

Adolf Hitler: His Part in Our Downfall



How Hitler Won World War II and Conquered Europe
by the Biggest Bloggers
(edited by Ian R. Durie)

Adolf Hitler: His Part In Our Downfall

How Hitler Won World War Three And Conquered Europe

by The Boggart Bloggers
(edited by Ian R Thorpe)

Acknowledgement:

The main title is a play on the wording of Spike Milligan's memoir, "Adolf Hitler: My Part In His Downfall" an hilarious and often moving personal account of the comedy genius' experiences in World War Two. Through it we get an insight into the bureaucratic insanity of war, contrasted with the personal tragedy, and plenty of reminders that even among the death and bloodshed of the conflict, being able to laugh at one's own situation and at pomposity, stupidity and the ineptitude of those who take refuge in pointless rules and regulations, is a large part of what makes us human. As long as my generation live, Gunner Terence (Spike) Milligan will be fondly remembered.

Now it falls to those he inspired to love freedom and resist tyranny to fight against a more subtle attempt to enslave most of Europe.

Published by Greenteeth Media, 2016
greenboggart@gmail.com



Creative commons licence, Attrib, non commercial, no derivatives distribute freely (and please distribute as widely as possible, democracy faces its greatest threat)

Users please link to <http://edbutt.blogspot.co.uk/>

Fair Use: This page may contain copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers in this free e-book under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues, pertaining particularly to the European Union.

Contents

The main title is a nod and a wink to Spike Milligan from whose memoir, 'Adolf Hitle: My Part In His Downfall' I learned a lot about the stupidity of bureaucrats

- 1.1 Disinfecting History
- 1.2 The Ideology of The Nazi Founders Of The European Project Is Still Influential Today
The Idea Of A Unified Europe Under German Control Was Bound To Appeal To Nazi Leaders
The Bank Of International Settlements - A Bridge From Hitler To The European Commission

The Fourth Reich is here - without a shot being fired
European Genocide Through Mass Migration - A Long Term Agenda

or

-
- 5.1 The EU Is Killing The NHS
 - 5.2 The Common Agricultural Policy Raised Food Prices
 - 5.3 The Common Fisheries Policy Destroyed British Fishing Industry
 - 5.4 EU WASTES VAST QUANTITIES OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY

It is not surprising that official histories of the European Union (E U) make little mention of the organisation's true origins, preferring to start in the middle as it were with the signing by the original six members of the Treaty Of Rome in 1957. And while the man referred to by most people (including myself elsewhere) as the Father of the European Union, the French bureaucrat Jean Monnet, is indeed the progenitor of the modern bureaucratic structure that is trying to move towards forming all twenty eight current members into a single political entity, the idea was originally conceived by the Nazis in Germany and Italy's Fascisti led by Benito Mussolini.

In 1933 Mussolini, whose philosophy was based on collaboration between big business and government to form an unchallengable central authority, spoke for the first time in the modern era of the need for political unity among the nations of Europe.

Not so long ago there were two career paths for bright pupils leaving school / higher education with decent qualifications. Those who were already old set their eyes firmly on an inflation linked pension and opted for forty years of boredom as time servers in the public sector. The risk takers, adventurers, those who planned to be young forever, went into business or industry and, some eventually, the entrepreneurial, the irresponsible (I'm mentioning no names here) struck out on their own hand having blown most of a small inheritance on travelling in the USA (an unusual thing in itself back in 1968), invested what was left on a van and some stock and began trading in the street markets of northern England. In that decade and the 1970s it was easy to set up in business, to change jobs or careers or to eventually slip back into the world of employment as I eventually did, due to the vagaries of life, a few years later. I ended up as a freelance Information Technology consultant, specialising in integrated voice and data networks for corporate and government clients, providing management skills on an EU project amongst many others. I, and other members of the partnership tended to be called in by government departments because all the practical skills were in the private sector. And the two seldom intermingled.

It is no longer so of course, the two way traffic between public and private sector senior management positions resembles a city ring road at rush hour. Swapping positions from private industry to government and vice versa is the norm in every strategically important industry, but is more pronounced in industries closely linked with government, but especially banking, energy, water, defence equipment, food, medicine, prisons, and information technology (a.k.a. surveillance). It's fascism, pure and simple. How can we say that? Well we have it from probably the highest authorities on fascism.

The travelator between at the Ministry of Defence or the Pentagon in London and Washington and the main defence manufacturers is an old and well trodden route needed, we are told, to keep the war machine well oiled in readiness for threats to national security, the only surprise is traffic has reached such levels in the USA even the government owned mainstream media are talking about it:

In Britain all three living former Prime Ministers have lucrative sinecures with banks and defence contractors while the board membership of major finance, industrial, media and technology companies reads like a roll call of governments over the past thirty years. In the other direction the names of senior civil and military servants who have moved to the private sector are not so well known but a little research reveals the route is a two way street.

The cosy relationships established between corporate executives or public service managers and their former colleagues and employers are not in the public interest. In fact those relationships often become a conduit through which taxpayers money is channelled into corporate coffers with little being received in exchange.

Guardian columnist Glenn Greenwald writes on the media's reluctance to challenge the [National Security justification](#) for fascism:

"Hayden is a partner in the Chertoff Group, a private entity that makes more and more money by increasing the fear levels of the US public and engineering massive government security contracts for their clients. Founded by former Homeland Security secretary Michael Chertoff, it's filled with former national security state officials who exploit their connections in and knowledge of Washington to secure hugely profitable government contracts for their clients."

Greenwald points out that CBS conveniently forgot to mention that Michael Hayden, mentioned in the video) was the person most responsible for implementing spying on Americans and that he now benefits financially from expanding that policy.

In 2006, the New York Times won the Pulitzer Prize for having revealed that the [NSA was eavesdropping](#) on Americans without warrants. The reason that was a scandal was because it was illegal under a 30-year-old law that made it a [felony, punishable by up to 5 years in prison](#) for each offense, to eavesdrop on Americans without those warrants. Although both the Bush and Obama DOJs ultimately prevented final adjudication by raising claims that we, as a country, are in a state of emergency, the money

[Michael Hayden, then Bush's NSA director](#). That's the very same Michael Hayden is now frequently presented by US television news channels as an industry authority on surveillance technology and an expert on the current NSA controversy. The nature of his military experience and pivotal role in implementing that illegal warrantless eavesdropping program are never referred to.

The phrase Conflict Of Interest does not appear to be fashionable these days.

Most people still view democracy, or rule according to the will of the majority as somehow opposite of fascism. Yet democracy has become so corrupted by corporate money, both democracy and fascism are now simply means to the same end, control. Democracy sounds nice in theory, but in practice the voters have very little say in public discourse, laws, or regulations; and when we get to vote, it's up between two politically identical entities whose campaigns encourage people to vote on the basics of ethnicity, religion, social class or sexual preference. Identity politics is not fascism but it is fascisms best friend.

So as is demonstrated, corporatism and statism are entirely compatible.

The idea of a politically integrated Europe came originally from Adolf Hitler himself. Addressing his followers in 1936 Hitler called for Europe to adopt a single legal system, and ever the consummate creator of memorable sound bites, he called for a United states Of Europe to describe his plan for a German Empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Caspian Sea (you can find this online but it is hard, a pint history of the Nazi's rise to power is you best bet), a single political unit with a single language and a single legal codex, moving towards the goal of a single culture based on unquestioning loyalty to the central authority. The name European Economic Community was coined by Reichsfuhrer Hermann Goering (all Nazis of any rank were fuhrers, from the lowly Gruppenfuhrer, to Hiltler's closest and most senior aides such as Goering, and the man himself, The Fuhrer, the leader, in Mafia language the Cappo di Tutti Cappi, the leader of all leaders. The Nazis were no slouches at public relations and understood that a name suggesting a positive, inclusive community was less likely to arouse opposition that something like The German National Socialist Empire.

In 1940 Walther Funk, head of the Bank Of International Settlements and the Nazi's

economics adviser put a written proposal to Hitler and other leading Nazis titled "The Economic reorganisation Of Europe." In it the idea of a single European currency was first raised. In 1942, when the Nazi advance of all fronts was faltering and the first signs that the war in Europe, the middle east and Africa initiative was swinging away from Germany, the Nazi party published a document titled "Basic Elements Of A Plan For The New Europe" which proposed harmonisation of labour and social welfare conditions among European countries.

Also in 1942 Richard Heidrich, high ranking Nazi official and one of the architects of The Holocaust presented 'The Reich Plan For Domination Of Europe' which historians note bears a remarkable similarity to the 1957 Treaty of Rome.

A year later, with the USA having entered the war and the tide of events definitely running against the Rome Berlin Tokyo axis, Hitler and his colleagues were starting to consider how Germany might still dominate Europe if the war against The British Empire, the USA and the Soviet Union was lost. Thirteen countries, including France and Italy, that were Nazi allies or under Nazi control were invited to join a European Federation under German military authority. I mention The British Empire in this paragraph because the role of Australia, Canada, the African colonies, India and Pakistan, and the Caribbean Islands in securing victory is too often forgotten.

In 1944, with the allies advancing on all fronts, arrogance was the only thing the Nazis had left. A conference in Berlin, 'How Will Germany Dominate The Peace When It Loses The War' was called. Vast amounts of money were moved via the Swiss based Bank Of International Settlements to the USA.

Developments halted after the surrender in 1945. Funk and other senior Nazis were convicted of war crimes and spent their days dancing the Spandau ballet, but collaborators in some of the nations the Nazis had conquered managed to evade justice and worm their way into the bureaucracies of governments whose priorities were to rebuild societies and economies. In May 1950 French foreign minister Robert Schuman proposed the establishment of a common market for coal and steel for those countries willing to delegate control of these sectors of their economies to an independent authority. In drawing up what was called the Schuman Plan—which actually had been authored by Jean Monnet, then head of the French planning agency—French policy makers were motivated by the belief that a new economic and political framework was needed to avoid future Franco-German conflicts. In 1952 the European Coal and Steel Community was formed by the Paris Treaty. Schuman had been a member of the French government from 1919 and was held by the Germans and forced to work with the Nazi authorities in France until he escaped in 1942 and his brainchild was the first step towards a politically and financially unified Europe, from day one however the ultimate objective was Hitler's vision, the creation of a "United States of Europe." West Germany, Italy, and the three Benelux countries subsequently agreed to negotiate on the basis of this plan.

By 1954 Schuman and Monnet's bureaucratic baby had removed nearly all barriers to trade between its members in coal, coke, steel, pig iron, and scrap iron. As a consequence, trade in these commodities rose dramatically in the 1950s. A set of common rules was established to control cartels and to regulate mergers but in effect the bureaucracy had overall control. The central institution, the [High Authority](#), fixed prices and set production limits or quotas and was authorized to impose fines on business firms that infringed treaty rules.

The next move was the formation of the European Economic Community (EEC, popularly known as The Common Market, by the Treaty Of Rome in 1957. The original members, Germany, France, Italy, The Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg agreed to cooperate economically as a way to avoiding future wars in the continent of Europe. In 1958 the EEC created the European Commission, an unelected, unaccountable executive branch to 'run' the EEC administrative branch. Over the decades, in an extreme case of 'mission creep' the powers of the Commissioners has grown and now the unelected commissioners have the power to dictate policy to sovereign nations, create and impose laws without their being voted on by national parliaments and decide how the EU should operate.

One of the tasks of the EU Commission is to increase the power of the European Union and enlarge its sphere of influence. To this end there is now an 'enlargement commissioner.' Would it surprise you to know this place holder is tasked with overseeing a [policy that will see Europe stretched beyond any logical geographic borders](#) to incorporate not just Turkey (which at least has a toehold on the European continent), but states such as Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan in the Caucasus, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and even north African nations including Egypt, Libya and Algeria.

Thus we see that what has now become the European Union was always intended to be a bureaucratic dictatorship as one would expect from a body founded on the ideas of Adolf Hitler and his Nazi colleagues and was and led by 'former' Nazis Fascists, sympathisers. The Charlemagne Prize awarded to Tony Blair, Edward Heath, Roy Jenkins and others who served the National socialist idea of removing democratic sovereignty from the nation states of Europe was also a Nazi brainchild, named after the Frankish King who is credited with first proposing a political union of nations and whose ideas led to the formation of The Holy Roman Empire." No wonder the EU has embraced many of the policies and of National Socialism and Fascism and now displays the characteristics of a totalitarian, corporatist Empire. That is what its fascist founders intended.

Let's look briefly at the backgrounds of Nazis and Fascists who were prominent in founding and supporting that "European Union" which now, indirectly, governs Britain (because the Labour Government of 1997 to 2010 and the Conservatives from 2010 did not dare sell out completely, there are still enough of us who believe in our nation and its individual culture to resist out total incorporation into a Federal EUSSR.

Walter Hallstein, [economist, diplomat and lawyer](#) or [prominent Nazi lawyer](#) depending on which biography you believe, a Hitler Youth “Nazi Leadership Officer” who promoted Nazism in Universities and the Legal profession and went on to become the First President of the European Commission in 1958. A quick comparison of the full biography and the sanitized official version published by the E U reveals that the Brussels bureaucracy does not care much for truth and in the manner of George Orwell's Big Brother regime has no qualms about erasing inconvenient details from history.

[Paul Henri Spaak](#), another early EU official whose online biographies are disinfected, he was a Belgian politician and government minister and a self confessed National socialist who collaborated with Germany throughout the war years, openly rejected the democracies in favour of the fascist powers and warned the Allies not to attack Germany through Belgium. He became a Founding Father of the European Union.

[Walther Funk](#), the senior Nazi economist, as already mentioned was a Minister under Goebbels at the Nazi Propaganda Ministry and as [the] Reich’s Economics Minister and his role in dispossessing Jews of their property earned him the nickname 'The Banker Of Gold Teeth'. He wrote the economic blueprint for a united Europe adopted by the European Union. He was employed in the Lower Saxony Education Ministry from 1957 to 1960 after his release from Spandau Prison and served as an ex - officio economic adviser to the EU.

[Hans Josef Globke](#) drafted the Nuremburg Race Laws and then became Director of the German Chancellor’s Office from 1953 to 1963 when the European Economic Community was created.

[Lady Diana Mosley](#), the Hitler-admiring wife of [Oswald] Mosley (a supporter of the European Union and leader of the British Union of Fascists) expressed her admiration for the European Union in a BBC interview shortly before her death.

It will surely be no surprise to anybody who is aware of the political nature of the Nazi Regime that Hitler and the rest of the Nazi leadership welcomed Funk’s plans for unifying Europe under a single government, thus in 1942 the German government was planning a European confederation to be dominated by Germany. In the same year a group of German businessmen held a conference in Berlin entitled `European Economic Community’(a phrase `European Economic Community first

used by Hermann Goering in 1940.) By 1942, Reinhard Heydrich, head of the Reich Security Central Office and renowned for his ruthlessness against enemies of the State, published 'The Reich Plan for the Domination of Europe,' a document which as has previously been remarked bears a remarkable similarity to the Treaty of Rome which founded The European Economic Community, now evolved into The European Union. In March 1943, 13 countries (including France and Italy) were invited to join a new European federation which would be under German military control. When the Nazis realised that they were losing the war they knew that they had to make a deal in order to preserve German domination in Europe. Thomas McKittrick, the president of the bank Of International Settlements (BIS) an American who was headquartered in Basel, Switzerland from 1940 to 1946,, acted as go between for the Nazis arrangement to transfer cash, gold, precious stones and art treasures to the USA where it was covertly stored in secure vaults. McKittrick also helped set up the negotiations to implement this plan without Franklyn D. Roosevelt or any of the people of integrity in Washington or the US business community learning of it. If Germany was to dominate post-war Europe, Funk and his colleagues judged it expedient to talk about European spirit, liberty, equality, fraternity and worldwide cooperation as the basis for their planned European Union. They decided to agree to share power, and even to allow other countries to take charge for a while. The Nazis knew that all they needed to do was maintain people sympathetic to their aims (such as McKittrick) in influential posts.

After McKittrick died in New Jersey in 1970, at age 81, the _____ described him as a world financier. His obituary described him as a man sufficiently daring to attend a bank meeting in Switzerland in 1940 "within earshot of a French-German artillery duel," while his peers voted by proxy instead. But as with many obituaries, McKittrick's death notice omitted far more of historical significance than it contained.

McKittrick played a crucial role in abetting Hitler's war and in revealing details about his Nazi colleagues to his friends in Washington, D.C. During McKittrick's presidency, the BIS unquestioningly accepted looted Nazi gold, brokered money laundering deals for the Nazis, and recognized the Nazi invasion and annexation of conquered countries, doing business with German puppet regimes in occupied nations. By doing so, it legitimized the sequestration of Jewish-owned a funds and property by Nazi controlled authorities in occupied countries. The BIS, which still flourishes today and does business with governments easily as unpleasant and tyrannical as the Nazis, and with terrorist organisations allegedly, was so indispensable to the overall Nazi project that the vice-president of the Reichsbank, Emil Puhl once referred to the it as the Reichsbank's only "foreign branch." In the closing months of the war, as American GIs gave their lives alongside troops from Britain and the colonies, French, Polish and Czech armies in exile and Russians, in the advance on Germany, the American banker McKittrick was arranging deals with Nazi officials and industrialists to protect their wealth and preserve their business empires after the inevitable Allied victory.

But McKittrick was also a key contact between the Allies and the Nazis, passing information back and forth from Washington to Berlin. His dealings with the Third Reich were encouraged both by the US State Department and by the Office for Strategic Services, the predecessor of the Central Intelligence Agency. He also served as a conduit for the exchange of information between anti-Nazi German business interests and the United States and ultimately served to help preserve the power of German industry after the war, in the face of opposition of the Treasury Secretary of the period, Henry Morgenthau.

One of the many things the modern EU has in common with The Nazis is the desire to micromanage every detail of the lives of people it rules.

Founded in Basel in 1930, where it is still headquartered today, the Bank of International Settlements is worth a closer look because of its links with the Nazis (the timeline is significant - Hitler had become leader of the "National Socialist German Workers' Party, nicknamed the Nazis, in 1921 and became known when his 'beer hall putsch', an attempt to take over the state government of Bavaria in 1923 failed and landed him in jail. During the year of his five year sentence that he actually served, he honed his political philosophy, incorporate populist ideas sure to appeal to the working classes and wrote the first draft of his book *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle) . The failed coup consigned the Nazi's to the political wilderness until 1929 when Germany, still recovering from World War One and the massive reparations it was forced to pay, was hit by the world recession and high unemployment. Many peoples' savings had been wiped out by hyperinflation earlier in the decade and many millions of Germans were suffering financial hardship. Hitler's populist message began to resonate and the Nazi's started to win elections, eventually gaining a majority in The Reichstag and taking power in 1933.

The Bank Of International Settlements was ostensibly set up as part of the Young Plan to administer German reparations payments for WWI, but its real purpose set out in its statutes was (and is) 'to promote the cooperation of central banks and to provide additional facilities for international financial operations.' The establishment of the BIS was the culmination of the bankers' decades-old dream to have their own bank; independent, free from pestilences like democratically elected politicians, meddling bureaucrats and inquisitive investigative journalists. Setting up shop in neutral Switzerland was a politically driven move rather than being linked to the reputation of that nation as a financial centre. Under the terms of its founding treaty, BIS assets could never be seized, even in

times of war. Tyrants and world domination fantasists are not likely to respect French, German, Italian or Indian banks, but Switzerland is different. When all ones cronies have their loot stashed in that nation, a wise tyrant would avoid it. Most felicitous of all, the BIS was self-financing and would be in perpetuity. Its clients were its own founders and shareholders, the central banks a. The BIS, boasted Gates McGarrah, an American banker who served as its first president, was “completely removed from any government or political control.”

Based in the northern Swiss city of Basel the BIS was founded to be the bankers banker. The Institution swiftly made itself into the principal pillar of the new international global financial system at a time of worldwide financial crisis. It organized bailouts for debt - ridden Austria, Spain, and Hungary. It provided banking services for central banks and global commercial banks,. Its annual reports on the state of the global economy became required reading in the world’s treasuries. Every month, the BIS brought together some of the most powerful central bankers in the world, in conditions of extreme secrecy, to discuss the world economy. Reporters were forbidden from even looking into the room where the directors met, even after they had left.

The cabal of central bankers, aided by their numerous friends on Wall Street, including John Foster Dulles, the future American secretary of state, and his brother Allen Dulles, had been instrumental in rebuilding Germany after WWI, a project that continued after Hitler took power in 1933. And BIS was the vehicle politicians used to keep their hands clean when doing business with the Nazis when the unsavoury nature of the regime's politics started to become public knowledge.

These little excursions into history may seem to be digressions but are very relevant. Just as the Nazis in the nineteen thirties and forties aimed to unify Europe under a single, centralized authority, and eventually to spread their control further afield, so the E U has been working towards a similar goal.

Oh, I know, I can hear the lovers of big authority and the sheeple screaming conspiracy theorist already and I'm not halfway though editing the book yet. But there is no conspiracy here, E U leaders and supporters of the European project have been quite open about this goal, people who are not aware of it must spend a lot of their time with fingers stuck in ears, singing Laa Laa Laa Laa Laa. They just don't want to hear the truth about the global dystopia we are being led towards.

In April 2010 the European Central Bank chief, Jean-Claude Trichet's announced that the Bank for International Settlements has been selected to become the primary engine for global governance in a shocking admission that one of the great 'conspiracy theories' beloved of all us right wing and left wing extremist nut jobs is in fact true, the financial and political elites are trying to move the world towards a single system of governance. Given the fact that BIS is an ultra-secretive menagerie of international bankers, once controlled by people with close links to the Nazis and even some who had been Nazis, who in collusion with global central banks, funnelled money through the institution to finance Hitler’s war machine and to export the wealth of leading Nazis and German

elitists who had collaborated with the regime to non - hostile jurisdictions.

In a speech to the US Council On Foreign relations (CFR), ECB head Trichet said that the Global Economy Meeting (GEM), which regularly meets at the BIS headquarters in Basel, “Has become the prime group for global governance among central banks”.

The GEM is basically a policy steering committee under the umbrella of the Bank for International Settlements. In its current form, the BIS, which itself is not accountable to any national government, is comprised of banking chiefs from global and central banks, most of which are private and also have no responsibility to their nation states or their citizens.

The board of directors who control the BIS include Federal Reserve chief, and the head of The Bank of England head, as well as the ECB chief.

Charles Higham’s widely acclaimed book *Trading With The Enemy, How the Allied multinationals supplied Nazi Germany throughout World War Two* points out, several parties at the Bretton Woods Conference in July 1944 wanted to see the Bank for International Settlements liquidated, because its role in aiding Nazi Germany loot occupied European countries during the war. Norway called for the bank to be shut down, a view supported by Harry Dexter White, U.S. Secretary of the Treasury and Henry Morgenthau, but the BIS survived despite its highly contentious Nazi influence.

Higham writes that the Bank of International Settlements had become, “A money funnel for American and British funds to flow into Nazi coffers and help Hitler build his war machine.” Nazi finance minister and one of the BIS founders, Hjalmar Schacht commented that the “Institution that would retain channels of communication and collusion between the world’s financial leaders even in the event of an international conflict. It was written into the Bank’s charter, concurred in by the respective governments, that the BIS should be immune from seizure, closure or censure, whether or not its owners were at war.”

The book continues, “The BIS was completely under Hitler’s control by the outbreak of World War II, Among the directors under Thomas H. McKittrick were Hermann Shmitz, head of the colossal Nazi industrial trust I.G. Farben, Baron Kurt von Schroder, head of the J.H. Stein Bank of Cologne and a leading officer and financier of the Gestapo; Dr. Walther Funk of the Reichsbank, and, of course, Emil Puhl. These last two figures were Hitler’s personal appointees to the board.”

Some American's may be uncomfortable that a countryman of theirs is now linked with such a repugnant political movement, but it was not only American officials and political figures who seduced by the Nazi ideology. Many of the British Labour Party's intellectual think tank, The Fabian Society, many members of which were drawn from the aristocracy, the senior professions and academia, thought Hitler had a lot of good ideas too, in fact in the years immediately following the Nazi accession to power the Labour Party believed it could work with Hitler on being returned

to power. And they were not alone. It was the Conservative Party, while in government that pursued the policy of appeasement.

Higham details how the gold looted from countries invaded by the Nazis was packed into vaults controlled by the Bank for International Settlements, and how Nazis who controlled the bank then forbade any discussion of the theft.

“The BIS was an instrument of Hitler, but its continuing existence was approved by Great Britain even after that country went to war with Germany, and the British director Sir Otto Niemeyer, and chairman Montagu Norman, remained in office throughout the war,” writes Higham, commenting on Washington State Congressman John M. Coffee's objections to American money being invested with the bank in 1944.

“The Nazi government has 85 million Swiss gold francs on deposit in the BIS. The majority of the board is made up of Nazi officials. Yet American money is being deposited in the Bank,” Mr. Coffee complained to the US Treasury Secretary.

In 1948, the BIS was compelled to hand over £4 million in looted Nazi gold to the allies, a tiny fraction of what had been seized illegally, and thanks to people like President Harry S. Truman the Rockefeller family, and other members of the financial and political elites, the bank was not dissolved. One of its most influential directors, Nazi banker Emil Puhl was actually invited to the United States as a guest of honour in 1950, though it was known he was a prominent Nazi.

Despite its inglorious past, the Bank For International Settlements continues to play a major role in the global elite's management of world affairs. The bank exercises power through its control of vast amounts of reserve currencies (sorry again, American Patriots, the US dollar is the main reserve currency but not the only one. The Euro, UK pound and Japanese Yen enjoy reserve currency status and they are expected to be joined by the Chinese Yuan in the near future. The UK pound is principally used in trades between member nations of the British Commonwealth and one reason the E U and the U S administration are so keen to keep Britain in the E U is that it prevents our country from developing trade ties with some potentially mighty emerging nation, principally India with its one billion plus population but also Pakistan with one hundred and eighty million people, Bangla Desh with one hundred and sixty five million and Nigeria with a rapidly growing population of one hundred and fifty million. As the hub of a trading community of such size, Britain would dwarf Brussels.

In view of that, the 7% of the world's available foreign exchange funds controlled by BIS, as well as the 712 tons of gold bullion it owns, presumably a sizeable portion of which is the bullion which was stolen from occupied countries by the Nazis who controlled the bank during the war, make it hugely important to those who do not wish to see their ability to rig markets, manipulate prices and maintain control of essential commodities eroded by a 'comeback kid' of world powers, especially a country that has the powerful City Of London financial centre within its borders. It

could also explain why the E U and its supporters in Washington and Basel are so keen to drive a political wedge between England and Scotland. Without Scotland, England is a minor league power, without England, Scotland is nothing.

“By controlling foreign exchange currency, plus gold, the BIS can go a long way toward determining the economic conditions in any given country,” [writes Doug Casey](#) of Investor Insight, “Remember that the next time The Federal Reserve, Bank of England or European Central Bank announces an interest rate hike. You can bet it didn’t happen without the concurrence of the BIS Board.”

The BIS is really nothing but a huge slush fund for global governance through which secret transfers of wealth from citizens are surreptitiously handed to the IMF. It's always worth remembering that when politicians like Barack Obama, Francois Hollande, David Cameron, Angela Merkel and Hillary Clinton amongst others talk of redistributing wealth from the wealthy world to the poor nations, the actual direction of the transfer is from hard up and modestly affluent taxpayers into the pockets of the corporate business and the obscenely rich, with some small change directed to high visibility projects such as digging wells in Africa. And the transactions are laundered through BIS of course. The modern Nazis are looting the world just as their predecessors did, they are just being more subtle about it.

For example, U.S. taxpayer monies can be passed through BIS to the IMF and from there anywhere. In essence, the BIS launders the money, since there is no transparency and no published accounts to indicate where particular deposits came from and where they went. Switzerland is a highly secretive financial centre of course, another reason perhaps why it was chosen as the base for BIS.

The fact that top Nazis were intimately involved in the activity of a global central bank that is now being put forward as one of the key elements of the drive towards world government is frightening. Every time we delve into the origins of the march towards world government, we find that top Nazis were instrumental in setting up and managing the many of the institutions that today seek impose a form of government that could never by any stretch of logic be described as democratic.

[Just as with the institutions that comprised the embryonic stages of the European Union,](#) Nazi fingerprints (and communist, but then the Nazis were national SOCIALISTS) are all over the origins of the move towards a technocratic global authority ruling the planet with nation states relegated to a level not far above the role of a church council. This fact demolishes any notion that global government is benevolent, humanitarian or progressive.

Centralization of power into the hands of the few is inherently undemocratic, elitist, and to the detriment of the people. But then it is astounding to observe the many people who style themselves 'left wing' liberal, socialist or progressive embracing the authoritarianism of Karl Marx's

communist manifesto because they think it is egalitarian, inclusive and a compassionate, caring approach to political management, apparently oblivious to the track record of socialist regimes around the world. I'll just mention a few names of communist and socialist leaders best remembered for the numbers of entirely innocent people their regimes murdered; Hitler (of course), Stalin (Soviet Russia), Mao Tse Tung (Communist China), Erich Honecker (East Germany), Pol Pot (Cambodia), Ho Chi Minh (North Vietnam), Kim Il Sung (North Korea), Nicolai Ceausescu (Romania), Mengistu Haile Mariam (Ethiopia), Fidel Castro (Cuba), and many others of course whose careers were cut short by popular uprisings or assassins sent, probably by shareholders in the BIS. There is nothing cuddly, caring or compassionate about socialism. To question authority quickly brings one to a bad end and even those who offer total obedience are not safe, the most innocuous utterance or gesture can be interpreted as dissidence by the paranoid authorities.

The Nazis who breathed life into the framework of global authoritarianism being used to set up world government today may have been usurped by an elite altogether more patient and subtle in their bid to impose a dictatorship run by banking dynasties, but the ultimate agenda remains the same, world government by an unelected elite or their appointees.

The arsenal of fear must almost be nearly exhausted. Those daring to vote to leave the EU will inflict on Britain [collapsing house prices](#) (according to George Osborne and Christine Lagarde of the IMF, who should worry about the EU's unemployment-soaked economies); [a "technical" recession](#) (Mark Carney, a "technical" Irish-Canadian with a long record of error, who for this disgraceful political interference should be kicked back to Ottawa); and, of course, the Third World War (Mr Cameron). It's clearly a Corporal Jones moment for the Remainers, though any cries of "don't panic" come far too late: they are manifestly drowning in it.

Anyway, two can play at this game. What must we fear if we stay? Not merely [relentless uncontrolled immigration](#) (and the lies told about it), putting such burdens on our schools, hospitals and infrastructure that UK citizens suffer, but the inevitability of our nation's destiny being increasingly subject to the wishes of foreigners whom we don't elect. I am not talking about the amorphous idea of "Brussels": I'm talking about Germany.

Five years ago I wrote a piece referring to the control Angela Merkel exerted over Europe as "the Fourth Reich". I was accused of a horrible breach of taste. However, when one looks at German power today one realises that, when I wrote, she had hardly even started. The key to German success is this: it participates in a weak currency (whose value would collapse without it) enabling its exports to sell far more cheaply than had it retained the Deutschmark. Therefore, it continues to grow in economic strength relative to its partners – including us – but especially those in the Eurozone, notably France and Italy, who would benefit greatly from restoring the Franc and the Lira.

Any net exporter in the EU – which we are most certainly not, given our £24bn trade gap with our partners in the first three months of 2016 – also benefits hugely from the vast and incomprehensible welter of EU regulations on products and employment law, which keep external competitors at arm's length and pile costs on them if they wish access to the single market. Germany is so rich, and getting richer at the expense not least of its partners, that it can afford to pretend globalisation isn't happening. We are not so fortunate, and leaving the EU to avoid all these regulations and take proper advantage of the wider world is not the least reason why we must vote

to get out.

If we stay in we are going to suffer immense collateral damage from two crises that the Germans will precipitate. First, there will be one in the Eurozone. My friend Dr Savvas Savouri, chief economist at the leading investment business Toscafund, predicts a “detonation of devaluations around the periphery of the Eurozone” in his latest briefing to clients. So incapable are non-Eurozone countries such as Hungary, Romania or Poland of competing with the German-dictated economic model that devaluation and the instability that will bring are their only options. So anyone who thinks our staying in the EU is like buying a ticket to a place of permanent prosperity wants his or her head examined.

Worse for Britain, Dr Savouri predicts Germany’s economy “will not come off lightly”, not least because its clients and customers will find its goods suddenly more expensive. And when Germany starts to struggle, God help the rest of the EU: because when the German chequebook closes, economies it is shoring up – such as Greece’s – will be on their own. And Greece’s economy is one-eleventh the size of France’s, which is a basket-case, and cannot go on as it is.

Dr Savouri also points out that if we stay in the EU there will be huge costs for us from all this chaos, despite being out of the Eurozone. “Having renewed our vows to remain in the EU ‘through sickness and in health’ we will be required to contribute to funding the fiscal efforts being applied to our ever more sickly EU partners,” he writes. The costs will be huge, and once we have committed ourselves to remain we will be forced to join the communal effort to save ailing partners. He calls it “the EU’s version of a Rooseveltian New Deal.”

He also argues that such a wave of economic hardship will propel more impoverished Europeans across open borders into the UK: and don’t forget what Iain Duncan Smith disclosed last week, that Mr Cameron deleted a passage about controlling immigration from a speech he made because he was told it would upset the Germans. That is the reality of our relationship with the EU: if we choose to stay in, the Germans will ensure that we become ever more obedient to their policies – so stand by for their next project, Turkey’s admission to the EU, and all that would entail.

It was not just deeply offensive, but ironic, that Mr Cameron should last week have evoked the idea of another world war in his latest intelligence-insulting act of hysteria aimed at making us vote to stay in the EU. It is not just that our fathers and grandfathers fought in two world wars to allow Britain the right to continue to rule itself, rather than to be ruled by Germans: Mr Cameron plainly won’t admit that German domination of the EU means it has conquered without war, and signing up to the EU is signing up to the Fourth Reich.

Ask the Greeks if you think I exaggerate: Germany runs Europe without firing a shot. It forces far weaker partners to stay in a currency zone that is crippling them, and uses its economic muscle to dictate immigration and other key policies. And if you believe the Germans won’t take a UK vote to stay in as a signal to continue and intensify their control over the EU, and to make us help pay for

its baleful effects, then you aren't paying attention. It's not war we should fear, but what the Germans do in peace.

There is no evidence that any of the 'Remain' campaign's scaremongering stories will actually happen of course, nor is there any reason to believe that the benefits the 'Leave' campaign tells us will fall into our laps should we decide in the referendum that Britain's future looks brighter outside the EU. Nobody can know what will happen in the future, politicians and economists may talk of where economic trends will take us in thirty or fifty years, but I'll throw in a scare story of my own to counter all of those.

In Yellowstone Park, Wyoming, USA there is a huge volcanic caldera, people who study earthquakes and volcanoes and such estimate it is several thousand years overdue for a massive eruption. For the past few years there has been a lot of seismic activity in the area, and video clips are available online of the ground visibly rising and falling as if it is a rubber mat floating on the sea. Scientific observations say the caldera is ready to blow, and if it does the devastation will be greater than Karakatoa or Tambora in the nineteenth century. The volcanic winter that follows could wipe out most life on earth. Predicting eruptions is an ever more uncertain science than gambling on horse races, the case is that Yellowstone could go tomorrow and if it does some experts say that with other concurrent intense volcanic activity on the so called Pacific ring Of Fire, a major eruption could tear the world in half or not for another ten thousand years. So all we can do is get on with our lives. Such disasters are possible, but in fact a very unlikely. And as the great French philosopher Eric Cantona (LOL) says, "He who forecasts all perils will never sail the seas."

In other words if we let fear of what just might happen limit our lives, those lives are never going to amount to much. Even the life of a bean counter includes risks.

The referendum on whether Britain should remain in the EU or leave is then not about economics, it is about whether you are happy to live for the rest of your life and to ensure your children and grandchildren and their offspring for the foreseeable future live in an increasingly oppressive dictatorship run by an unelected, technocratic regime appointed by the financial and academic elites.

Forget all those seductive blandishments from the left about equality, fairness and inclusiveness and remember that the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin in 1870 warned Karl Marx that a socialist government based on the socio - economic theories of Marx would quickly become more repressive and authoritarian than the despotic rule of the Russian Czars.

And forget all those promises from capitalists that 'trade brings prosperity and enriches us all. Trade enriches business owners and investors, and the EU's open doors immigration policy, by flooding developed societies with cheap, unskilled labour is driving down the wages of society's lowest paid. This was always the intention of course, nineteenth century liberalism and social democracy created and educated, informed and organised working class capable of challenging the

elite.

*

The founders of the European Union, French and Belgian bureaucrats for the main part, were from the 1950's were about mongrelising the people of Europe, in order to create the perfect "citizen", from a socialist angle of removing the individual cultural bonds that hold together nation states. Although you will not find the text on the internet anywhere, in the Headquarters of the European commission in Luxembourg, [The Baitment Jean Monnet](#) is a huge stone plaque on which the underlying principle of ending war by destroying the concept of the nation.



This is an ideology that goes back to the nineteenth century when followers of Karl Marx created the globalist movement with the instance aim of merging all the world's peoples into a single nation under one unelected, meritocratic governments.

We have seen a massive acceleration in the push towards this aim since 1997, but clearly the rate is not fast enough for members of the political, business and academic elites who believe they will form the upper layers of the meritocracy, so as we learned when the activities of Tony Blair's 'New Labour' government in actively recruiting migrants using agents in sub Saharan Africa and are boating them in thousands at a time.

At the time either Blair or his number two Gordon Brown referring to the British people (both deny it was themselves) promised to 'rub their noses in diversity'. I can't find text of the speech in which the phrase was used but you can read of the circumstances surrounding it in [this Op-Ed piece by political commentator Ed West](#)

The sheer contempt shown for British citizens and their culture and values is disgusting and should be enough to ensure no Labour government ever holds power again.

In view of numerous examples of Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat commitment to this ideological goal of moulting the world into a single political unit under the totalitarian government of an elitist meritocrat, people who have nasty suspicious minds and received the kind of education that taught us to question everything (particularly the motives of government, big business and the media, began to speculate about the true purpose of Obama and Blair's encouraging the "Arab Spring", when it was clear that removing the strong if tyrannical regimes of the region would cause a power vacuum that was very unlikely to resolve into western-style democracies.

It looks even more dodgy when you understand that the EU has well documented plans to extend its definition of Europe to include middle eastern and north African nations. Turkey, a geographically large nation with a mostly Muslim population has desired EU membership for many years and recently EU bureaucrats and leaders of the biggest member states have been eager to fast track Turkish membership even though the country's record on equality and human rights are appalling and despite its being a NATO member, the regime of President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has been illegally trading oil for arms with the terrorist movement ISIS. Another blatant breach of international law and EU membership criteria has been Erdogan's attacks on Kurdish communities within Turkish territory and also in Iraq and Syria. The vast bulk of Turkish territory is in Asia, however the Turkish enclave around Istanbul gives it a toehold on the European continent, which because the EU's ruling bureaucracy prioritizes the globalist agenda over humanitarian and legal concerns, qualifies Turkey for membership of the supranational unit George Orwell, in his novel 1984, called Eurasia.

People of a sceptical mindset might also speculate that the English Channel is an inconvenient barrier to globalist objectives such as a 'borderless' world, as it presents a pinch point in the flow of unskilled, illiterate, undomesticated migrants from third world cultures in which rape is acceptable, because the woman is at fault for 'allowing herself to be raped'. While it is impossible to close off cross channel routes completely, the Channel, a narrow, cold water strait between the north sea and the Atlantic Ocean presents a more formidable obstacle than the stretches of the Aegean Sea between Turkey and the Greek Islands or Libya and the Italian island of Lampedusa. And because Britain has never been a member of the 'borderless travel' Schengen Zone our government is better prepared to deal with attempts at illegal entry given funding and the will. How interesting to

observe the determination of the EU to find ways of circumventing Britain's border control arrangements just as the New Labour government under Blair and Gordon Brown ordered the UK's border control agencies to simply 'wave through' undocumented travellers without even counting them. This was a deliberate attempt to destabilise UK society so that we the people would be ready to accept we could only be secure as part of a Federal European State. Open borders has failed, the lawlessness of immigrants, the demands that they be accountable under Sharia Law rather than European Law, and the refusal to tolerate European customs and values as well as the EU bureaucracies failure to control the inflow of undocumented migrants, some genuine refugees from Barack Obama's wars, most just economic migrants, have led many EU nations to close their borders and reintroduce immigration controls.

As anti EU feeling continues to grow all around Europe, and the disintegration of the current federal superstate project progresses, it would be wise perhaps to remember how Britain was led into membership in the first place. It seems to me that most people have little idea why one of main players in the victorious alliance of the Second World War should have become so desperate to join a club of losers so soon after that victory. The answer to that question is key to understanding why the EU has gone so wrong.

The official narrative of twentieth century history misinforms economics students that Britain was in dire economic straits, and that the European Economic Community as it was then known, _____ . Political history students learn that after the Second World War Britain needed to recast her geopolitical position away from empire, and towards a more realistic one at the heart of Europe. Neither of these arguments, however, makes any sense at all.

The EEC in the 1960s and 1970s was in no position to regenerate anyone's economy. It spent most of its meagre resources on two hugely expensive and inefficient policies, the Common Agricultural Policy and The Common Fisheries Policy, and had no means or policies to generate economic growth among its original six members, Germany, France, Italy, The Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg, which beautiful though it is, can hardly be described as a major economic player.

When economic growth did start to happen, it did not come from the EU but from national economies, Germany's recovery from the defeat of the Nazis in World War Two, which was driven by Ludwig Erhard's supply-side reforms in West Germany in 1948 through to _____

_____ , European growth came from reforms introduced by individual countries which were copied elsewhere. EU policy has always been either irrelevant or positively detrimental (as was the case with the Euro).

Another untruth incorporated into European history is that British growth lagged behind Europe's. Sometimes it ran more or less parallel, at others it surged ahead. In the 1950s Western Europe had a growth rate of 3.5 per cent; in the 1960s, it was 4.5 per cent. But in 1959, when Harold Macmillan took office, the real annual growth rate of British GDP, according to the Office of National Statistics, was almost 6 per cent. It was again almost 6 per cent when de Gaulle vetoed our first application to join the EEC in 1963.

In 1973, when we entered the EEC, our annual national growth rate in real terms was a record 7.4 per cent. The present Chancellor would die for such figures. So the economic basket-case argument doesn't work.

Four of these countries held no international weight whatsoever. Germany was occupied and divided. France, meanwhile, had lost one colonial war in Vietnam and another in Algeria. De Gaulle had come to power to save the country from civil war. Most realists must surely have regarded these states as a bunch of losers. De Gaulle, himself a supreme realist, pointed out that Britain had democratic political institutions, world trade links, cheap food from the Commonwealth, and was a global power. Why would it want to enter the EEC?

The answer is that Harold Macmillan and his closest advisers were part of an intellectual tradition that saw the salvation of the world in some form of world government based on regional federations. He was also a close acquaintance of _____. It was therefore Macmillan who became the representative of the European federalist movement in the British cabinet.

In a speech in the House of Commons he even advocated a European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) before the real thing had been announced. He later arranged for a Treaty of Association to be signed between the UK and the ECSC, and it was he who ensured that a British representative was sent to the Brussels negotiations following the Messina Conference, which gave birth to the EEC.

In the late 1950s he pushed negotiations concerning a European Free Trade Association towards membership of the EEC. Then, when General de Gaulle began to turn the EEC into a less federalist body, he took the risk of submitting a full British membership application in the hope of frustrating Gaullist ambitions.

His aim, in alliance with US and European proponents of a federalist world order, was to frustrate the emerging Franco-German alliance which was seen as one of French and German nationalism.

Monnet met secretly with Heath and Macmillan on innumerable occasions to facilitate British entry. Indeed, he was informed before the British Parliament of the terms in which the British approach to Europe would be framed.

Despite advice from the Lord Chancellor, Lord Kilmuir, that membership would mean the end of British parliamentary sovereignty, Macmillan deliberately misled the House of Commons — and practically everyone else, from Commonwealth statesmen to cabinet colleagues and the public — that merely minor commercial negotiations were involved. He even tried to deceive de Gaulle that he was an anti-federalist and a close friend who would arrange for France, like Britain, to receive Polaris missiles from the Americans. De Gaulle saw completely through him and vetoed the British bid to enter.

Macmillan left Edward Heath to take matters forward, and Heath, along with Douglas Hurd, arranged — according to the Monnet papers — for the Tory Party to become a (secret) corporate member of Monnet's Action Committee for a United States of Europe.

According to _____, both the Labour and Liberal Parties later did the same. Meanwhile the Earl of Gosford, one of Macmillan's foreign policy ministers in the House of Lords, actually informed the House that the aim of the government's foreign policy was world government.

Today, this is still the case. Powerful international lobbies are already at work attempting to prove that any return to democratic self-government on the part of Britain will spell doom. American officials have already been primed to state that such a Britain would be excluded from any free trade deal with the USA and that the world needs the TTIP trade treaty which is predicated on the survival of the EU.

Fortunately, Republican candidates in the USA are becoming Eurosceptics and magazines there like [The National Interest](#) are publishing the case for Brexit. The international coalition behind Macmillan and Heath will find things a lot more difficult this time round — especially given the obvious difficulties of the Eurozone., the failure of EU migration policy and the lack of any coherent EU security policy.

Most importantly, having been fooled once, the British public will be much more difficult to fool again.

Boris Johnson is being accused of extremely exaggerating the comparison between the EU and the German Nazi's plan for a union of Europe. The pro-Brexit former Mayor has stated that both Hitler and Napoleon failed at unifying Europe and that the EU was "an attempt to do this by different methods", namely without weapons this time!

Donald Tusk, the European Union Council President, said that the former Mayor of London "had crossed all boundaries" by making the comparison. As we hope to have shown in this e-book Boris was unfairly criticised, the Nazi roots of the E U are well documented, the links to Nazi politics shared by many influential figures in shaping the E U in its early days are proved by their own words, reproduced here (and easily verifiable) and

Lord Heseltine, predictably a supporter of the Remain campaign labelled Johnson's comments "preposterous" & "obscene". It is the globalist Helestine who is obscene in his attempt to occupy the moral high ground in order to deflect attention from an organisation that he has always supported even when doing so meant opposing the best interests of Britain.

Development of The European Union is 100% documented by previous texts of what the Nazi regime envisaged for the continent of Europe after World War 2. While Boris Johnson's comment conflating Napoleon Bonaparte with Hitler, it is certainly true that Bonaparte sought to create a pen - European Empire.

[The European Community](#), a 1940 book by Nazi Economics Minister and war criminal Walther Funk wrote about the needs of creating a "Centralized European Union" and "European Economic Area's" he argued, "There must be a readiness to subordinate one's own interests in certain cases to those of [the EC]." Don't be put off by the German Title of this free .pdf, the text is an English translation.

Nazi academic Heinrich Hunke wrote, "Classic national economy is dead...community of fate which is the European economy...fate and extent of European co-operation depends on a new unity economic plan".

Fellow Nazi Gustav Koenig observed, "We have a real European Community task before us...I am convinced that this Community effort will last beyond the end of the war."

Other top Nazis who called for the creation of a pan-European federal economic superstate include Ribbentrop, the Norwegian traitor Quisling and [Arthur Seyss-Inquart](#), an Austrian politician and Nazi collaborator who spoke of "The new Europe of solidarity and co-operation among all of its

people... will find...rapidly increasing prosperity once national economic boundaries are removed.”

In 1940, Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda chief ordered the creation of the “large-scale economic unification of Europe,” believing that “in fifty years’ time people will no longer think in terms of countries.”

Just 53 years later, the European Union in its current form was established, with a plan to drive Europe towards 'ever closer integration' until the independence and national sovereignty of member states would be a thing of the past.

It's no surprise that what these top Nazis proposed is almost identical to what the EU has now become, with total surveillance, abolition of free speech and free thought and criminalization of dissent planned. The latter was of course implemented by Nazi Germany, the others were planned but the technology to achieve them was not available.

Boris is right – the EU is the very bureaucratic, centralized, dictatorial European federal superstate that Hitler and other top Nazis had planned to implement after World War 2.

THE COMMON ROOTS OF THE THIRD REICH AND THE EU OR FASCISM AND SOCIALISM, THE EVIL TWINS

"There is a lot of muddled thinking on what constitutes fascism. The definition cited by Benito Mussolini, the founder of modern fascism, is given in the first chapter of this book. The idea of fascism, however, is much older than that, the word derives from a symbol used by The Roman Empire to represent the unbreakable power of a centralised authority. 'The Fasces' depicts an axe with sticks bound around its shaft.



Ironically supporters of an ever bigger, ever more closely integrated, ever more centralised and ideologically driven European Union are quick to brand opponents and critics of the EU, the realisation of Hitler's dream of a Europe unified economically and politically under a single authority, as a fascist. This is nothing but the usual untruth and deflection we have come to expect from authoritarian extremist control freaks who have hi - jacked the political label left wing in order to cast themselves as cuddly, caring, inclusive, minority loving liberals.

The case is of course that true liberals (and we're an endangered species these days,) do not accept there is a duty to love certain minorities or points-of-view and hate others. A liberal will respond to people as individuals; it is not incumbent on anyone to like gays and lesbians because of their sexual preferences, or to give special treatment to members of a particular ethnic group or religious faith on the basis of their skin colour or what god they worship. We are entitled to choose whether we like or dislike a person on the basis of their qualities as an individual. Inertia and propaganda designed to convince people that the supporters of corporatism and statism know best has led to many people accepting the false morality of the false left. "What good fortune for governments," said Hitler, "that the people do not think.")

The important thing to remember is that modern fascism was invented by Mussolini in 1919 and his definition is quite simple: 'Liberalism denied the state in the name of the individual,' he said, 'fascism reasserts the rights of the state as expressing the real essence of the individual.'

Thus we see, that while liberalism or even anarchism do not deny individuals the right to think for themselves or act collectively where group action best serves individual interests, the statism or corporatism of those who style themselves 'progressives' or 'left - wing' are in fact the most extreme right wing group, they would deny individual rights and marginalise those who declined to conform.

Mussolini went on to argue: 'the more complicated the forms of civilisation, the more restricted the freedom of the individual must become.' It is clear from these comments that the European Union fulfils the criteria for a truly fascist organisation. The EU reduces our freedom and our privacy because only the state (The Union, the superstate) really matters; the rights and needs of the corporate state (the European Union) takes precedence over the rights and needs of the citizens.

And where did the Nazi founders of the E U, Mussolini and the leaders of the various brutal dictatorships that have arisen from communism and socialism get their ideas about the downgrading of the individual (and the family unit) and the elevation of 'the big state' over 'small community'?

Society does not consist of individuals but expresses the sum of interrelations, the relations within which these individuals stand.

Karl Marx - Communist Manifesto

“In a higher phase of communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the

individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished;

; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-around development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be crossed in its entirety and society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!”

[Karl Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program](#)

Most of us who have contributed to this book have been told, in response to our articles, blogs and comments around the internet that we cannot seriously compare socialism and communism (good guys - white hats) to Naziism and Fascism (bad guys - black hats). Cant's we? Hitler persecuted Jews, homosexuals, gypsies, ethnic and religious minorities and political opponents; Mussolini persecuted Jews, homosexuals, ethnic and religious minorities, and political opponents (gypsies were never popular in Italy but the fascisti did them no favours), Stalin persecuted Jews and Armenians, homosexuals, gypsies, flower of all religions, political opponents and other ethnic minorities, Mao Tse Tung persecuted all of the above and anyone else he did not like. Do you notice a pattern?

The success of socialism depends on the imposition of an ideology on society and that in turn depends on the use of propaganda in education and mass media to shape peoples' minds. The idea is visible in Marx's writing when he confers a collective identity, 'the proleteriat' or more colloquially 'the proles' on the working classes. The idea that working class people are stupid and easily manipulated, while totally wrong, is attractive to elitist intellectuals who will have rarely met working class people in situations where both could feel at ease. This is demonstrated by the British socialist philosopher and mathematician in his essay 'The Impact Of Science On Society'. Russell, or The Earl Of Russell to give his formal title, a member of the elite socialist group [The Fabian Society](#) believed the path to a socialist utopia lay through the wilderness of tyranny. Like many of his socialist and communist fellow travellers as well as authoritarians such as Mussolini who are more frequently described as 'the right', Russell believe democracy was an obstacle to scientific and social progress and that a better society could only be achieved by the creation of a global, totalitarian, technocratic government. Though published after world War Two it contained ideas Russell and his Fabian socialist colleagues had been promoting since the late nineteenth century. As is typical of Russell, the writing style is excruciatingly dull (a trait shared by many socialist non fiction authors - they take themselves far too seriously). The beginning of the book seems reasonable and humanitarian, and is intended to soften the reader up for the disgusting conclusions which are presented as desirable or inevitable, conclusion which were, as stated above, adopted by Adolf Hitler and other authoritarian socialists.

You may also notice in the second paragraph, Russell employs a phrase I and other critics of global government thinking have been ridiculed for using, 'scientific dictatorship'. We new media writers and 'conspiracy theorists' did not invent such phrases, they were coined by people who worship science and constantly campaign for a 'new world order' under a global totalitarian government.

Read through the following quotes from the book (they're not that long, though they might seem to be) and decide for yourself how much of the conspiracy is already in place, and how desirable any form of socialist government is to people who value their freedom. (The Impact Of Science On Society is available as a [free download - Kindle, Epub, .pdf formats](#))

Read some relevant excerpts it in Russell's own words:

I think the subject which will be of most importance politically is mass psychology ... Its importance has been enormously increased by the growth of modern methods of propaganda. Of these the most influential is what is called 'education.' Religion plays a part, though a diminishing one; the press, the cinema, and the radio play an increasing part ... It may be hoped that in time anybody will be able to persuade anybody of anything if he can catch the patient young and is provided by the State with money and equipment.

The subject will make great strides when it is taken up by scientists under a scientific dictatorship ... The social psychologists of the future will have a number of classes of school children on whom they will try different methods of producing an unshakable conviction that snow is black. Various results will soon be arrived at. First, that the influence of home is obstructive. Second, that not much can be done unless indoctrination begins before the age of ten. Third, that verses set to music and repeatedly intoned are very effective. Fourth, that the opinion that snow is white must be held to show a morbid taste for eccentricity. But I anticipate. It is for future scientists to make these maxims precise and discover exactly how much it costs per head to make children believe that snow is black, and how much less it would cost to make them believe it is dark grey.

Although this science will be diligently studied, it will be rigidly confined to the governing class. The populace will not be allowed to know how its convictions were generated. When the technique has been perfected, every government that has been in charge of education for a generation will be able to control its subjects securely without

the need of armies or policemen.

Scientific societies are as yet in their infancy ... It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries. Fichte laid it down that education should aim at destroying free will, so that, after pupils have left school, they shall be incapable, throughout the rest of their lives, of thinking or acting otherwise than as their schoolmasters would have wished ... Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible ...

The Nazis were more scientific than the present rulers of Russia ... If they had survived, they would probably have soon taken to scientific breeding. Any nation which adopts this practice will, within a generation, secure great military advantages. The system, one may surmise, will be something like this: except possibly in the governing aristocracy, all but 5 per cent of males and 30 per cent of females will be sterilised. The 30 per cent of females will be expected to spend the years from eighteen to forty in reproduction, in order to secure adequate cannon fodder. As a rule, artificial insemination will be preferred to the natural method ...

Gradually, by selective breeding, the congenital differences between rulers and ruled will increase until they become almost different species. A revolt of the plebs would become as unthinkable as an organised insurrection of sheep against the practice of eating mutton.

After all, most civilised and semi-civilised countries known to history and had a large class of slaves or serfs completely subordinate to their owners. There is nothing in human nature that makes the persistence of such a system impossible. And the whole development of scientific technique has made it easier than it used to be to maintain a despotic rule of a minority. When the government controls the distribution of food, its power is absolute so long as they can count on the police and the armed forces. And their loyalty can be secured by giving them some of the privileges of the governing class. I do not see how any internal movement of revolt can ever bring freedom to the oppressed in a modern scientific dictatorship.

I do not pretend that birth control is the only way in which population can be kept from increasing. There are others, which, one must suppose, opponents of birth control would prefer. War, as I remarked a moment ago, has hitherto been disappointing in this respect,

but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could be spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. There would be nothing in this to offend the consciences of the devout or to restrain the ambitions of nationalists. The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other peoples. However, I am wandering from the question of stability, to which I must return.

There are three ways of securing a society that shall be stable as regards population. The first is that of birth control, the second that of infanticide or really destructive wars, and the third that of general misery except for a powerful minority. All these methods have been practised: the first, for example, by the Australian aborigines; the second by the Aztecs, the Spartans, and the rulers of Plato's Republic; the third in the world as some Western internationalists hope to make it and in Soviet Russia ... Of these three, only birth control avoids extreme cruelty and unhappiness for the majority of human beings. Meanwhile, so long as there is not a single world government there will be competition for power among the different nations. And as increase of population brings the threat of famine, national power will become more and more obviously the only way of avoiding starvation. There will therefore be blocs in which the hungry nations band together against those that are well fed. That is the explanation of the victory of communism in China.

The need for a world government, if the population problem is to be solved in any humane manner, is completely evident on Darwinian principles.

A society is not stable unless it is on the whole satisfactory to the holders of power and the holders of power are not exposed to the risk of successful revolution.

First, as regards physical conditions. Soil and raw materials must not be used up so fast that scientific progress cannot continually make good the loss by means of new inventions and discoveries ... If raw materials are not to be used up too fast, there must not be free competition for their acquisition and use but an international authority to ration them in "such quantities as may from time to time seem compatible with continued industrial prosperity". And similar considerations apply to soil conservation.

Second, as regards population ... To deal with this problem it will be necessary to find ways of preventing an increase in world population. If this is to be done otherwise than by wars, pestilences, and famines, it will demand a powerful international authority.

This authority should deal out the world's food to the various nations in proportion to their population at the time of the establishment of the authority. If any nation subsequently increased its population it should not on that account receive any more food. The motive for not increasing population would therefore be very compelling.

So Russell comprehensively damns himself as an authoritarian, a racist (in the sense of races being tribes, clans or castes) and a believer in eugenics and social engineering. The system he describes and that his successors in the socialist elite are now trying to build on a global scale might pay lip service to such high minded principles as egalitarianism, and redistribution of wealth, but when discussed behind closed doors sees no need to hide the fact that it's earliest model was 'The Fasces' the symbol of unbreakable power adopted by the Patrician class of The Roman Empire.

And that is what socialism, communism, fascism, statism, corporatism, whatever you call it is all about.

Where did all the confusion between fascism and socialism begin. A simple definition of socialism but one that works well enough in describing the origins of this way of organising society, is a community in which all members are equal, there is no King or Lord, no hierarchy and the will of the people, determined by simple majority voting, is the law. Direct democracy, for that it what we have just described, works fine in small communities, [The Levellers](#) or [The Diggers](#), seventeenth century English religious - radical groups who proposed radical reforms to the systems of land ownership and taxation (two hundred years before Karl Marx) and fought for the right to live in independent, self sufficient communities outside the auspices of The Church Of England, which was at the time very much part of government, the church parish being as much a system of local governance as a part of the apparatus of worship.

Direct democracy sounds lovely in theory but the problem is that while it worked perfectly well in the Leveller and Digger communities of at most a few hundred people, it becomes a nightmare to manage if the community grows to over twenty thousand. Ancient Athens, with an estimated population of around 250,000, was a slave based economy and so had around 50,000 full citizens with voting rights. And at that size, its democracy had become a nightmare to manage. Rome, with a much larger number of potential voters developed a system of representative democracy in which the voters elected people to represent their interests.

The problem is the bigger a democratic society gets, the more remote from ordinary people the government becomes. And human nature being what it is, that means those at hub of

government are so far removed from the concerns of individuals, they are easily seduced by wealth and power and thus are corrupted and act on behalf of vested interests rather than the people they are paid to represent. And if democracy can break down in a country of sixty million like Britain, so that nobody knows what the main parties stand for and many people end up voting on the basis of class divisions that have not been relevant since the 1960s, what hope would there be for an integrated European Union, a federal superstate with a total population of over 600 million, made up of people from twenty eight different national cultures and traditions. A totalitarian, fascistic system would be inevitable and those of us who observe the evolution of the E U see such a fascist system emerging now. And it is not just Europe.

At the American Political Science Association Panel 3 in 2005, under the title "Is It Time to Call It Fascism?" Professor Dvora Yanow of California State University, Hayward, the panel chairman tried to answer the panel's question: "Is there a theoretical-definitional grounding to make a claim for the present U.S. administration as fascist, and is it useful, critically, to use that language at this point in time?"

Skipping daintily over the ability of academics to seem as if they are talking (or writing) bollocks when in fact they are raising a good point, though fascism has been the subject of much study and thought, as a concept, has no intellectual basis nor did its founders even pretend to have any. Adolf Hitler's ravings in "Mein Kampf," Benito Mussolini's bombastic, self aggrandizing speeches, all can be described, in the words of Roger Scruton, as "an amalgam of disparate conceptions." but then fascism perhaps needs no underpinning philosophy. From the warrior cults of the ancient world to the backstabbing, double dealing deceivers of modern politics, fascism has been embedded in the psyche of a certain kind of person.

"Anyone who reads many studies of fascism as a multinational problem cannot but be struck by the frequency with which writers who begin by assuming they are dealing with a unitary phenomenon end up with several more or less discrete subcategories. Regardless of what criteria are applied, it seems very difficult to keep fascism from fragmenting.

"In spite of this, there has been a general reluctance to consider what must be regarded as a definite possibility: namely, that fascism as a generic concept has no validity and is without value for serious analytical purposes. ... The generic term fascism is in origin neither analytical nor descriptive."

Quite so. Fascism is simply a ruthless version of authoritarianism, and that is why, as described earlier, socialist and communist can be described as fascist.

Yet "fascism" still has meaning in democratic societies as seen in the fracas a few years ago over Austria's Joerg Haider. Labelling someone you dislike or with whose politics you disagree a "fascist" is still a refuge for those unable to construct an argument in internet forums. In the

language of the left, the only thing worse than being called a fascist is being called a racist. What defines a fascist really however is someone who believes in power through strength. In medieval terms that meant a guy wearing armour and carrying a sword or battle axe walking into a village and saying "I'm the best fighter around here, so I'm the boss man. Anyone who does not agree can fight me for the job." Power through strength.

Having combed their literature, the great and good of the American Political Science academy showed beyond doubt the affinities, too long ignored and denied, between fascism and Marxism-Leninism. (Don Luigi Sturzo who provided the *reductio ad absurdum*: Fascism was black communism and communism was red fascism.)

Richard Pipes has wrote that "Bolshevism and fascism were heresies of socialism." Recalling that Mussolini began his political career as a distinguished Italian socialist, the Professors concluded that "Fascism's most direct ideological inspiration came from the collateral influence of Italy's most radical 'subversives' - the Marxists of revolutionary syndicalism." A leading Soviet ideologist Nikolai Bukharin, who was purged by Josef Stalin for expressing misgivings about the Revolution alluded to the emerging system's fascist features. And the nineteenth century Russian Anarchist thinker Mikhail Bakunin, in 1870 told Karl Marx himself that once a communist government came to power it would quickly become even more oppressive than the absolutist monarchy of the Tsars.

By the early 1930s, the 'convergence' of fascism and Stalinism was being commented on by Marxists and non-Marxists alike, even Trotsky observed that 'Stalinism and fascism, in spite of deep difference in social foundations, are symmetrical phenomena. ' ... In an effort to detract from criticisms of their political system, Fascist politicians pointed out that the organization of Soviet society, with its inculcation of an ethic of military obedience, self-sacrifice and heroism, totalitarian regulation of public life, party-dominant hierarchical stratification all under the dominance of the an all powerful centralised state, corresponded in form, to the requirements of fascist doctrine.

Liberals, progressives, socialist and the shambolic broad left have never dared face the fact Marxism-Leninism and fascism of Hitler and Mussolini had a common origin.

"The new European economy will result from close economic collaboration between German and European countries,' the Nazi economist Walther Funk wrote in the 1930s. It is important to note that decades before the EU officially came into being, the idea of a politically and economically unified Europe was seen by its originators not as a union of equals, but the establishment of German dominance by Germany of the rest of Europe. There was never any doubt which nation would be in dominate federal republic called the United States of Europe. (The phrase United States of Europe was devised by Adolf Hitler himself you may remember from an earlier chapter).

It is beyond comprehension that politicians and economists express surprise when Germany's political domination of today's EU is raised in discussions, and who struggle to explain why Germany is booming and has by far the strongest economy in the EU. No one should be surprised by any of this because things have gone exactly to plan. The EU was intended to provide Naziism with an alternative to armed combat as a way of dominating Europe.

Since the financial crisis of 2008, in fact since it was floated in 1999, the Euro, the common currency of the European monetary system, has been in trouble one way or another. but while other nations that joined the system, particularly the weaker economic units of southern Europe, for example Greece and Portugal, and even some much larger economies, including Italy and Spain struggle, Germany has benefitted enormously from the Euro crisis and continues to benefit. Walther Funk knew that would be the case back in 1940, when he floated the idea of a single currency. He even predicted that a European Economic Union would not work for weaker economies when he warned that even after monetary union it would be impossible to have one standard of living throughout Europe. Obviously he knew that the Euro would be flawed. Nazi Germany would not be in the least surprised by modern Germany's economic supremacy in Europe.

In reality, the Euro was bound to cause chaos and massive unemployment throughout many parts of the European Union because of policies pursued by German politicians after the reunification of West and East Germany and before the foundation of the Euro. Partition after World War Two has thrust a spoke in the economic wheel of Funk's plan and delayed the Nazification by stealth of Europe for four decades. Ideologues are nothing if not patient and whereas you or I would probably want to see results from our life's work within our lifetime, these people are so convinced their ideas will lead to a perfect world, they are quite happy to think and plan generations ahead.

The policies which were designed to enable a unified Germany to control the EU involved

Germany entering the Euro at an advantageously low exchange rate, thereby giving it a huge competitive advantage over other Euro countries. In fact the Euro is really the Deutschmark by another name. This guaranteed Germany would get richer while other countries got poorer and that is exactly what is happening. (The French chose to join the Euro with a strong franc because it meant that they could enjoy cheap holidays in the rest of Europe.) The result is that because the Euro is undervalued relative to the German economy, and just as the USA exploits the fact that it is issuer of the main global reserve currency to gain competitive advantage in international trade, Germany exploits the fact that it dictates interest rates and other trade conditions to ensure it export far more than it imports and grows ever richer and stronger at the expense of its 'partners' in the single currency system.

“The ‘European project’ began on 9 May 1950 with the announcement by Germany and France of the European coal and steel community, with Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg taking up the offer to join with the. This led to the Treaty of Rome that established the European Economic Community (EEC).

The prime mover behind all this was actually Jean Monnet, a hugely influential French bureaucrat and businessman who somehow persuaded leaders of the smaller EEC members to ignore certain conflicts of interest. The power base Monnet had built up before and during the war gave him immense political influence while keeping out of the public eye (a pattern followed by many businessman - bureaucrats since, most notably the former United Nations General Secretary Maurice Strong, one of the biggest players in the move to global government). It was Monnet who secured the Allies' backing for General de Gaulle against Roosevelt's opposition, and in return, de Gaulle gave him responsibility for rebuilding the French economy and industry.

The ‘Schuman Declaration’ that launched the coal and steel community and laid the foundations for the European Union was the result of intrigue, and subterfuge by Monnet, who with great audacity persuaded the French and West German governments to set up a supranational organisation to co-ordinate their industries without their fully understanding what they had signed up to. This radical idea of an autonomous, bureaucratic organisation outside the legal system of any national government but with control over individual nations' industries laid the foundation for all that came after. Predictably, Monnet became president of the new body, called, with a disturbingly Orwellian sounding title, the High Authority. Shuman became the first president of the European Parliament in 1958.

What was really going on? There is a clue in the fact that Monnet was another pre-war protégé of the Synarchist Empire Movement. In 1936, Vivien Postel du Mas told Maurice Girodias that, alongside Coudenhove-Kalergi (see previous section), Monnet was an influential promoter of the synarchist agenda and publicly supported Canudo's pro-Europe groups. One colleague informants went so far as to describe Monnet as a “true synarch... whose membership of the

movement was never in doubt for the true initiates.”

Schuman, too, had formed synarchist connections in his youth, although not as directly involved with the movement as Monnet: he had worked closely on political reform in France and European integration with the professor of law Louis Le Fur, a synarchy activist.”

Sources – <http://www.newdawnmagazine.com/articles/synarchy-the-hidden-hand-behind-the-european-union>

https://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/pais/people/aldrich/publications/oss_cia_united_europe_eec_eu.pdf

Most British, and other Europeans whose dissatisfaction with the EU is growing, remain unaware of quite recently declassified documents from the US State Department archives “showing that US intelligence funded the European movement secretly for decades, and worked aggressively behind the scenes to push Britain into the project.”

When you understand this it explains a lot about Barack Obama's efforts to threaten and bully British voters into voting to surrender national sovereignty to the European bureaucratic dictatorship

One memorandum dated July 26, 1950, reveals a campaign to promote a full-fledged European parliament. It was signed by Gen William J Donovan, head of the American wartime Office of Strategic Services, the forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency.” In fact, “the key CIA front was the American Committee for a United Europe (ACUE), chaired by Donovan.

Another document shows that it provided 53.5 percent of the European movement’s funds in 1958. The board [of the ACUE] included Walter Bedell Smith and Allen Dulles, CIA directors in the fifties, and a caste of ex-OSS officials who moved in and out of the CIA.”

The archives show that the CIA essentially “treated some of the EU’s ‘founding fathers’ as hired hands,” and even “actively prevented them [from] finding alternative funding that would have broken reliance on Washington.”

<http://sputniknews.com/europe/20160501/1038913349/brexit-european-union-cia-project-analysis.html>

THE COUDENHOVE-KALERGI PLAN – THE GENOCIDE OF THE PEOPLES OF EUROPE

Mass immigration is a phenomenon, the causes of which are still cleverly concealed by the system, and the multicultural propaganda is trying to falsely portray it as inevitable. With this article we intend to prove once and for all, that this is not a spontaneous phenomenon. What they want to present as an inevitable outcome of modern life, is actually a plan conceived around a table and prepared for decades, to completely destroy the face of the continent.

Few people know that one of the main initiators of the process of European integration, was also the man who designed the genocide plan of the Peoples of Europe. It is a dark person, whose existence is unknown to the masses, but the elite considers him as one of the founders of the European Union. His name is [Richard Coudenhove Kalergi](#). His father was an Austrian diplomat named Heinrich von Coudenhove-Kalergi (with connections to the Byzantine family of the Kallergis) and his mother the Japanese Mitsu Aoyama. Kalergi, thanks to his close contacts with all European aristocrats and politicians, due to the relationships of his nobleman-diplomat father, and by moving behind the scenes, away from the glare of publicity, he managed to attract the most important heads of state to his plan, making them supporters and collaborators for the “project of European integration”.

European integration would be the first step in creating a world government. Among the first supporters, including Czech politicians Tomáš Masaryk and Edvard Beneš and the banker Max Warburg, who invested the first 60,000 marks. The Austrian Chancellor Ignaz Seipel and the next president of Austria, Karl Renner, took the responsibility for leading the “Pan-European” movement. Later, French politicians, such as Léon Blum, Aristide Briand, Alcide De Gasperi, etc will offer their help.

With the rise of Fascism in Europe, the project was abandoned and the “Pan-European” movement was forced to dissolve,

The CIA later undertakes the completion of the project.

In his book "Praktischer Idealismus", Kalergi indicates that the residents of the future “United States of Europe” will not be the People of the Old Continent, but a kind of sub-humans,

products of miscegenation. He clearly states that the peoples of Europe should interbreed with Asians and coloured races, thus creating a multinational flock with no quality and easily controlled by the ruling elite.

Kalergi proclaims the abolition of the right of self-determination and then the elimination of nations with the use of ethnic separatist movements and mass migration. In order for Europe to be controlled by an elite, he wants to turn people into one homogeneous mixed breed of Blacks, Whites and Asians. Who is is this elite however? Kalergi is particularly illuminating on this:

Although no textbook mentions Kalergi, his ideas are the guiding principles of the European Union. The belief that the peoples of Europe should be mixed with Africans and Asians, to destroy our identity and create a single mestizo race, is the basis of all community policies that aim to protect minorities. Not for humanitarian reasons, but because of the directives issued by the ruthless Regime that machinates the greatest genocide in history. European Prize
is awarded every two years to Europeans who have excelled in promoting this criminal plan.

The incitement to genocide, is also the basis of the constant appeals of the United Nations, that demands we accept millions of immigrants to help with the low birth rates of the EU.

of the

United Nations in New York, under the title “Immigration replacement: A solution to declining and ageing population,” Europe will need by 2025 159,000,000 migrants.

One could wonder how there can be such accuracy on the estimates of immigration, although it was not a premeditated plan. It is certain that the low birth rate could easily be reversed with appropriate measures to support families. It is just as clear that it is the contribution of foreign genes do not protect our genetic heritage, but that it enables their disappearance. The sole purpose of these measures is to completely distort our people, to turn them into a group of people without national,

historical and cultural cohesion. In short, the policies of the Kalergi plan was and still is, the basis of official government policies aimed at genocide of the Peoples of Europe, through mass immigration. G. Brock Chisholm, former director of the World Health Organization (OMS), proves that he has learned the lesson of Kalergi well when he says: “What people in all places have to do is to limit of birthrates and promote mixed marriages (between different races), this aims to create a single race in a world which will be directed by a central authority. ”

We face Europe’s fusion with the Third World. The plague of interracial marriage produces each year thousands of young people of mixed race: “The children of Kalergi”. Under the dual pressures of misinformation and humanitarian stupefaction, promoted by the MSM, the Europeans are being taught to renounce their origin, to renounce their national identity.

The servants of globalization are trying to convince us that to deny our identity, is a progressive and humanitarian act, that “racism” is wrong, because they want us all to be blind consumers.

Every one must see this truth, that European Integration amounts to genocide. We have no other option, the alternative is national suicide.

We therefore observe a personality with strong snobbish attitudes, arrogance, and, allow me the term, “degenerate elitism.” Also, the fact that his mother was Asian, perhaps created internal conflicts and frustrations, something that can happen to people with such temperament. But the most decisive factor must have been the “proper teenager”, which incidentally of course, was beside him, and became his first woman (at age 13): The Jewess Ida Roland, who would later become a famous actress.

On November 16th 2012, the President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, was awarded the Coudenhove-Kalergi Prize, during a special conference in Vienna, to celebrate the 90 years of the pan-European movement. The prize is awarded every two years to leading personalities for their outstanding contribution to the process of European integration.

A decisive factor that helped him win the prize was the balanced way in which President Van Rompuy executed his duties in the new position of President of the European Council, which was established by the Treaty of Lisbon. He handled this particularly sensitive leading and coordinating role with a spirit of determination and reconciliation, while emphasis was also given to his skilful arbitration on European affairs and unfailing commitment to European moral values.

During his speech, Mr Van Rompuy described the unification of Europe as a peace project. This idea, which was also the objective of the work of Coudenhove-Kalergi, after 90 years is still important. The award bears the name of Count Richard Nicolaus von Coudenhove-Kalergi (1894-1972), philosopher, diplomat, publisher and founder of the Pan-European Movement (1923). Coudenhove-Kalergi was the pioneer of European integration and popularized the idea of a federal Europe with his work.

When the United Kingdom joined the European Economic Community on 1 January 1973 under the Conservative government of Edward Heath, and again when a referendum was ordered by Labour Prime Minister Harold Wilson, who was against the EU along with most of his party, because even then they feared what effect such an organisation might have on democracy, it was portrayed as a European Free Trade organisation colloquially know as the 'Common Market'. After Britain and two more nations were added to the original six the organisation was began to be referred to as The European Community. Almost immediately the UK sampled examples of incredible bureaucracy such as the Common Agricultural Policy which appeared to reward inefficiency and a glut of overproduction which lead to the infamous 'butter mountains' and 'wine lakes' while the Common Fisheries Policy led to the destruction of fish stocks in British waters and

eventually to the near destruction of the entire British fishing industry because while more fish were actually caught, fewer were landed. More on those two bureaucratic insanities in a later chapter.

The European Project was pitched to the general UK public as a free trade organisation rather than a political union, but already some maverick voices in the UK were warning of an ulterior motive of creating a United States of Europe. Indeed, over the subsequent years the EC has obsessively pursued the goal of ever closer political and economic union between member nations (and increasing bureaucratic interference into everyday and business life in the those nations, it is not just in the UK that European bureaucracy is hated.) The Common Market or European Community was re-named European Union (EU) in 1993 following the Maastricht Treaty signed in 1992; this in effect took more rights from member nations over matters relating to foreign policy, military, criminal justice, and judicial cooperation to the central bureaucracy of the EU. The treaty revealed the true nature of European 'democracy', citizens of Denmark voted down the treaty and were asked to vote again as the people had not provided the correct affirmative result in their referendum at the first attempt. The UK's acceptance of this treaty was controversial, to say the least, and in true EU fashion British acceptance was stitched up by politicians and bureaucrats, the public were not given a chance to make their views known.

The Maastricht Treaty led to the creation of the Euro common currency in 1999. The Single Currency System (The Euro - bureaucrats are not known for imagination) was adopted by many, but not all member states. Significantly the UK with a British public opinion largely against joining the Euro negotiated an opt-out from this part of the treaty. It is also to former Financial Chancellor and Prime Minister Gordon Brown's credit that he resisted attempts for the UK to adopt the Euro currency. It is generally accepted that the UK would now be in a worse position economically had it joined, the single currency given the current economic state of Euro-zone nations whose leaders and economic advisers were foolish enough to tie their economies to the German economy at a time, and under conditions most favourable to Germany.

The plan to push Europe's sovereign nations towards 'ever closer union' has continued in spite of the economic problems of the Eurozone and the social problems caused by the immigration crisis. The attitude in the corridors of power, not just in Brussels, Luxembourg and Strasbourg, but also in the government offices of member nations where a cosy duopoly of centre left and centre right parties that are no longer politically distinguishable from each other except by the campaign colours they use, are far too cosy with the smooth face bureaucrats and back room deal makers who really formulate government policy. These people do not often say it publicly but they are nonetheless sure Europe will become a single political unit whether the people like it or not. The European Union behaves like any other government or corporate bureaucracy, with its prime function to grow and become more powerful, which is not the same as being more efficient or delivering better results.

When John Steinbeck wrote of 'The Monster' in his novel "[The Grapes Of Wrath](#)", (Chapter 5, that if the monster does not grow it dies, and to grow the monster must be fed, he was referring to banks. but banks are bureaucracies, and all bureaucracies, if fed, eventually grow into monsters. Here's how Steinbeck describes the process:

"The bank is something else than men. It happens that every man in a bank hates what the bank does, and yet the bank does it. The bank is something more than men, I tell you. It's the monster. Men made it, but they can't control it. The bank - the monster has to have profits all the time. It can't wait. It'll die. When the monster stops growing, it dies. It can't stay one size."

Because as it grows The Monster consumes more and more food people who feed the monster first become its slaves, as the monster consumes more of what they produce with more food and eventually it will grow so great it will consume everything. Thus the people who feed it will starve and there will be nobody to feed the monster. Then it too will die.

The orthodox interpretation among academics, teachers and critics of this bit of twentieth century myth making by Steinbeck is that the capitalist system will destroy itself. But Steinbeck was not a communist, nor was he a partisan. Like the warning of the Austrian economist Josef Schumpeter, who said that "Capitalism contains the seeds of its own destruction, socialism always leads to fascism," Elsewhere in *The Grapes Of Wrath* and in other novels and non-fiction works, John Steinbeck recognised that the monster could just as easily be the state as the banks, the political oligarchs of Soviet Russia or Red China or the financial oligarchs of western Europe or the USA.

This compulsion to grow was classically shown by the disgraceful Lisbon Treaty. This started life as the 'EU Constitution Treaty' which in short grabbed significantly more rights from member nations, giving the unelected bureaucrats supremacy over the elected governments of sovereign nations. This was put to a referendum in France and Holland, and was decisively rejected by the people of these countries. The EU simply rebranded the rejected Treaty as the 'Lisbon Treaty' and bullied nations into not having a referendum on it - Republic of Ireland was an exception due to its inherent constitution. The Irish people rejected the treaty by referendum - not the right answer for the EU so just as they had done when the people of Denmark failed in a referendum to give the answer the Bureaucrats had wanted, the Irish were bullied and bribed to vote again. All these shenanigans by the EU demonstrates it is not a political democracy in any shape or form, but more akin to a bureaucratic dictatorship - hence the nickname EUSSR given by some to the EU!

Without going into minute economic detail the Euro, as predicted by former UK Chancellors of the Exchequer Dennis Healey & Nigel Lawson together with many others across the political spectrum, is doomed and will more than likely fail in the near future. Greece, bankrupt for five

years now but prevented by the EU from leaving the Euro, and unable, because it uses the Euro, to take the steps needed to repair its always fragile economy and with a full scale humanitarian crisis on its hands due to economic policies imposed by the EU that are well suited to Germany but completely wrong for an agrarian economy based on small farm units, and very possibly others leaving the Euro. In the absence of complete political, taxation, banking unity the single currency is destined to fail. Very simply the European Union has been driven by political ideology rather than sound financial management. The EU has collectively spent/wasted far too much money and markets have cottoned on that some countries have borrowed more than they can afford to pay back. The inefficient countries in the Euro zone cannot independently devalue their currency or change interest rates, so are snookered whilst they stay in. The Greek economy does not generate enough tax revenue for the government to service the interest payments on its vast debts, let alone pay them off.

The UK Prime Minister David Cameron in a recent European summit in December 2011 to try and save the Euro (again), resisted the bullying tactics designed to extract more rights and money from the UK by unilaterally exercising a veto to their latest treaty amendment, effectively taking yet more powers away from member countries. This was certainly a popular stance with the people of the UK, and may well catalyse a detachment of the UK away from the ideological facet of the European Union, to concentrate purely on business trading links. Albeit much of this strong stance; appears to have been subsequently watered down, in the light of the usual Euro pressure.

Some of the rubbish that comes out of the mouths of various European Leaders and bureaucrats and the academics who advise them concerning trade is simply astounding in its stupidity. It is clear that most of these people do not have that slightest idea of what business is about or indeed of working in a business environment. What is often cited is that the UK needs the European Union to promote trade, and hence jobs. Utter bollocks, the EU in common with other bureaucracies actually hinders business efficiency - often to the total destruction of companies. This article will cite a number of examples from the personal author's business of how the EU actively hinders enterprise, but first an analogy.

Imagine a school playground where the boys (and to be a bit PC a few girls as well) are trading Football Cards. This is all quite simple, any duplicates are swapped for the players they are seeking. In other words trading is going on, no rules - no bureaucracy - all very simple. Until the staff of the school get involved to regulate the trade. It is decided that cards should only be traded at certain times, and that there should be an equal gender and ethnic mix of pupils trading, the cards are vetted and any the teachers don't like are banned. This is all getting a bit complicated, so they introduced forms to be signed by everyone, and an inventory of everyone's cards need to be kept.

The governing body decides that each pupil now needs to submit a monthly return of the cards traded. In the end the pupils find all this too much, and just give up trading cards. These is an

extreme example, but replace pupils with traders and the school staff with the European Union - and this is effectively the scenario imposed on businesses located within the Europe Union. In the same way the bureaucracy, time wasted, and cost of the EU actively hinders trade not encourages it.

The EU Working Time Directive was introduced in 1993. A little later than planned - this appeared to have been deliberately delayed to be pushed through when majority voting was allowed rather than the former unanimous voting. This became law in the United Kingdom 2009, the maximum 16 years transition time was utilised, which gives a fair idea of how popular this diktat was. In short the EU laid down a maximum of 48 hours in a working week, and a raft of other definitions. This has a profound adverse effect on working practices, and it is worth reiterating at this point that such 'rights' actually takes away rights for both employers and employees.

In the National Health Service (NHS) in the UK the Working Time Directive has effected the time doctors can be on call - as even sleeping time at employer's premises counts within the 48 hours. It is ironic that the self employed, particularly when starting up can have work directly imposed by EU/government at no pay which can push them in to working well beyond 48 hours a week! However, the employer has to provide a plethora of rights to employees, which the EU/government does not accommodate to the provider!

The EU is in essence a bureaucracy, and its behaviour is akin to a living organism to basically grow and survive. To grow, the organisation needs lots of money, and where else to turn but to the virtually religious ideology of 'Climate Change' (formerly 'Global Warming', terminology apparently dismissed due to 15 years of continual cooling if anything). The author has consistently argued that pollution in a general sense is not good, and much of this is driven by over population. However the thing with carbon emissions (specifically CO₂ - Carbon Dioxide) it can be measured - and hence taxed! These extra costs are passed on to businesses, and hence customers; but the EU is operating in a global economy and hence time after time companies in EU member countries are consistently handicapped in competitiveness.

The ideology of Climate Change has proved a goldmine for the European Union. The popular incandescent light bulbs have effectively been banned, notwithstanding that the 'low energy bulbs' are not really that efficient when considering that heat emitted by incandescent lighting (and hence heating savings) were not taken into comparison account, produce a poor and harsh light.

Furthermore energy saving dimmer switches are unusable at a sensible price, and the low energy light bulbs invariably use the poison Mercury which requires evacuation should a breakage occur. From a business perspective, the market would really go for a true low energy light bulb that quickly produces a pleasant light - the current low energy replacement does not offer this. Therefore Supply and Demand has to be manipulated by EU law to force consumers to use an inferior product.

The EU's Landfill Directive is a classic example of demonic bureaucracy in action. This directive came into force in 1999, with an implementation of 2001. Basically the result for the United Kingdom is that the EU dictates how much land fill of biodegradable waste goes into landfill, with virtually impossible to meet reduction targets, with of course large



finances for the UK amounting to billions of pounds for failing to meet these ridiculous targets. The author does not remember anyone voting for this, and it begs the question of why politicians signed over sovereign powers to the EU to do this, when a reverse Winston Churchill two finger salute would have been a more appropriate response.

The Net result of the landfill tax, as in many EU directives is that the over burgeoning EU Super state gains more money to waste. This has adversely affected businesses and the general population alike. The old chestnut of reducing CO2 'climate change' has been cited as a reason, and to encourage recycling. On examining the USA's experience of such matters, it appears that all the extra lorries and extra resources utilised for recycling circumvents any supposed savings. Basic rubbish collections in most of the UK is now fortnightly, but with additional collections for such items as food waste and recyclables - with twice the lorries used for effectively half the service. All for recycling materials that often are at maximum required supply capacity anyway. To use the newspaper columnist Richard Littlejohn's words 'You couldn't make it up'. Incidentally the author's company Datalite UK Ltd does recycle card and paper as packing materials - but this is purely for business efficiency reasons, not the result of some European diktat.

Another area, well beyond the scope of the original 'Common Market' concept is how the EU infringes into matters of 'Equality'. It is a truism that inequality exists from the moment of birth, and ultimately equality can only be achieved by treating everyone equally bad! The nearest to an 'equality' environment is a prison! Equality of opportunity is in the author's view a desirable concept, but equality of outcome can never be achieved. This makes 'Equality' a bureaucratic organisation's dream - there will always be conflict and an excuse for the organisation such as the European Union to increase their influence, size, and ultimately income in dealing with matters of 'Equality'. The mass of EU inspired legislation adversely affects business, and lets face it businesses are largely driven by profit - they would employ green with pink polka dot Martians if this resulted in a 5% increase in the bottom line! Also the ideology tends to treat people as groups rather than individuals, and can end up with reducing individual choice. The valid option of stay at home mums for example, is not really supported in politically correct circles.

The EU has also played havoc with any sensible control of immigration. With open borders, an illegal immigrant only has to sneak into any part of Europe (a favourite spot being via Greece) to be

allowed unfettered access to every member state, with the exception of the United Kingdom which still has border controls, albeit not as strong as they might be. Nevertheless the UK has seen a huge influx of immigration since the late 1990s and continuing, whether illegal or legal. Supply and Demand and infrastructure pressures, circumvents the supposed benefits of uncontrolled immigration to a country with scarce resources. Inevitably wages are driven down, with an ever burgeoning welfare bill.

The bureaucracy emanating from the EU is immense. By way of example a business can sell VAT free to a VAT registered business in another EU country. Sounds fine on the face of it, but the onus is on the supplying company to check the full validity of details supplied - in the absence of a central point to do so. In other words if a company outside the UK but within the EU supplies duff details, you can end up being responsible for their VAT bill! It gets worse HM Revenue and Customs require a separate VAT EC Sales Return - in addition to the full VAT return due at the end of the period. However the EC Sales Return needs to be submitted by the 21st of the month following the end of the period. This gives just two weeks (most company's need to wait around a week before commencing a VAT return, as some transactions are still going through the bank system) to complete what can be a time consuming task - all under threats of penalties from HMRC. To be frank it is in practice far easier to supply VAT free outside Europe, all this needs is a simple custom declaration. Also the reduction in bureaucracy and of course the lack of VAT requirement, explains why many items are despatched to the UK from the non EU Channel Island countries of Jersey and Guernsey!

Companies in the UK are required by law to produce accounts, and generally if a company gets their sums wrong, the company goes bust. However, the European Union appears to disregard every sound business practice, its own accounts have consistently failed audit, and in common with most large bureaucracies wastes money. The EU is in absolutely no position to dictate on how companies should run their businesses. The difference between the EU and a good business is that the later invests in success, and rapidly eliminates areas that fail. This is the opposite of the EU which invests in failure (such as Greece) at the expense of areas that succeed, such as Germany.

And of course the myriad of rules emanating from the EU appears at even a cursory business glance, designed to make European commerce as inefficient as possible, compared to the rest of the world. Such an example is the EU Cookie diktat. This was effective from 26th May 2012, and meant that around 90% of EU websites needed to have an opt in for collecting information or the web owner will face a fine of up to £500,000. A great detraction for the user's experience, and directly affects an organisation's ability to monitor performance of commerce websites. If fully complied with, web users will avoid EU websites like the plague - who wants to be bothered with continual nag boxes as they surf. Like so much nonsense that comes from the EU, this has not been thought through, ironically the majority of government websites are currently non compliant. I expect the EU wishes to take pot-shots at Google who provide Analytics will technically be illegal

or useless if the diktat is followed. This seems similar to the European Union attack on Microsoft - the EU (unelected) leaders seem to be adverse to efficient companies.

Top of the list of 'bonkers' concepts is the European currency. It is difficult to know where to start with this. The Euro has been instigated purely for political ideology, pure financial considerations appeared to have been totally disregarded. The idea that such diverse countries as Germany and Greece could share the same exchange rate and interest rate is deluded beyond belief. A staggering amount of countless billions of Euros has been wasted on trying to keep the Euro together, but to be frank the game is up. Nobody in their right mind would invest in a currency, where the European (unelected) leaders have already reneged on their commitments (Greece bond 'haircuts', in non 'Orwellian Double-speak' is a pure and simple default). Greece will be out of the Euro soon, and no doubt the rest of the PIIGS (Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece, & Spain) will follow suit - this needs to happen so that some sort of sanity and sensible economics resumes within the Euro zone. The United Kingdom the author predicts will actually be in quite a powerful position when this happens, once the initial shockwave subsides.

Much of what the European Union has undertaken appears crazy, but the EU behaves as any large bureaucracy behaves. The organisation has a vested interest in becoming ever larger and more encompassing, whether efficient or not. This provides greater employment and promotion prospects for those within the bureaucracy - because the organisation is funded by taxpayers, money is seen as virtually unlimited. Certainly financial effects of bad decisions are not as rapidly apparent, but eventually economical reality can catch up. This has happened in spectacular fashion within the European Union - which is on the point of financial meltdown - and unfortunately will take down many businesses with it. The adage goes that 'Turkeys Do Not Vote Christmas'; this does not mean that Christmas won't come anyway for the EU Turkeys!

EU Laws Make Life Impossible for Employers During recent years the EU has introduced a vast amount of legislation controlling the way in which employers can run their businesses. A tiny proportion of this legislation may help to protect employees against unscrupulous employers. Most of it, however, puts unbearable burdens on small employers. Legislation which forces employers to allow female members of staff to take a year off work after childbirth (and to have their job kept open for them) may work"

During recent years the EU has introduced a vast amount of legislation controlling the way in which employers can run their businesses. A tiny proportion of this legislation may help to protect employees against unscrupulous employers. Most of it, however, puts unbearable burdens on small employers. Legislation which forces employers to allow female members of staff to take a year off work after childbirth (and to have their job kept open for them) may work.

Such arrangements may work well enough at the EU's headquarters but prove impossibly difficult

for employers running small businesses with a handful of employees. The new laws arrive thick and fast. New fathers are entitled to take time off work. The EU has ruled that staff who fall ill while they are on holiday must be given extra holiday time to make up for the holiday they have lost through illness. Employees with disabled relatives or friends are entitled to take off as much time as they think they need. An employee with a disabled neighbour must be allowed to take the time off work if the neighbour needs taking to the dentist – however inconvenient this may be for the employer. According to the law there are already six million officially designated ‘carers’ in Britain. It is illegal to make employees redundant if they become blind or deaf (even if this means that they cannot do the work they are paid to do). And if an employee wants to write a book there is a law which says he or she should be allowed to take all the time they need to satisfy their creative urges

CHAPTER 4 ***BIRTH OF A BUREAUCRATIC DICTATORSHIP***

EU? DICTATORSHIP OF THE BUREAUCRATS

(Copyright material, revise thoroughly)

How many people in Britain and other European nation, I wonder, understand the full implications of implied condition of EU membership that states EU law supersedes national law. In fact it means that The Magna Carta, of which we British are rightly proud no longer means anything, the rights is confers on British citizens can be swept aside by bureaucratic edicts from the European Union. Likewise an even older legal codex which gave us certain rights. In 2012 when Mitt Romney ran for the US Presidency against the incumbent,t Barack Obama, Romney was viciously attacked by the Obama campaign for making a perfectly innocuous reference to Anglo - Saxon law.

Obama supporters accused Romney of suggesting that British law was superior to U.S. law. The candidate had meant nothing of the kind, he was referring to the Liber Judicialis, a bill of rights signed by King Alfred The Great who reigned from 870 to 898. In Liber Judicialis, King Alfred established [The Common Law](#). It is not known exactly when Alfred passed this law, for centuries its existence was disputed by despots and their cronies, who sought to strip Englishmen of their common law rights. by deed of the act, the the laws and customs of the nation were merged with laws based on the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule.

Alfred's son, Edward, declared

To all who are charged with the administration of public affairs I give the express command that they show themselves in all things to be just judges precisely as in the Liber Judicialis it is written; nor shall any of them fear to declare the common

law freely and courageously.

Prior to the Common Law, the Civil Law of Rome prevailed in England (Scotland and Wales were separate nations then) as it did throughout continental Europe. This was unpopular because, Rome having been ruled by the Catholic Church for several hundred years, contemporary Roman law gave the church privileges and immunities that seemed unfair to the many pagans in Britain. King Alfred's Common Law was widely adopted throughout northern Europe and became the basis for many national legal systems, including, understandably, that of the USA.

That is the Anglo Saxon law to which Mitt Romney referred, not modern British law, which though a good set of laws has been shaped to meet the needs of our nation. The influence of Liberal Judicialis is visible in the Constitution and Bill Of Rights of the USA, but almost a thousand years on years on from King Alfred, the wide differences are necessary to serve the needs of a vastly different society.

When William the Conqueror invaded in 1066, he brought with him jurists and clerics who tried to reimpose the principles of Roman civil law. Our ancient laws and customs resisted the assault and further attempts to create a system in which all were not equal before the law, but certain vested interests were treated preferentially. Thus The Common Law has remained without any serious amendment to its most important points; equality before the law, the right to trial by jury, innocence presumed until guilt is proved and certain freedoms. What we would now call the right of free speech was in Alfred's reign referred to as 'freedom of the road' the right to move around freely (free speech was hardly relevant, most people did not have access to information because they couldn't read.) Common Law includes another important clause which is very relevant to the European Union, the Charter of Liberties, which makes the Monarch subject to the law. The 1102 Synod of Westminster, which abolished slavery in England, the 1627 Petition of Right, which granted the right to criticise the government without fear of arrest, as well as Magna Carta and the Declaration of Right. Common Law defends property rights and rights to self defence all have their basis in The Common Law.

Many of our greatest constitutional documents are Common Law documents. These are not Acts of Parliament. Their principles cannot be repealed by Parliament, and when our Monarchs swear to uphold the "laws and customs" of the people of the United Kingdom as part of the Coronation ceremony, those "laws and customs" include Common Law.

Should we accept subjection to EU law, The Common Law and twelve hundred years of history will be thrown away.

Under E U law British citizens are now no longer legally able to do anything not specifically forbidden by law but are now forbidden from doing anything not specifically permitted by law, as was the case in Nazi Germany

EU's legal system will mean the end of all our traditional legal rights. According to our traditions, we are entitled to do those things which are not forbidden, but according to the EU, we are entitled to do those things which are allowed – everything else is forbidden. And what is allowed can be changed on a whim by individual European Commissioners.

The European Union and its supporters claim many laws that are really nothing more than pointless rules and regulations are necessary to improve the energy efficiency, environmental friendliness and health standards throughout the 28-member bloc. And in the run up to the referendum that will decide our future, those campaigning to keep us in the EU and subject to its ever growing bureaucratic dictatorship have denied that the meddling bureaucrats have made laws governing the amount that bananas and cucumbers are permitted to bend by. This is a lie, as one would expect from a campaign that can only succeed by concealing the truth:

- European Commission Regulation No. 1677/88, "Class I" and "Extra class" cucumbers are allowed a bend of 10mm per 10cm of length. "Class II" cucumbers can bend twice as much. Any cucumbers that are curvier may not be bought or sold."

and ...

European Union Directive 2257/94:

" ... it is a criminal offence to sell bananas of abnormal curvature. [...] Peaches picked between July and October must not be less than 5.6 cms in diameter [...] class 1 Victoria Plums must measure 3.5 centimeters across [...] carrots which are less than 1.9 centimeters wide at the thick end cannot be sold unless they are marked as baby carrots.

The European Union has approved bans on large vacuum cleaners in an effort to "re-educate" spendthrift citizens who consume too much energy, another pointless rule which supporters of the EU have denied the existence of even though all such laws and rules are a matter of public record.

EU bureaucrats have surrounded thousands of other consumer products, including clothes dryers, cosmetics, fruit jam, laptop computers, laundry detergents, light bulbs, olive oil, plastic bags, refrigerators, showerheads, television sets, tobacco, toilets, toys, urinals and wine cooling cabinets, with pointless and unenforceable laws.

A recent ban approved by the [European Parliament](#) on October 8, 2015 involves chocolate candy cigarettes because they "appeal to minors and consequently form a potential gateway to using tobacco products."

Critics of the growing bureaucratic dictatorship of Brussels say the seemingly endless number of bans, prohibitions, restrictions, regulations and edicts being enacted by unelected bureaucrats, many of which are being justified by environmental concerns which are based on the flimsiest of evidence, smacks of paternalistic liberalism. They claim it is over-regulation, and an

unacceptable intrusion into the private lives of 500 million EU citizens, who should be allowed to make their own decisions over whether they want to eat straight cucumbers or semi - circular bananas, and whether they want a high power kettle which uses exactly as much energy to boil a litre of water, as a kettle that take a little longer to bring its contents to the boil.

The vacuum cleaner ban was sneakily passed during the summer holidays in August and went largely unnoticed by the general public until after the German newspaper (FAZ) [published a story](#) about the new law on October 24.

"As of September 2014, only vacuum cleaners that consume less than 1600 watts may be sold in the EU," according to FAZ. "From 2017 only a maximum of 900 watts will be allowed. At the same time, the vacuum cleaner must be fitted with a label that grades energy consumption on a scale of seven letters and colours: The letter 'A' on a green background means very low energy consumption and the letter 'G' on a red background means very high energy consumption."

Critics say the EU's move to restrict the power of domestic vacuum cleaners—current vacuum cleaners boast an average of 1,800 watts—[will reduce their effectiveness](#) in sucking up dust and dirt; and, because households will have to use the new machines longer, they may end up actually increasing energy consumption. Others have said the change will reduce the ability of vacuum cleaners to remove fine particles from the air, and instead pump them back into the atmosphere, potentially leading to side-effects for allergy and asthma sufferers.

But then as satirist P J O'Rourke observed in his book 'All The Trouble In The World' bureaucrats often achieve the opposite of the result they are aiming for.

In an interview with UK newspaper The Daily Telegraph, [Giles Chichester](#), European Parliament Member for South West England and Gibraltar, said: "Banning powerful cleaners in households could have a severe impact on allergy and asthma sufferers. This is another example of how EU legislation has good intentions but sometimes there are detrimental side-effects. I hope that both the EU and the UK government can find a way around this so that we improve energy efficiency without forcing people back to their broomsticks."

The vacuum cleaner ban is part of the [European Ecodesign Directive](#), a wide-ranging legal framework approved in 2005 that establishes mandatory ecological requirements for energy-using and energy-related products and appliances in all 28 EU member states. The directive currently covers more than 40 product groups, which are said to be responsible for around 40% of all EU greenhouse gas emissions.

European bureaucrats have used Ecodesign regulations to ban dozens of products, including the incandescent light bulb, which has been outlawed in all EU countries. As of September 1, 2012, hundreds of millions of EU citizens have been forced to buy 'energy-efficient' fluorescent lamps, which contain toxic materials such as mercury, give off harmful levels of electromagnetic radiation,

provide such a poor quality of light people have to switch on extra lights to read or work at crafts, and because the fluorescent technology only pulls down energy at the top of the wave, actually use twice as much energy as it says on the box.

Another lie is that the low energy bulbs last much longer. In fact, while ten times as much energy is used in manufacture, if the bulbs are used in a normal domestic situation, (i.e. are switched on and off as light is required, they last little longer than incandescent bulbs.

Because the EU does not require retailers to take back the new bulbs, 80% end up in household garbage, leaving the mercury to ultimately seep into the soil or groundwater, according to an Austrian documentary film called "[Bulb Fiction](#)."

The makers of the film claim that the European light-bulb lobby, including global corporate businesses such as Philips and Osram, are behind the demise of the cheaper incandescent light bulb because of the larger profit margins associated with more expensive energy-saving light bulbs. So once again we see the E U putting corporate profits before the interests of the consumer.

According to the German news magazine [Der Spiegel](#), the EU ban on light bulbs was motivated less about genuine environmental concerns than it was about [scoring political points](#) on the international stage.

"A ban on incandescent light bulbs, which would be relatively easy to implement, would enable the EU to score some quick victories on the climate front. After all, the EU's pledge to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 20% by 2020 was highly ambitious from the start," according to the magazine.

Light bulbs and vacuum cleaners are not the only products the E U has demanded higher energy efficiency from. As of November 1, "the weighted condensation efficiency of condensation tumbler dryers must not be less than 60%," according to European Commission [Regulation No. 932/2012](#) dated October 3, 2012 which implements "Directive 2009/125/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to ecodesign requirements for household tumble driers."

On November 4, 2015 the European Commission, the executive arm of the European Union [adopted a proposal](#) that requires member states to implement measures which will reduce the use of plastic bags. That same week, Brussels announced draft regulations to [standardize the flushing of all toilets and urinals in the EU](#). The decision followed years of efforts by experts working for the European Commission's environment directorate, as well as "stakeholders" (water companies) studying "user behaviour" and "best practices."

According to the 60-page [technical report](#) on European toilets and urinals which took two years and an unspecified amount of taxpayer money to complete, EU experts have agreed that two "key elements" appear to affect the water consumption of flushing toilets and urinals: their design and user behaviour. Regarding user behaviour and "based on the discussions with stakeholders," the

experts have decided to set the average flush volume as "the arithmetic average of one full flush volume and three reduced flush volumes." Well at least they have not (yet) produced proposals to regulate the number of times a day we can have a waz, or the amount of water we are allowed to pass.

In May 2013, the European Commission announced the so-called [Plant Reproductive Material Law](#), an Orwellian directive that would make it illegal to "grow, reproduce or trade" any vegetable seeds that have not been "tested, approved and accepted" by a new EU bureaucracy named the [EU Plant Variety Agency](#). Given that the E U Commission, led by its 'scientific advisers' (aka corporate lobbyists) is absolutely mad for Genetically Modified food crops, which some independent scientists say pose health risks to humans and animals, this looks like another back door effort to hand control of a massive and vital industry, food production, to corporate business. The new law would give Brussels authority over all plants and seeds bought and sold in all 28 EU member states, and would prohibit home gardeners from growing their own plants from non-regulated seeds. Critics [say](#) the new law is an effort by the EU to gain "total domination of the food supply."

"This is an instance of bureaucracy out of control," according to Ben Gabel, director of the UK-based [Real Seed Catalogue](#). "All this new law does is create a whole new raft of EU civil servants being paid to move mountains of papers round all day, while interfering with the right of people to grow what they want, and charging fees for the use of plants that were domesticated and bred by the public over thousands of years of small-scale agriculture," says Gabel.

Arguably the most famous examples of EU over-regulation involve the previously mentioned rules on the size and appearance of fruit and vegetables. As well as the famous bendy banana and curved cucumber laws,

Brussels eventually [reversed](#) its curvy cucumber law after a public outcry, but EU regulations still apply to imperfectly shaped Brussels sprouts, carrots, cherries, apples and garlic. These regulations are needed as part of the EU's effort to cut "unnecessary" red tape we are told.

"We simply don't need to regulate this sort of thing at EU level," EU Agriculture Commissioner Mariann Fischer Boel said, adding that in the context of skyrocketing food prices and general economic difficulties, it made "no sense" to throw away perfectly good products due to their non regulation shape or size.

The "Eurocrats" in Brussels have suffered a number other symbolic defeats by European citizens fed up with runaway regulations. In March 2013, for example, the [British government relaxed EU rules](#) defining fruit jam.

According to EU rules, jam can only be labelled as such if it has more than 60% sugar in it. However, under new rules proposed by London, that figure will fall to 50%. The difference had

created what has been called a "no-jams land," meaning that jams with a sugar content between 50% and 60% had no legal name; anything containing less than 60% had to be called a "fruit spread," while jams with less than 50% sugar were to be called a "conserve."

"This is exactly the sort of ridiculous red tape that we want to do away with," according to Vince Cable, the British Business Secretary, said in an interview with the _____. "This stuff looks like jam, smells like jam and tastes like a jam—the only thing stopping it being called jam is some some bureaucratic rule. We want to sweep away unnecessary bureaucracy like this which is costing business time and money and stopping them doing what they should be doing: creating jobs, boosting the economy and in some cases, making jam."

In May 2013, the European Commission announced plans to [ban the use of refillable bottles](#) and dipping bowls of olive oil at restaurant tables. The refillable bottles are a staple on restaurant tables across Europe for diners who want to douse bread or salads.

The EU said that as of January 1, 2014, restaurants may only serve olive oil in tamper-proof packaging, labelled to EU standards. It said the move would protect consumers and improve hygiene.

But after critics accused Brussels of unwarranted meddling at a time of economic crisis, the European Union quickly backed down. According to [Dacian Cioloș](#), the European Commissioner for Agriculture, speaking bureaucratic gobbledegook, the ban was "not formulated in such a way as to assemble widespread support."

The EU's reversal was possibly influenced by the release on May 13 of a Pew Research Center poll showing that positive views of the European Union are at historical lows in most of the eight countries surveyed, even among the young. According to the poll, entitled "[The New Sick Man of Europe: The European Union](#)," the favorability of the EU has fallen from a median of 60% in 2012 to 45% in 2013.

In Germany, meanwhile, opposition is mounting to an EU directive on water-saving showerheads and taps. According to the German business newspaper _____, German appliances are already using 20% less water than in 1990, leading to a situation where the country's sewage pipes are in danger of drying up and cracking because not enough water is being flushed through the system. It is not as though saving water in Germany (where there is plenty) or Britain (where there is perhaps too much) helps those parts of the world affected by acute water shortage. Transporting water by tanker or pipeline would be so ridiculously expensive it would put the cost of buying drinking water beyond the means of the people who do not have access to pure water for domestic use.

In any event, German politicians appear increasingly fatalistic about the future of the EU's Soviet-style "central planning" apparatus. According to [Sven Giegold](#), a Member of the European

Parliament with Germany's Green Party, Europe's economic system "has now become too complex for a democracy."

Holger Kraemer, a Member of the European Parliament for Germany's business-friendly Free Democratic Party (FDP), [puts it this way](#): "We are heading for a dictatorship of bureaucrats." Which is what the contributors to this book have been saying for the past three decades.

No dictatorship is complete without its state police, The Gestapo, The KGB, Stasi, TonTon Macoute and so on. And the EU is no exception development, taking the usual 'do it by stealth' route, the European Commission quietly set up Europol, the European Police Office. The original report by Statewatch.org by which we know of how the powers of the seemingly non-threatening body outlined the powers of this Superstate police force, considered the expansion of Europol's mandate and powers, questioned its effectiveness and examined judicial and democratic controls and the decision-making process within the EU. Statewatch's concerns were reflected in the report's subtitle: "towards an unaccountable "FBI" in Europe". During 2006 the EU has been holding an internal "debate" on the "future of Europol". Let's have a closer look at those concerns.

Europol was one of the most ambitious aspects of the EU's "Third Pillar" (on justice and home affairs cooperation) agreed in the 1991 Maastricht Treaty, and among the most controversial. The Europol Convention was not until agreed in 1997 and Europol did not officially become operational until 1999, following ratification by national parliaments. But in reality, Europol was up-and-running much earlier, successive EU decisions (formal and informal) leading to the establishment of the Europol Drugs Unit (EDU) in The Hague in 1994.

Europol is now a well-resourced organisation with a staff of 530 (including 93 "liaison officers" on secondment from the member states) and an operating budget of just under 68 million Euros for 2007.

It was set-up as a central hub to collect intelligence from regional/national police forces in order to make links between crimes, suspects and investigations. Crucially, Europol's operational powers were limited to the collection and analysis of information and its mandate was limited to serious international crime. Europol is nevertheless able to retain a potentially endless cycle of data on criminals, suspects, victims and their associates, subject to the detailed data protection provisions in the Convention. This information is held in Europol's computer systems which finally went online in October 2005, more than four years later than planned (the initial contractor was sacked

after failing to deliver the system) and at a cost of at least 65 million Euros.

Since the entry into force of the Europol Convention in 1999, Europol and its advocates have argued successfully that the agency required more powers and a wider remit to fulfil its mandate.

Europol's competence was expanded from five to 27 specific forms of crime and now potentially extends to (facilitating investigations into) any criminal conspiracy that could be perceived to affect two or more member states. Europol has also steadily become more "operational" and is now authorised to participate in "joint investigative teams" in the member states and empowered to request individual states to "initiate, conduct or coordinate investigations in specific cases".

National parliaments have been presented with three protocols to the Europol Convention to implement these changes and the EU Council (member states) have agreed somewhere in the region of 40 implementing measures, along with 18 cooperation agreements with non-EU states and agencies.

In 2002, Statewatch suggested that Europol was being transformed from the "reactive", analytical agency envisaged by the Convention into a "proactive", investigative agency.

At the same time, there are serious concerns about Europol's effectiveness. Some member states' police forces are clearly reluctant to cooperate with Europol in the way that the Convention envisaged, preferring to cooperate through traditional bilateral channels. Europol is certainly providing logistical support to cross-border investigations and operations such as "controlled deliveries" (the surveillance of cross-border shipments of drugs, people or illegal goods) but is clearly hampered by a lack of quality intelligence from the member states. This in turn affects the quality of its analysis work on organised crime and terrorism and the extent to which its reports provide "added value" to policing in the member states.

Europol's annual reports naturally focus on "crime-busting" success stories but reports from the Dutch Central Investigative Agency (CRI) in 2001 and the United States FBI in 2006 have been a lot less complementary. The CRI described Europol as mostly "an upgraded serving-hatch for vehicle registration plates and telephone numbers" while the FBI cited "uncertainty and even distrust concerning the information/law enforcement intelligence process applied by Europol among the law enforcement community in the US".

The EU has conducted occasional evaluations of Europol in order to improve member states' compliance with the legislation (the results of which will have not been made public) but more searching questions are left unanswered. Was and is Europol a solution ahead of its time? What sort of EU police office does Europe need and want? Is Europol a good use of public money? Is it adequately regulated?

The current EU debate on the future of Europol addresses these questions selectively. While the lack of confidence in Europol among the member states is acknowledged, there has been no in-depth review of Europol's activities to date, nor any objective assessment of its shortcomings and

weaknesses. Instead, the “debate” about the future of Europol is a blueprint for more powers and a wider remit based on two assumptions. First, Europol’s “cumbersome” legal framework is preventing it fulfilling its potential (a lack of “awareness” of Europol on the part of the member states is also cited).

Second, that Europol needs yet more powers and a wider mandate to fulfil its potential. The circular nature of this argument is, of course, a recipe for Europol’s continuous expansion. The trajectory of this debate is hardly surprising given its orientation. A discussion at the informal EU Council of Justice and Home Affairs ministers in January 2006 was followed by a high-level, “stakeholders” conference on the “future of Europol” in February, where “A discussion emerged on whether Europol required enlargement or deepening. It was argued that this was not necessarily a contradiction, since these processes can be carried out simultaneously”

The Conclusions called upon member states to speed-up ratification of the protocols to the Europol Convention and invited the Commission to prepare proposals for Europol on the basis of the FOP report and principles for a “new legal framework” (discussed further below). There were no actual references to “accountability” within the text, the title apparently referring to the single suggestion that the

(emphasis added), a proposal that did not appear in the draft Council Conclusions on the “future of Europol” that followed in May. Europol’s mandate: from “reactive” to “proactive” to “investigative.” The first option for phrasing Europol’s mandate is “combating serious crime affecting two or more Member States, terrorism and forms of crime which affect a common interest covered by a Union policy”. This would extend the current Europol mandate from 27 specific crimes to somewhere in the region of 40 (almost all criminality) and give Europol a role in national as well as cross-border investigations where “federal” or “EU crimes” are concerned. The second option, “serious international crime and terrorist offences affecting two [MS]”, would maintain the status quo. However, in “exceptional cases”, suggest the FOP group, “Europol should not be prohibited from assisting [in cases] which are only related to one Member State”, again suggesting that Europol should have a hand in national investigations (a proposition that is repeated later in the FOP report).

In its commentary the FOP group proposes seven particularly controversial extensions to Europol’s remit. First, it suggests the addition of “major events with a public order policing impact” to the Europol mandate, a clear departure from “serious organised crime”. Second, it proposes that Europol should “act as service provider for EU information systems in the area of internal security”.

Specifically, it is proposed that Europol could host “a general EU-wide DNA database that is not limited to the forms of crime under Europol’s mandate” (a “PNR” data base of information on air travellers is also suggested). Third, it proposes the “integration of [national] police databases to enable/simplify the flow of information to Europol”. Fourth, it proposes wider access to its own

information system, suggesting that “Europol should be able to act as a black-box facilitator for all data exchange via and processed by Europol”. Fifth, citing the “principle of availability”, under which it is proposed by the EU that agencies in one member state should be able to access all law enforcement data in all the others, the FOP suggests that “Europol should get access to the IT systems of the Member States on the same footing... (e.g. regarding DNA, fingerprints, etc.).

Sixth, “Europol should be in a position to coordinate (not lead) a JIT” (joint investigation team), suggesting it should run cross-border investigations rather than simply assisting them as agreed in the protocol to the Convention.

Seventh, “as a long-term option, the role of Europol in the fight against the Euro counterfeiting and possibly EU crimes (to be defined) should be reinforced by granting Europol investigative (but not coercive) competences (following the model of OLAF [the European Commission’s anti-fraud office] with regard to the fight against defrauding the Communities’ financial interests”. This is the first significant demand for formal investigative powers which certainly are coercive as far as they would allow Europol to conduct independent investigations in the member states.

These proposals will likely face significant opposition. However, future opposition may be weaker when long standing demands to replace the “cumbersome” and “inflexible” Europol Convention with an EU Council decision are implemented (demands now endorsed by the Council). This presents an opportunity to introduce new powers for Europol and will in any case mean that subsequent amendments to its mandate and powers will not require ratification by national parliament

, so controversial proposals will be subject to less scrutiny and debate. The FOP group also proposes that implementing legislation should be “simplified” by “creating one single procedure for preparing and deciding secondary legislation”.

“The [Europol] Management Board could be designated as the legislative authority for staff and financial regulations, rules governing the relations with third parties, and analysis as well as confidentiality rules”.

So much for the separation of legislative and executive powers.

The People Of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, remember them, the island nation that built a global empire which at the beginning of the twentieth century dominated the world economically and militarily? Well due to fifty years of relentless politically correct propaganda, tyranny of weakness, the undermining of male virtues by Marxist feminists whose hatred of men allows for no concessions to fairness, reason or common sense, and spineless, testicularly deficient leaders (except for Margaret Thatcher, she had very big, hairy balls, are now to be subjected to [The Panopticon](#) treatment, constantly on view to the prying eyes and ears of a

foreign police force with powers that far exceed those of the British police. Europol, a European crimefighting and intelligence agency with powers that surpass even Hitler's infamous Gestapo, or the Cold War-era Soviet KGB.

Europol (a contraction of the European Police Office) was created in 1993 by a provision of the Maastricht Treaty but only became fully functional as of July 1, 1999. Originally pitched to the unsuspecting citizens of European Union member states as agency that would enable national police forces to share intelligence thus improving their abilities to fight crimes such as terrorism, money laundering and people trafficking (ironically all have increased exponentially since Europol was formed) Europol has expanded in size and scope and now conducts its own investigations across the 27 member states of the European Union.

Until quite recently Europol had operated as an extension of the various national intelligence and law enforcement communities already handling police and intelligence duties throughout the EU. Furthermore, Europol's constitutional status made it more or less answerable (and practically subordinate) to the pre-existing national crime fighting and intelligence gathering organizations. Given the world domination ambitions of the European Unions ruling bureaucracy that was never going to last. As of this year, the Hague has endowed Europol with the plenary powers of a full EU agency, with all the attendant rights and privileges. In other words Europol supersedes the national law enforcement of member states.

A few of those privileges are particularly distressing to Britons and, were they widely known among voters, would swing a lot of votes toward the Brexit campaign in the referendum on whether we should leave the undemocratic, increasingly authoritarian, warmongering and most of all bankrupt EU. According to the terms of its new status as the "official" criminal intelligence-gathering branch of the EU government, "[Europol now benefits from increased powers](#) to collect criminal information and a wider field of competence in supporting investigations." Among these increased powers is the power to access the voluminous personal data stored on the computers of British and other national police forces if agents suspect a person may be participating in a "preparatory" act that may lead to 'criminal behaviour'.

As has been reported in [_____](#), the database of information compiled and stored by the government of Prime Minister Gordon Brown is the most extensive in any developed nation, even exceeding that of the United States National security Agency (NSA). The database was established in 1995 and is the world's largest. It contains the DNA material of over five million Britons, a figure that represents 8 percent of the population of England and Wales. The recording system was initially developed, according to official information, to aid the police in the investigation of crime scenes and function as a "vital crime-fighting tool" in tracking down elusive offenders.

Now, every byte of that very personal information is available to Europol, without regard for

the national laws of the United Kingdom. The relevant data to which Europol now has unfettered access includes political affiliation, routine, places frequented, DNA, tax obligations, voiceprints, and sexual preference. In fine, everything stored on those massive mainframes is now firmly within the province of distant Europol investigators.

The legislation for granting Europol access to the personal data of Britons is much different from that governing their own national law enforcement. According to Title VI of the Maastricht Treaty, the Europol Convention, and the new directives, a mere suspicion of likely criminal behaviour in the following vague areas will trigger Europol investigation: racism, environmental crime, xenophobia, computer fraud, and crimes against the environment. Not only are these crimes against political correctness (Thought Crime dare I say) rather than real crimes that cause physical harm or material loss, they are also virtually impossible to prove to the standards set down in The Common Law (yes, good old King Alfred again.)

You read that correctly, Europol can now extract “behavioural data” on any citizen of any member state that it suspects, rightly or wrongly, of the Orwellian offence of Thought Crime, or is believed to be likely to participate in any of the above listed “serious crimes.”

Fears of the abolition of the right to freedom speech are rife among people who love and respect liberty and democracy in the UK. The vagueness of the provisions governing the scope of Europol’s mandate is particularly threatening, as the power to monitor and investigate crimes against the environment includes the right to arrest and pronounce guilty (without charges having to be laid or a trial held) of someone brave enough to question climate change, or the doubtful benefits of mass immigration for example.

“I am horrified,” Paul Nuttall, chairman of the UK Independence Party, said on TV. “We thought [Prime Minister] Gordon Brown’s big brother state was bad enough but at least we are could kick him out. These guys [Europol] we cannot sack until we leave the EU.”

Nuttall’s fears are echoed by James Welch, the legal affairs director of Liberty, a UK-based (and left leaning, the opposite end of the political spectrum to UKIP) civil liberties watch dog . “We have huge concerns that Europol appears to have been given powers to hold very sensitive information and to investigate and prosecute people for matters that aren’t even crimes in this country. Any extension of police powers at any level needs to be properly debated and scrutinised,” he stated.

Welch and his crew are a day late and a pound short for expecting the oversight of the EU superstate police force according to the laws and customs of the people of the United Kingdom or their elected representatives in Parliament. Those days are over and will never return unless the UK leaves the EU. Despite the zeal for devolution that has recently flourished in the UK, the sort of devolution that would see the United Kingdom parting company with its continental cousins is pipe dream while Britain is a member of the EU.

Another frightening aspect of Europol's recent upgrade to full Gestapo-like status is the removal of oversight exercised by member nations over its funding and staffing. As of now, Europol will enjoy absolute independence from all national governments and will receive financial support solely from the 'inner party' (another reference to George Orwell's 1984 for those who have not read it recently), the EU Commissioners in Brussels. The strength and survival of Europol will depend not on how well they are protecting the people of member states from 'acts likely to lead to criminal behaviour' but how well it is protecting its EU masters from criticism, dissent and the detrimental effects people exercising their right to free speech can have on unpopular, authoritarian regimes. Europol will not be subject to any checks or balances and will not be required to respond to complaints from offended member states.

There is legitimate concern in Britain that the ill-defined boundaries of Europol powers will permit further expansion of the agency's powers. There is still a streak of bloody-mindedness a thousand miles wide in the people of the United Kingdom, who live outside greater Londonistan. People in the west country, the Midlands, Lancashire and Yorkshire and the north east are inordinately proud of their regional identity and culture. There is a profound mistrust and dislike of all things European, Europhiles will dismiss this as Xenophobia but for all their Mickey Mouse degrees, lefties are not very literate. They do not understand it is perfectly possible to be proud of one's country, its culture and heritage while at the same time loving the nations and people of France, Spain, Italy, Sweden, Portugal, The Netherlands, Luxembourg and Denmark. And when the lefties talk of 'diversity' they again demonstrate their ignorance. I have spent time in all the aforementioned nations and enjoyed the company of their people while being enriched by their culture. And I still love my country and do not want it to change any more than I want any of those other countries to change. You see I like diversity, diversity makes the world wonderful and interesting. Trying to impose cultural and political uniformity on all those nations and their people is the opposite of diversity. So when you hear the politically correct, Europhiliac left bleating and tweeting about diversity, remember they're emotionally needy losers and are just being shallow, insincere hypocrites as usual, in the hope of attracting some internet likes. They hate diversity, that's why they try to reduce it to variation in skin colour while trying to impose conformity of mind.

Many sensible people are vocal critics of the European Union and the UK's membership therein are fearful of the Gestapo-like might of Europol.

"There is a real danger, that opposition to EU policies could make an individual liable to arrest. We now live in a pan-European state so it was to be expected that it would have a federal police force with power over us [Britons]."

The creation and expansion of the powers granted to a transnational police force with powers beyond those granted by the laws and constitutions of constituent countries, especially as it was done in almost total secrecy, ought to be enough to warn us of the true nature of the EU. While it is

certain that proponents of these trade associations and economic zones will emphasise notional benefits in very narrow areas of national life, it is equally certain that if you give a globalocrat an inch he will take a mile and what is presented as economic reform for the sake of efficiency today, will become authoritarian tyranny if not tomorrow then very soon. The behaviour goes with the bureaucratic mindset. These people fear Darwinian evolution almost as much as they fear having to make decisions. They are not the fittest, not the ones best equipped to survive and so they take refuge in rules and regulations, and then neutralise their more powerful rivals by paralysing the ability to act independently.

A five-year research programme in Artificial Intelligence backed by the European Commission and titled Project Indect, is working on developing computer programmes which act as "agents" to monitor and process information obtained from websites, social media and private computers through the use of 'digital surveillance techniques' (cybersnooping, which is illegal according to international law) .

The main goal of Project Indirect is to facilitate the "automatic detection of threats and abnormal behaviour or violence". In other words, the Eurocrats are planning to realise the dystopian society of Ray Bradbury's novel 'Minority Report'. Project Indect, which received nearly £10 million in funding from the European Union, involves the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) and computer scientists at York University, in addition to colleagues in nine other European countries.

Shami Chakrabarti, the director of human rights group Liberty, an organisation which does much good work but is not noted for right wing leanings, described the introduction of such mass surveillance techniques as a "sinister step" for any country, adding that it was "positively chilling" on a European scale. She's right, as anybody who worked in Information Technology through the 1970s, 80s and 90s will tell you, internet technology as a tool to monitor individuals' activities and control what information they have access to is a fascist dictator's wet dream.

The Indect project, which began in 2014, comes as the EU is pressing ahead with an expansion of its role in fighting crime, terrorism and managing migration, increasing its budget in these areas by 13.5% to nearly £900 million. Ironically in 2015 migration increased exponentially while there were more terrorist attacks in Europe for many years, and wars on terrorist groups such as ISIS and Al Qaeda in the middle east escalated. The project has hardly got started and already it is achieving the opposite of what was intended, that's quite an achievement even by the standards of E.U. bureaucrats.

The European Commission is calling for a "common culture" of law enforcement to be developed across the EU and for a third of police officers – more than 50,000 in the UK alone – to be given training in European affairs within the next five years. More centralisation, more power transferred from voters to bureaucrats.

According to the Open Europe think tank, increased emphasis on co-operation and intelligence sharing means that European police forces will gain access to sensitive information held by UK police, including the British DNA database. It also expects the number of UK citizens extradited under the controversial European Arrest Warrant to triple.

Stephen Booth, an analyst for Open Europe who has been involved in preparing a dossier on the European policing agenda, fears these developments and projects like Indect seem "Orwellian" and raised serious questions about individual liberty.

"This is all pretty scary stuff in my book. These projects would involve a huge invasion of privacy and citizens need to ask themselves whether the EU should be spending their taxes on them," he said.

"The EU lacks sufficient checks and balances and there is no evidence that anyone has ever asked 'is this actually in the best interests of our citizens?'"

Shami Chakrabarti added : "Profiling whole populations instead of monitoring individual suspects is a sinister step in any society. It's disturbing enough at national level, but on a Europe-wide scale the idea becomes positively chilling."

According to the official website for Project Indect its main objectives include "to develop a platform for the registration and exchange of operational data, acquisition of multimedia content, intelligent processing of all information and automatic detection of threats and recognition of abnormal behaviour or violence". All pretty innocuous sounding officialese of course, but the threat is hidden in the vagueness of the language. How, for example, can technology for 'automatic detection of threats' distinguish between dangerous subversives planning to blow up an office block or bring down a jet from a couple of spotty teenage nerds playing some computer game?

The website also comments on the "construction of agents assigned to continuous and automatic monitoring of public resources such as: web sites, discussion forums, usenet groups, file servers, p2p [peer-to-peer] networks as well as individual computer systems, building an internet-based intelligence gathering system, both active and passive".

York University's computer science department website details how its task is to develop "computational linguistic techniques for information gathering and learning from the web".

"Our focus is on novel techniques for word sense induction, entity resolution, relationship mining, social network analysis [and] sentiment analysis," it says. Don't let your children go to York, they obviously offer degrees in Advanced Fascism Studies.

A separate EU research project, Adabts – the Automatic Detection of Abnormal Behaviour and Threats in crowded Spaces – has received nearly £3 million. Based in Sweden its supporters the UK Home Office and British Aerospace Systems (BAe).

The objective of Adabts is "to develop models of suspicious behaviour" so these can be automatically detected using CCTV and other surveillance methods. The system would analyse the pitch of people's voices, the way their bodies move and track individuals within crowds. Again how does technology distinguish 'suspicious behaviour' and simply eccentric behaviour when neither term can be adequately defined.

Project coordinator Dr Jorgen Ahlberg, of the Swedish Defence Research Agency, said this would simply help CCTV operators notice when trouble was starting.

"People usually don't start to fight from one second to another," he said. "They start by arguing and pushing each other. It's not that 'oh you are pushing each other, you should be arrested', it's to alert an operator that something is going on.

"If it's a shopping mall, you could send a security guard into the vicinity and things [a fight] maybe wouldn't happen."

Obviously Ahlberg earned his doctorate in talking bollocks.

Open Europe believes intelligence gathered by Indect and other such systems could be used by another semi - secret E U agency, the EU Joint Situation Centre (SitCen), which it claims is " ". Critics have said it could develop into "Europe's CIA".

The dossier tells us: "The EU's Joint Situation Centre (SitCen) was originally established in order to monitor and assess worldwide events and situations on a 24-hour basis with a focus on potential crisis regions, terrorism and WMD-proliferation.

"However, since 2005, SitCen has been used to share counter-terrorism information.

"An increased role for SitCen should be of concern since the body is shrouded in so much secrecy.

"The expansion of what is effectively the beginning of an EU 'secret service' raises fundamental questions of political oversight in the member states."

Superintendent Gerry Murray, of the Northern Ireland Police Force, said the force's main role would be to ascertain if the system, which he said could be operated on a countrywide or European level, was a feasible tool for the police.

"A lot of it is very academic and very science-driven [at the moment]. Our budgets are shrinking, our human resources are shrinking and we are looking for IT technology that will help us five years down the line in reducing crime and combating criminal gangs," he said. "Within this

Project Indect there is an ethical board which will be looked at: is it permissible within the legislation of the country who may use it, who oversees it and is it human rights compliant."

CHAPTER 5

WHAT HAS THE EU DONE FOR US

It is not fair to say the EU alone is killing the NHS, Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government did a lot of harm by introducing an 'internal market' concept to the National Health Service which resulted in an explosion in the administrative workload as, for example, radiology department would have to invoice the surgical department for the cost (plus a small mark up) of the x-ray images needed in order to perform, a life saving operation. Each department had to employ bean counters to process the invoices and the movement of funds between budgets. And what bean counter are good at is expanding their role, elevating the role of bean counting above that of functions that actually get things done, and creating work for more bean counters.

Tony Blair's New Labour project also did irreparable harm with their Private Finance Initiatives. Though this mechanism for funding projects had been introduced by the Conservatives, Blair's Labour government that was famously "very relaxed about people getting stinking rich" actively helped corporations owned by Blair and Mandelson's merchant banker (in all [senses](#) of the term) cronies get rich by giving them a licence to print money. Here's an article from our Daily Stirrer news site, posted in 2010:

The NHS in England faces a total bill of £65bn for new hospitals built under the private finance initiative (PFI), according to figures quoted by BBC news. That is not £65 billion for building new hospitals but £65 billion a year for renting fully serviced hospitals from private contractors.

This annual bill, the "NHS mortgage" as some people call it means that for some local healthcare trusts annual repayments take up more than 10% of their turnover. Public Accountants have said the fees, which rise each year, would make it harder to achieve

necessary savings while senior medical said the situation would result in less money being available for patient care. But government sources insist the 103 schemes were providing value for money.

It may be that health and finance ministers in the coalition are reluctant to appear to be blaming the previous government for all the nations difficulties rather than trying to solve the problems or the case may be that the coalition were saddled with binding contracts by the irresponsibility and lack of business acumen that afflicted Labour in all spheres of government. Either way it is simply unbelievable that any finance expert would judge these Private Public Partnership Private Finance Initiatives are providing value for money services to the taxpayer. More likely they would be seen as a licence to print money for the private finance investors willing to underwrite Labour's spending plans in deals that would guarantee returns of many times the original investment.

Private Finance Initiatives (PFIs) were devised by the Conservatives but never really took off until 'New Labour' won power. In the days in which public policy was dominated by concerns about the size of the public sector or the public sector borrowing requirement, the PFI was seen as a means of funding public sector capital needs, but defining this as private rather than public debt. Both Conservative and Labour governments used PFI to mask the expansion of public debt and the true extent of the state's indebtedness to financial institutions.

The people who devised PFI were among those deluded academics and politicians who believed economies could keep growing forever driven by constantly increasing consumer spending. Constant growth in the economy would lead to constantly increasing affluence in the population and constantly increasing tax revenues for government. This constant growth would enable society to cover the ever mounting costs of this political subterfuge. The obvious analogy for PFI is a mortgage where you initially think it is affordable on the optimistic basis of short-term growth in personal income, but then disaster strikes, income growth collapses and repayment becomes an insurmountable challenge.

PFI contracts are very detailed, providing not only for the construction of new hospitals and schools but also for their maintenance, cleaning and other services. Some of these contracts cost several million pounds to draw up and, once agreed, tie contractors to often onerous payments for 30 years and more. Furthermore, they include clauses facilitating the passing on of costs to the NHS when, for instance, national standards of cleaning or safety change. A parallel in business is a company that rents serviced offices in which not only the floor space but the utilities, janitorial services, office furniture, security and administrative functions are provided by the building's operator. If the company then outsources other functions such as IT, accounting, distribution, manufacturing and sales it can become a virtual company, a management team running a business in which everything else is done

by third parties.

That is fine so long as the company keeps growing. The problems set in when adverse trading conditions are encountered and revenue is squeezed. All the services still have to be paid for and suppliers have to cope with cost inflation. The virtual company finds reducing overheads difficult because it is tied in to long term contracts.

Now the National Health Service faces declining real income. The government may give assurances that the health budget is ringfenced but in the face of falling tax revenues and rising benefits how solid is the fence? The NHS will have to pay increased VAT and national insurance rates just as any other business would. That the budget is ringfenced does not mean it has to be increased. Inflation will erode the value of money granted by the ministry to each health trust. Cuts in local authority spending may mean social care funding will have to be augmented by transfers from the NHS to council budgets. If this does not happen, "bed blocking" will reduce hospitals' capacity to manage increasing patient demand. Last week it was announced that £500m will have to be transferred from NHS to social care funding in the current year.

The consequences of these cost pressures for hospitals built on PFI contracts are that those hospitals now face significant financial pressures. In principle this should not be a problem as PFI was promoted as a mechanism to increase NHS efficiency or value for money. This was despite it obviously being cheaper for government to borrow on capital markets compared to contracting private organisations to build, own and operate hospitals and other services.

How the "efficiency" gains of PFI are achieved remains unclear, partly because the contracts are "confidential" thus it is impossible to offer a critique of how they work and how money is distributed and accounted for. In the absence of an auditors quantification of the alleged gains, probably as illusory as the toxic assets banks traded in before the financial crash. Which leave us with little choice but to assume PFI schemes were really never anything more than a licence for the private sector to pocket taxpayers money.

While we cannot associate the EU with previous levels of privatisation, the Trans - Atlantic Trade And Investment Policy (TTIP) an alleged 'free trade' treaty being negotiated in secret between European Union Bureaucrats and Corporate and Government lawyers for the United States government will open a very wide door for further privatisation. If your family doctor or dentist has recently joined one of the new superpractices you may not be aware these are set up, usually by Private Finance Initiative contracts agreed with American owned for - profit healthcare providers. Now under this pernicious free trade deal, should a future British government decide to renationalise healthcare by taking these back into public ownership, the investors would be able to sue the British government of the day for loss of profits. Negotiations of the terms for TTIP have been negotiated in conditions of such secrecy (far greater security was in force than existed around Hillary Clinton's email server when she was Secretary Of State in the Obama Administration for instance) that the little we know of its immensely far reaching terms and conditions has come from public spirited whistleblowers via websites like [Wikileaks](#) and [The Intercept](#). Even our elected representative have not been allowed to scrutinise the drafts, which should tell you it is not in the interests of us ordinary punters, but shifts power away from democratic assemblies to bureaucrats and corporate bosses.

In addition to these threats to our National Health Service, the EU has also done enormous damage to the quality of medical care in Britain. It is because of the EU working hours directive that general practitioners no longer provide 24 hour cover for their patients and it is because of the EU that hundreds of thousands of hospital patients go for several days at a time without seeing a doctor at all. There is no doubt that laws which came from the EU are responsible for thousands of deaths and much misery. The EU law which has done the most damage has, of course, been the 'working time directive' which has put strict, legal limits on the number of hours doctors and nurses are allowed to work. It is because of this legislation that the modern doctor works the sort of hours traditionally associated with librarian and local council employees. If hospital doctors work more hours than the EU permits then the hospital must pay a huge fine. The result of this legal nonsense is that doctors have to abandon patients in the middle of treating them and at weekends there are often no doctors available at all. The EU has made things even worse by ruling that if doctors are asleep but on call then they are 'working' even if they are not woken up. To make sure that doctors obey the EU legislation, hospitals employ Working Time Directive Project Managers (on salaries in excess of £50,000) whose sole job is to make sure that doctors clock off on time and don't spend a moment more than the EU allows on looking after patients. The NHS spends an estimated £250,000,000 a year policing the Working Time Directive to satisfy the demands of EU Eurocrats. The EU law limiting the number of hours doctors work has had many consequences. For instance, whereas, just a few years ago, doctors who became consultants usually had 30,000 hours of experience and training, today's young doctors can become consultants after just 6,000 hours of experience and training. So, today's consultants have one fifth the experience of their predecessors. It is largely because of the EU's law that inadequately trained nurses have been given the authority

to prescribe drugs, provide anaesthesia and perform operations.

The European Union's common agricultural policy (CAP) is dangerously expensive and wasteful, it was designed to provide generous subsidies for French peasant farmers when General Charles De Gaulle, a great war leader but a deeply conservative politician was trying to hold back the tide of progress and preserve a way of life that was no longer viable. For all its inefficiencies and contradictions the CAP carries on in the twenty first century, beloved of bureaucrats because it provides endless opportunities for meddling in what they do not understand, creating myriad pointless and unenforceable rules and regulations and expanding bureaucratic empires within the EU administrative universe.

It is estimated that the CAP costs families throughout Europe on average £2,000 a year each. Many people find it difficult to understand why Britain's first application to join the Common Market was vetoed by General de Gaulle in 1967 when he claimed that Britain was an island and not suited to be a member of a European 'superstate'. The French President had, of course, been saved by the British during the Second World War and had led the French resistance and the French Army in exile from London. So had he turned against his old ally?

The game de Gaulle was playing was a tactical one, he wanted to delay Britain's entry until the Common Agricultural Policy had been set up and was working. Once the CAP was alive and well de Gaulle changed his mind, decided that we were suitable members of a European charity organisation and encouraged Britain to reapply. Though he was too astute a politician, now the system that would protect French farmers from the competition of more mechanised and efficient British farmers he wanted Britain in the Common Market so that we could help pay the massive costs of the CAP and help keep him and his party in power by funding generous subsidies for inefficient French farming.

It is through the CAP that the EU buys up all the excess milk, butter, cereals and so on grown within the EU. The excesses are gathered together as milk lakes and butter mountains and then dumped in other parts of the world. This dumping of cheap food (also done by the USA where subsidies are used as sweeteners by politicians eager to attract the support of farmers and their workers). Such subsidies wreck the farming economies of developing African and Asian countries, subsistence farmers simply cannot compete with subsidies produce and so are shut out of the food trade in the large population centres of their own countries. There can be no doubt that the CAP is one of the main causes of malnutrition and starvation in Africa. And so, to sum up, the EU's Common Agricultural Policy has resulted in impoverishment and starvation in the Third World and dramatically increased the price of food in Europe, while simultaneously made life much more difficult for farmers in Britain who have responded amazingly well by achieving further efficiencies without resorting to feeding livestock with growth hormones or using pesticides and herbicides granted food safety approval on the strength of dubious scientific testing, and in other EU nations that have encouraged their agricultural community to become more efficient.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) of the European Union (EU) is in many respects a highly dysfunctional policy which fails to achieve its objectives or only does so at considerable cost. Nevertheless, it remains a cornerstone of the EU, accounting for around 40 per cent of the EU budget, and many UK and European farmers are dependent on it for their continued survival. How so you might well ask, having just read that farmers in forward looking nations responded to the challenge by improving their productivity. The previously quoted observation of American satirist P. J. O'Rourke come to mind again, that whatever bureaucrats set out to do they usually end up achieving the opposite. P. J. could have been talking about the EU because in their zeal to be fair to less competitive nations they have imposed production quotas which have resulted in vast amounts of land designated for dairy farming, growing grain or potatoes or pig farming being 'set aside'. The farmer is paid for not grazing dairy cattle or growing crops so long as he does not use the land for anything else. He cannot even allow members of the local pony club to let their horses graze in his pastures or mountain bike enthusiasts ride round one of his fields because even if he is making no money from allowing the activities, because if you are using the land for grazing horses or letting mountain bikers loose then you are not 'not producing milk' or 'not growing potatoes'. In the great tradition of Nazi and Fascist officials and petite fonctionnaires the organisation thrives in ridiculously precise interpretations of rules and regulations. And as Aristotle said over two thousand years ago, "The greatest inequalities arise from trying to make unequal things equal."

When the [Treaty of Rome](#) established the Common European Market in 1958, state intervention was a major feature of agriculture in the six member states. If the principle of free movement of goods was to apply to agricultural produce, national support policies which were incompatible with the Common Market's principle of 'free trade' had to be transferred to the European level.

It was also believed that agriculture because of its unique characteristics compared to other industries had to be dealt with differently. Farm production is affected by the weather and this leads to either over production or under production. Prices can also be highly volatile, especially for commodities traded globally.

The basic objectives of the CAP; to increase agricultural productivity by promoting technical progress and ensuring the optimum use of the factors of production, in particular labour, ensure an acceptable standard of living for farmers, stabilise markets, to ensure the availability and ensure reasonable prices for consumers, have not changed since the Treaty of Rome. You may have noticed some of these objectives conflict. For example, protecting farmers' incomes by erecting high tariff barriers against goods imported from outside the EU raises prices for consumers. The advancement of agricultural productivity depends not so much on actions by the EU as technological advances and improvements in the knowledge base of farmers. So from the start the EU was more superstate than common market.

The way in which the CAP operated has changed over time. Originally, farmers were supported through a system of intervention purchasing. This meant that a floor price would be fixed for a particular product and farmers could sell any surplus into an intervention store where they could be held until they were sold at that price provided that it met basic quality standards. This encouraged farmers to overproduce, particularly products for which there was not increasing demand, because they were certain of being able to sell their products at a profit. Intervention stocks held in intervention stores referred to as butter or grain mountains and milk or wine lakes then built up.

The EU faced the problem of disposing of these stocks. One way of doing this was, as mentioned above, to provide subsidies to exporters to sell the surpluses in countries outside the EU. However, this led to trade wars with countries like the United States which also started to subsidise its exports.

Export subsidies are now being phased out, but the EU retains very high tariff barriers against imports, particularly in sectors such as meat and dairy products.

Financial support is now provided for farmers in 'Pillar 1' which covers general subsidies through a basic payment. Although member states and their regions have some flexibility in how they scale this payment, usually based on the size of the farm and the payments it has received in the past. This has meant that very large payments of over a million Euros have gone to some farms such as arable farmers in Britain's wheat growing area, East Anglia, although some limited 'capping' of these payments has now been introduced.

Critics of CAP say it can be seen as a welfare policy to help farmers in remote areas with higher payments for farms in areas of great disadvantage. Such farms may also benefit from 'Pillar 2' payments which are targeted subsidies such as agri-environmental schemes and rural

development. In the UK, Pillar 1 payments outweigh Pillar 2 payments by a ratio of approximately

Most of the subsidies paid are, therefore, not targeted to particular policy objectives.

Environmentalists object that the CAP has encouraged more intensive forms of farming in the EU with a greater reliance on fertilisers and agrochemicals. Soils may be damaged and serious water pollution may occur.

The subsidies paid under the CAP have also had the effect of forcing up land prices, making it difficult for new entrants to come into the industry other than through inheritance. The workforce is ageing and this does not help innovation.

EU Has Destroyed Britain's Fishing Industry. Europhiles will dispute this and try to claim the Common fisheries policy has saved fish stocks in British waters, this claim was made by an academic, a fisheries expert who studies the theory of fish in a university faculty miles from the sea, but who has probably never been on a trawler. It is bollocks, as most claims of those who support the EU will be. Just before Britain joined the EU, the existing members suddenly agreed to a new principle: equal access to 'community' fishing waters. Since Britain is an island which has traditionally supported a prosperous fishing industry this sudden change in the laws should have sent our politicians back to the negotiating table. Changing an important section of a contract at the last moment is a long-established negotiating tactic commonly used by crooks such as the corporate crook George Soros. It is also par for the course for EU bureaucrats.

But Edward Heath was desperate to sign up and receive the £35,000 pay off his European cronies had promised him for getting Britain into the EU (worth about £600,000 today - that's largely due to the effect globalisation has had on money) and so he said nothing, treating our fishing industry as expendable. Today, it is widely agreed that the EU's common fisheries policy is a shambles. It has ruined the British fishing industry and created a social, economic and environmental disaster. As a result of the EU's laws, most of the important fishing areas around Britain have been dangerously over-fished.

Fifty years ago Britain's fishing industry employed around 50,000 fishermen. Today there are around 17,000. Thousands of jobs have been lost on the boats, and further down the supply chain - the fish processors, the net makers, the equipment suppliers, the market sellers and the transport companies whose livelihoods also depend on the industry. But have the EU quotas saved fishing stocks or simply masked even more disastrous overfishing that they were intended to control.

When fishermen reach their quota limits for a fish species for a year, they cannot land any more of that type of fish, the archives of the [Grimsby fish merchants' association](#), which represents the industry in Britain's largest fishing port, will tell you. And that represents the saving of fish stocks to a mindset that is obsessed with rules and regulations. Reality pays little attention to rules however and beyond choosing to cast their nets in areas where certain species are known to be abundant, fishing crews have little control over what they pull up out of the water.

Fishes for which the quota has been reached have to be thrown back into the sea. Traumatized and often injured, few survive.

"And for every fisherman's job that goes, eight more shore jobs will follow," a trawler owner commented to the Grimsby fish merchants web site.

The fishermen argue they are struggling to survive in an industry hit hard by quotas, restrictions and declining fish stocks. But the bureaucrats, oblivious to practical considerations as ever, point to the reduced numbers of fish being landed and produced statistics derived by academics from mathematical models of fish shoals to prove the policy has worked.

Fish stocks have in fact improved recently having declined so far due to the EU's insane policy that it was simply not worth the trawlers putting to sea. The big factory trawlers that did so much damage to fishing grounds in British territorial waters moved to Arctic waters or even the south Atlantic, these boats are equipped to process and freeze their catch on board, distance is no object.

The UK has the largest fleet of boats under 10 metres in Europe. Yet the subsidy policy is geared to help the larger boats, the fleets of France and Spain. They're subsidised at every turn. They're subsidised when they're built, when they go to sea, when they don't go to sea and when they're scrapped.

All that can be concluded from learning how the Common fisheries Policy has destroyed British Fishing as a viable industry is that we the taxpayers are paying the EU to subsidise our fishing fleets rivals to plunder our fish. What the EU's Fisheries policy also does is to plunder not only our seas but oceans across the world.

Fish is as tasty and popular as ever, but nobody anywhere who is involved in commercial fishing for their livelihood seems to like the policies that regulate the industry in the EU. For decades, European management of fisheries has been lambasted by fishers, conservationists and scientists, and people [including us](#) who like to eat good quality fish but balk at paying the exorbitant prices bureaucratic and authoritarian policies have caused,

The centrepiece of this system, the EU's Common Fisheries Policy, is particularly unpopular. Some scientists even argue it is [designed to fail](#). And how familiar that must sound to people who have read this book. Opponents blame it for not only mismanaging Europe's highly productive seas,

but also for giving away “our fish”, with the subject recently taking centre stage in an unlikely [viral Brexit campaign video](#). But as so often when looking at aspects of the European Union, people gave the impression that the Common Fisheries Policy has not worked because they take it at face value. All E U policies, whatever issues they are reputed to address, are really about only one thing. Increasing the level of power and control exercised by the bureaucracy.

Ownership of UK fishing quotas is controversial and often misunderstood. After total EU fishing limits are decided by the Council of Fisheries ministers, it is up to each member state to distribute its share among its own fleet.

This is not an EU decision. The fact that a single [giant Dutch-owned vessel](#) nets a quarter of the English quota (6% of the UK total) might be shocking, especially considering the UK’s quota is in theory shared between [more than 6,000 vessels](#). Academics say the UK government could easily change how it allocates fish but what is possible within EU rules would not represent a real improvement. Pro EU voices say alternative allocation systems suggested by [some pro-Brexit groups](#) are already in place [elsewhere in Europe](#). What they don't say is that these nations are non EU nations.

With an official net immigration figure of 350,000, and probably as many more entering the country illegally, Britain cannot possibly control immigration until it leaves the European Union and takes control of the borders. This is because freedom of movement rules gives other EU citizens an automatic right to live here. And once people from outside the EU are accepted and granted residency by another EU nation they can move freely within the union'

The Remain campaign say leaving will not solve the migration crisis but bring it to Britain’s doorstep because border controls from the Continent will move from Calais in France to Dover in UK. Maybe so (although it is unlikely because The Channel is a rather more formidable border fence than a bureaucrat with a clipboard, and least our border police will be able to turn people away.

Shortly after the European Elections of 2014, the media were still digesting Ed Miliband’s apology for his party’s woeful underestimate of both the scale of immigration and public concern about it. Mr Miliband said that Labour had let too many immigrants from Eastern Europe into the country too quickly by lifting controls on admissions from new EU member states before others did. There was no mention of immigrants from the middle east, in spite of the recent scandals in Rotherham, Oxford and other towns with a large contingent of Sunni Muslim immigrants where,

local officials and police forces in collusion with the Labour run town councils have turned a blind eye to widespread sexual abuse of under age white girls by Pakistani men?

Apparently not because the medieval social ideas imported from Pakistan and Bangladesh, where the local culture and prevailing religion permits wife - beating, rape of 'immodest women', forced marriages and honour killings of disobedient daughters, throw up problems that no one wants to address.

But Labour wasn't just "insufficiently alive to the burdens" of ordinary people, as Miliband, a decent man but totally out of touch with the working class voters his party claims to represent, had claimed. Labour party activists deliberately and dishonestly smeared many who voiced concerns. James Cameron, the envoy to Romania, and Steve Moxon, the civil servant who revealed that the Home Office was rubber-stamping bogus visa applications in 2004, were branded as racists. When Labour MP Frank Field set up the Cross-Party Group on Balanced Migration in 2008, his colleagues in 'The People's Party' openly called him a racist. Volumes could have been filled with the names of people who tried to express reasonable concerns, including social workers and policemen at the sharp end — and were silenced by a political establishment determined to suppress free speech.

Such censorship was supported by the abuse of statistics. Westminster City Council and others requested extra funding to run services because so many new immigrants, unskilled and only able to speak a few words of English, were registering for housing benefit, health services and schools, the Government flatly denied the claims and produced bogus figures to support the decision. When campaign group Migration Watch predicted in 2002 that net immigration would reach two million over the coming decade (which has turned out to be an underestimate), it was attacked as "muddled", "duplicitous" and racist.

The Home Office stuck to its notorious estimate that only 13,000 Eastern Europeans would move to Britain after EU enlargement, though more than a million had arrived by the end of 2009. And of course the idiotic screechers of the politically correct left were happy to parrot these bogus figures in comment threads on blogs and news articles.

In recent years, with the authoritarian EU having forced an even more lax immigration policy on member states, the government has continued to base its estimates of movements on the ONS Passenger Survey, a survey at ports and airports that is entirely voluntary. A government that wanted the truth would have done what the Conservative / Liberal democrat coalition was criticized by EU officials for doing; gathering data from councils and GPs. The coalition government had planned to restore border controls but pressure from the EU blocked their efforts. Another few million reasons for leaving the EU, vote UKIP.

Parliamentary sovereignty is the most important principle of the UK constitution. It makes Parliament the supreme legal authority in the UK, which can create or end any law. Generally, the courts cannot overrule its legislation and no Parliament can pass laws that future Parliaments cannot change. Parliamentary sovereignty is the most important part of the UK constitution. People often refer to the UK having an 'unwritten constitution' but that's not strictly true. It may not exist in a single text, like in the USA or Germany, but large parts of it are written down, much of it in the laws passed in Parliament - known as statute law.

Therefore, the UK constitution is often described as 'partly written and wholly uncodified'. (Uncodified means that the UK does not have a single, written constitution.)

The European Arrest Warrant allows British citizens to be sent abroad and charged for crimes in foreign courts, often for minor offences. Exit would stop this.

Rapists, murders and other serious criminals who commit offences in Britain can only be returned after fleeing abroad thanks to the European Arrest Warrant according to Europhiles. Exit would stop justice being done. This is blatantly untrue. Prior to the introduction of the European Arrest Warrant the UK had mutual extradition treaties with nations in Europe and many outside Europe. Now we cannot negotiate our own treaties, all trade and security treaties have to be negotiated by the EU Commission on behalf of all member states.

It is worth remembering here that as well as being members of Europol we are also signatories of the European Agreement On Human Rights, thus, while UK citizens can be extradited to other EU nations for trivial offences such as non payment of parking fines, our membership of the EU will prevent a suspected murderer or rapist who seeks refuge in Britain or elsewhere in the European Union being extradited to most third world nations because lawyers will argue that they will suffer human rights abuses.

Britain's links with the EU are holding back its focus on emerging markets – there is no major EU trade deal with China or India, or with 'second division' population nations such as Nigeria and Pakistan for example. Leaving would allow the UK to diversify its international links with trade deals suited to the EU economy, while the EU will only countenance trade deals covering all twenty eight nations with their diverse economies from mighty Germany to tiny island nations like Malta.

Corruption and Fraud are endemic within the EU. Back in 1999 the entire EU Commission was forced to resign because of massive and barely concealed fraud, theft and incompetence within the EU. (The disgraced commissioners hung on for six months until they had negotiated a severance deal and when they did quit they kept their pensions.) The EU's official Court of Auditors estimated that £1.1 billion had been misspent. No accurate figure could be assessed because auditors found, the commissioners had ordered the destruction of documents relating to the relevant years.

'Opportunities for fraud are open and they are taken advantage of' Marta Andreasen, the EU's former Chief Accountant said. She was sacked for being too honest and not playing the game after complaining of fraud within the EU's accounting systems.

On larger scale fraud and embezzlement throughout the EU, it is estimated that fraud and theft by officials costs the EU (which means European taxpayers) a large part of its annual £100 billion a year budget and year on year is rising far more rapidly than the EU economy is growing.

VAT fraud within the EU (the notorious [carousel fraud](#)) costs European taxpayers another £100 billion a year. Every year billions of Euros leak through holes in the EU's accounting procedures and vanish. In 2013 alone the European Union wasted £6 billion on fraudulent, illegal or ineligible spending projects.

That year, for the 19th year in a row, official auditors refused to approve the EU's accounts or to guarantee their accuracy. Auditors routinely complain that the EU's budget is full of errors and that the failure to follow the correct procedures makes the accounting chaos impossible to untangle.

Fraud, corruption and theft are endemic, the various European Mafia's are well connected to the EU's agencies and it is probable that EU taxpayers money its way into the pockets and campaign funds of politicians, even some US politicians who, on being elected to high office suddenly become very enthusiastic about enlarging the European Union and speeding up the process of ever closer union.

Money that the EU has given as 'grants' to member countries often disappears. Funds that were paid for bridge building and job creation are quite possibly spent on fast cars, expensive wine and luxury holidays. It does not seem at all unfair to conclude that a third of EU employees are

corrupt, a third are incompetent and a third are both corrupt and incompetent. In Steig Larsson's novel *The Girl With A Dragon Tattoo*, in the early chapters in which the author is telling the story of journalist Mikail Blomqvist's fall from grace when he tries to expose the crooked financier Wennerstrom, a fraud involving a bogus industrial operation is described. The large modern factory which records show was 'funded by the EU' is in reality a derelict and abandoned corrugated iron shed. However somebody is filling out and submitting all the necessary forms, and for reasons of their own nobody checks that the forms reflect real production and revenue.

As someone who, when I worked for the EU, was involved as a technical expert on a project to 'standardise trade data collection systems throughout member states, I can tell you unequivocally that Larsson drew on real frauds to construct that fiction.

If the EU were a company, its directors would by now be serving long prison terms.

In spite of all this, no one employed by the EU has ever been prosecuted for fraud or embezzlement, nor have any ever feared hearing those dreaded words, "You're fired" due to their laziness, incompetence or abuse of their position. Everybody who works for the EU (not contractors as I was but permanent staff, I finished up editing e-books for my sins - IanR Thorpe, editor) has lifetime immunity from prosecution on ALL crimes, not just those relating to the work they were involved in. They are also exempt from tax and when travelling abroad have diplomatic immunity. EU staff members are as untouchable as Europol ~~licenced-to-kill-secret-agents~~ officers, neither can be investigated, charged or arrested whatever they have done. This immunity continues after their employment has ceased. Buildings occupied by EU officials are also immune – they are 'out of bounds' and cannot be searched by the police. The lifetime immunity enjoyed by EU employees means that they cannot be prosecuted whatever they have done – even if they have clearly broken the law.

Obviously the bureaucracy does not believe in Cicero's, King Alfred's or the US Constitution's principle of all being equal before the law. In the finest traditions of tyranny, the European Union elite, in common with the Soviet, red Chinese and of course the Nazi elite, have placed themselves above the law. Is it any wonder that as I write, one major European nation is in a state of civil unrest and several others are close. Throughout the European Union people are waking up to what this organisation is all about.

The extent of corruption in Europe is "breathtaking" and it costs the EU economy at least 120bn Euros (£99bn) annually, the European Commission says.

EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmstrom has presented a [full report](#) on the problem.

She said the true cost of corruption was "probably much higher" than 120bn.

[Three-quarters of Europeans surveyed](#) for the Commission study said that corruption was widespread, and more than half said the level had increased.

"The extent of the problem in Europe is breathtaking, although Sweden is among the countries with the least problems," Ms Malmstrom wrote in Sweden's *Goose-stepping* daily.

The cost to the EU economy is equivalent to the bloc's annual budget.

For the report the Commission engaged independent consultants who studied corruption [in all 28 EU member states](#). The Commission says it is the first time it has done such a survey.

National governments, rather than EU agencies are responsible for fighting corruption in the EU. Ms Malmstrom reported that national governments and the European Parliament had required the Commission to carry out the EU-wide study. The task of The Commission, she complained, is to draft EU laws and enforces compliance with EU treaties.

Though Britain had the lowest reported rate of corruption, with less than one per cent of businesses and organisations that had dealings with the EU complaining of requests for bribes, kickbacks and 'hospitality' in some countries there was a relatively high number reporting personal experience of bribery in return for business.

In Croatia, the Czech Republic, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Romania and Greece, between 6% and 29% of respondents said they had been asked for a bribe, or had been expected to pay one, in the past 12 months. There were also high levels of corruption in Poland (15%), Slovakia (14%) and Hungary (13%), where the most prevalent instances were in healthcare. Malmstrom said corruption was eroding trust in democracy and draining resources from the legal economy.

"The political commitment to tackle corruption and fraud seems to be missing," she complained.

The EU has an anti-fraud agency, OLAF (O, laugh?), which is focused on dealing with fraud and corruption affecting the EU budget. Unlike Europol, OLAF has limited resources. In 2011 its budget was just 23.5m Euros.

The Commission highlighted that the areas of Public procurement (public bodies buying goods and services) which forms about one-fifth of the EU's total output (GDP) and is vulnerable to corruption. Better controls and integrity standards are needed but as the EU Commissioners, in their eagerness to build a pan - European bureaucratic empire, have enrolled into the club several nations notorious for their gangster culture, one would expect little improvement in the foreseeable future.

The EU study includes two major opinion polls conducted by Eurobarometer, the Commission's in - house polling service. Four in ten of the businesses surveyed described corruption as an obstacle to doing business in Europe. Sweden "is undoubtedly one of the countries with the least problems with corruption, and other EU countries should learn from Sweden's solutions for dealing with the problem", Ms Malmstrom said, pointing to laws on transparency and openness. In itself that is an illustration of the naivete and unworldliness of the people who run the EU. Since when did passing new laws stop criminals doing as they wished.

Organised crime groups have sophisticated networks across Europe and [the EU police](#)

[agency Europol says](#) there are at least 3,000 of them.

Bulgaria, Romania and Italy are particular hotspots for organised crime gangs in the EU, but white-collar crimes like bribery and VAT (sales tax) fraud plague many EU countries. Last year Europol director Rob Wainwright said VAT fraud in the carbon credits market had cost the EU about 5bn Euros.

Malmstrom's report has generated its own controversy. Publication was delayed for months, and some member states were critical of the European Commission for interfering in areas which they believed were none of its business. Originally, the report was also supposed to have included a chapter assessing corruption within EU institutions as well as within member states. But it will surprise few people to learn that idea was dropped.

Nevertheless the figures revealed will certainly raise some eyebrows.

The commission's estimate that corruption is costing the EU economy about 120bn Euros - the size of the EU's annual budget - could well be a conservative one. Other experts believe the real figure is probably higher. Cecilia Malmstrom described the scale of the problem as breath-taking. One thing is clear though, a continent that has been mired in economic crisis for years needs to do a better job in combating corruption. The European Union is failing to take steps to tackle the "corruption" and "systemic fraud" that is rife in the bloc, Britain's pro-Brexit justice minister Dominic Raab says.

The European anti-fraud office identified £685 million to be recovered in 2014, the most recent figures available, compared with £147 in 2011.

In 2015, there were a record 1,417 fraud allegations across the European Union, according to Raab, which he labelled

A spokesperson for Transparency International tried to downplay the matter, saying the EU failing to implement the first step of the UN convention, an assessment of its anti-corruption rules and capacities was an "embarrassment rather than an issue of overwhelming significance."

The spokesperson said the NGO is not keen to be drawn into the debate over Britain's membership in the EU, insisting it is a non-political organization.

Raab accused Transparency International of being "scared of a backlash from the establishment.

