




**Answers by The Viscount  
Monckton of Brenchley  
to questions from John  
Griffing, Esq., of Texas**







# **Answers by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley to questions from John Griffing, Esq., of Texas**

© The Bruges Group 2013

Published in December 2013 by

The Bruges Group, 214 Linen Hall, 162-168 Regent Street, London W1B 5TB

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

Follow us on twitter  @brugesgroup Find our facebook group:  The Bruges Group

Bruges Group publications are not intended to represent a corporate view of European and international developments. Contributions are chosen on the basis of their intellectual rigour and their ability to open up new avenues for debate.

# Answers by The Viscount Monckton of Brenchley to questions from John Griffing, Esq., of Texas


**1. The United Kingdom has changed dramatically in the last decade. Reforms giving ministers the power to make law independent of Parliament, the passage of Lisbon, and anti-defamation statutes that favor the growing Islamization of the British Isles have all radically changed the relationship between Britons and their government. Some would say that freedom in Britain is almost nonexistent. How would you respond to such assertions?**

Liberty is a fragile flower to be admired, valued, and accordingly nurtured. Few now cry freedom. According to an official German government estimate, some 83% of the laws of the vassal-states of the European tyranny-by-clerk are first proposed for us in secret, behind closed doors overseas, by the pampered, unelected *Kommissars* of Brussels, whom we may not question, hold to account, elect, remove, or replace.

Britain was once one of the world's most radical democracies. We are now a mere satrapy of an alien empire of bloodless, parasitic, custard-faced paper-shufflers. Ministers have long had, and have increasingly used and abused, powers to make laws independent of Parliament by way of delegated legislation.

Now the European tyranny, too, has the power to make laws independent either of the European *Duma* or of the elected parliaments of the vassal-states, by a procedure known as the "Commission Regulation", which, once promulgated even by the most junior of the *cuisses-de-cuir* of Brussels, has the immediate force of supreme law throughout Europe and must be enforced by British courts whether our elected representatives like it or not.

They do not like it. During the last Parliament, on 200 occasions the European legislative scrutiny committee of the House of Commons – for some reason the only committee of the House other than the security and intelligence committee to meet behind closed doors – rejected proposed European "Directives" – the revealing name for secretly-drafted laws originating in Brussels that our Parliament is obliged willy-nilly to enact. Yet on every single occasion the Directive was duly enacted, for our elected representatives have no say in the matter.



No Islamic nation has the right to send its citizens to settle in Britain. Yet even 30 years ago, during the time of Margaret Thatcher, there were 1 million Muslims in Britain. Now no one knows how many there are, but it is thought there are well over 3 million. Mosques are appearing everywhere. At one level, Britons see their acceptance of the Muslim influx as an instance of their famous tolerance. At another, there is a growing concern that Sharia law is supplanting United Kingdom law not only in matters of contract, where the parties may freely decide what law shall govern agreements between them, but also in wider affairs. Rabble-rousing Muslim preachers have been stirring up what in former times would have been excoriated and then extirpated as open sedition, but the European Human Rights Convention is routinely exploited by such firebrands to prevent their immediate removal from Britain.

Furthermore, governments of the Left, not only in Britain but also in the United States, have been abusing the power to make treaties, engaging in a flurry of treaty-making with other Leftist regimes and thereby binding successor Parliaments willy-nilly. In the United States, the Constitution provides a safeguard, in that a treaty cannot be ratified by the President unless two-thirds of the Senate shall first have approved the treaty. In Britain there is no such safeguard. Ministers, without the consent of Parliament, may exercise – and, under regimes of the Left, over-frequently exercise – treaty-making powers to bind their successors to Leftist objectives that the people may have rejected at the ballot-box.

For instance, the treaties giving rights to asylum-seekers are now being exploited by governments of the Left to provide a pretext for permitting unlimited immigration, for most immigrants, at least in the first generation, vote Left. By these and other means, governments of the Left are constantly manipulating the political terms of trade in their favor, permanently depriving the center-Right of the power to reverse their policies.

Would we regard ourselves as a free country? Not any more. A lawyer once told me, “Every time I get into my car, I imagine I am committing an offense – and I almost certainly am.” The rate at which new criminal offenses have been created continues to accelerate.

Once a British subject, asked by a fellow-citizen whether he might smoke or sing or dance, would contentedly reply, “It’s a free country!” No one says that now.

**2. The European Parliament, supposedly the elected legislature for the European Union (EU), is an institution in which Britain regrettably must participate. As long as Britain is trapped in the EU, its voice must be loud and bold. When Lisbon was rammed through the European Parliament, arguably ending whatever remained of national sovereignty in Europe, some likened the way Members of Parliament (MEPs) were silenced to the infamous Enabling Act of 1933 that abolished the German Reichstag. Can you elaborate?**

I was intimately involved in the attempts in the late 1980s and early 1990s to democratize the European constitution, which at that time (and still more today) is an uninspiring collection of turgid but viscerally anti-democratic treaties granting inordinate and unsupervised power to the 30,000 overprivileged, underworked and overpaid uncivil servants of the Dismal Empire, one in ten of whom are paid more than the British Prime Minister. Over a series of lunches at the Beefsteak Club, I gave detailed briefings to my Noble Friend Lord Stockton, who was a member of the constitutional convention whose job was to devise a new constitution for Europe to replace the multiplicity of obscurantist and often conflicting treaties by which, step by invisible step, the *cuisses-de-cuir* had stolen away the democratic power of the *sans-culottes*.

His Lordship was horrified at what I told him. I explained how a law is made in the European Union, for the process is deliberately rather secretive and is never revealed in the mainstream news media, who are in the tank for the Dismal Empire because its structure is in essence a Westward migration of the now-defunct Soviet constitution.

The first stage in the promulgation of a new European law is the lobbying stage. At this stage, some of the thousands of paid lobbyists who infest Brussels approach the handful of unelected, mysterious and all-powerful *Kommissars* who alone have the power to propose a new law. When the appropriate bribes have been paid, the *Kommissars* meet behind closed doors and eventually emerge to issue a draft "Directive", the revealing word for a European law. The draft Directive is then passed to a body so secret that until very recently, and only then under pressure from reformers attempting to introduce the notion of democracy to the system, its very existence was not mentioned on any European Union website. This body is the Council of Permanent Representatives, which, like most European bodies, is given the near-meaningless pseudo-acronym "Coreper", so that virtually no one will know what it is or does. It is a body of (you guessed it) unelected bureaucrats who meet (you guessed it again) behind closed doors to turn the draft Directive into due legal form as a new law.

The Directive is then passed to the Council of Ministers, which is (you guessed it) not a council of Ministers but a body of (yup) unelected bureaucrats who meet (yup again) behind closed doors to decide whether the Directive should become a new law for Europe or not. Ministers have the theoretical right to attend the Council of Ministers but very seldom do. On one occasion during Margaret Thatcher's reign, the brightest member of her Cabinet, Sir Nicholas Ridley, received a copy of a Directive on rare birds from Coreper and, as a knowledgeable countryman, gave it a more than usually careful read. It was uncharacteristically excellent. He decided to attend the Council of Ministers, so that he could personally congratulate the officials who had drafted it and indicate the Government's support for it. When he arrived in Brussels, he was astonished to find himself the only Minister present. The relevant *Kommissar* then informed the meeting that the Directive would not proceed because the Commission had decided to withdraw it. Ridley was baffled, and asked why. The *Kommissar* said: "We wanted to teach you all a lesson in where the real power now lies. It does not lie with mere elected Ministers such as you. We have decided to withdraw the Directive just to show that we can. All legislative power lies in our hands now. Good day." And the *Kommissar* walked out. Nicky Ridley, who told me this story, said, "Until then, I had been an enthusiastic supporter of the European project. That was the moment when the scales fell from my eyes and I saw the full horror of what we had done in allowing ourselves to be dragged in." From then on, Ridley was an active opponent of the EU.


Only if the Council of "Ministers" has rubber-stamped the Directive does it go to the only elected body in the EU, the European "Parliament". It is not, of course, a Parliament at all. Or, if it is, it is a mere Parliament of Eunuchs. For it lacks even the power to father a Bill. Indeed, there is no such thing as a Bill. The European "Parliament" has little more power than to say Yea or Nay to the Directives that are put in front of it. If it says Yea, the Directive is then promulgated and the national parliaments of the member-states are obliged by treaty to enact it, whether the people's representative like it or not. The people's will, as expressed by those whom they have elected to their national parliaments, no longer comes into it. But the "Parliament's" Nay does not mean Nay. If it rejects a Directive, a reconciliation committee is established between the Council of "Ministers" and the "Parliament" to haggle over whether the "Directive" is to be approved. And, even if the final decision is indeed Nay, the *Kommissars* have – and frequently use – two separate powers simply to override the will of the elected *Duma* of Europe. First, there is the power simply to issue the Directive anyway, in the form of what is called a "Commission Regulation". That has the immediate force of supreme law throughout the European Reich, and no parliament, whether in Brussels or in any of the member-states,

has any power whatsoever to say or do anything about it. As Hitler himself says in proposing precisely this arrangement in *Mein Kampf*, the parliament of Europe may vote, but its vote will not mean anything, for the will of the governing class must not be overridden by that of the mere people. It was for this reason that he persuaded the Reichstag to vote itself out of existence in 1933, giving him absolute power.

The second power of the *Kommissars* to nullify a decision of the European “Parliament” is written into the Maastricht Treaty five times. It is an overriding power which may be freely exercised at any time and without even giving a reason. When I obtained the first copy in Britain of the Maastricht Treaty draft (which had been kept secret from the people until I revealed all) and when I wrote about it in the London *Evening Standard*, I explained that the unelected *Kommissars* had the power to cancel any decision of the European “Parliament”. Douglas Hurd, then the Foreign Secretary, whose job was to negotiate the terms of the Treaty, wrote a furious letter to the Editor saying that he knew of no such provision. Of course he did not know of any of the five provisions, for he was an idle sort, and had not bothered to read the hundreds of pages of turgid bureaucratise at all, still less to work out what any of it meant. I wrote him a crushing letter of reply, and his limp response was, “I think you are wrong”, which, being translated, signifies “I know you are right.”

In the end, the lamentable government of John Major, who pushed the Maastricht Treaty through the Westminster Parliament against the rules of the House even after the House had defeated it, got its own back. A new editor was appointed, and he went to see John Major to ask how he could help. The reply from the Prime Minister was immediate. “Sack Monckton,” he said. The editor, a useless fellow, did the Prime Minister’s bidding and I collected an enormous payout for agreeing to go quietly. Two months later, I fell seriously ill and would have had to retire in any event, but my contract would not have entitled me to a single penny in compensation. So the hapless Major ended up handsomely benefiting the person he most wanted to harm in all the world. Years later, when asked which national paper he would have closed if he had had the power, he snapped, “The Evening Standard.” Oh, and three weeks after I was sacked, the European Exchange-Rate Mechanism, the daft precursor to the even dafter euro, collapsed as I had been alone in predicting for months that it would.

Most people who learn of the elaborate and dangerously anti-democratic pantomime by which five laws in six now enacted in the member-states are tabled and imposed upon them from behind closed doors by people whom nobody elects are outraged. Once, at a meeting of the World Federation of Scientists, I was explaining the system of EU lawmaking to a scientist who had no idea of how anti-democratic the




system was. She was horrified, and angry that the news media had never told her any of this. She asked for chapter and verse in the various treaties, which I provided. Opposite at the dinner-table was a very senior EU bureaucrat who went redder and redder in the face with fury as I exposed the whole ghastly system. Eventually, he exploded and said that my description of how an EU law was made was a travesty. So I invited him to name one single point that I had made that was in any degree incorrect, and to provide chapter and verse from the treaties as I had been asked to do. He was unable to nominate a single point that was in the least degree inaccurate. His fury, it turned out, was not because I was wrong. It was because I knew.

**3. During the last four American presidencies, executive power has grown exponentially, and the use of signing statements and executive orders as lawmaking tools separate from Congress has increased dramatically. In the context of the previous question, can you please draw parallels to trends in Britain and the EU? How might American and British citizens return legislative power to its proper, democratically elected custodians?**

Let us be blunt. Democracy is dying. Or, rather, it is being salami-sliced out of existence by a predatory governing class, on both sides of the Atlantic, that has realized that educational standards have fallen so far, and the news media are so deep into the tank for totalitarianism, that the traditional role of the media as defenders of the will of the people and of the people's right to express that will through the ballot box will no longer be exercised. Democracy has already been near-totally extinguished in the United Kingdom, since only one law in six is now made by people we elect. Our once-sovereign Parliament, the former embodiment of the people's will, is now the world's costliest rubber stamp. Even though your Congress need not be quite as much of a rubber stamp as our Parliament, the democracy-hating Left have begun to neutralize it in a fashion not unlike the European Communists who run the EU. For the Left's propensity to make treaties that bind the United States in such a way that Congress itself cannot undo the new treaty provisions has largely but near-invisibly stolen away the once-undisputed sovereignty of the United States.

How, then, do we restore legislative power to Congress? Step one: wake up the GOP. While the only significant party that might in theory oppose the totalitarians does just about nothing, your democracy will continue to be dismantled, piece by piece, inch by mile, until you will suddenly wake up one day, as we have, and realize






that you are no longer the nation your Founding Fathers had the vision to intend that you should be.

In the United States, it is essential that you should use the GOP's current period of opposition to prepare legislation that will reassert Article 1, Section 1 of your Constitution. That Section is the charter of Congress: lose that, and you lose Congress: lose Congress, and you lose democracy. It is also essential that you should circumscribe the powers of Left-leaning administrations to make treaties that indefinitely bind successor administrations. One simple way to do that would be to propose an amendment to the Constitution forbidding the President to make or the Senate to ratify any treaty unless the treaty contained a sunset clause that would ensure the participation of the US would cease unless the Senate specifically re-ratified the treaty on the termination date for a further term of  $n$  years. If the "Democrats" prevented that amendment, then a Bill should be passed enjoining the Senate to make no treaties unless they contained sunset clauses (if such a Bill is not unconstitutional). The main point is that one should become as much a master of the legislative possibilities as the totalitarians are, and one should at least try to fight them. You will lose your country otherwise. This is not a time to be limp-wristed, still less a time to be asleep.

**4. The British Parliament recently adopted reforms that give Crown Ministers legislative power, making parliament virtually unnecessary to the governance of the UK. Can you comment on these regulatory reforms? Is this similar to what the Obama Administration is doing with Czars?**

In practice, British Ministers already have enormous powers to make legislation as they go along, under powers delegated to them under thousands of previous Acts of Parliament. The new procedure is a further extension of this power, which is not really quite the same as Obama's appointment of Czars (or, rather, *Kommissars*) to exercise administrative and, to some degree, legislative powers. How to stop this drift towards dictatorship on both sides of the Atlantic? It will be necessary for the people's elected representatives to reassert their authority over the predatory bureaucracies that are slowly squeezing all real democracy out of the system. If those whom the people elect will not even try to reassert their authority, then the people would be within their rights if they voted for parties that suggested considerable reductions in the pay and privileges of members of Congress in



recognition of the much-reduced role that Congress now plays in the government of the United States.

It is when one sees the extent to which the elected institutions of democracy are failing that one realizes one can no longer rely upon the public sector for salvation in the face of the coming financial crisis. It will be necessary to replace the now-unrepresentative democracy of elected but increasingly powerless parliaments and congresses with the direct democracy and cheerful chaos of the free market, by the rapid and systematic transfer of what are now the functions of municipal, State and even Federal government into the hands of competing private institutions.

It may also be advisable to establish a parallel Congress in Washington, elected by privately-conducted ballots across the nation, and committed to dealing with all of the problems that the existing Congress, by its inaction, has created or exacerbated. The Tea Parties need to raise their game. Shouting from the sidelines is not going to be enough, if we are to save democracy from extinction.

Another necessary measure is to impose upon all organs of the Press the duty to give both sides of any political question, and to give approximately as much space to opponents of their favorites on the Left as the proportion of the House occupied by the Left's opponents. On climate change, to name but one topic, the mainstream media have been unforgivably one-sided. Democracy cannot function unless the Press does what it once proudly regarded as its duty: to inform the public of both sides of any argument, with the fairness and completeness of, say, the Madison Papers.


The point is this. Democracy is going down, unless the people now rise up and demand its restoration, repair, and re-establishment. Perhaps Fox News can be persuaded to hire a football stadium and invite all the people of America to attend a People's Constitutional Convention to debate the death of democracy and to issue proposals for its restoration. The Press would not be able to resist covering such an event, and, if well stage-managed, it would be able to raise many of the issues that I have only had the time and space barely to touch upon here.

**5. David Cameron rode in on a wave of anti-Blair/Brown sentiment. Many might conclude that the coalition win was a vote against Labour, and not necessarily for Thatcherite conservatism (which Cameron most assuredly does not embody). What do you think is needed to return Britain back to common sense conservatives, both in its dealings with the EU and domestic policy?**

At the 2010 General Election, the voters were not offered any recognizable form of Conservatism, let alone of Thatcherism. David Cameron, in his first speech as leader of the Conservatives, made it quite plain that he was not really a Conservative at all. He had carefully concealed this fact from those who had voted for him in the leadership election, many of whom have detested him ever since for having misled them with such complete success. By going so very far to the Left, Cameron has made the Conservatives unelectable, because all true Conservatives have left the party and joined the United Kingdom Independence Party, to which I subscribe, and which still stands for everything that Margaret Thatcher stood for. It achieved 25% of the national vote in the recent municipal elections in England and Wales, and now looks as though it may win seats in the UK Parliament for the first time in 2015. It already holds a dozen of Britain's 81 seats in the European "Parliament", making it the second-largest party in EU elections, and may well become the largest party next year.

The most direct method of returning Britain to truly Conservative values, then, is for the population to vote for UKIP. This is what is now beginning to happen quite rapidly, and the Conservative Party now knows that it will undoubtedly lose the coming General Election by a very substantial margin, even though the leader of the Labor Party is the least impressive in its history, because UKIP will take far more votes from the Conservatives than from Labor. Already, the Conservatives are beginning to try to negotiate with UKIP. As the leader of UKIP in Scotland, I was approached by a very senior Conservative recently and invited to join up again, and I was offered a safe seat if only I were willing to agree. However, UKIP is made of sterner stuff than that, so I politely declined, to the enormous discomfiture of the offeror, who had expected the sort of selfish ambition that is now routine in what was once the Conservative party.

I predict – perhaps rashly – that events will now unfold in Britain as follows. First, as the election approaches, Cameron will approach our national leader, Nigel Farage, who, however, distrusts him and will do no deals with him. The Conservative party will then have the choice of ditching Cameron and choosing Boris Johnson (currently Mayor of London) as its leader before the election, or doing the same after the election. I think they will not be bright enough or brave enough to do it before the



election, which Labor (despite its catastrophic leader) will win, but they will certainly ditch Cameron afterward. Thereupon, Boris Johnson, to whom Mr. Farage will be ready to talk, will come to an arrangement with him to fight on a joint ticket at the 2020 general election, and after that election, which the joint ticket will win because a vast majority of the population wants a vote on whether we stay in or come out of the EU, the first order of business in Parliament at Westminster will be a Bill for an immediate referendum on Britain's EU membership, which the opponents of EU membership will win by 55% to 45%. Thereupon, Britain will withdraw from the EU.

As for domestic policy, once Cameron goes Johnson, his most likely replacement, will restore true Conservative policies, which will be much more popular than Cameron's cloying and irremediably fatuous Left-of-center "liberalism".

**6. Will we ever see another British Prime Minister wield the "handbag" against EU centralism, or has Lisbon removed any modicum of national sovereignty that remained? Please clarify.**

Lisbon certainly leaves Britain nothing that is recognizable as independent, national sovereignty. We are now a vassal state of the Dismal Empire in all but name. No amount of renegotiation is now possible, for there are almost 30 member states, every one of which would have to agree to give Britain what they would all see as preferential terms. Accordingly, as the former leader of UKIP, Malcolm Pearson, puts it, "the only way out is the door." If we want to address the multiplicity of complications and expenses and unfreedoms that membership of the Dismal Empire inflicts upon us, far and away the simplest, cheapest, cleanest and most complete solution is simply to leave. If we leave, so will many other countries.

**7. The Euro is considered unstable by many, and appears to be on the road to collapse. Financial integrationists the world over see this potential collapse as a path to forging a new, global currency unit for the industrial countries—long the dream of academia. Is this the case, and if so, how would you recommend national sovereignty advocates counter such moves?**

Yes, the Euro is finished, though it will be kept alive as a vanity project by those who would not be told by the likes of me that it was going to fail. I predicted its failure in detail in a lecture to the economics and international relations faculties at St. Andrews University in 1996, a year before it was introduced, because at


that time it was already clear that, in flagrant defiance of the EU treaties, the *Kommissars* had decided to abandon all eight of the economic-convergence criteria for member-states' accession to the euro that had been enshrined – after years of negotiation – in the Maastricht Treaty. The theory of optimal currency areas dictated that without economic convergence any attempt to inflict a single currency on Europe would drive several poorer countries to the wall and would entail massive cash transfers from the richer to the poorer countries, to the manifest disadvantage of both.

For reasons of competition as much as of national independence and the right to retain the seigniorage on one's own currency, I do not favor the totalitarians' proposal to double down on the abject failure of the euro by adopting the globo. Far better to have as many competing currency boards as the market will bear, regulated by law to ensure that they were fully funded and were dealing honestly, but otherwise free to compete with one another. To counter the attempts of the usual suspects to introduce the globo, I should favor getting on with the establishment of the first private currency board in the United States as a matter of profitable urgency.

**8. Regional devolution in the UK has been changed as a matter of form, but the substance is still present. [See my latest paper for Bruges Group, “Divide and Conquer.”] What is your assessment of regional devolution in the UK and how will this impact British power and influence in the foreign policy sphere?**

A year from now, Scotland will vote on whether to separate from the United Kingdom. So far, the “First Minister” of Scotland, Mr Salmond, who favors separation, has not succeeded in manufacturing a sufficiently substantial and popular disagreement with London to have any realistic opportunity to win the separation referendum. My own prediction is that the referendum will fail by approximately 65% to 35%, whereupon Mr Salmond will retire and the Scottish National Party will lose office to Labor (the Conservatives being monstrously unpopular in Scotland these days: they secured 55% of the national vote in 1955 but are now down to just 7%, with UKIP, relatively new in Scotland, already polling about the same. There are no plans for separatism in Wales or Northern Ireland.

There is a curious unreality about the proposals of the Scottish Nationalists for what they are trying to call “independence”. Not only do they not have the faintest idea how they are going to pay the annual \$30 billion welfare check in the absence of the vast subsidies from English taxpayers that Scotland now receives, but they are also



not offering anything that is recognizable as independence for Scotland, because they are intent on remaining in the EU, which makes 83% of Britain's laws, while Westminster, from which Salmond & Co. are demanding "independence", makes only 5% of Scotland's laws.

There is a very good case for allowing most if not all powers recouped from the EU upon Britain's exit to be devolved to the Celtic fringes. This would involve no loss of power at Westminster, but would greatly increase the powers of the elected regional assemblies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland at the expense of the EU. This proposal, which came from our Young UKIP chairman in Scotland, may soon become UKIP's policy nationally.

Provided that none of the Celtic fringes leaves the United Kingdom altogether, return of powers from Europe to the regions rather than to Westminster would have no impact on the UK's international standing or membership of bodies such as the UN Security Council. Even if, say, Scotland were to secede following next September's referendum, the remainder of the United Kingdom would remain the successor state in law for purposes of all international treaties, whereas a separated Scotland would have to apply to accede to all of the treaties (including the EU treaties) all over again. The EU has made it plain to Scotland that as a condition of its joining the EU as a nation in its own right it would be obliged to join the euro – a suggestion that has proven extremely unpopular in Scotland, and is another powerful reason why the Nationalists will, I think, lose the separation referendum vote by at least 2:1.

27 Queen Street, Edinburgh, EH2 1JX  
11 September 2013

## THE BRUGES GROUP

The Bruges Group is an independent all-party think tank. Set up in February 1989, its aim was to promote the idea of a less centralised European structure than that emerging in Brussels. Its inspiration was Margaret Thatcher's Bruges speech in September 1988, in which she remarked that "We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain, only to see them re-imposed at a European level...". The Bruges Group has had a major effect on public opinion and forged links with Members of Parliament as well as with similarly minded groups in other countries. The Bruges Group spearheads the intellectual battle against the notion of "ever-closer Union" in Europe. Through its ground-breaking publications and wide-ranging discussions it will continue its fight against further integration and, above all, against British involvement in a single European state.

## WHO WE ARE

**Founder President:** The Rt Hon. the Baroness Thatcher of Kesteven LG, OM, FRS  
**President:** The Rt Hon. The Lord Tebbit of Chingford, CH PC  
**Vice-President:** The Rt Hon. the Lord Lamont of Lerwick  
**Chairman:** Barry Legg  
**Director:** Robert Oulds MA, FRSA  
**Head of Research:** Dr Helen Szamuely  
**Washington D.C. Representative:** John O'Sullivan CBE,  
**Founder Chairman:** Lord Harris of High Cross  
**Former Chairmen:** Dr Brian Hindley, Dr Martin Holmes & Professor Kenneth Minogue

**Academic Advisory Council:**  
Professor Tim Congdon  
Professor Christie Davies  
Professor Norman Stone  
Dr Richard Howarth  
Professor Patrick Minford  
Ruth Lea  
Andrew Roberts  
Martin Howe, QC  
John O'Sullivan, CBE

**Sponsors and Patrons:**  
E P Gardner  
Dryden Gilling-Smith  
Lord Kalms  
David Caldow  
Andrew Cook  
Lord Howard  
Brian Kingham  
Lord Pearson of Rannoch  
Eddie Addison  
Ian Butler  
Thomas Griffin  
Lord Young of Graffham  
Michael Fisher  
Oliver Marriott  
Hon. Sir Rocco Forte  
Graham Hale  
W J Edwards  
Michael Freeman  
Richard E.L. Smith

## BRUGES GROUP MEETINGS

The Bruges Group holds regular high-profile public meetings, seminars, debates and conferences. These enable influential speakers to contribute to the European debate. Speakers are selected purely by the contribution they can make to enhance the debate.

For further information about the Bruges Group, to attend our meetings, or join and receive our publications, please see the membership form at the end of this paper. Alternatively, you can visit our website [www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com) or contact us at [info@brugesgroup.com](mailto:info@brugesgroup.com).

### Contact us

For more information about the Bruges Group please contact:  
Robert Oulds, Director  
**The Bruges Group**, 214 Linen Hall, 162-168 Regent Street, London W1B 5TB  
**Tel:** +44 (0)20 7287 4414  
**Email:** [info@brugesgroup.com](mailto:info@brugesgroup.com)



[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)