



The Euro Realist Bulletin

An occasional bulleting
campaigning for an EU free Britain &
Parliamentary sovereignty

Edition 32

DECEMBER 2016

*Wishing all Euro
Realist readers a
very happy Christmas*



Freedom TODAY

**THE MAGAZINE OF THE
FREEDOM ASSOCIATION**

**For membership (cost £30 per annum)
which includes copies of Freedom Today.**

**Contact: The Freedom Association,
Richwood House, 1 Trinity School Lane,
Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL52 2JL**

Tel: 0845 8339626

For page 2 scroll down

THE FORGOTTEN PEOPLE

BY COLIN BULLEN

As long ago as May 1942 Robert Menzies, a man who was Prime Minister of Australia many times, spoke of the *Forgotten People*, by which he meant the middle class, but his definition of them now applies to the bulk of the British people who, for many years, have been similarly ignored by the politicians. Menzies called these forgotten people the backbone of the country and his words could have been written to describe contemporary Britain.



Colin Bullen: the silent majority.

Of the elite:

"I exclude at one end of the scale the rich and powerful: those who control great funds and enterprises, and are as a rule able to protect themselves - though it must be said that in a political sense they have as a rule shown neither comprehension nor competence. But I exclude them because, in most material difficulties, the rich can look after themselves".

Of those forgotten:

"They are for the most part unorganised and unself-conscious. They are not rich enough to have individual power. They are taken for granted by each political party in turn. They are not sufficiently lacking in individualism to be organised for what in these days we call 'pressure politics'."

Could there be a better description of those who have been treated with such contempt by our politicians for decades? These are the people who Calvin Coolidge in 1920 and, more famously, Richard Nixon in November 1969, called the 'Silent Majority', by which was meant the large group of people in a country who do not express their opinions publicly, who do not participate in public discourse, and are overshadowed in the media by the more vocal minority.

Undoubtedly it was those such as they that G K Chesterton had in mind when, in 1907, he wrote 'The Secret People', with its famous final lines *"But we are the people of England; and we have not spoken yet. Smile at us, pay us, pass us. But do not quite forget"*. It has been pointed out that Chesterton loved the nation but loathed the state, particularly states that were heavily centralised, and run for the benefit of elites. Of

this the British state in his time was a prime example and the EU is one such in ours.

On the 23rd June 2016 the British people did speak and made it clear that they had had enough of the EU and all its works. The new Prime Minister promised that the decision would be respected, and that it would now be implemented, yet those of us who have always recognized the nature of the enemy know that there's many a slip 'twixt the cup and the lip".

We see an oligarchy in Westminster where so many in parliament move from student politics to become political assistants, then political advisors, before receiving their reward as MPs or MEPs, without ever working in the real world inhabited by those they claim to represent. In this they have much more in common with their fellow continental politicians than they do with the ordinary British voter. The truth is that the professional politicians can no more be trusted to vote to implement Brexit than turkeys could be expected to vote for Christmas. If we free ourselves from the EU then they will no longer be able to look forward to the culmination of their careers being a very well paid sinecure in the European parliament, or its overweening bureaucracy, while, in their time as MPs, they would not be able to hide behind the excuse that they cannot do what their constituents wish, as the executive competence has passed to Brussels. No sooner had the result of the referendum become clear than we were immediately confronted with the fact that the clearly expressed desire of the people may yet be negated by the manoeuvrings of those supposedly representing them, but who will put their self interest first, and now we have the proof.

The decision taken by three High Court judges regarding Brexit confirms what has been obvious for years: that there are those, in the judiciary and parliament, who are committed to further the ambitions of those who rule the EU, and who are determined to suppress the free will of the British people. Despite their mendacious claims to support democracy Europhiles will be rejoicing at such a blatant attempt to undermine

Continued on page 4.....

For page 3 scroll down

The Forgotten people continued:

the result of the referendum, so for all those who voted to take back our nation from the control of unelected bureaucrats in Brussels the choice is now clear.

Either we tamely accept that our wishes are as nothing compared to those of the privileged, liberal elite or we decide to oppose them all the way. Although taking part in protest marches may not be to everyone's taste we can make clear to those who purport to represent us that we demand that they respect the decision taken by the electorate. Should a general election be called then only those who openly declare their support for a clean break with the EU should be supported, as this issue is of greater importance for our future than almost any other.

Those applauding the decision in the High Court concerning article 50 reveal themselves to be arrant hypocrites. For four decades they have supported the transfer of power from Westminster to Brussels, resulting in hundreds of directives and regulations becoming law in this country, without even a cursory scrutiny by our elected representatives in the Commons. Now they claim to be concerned for the sovereignty of parliament, when in fact they are aware that there is a majority of MPs determined to frustrate the will of the people, for their own selfish ends, but in a way which will suit the rich elitists bringing the case. Even worse we now see such people crying crocodile tears over a supposed insult to the independence of the judiciary, perhaps valid were judges omniscient, olympian figures whose decisions could be trusted to be untainted by bias, the reality being that, of the three involved, one was associated with a pro EU legal group, while another is known to be a friend of Tony Blair, the latter a man who would do anything to keep us in the EU.

As usual the BBC leapt right in supporting the elite. On the Marr show the rich fund manager leading this anti democratic campaign, Gina Miller, was, as one might expect, given time to spout her nonsense, following her previous arrogant statement that she felt sorry for those who had been 'deceived into voting to leave' by saying that listening to the will of the people was behaving like a "Tin Pot dictatorship", while

one of those reviewing the papers on Broadcasting House said that we should stay in the EU and negotiate reforms, ignoring the fact that the Europhile Cameron had been unable to achieve anything worthwhile when he tried.

We face a constitutional crisis of more significance than any in living memory as the elite seek to once again treat the decent, patriotic majority as the forgotten people. We should be clear that Article 50 was designed by the rulers of the EU to prevent a country leaving, a trick similar to that attempted by the dying USSR in relation to the Baltic states, who solved the problem by ignoring the legalistic deceit and declaring themselves independent at once. We should emulate their brave action and go now.

Even if the Europhiles in parliament are driven back there will be long and difficult negotiations before we are free, but that is a small price to pay for the preservation of our democracy. After all, last time we had to fight a world war to do the same.

.....
Those applauding the decision in the High Court concerning article 50 reveal themselves to be arrant hypocrites.

A SECOND GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

BY JOHN PETLEY

It was a time when scientific knowledge was advancing; a rumbustious, turbulent period of increasing prosperity, but also of growing scepticism. It was also a time when many were concerned about the degree of influence exercised by adherents and supporters of a religion widely regarded as inimical to our country's interests. Meanwhile, members of the judiciary, in this instance, the Lord Chief Justice and his associates, were widely believed to be exceeding their powers. Into this heady mix, quite suddenly, came a crisis caused by the departure of a political leader, throwing the country into a constitutional crisis which took several months to resolve. Yet in due course the country was to emerge stronger and freer, upsets in Scotland and Northern Ireland notwithstanding.

Brexit Britain and predictions for the future? No; this was 1688, the year when King James II's disastrous three-year reign was brought to an abrupt end with his flight into exile in France. However, the parallels with the current state of affairs are quite striking.

Like June 23rd 2016, the landing of William of Orange at Brixham on 5th November 1688 followed by James's hasty departure marked a point after which the country would never be the same again. Time was ripe for change as the prevailing ideology which determined the way we were ruled had become obsolete. It wasn't working for people at all levels of society As with post-Brexit Britain, the issue was accountability.

James's grandfather, King James I, was an ardent believer in the Divine Right of Kings – in other words, the monarch is responsible to God and God alone. In 1649, this belief was to cost his son, Charles I, his head. Charles' younger son may not have stated the doctrine with the same conviction as his grandfather, but it was nonetheless James's authoritarian style, disregarding any democratic process that stood in his way, that led to mounting opposition across the land. The birth of a son by his Roman Catholic queen, Mary of Modena, in the summer of 1688 was the straw that broke the camel's back. William, his Protestant son-in-law, was invited to reign in his stead and before long, James was gone.

Fast forward to 2016 and the issue of accountability has returned with a vengeance. This time, it is not the monarchy which has been the focus of popular discontent but a self-selecting and self-serving élite. This élite does not just include politicians. The attacks by the media on the three judges who gave the High Court ruling insisting on Parliament's approval for triggering Article 50 on November 3rd were quite unprecedented. Whether it is the judges or the law itself which is at fault, there is a growing belief that the legal process has been compromised and can no longer be trusted to deliver justice for all.

We only have to look at the so-called "gay cake" ruling which took place less than ten days before the Brexit case to prove the point. Daniel McArthur, co-owner of Ashers Bakery, the company found guilty of discrimination, said after the verdict was announced that "If equality law means people can be punished for politely refusing to support other people's causes then equality law needs to change." An opinion poll conducted a few days earlier showed support for Mr McArthur's stance running at over 70%. When such a clear majority is saying in effect that "the law is an ass," something is seriously wrong.

Of course, disillusion with the system by which we are governed and its leading representatives is not a phenomenon peculiar to the UK. The extraordinary victory of Donald Trump in the US presidential election reminds us that similar sentiments can be found elsewhere. The "establishment" is finding itself on the back foot in many parts of the globe.

Shortly before the Trump victory, the MarketWatch website published a particularly nauseating article by the economist Anatole Kaletsky who was confident that the current global tide of anti-establishment sentiment will ebb away. He wrote that "*the Brexit vote will begin to look like an aberration – not the start of a powerful new trend..but the end of a backlash against modernity by an unstable alliance of social authoritarians and laissez faire market liberals. It will be the last gasp of an aging generation that tried to impose its nostalgic*

.....
As with post-Brexit Britain, the issue
was accountability.

For page 5 scroll down

parochialism on an increasingly cosmopolitan younger generation, but succeeded in only one unfortunate country.”

Perhaps the Trump victory may force Kaletsky and his ilk to wake up and smell the coffee. It isn't easy, however, for today's internationalist metropolitan elite to face reality. Such people regard anyone who does not share their opinions as gormless dinosaurs who, if they are ignored, will hopefully go away. This flies in the face of reality. More white college-educated men voted for Trump than for Clinton, just as over here, plenty of articulate, educated and not particularly geriatric voters supported Brexit. Speaking as one of them, it was not through any desire to return to a rose-tinted past but because I want to move our country forward. Obviously, leaving the EU will not achieve this goal by itself, but it creates the space for the renewal of our stagnant political system.

In this country, we have been pretty good at managing transition without bloody conflict. The deposition of James II, immortalised as the Glorious Revolution, proves the point. Within a matter of a couple of years, the Bill of Rights was passed, enshrining our freedoms in law, religious freedom was granted to Protestant dissenters and the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings was dead in the water. **Can we accomplish** peaceful change as successfully? – a second Glorious revolution? If so, we need to know what needs to be changed this time round and how to do it. The key issue, as in 1688, is accountability. It is not sufficient to give the political elite a kick in the teeth nor do we want authoritarianism or demagoguery. Rather, the checks and balances of our political system need a massive tweak to give us, the voters, greater

.....
It isn't easy, however, for today's internationalist metropolitan elite to face reality.
.....

control over the people we elect to represent us.

Changing the voting system to some form of proportional representation, the panacea beloved of the Lib Dems and some UKIP members, is an irrelevancy. You can still end up electing a tyrant under a PR system – ask voters in Russia or Zimbabwe! The failed Recall bill, which allows voters to force a by-election where an MP is found to have engaged in serious wrongdoing and having had a petition calling for a by-election signed by 10% of his or her constituents, is a better idea and needs to be resurrected.

However, if we are seeking best practise from elsewhere as a model for political renewal, one country stands out as a beacon of light – Switzerland. In that country, power is decentralised and elected representatives can be called to account by the voters through binding referendums. An MP committed to public service and the good of his or her constituents need fear nothing from a requirement for greater accountability. At the same time, however, giving extra power to the people clips the wings of ambitious tyrants. No one, except Tony Blair, it seems, ever wants to see another Tony Blair. Direct Democracy – in other words, referendums on Swiss lines, is the best way of avoiding such a calamity.

Of course, working out how to adapt the Swiss model for the UK will be a complex task, but it is good at least to have some broad outlines for the renewal of democracy in our country. Brexit has given us the greatest opportunity for beneficial change within living memory. We must not let this chance of engineering a second Glorious Revolution slip through our hands.

LEAVE IT!

BY PHILIP BOTTOMLEY

There has been a lot of talk about 'Hard 'Soft' Brexit', which creates confusion as to the terms of the UK leaving the EU and confusion as to who has a say on said terms. To me; and excuse me for being simplistic, but if I had joined a club forty years ago I would have first had to accept all of the rules of that club, agreed the annual fees and I would have acted in the best interests of that club. However, if said club had over the past ten years or so started to act in a manner that was not in my best interest I would have wrestled with my conscience and if I felt strongly enough about my mistreatment I would leave. In doing so I would have severed all relations with that club and would be free to join any other club or institution at my will.

The United Kingdom belonged to a club, a trading club initially but, it soon became apparent that the Officials who ran the club wanted it to be so much more than just a trading bloc. Their indifference to club members and the largesse afforded to certain supporters of the club led to widespread unease and distrust in the management of the club.

Fearing for his position as Prime Minister and also for his chances of winning a General Election, David Cameron gave the British people a referendum on the issue of membership of the EU (club). The questions were simple; 'Do you want to remain in the EU?' "Do you want to Leave the EU?"

As I said, to me the outcome of both questions were quite simple to understand. If the country voted to stay, then it would have stayed as a member of the EU and accepted all rules and conditions associated with being a member. On the other hand, had the country votes to leave the EU then it does so on the understanding that it severs all ties with the EU and must stand on its own in the world.



Philip Bottomley
revoke the ECA.

The British people chose the latter and did so by a one million plus majority. To argue that because the margin between the Leave vote and the Remain vote was only just above 3% and that sixteen million people wanted to stay in the EU, and this therefore gives these people a Right to have a say in the Terms of the UK's departure, is ludicrous!

Put simply, there are no '*terms of leaving*' what is to be discussed are Terms of trade. This is not as big a deal as the anti Democratic Establishment MPs make it out to be. To listen to them one would think that

the EU is the only trading bloc in the world and that we have made a drastic mistake in leaving it. This would only be partially true if that were the case.

We now have a fantastic opportunity to get back onto the world stage proper. Like a Mandela being released after forty years of false imprisonment. This is the UKs "*Rainbow Moment*"! Taking the analogy one step further, it does mean that before the rainbow we will have to weather the storm. So far we have been able to do so despite the whinging and whining from the undemocratic establishment figures who can see no further than their bloated egos.

We do not need to debate our terms of leaving, we do not need to debate what '*model*' we adopt. What we do need to do is to get on with it and start the formal process. You cannot leave a club cleanly if the club management do not know of your intentions to do so.

It is time to invoke whatever needs to be invoked, repeal the 1972 European Communities Act, Scrap the Common Agricultural Policy along with the Common Fisheries Policy and lets get on with it. As they used to say in the old Wild West when starting a cattle drive. "Let's git, daylight's a wasting!"

HIGH COURT BREXIT CASE

BY EDWARD SPALTON



Edward Spalton: no man should be judge in his own cause.

People who have spent all their political lives undermining the sovereignty of this country and its Parliament are now appealing to the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty to delay and frustrate the exit of this country from the European Union. These are people who would echo the sentiments of Ken Clarke "I

look forward to the day when the Westminster Parliament is just a council chamber in Europe"

They have now been joined by senior judges, including Baron Thomas of Cwmgiedd, Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales. His Lordship is a founder member of the European Law Institute, an organisation set up for the "enhancement of European legal integration" – that is, the ever increasing subjection of our law to the laws of the European Union.

Surely he must be aware of the principle

Continued on page 7.....

For page 7 scroll down

High Court Brexit Case continued:

that no man should be judge in his own cause – “*nemo iudex in causa sua debet esse*”. Yet he ignored it when he decided to sit on this case. The maxim was firmly established in the case “*Frome United Breweries Co v Bath*”, in which the then Lord Chancellor made a decision favourable to a canal company whilst, unknown to the parties involved, he was a shareholder of the company. His decision was set aside. “*This will be a lesson to all...tribunals to take care, not only that in their decrees they are not influenced by their personal interests, but to avoid the appearance of labouring under such an influence.*” Perhaps this partiality in London is the reason for the High Court’s decision being opposite to that in Northern Ireland..

Even local authorities are more careful. I recall that a lady, who campaigned to preserve the old Derby bus station, became a councillor and was disqualified from voting on the matter because her campaign was ruled to be “an interest”.

Over decades, independence campaigners have approached the courts to oppose increased subjection to the EU. On each occasion, they were summarily rebuffed on the grounds that the EU treaties were matters of Royal Prerogative – beyond reach of the courts. There are even Europhiles who fantasise about this case going to the European Court of Justice.

It is an activist organisation, dedicated to promoting “ever closer union”. In case c-274/99 the Advocate General stated “*Criticism of the EU is akin to blasphemy and can be restricted without affecting freedom of speech*”.

It is unlikely that the case will go there because the relevant EU treaty specifies that countries invoking Article 50 to leave the EU do so “in accordance with their own constitutional requirements” – certainly not something which the judges just made up. Edward Spalton is the Chairman of the Campaign for an Independent Britain.

**JOIN**

Membership is £20 a year or £10 for OAPs
CIB, 3 Stamford Drive, Leicester, LE6 0YD.
admin@campaignforanindependentbritain.org

Web-site: www.eurosceptic.org.uk

THE JUNE PRESS BOOKS

Tel: 08456 120175

E-mail: info@junepress.com

How The UK Voted To Leave The EU

by Michael Mosbacher & Oliver Wiseman, £10.00. The story of how a once fringe idea, (leaving the EU) dismissed by many as a foolhardy leap in the dark, captured the imagination of the British people. This is an account not only of a few frantic months on the campaign trail but also of the battle of ideas and egos culminated in the UK voting Leave.

The Dark Side of European Integration by Dr Alina Polyakova, £22.99. Polyakova studies the rise of the far right in the EU, Europe and beyond. Concludes that member states may abandon the EU in the interest of national protection, or a new European identity will integrate Europe. This is the intended but still unrealised outcome of European integration.

Britain's Referendum Decision and its Effects by Stephen Bush, £8.99. Fact based and clearly written for now and the future, this book will help you to make an informed decision about EU membership.

The Road to Freedom by Gerard Batten MEP, £8.99. In this updated book, following the 2016 Brexit Referendum result, Batten with well argued points explains how Article 50 for leaving the EU is a trap and that joining the EFTA or the EEA will not give the UK true independence. He shows why the only true way to leave the EU is for parliament to repeal the European Economic Communities act 1972.

SEND PAYMENTS TO

THE JUNE PRESS LTD

PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon, TQ9 7WA.

Please add 10% P & P

TO CONTACT THE EURO REALIST BULLETIN

Send your e-mails to: eurorealistnl@aol.com
The Euro Realist is published by WAEC, write to: “WAEC, 53 Daisy Bank Crescent, Walsall, WS5 3BH.Tel: 01922 631970, or, 07813 153897

The Euro Realist Bulletin is sent out by e-mail only and is free to those who wish to receive it