

Brexit Referendum, Fraud and Criminality

in www.jimhadams.org: Politics & Human Rights (originally 11th May 2017)

This is a critical document that we have circulated to six senior members of the Labour Party including the leader. The issues are important and concern Brexit issues and the referendum.

It is clear to us that there have been gross irregularities and illegalities during the holding of the referendum.

Graham Ennis and Jim Adams have been involved in investigations into what happened during the referendum. We are both activists and are deeply concerned about the illegal way in which the Leave campaign was run.

One of us is now working in conjunction with a well-known Human Rights law firm in London to prepare a legal challenge in the High Court and elsewhere and to make a complaint of criminal misconduct against Leave.EU and those associated with it of serious breaches of the civil and criminal law.

This would be an action similar to that which Miss Gina Miller took in the High Court to force a Parliamentary vote for Brexit, but it goes further and challenges the basic legitimacy of the vote. We are satisfied that there have been criminal breaches of the law by Leave.EU and those associated with it, in particular: *Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act, 2000* and the relevant electoral Acts governing funding of such referendums.

We have been assured by the Electoral Commission with whom we have had discussions that a full investigation is now taking place.

We believe that substantial funds external to the United Kingdom were illegally transferred to the UK and directed into support of Leave.EU etc., contrary to the 2000 Act, which expressly forbids foreign funding and interference in any political electoral campaign in the UK.

We also believe that serious breaches took place of the Data Protection Act and that we should formally lodge a complaint and legal process over them.

We have been strongly advised by the Electoral Commission to make a separate criminal complaint to the Metropolitan Police which we will be formally doing via our lawyers in London with whom one of us has had a long association as a Human Rights and Civil Liberties activist. The law firm are at present acting for us pro bono as they share our deep concerns.

We think this does have relevance to the legality of Brexit. Given this, we are surprised at the limited coverage, essentially in the Guardian and Observer of these issues. The actual evidence is substantial. We do not wish to write a multi-page letter and we are trying to be succinct. But we are satisfied that from investigations that have taken place that our thinking is overwhelmingly correct.

We will give some examples, which apply to the 2015 general election and the Brexit vote. We are satisfied in both that very substantial amounts of cash were illegally used from foreign sources. To mention essentially an example from Brexit, the evidence shows that in excess of £31 million in Sterling was illegally transferred to the UK, breaching the 2000 Act, and distributed to various Leave organisations before the spending limits date for Brexit was activated by the Electoral Commission. However, foreign funding of Brexit campaigning is a criminal offence.

A further \$6½ million was sent directly to a UK company located in London that provides political campaign services and data management to political parties and others. The company concerned is Cambridge Analytica UK, which in turn was funded as a subsidiary of an American owned group operating in the UK. Essentially this company is controlled and owned via offshore proxy holdings by the American billionaire Robert Mercer in New York. Mr Mercer was also a conduit for other funds used in both the last general election and the Brexit vote. These funds are also illegal and are criminal offences.

A Mr Steven Bannon, who formerly was serving as Director of Strategy at the White House in the Presidency of the current incumbent, Trump, was at all times prior to and during the Brexit campaign giving political guidance and advice and provided executive control of the funding at Cambridge Analytica. He was an executive of this British registered company on director's fees of \$125,000 per year (last year of service). He in turn directed that \$6½ million of electoral support was to be directed to Leave.EU and associates during the Brexit campaign and after the financial limits were declared by the Electoral Commission.

One of us has been informed by the Electoral Commission, with whom we have had discussions, that no such support in kind from Cambridge Analytica was declared in their expenses declaration to the Commission. The limit for declaring such support in kind is £750 in total. The Electoral Commission have declared to one of us that the electoral funding of Leave.EU shows no report of this illegal funding. They have within the public interest and their powers now placed these declarations of funding for Leave.EU on their website. This explains the reasons for the legal investigation that has currently been instigated.

In total, we believe that from various sources in excess of £30 million was laundered contrary to UK law into the Brexit campaign.

We are also concerned, as one of us is a skilled investigator previously involved in Human Rights and War Crimes investigations, that there are clear indications of the involvement of UK intelligence and security agencies, and foreign intelligence agencies and government in this particular matter. For example (this might represent a typical case) one of the Ulster Unionist parties during Brexit received a very substantial donation to support pro-Brexit campaigning in Northern Ireland. The sum involved was approximately £500,000. This money was received from a dubious "Institute" in Belfast with connections with Ulster Loyalist extremists. However, £480,000 of this money was not then spent in Northern Ireland, but was sent to the UK mainland where it was spent in the Leave.EU campaign. The

Electoral Commission have received no declarations or indications of the sources of the applications of these funds. It is therefore criminal funding.

We also maintain that the original source of the Belfast money was offshore and criminally breached the conditions of the 2000 Act. It also criminally breached the limits of Brexit spending.

This funding was received in secret by the Ulster Democratic Unionist Party taking advantage of Northern Ireland's political donor secrecy laws. Under political pressure from Northern Ireland parties the DUP would only say that the money came from an organisation. Political funding in Northern Ireland is uniquely secretive. In the rest of the UK all parties must declare donations above £7,500, or £1,500 to local branches. The Electoral Commission records donations to Northern Ireland political parties, but these are not made public due to special circumstances linked to the previous armed conflict.

However, the donor organisation has now been traced. It appears to have links to the former Director General of the Saudi intelligence service and father of the current Saudi Ambassador to the UK. This organisation is known as the Constitutional Research Council. It does not appear to have formal legal existence or structure that can be traced. It does however act as a conduit for very substantial sums of political funding on various rightwing issues. It is controlled and chaired by the prominent Scottish Conservative, Richard Cook (previous deputy chair of Scottish Conservatives). Cook has strong links with Saudi Arabia. He was joint owner of a UK company registered in Scotland together with the former head of the Saudi Arabian intelligence agency, Prince Nawwaf bin Abdul Aziz. The group CRC has no clear history of activity beyond channelling money to UK rightwing causes. It is widely supposed that this funding is potentially linked to the Saudi intelligence agency. Cook is a former Scottish director of the Campaign Against Political Correctness, former Scottish representative of Conservative Friends of Israel, and has been involved with known Saudi Arabian intelligence officials in offshore business operations with them.

We think that the money can be traced to Saudi Arabia and specifically to Saudi government public funds. These funds came from the Saudi intelligence service. They were authorised by the then Deputy Director of Saudi Intelligence. Further, although the funds are Saudi, we believe their donation was instigated by certain elements and conservative organisations in the United States, and the possible involvement of an American intelligence agency. We think that these actions cross-link to Mr Robert Mercer in New York and to Steven Bannon. Mercer and Bannon have known links in turn with prominent Saudi politicians and the former head of the Saudi intelligence agency.

We have given this example of illegal funding as it is relatively small and easy to understand, but clearly illustrates the techniques and intelligence methodologies that are frequently used in such cases. It is our strongest belief that we are probably dealing with at least ten similar funding operations, and possibly twice that. We give this purely as an example.

The other funding operations we mentioned would probably be found to have used similar structures, links and contacts for the transfer of "dark" money in order to obscure and conceal

its source. The example we describe is almost a classic example of an intelligence organisation offshore funding operation.

We also believe that Robert Mercer was involved in the “Brexit operation” and can be legally established as having done so. We believe that Mercer did so as the consequence of the instigation of prominent American conservative organisations and individuals and that these individuals via their own links and those of Cook in Scotland used this influence to prevail upon high-level Saudi interests and individuals to initiate this funding operation.

We note with concern that the police service in Northern Ireland are fully aware of the circumstances of the above example, which breaches both mainland and Ulster law, but are refusing and resisting taking action on the matter. We further note that the Metropolitan Police are also aware of these issues, but have shown a distinct lack of duty in investigating these serious criminal matters. In both cases involving the Ulster and Metropolitan Police, their refusal to investigate breaches the law on criminal accessory and criminal conspiracy and could be subject to judicial review. In view of the fact that it is a public matter and political, then as Crown officers they have in our opinion breached the Treason Act, specifically offences of Treason Felony.

The report gives no more than a brief outline of what we have discovered so far, but it does explain the importance of it. We would say again that we were most strongly advised by the Electoral Commission to make a criminal complaint to the Metropolitan Police and we shall be doing so. The involvement on a formal legal basis of our law firm, through which we intend to channel all our legal and criminal complaints, and our dealings with the Electoral Commission and ditto the office of the Information Commissioner, who has also advised us, is to give a proper legal grounding and a clear legal audit trail that cannot be ignored by the relevant Police authorities or other public officials, and can be publicly disclosed to the media when appropriate.

The Labour party has failed in its duty as a parliamentary opposition. Given that leading figures were briefed and refused to engage on the issue, and that this is a matter of crucial democratic and political importance, the leadership of the Labour party refused any moral or political leadership and deliberately ignored the evidence.

We have now decided to alert the UK and Irish media with this preliminary report. The reasons are to disclose the issues on the criminal complicity of the UK Police and the Police Service of Northern Ireland. Questions need to be asked on UK security and intelligence agencies and foreign agencies in this Brexit scandal.

After this document was written, we and other groups have been informed that the Electoral Commission must take legal action on these issues. But the Electoral Commission has no statutory instruments to do so. Action is being blocked at the highest level, basically because these people do not want investigation into themselves. A High Court action is feasible, but the cost is about £100,000. It might be possible to find this by crowd funding.