A LETTER TO JANE BIRKBY

Jane,

VIENNA TREATY CONVENTION... EXIT ROUTE FROM THE EU

Thank you and I agree with what you say and it is good to have your input.

However, until a UK government wish to "walk away" from the EU they will presumably continue to follow like sheep. So seeking to prove that MPs follow an illegal and corrupt act would presumably make little difference to those sheep, as they would simply vote to accept EU rules (until the end of their parliamentary term).

The importance of what you are saying is that WHEN a UK Government actually wish to leave, they can ignore the crazy exit rules of article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty and simply have that vote at Westminster and leave. That is very important to me.

UKIP do not accept this, as Farage believes that the EU exit requirements must be followed. AIP say that Westminster has the ability and any referendum is legally not necessary.

Hence our slogan "UK Independence NOW."

Mike

MIKE NATTRASS MEP
AN INDEPENDENCE PARTY
www.aipmep.org
0121 333 7737

"UK INDEPENDENCE NOW"

from jane birkby

To: mikenattrass@hotmail.com


Dear Mike Nattrass,

For your information here are the two International Treaties identified by Leolin Price QC, which tie in with the evidence (English Constitution Group) against Edward Heath and subsequent Cabinets that the 1972 Treaty was signed illegally and with corruption, which makes the founding treaty upon which all the others rely "null and void" and "of no legal force", giving Britain the right to just walk away with no penalty, no referendum needed, from the whole corrupt edifice that is the EU.

I should be interested in your view on this.

Kind regards

Jane Birkby

YES, I DO AGREE AND I AM SO PLEASED TO HAVE THIS INPUT AS IT IS "AIP POLICY" JUSTIFIED, THANK
YOU.
My own "we can leave" conclusions were based on the simple fact that one parliament cannot bind a subsequent parliament, under our constitution.
Your view, that it is also corrupt and therefore invalid, is yet another string to the bow (of burning gold) .......
Will you stand with us in a Region and promote that view? Mike

Pertinent paragraphs in red.

**LEOLIN PRICE QC article in International Currency Review 2005 vol 30 no.4**

**THE VIENNA TREATY CONVENTION**

Under the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties there are two key provisions which authorise a signatory power to abrogate a bilateral or multilateral treaty unilaterally, **without giving the stipulated notice**.

1. Where corruption has been demonstrated in respect of procuring the treaty in the first place, or in respect of any dimension of it's implementation.

snipped

European Commission (EC) permits and is associated with corruption on a monumental scale, which the EU authorities have tried to cover up with declining success.

2. Where there has been material change of circumstances.

snipped

**A material change of circumstances has surfaced into the daylight, to begin with, following the death of Sir Edward Heath. It has been revealed that he was an agent for a foreign power, accepted corrupt payments for his services, and lied to the British people concerning the nature of the geopolitical trap into which he had been instructed by his handlers to lead them - and that he did all this on behalf of a foreign power which has all along disguised its continuing Nazi orientation.**

**PART V SECTION 2. INVALIDITY OF TREATIES**

**Article 46**

**Provisions of internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties**

1. A State may not invoke the fact that its consent to be bound by a treaty has been expressed in violation of a provision of its internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties as invalidating its consent unless that violation was manifest and concerned a rule of its internal law of fundamental importance.

2. A violation is manifest if it would be objectively evident to any State conducting itself in the matter in accordance with normal practice and in good faith.

**Article 47**

**Specific restrictions on authority to express the consent of a State**

If the authority of a representative to express the consent of a State to be bound by a particular treaty has been made subject to a specific restriction, his omission to observe that restriction may not be invoked as invalidating the consent expressed by him unless the restriction was notified to the other negotiating States prior to his expressing such consent.

**Article 48**

**Error**
1. A State may invoke an error in a treaty as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty if the error relates to a fact or situation which was assumed by that State to exist at the time when the treaty was concluded and formed an essential basis of its consent to be bound by the treaty.

**Article 49**

**Fraud**

If a State has been induced to conclude a treaty by the fraudulent conduct of another negotiating State, the State may invoke the fraud as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

**Article 50**

**Corruption of a representative of a State**

If the expression of a State’s consent to be bound by a treaty has been procured through the corruption of its representative directly or indirectly by another negotiating State, the State may invoke such corruption as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

**Article 51**

**Coercion of a representative of a State**

The expression of a State’s consent to be bound by a treaty which has been procured by the coercion of its representative through acts or threats directed against him shall be without any legal effect.

**Article 52**

**Coercion of a State by the threat or use of force**

A treaty is void if its conclusion has been procured by the threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

**Article 53**

**Treaties conflicting with a peremptory norm of general international law ("jus cogens")**

A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law. For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.

**SECTION 3. TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES**

**Article 62**

**Fundamental change of circumstances**

1. A fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless:

(a) the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and

(b) the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty.

2. A fundamental change of circumstances may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty:
(a) if the treaty establishes a boundary; or

(b) if the fundamental change is the result of a breach by the party invoking it either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

3. If, under the foregoing paragraphs, a party may invoke a fundamental change of circumstances as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty it may also invoke the change as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty.

SECTION 5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE INVALIDITY, TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF A TREATY

Article 69

Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty

1. A treaty the invalidity of which is established under the present Convention is void. The provisions of a void treaty have no legal force.

2. If acts have nevertheless been performed in reliance on such a treaty:

(a) each party may require any other party to establish as far as possible in their mutual relations the position that would have existed if the acts had not been performed;

(b) acts performed in good faith before the invalidity was invoked are not rendered unlawful by reason only of the invalidity of the treaty.

3. In cases falling under article 49, 50, 51 or 52, paragraph 2 does not apply with respect to the party to which the fraud, the act of corruption or the coercion is imputable.

4. In the case of the invalidity of a particular State’s consent to be bound by a multilateral treaty, the foregoing rules apply in the relations between that State and the parties to the treaty.

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1986