

The failure of the EU to prosper Britain

Introduction

The constant mantra of Pro-EU activists and campaigners is that Britain is better off within the EU. Its economic security is best secured in the EU. The best guarantee for workers rights is secured by membership of the EU. Financial stability is better within the EU. Supply of labour is secured by being in the EU. And most commonly, European war is prevented by being in the EU.

All these supposed axioms turn out to be fallacious. Indeed, the massive EU budget for propaganda (97 billion Euros),¹ by which it continually brainwashes victims in the education system and promotes conditioning through the media and paid-for politicians, is the reason why the general public believes these things to be true.

The fact is that in every area the EU has been little short of catastrophic for Britain. Being in the EU has been an utter failure.

This is to be expected because the EU was never about securing prosperity for member nation states but about creating a federalised, corporate empire based on Marxist principles; the first of a western power bloc to help build a future global empire. Trading benefits and the lie of prosperity were the deceitful means of attracting nations into this fascist club.

Let us examine the truth about the supposed benefits of being in the EU.

Democracy issues

Loss of UK sovereignty

I need not develop this theme much as I have explained this many times. In short the EU has ruined representative democracy in Britain. Britons expect MPs to be their representatives regarding how Britain is governed, but MPs have no control over international treaties we signed up to with the EU which give the EU Commission and Council control over our own laws and many areas of government oversight. Indeed, the Queen herself is now a subject of the EU totalitarian system.

The EU Parliament has no teeth

But what about the EU Parliament? Surely that is a bastion of democracy. In fact it is no such thing. Although we elect 73 MEPs to the EU parliament, this parliament has no effective power whatsoever. It is a mere public front to pretend there is democracy. This parliament cannot bring forward new laws and can only comment on proposals for new laws brought forward by the Commission.

The real power

The EU Commission

The Commission is undemocratic and filled with appointed ministers (usually failed politicians amenable to the EU vision). This is the real controlling power in the EU.

¹ Coca Cola's PR budget is 4 billion Euros.

The Council of Ministers

In the Council of Ministers Britain is only one of 28 nation representatives and cannot control regulations and laws imposed upon the British people. Decision making is almost entirely made by qualified majority voting. This means that Britain has 29 votes compared to Malta that has three, i.e. 15 times more influence, per head of population, than the UK.

The European Court

The European Court is a political court committed to push EU integration that overthrows basic principles of English Common Law.²

Example

Jacob Rees Mogg gave an example, in the Oxford Union, of EU democracy in action. One of his constituents, a farmer, was fined by the EU. He took his grievance to Mogg, his MP, who wrote to the appropriate minister. The farmer's cow had died between Christmas and the New Year and the registration papers the farmer posted got delayed and were received a day late, hence the fine. The minister refused to act on this unfair procedure explaining that if he used his discretion the EU would fine Great Britain, so his hands were tied. Thus there is no representation or redress in matters regarding the EU. This is an essential failure of representation and justice, which is contrary to the British Constitution.

Totalitarian behaviour

In practice the EU rides roughshod over democracy. When referendums gave the wrong vote in Ireland, Denmark, The Netherlands and France, the population was told to vote again. When the Constitution failed to be agreed, it was reworked as the Lisbon Treaty and then activated without any democratic process at all.

In short, Britain has become far less democratic as a member of the EU. The electorate has no effective say in regulations imposed upon business, national infrastructure and social life. Over 60% of our laws stem from the EU over which we have no redress via MPs and cannot change by a General Election.

The turnout at MEP elections has greatly diminished over the years since people are disengaged with the EU in real terms. In 1979 62% of Europeans voted in the elections, now its 42%. In Britain the percentage is even less; in 2014 only 36% voted in the EU elections. But since these votes are only for MEPs with no power, there's not much point anyway.

Interim conclusion

The EU is far from being democratic. It is a top-down, fascist system ruled by unelected bureaucrats.

The cost

The cost of being in this fascist club is enormous. Britain, as a large economy, is a net contributor to the EU, paying for the many nations, which gain from membership because their economies are so small. For this massive cost Britain has seen whole industries, like fishing, demolished.³

² Such as no man being tried in his own court.

³ British fishermen were restricted by limited quotas and restricted fishing in their own territorial waters, while Spain was allowed to use industrial fishing methods to fish in our waters. This bankrupted hundreds of fishing businesses and put whole towns into austerity.

The cost of EU infrastructure

These figures came from MEP Janice Atkinson.⁴

- *Cost of MEPs*: each single MEP costs £2 million per annum. The 751 MEPs cost 1 billion Euros. That includes salaries, staff, translation and expenses, being 60% of the EU budget. Free health care costs 3 million Euros. Free Viagra is also given to male MEPs. Chauffeurs and BMW / Mercedes cars cost 6.5 million Euros, plus free parking.
- *The travelling circus*: each month 751 MEPs, the Commissioners and the whole entourage decamps from Brussels⁵ and travels to Strasbourg⁶ to vote (four days per month). This results from an agreement demanded by the French when the first treaty was written. The cost is 130 million pounds.
- *The overseas funding scam* (Global Europe): in 2018 13% of the EU budget was spent on vanity projects costing 10 billion Euros. This is in addition to Britain's foreign aid of £14 billion per year.
- *EU Administration costs* in Brussels, Strasbourg, Luxembourg and elsewhere: 9 billion Euros.
- *Total EU budget* for 2014-2020 is 960 billion Euros. The budget for the next six years is 1.13 trillion Euros.

The unelected Jean Claude Juncker's salary is £245,00. This is more than double the UK Prime Minister's salary. To this must be added the cost of chauffeurs, expenses and a huge home allowance.

Mrs Fredricka Mogerini (a commissioner, a sort of foreign secretary) is a Communist who has never had a real job but has a salary of £250,000. She recently spent £67,000 on a visit to Azerbaijan.

The cost to Britain

According to the BBC news website,⁷ the cost of being a member of the EU is as follows:

	Year/£m	Week/£m	Day/£m
Gross contribution	18,777	361	51
Subtract rebate	14,361	276	39
Subtract public sector receipts	9,785	188	27
Subtract private sector receipts	8,385	161	23

So even on the most favourable estimate (to Remainers), the UK gives the EU 23 million pounds every day. However, that is not really a true picture since grants to public and private sector groups may not be what we actually want to spend our money on (certainly not Common Purpose) so the figure is really 39 million every day. We can choose whether or not to continue the grants of 16 million a day.⁸

⁴ Rebel media YouTube.

⁵ The capital of Belgium.

⁶ In NE France, in Alsace, close to the border with Germany.

⁷ 'Reality Check: how much does the EU budget cost the UK?'

⁸ For instance, research grants on good issues will be desirable. Farming subsidies will initially be necessary.

The corruption

EU accounts have not been audited in 20 years.⁹ This is because corruption is endemic. The BBC claims that the Court of Audit signed off EU accounts every year since 2007. But even the BBC admits that misuse of 4.4% of the EU budget is admitted. So the accounts are not balanced and not properly signed off. In 2015 the amount not signed off was 4.7% of the budget, which was 6.97 billion Euros.

Other commentators disagree with the BBC. In fact the EU finances are very corrupt but the situation is very complex. In simple terms:¹⁰

- Since 1977 the EU budget was audited annually by the European Court of Auditors in Luxembourg, which is funded by, and is part of, the EU.
- In the 1980s there were many allegations of fraud so the EU formed the Unit for the Co-ordination of Fraud Protection [UCLAF] in 1988.
- In 1997 the Court of Auditors investigated the UCLAF and discovered fraud cases, conflicts of interest, favouritism, and bad management. Many cases were initiated by staff members of the Commission reporting senior officials committing fraud.
- The court produced a report which was described as ‘devastating’. No one had been prosecuted for this fraud. In fact there was no EU prosecutor to take up such cases and only a member state could take legal action against suspected fraudsters. There were calls for the UCLAF to be replaced by a police body.
- In 1998 the assistant auditor Paul van Bultenen blew the whistle to the EU parliament expressing his discontent with fraud. He was suspended and his salary halved. But he persevered and this led to the collapse of the Jacques Santer Commission. (‘Santergate’).
- UCLAF was then replaced by OLAF. However, the rules worked against this body as it had the previous one. OLAF is notified of 12,000 cases of possible fraud every year but it only investigates 200 per year, i.e. 98% of reported cases go without investigation. It has only recovered less than one thousandth of the amount unaccounted for since 1999.
- One reason is that EU officials have immunity from prosecution while they work for the EU, and then for the rest of their lives for any acts committed while working for the EU. This is a thief’s charter.
- In 2002 Marta Andreason was appointed the EU’s first Chief Accountant. She was immediately critical of the EU’s accounting system for being open to fraud. She complained to the Commissioner Michaele Schreyer and the Commission President Romano Prodi. After no reply she approached members of the EU Parliament budget control committee. She then refused to sign off the 2001 EU accounts and went public. She was immediately sacked and put under intense pressure.
- Other officials tried to expose the fraud and were all sacked, suspended or disciplined. These include: Dorte Schmidt-Brown (who revealed that millions of Euros were diverted to family and friends), Robert Dougal Watt (sacked for reporting corruption within the auditing body) and Robert McCoy (reported systematic abuse of expenses, such as claims for non-existent meetings or travel; McCoy was hounded into sickness).
- To deal with the huge problem with public perception, the EU changed the rules. The Court of Auditors audited the budget annually but they no longer signed off the accounts as a whole. They created two sections; one that they were willing to sign off and what that they refused to sign off. The later is called *‘opinion on the underlying*

⁹ Philip Davies MP, statement at PM Questions in the House of Commons.

¹⁰ I acknowledge a debt to Richard Milton Books, ‘Have the EU accounts been signed off or not?’, 30 March 2016. Updated 28 October 2018.

payments which have been negative or adverse; in other words, suspicious. Numerous excuses, such as the budget being too big to cope with, were made to explain this procedure. The word 'fraud' was exchanged for 'irregular'.

In other words, contrary to the lies of the BBC (nothing unusual there), the accounts have not been signed off in 20 years. Note the Daily Telegraph headline, '*EU auditors refuse to sign off more than £100 billion*'. The EU response to this is a pack of lies, dissembling and obfuscation.¹¹

Researchers have stated that the true cost of EU corruption is up to 900 billion Euros every year.¹² That is 1,980 Euros for each UK person every year.

The total loss to the UK from EU corruption is up to 120 billion Euros every year.¹³

Interim conclusion

The EU is a very corrupt body and one which cannot be reformed due to its governing structure. The cost of membership for the UK is staggering and worthless.

The economic effect of 47 years in the EU

Project fear today constantly tells the British public that leaving the EU will cause Armageddon and ruin the economy (though they never explain why this is). Yet when Britain joined the EEC, in a move that was supposed to bring prosperity, the actual figures that followed showed that the average British worker saw an increase in household expenses of £18 per WEEK. This was when low paid manual workers could earn as little as thirty pounds per week. The official average weekly wage was £103 but many working class labourers and clerks earned less than half that amount.¹⁴ Even for someone on this amount, joining the EEC caused an increase cost of 17.4% per week. Nobody ever mentions this in debates today.

The EU stifled British economic growth

Contrary to the elite-controlled politicians in Westminster who constantly affirm that the EU is vital to British economic prosperity, the historic facts are that it worsened prosperity.

UK total factor productivity growth fell from 3.84% in 1973 (2.88% in the ten years ending 1973) to 0.14% in 2016 (negative 0.17% per annum in the ten years ending 2016).¹⁵ Today's growth is only 43% of the size that it should have been.

Stripping out the 2008-9 crash years, the last 20 years of growth is the worst since the 20 years ending 1922 (which included WWI).

The EU has failed its states economically. Over the 28 years to 2017, UK total factor production was up 4.8%, France was 3.6%, Italy -5.3%, Spain -8.3% and even Germany was 13.9%.¹⁶

¹¹ Clarification by the European Court of Auditors, 11 November 2014, Re: claim by Telegraph that EU auditors refuse to sign off more than £100 billion of its own spending?

¹² RAND Europe analysis.

¹³ Richard Milton, op. cit.

¹⁴ At this time I was an impoverished student with a family living on £8 per week in term time (I got jobs when possible in vacation periods and earned more, less than £20). Fortunately, my rent was then £3.50.

¹⁵ US Federal Reserve Bank figures. See Zero Hedge, Tyler Durden, 'An open letter to the UK Prime Minister (from one of the 17 million)', 4 April 2019.

UK production is down 5.1% since peaking in 2006. Companies have been pulling out of investing in Britain for many years. Note Dyson's necessary transfer of production to South East Asia to be nearer its main customers. Fall in productivity growth reflects unproductive allocation of capital, either directly from fiscal and spending policy or as a result of regulation and monetary boundaries imposed, which distort pricing signals and investment decisions. This leads to stagnation of wages, which have faced the lowest increases since the Napoleonic Wars. This also leads to using immigrants on low wages to compensate. '*Britain's business model is broken*'.¹⁷ It now relies on low wages, zero-hour contracts, temporary short-term staffing and a huge gap between the rich and the poor. The business model is cheap wages and temporary jobs – which ruins upward mobility and is contrary to traditional Conservative models.

Politicians are to blame for this loss of productivity and stagnation. They simply do not understand the damage they are doing. Just look at the much-lauded George Osborne; far from being a good Chancellor, he doubled the national debt and presided over 'Omni-shambles' budgets. Why was he not held to account? Instead he was praised and given a cushy media job in the city.

The electorate has been outsourcing the management of the economy and society, and the collapse of capital that entails, to people who are clearly not sufficiently skilled to be given that responsibility. The public is starting to recognise this.¹⁸

European policies are unaffordable. Productivity will further decline unless government policies change. Standards of living will fall even further than they have in recent years. The next generation will suffer even further decline than the current generation (which is the first generation to be worse off than parents for many decades). The NHS is already at the point of collapse and Social Services cannot cope with the demands upon them in many areas. Councils are broke and close to failing to provide legal responsibilities.

Zero or false UK elite data versus international databases

During the period that Britain has been in the EU single market (23 years), no government bothered to investigate whether this was beneficial or not. It was just assumed that tariff free trade was beneficial.

Facing the referendum in 2016, George Osborne commissioned a Treasury report which stated that being in the EU was economically beneficial and leaving the EU would be a financial disaster. The Bank of England and the IMF likewise made the same claims.

All these reports have now been categorically discredited, and their authors have apologised. This was mere government propaganda and Project Fear.

Richard Milton explains that Michael Burrage, a top economic analyst and former lecturer at the LSE, used independent databases and trading information to analyse Britain's involvement in the EU. This is hard data not speculation.¹⁹

Burrage stated that comparing the single market years (1993-2015) with the Common Market decades (1973-1992), the single market years show a period of decline for UK export growth to the EU. This period ranks Britain 36th in the top 40 fastest growing

¹⁶ US Conference Board data.

¹⁷ Yanis Varoufakis on BBC TV Question Time.

¹⁸ Tyler Durden, op. cit.

¹⁹ Burrage, 'It's OK to walk away: a review of the UK's Brexit options with the help of seven international databases', Civitas, London, 2016.

exporters. Britain is surpassed by many countries trading with the EU under WTO terms. The growth of UK exports to 111 countries under WTO rules since 1993 has been four times greater than its exports to the EU.

The growth of goods exports of the UK to the EU over 43 years is barely distinguishable from 14 countries that trade under WTO rules (but these do not have to pay EU membership). Over the last 23 years exports from these 14 countries have grown 27% more than exports from the UK. For example Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Turkey have performed much better than EU member states.

The examination of international databases strongly support Britain's withdrawal from the EU and seeking a bilateral trade agreement. However, WTO terms would still be more beneficial than being in the EU. No deal really is better than a bad deal.

Interim conclusion

The EU has, in 47 years, done nothing to improve the economic situation of Britain. In fact, it has worsened its prosperity.

At the moment the nations outside the EU trading on WTO terms are growing whilst the EU is stagnating. The lack of growth in the EU is due to structural problems that cannot be fixed, such as the divergence of the north and south, the contrasts between France and Germany with the smaller nations, the impossibility of a 'one size fits all' currency and so on. Many are predicting a collapse of the EU within ten years. Britain is far better off getting out fast with no deal.

Economic studies that show that Britain will be better off leaving the EU

Patrick Minford

Professor of Economics at Cardiff Business School. See: '*Should Britain leave the EU?*' (2005). Written with a research team, this is a detailed explanation of the economics of the UK and the EU. This states that British customers will pay an average of 8% less for goods out of the EU because we will be able to buy at world market prices rather than EU protectionist prices.

Iain Mansfield

The Director of Trade and Industry at the British Embassy in Manila. '*A Blueprint for Britain: openness not isolation*' (2014).

This essay won the 100,000 Euros Brexit Prize awarded by the Institute for Economic Affairs. The government banned him from giving interviews. His chief claim is that Brexit will allow Britain to shift UK exports and trade away from the EU and towards merging markets where the majority of the world's growth is located.

Warwick Lightfoot

Economic specialist in monetary economics and public finance; former special advisor to the Chancellor (1989-1992). A round up of key points in *The Spectator*, 'A sober economic analysis shows that Brexit is best' (2016).

In comparison, Remainers in 2016 failed to provide a single professional study saying that remaining in the EU was economically better. Yet the House of Commons Library provided a briefing paper in 2013 referring to four studies, all of which found either zero or a

negative effect being in the EU. This was backed up by a previous US International Trade Commission study finding that Britain would have zero financial benefit staying in the EU.

These studies were based on historic economic facts, not random speculations about future possibilities.

Social benefits supposed to have emanated from the EU

Many of the things repeatedly claimed as benefits from the EU are actually the result of the work of others, not the EU.²⁰

The EU enables Brits to live and work in Europe

This is nonsense. Brits have lived and worked in Europe for centuries. Note the recent popular ITV drama *The Durrells*²¹ which dramatises the true story of the Durrell family that lived for years in Corfu in the 30s. For a tax dodge, the Rolling Stones lived in France for a period around 1970. Over 100 years ago, the church leader Charles Spurgeon would live for prolonged periods in Mentone, France for his health. In fact wealthy aristocrats had lived in Europe for centuries, such as Lord Byron.

You do not need to be in the EU in order to work and live in Europe.

In the same way many Brits today live for extended periods, or even permanently, in countries outside the EU. There is nothing unusual in this. Many British actors live semi-permanently in Los Angeles because that is the centre of the movie business. John Lennon lived for years in New York.

Cheaper mobile 'phone charges

The separation of charging nationally gave rise to roaming charges, which were often excessive. In 1999 an international association (International Telephone Users Group) asked the EU to change its regulations so roaming charges could be abolished, but the EU did nothing. So INTUG went to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The OECD lobbied the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), which published a report in 2008 demanding free roaming charges worldwide. The EU did nothing. In 2013 the OECD published a report stating that international roaming services fall under the scope of WTO provisions. This report led to the abolition of roaming charges. In 2013 most of the world removing roaming charges, but not the EU. Finally in 2014 the EU caught up with the rest of the world and voted to abolish roaming charges – in 2017, long after the rest of the world.

Thus the EU actually resisted abolishing roaming charges for much longer than any other nation.

Beaches without pollution

The cleaning up of beaches was actually a worldwide programme initiated by the Foundation for Environmental Education based in Copenhagen and which awards the Blue Flag certificate to clean beaches.

²⁰ I acknowledge a part debt to Richard Milton Books here, 'What has the EU ever done for us?' 19 April 2016.

²¹ Based on the books of Gerald (Malcolm) Durrell (1925–95), the English zoologist and writer, younger brother of novelist Lawrence Durrell.

Worker's rights

Equal pay for men and women, banning discrimination because of sex, age, or race are rights that were fought for by the International Labour Organisation (ILO), a UN agency. The EU adopted these policies adding an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy between workers and the UN.

While Britain has a seat in the ILO's governing body the EU does not and plays no part in its campaigns. Britain played more of a role in securing worker's rights than the EU did. This role would continue once Britain left the EU so Remainers need not harp on about this being ditched on exiting the EU.

In any case, Britain has a better record on worker's rights than the EU. Britain legalised equal pay in 1970 before it joined the EU. Britain also already had sex and race discrimination laws. Maternity leave also exceeded the EU minimum of 14 weeks when that came in later.

The higher minimum wage, the apprenticeship levy payroll tax, restrictions on skilled migrant workers and requirement to publish gender pay gaps were not imposed by the EU but were Conservative initiatives.

The European Court of Human Rights

This was not an EU initiative but was founded in 1953 before the EU was formed. When Britain leaves the EU it will continue to be a signatory of this court.

Health and safety

Workplace safety is regulated globally by the International Labour Organisation (ILO). The EU actually copied a number of the ILO initiatives, then claimed credit for this.

Health issues are assessed by the World Health Organisation (WHO) based in Geneva, another UN agency. The EU adopted many WHO recommendations which were copied into EU regulations. Britain would continue to contribute to the WHO upon leaving the EU.

Interim conclusion

I could continue to identify benefits that are claimed to be from the EU but are actually from other sources, for several pages, but the point has been made.

The reason that people think these benefits and regulations originate in the EU is because the EU spends billions every year conditioning Brits, and especially children in education, that this is the case, with constant propaganda. The EU is simply lying.

Labour supply

Does the UK depend upon the supply of Labour from EU nations?

Certainly there has been a great deal of immigration from Eastern Europe because these workers can earn far more money doing simple jobs here than they can earn at home. But there is a great deal of immigration from other countries also. For example, very many nurses in the NHS are from the Philippines or India. 11% of all NHS staff are not British. How will Brexit impact this labour force?

Firstly, there is no reason to panic at all. EU nationals working in the UK have already been told by the government that they will be accepted within Britain as before, in a reciprocal

agreement with the EU. There need be no shortage of low-skilled labour because there is no forced return of ex-pats. The issue of labour is a non-problem. Yet Remainers constantly bring this up as a dreadful result of Brexit.

There are currently 2.1 million EU immigrants working in the UK. These help to remedy the shortages in certain industries, such as construction. They also spend money in the UK as well as pay tax.²² This benefit need not change upon Brexit. Why would any government expel them?

If there were to be a shortfall, this would result in increased wages for British labourers since businesses would be in competition for a reduced workforce. For once employees would be in a position of great influence. This could have a general beneficial impact on all workers. Low wages is one of the great evils in today's society and the key reason for downward mobility and social problems. A rise in wages could greatly enhance society.

The increased cost to businesses would force a long-needed reassessment of overall costs and perhaps put an end to the increasing overpayment of executives and board members. The market would force improvements upon corporations. It would also force the government to invest in worker training programmes and develop apprenticeships; another beneficial measure to society. It might also stop the government from focusing upon service industries and schemes to profit rich corporatists and bankers and concentrate upon the working class and middle class for a change. The government has been doing little to fix the skills gap in the workforce for many years – lack of necessary workers would force this issue.

However recruitment agencies are already having a problem since there has been a decrease of 95% of EU nationals joining the UK workforce since 2016. In autumn 2018 70% of employers with vacancies said that some of these were hard to fill compared to spring 2017. While this is problematic, it has not seriously dented GDP. Again this will put pressure on companies to boost wages and improve working conditions for labourers due to competition for workers. An LMO survey autumn 2018 showed that half of organisations had raised starting salaries. 51% had increased salaries in some capacity and up-skilled existing employees.²³

Despite the fears created by Remainers, two thirds of organisations said they would continue to employ EU nationals.²⁴ 55% of organisations said that leaving the EU has no impact on their training and skills development and 20% had reduced it (this may be a mistake).²⁵ However, organisations that employ EU nationals were investing in training and seeking to recruit from a wider range of under represented groups, such as older workers or ethnic minorities.

In conclusion two things emerge: the first is that there is no reason to expel EU nationals upon Brexit. The government has stated that it will not do this, so there is no labour problem at all. Secondly, were many EU nationals to leave Britain for some reason, the result would be a greater focus upon British workers in raised wages, better skills training and improved working conditions.

²² A study by University College London in 2018 claimed that EU migrants contributed (net) £20bn to public finances.

²³ Labour Market Outlook, CIPD, (the professional body for HR), autumn 2018. Resourcing and talent planning survey, CIPD, 2017.

²⁴ CIPD research, survey report 2017, HAYS recruiting experts.

²⁵ Labour Market Outlook, CIPD, Winter 2017-18.

There is no downside to Brexit regarding the labour market.

Peace in Europe?

Supporters of the EU constantly harp on the supposed axiom that the EU has prevented any wars in Europe and stopped the horror of another world war. In fact the opposite is the truth.

Firstly, there have been a number of wars and military actions, even including NATO forces, in Europe since WWII. For example:

- The Bosnia War between Bosnia and Herzegovina (1992-1995). Over 101,000 killed, mostly Bosnians. It was the first case of genocide in Europe since WWII.
- The Kosovo War (1998-1999). Over 13,000 killed or missing. During the war 1.45 million Albanian people were displaced. After the war 200,000 Serbs and others fled Kosovo.
- The massive illegal NATO bombing and air strikes on Yugoslavia during the Kosovo War killing over 488 civilians, including refugees.
- The EU allowance of NATO and American military and missile bases in Eastern Europe contrary to previous agreements with Russia. This equates to European encroachment eastwards, which poses a severe military threat to Russia that could precipitate world war three.

Furthermore, the EU policy of open migration and welcoming uncontrolled Muslim immigration (e.g. over one million into Germany in one year) has precipitated civil unrest in Germany, Sweden and France and great protests from Italy, Greece, Hungary and Poland. In parts of Sweden cities are now no-go areas for white Europeans where riots, fires, shootings and even grenades in the street are commonplace. This has led to violent crime and mass rape skyrocketing in areas where there is intense settling of Muslim migrants. The crimes include murder, rape, gang rape, drug dealing, violent burglary and muggings, kidnapping, and human trafficking. The victims of rape include young girls and old women.

Interim conclusion

Far from the EU guaranteeing peace, it has exacerbated violence and done nothing to stop bombing, missile strikes, genocide and full-on wars on European soil. Its attitude to Russia is extremely worrying and a provocation to global war.

Example of an EU fat cat that you pay for

David Milliband

Former Foreign Secretary in the Blair government. Failed leadership bid in the Labour Party; then quit UK politics. Then became president and CEO of the International Rescue Committee (IRC) in New York; for which he gets £425,000 every year.

However, the IRC is paid for by the EU; thus British taxpayers share in paying this ridiculous salary for a charity to a failed British politician.

To no surprise, David Milliband constantly campaigns for Britain to stay in the EU. He also introduced the bill in 2007 to ratify the EU Lisbon Treaty (Constitution). He quoted

organisations that supported the treaty. He did not say that these same organisations (such as Oxfam, NSPCC, ActionAid etc.) had together received 43,051,542 Euros from the EU.

The EU funds many NGOs, charities and worker's organisations. These groups then parrot praise of EU initiatives claiming that they are independent voices of the people. This is deception and manipulation.

Examples of lies, collusion, obfuscation and treachery

The Norway option

Claim

Norway contributes to the EU budget and must retain all the EU's standards, financial regulations and employment regulations. It has adopted 75% of EU laws. Thus it pays for trade but has no say in adopted laws. It is also compelled to allow free movement of EU citizens.

Truth

Norway does not contribute to the EU budget. It pays for services and programmes that it chooses to have, such as technology initiatives. Norway does not pay for the EEA, which grants it access to the EU single market. It does make some voluntary payments, such as aid programmes. Further, Norway only adopted about 21% of EU laws.

This was confirmed by a speech by Atle Leikvoll, Norwegian ambassador to the EU, in the EU Parliament on 5 November 2014 (available on YouTube).

Norway is not compelled to allow free movement of EU citizens either. It signed an agreement to accept free movement of EU workers, not citizens (which is what Britain accepts). Workers cannot bring their families to Norway. This deters economic migrants and benefit scroungers.

Promotion of Remain

The Leave campaign was restricted by law to spending £7 million on promotion. The Remain side, however, was enabled by David Cameron to spend £26 million through using various loopholes. The government also spent £9 million on leaflets to every house.

The Leave campaign took advice from the Electoral Commission and spent certain sums of money based on that advice. It was fully compliant with the legal advice given. It turned out that this advice was wrong but the Electoral Commission nevertheless later prosecuted the Leave campaign for following its own advice. Yet still day after day someone in the media states that the Leave campaign acted illegally, for spending a few hundred thousand pounds too much in good faith – despite the fact that the Remain campaign spent many millions of pounds more and also acted illegally in detail.

The EU however, is not so limited and it spent millions on promoting the Remain campaign and the current anti-Brexit promotion through proxies. Whenever leading people (businessmen, scientists, bankers, and journalists) insist that Britain is better off staying in the EU check to see if they have received large amounts of cash from the EU via some organisation (like George Soros' Open Society).

The current British Parliament

The situation in British politics is now such a shambles that it is deservedly mocked as a theatre of the absurd. It has descended from being the mother of parliamentary democracy to a viper's nest of treason and treachery.

The reason for this is the lack of representation in Parliament that has steadily risen in the last few decades. We now have a political class of MPs with their noses in the trough, many of whom have never done a proper job and are completely out of touch with the people they supposedly represent (with a few virtuous exceptions).²⁶

The overall situation is this:

- **FACT:** 17.4 million people voted to leave the EU, which everyone at the time were clearly told meant leaving the single market and the customs union. Claims that Brexit means many things and no one knew what they were voting for is a lie.
- **FACT:** this was an unprecedented plebiscite attracting many people that had not voted in a general election in many years due to apathy or disenchantment with MPs. Voters were told by the government that their vote would be implemented and that it was binding.
- **FACT:** this was solidified in a general election where both the Labour Party and the Conservatives pledged in their manifestos to leave the EU and honour the referendum. Thus 85% of the population voted to leave the EU. This is the highest amount of people to vote together for something in British history. The claim that it was nearly an even split is wrong.
- **FACT:** Theresa May pledged in the general election hustings to leave the EU. She repeatedly stated that no deal was better than a bad deal. She repeated this promise in her victory speech, her Lancaster House speech and her Mansion House speech.
- **FACT:** Bills to withdraw from the EU and to invoke Article 50 were passed in Parliament. This makes it law that Britain should leave the EU on 29 March 2019. The recent extension granted by the EU, initiated under government prerogative, to 12 April is highly questionable and is being tested in the courts with a writ by Robin Tilbrook, with little media attention. Several leading lawyers have stated that this extension is illegal.
- **FACT:** Theresa May voted to Remain in the EU.
- **FACT:** Jeremy Corbin had always been a Eurosceptic and voted against EU policies, such as Maastricht, time after time. His current position of promoting remaining in the single market and the customs union reveals that he is a hypocrite that cannot be trusted. He also appointed Keir Starmer to be the shadow Brexit secretary knowing that he was a Remainer.
- **FACT:** Labour is split across the country with roughly 50/50 voting for and against leaving the EU.
- **POLL:** 70% of Conservatives want to leave the EU without a deal.
- **POLL:** in different polls, between 60 and 70% of the population wants to leave without a deal.
- **FACT:** 85% of MPs are Remainers.
- **FACT:** the Speaker of the House of Commons is a Remainer who appears to have abused his power to promote the Remain cause (he denies this).

²⁶ Of the Tories, Jacob Rees Mogg (leaver); of Labour, Jess Phillips (remainer).

- FACT: A motion was passed in the Commons to reject a no-deal Brexit, proposed by Yvette Cooper. It passed by one vote but this included the vote of a convicted criminal, Fiona Onasanya, who voted wearing an ankle transponder tag under curfew.
- FACT: Dominic Grieve is a prominent Remainer who has secured a significant presence in the media, has proposed motions against Brexit in the Commons and has publicly claimed that the referendum vote is not legally binding. He recently lost a vote of no confidence in his Conservative Beaconsfield constituency (182 to 131). He refused to stand down. He was also one of the MPs that sought to take control of the Commons business away from the government. Beaconsfield was a Remain constituency by 0.9% but even Remainers feel that Grieve has gone too far in destabilising Parliament, hence the no confidence vote.
- FACT: Oliver Letwin and Yvette Cooper brought forward a bill, rushed through Parliament, to extend Article 50. It passed through the Lords on Monday 8 April and gained Royal Assent (though not signed by the Queen).
- FACT: Letwin's West Dorset constituency voted 51% in favour of leaving the EU. Cooper's Normanton constituency voted 69.26% to leave the EU. In 2017 Cooper stated, *'Nobody said, "well you know what, I'm just not going to respect the result afterwards"; that's the kind of thing that Donald Trump would say'*. She also said, *'We had a referendum. The thing I feel more concerned about than any possible scenario ... is the idea of becoming a country that no longer respects democratic values and I think that matters. We had a referendum ... we didn't go into that referendum ... saying look I want you to vote Remain but to be honest it doesn't matter how you vote I'm going to ignore you.'*²⁷ Since this describes exactly how she has behaved, Cooper has not just betrayed her constituency but has proved to be the worst kind of political hypocrite that characterises Westminster today.
- FACT: Many of the prominent Remain (or rejecters of no deal) MPs with significant voices in the media actually represent constituencies that voted leave. These include: Yvette Cooper, Tom Watson, Sarah Wollaston, Sam Gyimah, Amber Rudd, Jo Johnson, Stephen Kinnock, Margaret Beckett, Nick Boles, Pat McFadden, Mary Creagh, Philip Lee, Anna Soubry, Richard Harrington and Oliver Letwin. These people deserve to be ousted at the next general election.
- FACT: many of the MPs trying to derail Brexit and who voted against a no-deal Brexit actually voted to invoke Article 50, such as Dominic Grieve and Anna Soubry (in fact every Tory except Ken Clarke).

This is the reason for the deadlock and for the treachery. The House of Commons is doing everything possible to derail Brexit and to thwart the clear will of the people. Parliament no longer represents the people and needs thorough reform.

Though the people voted in a clear majority (far greater than any PM ever gets) to leave the EU (including the single market and the customs union) those in power seek to reverse it. Those in power include:

- The Prime Minister.
- The majority of the Cabinet.
- The civil service.
- The official opposition (Labour Party).
- The SNP.
- Plaid Cymry.
- The LibDems.

²⁷ Speech at the Mile End Institute. Clips available at Guido Fawkes blog.

- The greater proportion of the press.
- The television media.
- The news media.
- The majority of journalists, commentators, satirists and comedians.
- PA people with a media presence like Alastair Campbell.
- Retired politicians with influence, e.g. Tony Blair, Peter Mandelson.
- The majority of leaders of large business corporations (but not small businesses).

The people who voted leave have been constantly derided as: stupid, selfish, aged, vacuous, uninformed, racist and chauvinist.

This paper demonstrates that far from being stupid, the people have actually got more sense than the supposed experts. The politicians and establishment are utterly wrong on the benefits of being in the EU; there are none. The people have got it right.

Conclusion

In summary:

- The EU costs Britain huge amounts of money.
- The EU wastes huge amounts of money in its infrastructure.
- The EU has severely damaged Britain's productivity and worsened its prosperity.
- The EU is very corrupt; its accounts have not been audited for many years. Billions are lost every year.
- The EU demolished the UK's fishing industry and brought many towns into dilapidation and ruin.
- The EU ruined many farmers, especially dairy farmers. Those that survived relied on EU subsidies growing products that were not useful to the public and contributed to food mountains and waste.²⁸ Britons now buy much food from other countries instead of growing her own, which creates an insecure dependency chain of imports.
- The EU destroyed UK sovereignty and in fact membership in the EU is treasonous against the British Constitution (see previous papers).
- The EU is not a democratic institution but a fascist organisation run by unelected bureaucrats. Britons have no representation against this through Parliament. The EU Parliament is a mere talking shop with no power, so your MEP cannot help you either.
- Many of the claimed benefits of being in the EU (e.g. worker's rights) had nothing to do with the EU at all; in fact the EU was often slower than other nations to regulate for these rights.
- The EU did not secure permanent peace in Europe after WWII. It did not stop wars and has contributed to threatening the Russian border.
- The public was lied to at the point of deciding to join the EU and has been constantly lied to since. This is perpetrated by a massive EU budget of many billions used in propaganda to condition young people (which is why they support the EU even though they can rarely say why).

²⁸ Note the many huge fields of rape. This is turned into rapeseed oil, which is actually not healthy for cooking with. If these fields were farmed for organic vegetables, the benefit to Britons would be huge.

Currently the establishment, most of the media and the political class are working in concert to try to stop Brexit, or to keep us in the EU in a deal that is worse than current membership. This is treason. It is also a civil war between the establishment and the people. The lies they constantly repeat have been addressed in this paper. Brexit is a real opportunity for Britain to change direction and prosper the whole population (instead of just the bankers and financiers) once again. Failure to exit the EU will result in Britain being a slave to its institutions and laws but unable to exert any political influence.

Further reading from this writer

- Brexit deal chaos (2018).
- Clarity on the Brexit situation (2018).
- Exiting the EU: summary (2016).
- Exiting the European Union (2016).
- Surrendering foreign policy (2019).
- Facts About The European Union (1997).

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version
© Thomas Nelson 1982

Paul Fahy Copyright © 2019
Understanding Ministries
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>