



The Euro Realist Bulletin

An occasional bulleting

campaigning for an EU free Britain &

Parliamentary sovereignty

Edition 30

OCTOBER 2016

THE BREXIT BOOM

Despite the dire warnings of disaster and an economic meltdown made by the remainiacs in the run up to the June EU referendum, since the majority of voters made the wisest decision of their lives to quit the dying EU, a new confidence has emerged in Britain as the nation heads for a return to sovereignty and democracy.

The press is full of good news for the British economy, rather than other nations abandoning the UK, as the negative 'Remain' campaign warned, many are now beating a path to the UK's door to arrange trade deals. Nissan Renault are warning about tariffs when Britain leaves the EU, but this company has cried wolf too many times before and despite warnings if the UK did not surrender sterling for the collapsing euro it is still here and making a profit. On the 22nd September 2016 the Daily Telegraph reported British car manufacturers are enjoying an export boom

As Theresa May prepares a "Great Repeal Bill" to repeal the 1972 European Communities Act, the people of Britain can go forward to a new, free and democratic future outside the constraints of the EU. The Brexit boom has already begun as the nation and its businesses find a new found confidence in the UK.



JOIN THE BRUGES GROUP

214 Linen Hall, 162-168 Regent Street, London W1B

Tel: 020 7287 4414

E-mail: info@brugesgroup.com

BREXIT MEANS BREXIT

Speaking in a debate on the Government's statement about the G20 summit (07.09.16), the independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon has reminded the House of Lords that "Brexit means leave" and that the referendum vote was an instruction to the Government "to get on with it."

Lord Stoddart made his remarks after listening to a number of Peers making speeches spreading doom and gloom about Brexit and the state of play regarding the preparations for withdrawal. He added that the electorate "were asked whether they wished to remain or whether they wished to leave. They decided that they wanted to leave. That was an instruction to the Government to get on with it. The great disgrace is that the Government and the Civil Service had not prepared for either alternative. That, of course, is the problem we are facing now."

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

MIGRATION, RACISM & THE REFERENDUM

BY JOHN PETLEY

Leave voter = keen to restrict migration = racist. Of all the inaccuracies and misleading statements which blighted the referendum campaign, this has to be one of the worst. What is more, three months later it is still being peddled in some quarters. Early in September, BBC Radio 4 broadcast a programme called *Eastern Europeans in Brexitland* which included an interview with a Pole who described how one of his Polish friends walked down a street in the English town where they lived on June 24th looking at people and wondering, "Did you vote out? Did you vote out?" The implication was clear – "if you voted out, you voted against me. You are a racist."

Since June 23rd, a number of ugly racist incidents have taken place, notably the appalling murder of Arkadiusz Jozwik in Harlow which must be condemned in the strongest possible terms. Among the 17,410,742 voters who supported Brexit, there were unquestionably a small minority who are filled with hate for foreigners, but to suggest that these thugs made up the majority of leave voters is not only very wide of the mark, but utterly reprehensible.

For one thing, not all leave voters were necessarily opposed to immigration. This is particularly true in urban areas. Since the referendum, a new group has been formed called *Leavers for London* <http://leaversoflondon.weebly.com/> whose founder, Lucy Harris, says that Leave voters in the capital are being routinely denounced as "anti-immigration closet racists." She wishes to refute this. She supported Brexit because she felt that the EU was undemocratic and remaining a member would have ultimately resulted in restrictions to our freedoms. She personally claims to have "benefitted greatly" from EU migration. In a similar vein, Douglas Carswell, UKIP's sole MP, has also stated that he does not want Brexit to lead to lower levels of migration.

To complicate the issue still further, Theresa May, when home secretary, delivered a very forthright speech on the subject of immigration during last year's Conservative conference. She received praise from some quarters and considerable criticism from others for warning that, among other things, "when immigration is too high, when the pace of change is too fast, it's impossible to build a cohesive society." Some commentators expected her to support Brexit on the basis of this speech but instead, she supported remain, albeit not particularly strongly.

The Campaign for an Independent Britain took a very pragmatic view during the campaign. Believing that people concerned about immigration were most likely to have already decided to vote to leave, we focussed on other issues specifically to win round wavering voters for whom immigration was not their prime concern.

This set us at odds with some other campaigners, but we believe that we were vindicated by the result and the controversial UKIP "Breaking point" poster which actually depicted migrants in Slovenia may not have had the impact attributed to it. Anna Soubry, an ardent remainer said, "It was like we kind of made and won that argument, so then the vacuum appeared and then bang, in they came with their killer card, which was immigration and we refused to engage in it." She described meeting voters in those final weeks of the campaign who made it clear that they were voting to leave because of

the immigration issue, but had they only just made their minds up? I doubt it. Those of us on the campaign trail were noticing the tide beginning to shift in our direction well before the poster appeared. While immigration did crop up in the audience questions in some of the debates in which I participated, it wasn't even mentioned in others.

But immigration was unquestionably a big concern for many voters. Lord Ashcroft's polling suggests that it 33% of Brexit supporters cited it as their principal reason for wanting to leave the EU, second only to the sovereignty issue, which was the main concern of 49%. The reasons for 5 million voters feeling so strongly about immigration are varied, but Theresa May's reference to the problems in building a cohesive society when immigration levels are so high was a recognition that branding them all racists is simplistic and wrong. Many people may not hate foreigners but nevertheless live in areas suffering considerable problems due to the recent levels of migration, from both within and without the EU.

At this point, a brief historical overview may be of some help. Not having been successfully invaded since 1066, we managed to remain pretty ethnically homogeneous for a thousand years or so up to the late 1940s. Sociological studies suggest that such societies develop a level of trust which is most conducive to freedom, democracy and peace. A common culture, shared values and identity help bind a people together. This was certainly true in our country. The benign influence of our Common Law legal system and the growth of parliamentary democracy in the 17th and 18th centuries also played their part. In the words of the economist Roger Bootle, we "have learned to live together, and often to die together in common cause." Our country has "strong bonds of institutions, common feeling and shared experience." People who feel comfortable with each other are more likely to be willing to share their financial resources and even to make sacrifices for the common good.

This stability and cohesion enabled us successfully to absorb those immigrants who did arrive

Continued on page 3....

.....
For one thing, not all leave voters were necessarily opposed to immigration.

Migration continued: on our shores. Significantly, the largest immigrant community, the Huguenots, came here because they could identify more closely with our Protestant culture than the autocratic Roman Catholicism of Louis XIV’s France. There was some hostility towards this group of around 40,000-50,000 foreigners at first and they initially kept themselves separate. Later, however, the hostility subsided and they integrated, intermarrying with the indigenous population to the degree that Huguenot blood flows through some 25% of London’s population, along with a substantial number of who live elsewhere, including your author,

We welcomed further French refugees after the revolution of 1789 and provided sanctuary to other individuals and groups during the 19th century, including Karl Marx, who fell foul of the Prussian government and was later expelled from France for his revolutionary views and Russian Jews fleeing the pogroms. The 19th century also saw a trickle of European migrants, particularly from Germany and Italy, who came to set up enterprises in the more business-friendly environment of the UK.

All the same, until the Second World War, the UK population remained largely homogeneous, except in some larger cities and ports. Liverpool’s Chinese community dates back nearly 200 years and Yemeni sailors started to settle in Cardiff a few years later. Elsewhere, particularly in the countryside, you could live much of your life without much, if any, contact with immigrants.

Fast forward to 2016 and we are in a very different world and in some places, the change has taken place very rapidly. Eastern European migrants arrived in considerable numbers to work in rural areas and small market towns which, prior to 2004, were still largely ethnically homogeneous. We now also have areas in our big cities cut off from the rest of the population and showing no sign of wanting to integrate.

Furthermore, unlike the Huguenots who arrived over a limited period or the European entrepreneurs of the 19th century who were pretty few in number, we face a continuous and substantial flow of migrants of one kind or other which shows no sign of abating. We are, in other words, in unprecedented territory and cannot be sure how our country will cope in the longer term.

Of course, Enoch Powell famously (or perhaps, infamously) was issuing similar warnings in the 1960s when immigration levels were much lower and thankfully, things have not proved as dire as he was predicting. However, the leave voters which Anna

Soubry encountered were clearly feeling desperate and ignored. Such language as “I’m out, I’m out, get these immigrants out” is not very pleasant, but it was as if the referendum had blown the top off a bottle that had been fizzing away for many years. It offered people a chance publicly to express a sentiment that for many years they had only dared utter in private, as in the aftermath of Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech, any criticism of migration became something of a taboo.

This taboo was ruthlessly exploited by some on the political left for their own ends. Andrew Neather, a former speechwriter to Tony Blair, claimed that Labour wanted to “rub the Right’s nose in diversity.” Their driving political purpose, he claimed was “that mass immigration was the way that the Government was going to make the UK truly multicultural.”

Even more disturbing were the comments made by Peter Sutherland, a former European Commissioner, to the House of Lords home affairs select committee in 2012, who stated that the European Union should be doing its best to undermine the sense of homogeneity in countries like the UK.

A project of deliberate diversification and multiculturalism is not only misguided but dangerous. It fails to take into account one very important subject - human nature. Ever since the Enlightenment of the 18th Century, a succession of intellectuals believed that given the right conditions, we can build some sort of utopia on earth. Marxism’s promotion of the big state was always viewed as a short-term measure which would wither away once it had resolved inequality and class conflict.

In more recent times, the Blairite left and its counterparts in other countries have believed that their own ideals of a multicultural, socially liberal world can be imposed on the rest of the population through legislation and the all-pervasive media. Those “narrow prejudices” of the increasingly despised white working classes, not to mention other groups like Evangelical Christians, would eventually disappear in favour of this more enlightened, universalist mindset.

Unfortunately, this thinking is fallacious. It was always fallacious and those leave voters concerned about immigration have proved the point. Human beings naturally tend to identify more with those with whom they feel a certain affinity than with those they don’t. The concept of tribalism – dividing people into “our group” and “those on the outside” seems to be ingrained into us. We tend to form our closest friendships with people of a similar worldview or intellectual status to ourselves. We join societies made

Continued on page 4.....

Migration continued: up of people who share our interests. Sometimes, we even create our own tribes – for instance supporters of a given football club.

Tribalism at this sort of level is fairly harmless, but research from the USA reveal that it goes far deeper. A study by three academics from Harvard University showed that in the USA, the states with the greatest resistance to the introduction of a European-style welfare state are those which are the most ethnically diverse. In other words, there is less willingness to give and take in societies that are less cohesive.

Tribalism can become dangerous when a group, particularly if it represents the majority, feels threatened by the outsiders.

Unfortunately, the stifling of any real debate about the merits of immigration coupled with the sharp increase in the number of migrants since 2004 has created precisely this sense of alienation. The few widely-reported racist incidents since June 23rd represent only the tip of an iceberg.

A poll for *Sky News* in October 2013 confirmed the hardening of attitudes since the 2010 general election. It found more than two thirds of the British public believe the UK population is too large, while the same percentage (67%) of those questioned said that the government's attempt to reduce net migration to 100,000 a year was not sufficient and that more should be done.

More than a quarter of those polled (27%) believe the wave of immigration Britain has experienced in the last decade has brought no positive benefit to the nation, and more than half (52%) say they would be more likely to vote for a party that promises significantly to reduce the level of migration.

Few people who moan about increased waiting times in doctor's surgeries, the lack of places for children in local schools or claiming that migrants are being given preferential access to council housing are likely to use the same blunt language about migrants as the Brexit supporters quoted by Anna Soubry. Even fewer would resort to verbal or physical abuse of migrants, but their grievances are very real and will not be easy to address.

What is desperately needed is to pause for breath and address the issues caused by the surge in our population, but stopping the flow, even if we do succeed in obtaining a Brexit settlement restricting free movement from the EU, isn't going to be easy.

And what of the cost, both financial and environmental, of addressing these issues? To take just one example, why was there such strong support for tighter immigration control among rural communities with little or no migrants? This has surprised some

researchers, but the reason is simple. Country dwellers are savvy enough to know that even if the proposed development which threatens the charm of their village or small town may not end up housing immigrants, if we had restricted immigration 20 years ago, our population would be more or less static and the countryside they love would not be under such pressure.

What is particularly disturbing is that in a society where trust has been eroded and divisions run deep, it is all too easy to create further divisions. In 1968, Jane Elliott, an American schoolteacher and anti-racism activist, conducted an experiment in her class whereby, with her pupils' consent, blue-eyed children

were given special privileges and encouraged not to socialise with those with brown eyes. She later reversed the process, giving the brown-eyed pupils superior status. On both occasions during the

experiments, the favoured group began to taunt the inferior group and were generally unpleasant to them, even those who had been their friends beforehand.

This experiment was played out for real in the disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990s, with horrific consequences. In Bosnia, there are anecdotal accounts of neighbours from different ethnic groups who had been living peacefully next to each other for many years suddenly becoming violently hostile. If a country does not enjoy the stability which we have known as a nation for much of the previous 200-300 years, it only takes a little spark to start what can be a very ugly conflagration.

While I am not predicting anything on this scale happening in this country, it would be foolish to say it could never happen. A successful Brexit therefore, besides restoring our sovereignty and ensuring trade can continue, needs to address these issues. It is quite clear that migration has to be drastically reduced if we are to maintain a cohesive society and rebuild trust in our institutions.

In London, many people on both the leave and remain sides enjoy the diversity to be found in the city and are comfortable with immigration and multiculturalism. Many people have chosen to come to London, both from abroad and from other parts of the UK to be part of its unique culture. Universities also tend to be relaxed about the very international culture. Away from our capital city and the academic world, however, a different mindset prevails.

I therefore believe that Douglas Carswell's assertion that current level of labour mobility - and thus the level of immigration - currently to be found in

Continued on page 5.....

.....
What is desperately needed is to pause for breath and address the issues caused by the surge in our population,
.....

Migration continued: London will be the norm across much of the country within 40 years will prove seriously wide of the mark. Non-metropolitan Britain has sent a very powerful signal that it wants immigration reduced and thankfully, Theresa May, David Davis and Liam Fox, if not Boris Johnson, have taken note. It is after all politicians, especially people like Tony Blair, who have caused their problems, not the immigrants themselves.

Of course, migration from the EU is only part of the issue, with different laws governing non-EU migrants and refugees, but voters aren't necessarily bothered about the finer points of detail. Furthermore, it won't be plain sailing to secure a deal for exiting the EU which impinges on the hallowed free movement principle. It is rather hypocritical that the most vocal opponents of any compromise here are the Visegrad countries (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia) who have cited their unreadiness (for which read "reluctance") to embrace multiculturalism in justification of their refusal to accept any quota system for refugees.

However, this only underscores the point that multiculturalism is being forced onto the back foot on a previously unparalleled scale. The concerns of

those 33% of Brexit supporters are not a peculiarly UK phenomenon. Opposition to mass immigration lies behind the rise of Marine le Pen's *Front National* in France and *Alternative für Deutschland* in Germany. Even the argument that immigrants are needed to fill job vacancies will lose its resonance soon. A recent report by Andy Haldane of the Bank of England suggests that up to 15 million jobs in the UK could be at risk because of advances in automation – in other words, they will be soon done by robots. Most of these jobs are at the low-skilled end, which are currently largely the preserve of immigrants.

It may sound a very negative and defeatist argument to say that a desire to restrict immigration, far from being racist is actually the best way of reducing or preventing racism, but we need to be realistic. Three hundred years after the Enlightenment, its view of human nature, which underpins the mindset of multiculturalists like Peter Sutherland and New Labour, has proved fatally flawed. Rather than foolishly seeking to build utopia, we need to be engaging in damage limitation and ensuring that Brexit will be accompanied by the actions necessary to rebuild trust and cohesion within our fragmented society.

WAKE UP ENGLAND

BY CHRISTOPHER GILL

There is an old gag which goes something like this: Question: How do you know when politicians are lying? Answer: When you see their lips move!

On 23rd June 17,410,742 people voted to "Leave the European Union". The other question on the ballot paper was "Remain a member of the European Union" - nowhere on the ballot paper was there an option of voting to "Negotiate to leave the European Union" but that is what our duplicitous politicians are doing!

Leaving the EU implicitly means the complete restoration of national sovereignty; the right to be governed solely by the laws made in our own Parliaments and Assemblies; the absolute right to control our own borders; the freedom to negotiate our own trading arrangements with whichever other countries we choose; for our armed forces to be deployed solely at the behest of the Westminster Parliament (and in concert with our NATO allies) and for the administration of justice to be in accordance with the law of *habeas corpus* and all the other traditional defences and protections against state-



Christopher Gill:
restore national
sovereignty.

inspired coercion which are the genius of the British criminal justice system.

As far as we 'leavers' are concerned these particular features are absolutely non-negotiable so what is there left to negotiate?

To this question there will be a chorus of voices saying 'our future trading arrangements, of course'!

What these people are saying is that we must be able to continue to trade with the EU on the supposedly favourable terms that we currently enjoy - tariff free 'access to the world's biggest market'

and all that jazz.

That being the case and if our Government was seriously intent upon honouring the unambiguous result of the Referendum it would simply tell Brussels that "We're out, but if you guys want to continue trading with us on the current basis the choice is yours".

Does anyone seriously believe that the EU would turn down such an offer given that, as is well-known, they sell far more to us than we sell to them and mindful of the fact that their

Continued on page 6.....

For page 6 scroll down

Wake up England continued:

economies are becoming increasingly sclerotic, whilst ours, contrary to all the doom-laden predictions', continues to grow, making it an increasingly attractive destination for EU exports.

During the Referendum campaign the 'remainians' made much of the fact that it had taken the EU over 7 years to make an incomplete trade deal with Canada. By the same logic a trade deal with the UK is not going to be settled any time soon, simply because getting the agreement of 27 other countries to every dot and comma is verging on the impossible. On the other hand the present trading arrangements are apparently acceptable to all concerned so why would both parties not settle for what they have already got instead of opening a veritable Pandora's box ?

Those who wish to play the negotiation card have nothing to lose. The 'remainians' will be content to see us perpetually ensnared by the EU. Similarly, the hundreds of civil servants drafted into the new Brexit department and the Ministers themselves have no incentive to make themselves redundant and, perish the thought, even our pro-EU Prime Minister may be secretly harbouring the thought that if the charade of negotiation can be kept going long enough we may never actually escape the Brussels straightjacket !

With so many non-EU countries apparently now clamouring for trade deals with the UK we must call the EU's bluff and see, when push comes to shove, how many German car-makers, Italian wine-makers, French cheese-makers etc. etc. wouldn't, on a reciprocal basis, want to perpetuate the current terms of trade with their best customer.

'Wake up England' - you're being conned ! Playing Brexit long by agreeing to negotiate our way out of the EU is not what we voted for !

Playing it long may well suit the nefarious purposes of the 'remainians', but for us 'leavers' it threatens to be the kiss of death.

**JOIN**

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

Web-site: www.eurocentic.org.uk

THE JUNE PRESS BOOKS

Tel: 08456 120175

E-mail: info@junepress.com

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, the Article 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.

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.

Brexit Revolt 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.

Mayhem In France by Cy Charles Ross, £6.99. A wartime adventure based on real experience in occupied France during the Second World War. It depicts a young member of the Fleet Air Arm naively volunteering for operational duties; allied to the French resistance.

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