

The European project is making people poorer

Extract of a Bruges group article by Clifford Miller

Remainers claim “We’re better off in” [i.e. economically in the European Union]. But is it true? And if “We’re better off out” people need to know. The UK is tipped to overtake Germany and become the largest economy in Europe. Will the UK’s Gross Domestic Product [GDP] increase faster if we are out of the EU and make us in the UK all wealthier? And could that be sooner than later if we are out?

....the question is would UK economic growth have been better if the UK had historically not been part of the EU? Can the confidence in the UK’s ability to trade outside of the EU bloc be justified with evidence? So, let us keep an even keel and look a little more scientifically at empirical evidence of the performance of the EU using historic economic data. Historical data makes it more difficult to make excuses. It evens out temporary disparities over time. Where there is a world economic downturn, that ipso facto affects the world. Figures covering the world economy over such a period provides fewer hiding places for those with something to hide [eg. the EU and especially the failing Eurozone].

In 2017 Global Finance Magazine [GFM] published comparative world economic growth figures. The magazine is not polemical. It aims to help corporate leaders chart the course of global business and finance, so it needs to publish reliable information. GFM chose particular regions and

country groups to make economic growth comparisons. The original data came from the International Monetary Fund [IMF]. The regions and country groups which GFM used for comparisons are the IMF regions and country groups. In two sets of figures, the totality of the figures covered a twelve year period – the more relevant figures covered 10 years - 2008-2017 - that is less likely to be considered Sunny Day Economic data.

One might like to see figures over a longer period – specifically the entire 46 years of UK membership of the “European Project”. Convenient data for that entire period does not appear to be readily available. The risk in using data over such a long period lies in its reliability: who produces those figures, how they do it, what adjustments they make and how reliable their interpretations might be in the light of world events and events affecting specific countries and regions over such a period, such as the Gulf Wars, the dissolution of the former Soviet Union, the fall of the Berlin Wall and reunification of Germany. And more importantly there is also author bias – by accident or by design.

IMF world data starts in 1980, so comparisons over longer periods are possible. However, assuming one can take the IMF sourced GFM 10 year average figures on face value one can see that over a 10-year period from 2008 to 2017 the EU’s Eurozone had the lowest average economic growth

over that 10-year period in the world at a seemingly dismal 0.4% in comparison. The wider EU’s economic growth over that 10-year period was second worst at a slightly less dismal 0.7%.

By comparison the 10-year average GDP growth world-wide was 3.2% or 8 times that of the Eurozone and 4.5 times better than the EU. In effect the overall world economic growth sits in the middle providing a benchmark to compare the best and worst performers in the world. So, shocking but true, Boris Johnson’s 29th May 2016 *Telegraph* published analysis of the EU-Antarctica economic alignment holds, despite the valiant but [one hopes] misguided efforts of charity “Full Fact”, ITN, economic academics and others.

It is still likely to be misleading to compare developing economies with the EU. Economies of developing nations can experience greater annual GDP growth and faster historical economic growth than the more mature advanced economies of developed nations over the same periods. This seems to be reflected in the GFM figures for regions experiencing the greatest historic economic growth over 10 years.

Emerging and developing Asia was top over 10 years with 7.2% average annual GDP growth. Emerging markets and developing economies were joint second at 5% with the ASEAN-5. Surprisingly, Sub-Saharan

Continued on page 2

INSIDE: *The leave deal and the General Election p 4 – EU plans for further expansion p 5 - Perks of being an ex-EU President p 5 – European intelligence gathering p 6 - Facial recognition worries p 6 – EU needs military power p 6 - The key Brexit issues in 2020 p 7 – The EU no one voted for p 8. Letters p 9 & 10*

The European project is making people poorer

Africa was fourth at 4.7%. Middle East, North Africa, Afghanistan, and Pakistan were fifth at 3.5% with Middle East and North Africa taken alone next at 3.4%. Emerging and developing Europe was seventh at 3.9%. However, when we compare Advanced Economies [but excluding the G7 and Eurozone], at 2.4% average 10 year economic growth the performance of the EU and Eurozone are substantially worse [0.7 and 0.4% respectively]. Latin America and the Caribbean are also still better coming in at 2.2% and the Commonwealth of Independent States [i.e. former Soviet Union aligned states] is at 1.2%. “Advanced economies” at 1.10% is still substantially better despite that figure being dragged down by the inclusion of the average economic growth of the ailing EU and Eurozone in that economic grouping. The better comparison is probably with the “Advanced economies excluding the EU and Eurozone” – which is six times better growth than the Eurozone and 3.5 times that of the EU.

And what of the longer period? During the period 1980 to 2018 the worst performers for average annual world economic growth were: the Eurozone bottom at 1.49%, the former Soviet Union aligned states [Commonwealth of Independent States] next at 1.81% and third worst is the EU at 1.89%.

Obviously, attempting to cover such a long period since the end of 1979 one needs to consider relevant world events, but the figures still provide a comparison to world economic growth performance. And it is going to source and not relying just on the GFM figures [even though in turn also sourced from the IMF].

The dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 left the economies of those states in dire condition. Extremely poor economic growth dragged down their average economic growth figure over the period since 1992. For

example, 1993 to 1996 the economies contracted instead of growing with large annual contractions of; -9.57%, -13.86%, -5.34% and -3.57% respectively. That has changed substantially as the GFM figures indicate to 1.2% 10 year average economic growth to 2017 compared to the Eurozone of 0.4%.

The Eurozone started with the euro’s launch on 1st January 1999. It was then an ‘invisible’ currency, only used for accounting purposes and electronic payments for the first three years. The big change came on 1st January 2002 in 12 EU countries with the biggest cash changeover in history. The Eurozone grew over time as other EU states joined that currency system. So, one must bear in mind the world has been changing when looking at the figures.

No doubt Remainers will endeavour to criticise and undermine the figures presented here. However, by keeping faithful to the original data and avoiding “adjustments” it is likely to be more difficult to argue with. They will of course try no doubt.

Whatever one’s perspective and whatever counter-arguments might be deployed, the plain and stark fact, whichever way one looks at this is, the EU [which includes the Eurozone] on these IMF sourced figures has the worst 10 year average historic economic growth in the world and the Eurozone is worst of all at 0.4%. That is far from the world benchmark of a 3.2% ten year average growth, which sits in the middle of the best and the worst economic growth regions in the world. It is 8 times that of the Eurozone and 4.5 times better than the EU. And the EU and Eurozone have consistently been bottom on average annual economic growth since 1980 with the temporary exception of the Commonwealth of Independent States on their sudden emergence following the dissolution of the Soviet Union.

But what also can we say about this?

What can we say about the top performing countries for growth in the world even if we cannot fairly compare their impressive growth figures as fast developing economies with more mature developed nations? We can say this: those countries’ economies have been growing in many cases over decades with a cumulative growth record which tells us something - the people in those nations have more money to spend now than they had twenty or thirty years ago. A country like Bangladesh with annual growth in the region of 5-6% over many years will be far wealthier now than 30 years ago. And we should also consider the IMF “Other Advanced economies” which can be more easily compared to the EU and Eurozone and which have had substantially better historic economic growth. They will also have more money to spend, countries like Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, Israel and Korea. To those one must add the G7 powerhouse of the USA and also Canada. And when people in other countries have more money to spend, does the UK have products and services they could need or want? Are there greater opportunities for trade now world-wide than 10, 20 or 30 years ago? And if so, are we better off out of the EU?

An in-depth analysis of these questions is for another article. The Leave answer we know is in the affirmative, but is it justified?

When put in a perspective as done in this article one can start to see the sense of it. The EU’s economic growth record is poor. There are 500 million people in the EU and many member states [e.g. those like Bulgaria] are not wealthy and net recipients of the EU budget contributions.

The Rest of the World is estimated to comprise just over 7 billion people and many more countries than the EU including many developed economies. The opportunities for trade must logically be far greater than those

The European project is making people poorer

presented by the vastly smaller EU trading block. Perhaps this might be behind the recent claims that Angela Merkel allegedly expressed concerns about Brexit making the UK a competitor. And if that is what the EU is about, suppressing competition from the UK, is that alone reason to be out? What does Merkel know that others do not about the potential economic consequences for Germany of the UK leaving the EU?

One might ask whether the EU is the kind of anchor which instead of stabilising the economies of member states, destabilises by dragging their economies down? What view should citizens of the PIIGS take? Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Greece and Spain are the economic basket cases of Europe needing bailouts with invented EU money conjured up like a magic trick literally overnight to stave off a collapse of the Euro, as Donald Tusk described in an interview about the crisis and the EU's management of it. Tusk seems to be genuine honourable committed passionate and sound, so no personal criticism of the man is intended here.

And when one looks further one thing is noticeable about the EU debate. That is how Europhiles become very quiet and do not engage in discussion to argue about the wider economic, social and political instability across the EU member states which has followed the unhelpful EU policy of austerity. To avoid discussion they keep silent, hoping to push or provoking debate onto other issues. They need to be challenged and all need to know and master a knowledge and understanding of the manifold failings of the EU to do so. It is no easy task because there are so many. And we come to the real question about Brexit. It is not "are we better off in than out" or vice versa.

The real Brexit question is not being debated nor has it been, nor are the public being informed. Europhiles and

Remainers alike also tend not to engage in the debate about all the things that are wrong with the EU – pushing the subject onto other issues instead.

What is wrong with the EU goes beyond economic growth and the destabilising effect the EU has had across Europe since its formation nearly thirty years ago, and what looms large in any picture of peace in Europe is not how the EEC nor how the EU has helped maintain peace. There has been an exponential rise in prosperity since the end of World War II. That rise in prosperity would have happened with or without the EEC and EU. It has been seen across the entire world. Simply put, people in the developed EU economies have been too busy making money since 1945 to want to go to war with each other.

But once we see economic, political and social instability, especially if there is recession and economic decline, then there could be instability which might see a return to conflict between nations in Europe. The relatively recent Balkan wars are a demonstration of what can happen – that was war in Europe – whether anyone likes to see it as that or not – and there were war crimes trials – which we have known before then.

Never forget that some of the ordinary people walking down the street in your town in your road where your live are capable of doing what was done in the Balkan war and before. We are all fallible and subject to the same psychological pressures whether we like to admit that or not. Some are more fallible and more subject than others. The message is not to blame people but to recognise the reality. The ultimate question is whether the "European Project" is ever capable of ensuring peace in Europe. Frankly, it is creating instability socially, politically and economically. And in this writer's view it is not the driver of peace – peace since 1945 is built on prosperity

and enjoying all that brings.

Is economic growth – or at least political and social stability – more important than the EU? And regardless of what happens to the world in the coming decades.

It is all well and good speaking of our friends and partners, but historically Europe has been mired in conflicts over centuries. Those conflicts have not gone away. What social, political or economic changes might return the continent to greater or wider conflict? One cannot pretend it is impossible. Indeed, we see it happening now – albeit and inappropriately not all is reported in our newspapers or on our television screens, including it seems events in the UK. Are France and Germany and other EU states friends? Do not be misled by the mellowing of rhetoric over the past three years since the Referendum. The EU has mellowed most likely because of what some might interpret as posturing and statements aimed at the UK were counterproductive, persuading former Remainers to want to support leaving. And they need the UK's money. Voting to veto extensions to the Article 50 period is like Turkey's voting for Christmas. There is little doubt that whilst the prospect of keeping money coming into the EU Commission and Council's coffers from the UK remains, they will extend the period. Where the breaking point is and when an EU member state might veto an extension is moot.

If the EU becomes the centre of the EU "Empire" as some claim it has been described by its proponents, and if it then has military forces under its control, what use might be made of them in dealing with dissent and conflicts internal to or between the EU states and the EU? How easy would it be to suspend the rule of law in the EU in the event of a widespread collapse of social order or dissent against the ruling class?.....

The leave deal and the General Election

Rodney Atkinson

I have been following British electoral politics since the end of the 1950s and never has there been such a threat to the entire basis of our civilisation as in this election.

* Labour's Bankrupting spending pledges and nationalisation programme will cripple us with massive debts and higher taxes

* Islamophobia threat to democracy. Labour will imprison you for criticising Islamic teaching or for "fearing Islam". Because, as Lord Mandelson admitted, Labour "scoured the world" for immigrants who would vote for them they have become in effect the Islamic extremist Party with known vote riggers allied to Corbyn.

* Labour's Mass free immigration policy will continue this trend.

* The Corbyn clique is a serious Marxist threat to the family through the militant LGBT movement.

* Labour and the Lib-Dems (and even the May Government) represent a Massive threat to child physical and mental health through transgender politics and the forced medication of children to delay puberty. A new conservative Government has a chance to reverse this.

* Labour and the Lib-Dems will reverse the will of the people and remain in the EU.

I have spent 30 years seeking;

a) a vote by the British people to leave the corporatist fascist and German imperialist European Union

b) a British political party led by and committed to the necessary legislation to leave the EU.

At last we have both. We cannot afford more delay. The deal negotiated by Johnson after the treasonous May deal is flawed but do-able. I explain why below.

So do we need (at this election) the Brexit Party? A Deltapoll showed that when asked how they would vote with

the Brexit Party on the ballot paper, 41% would vote Conservative, 29% said Labour, 16% went for the Lib-Dems, and 6% said the Brexit Party.

When asked how they would vote without the option of the Brexit Party, the Labour score rises by 1 percentage point to 30%, but the Tory figure rises 5 percentage points to 46%.

It is therefore inevitable that votes for the Brexit Party would deliver many seats to Labour and the Lib-Dems and prevent a Tory majority. That majority is essential to prevent the lying, twisting, constitution-distorting behaviour of a Remainer Parliament defying the will of the people and destroying democracy itself.

Even in the North where the Brexit Party claims that it has a better chance of beating Labour than the Tories, there has been a traditional and strong (small "C") conservative patriotic vote within Labour ranks – of the kind that supports Brexit – but which has little or nothing in common with Nigel Farage. **The north has the strongest working class vote and among workers the Tories now have a 20% lead (Yougov Poll 11-12th Nov).** Indeed when I was lead candidate for UKIP in 1999 in the North East and we achieved over 8% of the vote we wrote our own election leaflets rather than follow the Farage line.

So unless there is real proven local polling which shows the Brexit Party has the best chance of victory in a constituency or the local Tory candidate is not an open Remainer then the obvious and critical vote is for the Conservative candidate and the probability of "Leave by Christmas"!

Time is critical. The costs of EU economic collapse falling on us as we delay Brexit and the boredom (or antipathy) of our US and Commonwealth friends waiting for a trade deal would be massive. The US

Government's trade promotion authority will expire in July 2020.

The Boris Johnson EU leave deal

Because of the grotesque treachery and incompetence of Theresa May (who will go down in history as an ideological companion to Edward Heath) this official Leave deal will see the UK leave the EU but there will be no deal on trade. That has to be negotiated. As I pointed out a long time ago there were two "no deals" on the table. The one Theresa May and her Remainer Parliament rejected and Theresa May's deal itself.

However, the very worst of the May deal has gone and the template for the imminent trade deal negotiations is far more acceptable and will greatly enhance the UK's bargaining position in the trade negotiations to come. The Government has committed to ending the trade negotiations by December 2020.

So here is a brief summary of the strengths of the Johnson Leave deal:

* The end of the Irish backstop means the end of the UK in the EU customs union – so now able to make trade deals with US, NZ, Canada, Australia, the Trans Pacific Partnership etc. Those trade partners make clear the Northern Ireland situation does not affect their desire to do deals.

* Under the May deal the EU would have been able to effectively use the backstop to keep us in the EU until we signed up to any crippling terms. Now the UK can just walk away if the terms are not fair and in our interests.

* While May's deal committed to a customs union in goods trade, Boris's commitment is to a straight Free Trade Agreement with regulatory divergence – so trading partners can now get on with the job of negotiating.

* The Transition period will not hinder the UK – trade negotiations

The leave deal and the General Election

take time to come into effect so 1st January 2021 is no problem.

* EU Labour and environmental standards are relevant for both EU and US so there is no difference there – despite Labour scare mongering.

* There is no question of breaking up the NHS for the sake of a US trade deal – President Trump has specifically rejected that. All drugs and many operations are already private sector provided to the NHS.

Not once in all my years as a US trade policy advisor or on the advisory committees to the United States Trade Representative did I ever hear that the NHS was a US negotiating objective. - Shanker Singham

* In the new Political Declaration there is no longer a requirement for rules alignment with the EU. Rules on competition and State aids are replaced by a commitment to not distort trade and the new aim is for “trade as

frictionless as possible”. All these rebalance the trade negotiations to the benefit and freedom of the UK.

* Finally on the potentially dangerous arrangements for the UK’s involvement in European Defence and procurement there is a specific change whereby it is the UK’s decision whether to partake in any European defence operations.

But our future is in the hands of the parliament elected on 12th December 2019.

There are still great problems with this agreement – on the amount payable to the EU (although much of that refers simply to our delayed departure) the continued powers of the European Court, the rights of EU citizens in the UK for years to come (although a strong UK Government can ensure these must be reciprocated for UK citizens in Europe) and potential

damaging laws in the transition period.

But the most insightful legal analyst of this EU UK crisis over many years, Martin Howe QC, believes that the urgency of our departure is so great that it must be done and the above constitute “*a cheque the British people must pay for the negligence of Theresa May*”.

It is indeed payment for decades of betrayal by the British political class and we must be thankful that we at last have a nation, a people and a Government dedicated to putting our constitution, parliament, democracy, free trade and freedom above all else.

But only a Government with a substantial majority can see this through. Only a Parliament with fewer Labour and Liberal Democrat saboteurs can see our constitution and democracy restored.

Source www.freenations.net

EU plans for further expansion

While the UK is leaving the EU empire, its leaders are still attempting to grow it in size, even though the financial liabilities will also increase. With the loss of UK finances it could well prove its downfall.

A little reported statement by President Tusk but now being circulated within the eurosceptic media will cause alarm but not surprise regarding the intentions of the EU elite.

In a visit to the capital of Albania the former President of the EU Council Donald Tusk announced that:

“There will be no stable and safe Europe without the integration of all

the Balkans in the EU.”

This should not be surprising to those who heard a former statement by Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of EU Commission (the de facto Foreign and Defence Secretary):

“The big loser of the game that currently is being played will be the UK.”

“When we talk about the future of the EU, we have to take into consideration that countries especially in the Western Balkans will eventually become members of the European Union so we will be more than 27. The power of attraction of the EU is still

extremely strong.”

There are six Western Balkans countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo (still not recognised by the UN and many countries around the world), Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia.

Should this idea take root then the EU will lose \$2.72 TRILLION dollars of GDP per year, after the UK leaves along with a 50 million drop in its total population.

We should not forget that the EU Council is the EU’s highest decision-making body.

Perks of being an ex-EU President

According to an EU commission spokeswoman, the outgoing EU Commission president Jean-Claude Juncker will have access to some of the executive’s resources for five years

after leaving office. Juncker can have an office provided by the commission, access to non-confidential information, such as figures and latest policy developments, and press articles.

Juncker will also have access to a commission driver if he is called to perform as former commission chief.

[Sounds like a good life paid for by the very generous taxpayers.]

European intelligence gathering

The EU is pushing ahead with intelligence monitoring in its drive for closer integration by using the newer high speed technologies now available.

Increasingly the use of biometric data and facial recognition is being used to spy upon the public without ever requesting their consent and in so doing removing their democratic rights.

Throughout the EU new powers are being sought and introduced thus allowing intelligence gathering to be granted even further intrusive surveillance abilities. Added to this is the push for the use of digital services to be forced upon the general public. Thus allowing greater collection of personal information by the back door.

A recent documented case is the use of facial recognition software, by the city of Nice, one of many trial locations in Europe, used to identify people at large gatherings

The increasing use of this data leaves large unanswered questions, not just the legality issue but who is responsible for any incorrectly included data and the effects that could have upon the lives of the people affected by it. A lot of this data is collected by the Counter Terrorism Group's operative platform in The Hague where 30 different intelligence

services submit data to a giant database.

Furthermore, the use of the EU free-travel Schengen Zone means that its security system stores the fingerprints and facial images along with other personal details about all those who make use of it. This data is freely available to a great number of EU officials as well as the joint police agencies like Europol and Interpol.

According to an article in the *euobserver* by Thorsten Wetzling:

"In the European Commission, more than €1bn are earmarked for these and other massive 'interoperability' projects until 2027.

By rendering vast amounts of personal data even more accessible for law enforcement, border, and intelligence agencies across jurisdictions, Europe further erodes already waned demarcation lines between operational agencies and those that are collecting information about potential threats.

This is a worrying development. In some instances, notably Austria and Latvia, police and intelligence functions are already performed by a single agency. Granting inter-jurisdictional access and pushing for greater interoperability will do away with important firewalls that history

has wisely dictated in some countries.

Currently, our open societies - the ones that are meant to benefit from this development - have far too little information, let alone say, on this agenda. Moreover, our oversight and data protection bodies have yet to catch up on the technological revolution.

Their audit and review mechanisms, for example, are everything but fully synced, automated, and comprehensive. This invites abuse and does little to close ever-growing accountability gaps.

If we want to protect fundamental rights and align European surveillance practices with our democratic principles, we need to start a meaningful public dialogue about the momentous changes that are taking place.

With the stakes being so high and the potential for mutual learning so great, it is striking that people in the agencies and oversight bodies, government, civil society, business, and academia rarely engage in regular, open, and inclusive conversation on these matters.

Given the complexity of security policy in a rapidly changing world, it may seem preferable to bury our heads in the sand and let the ones inside the ring of secrecy run the show."

Facial recognition

Following the above article it is good to see that at least one European agency is alive to the implications and threats of living under a surveillance system, but will anything change?

A new report published on the 27th

November, warns EU institutions and member states over new facial recognition technologies, saying collecting facial images of individuals without their consent or chance to refuse "can have a negative impact on people's dignity".

The report from the European Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) points out that the risk of errors and data leakages raises fundamental rights concerns related to privacy, human dignity, personal data protection or non-discrimination.

EU needs military power

Despite denials to UK citizens by our politicians regarding EU military ambitions, others are more honest.

Is this the real future direction for the EU as the former prime minister of

Italy and MEP Silvio Berlusconi said in November 2019, that Europe needs to become a global military power "to have a seat at the table where decision are made" with America and China. "We also need military capacity to

defend ourselves in case of a massive invasion phenomenon," Berlusconi added, saying his party will return to government soon as the current Italian government is "unprepared, unqualified and inexperienced".

The key Brexit issues in 2020

Open Europe article 8th November 2019

Dominic Walsh

After the result of the UK election is known the attention is turning to the key Brexit decisions that will need to be made after the results come in.

“...In particular, a Conservative Government that ratifies the Withdrawal Agreement will quickly need to decide whether it will need an extension to the transition period – which has been eaten into by the successive extensions to Article 50. The transition is due to end in December 2020, with the option to extend it by up to two years. If that option is not taken, the UK and the EU will have just 11 months to negotiate the future relationship.

This week, ministers Michael Gove and Liz Truss appeared to rule out extending the transition, arguing that it would not be needed. Whether this commitment will stand in the next phase remains to be seen, especially as 11 months is unlikely to be long enough to negotiate anything other than a very basic trade agreement with the EU. That is not to say the negotiations will take as long as previous EU FTAs, which have often taken over five years. The unique importance of the UK-EU relationship and the pressure of multiple deadlines are likely to add a sense of urgency that will hurry the process along. Nevertheless, this only goes so far. As well as the negotiations themselves, both sides will need to agree internally on negotiation mandates before talks begin, and will also need to ratify and implement the deal – all of which will take time.

Any transition extension would require the UK to make a financial contribution to the EU budget, though the amount would be subject to negotiation. The cost of the original transition is the same as the UK’s net budget contributions as an EU member – around £8-10bn a year. However, the cost of an extended transition could

well be lower. For example, the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) will not apply to the UK after 2020 even if the transition is extended. The cost of CAP ought, therefore, to be subtracted from any UK contribution for 2021 and 2022 – reducing the net annual figure by around £2bn.

If the transition is not extended and an FTA is not in place by December 2020, the default is that the UK would fall back onto trading with the EU on World Trade Organisation terms from January 2021. However, this would not be the same as a 2019 ‘No Deal’ Brexit. Although the long-term consequences for trade between the EU and Great Britain would largely be the same (albeit with an extra year to prepare), the Northern Ireland Protocol would remain in place, as would provisions to protect citizens’ rights. The financial settlement or ‘divorce bill’ would also not be in doubt – indeed, much of it would already have been paid by this point. More broadly, the political atmosphere between the UK and the EU might be less acrimonious – potentially making sectoral deals on issues like aviation and data more feasible than in a ‘No Withdrawal Agreement’ scenario.

While 2020 under the Conservatives would be dominated by future relationship talks and the question of transition extension, a Labour-led Government would face a different set of issues. They would seek to extend Article 50 for at least six months, renegotiate the Brexit deal with the EU, and then put it to a referendum against Remain.

Labour’s deal would likely keep most of the Withdrawal Agreement intact, though they might seek to return to the backstop negotiated by Theresa May and would also need to adjust the dates of the transition period (which in turn has implications for the financial settlement). They would also look to rework the Political Declaration to

commit to a customs union and “alignment” with the single market. Though there are potential flashpoints on state aid and what exactly “alignment” means, Labour’s deal is largely negotiable from an EU policy perspective. The problem is political, as this deal would be negotiated by a party that largely supports Remain and then pitted against Remain in a referendum. Such a referendum may have little political legitimacy with Leave voters, especially if Labour’s deal is seen as Remain in all but name.

Whoever wins this election, Brexit will not be “done” any time soon; the UK will simply move to the next phase, whether that is negotiating the future relationship or preparing for a further referendum.”

Further notes:

* The incoming President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen, has WRITTEN to Prime Minister Boris Johnson asking him to propose a candidate for the UK’s EU Commissioner “rapidly, in the shortest possible time.” The appointment of a UK Commissioner would allow the Commissioner and von der Leyen to take office on 1st December, though the Commissioner would then have to stand down on the 31st January unless another extension was agreed.

* The President of France, Emmanuel Macron, has SAID that Europe is “currently experiencing... the brain death of NATO.” In an interview with the *Economist*, Macron said, “I’d argue that we should reassess the reality of what NATO is in the light of the commitment of the United States.” The German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, said that Macron “used drastic words – that is not my view of co-operation in NATO.”

Source: openeurope.org.uk

The EU no one voted for

Article continued from eurofacts Vol 25 No 3 dated 18th November 2019

European Central Bank now an institution of the Union. Provisions for QMV in Council; Declaration that EU Law has *primacy* over that of Member States; symbols of the Union acknowledged by 16 states. And still no one voted.

Despite the magnitude of the changes introduced, a number of UK redlines & the Treaty being almost a mirror image of the failed Constitution, the text was agreed by Heads of State, including Gordon Brown, in less than 3 months. A miracle in EU terms.

The next step was to ratify the Treaty. In 2004 Tony Blair offered a UK referendum on the Constitution. Despite Lisbon being almost a carbon copy of the failed Constitution, Gordon Brown reneged on Labour's election promise to hold one.

A High Court case was brought. The court agreed with the Government in its assertion the referendum was only promised on the Constitution and Lisbon was only a treaty. A further appeal also failed. Still no one had voted.

All references to the Constitution were removed in the Treaty to make it look like it had been abandoned. Member States who had previously rejected the Constitution via referendum also decided to not have another one. France and Holland signed up this time.

As is now the norm Ireland had a referendum on the Treaty. As is now the norm the Irish rejected the Treaty (No 53.2% turn out 53.1%). As is now the norm the Irish were forced to vote again. Irish Government concluded voters had a lack of knowledge. Ring a bell?

So as is the norm Ireland voted again and this time said (Yes 67.1% turn out 59%) but also secured guarantees on abortion, taxation and military neutrality. Perhaps it wasn't lack of knowledge after all. Power to the people.

In fairness to the EU not everything in Lisbon is bad. The Treaty introduced

Article 50 which defines voluntary withdrawal from the EU of a Member State. 17.4 million of us voted to trigger it in 2016!

No one voted for the introduction of the Euro as single currency of the Union. Maastricht obliged Member States to replace their currency with the €. Of 12 Member States at that time 3 had a referendum, UK and Denmark opted out meaning the other 7 replaced their currency without asking.

No one voted to abolish the Purchase Tax and replace it with VAT. This was a condition of our entry into the EEC and was achieved via the 1972 Accession Treaty and the 1972 Finance Bill which no one voted for.

The Purchase Tax was introduced as a 'luxury tax' during WWII and applied to items like jewellery, china, porcelain, fur, silk, lace, cosmetics etc. VAT was applied to a much broader range of items & also businesses and services including many essentials.

Examples: clothes & footwear; electrical goods; fruit juice; prams; fuels; water; sweets; alcohol; CDs & DVDs; nuts... VAT is an indirect tax and is now the 3rd largest source of government revenue.

We are subject to EU law whereby the standard rate of VAT *cannot* be lower than 15%. Also the EU Council must approve any temporary reduction in the public interest. Even though no one voted for it we pay over €3.6bn in VAT to the EU every year.

In 1975 Referendum pamphlet, Government used as justification for Remain that Britain had a new deal which would see us receive £125m back from EU funds without mentioning what we would pay. Between 2010-16 our *net* contribution was €80bn. No-one voted for that.

The Government also said we "would not have to put VAT on necessities like food" But it didn't say what it would be put on. "We have also maintained our freedom to pursue our own policies in taxation..."

No one voted to hand over control of our fishing grounds to the EEC. Council regulation 2141/70 was drawn up by the original 6 members just hours before applications to join were received from the UK, Ireland, Norway and Denmark in 1970.

This ensured the issue became part of the negotiations on the Accession Treaty in 1972. The UK first refused to accept the rules but gave way and signed the Accession Treaty anyway. Norway refused and therefore did not join the Community at all.

No one voted for the Common Fisheries Policy which sets quotas for Member States. Quotas are based on 1970s hauls and as Britain fished extensively outside EU waters up to 1976, arguably our quota is lower than it should be.

No one voted to allow policy and decision making to be shared with the EU. It is estimated Britain provides 13% of the water in the EU but is only allowed to catch 30% of the fish in that water. Norway's total quota is 2.5 times larger despite being non-EU.

When the UK joined the EEC in 1973 we had 36/198 seats in what is now the EU Parliament. That's 18.18% of the vote and the same as Germany.

Due to the multiple Accession Treaties, which no one voted for, the UK's vote has been reduced to 76/751 seats or 9.72%. That's a reduction in voting power of 47%.

Over the same period Germany's vote has been reduced to 96/751 seats or 12.78%. That's a reduction of voting power of only 30%. And no-one voted.

The UK is 2nd highest net contributor to EU budget with 3rd most voting power. Poland is 2nd highest net *recipient* with 5th most voting power. Spain is 3rd highest net *recipient* with 4th most voting power. EU fairness in action.

No one voted for a system of Proportional Representation to be used to elect our MEPs.... (note AV was rejected in a UK-wide referendum in 2011).....

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: euofacts@junepress.com

Voting age

Dear Sir,

We are being told that the voting age will soon be lowered to 16 if many politicians especially Labour ones get there way.

However, this has not been thought through properly, already we can see that currently 18-year olds in the main support the Labour party due to the implications that they will receive a free university education.

This is not actually the case;

Firstly, the cost will be born by the younger voters as they join the workforce, because what is described as free, has to be paid for eventually by taxation or other stealth taxes.

Secondly, the loss of sufficient finance for universities will lead to a drain of the better tutors as they find that industry is better paid than staying and teaching the next generation. Result could well be that we have less well educated pupils.

The most serious side of this is that school teachers have always been seen to have left-wing tendencies, and as night follows day they encourage students down that same track. This is good for the Labour party but not necessarily for the country at large.

It follows therefore, that the teaching profession will in future need to be politically balanced in order to give better advice for students. Teachers will need to be vetted as to their political allegiances before they can enter classrooms. Many will consider this an infringement of their rights.

Schools will also need to give space for outside political organisation to have access to students in order for students to be in a position to understand fully and unbiased the position of each political party.

We can already see that once students come out of the educational sector and into the real world of employment they become more

politically aware as to what and how voting really affects their lives and those around them.

When leaving education most are Labour supporters but as they get older and better informed they change.

For proof of this we only have to look at the actual reality of elections where in the main the country is split almost equally between left and right, in other words the left-wing lose voters as they become better informed by world events.

DAVID TURNER
Swindon

Free speech

Dear Sir,

Chief Magistrate Emma Arbuthnot at Westminster Magistrates Court, ruled on Anna Soubry's case against English Democrat prospective candidate Amy Dalla Mura, for speaking the truth about Anna Soubry being a Traitor under Constitutional Treason Law 1351 "for adhering to the King's (Queen's) enemies in His (Her) Realm" and ignoring the instructions of her bosses, the Sovereign People of Britain, whose sovereignty is held in trust by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

She banned English Democrat Amy from the constituency of Broxtowe where she is standing as a candidate, all because she voiced a political view.

This is a worrying development for those who believe in debate, democracy and free speech.

It potentially sets a dangerous precedent.

When anger at MPs can be refashioned as harassment, the right to protest itself is called into question.

When judges can instruct candidates in an election to stay away from the constituency they are contesting, the independence of the political sphere is called into question.

We know that Anna Soubry does not believe in democracy as evidenced by

her actions, and the rest of us will feel alarmed by the seriously anti-democratic and illiberal consequences that this verdict could have.

Have the Judiciary abused their power and set themselves above, and against the Queen and the sovereign people of this country, thereby "compassing and imagining the death of the Queen" (also Treason Act 1351) a major crime?

MRS JANE BIRKBY
UK

UK election

Dear Sir,

At the time of writing, the result of the UK election is unknown. However, one thing appears to be certain, and that is unless the Conservative government wins a majority of the seats on offer then the UK will never leave the EU.

We have already seen the Labour party playing games with the idea of pretending to care about the public vote of 2016 while actually seeking ways of ignoring it.

The others in the main (excluding the smaller Brexit party and UKIP) have made it clear that they will remain inside the EU regardless of the cost to the UK taxpayers and democracy itself.

Having been a Labour supporter all my life like my family before I cannot believe the arrogance the party is now showing. The idea that the country can afford to give so much to all is the greatest con trick of all.

Anyone who believes in such trickery are truly blinkered and will be shocked should Labour get into power, all taxpayers mainly the poorer will be forced to replenish the funds.

The idea that only top-taxpayers or industry will pay, just means there will be fewer jobs and greater unemployment as the rich and industry move outside the UK and the EU.

RICHARD ROBERTS
Reading

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: euofacts@junepress.com

A Brexiteer's poem

I'm- a Brexiteer, and I'm very clear
that-I'd-made, the right decision
But -not, to leave, on hallows eve,
we've lost all that remission!
For-to-wait, and wait, as-a vassal,
state, there-is, no rhyme, nor reason
Edward Heath, lied through his teeth,
that's tantamount to *treason?*

In seventy-two, he took us through,
a process of surrender
Surrender of our sovereign powers,
viz: It *their*-country, now, not *ours*
But Winston Churchill,
please remember, said this country'l
ner surrender
So -let's, take-back, *our* rightful
powers, and, push *them* off,
their iv'ry towers

See-the-young, 'intelligensia',
and-the-ones-with, 'ego-mentia'
Waving Europe's flag so proudly,
shouting insults, oh so loudly
At-those, who-wave, the Union Jack,
and yearn, to get, *their* country back
I know, which ones, are patriotic,
and-those, who-are, just idi-otic

Jo Swinson, she's, a Liberal-Dem,
and vows, she'll-be, our next PM
She's been taught, from early age,
that Franco/German's, all the rage
Her ego's greater than the Blair's, for
Britain, she, no longer cares
Let voters show, her what's amis, and
save us from that dark abiss

December 12th is polling day, that's
when, the people, have, *their* say
But if, Jo deems, results perverse,
she will-try, to seek, reverse!
Lib-Dems, Labour, SNP,
rebel Tories, don't you see?
All want, to thwart,

the peoples choice,
fellow Brits, *we have no voice!*

Oh for, a way, to have-our say,
and make, our voices heard
Its not beyond the wit of man,
on that, you may have my word
We need some laws, to make them
pause, when ere they go astray

To-send, them packing, lies and all,
and send them on *their* way

Who do you think you are kidding
Mr Junckers, if you think old
Englands done?

ALAN HEYWOOD
Surrey

Posting to the EU

Dear Sir,
This little snippet is not widely known
yet BUT, if you have **any mail going
to Europe**, be it cards, letters or
parcels, **the Post Office is refusing to
sell European stamps**, they no longer
exist and you cannot as you once
could, use UK internal stamps for that
purpose!

**Every single item for Europe must
now be individually weighed and
label-stamped by P.O. staff!**
You need little imagination to see the
shuffling queues forming and some
will just not bother. If you'd not
realised yet, our inter-personal
communication is under attack too!

JOHN SEARS
Essex

Corbyn's Britain

Dear Sir,
I have just finished reading the book
"Corbyn's Britain" that I purchased

from the June Press, and I firmly
believe it should be compulsory
reading for all those young voters who
have never lived under a Labour
government.

The book light hearted in some ways
but truly thought provoking in others
reminds the people of the UK just what
a mess the Labour government created
in the past and clearly aim to return to
in the future.

The power of the Union's over the
direction of the Labour party has and
will always be of great concern to all
those who wish to live in a stable
democratic country.

SAMANTHA DAVIS
Coventry

{Corbyn's Britain £13.99
plus 10% p&p see rear page}

Memorial

Dear Sir,
Having been attending the Campaign
for an Independent Britain (CIB)
meetings for many years I was
saddened to here of the death of
Donald Martin who died on the 22nd
October 2019, after a long fight with
Parkinson's disease.

Donald was chairman of the CIB
2013/13 and along with his wife Jane
was a long-term devoted supporter of
an Independent Britain and had seen
the dangers in the European project
from 1956 (a year before the Treaty of
Rome).

He was described by the CIB as one
of those remarkable people who saw
the dangers for our country and the
Commonwealth inherent in the
European project from its very early
days from the vantage point of
Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

DAVID TURNER
London

*euofacts wishes its readers the compliments of the season.
Our next issue will be published on the 7th February 2020.*

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **9th January**, 6.00 pm

“Culture, Creativity and the Culture Mile”

The Lord Mayor of London

Highlights the significant social and economic impact of culture on the City of London and the UK

PUBLIC MEETING
Old Library, Guildhall, London SW1
Admission Free
Ticket Required

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **14th January**, 6.00 pm

“Ending Our Consumer Addiction”

Jacqueline McGlade, *Jackson Professor of the Environment*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **20th January**, 6.00 pm

“George IV: Radical or Reactionary?”

Dr Stella Tillyard, *Birkbeck College, University of London*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **22nd January**, 6.00 pm

“Public Speaking Without Fear”

Alex Edmans, *Mercer’s School Memorial Professor of Business*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **30th January**, 6.00 pm

“Can the Law Keep Up With Changes In Society?”

Jo Delahunty, *Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

FREE
Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of the UK-EU relationship.

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175
or
Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Government **13th December**
recess ends

UK Government **To be announced**
Christmas recess
Dates

2020

Croatia takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

At the time of going to press!
Current Official date **31st January**
for completion of
Article 50 negotiations
between the UK and the EU
and start of a possible ‘Transition Deal’ due to end in December 2020

Germany takes over **1st July**
Council Presidency

Possible Current date **31st December**
for completion of
EU/UK Transition Deal

2021

Portugal takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Party

www.thebrexitparty.org

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

British Future

www.britishfuture.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaonline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk

Change Britain

www.changebritain.org

Concordance

www.concordanceout.eu

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Futurus

www.futurus-thinktank.com

Get Britain Out

www.getbritainout.org

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.co.uk

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

GrassRootsOut

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.eurosafeguards.com

Leave means leave

www.leavemeansleave.eu

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Save Britain’s Fish

www.ffl.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The Taxpayers’ Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Special Offers

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the Death of Local Government
by *Lindsay Jenkins*.

£14.99 - Pbk 2005 - 215 pp.

Following on from her successful books "Britain Held Hostage" and "The Last Days of Britain" this book contains even more damaging information of the threat of ever-closer union with the EU.

(NOW ONLY £9)

'Europe' doesn't Work

A discussion of the 3-million-jobs-at-risk lie and related misconceptions
by *Tim Congdon*.

£5.00 - Pamphlet 2013 - 32 pp

Why jobs and economic prosperity does not require membership of the EU.

(NOW ONLY £3)

Time for the UK to Face the Facts

What the politicians do not want to admit! And they do not tell
by *Christopher Hoskin*.

£7.99 - Pbk 2013 - 109 pp

How our politicians through our membership of the EU have adversely affected British Industry and failed to support those who elected them.

(NOW ONLY £5)

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK only)

Seizing the moment

by *John Ashworth*. **£4.00**

The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200nm/midline resources zone.

The Tribe

The Liberal-Left and the System of Diversity

by *Ben Cobby*. **£14.95**

How and why the progressive liberal-left, now dominates our public life, has taken on the politics of race, gender, etc. as a key part of its own group identity.

The Democratic Imperative

by *Robert Corfe*. **£12.99**

Why democracy is only possible in a nation state.

A Doomed Marriage

Why Britain Should Leave the EU
by *Daniel Hannan*. **£8.99**

Without EU membership, the UK can become the most successful nation.

The Betrayal of British Industry

by *J. Brian Heywood*. **£3.00**

How government has failed to protect the UK industrial sector from foreign companies, putting at risk the long-term economic prosperity of the UK.

Tel: 08456 120 175

Costly Affairs In British Foreign Policy

The advantages of foresight
by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£3.00**

Why you do not need to go to war or take hostile action against any country whose regime you dislike

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union

by *Bob Lyddon*. **£8.00**

How the UK's exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and maybe more.

Corbyn's Britain

Land of the Superwoke:

A Travel Guide to Corbyn's Britain
by *Lee Rotherham*. **£13.99**

With a foreword by Jacob Rees-Mogg MP, a glimpse into the past and possible future of a Hard Left Government.

Two Midshipmen at Gallipoli

by *Hugh Williams*. **£10.00**

Letters and memoirs of those who led the assault on W. Beach in 1915.

**UK PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
Send payment to**

**JUNE PRESS LTD, PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Email: info@junepress.com

www.junepress.com

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£30
Europe (Airmail)	£42/€50
Rest of World	£55/\$95
Reduced rate (UK only)	£20

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *eurofacts* and the occasional papers.

I enclose my annual payment of £.....
to *eurofacts*: **PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA**

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020 7973 1992
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	020 7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	01738 783936
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	www.conservativesforbritain.org
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

British Future	www.britishfuture.org
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	www.globalbritain.org
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Brexit Party	www.thebrexitparty.org
Nigel Farage MEP	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Boris Johnson MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Jonathan Bartley and Sian Berry	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Jo Swinson MP	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Richard Braine	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006