

Snakes in the Grass and Wolves in Sheep's Clothing. Threats to Independence in the Post-Brexit Era

CIB chairman Edward Spalton notes that the EU is not the only threat to nation state democracy. Other international organisations such as the United Nations and the World Health Organisation have powerful bureaucracies with officials who aspire to supranational technocratic rule. We must continue to be alert to threats to our independence in all their guises.

Whilst this article is mostly concerned with foreign personalities and organisations, we must not forget that the EU could never have asserted the slightest legal authority over us without the enthusiastic support of British politicians who gave their first loyalty to the European project, contrary to the most solemn possible oath to which they would assent when their successful careers carried them into the Privy Council.

Alone amongst the member states, British politicians tried rather successfully to conceal the depth of the submission involved – and this was quite deliberate from the very early post war era. Peter Thorneycroft MP, later Chancellor of the Exchequer and Chairman of the Conservative Party, wrote in his *Design for Europe* (1947):

'No government dependent on a democratic vote

could possibly agree in advance to the sacrifice that any adequate plan must involve. The British people must be led slowly and unconsciously in to the abandonment of their traditional economic defences.'

This shows the career politician's contempt for the people he supposedly represents – in this case, people who had recently spent all their treasure and much of their blood to defend freedom, their own and others'. They were to be led into a new, alien, technocratic form of government of which they were to be kept in ignorance. The Official Secrets Act kept the lid on much more detail for thirty years after the deed was done in 1973.

A cross-party deceit

In the run-up to our joining the EEC, the deceit was a cross-party affair. Roy Jenkins was one of the Labour MPs working behind the scenes to defy his party's policy and get the European Communities Act 1972 passed. He went around the country saying that the Commonwealth countries, now grown up and independent, wanted nothing more to do with us, so we must turn to Europe. A young, authoritative, enthusiastic Conservative MP came to our Grain Trade Conference in Buxton to tell us exactly the same thing. He was John Selwyn Gummer, now Lord Deben.

It just happened that I knew he was not telling the truth. Our family business had bought thousands of tons of milk powder from New Zealand for baby calf food over the years, and that would have to stop. I knew that nobody liked losing their best customers. The New Zealanders were very stoic and quiet. They had to be. They were entirely dependent on the

British government to negotiate a quota with the European authorities for their butter and lamb sales in Britain. So it was a piece of misinformation which the very intelligent Mr Gummer could assert without the least fear of contradiction.

Ironically it was his speech which convinced me that there must be more evil for us in the European project, if it had to be supported from the beginning with such an untruth.

The deal was that we would ditch our Commonwealth suppliers and our access to the world market for food. We would pay much higher European prices. In return we would get access to the EEC market for our industrial goods, motor cars and so on. Mr Selwyn Gummer was convinced that our sales of British cars would boom as soon as we no longer had to pay customs duty because we were inside the 'Common Market'.

It didn't work out like that, did it? The European project never was a mere 'Common Market' but always a political union. Nearly thirty years later another enthusiastic Europhile admitted that it had been wrong to deceive people about its nature:

'Not only was it wrong for us to deal superficially with what Europe involved but we've paid the price for it ever since, because every time there's a crisis in Europe, people say, with some justification, "Well we would not have been part of this if we'd really known the implications."'

– Lord Hattersley in BBC Radio 4 Programme 'A Letter to The Times', 3 February 2000.

So, in dealing with international organisations in future, we need to look behind the labels to see what their real objectives are. And we need politicians who are far more sceptical and dedicated to our country's interest than the Thorneycrofts, Gummers, Jenkinses and Hattersleys of yesteryear. The EU is not the only organisation which has a governing institution (in the form of the European Commission) which is legally beyond democratic control. Other international organisations also have powerful bureaucracies whose officials are similarly above public scrutiny, and who have ambitions of their own far beyond their apparent function.

Ambitions of 'world government'

The **World Health Organisation (WHO)**, founded in 1948, is in the news today for its role in attempting to manage the COVID pandemic at a transnational level. But had wider ambitions from the start. Its first Director General, Dr Brock Chisholm, certainly aspired to be more than family doctor to the world. Above all he wanted power, writing:

'To achieve world government it is necessary to remove from the minds of men their individualism, loyalty to family, tradition, national patriotism and religious dogmas. The reinterpretation and eventually eradication of the concept of right and wrong which has been the basis of child training, the substitution of intelligent and rational thinking for faith in the certainties of old people, these are the objectives...'

Quite a number of these objectives are well on their way to achievement.

No doubt Chisholm recruited like-minded colleagues who appointed successors of similar ambitions. Today the WHO is funded to a very large extent by pharmaceutical companies who produce vaccines, foundations whose wealth comes from similar sources and aspirants to global influence like Bill Gates.

So the WHO clearly requires close scrutiny. But, operating from its Swiss base, WHO and its participating delegations and organisations have diplomatic immunity and, rather like EU Commissioners, are beyond the reach of normal law and public investigation. Bill Gates even applied to become a sort of one man country to enjoy this immunity – over and above what is conferred by vaccination, that is!

Resistance is futile?

‘Resistance is futile!’ became an ironic catch phrase amongst independence campaigners in the early Nineties, as we came up against the bland, effortless assumption of superiority by Europhiles, who had such exceedingly high opinions of themselves. The catchphrase was from the film *Star Trek: First Contact*. The full quotation was:

‘We are the Borg. Lower your shields and surrender your ships. We will add your biological and technical distinctiveness to our own. Your culture will adapt to serve us. Resistance is futile.’

The Borg were an electro-humanoid race with a single hive mind. Of course, our resistance did not falter in the face of Europhile arrogance, but only hardened.

Now, compare the Borg's philosophy with the following from **Dr Robert Muller**, who served as a leading United Nations bureaucrat for some four decades from its foundation in the 1940s, eventually rising to Assistant Secretary-General. In his 'Framework for Planetary and Cosmic Consciousness' (1995), Dr Muller wrote:

'The United Nations is the biological metaorganism of the human species. We have now the birth of a global nervous system. We are beginning to have a global heart, be it only our love for nature to preserve this earth – this planet of ours – and we will also see the birth of a global soul. Whoever will understand that we are a part of the universe and of evolution – that we are cells of a total humanity. We should replace the word politics by planetics. We need the planetary management, planetary caretakers.'

Dr Muller joined the UN in 1948, eventually becoming Assistant Secretary-General, working on inter-agency affairs, co-ordinating the work of thirty two UN specialised agencies and world programmes, also in charge of several world conferences and international years. He retired in 1986. He went on to an active retirement. He received the UNESCO Peace Education Prize in 1989, the Albert Schweitzer International Prize for the Humanities in 1993 and the Eleanor Roosevelt Man of Vision Award in 1994, as well as a nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize. He became Chancellor Emeritus of the United Nations University for Peace in Costa Rica. He died in 2010.

In a collection of notes which he circulated in 2003 was this quotation from Jean Monnet (described as Conceiver of the European Community, now the European Union):

'Have I not said clearly enough that the Community we created is not an end in itself? It is a process of change, continuing in that same process which in an earlier period produced our national forms of life. The sovereign nations of the past can no longer solve the problems of the present: they cannot ensure their own progress or control their own future. And the Community itself is only a stage on the way of the organised world of tomorrow.'

The foes of democracy

So, in opposing the European Union we were only tackling a corner of a much larger campaign against the nations of the world. It is totalitarian, universal and intended to be eternal – a sort of bastard religion or global fascism. It inspires the fanatics of Extinction Rebellion and others. It will tolerate no rival and non-conforming scientists are ruthlessly 'cancelled'.

So I was not surprised to read in March that Lord Deben, who is now Chairman of the 'independent' Climate Change Committee, has demanded authoritarian rule to deliver 'Net Zero'. Deben may no longer be plain old John Selwyn Gummer, but he hasn't changed much since 1972 in his fondness for imposing anti-democratic, unaccountable forms of government on the people of this country.

There are many similar people who will bear watching as we scan the horizon for our external foes, concealed under the camouflage of benign intentions.