

Exiting the EU: Summary

This paper is a précis of the much larger booklet, 'Exiting the European Union', to which you are directed for further information and detailed sources. My purpose here is to succinctly show why the EU is a bad idea for Britain and why we should leave.

Origins and purpose of the EU

The original purpose of a European union was categorically to create a federal superstate, one with sovereignty over member nations that would be reduced to less autonomy than the individual states in America.

This must be plainly understood. The founding fathers of the EU hated national sovereignty and even hated the social and cultural ethnic individuality of European nations, which they planned to eventually dilute with mass immigration from Africa and the Near East.

Thus the original literature, and even the first draft of some treaties, called the EEC (as it was at first) the 'United States of Europe'. It was always planned to evolve into a single sovereign nation where member states were reduced to mere regions with no power and no sovereignty. The future plan is for the UK to be divided into a series of smaller regions (one partly in France) directly responsible to the EU and not Parliament.

The central power base of the EU was always planned to reside in a cabal of unelected bureaucrats that represented no one; in fact the concept of democracy was despised by the fathers of the EU who did not trust the people at all. This is openly stated in the writings of pioneer Eurocrats like: Arthur Salter, Jean Monnet, and Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi.

As plans unfolded to create a unified European state it became clear that deception was going to be necessary to fool some nations into joining (some nations, like France, were involved because they stood to gain significantly in monetary terms). Thus developments were publicised on the basis of an economic union with no loss of sovereignty. You must understand that this was a barefaced lie. Thus it was planned to develop a federal superstate by stages and by stealth, under the guise of treaties supposedly based upon economic policy.

The politicians that took Britain into the EEC, chiefly Tories and especially Edward Heath, knew for decades that it would mean a loss of sovereignty for Britain to join and would even be a denial of the Constitution. This was covered up.

The EU is not democratic

The EU is not democratic in any sense whatsoever. It is also important to note that Britain has no determining influence over its decisions at all.

The power base is in an unelected group of commissioners that are the real controlling power. The control centre of the EU is based in 50 people: 15 heads of state and government; 15 ministers in the Council of Ministers; 20 European commissioners (two are British). None of these people have been elected by the people to carry out European

government functions and they are not accountable to anyone! The Council of Ministers is the law making body of the EU. It meets in secret, so is rather like a Cabinet meeting. Many decisions are made here by majority vote, not consensus.

The executive body is the Commission, which instigates legislative proposals put to the council and which supervises the implementation of decisions. These representatives are not democratically elected and this meeting is also secret. It is not responsible to any other body and agrees directives that become EU law.

The EU parliament is a mere figurehead. The democratically elected European Parliament (MEPs) and the various national parliaments cannot overturn decisions made by the 50 people in the Council of Ministers. The European Parliament has nothing in common with Westminster but the name. It does not represent an electorate and is not the powerhouse of Europe; it merely comments upon policies already made by the Council of Ministers. It is really an assembly meeting only five days a month.

The Court of Justice is based in Luxembourg and is the final arbiter on the interpretation of EU treaties. It can (and does) overrule national state laws.

So the two key bodies that run the EU (The Council of Ministers & the Commission) are filled with unelected people and meet in secret. The parliament is essentially useless and a window dressing to pretend to give members states a say in things. [See appendix one.]

The EU is corrupt

Every aspect of the EU is riddled with corruption, whether in governance or in finances.

Financial corruption

Various high-level whistleblowers have exposed elements of this but the EU's own auditors confirm this formally. Fraud and lax management cost £2 billion in 1994 (figures from the EU Court of Auditors). Year after year, for nearly 20 years, auditors have failed to balance the EU finance books; billions get written off without investigation. A report by the European Court of Auditors in November 2000 found that over £4 billion of taxpayer's money was wasted by the Commission during 1999 alone.

There have been multiple scandals, perhaps best illustrated by the exposé of Marta Andreasen, a Spanish accountant who had been appointed as the Commission's chief officer to clean up accounts. Andreasen soon found many irregularities. The accounts did not even use double-entry book-keeping. When she refused to sign off the Commission's 2001 accounts (because it would be a breach of regulations) she was threatened with the sack. She wrote to Romano Prodi and his two vice-presidents (one of which was Neil Kinnock, who had been charged with reforming the Commission). Shortly after this she was released from her post. After this the Commission tried to blacken her name.

Andreasen's charges were supported by Dougal Watt who had independently lodged an official complaint against nepotism, corruption and mismanagement within the Court of Auditors itself and his complaint was endorsed by 205 colleagues. He was also dismissed.

Organisational corruption

The structure of the EU is wide open to corruption, particularly by strong lobby groups and countries able to manipulate the system, such as France did with the CAP when it absorbed

91% of the EEC budget to pay for subsidies to French farmers. France also tricked Britain into handing over its fishing grounds, primarily for the benefit of French fishermen.

All one has to do is to vigorously lobby the Commission, which alone determines new laws, and this is wide open to corruption. Each year the Commission is responsible for disbursing tens of billions of pounds; often on the discretion of only a few officials accountable to no one, except a Commissioner. Scandals have already emerged, such as those that led to the mass resignations of Commissioners in 1999.

For example, French and Belgian manufacturers of asbestos substitutes successfully brought in new laws banning asbestos. Big Pharma companies successfully lobbied to gain directives on vitamin and mineral supplements and herbal remedies, effectively outlawing them.

The EU is opposed to evangelical Christianity

The founding fathers and the central powers that rule the EU are vigorously opposed to Biblical Christianity. Their objective is to destroy the Christian moral basis of the European nations under its sway.

The two chief means of doing this are firstly to use massive propaganda, at a cost of billions of pounds, to brainwash the population, mainly the young through controlled education, in order to inculcate amoral or wicked morals into the thinking of people. The plan is to bring an increasingly secular, humanist and liberal agenda to our country.

The second method is to change the laws of member nations and replace them with laws that legislate against the ethics of the Bible, which were the original basis of British Common law.

Examples of this:

- The legalisation of homosexual marriages.
- Publicly affirming that homosexuality is abnormal or detestable is now a criminal offence.
- Regulations demanding that Christian businesses serve homosexuals, such as landlords of Bed and Breakfast guest homes or Christian bakeries. Christians have been prosecuted for refusing to comply.
- EU legislation required Britain to bring in sex education lessons to children as young as five. This included graphic details (including images) recommending oral sex and masturbation. There are also educational materials affirming that homosexual relationships are 'normal'.
- Christian campaigners (some in their 80s) that have peacefully protested at Gay rallies have been arrested for hate crimes.
- Christian preachers have been arrested for publicly preaching the Gospel in certain ethnic areas in London.

The cost of EU membership

We pay 0.25% of our GDP. Britain pays a membership fee of £18.4 billion, or £51 million a day.

Payments exceed grants. In 1995 payments = £8.9 bn., receipts = £4.8 bn., net contribution = £4.1 bn. The cost of our membership could solve many national problems, such as fixing the NHS.

Being in the EU costs 5.4p on the basic rate of the UK income tax (1996/7). The EU has also demanded that we put VAT on products formerly exempt, such as bridge tolls. It plans to extend VAT much further on items currently exempt.

The EU protection policy inflates the cost of basic food products by 150% above world market prices.

The Common Agriculture Policy

This key policy was determined by ruthless negotiations from de Gaulle in the 60s. It makes France the massive beneficiary of EU money, way out of proportion to her contributions. In the days of the EEC, around 1970, it occupied 91% of the EEC's budget.

By joining the EEC Britain certified the future decimation of the UK's farming industry, killing jobs, and paying huge fees in order to import French produce. Only a madman would have accepted that deal. This shift to paying for imported French produce put up food prices. In the late 90s the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) increased the average British family's food bill by, at least, £18 per week (£1000 p.a.). This is a concealed tax.

The CAP spends £250 million per week on the storage, dumping and destruction of food while many nations are starving. Each year the CAP generates over £6 Billion worth of fraud involving the Mafia according to the EU's own Court of Auditors. Britain currently spends £3 billion a year subsidising French farmers; this could be directed to support English farmers (on top of other existing subsidies).

House of Commons research figures (reported by *The Times* 20.10.95), showed that without the cost of supporting the CAP, a pint of milk costing 36p in 1995 would cost only 17p, a kilo of sugar costing 71p would be 33p and a large loaf costing 53p would cost 38p. Beef prices were doubled, lamb was increased by a third, chicken and pork by a quarter as a result of the CAP.

It is estimated that **1 million British jobs have been lost** between 1973-1997 as a result of the CAP alone.

The Common Fisheries Policy

When this was being negotiated, during the period of Britain's accession to the EU, blatant lies were told to Parliament by the negotiators such as that Britain would control fishing rights up to 12 miles when in fact it was only six and even then under EU regulations, with a later policy for removing any control at all. The accession treaty wording was not seen by Parliament at the time of the debate.

It enabled European nations, that had over-fished their own fishing grounds, exhausting stocks, to take all our fish. This policy was so serious for Norwegians that, even with better concessions, Norway rejected membership of the EU.

We gave away our fishing grounds. The Common Fisheries Policy has decimated our fishing fleet and allows foreign vessels, with larger quotas, to fish in our waters which then sell our fish back to us!

The Common Fisheries Policy has cost Britain over 115,000 jobs and devastated coastal communities where there is no other work.

EU regulations on manufacturing and produce

We should not forget the consequences in cost and jobs of the myriad of EU regulations being formulated daily. Many businesses have simply given up trying to keep up with them and have gone out of business. Other firms find that they need to continually spend money revamping their operation in order to comply with the next one.

The cost of EU regulation is over 6% of UK GDP, or over £90 billion a year. In 2006 it was estimated that EU over-regulation cost 600bn Euros each year.

Less than 15% of Britain's GDP is based on trade with the EU yet its regulations affect every UK business.

Over 70% of Britain's GDP is generated within the UK but this is still subject to EU law.

The impact upon trade

Britain is the 6th largest economy in the world and despite massive decline, its manufacturing is still in the top ten (currently 7th). It is the home of the universal language of English and the centre of international finance in London. It also has special relationships with the former Commonwealth countries and with the USA. Despite all these massive advantages, Britain cannot make its own independent trade deals with anyone at all; these have to be conducted by the EU. Britain actually has more real clout than the EU.

Small nations like Iceland and Norway can make good trade deals with the EU and even China; why do supporters of the EU state that Britain could not make such trade deals? This is a plain lie.

Neither would Britain lose its current exports to the EU. Long established markets would continue as European citizens would still want our products. Germans will not suddenly cease buying Dyson vacuum cleaners. Conversely, Europe would not want to alienate Britain as a market. BMW would still want to sell cars to us. Nothing much will change unless the EU acts against us politically out of spite.

Current EU decline

The EU is currently the sick man of the world in terms of economy and this is dragging Britain down. The Eurozone is a complete failure, as was always inevitable. It is economic madness to force a one-size-fits-all financial system upon different sizes and types of economy. When Greece defaults (which is also inevitable) the Euro project will be doomed.

Why tie ourselves to a failing economic body when we could be free to set our own advantageous trade deals with the world?

The problem of immigration

You must keep in mind that the fathers of the EU wrote that they sought a dilution of national cultures and ethnicity, which would be achieved by mass migration to destabilise member nations. This is now well underway.

Border controls

The Schengen Area

The idea of open borders (abolition of checks, free movement of people) is fundamental to EU aims and the Schengen Agreement was the beginning of the fulfilment of this. It allowed open borders between member states of the agreement. The agreement was signed in June 1985 between Belgium, France, West Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

It was supplemented in 1990 with the abolition of internal border controls and a common visa policy. Today it comprises 26 European countries and has been administered by the EU since 1999. The Amsterdam Treaty also provided opt-outs only for Ireland and Britain.

The notion of uncontrolled, unsupervised borders is absolute nonsense, and so it has proved. Faced with a migrant crisis of unforeseen proportions, the Schengen states have found themselves flooded with an immigration crisis they could not control. Faced with a massive problem, some states were forced to initiate border controls in places that were previously thought inconceivable, such as on the Oresund Bridge between Malmo and Copenhagen imposed by Sweden in January 2016.

The Maastricht Treaty

The Maastricht Treaty removed our right to identify travellers at our borders, control immigration, asylum and the issue of visas. We have no control whatsoever over immigrants from EU countries because that is a legal right obtained by treaty. We break EU law if we do this. Since the greatest mass of immigrants come from the EU, we have no ability to stem the flow, which is already at the point of destroying the infrastructure of certain towns in the UK. Some English-speaking children cannot find a school in their area where English is the main language.

Thus Britain has an open door policy to the 50 million inhabitants of the EU and we can do nothing whatsoever to stop Europeans entering our country. It has also resulted in draconian measures against Commonwealth inhabitants that have links to Britain, such as relatives. Routinely, aged parents of British citizens are sent back to India or Pakistan to try to keep immigration figures down, while any Romanian or Bulgarian can enter without control.

The big issue: the ruination of national sovereignty

Our Constitution

Before we examine the matter of sovereignty we need to examine the basic principles of British sovereignty – our Constitution.

The essentials of our written Constitution are based in the following:

- *The Magna Carta*: signed by King John in 1215, was a democratic document drawn up by barons and nobles to restrict any despotic king. It declared various essential principles to protect British people, such as the right to a trial by a jury of one's peers. It became the basis of British Common Law and most of its statutes are in force today. It was based upon English Common Law dating to before Alfred the Great, who also wrote statutory laws affirming the liberty of citizens.
- *The Declaration of Rights / The Bill of Rights 1689*: The Bill of Rights is a crucial democratic document that contains the Declaration of Rights within it. It was drawn up after the Glorious Revolution of 1688 to be a legal basis for the reign of William and Mary subsequent to the end of Stuart tyranny, which had been based on the divine right of kings and absolute power in the monarchy that had led to civil war.

- *The Coronation Oath Act of 1689*: This document ensured that the crown is governed by a contract with the people under law.
- *The Act of Settlement of 1701*: This provided for a Protestant succession and reaffirmed certain Constitutional principles.

Regarding Parliament

MPs have to swear an oath of allegiance to the monarch in order to become a Member of Parliament. This means that MPs are subservient to the Queen and thus subservient to law and the principles of the Constitution. Cabinet Ministers swear a further oath of conduct and allegiance to the Constitution in the person of the Crown. The Oath of Office of the Privy Council also involves swearing allegiance to the Constitution.

Parliament is a law-making body that is subservient to the British Constitution and historic legal statutes. It does not have absolute, independent powers. The law rules over Parliament. The monarch is there to confirm that new laws benefit the people and are not oppressive or contradict the principles of the Constitution.

The situation brought about by our inclusion in the EU

The Lisbon Treaty was brought in to replace the defunct attempt at creating an EU constitution. This treaty virtually replaced that constitution by stealth. The Lisbon Treaty affirms the primacy of the EU over the law of member states. This is the fulfilment of the original ideas held by Monnet and the pioneers of a United States of Europe. Thus the Lisbon Treaty is in direct contradiction with the British Constitution.

Concluding points

- The Constitution gives primacy to the law not to Parliament.
- The Coronation Oath is a contract between the monarch and the people to ensure proper government. It secures the primacy of the law over both Parliament and the Crown.
- To give governing powers to people with no allegiance to the Constitution, the British people, or the British monarch is treason. To give powers of government to unelected, unrepresentative, non-removable people in Brussels is unconstitutional and treason.
- Acceptance of the supremacy of EU law (which is done by judges every day) is treason.

The crucial issue: sovereignty

The root issue facing Britons today is about sovereignty; this overrides all other considerations. Democracy requires that the people we vote in as MPs truly represent us and have the sovereign power to determine our laws and policies. Thus trade, the economy, taxation, security, regulations for industry and so on should all be determined by the British people and not some unelected bureaucrat in Brussels.

For decades we have had the EU determine what goes on in our own country from controlling our borders down to regulations of minute details of our infrastructure, such as the weight of bananas and the shape of cucumbers. Frequently, these rules work against the national interest and only serve EU strategies.

The extent of domination of the EU through repeated treaties is shocking and most people are unaware of it. For example:

- The Queen has been reduced, by the Maastricht treaty, to the position of a subject of Brussels.
- Britain must submit its economic plans to Brussels.

- EU law supersedes British law.
- Parliament has lost its sovereignty. The Maastricht Treaty gives Brussels supremacy in over 70 policy areas, including: taxation, monetary policy, education, immigration, judicial policy, health and safety, industrial policy, energy etc. There is no veto in any of these areas!

The Treaty of Maastricht was an irreversible and internationally enforceable treaty. Signing it was illegal and treasonable in British law; Parliament is not able to bind any future Parliaments. The clear principles contained in the Bill of Rights of 1689 have been overturned e.g: *'the execution of laws ... without the consent of Parliament is illegal.'*

Reasons given for staying in

It is vital to save our economy, particularly trade

- Between 1973 and 1997 the UK amassed a trade deficit with Europe of £70 billion. In 2014 there was a trade deficit of over £50bn.
- Less than half of UK exports (41%; less than 15% of Britain's GDP) go to the EU; less than 3% of all businesses in the UK have any dealings with the EU.
- Only 25% of UK investments overseas are with the EU and less than 5% of investment in the UK is from the EU.
- Britain has a trade surplus with the rest of the world (over £80 billion). 75% of overseas investments are outside the EU. The UK gets twice as much inward investment from Commonwealth countries than from the EU. Most of our trade is denominated in dollars and most of our principal trading partners are in the Anglo-Saxon world, not Europe. Britain's best trading relationships are with the USA and Switzerland, not the EU.
- English speaking democracies, such as the US, Canada and Australia, have seen their exports to the EU grow over the past 22 years. Being in the EU did not help the UK to grow as much.
- Membership of the EU is not required to trade with it. For example: Switzerland rejected membership of the EU in 1993 yet exports (per capita) 3½ times as Britain to the EU; Norway exports 3 times as much as Britain to the EU. Norway rejected EU membership but kept her trading advantages, her fishing grounds and has no EU regulations or costs.
- A nation does not have to be in a large trading bloc to succeed. Norway and Switzerland are not in the EU but they export more to the EU than the UK does (per capita). Membership of the EU is not vital for trade.
- Being free from the EU's Common Tariff, the UK would benefit from free trade by about 3% of GDP.

We would lose vital foreign investment which is based on our membership of the EU

This is just a lie. In 2010 a survey by Ernst and Young on Britain's attractiveness to foreign investors found that we were the top Foreign Investment Destination in Europe, mainly due to the City of London and our close connection with the US. The EU was not in the picture at all. The main factors were: British culture and values, the English language, the telecommunications infrastructure, quality of life, stable social environment plus transport and logistics infrastructure.

We would lose world influence

Another lie. Britain sustains a major influence in the world by its history, its culture, its alliance with America, its historic Commonwealth relationships, and its economy (6th largest in the world). Britain is also a member of the G20 and G8 nations and has a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. It also has seats in the IMF and WTO. London is still the financial capital of the world and one of the top ten manufacturing nations.

Membership of the EU damages our influence in the world. Over-regulation has diminished our manufacturing industry. It has made the economy and the City of London less competitive and has damaged our trade effectiveness. The EU is also seeking a single voice for the EU in the UN and the IMF.

It is vital for our security

The EU is not vital for security at all. Britain is an ally of the US and a member of NATO; it has no need of being in the EU for security.

It is vital for international police work

Rubbish. We worked in tandem with Interpol long before the EU with no difficulties.

It is necessary to control migration

Being in the EU greatly worsens our ability to control immigration. We have no control at all over migrants from the EU.

It is vital to secure employment

The EU needs us more than we need it regarding trade; it sells more to us than we do to them. In 2014 there was a trade deficit of over £50bn. If we agreed a Free Trade Agreement with the EU we could preserve the current benefits of trade.

The only jobs dependent upon the EU are those politicians and accessories that are part of the EU, such as MEPs. There is no need for manufacturing or other real jobs to vanish if we left the EU. If we could boost or trade with former Commonwealth countries and reduce the red tape caused by the EU we could actually generate more jobs.

Furthermore, if we re-invested the costs of being in the EU (£51 million a day) into infrastructure projects, such as building new homes and hospitals, we could generate many new jobs.

The claim by 'in' campaigners that 3 million UK jobs would be lost in a Brexit, is a misreading of academic research conducted in 2000. The author of that study, Professor Iain Begg (LSE) has rejected the claim. He also affirms that the '*economic plus or minus is very small*'.

It has provided peace for decades and avoided a European war

This is just a joke. People who maintain this are either ignorant or foolish. There has been a major Elite war in the middle of Europe (the Kosovo War). The EU (mainly through NATO) has been involved in multiple wars outside Europe, which have killed British servicemen (Gulf War, Iraq War, Afghanistan War). Until the downfall of the USSR, Europe was fully engaged in the Cold War where nuclear war was a continual threat.

European forces have been actively acting in aggression by expanding, contrary to international agreements, eastwards and have been involved in the Ukrainian conflict to deliberately provoke Russia. A world war could erupt from this conflict alone.

European forces have been fully involved in the Syrian Civil War, which was initiated and supplied by NATO forces for a variety of reasons. This area also could quickly erupt into a world war between the west and Russia / Iran.

Far from securing peace, our involvement with Europe and NATO has brought us into wars that had nothing to do with British interests, some of which were illegal under international laws.

People usually have in mind a European war, remembering WWII. In fact it has been NATO, not the EU, that prevented the Cold War escalating into world war. The reality is that the EU seeks to undermine NATO and take its job over. The EU policies also diminish national parliamentary democracy, which has aided the peace process.

We need to stay in to have a say and influence decisions

We have virtually no say or influence in decisions at the moment, look at the section of the workings of the EU to see why. The UK only has 8.4% of voting power in the useless parliament and the Lisbon Treaty took away our veto in many policy areas. Our representation in the Commission and the Council of Ministers is vastly outnumbered. We would have far more influence as an independent sovereign nation, the world's 6th largest economy, and a nation the EU wants to trade with.

Reasons to leave

- Trade: Freedom to make our own trade deals with the world and especially the Commonwealth. The economy would be free to improve and develop better trade with the world and stop our deficit with the EU.
- Cost savings: We would be better off, not least by gaining £51 million per day currently paid in membership fees. Taxes could be lowered.
- Border controls: We would instantly be able to control our own borders.
- Restoring the British legal system based upon the Constitution: We would re-institute the superiority of the British legal system.
- Better business practices: We could free up UK businesses from the morass of EU red tape that is binding them.
- Re-invigorate our ailing fisheries and agriculture: We would re-invigorate our agriculture and fishing industries and stop the poaching of EU ships in our waters.
- Sovereignty: Most important, we could restore national, independent sovereignty in all areas according to the national interest, sustained by democratic processes. This is in contrast to the current EU despotic rule by unelected bureaucrats in Brussels.

Summary

- The real objective of the EU has always been to create a federal united states of Europe run by unelected, fascist representatives of the global Elite.
- Heath and the chief Tory politicians involved knew all along that the purpose of the EEC was to develop political union in a federated super-state. They lied to the UK populace that it was really about an economic market that would make Britain prosperous. They also knew that it was treason against the Constitution, but they rode roughshod all over it. Without a doubt, Edward Heath is a traitor.

- The essential working of the EU is performed by unelected people meeting in secret. This is not democracy.
- Why should we remain in an organisation that is corrupt and cannot even balance its own books over decades?
- The structure of the EU, particularly the unelected Commission, is wide open to corruption and has been found guilty many times.
- The EU has been an appalling generator of bad laws and immoral regulations. It is distinctly anti-Christian. The EU has decimated some of our key industries, cost over a million jobs and left us far from being self-sustainable. It costs the country far more than we gain, in terms of money, and the supposed benefits in trade are nebulous.
- There is no strength in the argument that being in the EU is a guarantee of economic success, or that being in the EU is a safeguard for financial security. In fact the reverse is true; being in the EU is an anchor dragging member states down at this point in time.
- The essential EU principle of open borders within its territories is a complete failure.
- The EU has greatly damaged our ability to control our own borders and we have no control at all over immigration from EU countries.
- Whatever subject you investigate, the EU is a failure, which is why there is growing opposition to it in every EU member state and there is a surge of right-wing nationalism.
- It is wrong to believe that Britain has no written Constitution. There are several documents that form the basis of Common Law and Constitutional commitment, which the monarch and Parliament are submitted to. Parliament was un-constitutional in taking us into the EU; it was a breach of law. Furthermore, the EU is opposed to the principles of our Constitution and denies our laws.
- The most important matter is to regain our national sovereignty, make our own laws, set up our own regulations, and regain border controls. We need a democratic parliament that controls its own affairs.
- None of the claimed benefits of remaining in the EU stack up. We would be better off getting out.

Conclusion

Deception

The origins of the EU lie in deception and skull-duggery; it only gained momentum by stealth. The British people (and even the Heath Cabinet) were callously lied to by Ted Heath when we joined the EEC and voted on a referendum later. Why would a sincere political venture require lies, deception, obfuscation, misrepresentation and stealth to produce a good thing? The history shows the devilish nature of the EU.

The original purpose was always for a 'United States of Europe', though these words were later deleted from treaty drafts to avoid stating the obvious purpose in black and white. Political integration in a federated Europe is what the EU is all about. Any idea of a common market is window dressing; it is about power and control.

We need to rule ourselves in a democratic process

The only reason for a federalisation of Europe is for a small group of people to be able to rule the area as tyrants. There is no other reason and no other benefit. The unelected cabal that rules the EU is tied to the global Elite that is pushing the world towards a precipice.

All nations need to be able to govern their country themselves, ruling as simply as possible with the minimum of necessary laws and regulations. The idea that unelected foreign leaders, passing tens of thousands of regulations and laws to dominate us, is a good thing is insanity; there are now 160,000 pages of small print of laws from the EU that dominate us.

The rising tide of EU scepticism

The fact of the matter is that the EU needs us far more than we need them and a Brexit could result in a slow disintegration of the EU project. Thus vast sums are being spent by the EU and the Elite separately to secure a 'remain' vote. Nevertheless, recent polls show that the majority of the population wants to leave the EU. In some areas the figures are 80% for leaving. Geographically, most of England is for Brexit, while Wales and Scotland are for staying in (although there is increasing anti-EU feeling in Wales). Working class areas are more anti-EU. Two-thirds of Tory MPs want out.

Contrary to the lies of the 'In' politicians, very many businessmen, billionaires, entrepreneurs and UK corporations favour leaving the EU. Even the Director General of the British Chamber of Commerce, John Longworth, publicly expressed favour of leaving the EU, for which he was sacked. Eighty businessmen and community leaders savaged Cameron's EU deal and complained that EU membership hampered trade with the rest of the world. *Business Insider UK* reported that Brexit is becoming more appealing to British business owners. *The Week's Prosper* magazine, a respected journal about money and finance, has come out in favour of Brexit and given sound financial reasons why. Even Hedge Fund businessmen are now opposed to the EU.

We are not alone in realising the fascist ambitions of the EU. Most EU member states have rising numbers wanting an exit from the EU, with very high proportions in Poland (42%), Italy (53%), France (56%), Germany (59%), UK (69%) and Spain (72%).

Scaremongering

Scaremongering tactics are already being used to try to force voters to stay in the EU. This has been done many times before.

New Labour created fear about the collapse of British industry and inward investment if Britain kept out of the euro but the figures told a different story. By July 2000 the number of foreign investment projects rose by 16% to 757 of which manufacturing accounted for 40%. The UK is an attractive place to invest.

The DTI leaked a memo, which warned of a '*manufacturing breakdown*' if we do not join the euro and emphasised that Japanese companies were considering withdrawing. Actually, only 4% of the previous year's foreign investment came from Japan while 49% came from America - and the Yanks were opposed to us entering the euro-zone. The scaremongering tactics were just scurrilous lies then and they are now.

Thus we are seeing politicians now telling lie after lie, such as that 3 million UK jobs will be lost if we leave the EU. This is false and those repeating it know it is false.


A great opportunity

This is an opportunity to restore our Constitution, which has been treacherously repudiated. Politicians did this knowingly and they should be prosecuted for treason. If we fail to grasp this opportunity the EU will gain greater power and then ride roughshod over our liberties like never before. In that event, fascism is certainly round the corner. Great

Britain will be finished, as it becomes partitioned into regions dominated by unelected officials in Brussels. You have been warned.

Appendix One

The EU Legislative Process



It can be seen that the Council of Ministers is the body with the real power, along with the Commission which initiates policy, and we should bear in mind that the EU is issuing approximately 27 directives everyday, all of which we have to comply with, none of which have been sanctioned individually by Westminster.

Appendix Two

Examples of lies told to keep us in the EU

Lie	Truth
Leaving the EU will result in the loss of 3 million jobs.	Complete fiction. This figure was based upon academic research conducted in 2000 by Professor Iain Begg (LSE) who has rejected the claim and politicians know that this is a lie and yet still repeat it.
The EU has not violated our Constitution; or denials that there is a Constitution.	This is just folly. MPs have to swear an oath to the Constitution and the MP's handbook explains that they are under it. Various EU treaties, particularly Maastricht and Lisbon, absolutely violate English law and the Constitution.
It is not a matter of sovereignty but of a trade partnership.	A plain lie. This was a deliberate lie planned from early on in the development of the EU to hide the strategy of destroying nation member states to enable to dictatorial control of Europe by unelected officials. Already Britain has lost sovereignty in multiple areas of government (e.g. border control, agriculture, fishing, education, manufacturing, VAT, social laws etc.).
The EU is not a superstate but a coalition of member states working for the common good.	This is a lie. It was always intended to become a federal 'United States of Europe' (the term used by the founders of the EEC). However, the member states have less autonomy than the states within the USA. The founders of the EU hated national sovereignty as well as democracy. Their political philosophy is based on totalitarianism by a secret cabal. The future development of the EU will result in a fascist state – that was always the plan.
The EU is democratic and has a working parliament.	It is actually completely undemocratic. The parliament is just window dressing and has no power whatsoever. Laws are proposed by the Commission and debated by the Council of Ministers; both meet in secret and have unelected members.
We need to be in the EU in order to influence it.	We have no legal influence in the EU to change policy determined by the Commission. Our members in the Commission are hugely outnumbered, but are treacherous Eurocrats anyway
Britain is not big enough alone and could not make favourable trade deals; thus it needs the clout of the EU.	Smaller nations like Iceland and Norway have made good trade deals with the EU and even China. Britain has far more advantages than these countries and has even more clout than the EU due to its history, culture, language, infrastructure and special relationships with the US and the Commonwealth.
Our security is dependent upon being in the EU.	Poppycock! Being in the EU worsens our security, such as being unable to stop EU citizens entering the country freely. Retired CIA leaders have warned that the EU hampers our security. It is accepted that Islamic Jihadists have entered Europe in large numbers through the migrant crisis. The Schengen Area enables such to pass through Europe undetected. Recent attacks show the lapses of the EU. The Paris and Brussels attacks were warned before the events but ignored. Some attackers were even named by the secret services of nations outside Europe. The 'Five Eyes' system of intelligence gathering (e.g. UK, Australia, USA) is far more important than the EU.