dealing with a very streamlined institution -- describes an EU where the eurozone’s interests gradually take over Brussels institutions.

Let us be charitable and suppose the EU sticks to the commitment it gave David Cameron in the renegotiation that the eurozone will not discriminate against non-members. We may be able to fend off some negative change, but our ability to bring positive reform will wither . At the same time we will remain subject to all the restrictions on our sovereignty and economy that Brussels imposes.

Eurozone crisis

The Eurozone is facing long-term crisis even if it manages to put its present agonies behind it. The daunting demographic reality shows the Eurozone is a ticking time bomb. The population of the

currency's member euro countries is predicted to fall over the next 35 years as the number of over-65s grows rapidly.

Research we are releasing today shows that by 2050 the zone's pension bill will go up by 2.1% of GDP because of this ageing population. This will fall onto the shoulders of a shrinking number of workers. Once you add in the rising cost of debt interest, this implies taxes in the euro countries going up by 17.6%.

As Mervyn King, the former Bank of England governor, concluded in his book *Alchemy*, there are two likely alternatives. For the single currency is to survive, we need a country called Europe, or the euro breaks up. For us in the UK that means either consigning the nation state to history or being part of the currency's messy break-up.

Britain clearly does not want any part in either of those options, and is better off staying clear.

There are other clear pointers towards a country called Europe—like the borderless Schengen zone, if it survives. A successful Schengen requires an EU police force to control the external borders. And if you look at some of the developments between Germany and the Netherlands, there is a European army in the making.

Crying wolf

Those on the Remain campaign warn of disaster if we leave. We have heard these warnings of doom before -- from those who supported our joining the euro and the Exchange Rate Mechanism. In the run-up to joining the ERM, the head of the Stock Exchange said London's status as Europe's financial centre would be threatened if we stayed out. The governor of the Bank of England and the CBI were enthusiasts.

We went in, we crashed out -- and enjoyed our longest period of growth for at least 200 years.

It was not long, though, before they were at it again -- and Michael Heseltine said that staying out of the euro was "threatening great swathes of British industry". Thankfully, the Labour government did not listen. And free of the shackles of a fixed exchange rate, we have recovered from the financial crisis more quickly and strongly than the continental economies.

Benefits of Out

To those who say leaving is a leap in the dark I say it is jumping from darkness into light. I agree with what the Prime Minister said a few months ago: "My argument is not going to be in any way that Britain can't succeed outside the EU. Of course we could. We're a great country."

The shape of the global economy and the way it works have changed profoundly since Britain joined the EU.

As other economic powers have risen, so Europe's share of the world economy has sunk. And whether it is in cars, labour law, banking or food, many of the rules governing Europe's internal market are now agreed globally, with the EU acting as a costly middleman to pass them down. The idea of regional economic blocs will soon seem as outdated as so many other kinds of middle management.

Trade, the motor of globalisation, has speeded up thanks to the steady fall in tariffs since the creation of the World Trade Organisation in 1995. If we leave, we can take back our WTO seat, which Brussels currently occupies on our behalf, and reach our own trade deals, creating new prosperity and jobs.

We may decide to speed up talks with emerging economic superpowers like India and China and perhaps to reboot our relations with old friends like Canada and New Zealand. Asking if the EU itself would be reluctant to reach a new deal with us is a legitimate question. And no doubt the Commission and those who draw their salaries and pensions from the EU would not be too happy.

But are we really to believe that member states would throw away the free trade they currently enjoy with this country, the world's fifth-biggest economy? Would they really betray the interests of their own people like that? Would the Germans really no longer buy Minis from the UK and stop selling BMWs and Audi's to us?

We are told that the EU would never agree to free trade without us agreeing to free movement of people. In the case of Britain, I believe control of our immigration policy should be something we debate and decide on here.

We should not simply accept EU preconditions.

This does not mean we are an inward-looking country. Just that we are one that looks out not only to Europe, but to the wider world too.

Is it fair that my Birmingham constituents who are the grandchildren of immigrants from the Indian

subcontinent find it so hard to get their relations here for family weddings when someone from Romania or Latvia can come and go at will?

Immigration is placing the NHS under huge strain and undermining patient safety, and our ability to control the NHS could be further undermined by the way the pressure that could be made worse by the TTIP agreement the EU is negotiating with the US.

We could consider a points system that favours those with the skills that can help Britain. How we manage migration is just one among numerous issues we will need to discuss when the process of leaving starts. As Angela Merkel says, "wir schaffen das"-- we'll get there. And there could be other benefits from leaving. Perhaps, as Stuart Rose from the In campaign so kindly pointed out, wages may even go up.

Conclusion

It has not always been comfortable for me to see the direction Europe has taken—the arc from the recovery and optimism of my parents' generation to my disillusionment today. Now, I look forward to the kind of country I would like my grandchildren to grow up in. Whatever happens, I hope they can live in an open, free and prosperous Britain at ease with its neighbours and with the choices it has made.

For years, British governments have tried to be pragmatic about Europe. They have taken the view that the day of decision could be kicked down the road, that we could be at the heart of Europe without being part of the state-building project.

But once the euro was created it became impossible to remain in both camps. Now the time has come to decide what is in the best long-term interests of the country.

If the EU were an energy supplier or a bank, you would long ago have stopped believing its hype, you would have seen it was hopeless value for money and never listened to its customers. You would just move your account.

It is time for Britain to recognise that Brussels has had enough chances. And that the only safe option is to Vote Leave.

BREXIT WILL BREAK-UP EU: LEAVE VOTE TO SPARK DOMINO EFFECT ACROSS BLOC, SAYS GOVE

Greg Heffer; Express

A BREXIT vote will 'liberate' the rest of Europe from the "remote and unelected bureaucracy" of the EU, a senior Government minister said.

Justice Secretary Michael Gove said a British exit would inspire a domino effect among nations also wanting to be free of the bloc's "unelected bureaucracy". He urged Britons to quit the EU on June 23 in order to send a "message to the EU's peoples... that a different Europe is possible". The Cabinet minister, who is spearheading the official Brexit campaign ahead of the EU referendum, said Britain would thrive outside the Brussels-based bloc.

The UK's success outside the EU would then inspire demands from the populations of other European countries for "a different future" and lead to "the democratic liberation of a whole continent", the Tory MP said.

Delivering a speech at the Vote Leave campaign's headquarters in Westminster, Mr Gove outlined the how Britain's "best days lie ahead" of it outside the EU. Noting how recent referendums in Ireland and Holland had shown how "the peoples of the EU are profoundly unhappy with the European project", he said a Brexit vote this summer would bring the "significant and under-appreciated benefit" of sparking the reform of the EU.

Michael Gove said Brexit will spark a 'contagion' of democracy across Europe. What will enrage, and disorientate, EU elites is the UK's success outside the Union.

Highlighting how a string of EU bosses have warned Brexit "will lead to contagion and the collapse of Europe", Mr Gove said: "Yes there will be 'contagion' if Britain leaves the EU. But what will be catching is democracy." He added: "What will enrage, and disorientate, EU elites is the UK's success

outside the Union, “Regaining control over our laws, taxes and borders and forging new trade deals while also shedding unnecessary regulation will enhance our competitive advantage over other EU nations. “Our superior growth rate, and better growth prospects, will only strengthen. Our attractiveness to inward investors and our influence on the world stage will only grow. But while this might provoke both angst and even resentment among EU elites, the UK’s success will send a very different message to the EU’s peoples. They will see that a different Europe is possible.”

The Surrey Heath MP said countries such as Greece, Spain and Portugal had suffered hugely due to the EU’s failure to solve the eurozone debt crisis; Italy had seen an “elected Government dismissed by Brussels” and Denmark’s found its opt-outs from EU rules “repeatedly overridden” by Euro judges. He added: “For Europe, Britain voting to leave will be the beginning of something potentially even more exciting - the democratic liberation of a whole Continent. If we vote to leave we will have - in the words of a former British Prime Minister - saved our country by our exertions and Europe by our example.”

THE POSITIVE CASE FOR A NEW EUROPE WITHOUT THE EU

Euroscepticism

Summary: the case against the EU

What’s wrong with the EU? Read on ...

No demos

There does not exist a single group of people in respect of whom the EU could be a democracy.

No mandate

Even if there were or is a European demos, what is done by the Commission is not in response to any expressed or felt need of the citizens. In normal democratic politics you have occasional elections, during which time certain issues are publicly discussed. Whoever wins power has some justification for carrying out whatever programme they were proposing while trying to get elected.

This just doesn’t happen in the EU. The Commission isn’t elected, and the elected European Parliament does not have a mandate to do any particular course of action. Unelected bodies should not have the right to initiate legislation. So either the Commission should be elected, or it should be deprived of any right to initiate legislation.

Separation of powers

The Council of Ministers must assent to legislation, like the second chamber of many legislatures. It comprises representatives of the executive branch of each member state government. This provides those governments with a means of bypassing their respective parliaments, which often constitute the primary day-to-day democratic check on their activities. Over time, it motivates governments to hand more powers from national parliaments to the EU, and suborns national political parties into supporting the EU if they have a reasonable chance to form the executive.

Contemporaneity

EC legislation is not sufficiently contemporaneous in its passage. It is simply bad governance to allow a legislative process to span long periods of time, and the UK Parliament at least limits the amount of time which may elapse between the initiation of a legislative measure and its conclusion.

In the EU, the Commission may wait years for an opportunity to put some pet project through the legislative machine; it’s not possible for citizens opposing the legislation ever to be sure they’ve won.

Accounts

The EU's accounts notoriously never get signed off. Member States ought simply to block the provision of new money until this happens. This is basic good governance. Because the system forces taxpayers to hand over cash even when there's no guarantee it's being spent properly, there's no discipline: money will and does get misspent. If misspending money had negative consequences, it would stop.

Transparency

Whereas many people accused of error will retaliate illegally and immorally at their accusers, the EU has the exacerbating factor of paranoia about Euroscepticism. I don't have good evidence on this point yet, but my impression is that fears of exposure of one scandal or another motivate even more secrecy and vituperation from the EU's bureaucracy than would happen otherwise.

I can't find out what happened in the Hans-Martin Tillack case, but it seems the EU Commission got the Belgian police to arrest him and hand over his notes, revealing who the whistleblowers were, and that Belgian law differs from that of other EU countries in allowing the "authorities" (and it should be noted that the EU Commission is not part of the Belgian state) to get away with this, calling into serious question the appropriateness of locating so many EU institutions in that country.

Money

If a government needs tax money to survive (and in the present day, this is effectively true around the world), and cannot on its own authority raise this tax, then it will become beholden to whoever or whatever does possess this authority (Parliament, in the case of Westminster-style polities). Parliament has the power it does because it can bankrupt the UK government if it doesn't get its way: a majority in the House of Commons which disagrees with this policy, that appointment or yonder exercise of ministerial authority can simply threaten not to pass the next Budget. The need for periodic tax-raising and the requirement for renewed elections keeps the system accountable to the public. Effectively, the tax-raising is on an annual basis, so on average the Government ought to be able to survive six months. (In practice I'm not sure what would happen if the Government lost its majority with many months to go before the next Budget vote.)

I don't understand the precise way the EU's budget works as a matter of law, but it seems that Member States are obligated to hand over money on a septennial basis; this strikes me as far too long-term a grant of legal tax-raising authority. There's much less pressure to do what citizens want if you can legally tax them for the next seven years.

Platinum Plating

Gold-plating is the embellishment of EC legislation by national bureaucracies. Sometimes this is necessary on account of the poor quality of the original legislation. In other cases, measures implementing EC legislation are not scrutinised as heavily as normal legislation and may contain unjustified extensions; these extensions are invalidly waved through under the fast-track procedures, and then defended as though they were part of the EC measure as a whole.

Platinum plating is when gold-plating happens twice: unnecessary additions have to be implemented in national law because they've been added by EU legislators purportedly implementing some international obligation.

As a general rule, national legislation should be used to implement international rules, rather than having a three-stage process with the EU in between. This insulates the public against an additional opportunity for politicians and civil servants to pass off their pet projects as legal obligations.

ECJ partiality

The Court of Justice of the European Communities (ECJ) has held itself to be responsible for adjudicating disputes about the meaning of the treaties. The treaties empower the Community (or, later, the Union) to legislate in certain areas. The ECJ claims to have the final say on whether a measure goes beyond what is allowed in the treaties, but time after time after time, with a monotony and regularity acquiring an almost mathematical and aesthetic purity and wholeness, this Court has decided in favour of the EU/EC/EEC against the Member State. In the fifty-year history of the EU and its predecessors, there appears to have been only one finding that a measure was ultra vires the treaties (a directive about tobacco advertising opposed by Germany).

Non-existent civil society

Civil society barely exists at the European level. By civil society I mean non-governmental, non-profit organisations (charities, political groups, many sports clubs, churches, universities, trades unions, business associations, foundations, institutes and so on), and mean to exclude for-profit organisations such as for-profit companies, cooperatives, and mutual societies, and all governmental institutions. At the European level, most institutions corresponding to these sorts of things are either state-funded, or don't exist. The best you can get tends to be a Europe-wide confederation of national civil society institutions. There are vanishingly few Europe-wide membership organisations comprising individuals, and it is hard to set them up.

There is no pan-European media

This is possibly the gravest of the problems, and one which is difficult to remedy by state or private acts.

THE LEFT MUST PUT BRITAIN'S EU WITHDRAWAL ON THE AGENDA

Owen Jones

Progressives should be appalled by European Union's ruination of Greece. It's time to reclaim the Eurosceptic cause

At first, only a few dipped their toes in the water; then others, hesitantly, followed their lead, all the time looking at each other for reassurance. As austerity-ravaged Greece was placed under what Yanis Varoufakis terms a "postmodern occupation", its sovereignty overturned and compelled to implement more of the policies that have achieved nothing but economic ruin, Britain's left is turning against the European Union, and fast.

"Everything good about the EU is in retreat; everything bad is on the rampage," writes George Monbiot, explaining his about-turn. "All my life I've been pro-Europe," says Caitlin Moran, "but seeing how Germany is treating Greece, I am finding it increasingly distasteful." Nick Cohen believes the EU is being portrayed "with some truth, as a cruel, fanatical and stupid institution". "How can the left support what is being done?" asks Suzanne Moore. "The European 'Union'. Not in my name." There are senior Labour figures in Westminster and Holyrood privately moving to an "out" position too.

The list goes on, and it is growing. The more left wing opponents of the EU come out, the more momentum will gather pace and gain critical mass. For those of us on the left who have always been critical of the EU, it has felt like a lonely crusade. But left support for withdrawal – "Lexit", if you like – is not new. If anything, this new wave of left Euroscepticism represents a reawakening. Much of the left campaigned against entering the European Economic Community when Margaret Thatcher and the like campaigned for membership.

It would threaten the ability of left wing governments to implement policies, people like my parents thought, and would forbid the sort of industrial activism needed to protect domestic industries. But then Thatcherism happened, and an increasingly battered and demoralised left began to believe that the only hope of progressive legislation was via Brussels. The misery of the left was, in the 1980s, matched by the triumphalism of the free marketeers, who had transformed Britain beyond many of their wildest ambitions, and began to baulk at the restraints put on their dreams by the European project.

The left's pessimism about the possibility of implementing social reform at home without the help of the EU fused with a progressive vision of internationalism and unity, one that had emerged from the rubble of fascism and genocidal war. It is perhaps this feelgood halo that has been extinguished by a country the EU has driven into an economic collapse unseen since America's great depression. It was German and French banks who recklessly lent to Greece that have benefited from bailouts, not the Greek economy. The destruction of Greece's national sovereignty was achieved by economic strangulation, and treatment dealt out to Alexis Tsipras likened to "extensive mental waterboarding". Slovakia's deputy prime minister, Peter Kažimír, may have deleted his tweet calling this modern-day Versailles "the results of their 'Greek Spring'", but he is right: this was all about crushing a rebellion.

Ugly indeed. As the former European commission adviser Philippe Legrain puts it, "Germany is proving to be a calamitous hegemon," overruling even France's objections.

The euro suits Germany, of course, as a weak euro is good for its exports and prevents poorer EU countries getting a competitive edge. But look at how the EU has operated. It has driven elected governments – however unsavoury, like Silvio Berlusconi's – from office. Ireland and Portugal were also blackmailed. The 2011 treaty effectively banned Keynesian economics in the eurozone.

But even outside the eurozone, our democracy is threatened. The Transatlantic Trade Investment Partnership (TTIP), typically negotiated by the EU in secret with corporate interests, threatens a race to the-bottom in environmental and other standards. Even more ominously, it would give large corporations the ability to sue elected governments to try to stop them introducing policies that supposedly hit their profit margins, whatever their democratic mandate. It would clear the way to not only expand the privatisation of our NHS, but make it irreversible too. Royal Mail may have been privatised by the Tories, but it was the EU that began the process by enforcing the liberalisation of the natural monopoly of postal services. Want to nationalise the railways? That means you have to not only overcome European commission rail directive 91/440/EEC, but potentially the proposed Fourth Railway Package too.

Other treaties and directives enforce free market policies based on privatisation and marketisation of our public services and utilities. David Cameron is now proposing a renegotiation that will strip away many of the remaining "good bits" of the EU, particularly opting out of employment protection rules. Yet he depends on the left to campaign for and support his new package, which will be to stay in an increasingly pro-corporate EU shorn of pro-worker trappings. Can we honestly endorse that?

Let's just be honest about our fears. We fear that we will inadvertently line up with the xenophobes and the immigrant-bashing nationalists, and a "no" result will be seen as their vindication, unleashing a carnival of Ukippery. Hostility to the EU is seen as the preserve of the hard right, and not the sort of thing progressives should entertain. And that is why – if indeed much of the left decides on Lexit – it must run its own separate campaign and try and win ownership of the issue.

Such a campaign would focus on building a new Britain, one of workers' rights, a genuine living wage, public ownership, industrial activism and tax justice. Such a populist campaign could help the left reconnect with working-class communities it lost touch with long ago. My fear otherwise is a repetition of the Scottish referendum: but this time, instead of the progressive SNP as the beneficiaries, with UKIP mopping up in working-class communities as big businesses issue chilling threats about the risks of voting the wrong way. Without a prominent Left Out campaign, UKIP could displace Labour right across northern England. That would be the real vindication of

Ukippery.

Lexit may be seen as a betrayal of solidarity with the left in the EU: Syriza and Podemos in Spain are trying to change the institution, after all, not leave it. Syriza's experience illustrates just how forlorn that cause is. But in any case, the threat of Brexit would help them. Germany has little incentive to change tack: it benefits enormously from the current arrangements. If its behaviour is seen to be causing the break-up of the EU, it will strengthen the hand of those opposing the status quo. The case for Lexit grows ever stronger, and – at the very least – more of us need to start dipping our toes in the water.

NIGEL FARAGE ON EUROPEAN DISUNION

Alexandra Wolfe; Wall Street Journal

The UKIP leader on withdrawing from the EU, his controversial views about immigration and the failings of the political establishment

Nigel Farage, leader of the U.K. Independence Party, a populist movement whose chief aim is to have the U.K. withdraw from the European Union, puts everyone he meets through what he calls “the Farage test.” Most politicians fail it. “They’re all so bloody earnest,” he says. “God help us.”

What does the test entail? “Number one: Would I want to have a drink with them? And number two: Would I employ them?” he explains. “You’ve already been through it,” he tells me with a chuckle. “Provided you get one out of two, you’re OK with me.”

Mr. Farage, 50, is one of the most recognizable faces in a rising wave of antiestablishment politicians across Europe who are winning votes by denouncing the EU's policies. His party has picked up two seats in the British Parliament in recent months and could get a few more in the general election in May. (Most polls put support for UKIP at 13% to 15% among would-be voters, compared with around 33% each for Labour and the Tories.) He presents himself as a man of the people and is often photographed with a pint and a cigarette at the local pub.

But for the past month, Mr. Farage has sworn off alcohol, an experience he calls both “amazing” and “miserable.” Today, he’s having lunch at an Italian restaurant about two hours southeast of London in Thanet, near his home. A waitress immediately apologizes to Mr. Farage for not serving pints. He says, “Everyone just thinks I spend my whole life drinking beers!” With his dry month over, he orders a bottle of red wine, sparkling water and a steak. He’s in a good mood: The victory of the left-wing Syriza party in Greece has heartened him; it has refused to meet the EU's terms for repaying loans. Mr. Farage takes that as a sign of momentum against the EU. He has argued that Greece should go further by rejecting the euro and returning to the drachma.

As the U.K. approaches elections, the recent terrorist attacks in Paris have added to long-standing financial and economic worries, and UKIP has been a beneficiary of the gloomy news. He sees his role as larger than the British arena. “You mustn’t think of me as being a British politician purely but a European politician,” he says. “All of Europe is changing.”

Mr. Farage thinks that these days have brought a new version of the Berlin Wall. “I grew up with the Berlin Wall in Europe, with an East-West split,” he says. “I’m now middle-aged, and Europe’s got another Berlin Wall. It goes down the middle of Europe...and it’s called the euro. Yet the economic system and the series of bailouts that we’ve had have locked the north and south together in a sort of death lock.”

Meanwhile, at the restaurant in Thanet, Mr. Farage's security staff is starting to get fidgety. They've noticed that a woman sitting at the other end of the restaurant is keeping an eye on our table. Mr. Farage's senior adviser Raheem Kassam, a former editor for the conservative blog Breitbart.com, thinks that she's part of a protest group that regularly chases him around Thanet.

Mr. Farage dismisses her and her ilk as extremists. The bigger threat, he says, is from the British political establishment at Westminster. “The establishment is very, very scared of us and is closing ranks against us in the most astonishing way,” he says. Party members have been called “pranks, gadflies, eccentrics, fruitcakes, swivel-eyed loons and closet racists.” In December, a UKIP candidate stepped down after referring to a woman with a Chinese name as a “chinky.” Mr. Farage defended the candidate as a “rough diamond.” Politicians are ‘all so bloody earnest,’ he says. ‘God help us.’

Mr. Farage says he is upset at the British media's portrayal of himself and UKIP as fringe elements. "In many ways, a lot of what we stand for you would describe as classical liberalism," he says. The negative narrative about UKIP comes, he says, from a sense of "political correctness that says if you even debate immigration you must by definition be racist."

Mr. Farage has called for restrictions on immigration, but he doesn't see his views as radical. He points to Australia, which has an annual immigration target and uses a points system to selectively recruit highly skilled immigrants. "What we want is an Australian-style points system," he says. "All we're arguing for is what America attempts to do and for what most countries in the world attempt to do, and that's why we're gaining ground, because we have a logical position. I'm not against foreign people, but there has to be a degree of control over this because at the moment now we discriminate against the whole world in favor of south and Eastern Europe,".

Official statistics show that about 260,000 more people came to Britain than left between June 2013 and June 2014, 43% higher than the previous year. Over half of those were EU citizens. "It's absolutely crackers," he says. He blames issues around immigration for attacks such as the one on the French satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo. "You'd have to be away with the fairies to think that it wasn't in some way related to immigration, but it's more than that, isn't it," he says. "We have taken a multicultural approach in this country, a state-sponsored multiculturalism for 40 years," he says. "The French in fact didn't go down this route, but in both cases it hasn't worked. All you can conclude is that it's very difficult to assimilate such large numbers of people."

Born in Kent, near where he now lives, Mr. Farage came of age in the 1970s—a time, he says, when "the country was going to the dogs." His parents and grandparents talked about politics at most meals. Back then, he says, inflation was over 20%, and income taxes were surging. Margaret Thatcher's pro-business policies, including tax cuts, convinced him to skip college and go to London to join the world of finance. After her election, he says, "suddenly there was the growth of this new phenomenon called the yuppie, and I wanted to be one of them." He says he would have stayed in business if it weren't for the creation of the current EU in 1993. "I had to do something about it," he says. That year, he became one of the founding members of UKIP.

These days, Mr. Farage says that he is focused on helping the U.K. regain its "national self-confidence." He regrets that the country must yield to the EU on so many issues. He says that Switzerland and Iceland (neither an EU member) have more global trade deals than Britain does, and they are not similarly constrained.

Mr. Farage's public statements are often laced with humor. He admits to relishing the attention he receives. "I really missed my vocation," he says. "I should've been a pantomime on stage." For now, he is focused on the coming elections. Many people don't think UKIP has much of a chance to bring about a true referendum on leaving the EU. "Forces will tell everybody that the sky will fall if we change anything, but I think actually we can win," says Mr. Farage.

Lunch is drawing to a close, and as the waitress clears a second bottle of wine from the table, Mr. Farage's security team motions that it's time to go. The woman who had been sitting across the restaurant has called in her fellow protesters, and we are told that a group of them is descending.

"We're fighting on all fronts," says Mr. Farage as he gets into the car. He says that he's not afraid of the protesters or the Westminster establishment. "The old British army used to say: 'Wait for the whites of their eyes before you start firing the rifles,'" he says. "We've got our bayonets fixed, and we're charging."

BRADFORD AND DISTRICT GREEN PARTY UNDERSTAND WHY WE MUST VOTE TO LEAVE

Joshua Bastow; Bradford Green Party; via several sources

(Whilst the Green Party leadership eulogises some imaginary EU wonderland, not all the troops are in line. There has always been a significant EU sceptic grouping in the party .. but all parties are split - Ed)

Tell your local Greens to vote to leave

<https://bradford.greenparty.org.uk/news/2015/11/13/why-we-must-campaign-to-leave-the-european->

union/

There are some heated debates going on around the country, but as members of The Green Party, we must realise that the European Union will not help us in any of our goals, and instead prevent progress in our country.

1. Democracy

As a big believer in people power, and freedoms over surveillance, I believe that this European Union is threatening the oldest democracy in history. I'm hoping we haven't forgot the controversial Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), which is being negotiated behind closed doors. I don't understand, how we can support these negotiations (made on our behalf by the European Union) when they are not in the interest of the British people. It threatens our NHS.

Not only do we have the evidence with TTIP, but also the transparency within the organisation itself. Who actually elects the commission? That is a question I would like to ask you, and why should these bureaucrats be making decisions on our behalf, even though most of them are not in our interest? I think a question to help you realise this, is do you know who Frans Timmermans is? He is actually the first-vice president of the commission. Not like we chose him for that job.

And finally, and probably most importantly, the EU laughs in the face of democracy. The Dutch and French voted no to the European Constitution in 2005, they rebranded it the Lisbon treaty (which is 99% the same), and forced it through without the people having a referendum. It is as if, when a country makes the wrong choice they are told off. Now, this isn't all down to the EU, of course, our own parliament destroyed democracy by not even letting us have a referendum on the treaties.

2. Corporatism

Now, the EU often gets called capitalist, which is a massive misconception. If it was capitalist, there would be much less regulation, such as regulation on how curved a cucumber can be to be sold within the EU. It is corporatist. The Oxford English Dictionary defines corporatism as:

"The control of a state or organisation by large interest groups"

What that basically means is, that large corporations are in charge when it comes to the EU. The small businesses are being throttled by big business, who have very little competition and have monopolised many industries due to their 'friends' within the commission itself. This is something we must seek to destroy. Corporatism is the worst form of government dictatorship there is, and shows we are being run by a kakistocracy

3. Climate Change

Climate change is a big issue for me, and many members of the Green Party. However, the European Union cannot solve the problem. What the EU advocates is the use of biomass generators to replace coal, oil and gas. However, these release more Carbon Dioxide than gas production, and is more hazardous than Nuclear Power. Even though 'King Coal' is our ultimate enemy, telling people to switch to biomass is not the answer, and never will be. We need a combination of wind, solar, geothermal, hydropower and (controversially) Nuclear Fusion.

4. Rise of the Far Right

The European Union has brought with it a dangerous group of people – the far right nationalists. This is true across the board, especially in France, Sweden and even Hungary. These people have risen due to the unpopularity of the EU within these countries, and if we are not careful, we could return to an age of fascism in these European Countries

5. Britain needs Europe, not the EU

The two words have been confused for too long – the EU is not Europe. The EU was supposed to bring peace and prosperity, but instead we have seen wage compression, falling standards of living and a stagnant trading block. The EU is in now way prosperous. Europe was once our greatest ally, but our island mentality means that we don't love Europe as much as the EU would like, and closer integration into an "EU super state" is not the will of the British people.

I would happily talk for hours about why we should leave, and this is just a taster of some of the reasons why we should leave.

If you are in the Bradford area, and are wanting to campaign for the 'out' vote in the European referendum, join my local campaign here (in partnership with Leave.EU).

IRISH STATEMENT ON THE "BREXIT" REFERENDUM...

***Anthony Coughlan; National Platform EU Research and Information
Centre, Dublin; via Dave Barnby***

Dear British Friends,

"We must sow terror in the hearts of the Irish people," a senior Irish politician said to Irish Independent journalist James Downey in 2001, explaining how the Republic's Government would reverse the Irish people's No vote to the EU's Nice Treaty that year and turn it into a Yes vote to the same treaty the year following.

This was duly done and voters in Ireland's second referendum on this EU treaty were threatened with the local equivalent of Prime Minister Cameron's lurid vision of economic apocalypse and World War 3 if they did not vote the way Brussels and their own ultra-Europhile politicians wanted.

Spreading fear and misinformation, using bullying and threats, is standard practice for the supporters of the supranational integration project in every EU country as they seek ever more power for themselves by undermining the national democracy of their own peoples and taking ever more power and control away from national Parliaments and Governments.

If Britain votes to leave the EU, other EU countries will almost certainly follow, quite possibly Denmark, Sweden, Finland or Holland. Ireland should do so too, thereby releasing itself from the deadly embrace of the Eurozone, joining which was the biggest mistake ever made by the Irish State and which has made the Irish people into wage-toilers for Europe's bankers.

Ireland applied to join the then EEC in 1961 because the United Kingdom did so. Ireland joined the EEC in 1973 because the UK did so. If the British people vote to regain their independence on 23 June, the Irish State should follow their example. That is the only way to break free of the Eurozone, an area with which the Republic does less than one-third of its trade and which it should never have joined

The disastrous euro-currency project is bound to implode in the next few years. If Britain votes to remain in the EU it must suffer significant collateral damage from that implosion, while British taxpayers will be expected to foot the bill to keep the Eurozone together, as happened when they were made to contribute to Ireland's so-called "bailout" in 2010, which was really a bailout of German, French and other EU Banks.

If the British people vote to leave the EU, they will be striking a mighty blow for democracy and true internationalism in face of the threats from Brussels and Berlin, encouraged by Washington.

They will encourage democrats in every EU country, whether Left, Right or Centre, to break away from the institutional monster that is the EU and re-establish their national independence and

democracy - that being the only basis for stable, long-lasting and friendly cooperation amongst Europe's nations and States.

JIM SILLARS TO CAMPAIGN FOR EUROPEAN UNION EXIT

Edinburgh News

Former SNP deputy leader Jim Sillars has criticised the party's "love affair" with Europe as he revealed he will campaign for the UK to leave the European Union (EU). Mr Sillars said he had met and would be happy to work with former MP Nigel Griffiths, who is leading a Labour campaign to leave the EU in Scotland. "There is a tendency if anyone within the party criticises the leadership to be then described as being disloyal. I think that's a very unhealthy situation inside any democratic political party."

The veteran nationalist and independence campaigner said he believed there could be SNP members who disagreed with the party leadership on Europe but would not speak out for fear of being branded "disloyal".

First Minister and SNP leader Nicola Sturgeon is strongly in favour of remaining in the EU.

Mr Sillars, husband of the late Margo MacDonald MSP, said: "I certainly met Nigel Griffiths and I'm very impressed by how he has put together a very good Labour Leave campaign in Scotland, but of course this is for Labour Party members and Labour supporters, of which at the moment I am not. I'm very happy to co-operate with Nigel. If I can be helpful, I will be helpful."

Mr Sillars said he had been "really astonished" by the number of SNP members he had spoken to who said that they did not want to remain in the EU. He said: "There is a tendency if anyone within the party criticises the leadership to be then described as being disloyal. I think that's a very unhealthy situation inside any democratic political party."

"There may be the situation in which a number of people would like to come out openly and say 'I don't agree with the party leadership on the EU', but prefer not to say so in public. I'm not in that category. I've said this to SNP members: what I cannot get my head round with the continuing SNP love affair with the EU is for us to go and bat for the EU, an organisation which, during the referendum, told us to get stuffed and would no doubt tell us to get stuffed second time round as well. They made sure that the message came through on behalf of Better Together and the Tory government that we would not be allowed automatic entry as a member state. Why we should laud an organisation and tell our supporters to vote to remain in it, when it holds us in such contempt, is something I personally don't understand when there are alternatives for us, which is the European Free Trade Association and the European Economic Area with its treaty with the EU."

He added: "I think (the EU) is a profoundly undemocratic organisation which has shown a callous disregard for people, in Portugal, Spain and Greece for example. They've been willing to make people destitute - beggar nations - in pursuit of a single policy to create a United States of Europe irrespective of whether the people want it."

ENOCH POWELL AND TONY BENN WERE RIGHT ON EUROPE – IT WAS A GREAT DECEPTION

Christopher Booker; The Telegraph

The two were spot on that the 'project' we were being asked to sign up to was to create a political government for Europe

(The Great Deception is a book that will make the scales fall from a few eyes! - Ed)

In joining all those other oldies telling us how they voted in the last EU referendum 40 years ago, I confess that, like many others, I voted “Yes” because I couldn’t support the two most prominent “No” campaigners, the Right-winger Enoch Powell and the Left-winger Tony Benn. Only years later, when I co-authored an exhaustively researched book on the history of the “European project”, did I realise that on this issue at least they had both been absolutely right.

In the decisive debate on the European Communities Bill in 1972, Powell explained yet again that the real purpose of the “project” we were being asked to sign up to was to create a political government for Europe; and that our own elected Parliament had no right to subordinate itself in perpetuity to an unelected supranational body, which could impose on us laws not in our national interest.

When the Bill included a clause empowering ministers to put anything coming from Brussels straight into British law without consulting Parliament, Benn memorably observed that this open-ended surrender of our power to govern ourselves was “a coup d’état by a political class who did not believe in popular sovereignty”.

As the book extensively documented, the two prime ministers who took us into “Europe”, Harold Macmillan and Edward Heath, were both made fully aware that the “Common Market” was only ever intended to be a front to the project’s real, long-term political intentions. But in 1961 Macmillan told his Cabinet how vital it was that this must be kept out of view. The deal must be sold to the British people as no more than an “economic arrangement”, affecting no more than trade and jobs – as was faithfully echoed by Heath in 1971.

Thus were we taken in on the basis of what we called, as the title of our book, *The Great Deception*. It is exactly that same deception which will be used to dominate the “Yes” side’s campaign in this second referendum 40 years later.

THE MYTH OF 'PEACE IN EUROPE'

Frank Taylor

The European Union vaunts itself as the agent of peace. At last, the argument goes, nations can set their armies aside and come together in mutual friendship.

Such an account is for the historical ignoramus and begins to unravel rapidly as soon as it is put onto the dissecting table and subjected to the scalpel of history.

At the outbreak of the First World War, Georges Clemenceau, a wise man with a gift for a good epithet, is said to have commented that the only problem of the balance of power in Europe since Waterloo, was that there were twenty million too many Germans.

What he meant was that in a hundred years the only disturbance to the peace of the continent had come from one country only ... Prussia, later to morph into the German Empire from 1871. This one state was the prime aggressor in wars against Denmark (1838-51 and 1864), Austria (1866); France (1870-71); and finally the two World Wars of the twentieth century.

Previous attempts at European hegemony had ended in defeats of such catastrophic and traumatic finality as to render any return impossible. Spain's claims on continental Europe were dismantled by a series of treaties during and after the Wars of the Spanish Succession during the first quarter of the eighteenth century. Thereafter Spain only returned to Europe's battlefields as a reluctant French proxy during the Seven Years War and the Napoleonic Wars. France herself met her final denouement in 1815.

Hitler's Reich was dismembered in 1945. But now, with the re-unification of Germany a generation ago, that problem has returned to us in a new form. The political and economic clout of the new, unified Germany, is an issue of concern both within and beyond these shores. Indeed there are some who, without too much hyperbole, are describing the present European Union, as 'Greater Germany' or the 'Fourth Reich'. It is again Germany's size, albeit through no fault of its own, that disrupts, the balance of Europe as it has done for almost a century and a half.

It is vital also to remember that in the 1930's, Hitler's Reich was spending close to 20% of GDP on its military. Such spending, and over a number of years, by a very large state, would be the minimum military requirement for a war of continental conquest on Hitlerian or Napoleonic lines. No democratically elected government would be able to spend anything approaching such an amount on its military and remain in office.

The notion that any modern European state could, on the basis of a military budget of under 2% of GDP, launch a war of continental conquest is light years beyond preposterous.

The only other state to trouble Europe since 1945 (leaving aside arguments as to how much the cold war served the interests of Western military-industrial interests) ... Russia .. has never been, nor is ever likely to be, part of the European 'project'. The prime container of any Russian ambitions has not been the EU but NATO and the USA.

Nor do 'commonalities' necessarily prevent conflict. There was a time when the world had a common (although not a 'single') currency ... gold and other bullion metals. There was a time when virtually all of the important diplomatic, legal and ecclesiastical business of Europe was conducted in a common language ... Latin. None of that prevented the conflicts of the time.

In all this the UK has a different and unique position. Whilst it has certainly sought influence in continental Europe, the UK has never sought territorial conquest. Indeed, for significant periods of its history the UK has been fairly detached from continental affairs.

The last claims to parts of France were dismantled in Tudor times. We may also be thankful to the wisdom King George I in his decision that the Crowns of Britain and Hanover could not rest upon the same head.

So 'peace in Europe' has had little, if anything to do with the EU. It has had much to do with Russia, the USA, NATO, the bitter and bloody lessons learned from previous attempts at European hegemony, modern travel and communications, and the advent of at least an imperfect democracy.

I have remarked before on the ability of the EU, like some snake charmer, to completely hypnotize many intelligent and well-meaning people. At least this alluring tune can be pushed to the bottom of the charts!

HISTORY OF THE EU'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE OVER UK CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Torquil Dick-Erikson; UKIP Daily.

In April 1997, at a specially convened seminar in Spain, the EU Commission unveiled its "Corpus Juris project", for a single system of criminal law for the whole of Europe, based entirely on Napoleonic-inquisitorial principles. It takes the form of an embryo criminal code. It would sweep away our own Magna Carta based system, and in particular our Trial by Jury and Lay Magistrates (art. 26.1), our Habeas Corpus (art. 20.3.g), our protection against double jeopardy (art. 27.2). I happened to be among 141 European jurists invited to attend, as guests of the Commission. I was included in the Italian delegation, as a last-minute replacement. The head of the Italian delegation had read an article I had published in an Italian law journal and had been impressed enough to invite me to come along and fill an empty slot.

In 1998 Brussels called an interparliamentary conference to look at the Corpus Juris project and to ask the participants, "How ready are the people of your country for a Europe-wide single system of criminal justice?". The British delegation included Humfrey Malins QC MP, who looked at the Corpus Juris project, was horrified and wrote a letter to the Telegraph about it. The Telegraph, also primed by what I had reported in The European Journal, ran a week of articles every day sounding the alarm about Corpus Juris. The Telegraph had the necessary authority and credibility to galvanise some into action. There were PQs from two MPs, and Kate Hoey, Home Office Minister at the time, read Corpus Juris and was horrified and promised to veto it. Meanwhile the Labour MEP Pauline Green led all the Eurosocijalists, including the Brits, to vote to "welcome" Corpus Juris in a resolution in the European Parliament. Blair did not have the stomach to disown Kate Hoey publicly (though later she was moved from Home to Sport), nor to publicly endorse Ms Green. There was then a weighty Report from the

House of Lords, which examined Corpus Juris and rejected it (HL 62, 1999).

The EU realised that there would be a huge, flaming row with the UK which would boost the withdrawalist side enormously if they insisted and tried to bulldoze it through by Qualified Majority Voting, as a German and an Italian MEP told the House of Lords' Committee they had been planning to do. So they put it quietly aside. The story was now that it had never been an EU proposal, but merely an exercise by a bunch of academics, almost as if they were just wishing to while away a rainy afternoon. The EU came to realise how inflammatory it was potentially, and how it would really frighten the monkey (Britain) who would escape their clutches if they put it on the agenda again. So it disappeared from the radar. The BBC and other media decided it was a non-story. The Telegraph did not mention it again. And there it has remained until now – at the back of the fridge.

Instead of a single criminal-law system for all Europe, it was decided at Tampere in 1999 that each nation would keep its own legal system, but to have “mutual recognition” of each other's legal decisions. Mutual recognition presupposes mutual confidence in the fairness of each other's systems. The other systems were and are largely unstudied, unresearched and unknown – at least in Britain, so it was decided that since they were all signed up to the European Convention on Human Rights and subject to the European Court of HR, that was OK. The main fruit of this approach has been the European Arrest Warrant. A provision was and is that a EAW should not provide any indication of evidence of a prima facie case, and the country receiving a EAW is not allowed to ask for any evidence, but has to trust the requesting country blindly.

Thus, the EAW, far from being an alternative to Corpus Juris, is actually a stepping stone towards it. By enabling arrest and lengthy “precautionary” imprisonment (months, and longer) without evidence nor any public hearing, it tramples underfoot our Habeas Corpus rights.

The next step towards Corpus Juris is to establish its central pillar – the European Public Prosecutor. This is now underway, though the UK has opted out. But having accepted the EAW, our opt-out from the EPP's jurisdiction can be circumvented, for he will be able to issue EAWs against Britons in Britain, as confirmed by Jonathan Fisher QC in a formal Counsel's Opinion, commissioned by the President of the Freedom Association, Christopher Gill.

All this was to be kept in abeyance, as long as the UK had an escape route, ie the ability to head for the exit door if its people and Parliament feel that our freedom is severely and really threatened. It is still, so far, open to Parliament to rescind the ECA72 (even unilaterally and with immediate effect if we feel that Brussels might abuse its residual power over us if we took the route of article 50).

But once Brussels sees that we are locked inside, and no longer have a quick way out, then they will wheel out Corpus Juris once more, and we will get the full nine yards of it.

This will be the case if the Brexit referendum returns a victory for the IN vote. The tragedy at present is that we are heading for the vote with 99% of the electorate in complete and blissful ignorance of this specific, looming, threat to our personal freedom and its safeguards from arbitrary arrest and wrongful imprisonment.

Why is criminal law so important? and why is Brussels so keen on getting control over our criminal law? British people usually think that taxation, monetary policy, business regulation, etc are more important. This is because we think of criminal law as being merely about catching and punishing criminals.

We British have had such a long and unbroken history of peaceful constitutional development, that we have forgotten that, at the end of the day, criminal law is actually the handle granting complete control over a State and all its inhabitants. Criminal law means police, handcuffs and prisons. It means the physically forceful, enforcement powers of the State over the citizens. It is under the criminal law that the State can (or cannot) send its officers into your home, breaking down the door, hauling you out of your bed and off to a prison. The State holds a monopoly of legal, even lethal, force over the citizens, and the exercise of this power is regulated by the criminal law.

In fact, the EU has not only developed the Corpus Juris project. It is also training and drilling its own paramilitary, lethally armed, police force, the European Gendarmerie Force (EGF). Six national gendarmeries are being trained and drilled side by side, in a location in Northern Italy, to weld them into a single European corps. They will then be deployed all over the territory, and once inside Britain – Mrs May said in 2012 “Of course we will call upon them, if we see the need” – they will surely not leave if asked to go by a merely British government, for they will owe allegiance only to Brussels.

The Corpus Juris plan envisages not only a European Public Prosecutor stationed in Brussels, but also that he shall have a Delegated Prosecutor in each member state (art. 18.3). And the national prosecutors will be “under a duty to assist him” (art. 18.5). And if there are riots and resistance to the imposition of these alien laws, the EGF will be available to suppress them. It will also be available to do the bidding of the European Prosecutor, should the local enforcement agencies prove recalcitrant. It will look like, feel like, and be like... a military occupation by a hostile armed foreign force.

The above scenario looks and sounds quite incredible to any British person. Unlike our continental friends, we have not seen anything like it, on our own shores, for hundreds of years. Yet it could so easily turn true. The documentary evidence of this plan is all there.

taken with the authors permission, from <https://savebritishjustice.wordpress.com>

Read his essay Magna Carta and Europe on the official, govt-sponsored, Magna Carta celebratory website:<http://www.magnacarta800th.com/articles/magna-carta-europe-yesterday-today>

The above was summarized by the novelist Frederick Forsyth (with the author's permission) in his weekly page in the Daily Express: <http://www.express.co.uk/comment/columnists/frederick-forsyth/578984/Napoleon-laugh>

Torquil made the following submission, "Serious Risks", to the House of Lords at the time of the debate on whether to reconfirm the European Arrest Warrant or not, giving some in-depth description of the differences between our system of criminal justice and those used on the continent. This text also contains links to the Youtube video-recording of the public debate he held against the British co-author of Corpus Juris, the Cambridge Law Professor John Spencer QC, in Cambridge in 1999. His motion that "Corpus Juris is a threat to our civil liberties" was carried by 39 votes to 4. Professor Spencer subsequently paid him the great compliment of naming and blaming him, in two published articles, as the man chiefly responsible for having influenced the media and the government to reject Corpus Juris. <http://www.tfa.net/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/Full-EU-HoLsubmission.pdf>

The full text of Jonathan Fisher QCs Counsels Opinion shows that by reconfirming the European Arrest Warrant, as it did in 2014, Parliament has enabled the European Prosecutor to sidestep our opt-out from his jurisdiction and to order the arrest of Britons in Britain. It can be read here: <http://www.tfa.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/OpinionJonathanFisher-QC.7.10.pdf>

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

Tel; (01746) 789326

frankinshropshire@hotmail.co.uk