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Dear Reader

Please, please read this to the end!

Following years of pressure by myself - and many others - you finally have a vote on whether we should remain in or leave the European Union.

I believe it is the single most important cross or mark you may ever make on any piece of paper in your lifetime.

I know it may seem complex, boring and remote.

But, we all know that nowadays governments determine so much of what we all do day in, day out. If you drive, get on a train, pay taxes, claim benefits, call an emergency service, go to a doctor or many other aspects of all modern life, you ARE involved in politics. So, I think it is really important that YOU have a say.

And, whether or not we remain in the European Union WILL decide how our country is run for many years to come.

Actually, I want to go further!

The British political class are relying on your indifference.

They quietly hope that you will not take the time to read this so they can continue to pull the wool over your eyes.

Therefore, reading this pamphlet becomes an act of rebellion in itself!

Why do I think that?

As a Member of the European Parliament, I have watched as you have been consistently misled for decades.

Words are used but do not mean what they appear to mean.

Statements are made which are intended to deceive.

It is what happened at the beginning of the 1970s when we joined the European institutions - please do not use the words 'Common Market', it is no such thing, as I will show.

That was done by the then Prime Minister, Harold Wilson.

Now, forty years later, another smooth, cunning Oxford-educated Prime Minister - David Cameron - is trying the same trick using the same sleight of hand to deprive us of the ability to govern ourselves.

Harold called himself a ‘Labour’ man, while ‘Dave’ styles himself ‘Conservative’ but for me there is absolutely no difference between them on this issue.

They pretend to be neutral, to be swayed by the facts and to be thinking of the interests of ordinary people. They believe that, by presenting themselves like this, they can load the dice in their favour.

I am very hopeful that, this time, the British people will see through their manipulations... this is how and why!

Yours sincerely

Nigel Farage
EFDD Co-President and MEP

PS a small number of you may recognise some of this. I first said much of this back in 2012. Now my words have come true, I have not tried to 're-invent the wheel' in telling you what is happening!
1975 and all that

Nobody under 50 will remember the convolutions surrounding British entry to the European Union. Even fewer will know the true story of what was going on behind the scenes.

The UK first applied in 1961 but two vetoes by France’s former wartime leader and later President, Charles de Gaulle, kept us out for over a decade. Entry was finally pushed through, without a referendum, in 1972 by Edward Heath’s Conservative government. But the issue was always controversial particularly in the Labour Party then led by Harold Wilson.

Wilson had famously shown his attitude to the truth when in 1967 he devalued the pound but claimed that this did not mean that ‘the pound in your pocket’ had been devalued! For a former Oxford University economics lecturer, it was both literally and figuratively an unbelievable position to take. It is now regularly used to illustrate a politician trying to argue that black is white!

This approach characterised what happened over Britain’s European Community membership.

The British establishment knew perfectly well that the long-term implications for British democracy and self-government were profound and damaging.

Papers not then publicly available tell us that the government’s own expert legal advisers were clear about what would be given away.

An internal government memorandum reads:

“I enclose a draft on sovereignty ... We are rather worried about the impact on Parliamentary opinion ... the fact of the primacy of community legislation cannot be disguised. But I feel that there is a case for omitting it altogether.”

A British Foreign Office paper is quite explicit:

“Community law is required to take precedence over domestic law: i.e. if a Community law conflicts with a statute, it is the statute which has to give way... the community system requires that such Community Law as applies directly as law in this country should by virtue of its own legal force as law in this country prevail over conflicting national legislation.”

(FCO 30/1048, National Archives)

Thus when, in the October 1974 General Election, Harold Wilson’s Labour Party manifesto included a pledge to renegotiate terms for Britain’s membership and then hold a referendum, the loss of sovereignty was an issue about which not merely the ‘yes’ campaign wanted to keep quiet but also the Government itself.

As well as ‘yes’ and ‘no’ pamphlets from the respective campaign teams - the ‘yes’ campaign had 10 times the resources of the ‘no’ - the referendum saw Wilson’s government issue to every household a taxpayer-funded pamphlet encouraging people to vote.

What’s the difference between a good campaign and a bad one? The budget. The ‘Yes’ campaign had ten times the resources of the ‘No’ campaign and won two-thirds of the vote.
Neutral it was not!

It referred in its opening line to ‘the European Community (Common Market)’ - and, thereafter, referred to the European Economic Community (as it then was) as the Common Market.

Words matter. The way you describe anything helps define your thinking. The term ‘Common Market’ was an informal, largely Anglo-Saxon shorthand which described the institution as the British wished it to be. In reality, it was no such thing, even then. The original 1957 Treaty of Rome explicitly commits signatories to ‘ever closer union’.

But this was a line carefully excluded from the British Government’s pro-EC membership propaganda. Instead they tried to pretend that sovereignty was being enhanced rather than abrogated:

“... we are asking you to vote in favour of remaining in the Community. ... No important new policy can be decided in Brussels or anywhere else without the consent of a British Minister answerable to a British Government and British Parliament. ... the prime minister declares that through membership of the Market we are better able to advance and protect our national interests. This is the essence of sovereignty.”

It is very simple.

Please contrast the statements in the internal FCO paper and the British government pamphlet for public consumption. The British establishment knew it was giving away its decision-making powers. It would not admit this in public and it was prepared to be highly duplicitous in covering it up.

Party backing: Margaret Thatcher put the full weight of the Conservatives behind the ‘Yes’ campaign in a launch speech at St Ermin’s, Westminster on April 16th 1975.

‘No essential loss of sovereignty’ - Edward Heath’s oft-repeated mantra from the early 1970s.

‘Beauty and the beast’. Where were you in 1975?

While the country was campaigning the pros and cons of European Community membership in April, May and June 1975, what else was going on?

In April, the Vietnam War ground to a close; on April 30th the last US helicopter left their embassy grounds as Saigon surrendered.

At home, the average house price was just under £12,000, a gallon of petrol cost 72p and the inflation rate reached 24%.

Derby County won the league, Manchester United got back in the top Division after their relegation the previous year, while West Ham beat Fulham 2-0 in the Cup final on May 5th - in their team were Frank Lampard (the father of today’s Frank Lampard) and Trevor Brooking.

‘Monty Python and the Holy Grail’ was launched on April 3rd, while ‘Jaws’ came out on June 20th; on TV, ‘The Good Life’ first appeared on April 4th.

On May 19th, the Eagles released their LP ‘One of Those Nights’ while in the UK the Bee-Gees released ‘Jive Talkin’ on May 31st. Meanwhile, Van McCoy launched a track from his album ‘Disco Baby’ as a single - ‘The Hustle’ - which became the disco hit of the summer.

Who was born that spring? Footballers Robbie Fowler (April 2nd) and David Beckham (May 3rd) and actress Christina Hendricks the following day. TV chef Jamie Oliver was born on May 27th and Spice Girl Mel B two days later.

On June 4th, just the day before the Referendum vote, saw the births of both Russell Brand and Angelina Jolie.

Perhaps the most significant birth took place on April 4th – Bill Gates and Paul Allen from Seattle launched Microsoft.

And the weather? There was snow in early April and more in early June, which stopped the cricket and fell as far south as London. Otherwise June saw the start of a warm dry period that continued through the summer and led to the famous 1976 drought.

Footballers Robbie Fowler (April 2nd) and David Beckham (May 3rd) and actress Christina Hendricks the following day. TV chef Jamie Oliver was born on May 27th and Spice Girl Mel B two days later.
I believe most British people would say the British establishment lied. I believe most British people would be right.

The campaigning also had another characteristic used time after time by those who support Britain’s EU membership. They ‘play the man not the ball’ and they play dirty.

Thus, to quote the Treasurer of the ‘Yes’ campaign Alastair McAlpine:

“The whole thrust of our campaign was to depict the anti-Marketeers as unreliable people – dangerous people who would lead you down the wrong path ... It wasn’t so much that it was sensible to stay in, but that anybody who proposed that we came out was off their rocker or virtually Marxist”.

In short, the advocates of EU membership were so short of confidence in the logic of their arguments that they had to denigrate their opponents in the most irrational and personal of terms.

With the sole exception of the Spectator, the entire media, including the BBC played the same game.

A referendum was duly held on 5 June 1975.

I was 11 at the time and could not vote.

The proposition to continue membership was passed with a substantial majority.

I believe it was a majority obtained by fraud and deception.

---

There is a joke amongst economists that a real free trade agreement can be illustrated by holding up a blank piece of paper. That is because if trade is genuinely free, there are no regulations to follow or tariffs to pay but business people and traders can get on without hindrance or interference in doing business and creating wealth.

Thus, in principle, to create a single market or free trade area is incredibly easy if you know what you are doing and think it through. It merely requires an absence of restriction - most easily achieved by the progressive - or instant - dismantling and removal of all existing barriers and tariffs.

Actually, the then EC was handed a golden opportunity to take exactly this road and do it more or less at a single stroke in the form of the Cassis de Dijon judgement.

(EC Case Number 120/78 Revue-Zentral AG v Bundesmonopolverwaltung für Branntwein)

It arose in 1979 from the attempt to import the French liqueur, Cassis - used in Kir - into West Germany, as it then was. The Germans refused it entry on the grounds that it did not match the categories and requirements for the legal sale of alcoholic drinks in their country. The resultant refusal ended up at the European Court of Justice which ruled that the Germans had to allow the product to enter Germany and be sold there.

This judgement has, potentially, massive implications. It prevents governments from blocking trade. It effectively establishes that a legitimate product in one country is legal in any country. All you
have to do is apply the principle when any dispute arises - and then extend it to services. You end up with a genuine free trade area - and you do not need ever more regulation.

It may be termed the mutual recognition approach but in this case the recognition is enforced legally through the courts under existing agreements. It therefore requires remarkably little regulation and avoids both bureaucracy and the imposition of uniformity.

The EC turned down what you might call this legal ‘get-out-of-jail-free’ card which potentially offered an easily achieved, minimal cost route to a genuine free trade area - or real ‘single market’.

Instead, they chose ‘harmonisation’.

This incredibly time and resource-consuming, ponderous and long-winded approach requires the definition of all products and services - to be followed by harmonising all the regulations and requirements relating to them. And, of course, this cannot be done without a vast army of officials.

Another way of describing harmonisation is the imposition of uniformity - a uniformity which extends not merely to the product or service itself but to everything associated with its manufacture or provision.

That is the thinking which means that there is no such thing as ‘just the single market’. Everything has to be harmonised i.e. made uniform - and that is what the European Union has now been busily doing for decades.

It results in unending new laws and regulations which eventually form a unified legal code enforced without distinction across the entire population of over 500 million people.

It gives rise to:

- pan-European environmental regulation
- continental-style social legislation
- common employment law
- uniform company and corporate law
- economic governance
- unrestricted immigration
- resultant welfare costs ...

the list is endless.

And all this to be part of a Union:

- with which we run a trade deficit when we run a surplus with the rest of the world.
- which grows relatively poorer as each new member joins (just wait for Turkey: the Conservative government, Labour and the Liberal Democrats all want it in), and
- which is ever less important in terms of world trade as economic growth switches to such countries as Brazil, China and India.

May I also add that, for the privilege of having to implement all these regulations, the United Kingdom has to pay the European Union a gross contribution of more than £55 million per day?

I do not believe many people would consider all this value for money.

The linkage between the single market and other broader objectives is perfectly illustrated by what happened to Margaret Thatcher’s single market programme.

The one-time Secretary of State for Trade, Lord Cockfield, proposed in a British ministerial white paper a series of trade-related measures designed to complete the Single Market.
As we have just seen, it is already clear that this imposition of uniformity has no logical stopping point. You harmonise everything connected with cross-border commerce - which in an increasingly homogenised world means almost everything.

In this way, the next logical step was, of course, a Single Currency.

Jacques Delors - secretly backed by that most Mandarin part of Britain's Whitehall establishment, the Foreign Office - had duped even Mrs Thatcher into opening the road to monetary union and its logical corollary, a Single European Currency.

They began with a dress rehearsal, in the form of ERM, the European Exchange Rate Mechanism: currency exchange rates were fixed to the Deutsch Mark within a band.

I remember vividly the day we joined. I was in Coates Wine bar in the City drinking with colleagues when a runner brought the news. “It’s ‘appened. They’ve done it. We’re in.”

All of us knew exactly what he was referring to - and for me it was a turning-point. As a City trader, I had spent hours - usually over a drink or two - discussing it with my fellow traders and dealers. I knew that, despite - or perhaps because of - the fact that it was backed by all three mainstream political parties and more or less the entire United Kingdom media, it would be a disaster.

Not only were my fears justified but the UK’s ERM debacle was, in its way, also a dress rehearsal for the current euro crisis. So it is...
When the euro came into existence - without the United Kingdom - I began asserting that the euro as currently structured was an economic nonsense containing within it the seeds of its own destruction: its own systemic contradictions which would - in time - tear it apart.

I spoke of bond yields - to the bemusement of almost the entire European Parliament which did not know what a bond yield was, let alone its importance to a common currency functioning across 17 disparate national economies. (It determines the cost of money to governments.)

I was jeered when I told them that Greek bonds trading 233 basis points higher than German bonds meant that the markets were on to them whether they liked it or not.

I, and colleagues, pointed out that the ‘books had been cooked’ to allow Greek entry. We suggested that regarding the risks associated with government debt in Germany as identical to those in Greece or Spain was more than a little optimistic.

We were derided by the EU elite. We were dismissed by a British Conservative Party leader as a bunch of ‘gadflies and cranks’.

The same pattern continues: do not risk intellectual debate with your opponents, you run the risk after all that they might be right. Instead denigrate and dismiss them as ‘off their rocker’.

In the longer term, out of all this came not merely the currency but a draft EU constitution. Rejected in referenda by the French and Dutch electorates, it was promptly slightly re-drafted, declared not to be a constitution at all but simply another treaty and became the Lisbon Treaty.
Let me identify some of the key points of the Lisbon text:

• all future accession states have to agree to join the euro: this means it is simply not envisaged as being possible in the long term to be within the EU but not in the Euro.

Similarly,

• as the Greeks have belatedly realised, there is simply no provision for exit from the euro. ‘You can check in any time you like but you can never leave’ (with apologies to the Eagles).

Interestingly,

• there is for the first time reference to leaving the European Union as a whole - by invoking Article 50, any member state can negotiate its terms of exit with a deadline of 2 years for this process.

These arrangements demonstrate just how EU membership is ‘all or nothing’, ‘in or out’. There is no provision for or reference to secondary or looser membership, an outer tier. There is no half-way house or ‘single market only’ programme on offer.

In his report to the Council of 26 June 2012, Herman Van Rompuy makes crystal clear where they are going:

“Vision

The report proposes a vision … based on four essential building blocks:

• An integrated financial framework …. Such a framework elevates responsibility for supervision to the European level, and provides for common mechanisms to resolve banks and guarantee customer deposits.

• An integrated budgetary framework …. Fiscal policy making at the national and European levels, encompassing coordination, joint decision-making, greater enforcement and commensurate steps towards common debt issuance. This framework could include also different forms of fiscal solidarity.

• An integrated economic policy framework which has sufficient mechanisms to ensure that national and European policies are in place that … are compatible with the smooth functioning of EMU.

• Ensuring …. the joint exercise of sovereignty for common policies and solidarity.

These four building blocks offer a coherent and complete architecture that will have to be put in place over the next decade. All four elements … require a lot of further work, including possible changes to the EU treaties at some point in time.”

(our emphasis)

In all fairness to the EU elite, I have to admit one thing about them. They have not and have never tried to hide it: ‘ever closer union’ was in from the beginning and has been constantly repeated ever since - in endless variations.

But the same cannot be said of the British establishment: ever since the membership and referendum debate of the early 1970s right up to the present day, it has sought to conceal this fundamental and irrevocable commitment.

We do not believe this particular leopard is about to change its spots!

Just as you cannot be ‘just a bit pregnant’ or ‘slightly pregnant’, (though you can be in the early stages of pregnancy - and know what inevitably follows), so you cannot be a little bit a member of the EU.

Line in the sand: from this date, we had no excuse for ignorance of the EU's direction.

Total clarity - Herman van Rompuy, unlike our politicians - has made it crystal clear what the future holds for the EU. Is that something we wish to share?
Referendum or plebiscite?

What is the difference between a referendum and a plebiscite?

Many dictionaries would see them as nothing more than synonyms. But the connotations of the word ‘plebiscite’ for many British people, at least, are of dodgy dealings to fix results.

This is based around a whole series of 19th and 20th century plebiscites used by rulers to appear to legitimise what they have already decided they want.

France’s Napoleon III did it in 1851 to legalise his coup d’etat; in 1852 to make himself an emperor; and, most shockingly perhaps, in 1860 to acquire the Piedmontese territories of Nice and Savoy from Count Cavour - in return for kick-starting the process of creating the Italian state. (There is little evidence to suggest the then people of Nice or Savoy wished to become French - and a lot to suggest that they didn’t.)

In the 1930s, the Germans conducted a number of plebiscites to give a veneer of legitimacy and popular approval to the criminal machinations of the Nazi regime.

So the answer - in a couple of sentences - is that:

• a referendum is effectively the asking of a straight question which can be answered ‘yes’ or ‘no’ after a period of open and transparent campaigning. The answer is not known in advance and all those involved will live with the free and fair choice the public has made.

• A plebiscite is intended to appear to the public as if it is a referendum but in fact, it has all pretty much been fixed. It usually involves what the judge in a court of law would call a leading question - or questions, as asking more than one can give leeway in getting the ‘right’ answer - and this question suddenly appears as if out of nowhere when up to that point, what might be asked has all appeared pretty straight-forward.

I believe that the EU elite have a tradition of effectively running plebiscites.

When the Irish voted the ‘wrong’ way they had to vote again until they got it right.

When the French and the Dutch turned down a new EU constitution, the EU powers-that-be made minor alterations to the documents, claimed that these meant it was not a constitution and therefore needed no further popular approval. That is the origin of the Lisbon Treaty, a treaty which in reality represented a massive further transfer of power from the member states to the EU institutions.

It also created the so-called ‘co-decision procedure’ which in reality turns the European Parliament and Council into a legislature but with law-making initiated not by either of these but by the unelected European Commission - making it the most undemocratic legislature in the developed world.

The British establishment has consistently maintained a consensus in favour of EU membership - a consensus built across the leaderships of all of the Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and Scottish Nationalist parties, (though there are honourable exceptions among backbench MPs in at least three of these parties).
You’ve been conned!

(apologies to ITV)

We are already beginning to see the new generation of falsehoods, half-truths and evasions.

As explained earlier, Harold Wilson kept on calling it the ‘Common Market’.

In the booklet paid for by taxpayers advocating a vote to stay in, Wilson’s government constantly referred to either the Common Market or, even, just ‘the Market’. How can you say ‘no’ to being in ‘the Market’?

Now, we hear the term ‘Single Market’. This is misleading in exactly the same way.

The European Union is a customs union with a common external tariff. It is also a uniform set of laws for 500 million people. You can trade with it perfectly successfully without being in it and you can sign key trade deals more easily without being in it. To take one simple example: the 325,000 people of Iceland have a trade deal with China; the 500 million people of the EU do not.

It is claimed that “being in Europe [sic, they mean EU but say Europe - the two are different] also means we benefit from free trade deals”. If Iceland’s tiny population can more easily sign deals, how can this possibly be valid?

It is one piece of a bigger picture.

Harold Wilson’s government used classic ‘scare’ tactics.

Not worth the paper

It has learned from this process. It is trying to turn the 2016 referendum into a plebiscite.

Are we witnessing Wilson and 1974-5 all over again?

Mr Wilson made a commitment to renegotiation, admitted that he had not necessarily “got everything we wanted” but claimed, despite this to have won “big and significant improvements” and then asked “you to vote in favour of remaining in the Community.”

What a heart-warming, cosy image of being part of a Community. Like ‘motherhood and apple pie’ it is surely almost impossible to say ‘no’.

Yet membership of that community costs us £55 million a day to lose the right to make our own laws and to have to get the permission of the EU elite to run our own country. It sounds to me more like a ‘boot camp’ than a community.

As we are winning the argument about how the UK’s membership inflicts damage rather than offering benefits - they, like the manipulations of some 19th or 20th century would-be dictator, want what I call a plebiscite. They try to ignore the law and the treaties, appear to renegotiate, come back claiming to have got “not all we want but enough”, and win a referendum by deception all over again.

£55 million - that’s what we pay the EU... EVERY DAY. The equivalent of over four times the yearly UK cost of the late Afghanistan war, or 17 new Type 45 frigates and 75% of the March 2015 budget cost of UK industry, agriculture employment and training. How many new hospitals would that money fund?
His leaflet talked of ‘FOOD and MONEY and JOBS’ [sic]. It then went on to try to frighten us: “...if we gave up membership of the Common Market... the effect could only be damaging... there would be a period of uncertainty... there would be a risk of making unemployment and inflation worse.”

Having set out the supposed risk, the leaflet offered the solution - and hope: “... we will be in a much stronger position to face the future if we stay inside the market...”

It also reassures us... “through membership of the Market [sic, he means the EU institutions] we are better able to advance and protect our national interests. This is the essence of sovereignty.”

Quite simply, that is not a definition of sovereignty that would be accepted by any reputable academic! The ‘in-siders’ twist language beyond recognition.

Now, let’s look at the scare tactics already coming out this time round.

It’s the same stuff: jobs, shop prices and risks!

The new leaflet ‘EUROPE & YOU’ claims

“The truth is no-one knows how bad it would be if Britain left Europe - but we do know UK businesses, jobs and families would be hit.”

The truth is no one knows how much better-off we might be.

The truth is that we literally cannot ‘leave Europe’ as it is a geographical expression referring to a continental landmass.

The truth is that they are trying to scare you - again!

If this booklet were to try to expose all their deception in this way, it would probably be longer than the Bible - and in practice unreadable!

But, please let me expose two of their falsehoods which they keep repeating - presumably on the principle that ‘you can fool all of the people, some of the time’.

The first relates to jobs. They keep scaring us about 3 million jobs - most notably Nick Clegg in debate with me but the figure is endlessly repeated, including in the leaflet ‘EUROPE & YOU’ (which should be called the EU & YOU but accuracy is not their strong-point).

The original source of the figure - LSE professor, Iain Begg - says this use of his work is “persistent misrepresentation”. In other words, had Clegg - Cameron at Oxford, or anyone else - put it like this in an essay, it would have got a big red cross and an ‘E’ or ‘FAIL’.

The second falsehood is about our trade.

Harold Wilson in his government’s leaflet threatened, “We would no longer be inside the Common Market tariff wall - but outside... We would just be outsiders looking in.”

The scare is again being repeated with phrases like “free to trade” - as if trade will stop and you cannot trade without EU membership: countries from Andorra, via China and Liechtenstein, to the USA seem to manage it!

Not only is our political class intellectually dishonest but the world has moved on since 1975.

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) has massively reduced ALL tariffs and tackled many non-tariff barriers over the last 40 years. Arguably it is now the EU which is an obstacle with its old-fashioned, ‘customs-union, common-external-tariff approach’.
Outside the EU, we could resume our own seat on the WTO. Being in the EU prevents this - and that is a fact.

Sorry to be technical but they are, again trying to frighten you with intellectually-dishonest rubbish - it would be another ‘FAIL’ for their work.

No one can know exactly what the future holds - that is the real truth - but, please accept that the relationship between what they say and the truth is exactly the same as it was under Wilson’s government in 1975: they misled you then and they are misleading you now.

However, it is worse than that.

An even better way to mislead is to omit information altogether. That is why I want to move on to what is being ignored by those who want us to stay in... the truth about what, in the long-term, staying in the European Union really means.

In particular, I want to spell out just why voting to stay in is NOT a vote to keep things as they are, nothing could be further from the truth.

Omar Khayyam was not describing the European Union. But he might have been!

The European Union is inexorable. It simply does not stop - ever.

This means that it is entirely different from traditional international treaties and arrangements.

Those are fixed. A document is signed and that is it - often for decades, (just like the Treaty which, nearly a century later, took Britain into the First World War.)

The European Union is a process: to use civil-service jargon, a direction of travel.

This is where “ever closer union” is so important, not the words but the concept.

Although this is not precisely defined, it means in practice that the member states lose ever more power to Brussels - to the point where they are replaced as states by a single European state: one in which they have been relegated to provinces.

David Cameron claims he wants to remove the words, “ever closer union” - or, at least get an opt-out. But, even if he technically
succeeds, it is not the words themselves which matter. What matters is the inexorable process they describe - one which is in practice impossible to stop.

Fortunately for me, the EU has published a new working document which helps explain what is happening. PE569.777v02-00 bears the name of my German MEP colleague, Elmar Brok, a key ally of Angela Merkel. (version quoted, dated 30.10.15)

Sorry to quote so extensively from the EU's awful, turgid bureaucracy-speak but it matters if you are to know the truth - and this document is the clearest one I have so far found.

I will provide some translation!

**The document says:**

The European Parliament’s legislative powers and control rights must be guaranteed, consolidated and strengthened

**TRANSLATION:**

The powers of Westminster will go, until it is just a provincial assembly.

**The document says:**

The function of the President of the European Council could be merged with that of the President of the European Commission.

**TRANSLATION:**

We will have a president of the European Union who will be more powerful than any Prime Minister.

**The document says:**

to transform the Council into a truly legislative chamber, the existing Council configurations should be reduced to a single one... there should be a complete switch to qualified majority voting (QMV)

**TRANSLATION:**

The Council will be turned into a Euro-Senate

---

**The document says:**

a new position of European Finance Minister... To support the function of the European Finance Minister described above, an EU Fiscal and Treasury Administration (similar to the US Congressional Budget Office) should be established

**TRANSLATION:**

Our own Chancellor of the Exchequer will take orders from this new EU super-minister. Please note that the comparison with the USA is entirely explicit: the EU plans to be, like them, a single state.

**The document says:**

We need further EMU reforms in order to provide the EMU with an effective and democratic economic government (for areas where the Commission can act as the executive, and where Parliament and the Council can act as co-legislators)... creating a more binding framework for economic policy...

**TRANSLATION:**

Your economy - the British economy - will be run by the EU. Get used to it!

**The document says:**

As the euro is the currency of the Union according to the Treaties, and the EU budget is designed to facilitate for less-developed Member States to catch up and become able to join the eurozone...

**TRANSLATION:**

Eventually you must adopt the euro - countries which do not are inferior. Get used to it!

**The document says:**

61. A Common Consolidated Corporate Tax Base directive, with a minimum rate and with common objectives for a progressive harmonization, should be adopted.

62. The EU should embark on a comprehensive review of existing VAT
The current refugee crisis has clearly revealed that the EU needs a common asylum and immigration policy, which must as well provide for the fair distribution of asylum seekers in the European Union.

**TRANSLATION:**
We will control your borders and who is in your country and has the right to be there.

Sorry but in the context of all these plans, Dave’s negotiation cannot get any useful, long-term concessions. In fact, it is a joke - but not a very funny one. (That makes it just like Harold’s in 1975. Some of you may remember that Harold’s then Foreign Secretary, the later PM, Jim Callaghan, actually admitted as much!)

Moreover and for the record, there is NO getting away from this. There is no such category as associate membership or ‘membership-lite’. And creating such a structure, if it could be done at all, would require massive treaty change; it is simply not ‘on the table’ as part of the Cameron talks.

So now you know what is in store for us if we vote to stay in.

And, if people tell you differently, they either do not know what they are talking about or they are trying to avoid you knowing the truth.

That is why for you and your children’s sake, we must all vote to leave the European Union.

The EU deprives us of self-government. The only way we can keep the right to decide what we want for ourselves is to leave a set of institutions which are not about markets and trade but rather take away our democracy, impose laws on us which we have not voted for and make us pay for the privilege.

It really is that simple!

---

**The document says:**

A common European capabilities and armaments policy... The European Defence Agency (EDA) should play a leading and coordinating role... common financing should be extended to the area of military expenditure... The creation of a permanent military operational headquarters... the institutionalisation of the various European military structures... into the EU framework, and the increase of the usability of the EU battlegroups.

**TRANSLATION:**
An EU army - and air-force and navy. (Please, please British political class, stop denying that this is happening!)
The less and less ‘common’ market

The original EEC - the ‘six’ of 1956 - was geographically compact and economically homogenous. Standards of living were broadly comparable and wage and benefit rates sufficiently similar not to create problems. This remained generally the case as the ‘six’ became fifteen.

In 2004, everything changed with simultaneous accession by 10 new states; most were countries escaping the damaging legacy of Communism. However sympathetic one is to such countries, the economic homogeneity disappeared virtually overnight with massive differences in living standards creating migration incentives understandably irresistible to millions.

All subsequent enlargement - Bulgaria, Romania and Croatia - also enlarged these economic divisions. More, even poorer states are firmly in the EU accession pipeline.

At the same time, minimum wage laws and benefit rates in the richer states only increase. In this way, incentives for those in less well-off countries to exercise their rights of free-movement can only increase significantly.

(And, none of this takes account of the many millions now entering the EU from the Middle East and Africa.)

LARGER AS WELL AS DEEPER

Becoming a member of the EU is a complex procedure which does not happen overnight. Applicant countries need to meet the conditions for membership and they must implement EU rules and regulations in all areas.

These are the current candidates:

- **Albania** (applied in 2009, confirmed as candidate June 2014, not expected to join EU until 2020 at the earliest).
- **Montenegro** (applied in 2008, confirmed as candidate December 2010, Montenegro’s Prime Minister has said he hopes his country will succeed in joining the EU before neighbouring Serbia or Macedonia).
- **Serbia** (applied in 2009, confirmed as candidate March 2012, unlikely to join the EU until 2020 at the earliest).
- The former Yugoslav Republic of **Macedonia** (applied in 2004, confirmed as candidate December 2005).
- **Turkey** (applied in 1987, confirmed as candidate December 1999, recent events may mean it is now on a fast track to EU membership).
No, I am not referring to our ‘contribution’ even though that is the EU taking £55 million of YOUR money every single day.

What I am referring to is the fact that EU membership is raising your cost of living and reducing your quality of life in ways which are less obvious but very real.

Let me explain.

We Brits are some of the worst-housed people in the world in relation to our overall standard of living and wealth.

We pay more - whether to buy or rent - for smaller, more cramped properties than people in similar countries. The underlying reason is simple: we do not have enough houses, we do not build enough or improve enough and what we do build is small and often loaded with social costs imposed by local authorities. It is worst in London and the area I represent, south-east England. It is the truth of life for millions.

Now this would be bad enough even if our population was static.

But it is not, it is growing: and much of that growth is the inevitable and automatic consequence of EU membership. It is illegal for us to try to control who comes into and stays in our country from the other 27 EU members.

Potential candidates:

- **Bosnia** and **Herzegovina** (has not yet formally applied for EU membership, The Commission says Bosnia is still plagued by an "unstable political climate" and ethnic divisions).
- **Kosovo** (last in the queue to join the EU because the international community remains split over its 2008 declaration of independence).

Impact of joining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>GDP (USD per head)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>2,831,700</td>
<td>$11,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>621,000</td>
<td>$15,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYR Macedonia</td>
<td>2,058,500</td>
<td>$13,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>7,164,000</td>
<td>$13,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>77,696,000</td>
<td>$19,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comparison, the average GDP in EU is $39,826.


EU hitting your pocket?

No, I am not referring to our ‘contribution’ even though that is the EU taking £55 million of YOUR money every single day.

What I am referring to is the fact that EU membership is raising your cost of living and reducing your quality of life in ways which are less obvious but very real.

Let me explain.

We Brits are some of the worst-housed people in the world in relation to our overall standard of living and wealth.

We pay more - whether to buy or rent - for smaller, more cramped properties than people in similar countries. The underlying reason is simple: we do not have enough houses, we do not build enough or improve enough and what we do build is small and often loaded with social costs imposed by local authorities. It is worst in London and the area I represent, south-east England. It is the truth of life for millions.

Now this would be bad enough even if our population was static.

But it is not, it is growing: and much of that growth is the inevitable and automatic consequence of EU membership. It is illegal for us to try to control who comes into and stays in our country from the other 27 EU members.
In truth, the official figures are very probably an under-estimate. Little-known but probably accurate work by supermarket statisticians suggests official figures are missing millions of people. As long ago as 2008, TESCO was quoted as saying that “they estimate the population of the UK to be closer to 80 million, based on the volume of certain staples that they sell.” A non-commercial agricultural institution has reckoned there are 77 million people currently in the UK, again based on how much we eat. (Incidentally, this may help explain significant discrepancies between population statistics and the numbers of national insurance numbers issued.)

There’s a complete mismatch between official population figures and those based on consumption estimates by food growers and retailers.

**UK population mismatch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Census</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.18 million</td>
<td>77 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph shows a significant difference between the official 2011 Census estimate and the estimate based on consumption. The official figure is lower, suggesting an under-estimate.

There is a complete mismatch between official population figures and those based on consumption estimates by food growers and retailers.

EU membership keeps our doors open.

So hard-working families who cannot get social housing, the young who cannot afford London rents, urban professionals who cannot afford to buy, growing families who cannot afford to move to have an extra room for their new child: all suffer directly from EU membership.

And, just as night follows day, this results in increasing demand for hospital beds in the NHS, school places, seats on commuter trains, parking spaces in town centres, and queues in doctor surgeries and government offices.

Frankly, all I am doing is spelling out facts - uncomfortable facts which frighten the British political class and the Eurocrats of Brussels.

Of course, I cannot give exact figures: that is because our country does not even know its own population and our border force do not systematically check EU citizens ‘in’ and ‘out’.

I cannot know numbers - and neither can anyone else. Yet, because it is not officially recorded does not mean it does not happen. An interviewer who demands the figures is being ridiculous when the logic is absolutely clear and only makes the basic assumptions of all causal analysis and behavioural economics.

Again, it is actually very simple: my opponents seek to blind you with statistics which give a misleading picture; they ignore how economies really work and pretend that the so-called ‘grey economy’ does not exist or is not important.

Please remember this as you mark your cross to say whether we should stay or leave the EU institutions helping to cause it all.

Population graph and estimates - sources

https://www.google.be/search?q=supermarket+Uk+population+under-estimate&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&gws_rd=cr&ei=8hKiVr7-KoaTsgHs2p_QCw

http://www.express.co.uk/comment/columnists/leo-mckinstry/3330977/Tories-fail-to-solve-immigration-crisis-that-blights-Britain.
Less to this than meets the eye

To coin a word, Dave's renegotiation is entirely underwhelming.

First, the extensive list of what has NOT happened: no treaty change, no repatriation of powers, no chance to make our own laws as we previously did, going back centuries and central to British culture and success. Dave has failed.

The so-called ‘red-card’ requires the support of over half the EU member states. Quite simply, this guarantees that the UK can only stop what a majority want to stop: that is a ‘red-card’ which is of no use whatsoever in the real world. It can only be used when so many EU member states object that a proposal would have been fairly easily stopped anyway. This means we cannot play this card when it actually matters for the British people - and that is no red card at all.

The UK needs to be able to stop what is wanted by others, sometimes all the others, but undermines British interests rooted in the UK’s different history, and political and legal culture. Dave has failed.

He has also failed over migration and benefits: our borders remain open and any relief to hard-pressed taxpayers in paying benefits to foreigners is short-term and temporary.

The core principle of non-discrimination which means you have to treat your own people and citizens from other members states identically remains in place and unchallenged. Dave has failed.

He has ditched pledges such that EU expenditure on agriculture and regional support, known as structural funds, will grow unchecked - and exacerbate the financial transfer eastwards as ever more poorer countries seek EU membership - including Turkey.

I have to say that Turkey seems to have run rings around EU negotiators in their exploitation of the situation in the Middle-East. It is a great shame that Dave has not shown comparable skill: Dave has failed.

More fundamentally, please look at what is written above about the future of the EU if we remain ‘in’. The ‘Moving Finger’ remains undisturbed in its movement: Merkel, Brok and co can continue their march to a United States of Europe undisturbed by anything Dave has said, done or negotiated.

David Cameron’s renegotiation is entirely comparable to Harold Wilson’s, a sham - and a dishonest one.

For, as we discovered in the decades after 1975, what you will get if the British people vote to remain is NOT the status quo. A vote to remain is NOT a ‘safe’ vote to keep things as they are. Far from being the risk-free option, it is the high-risk option.

A vote to remain is a vote to stay on an inexorable journey to a single destination which extinguishes all that makes Anglo-Saxon culture different - and I believe better. It is a vote for the vision described above as set out by Elmar Brok.
Mr Cameron has simply failed to deliver 10 pledges on which the British people were entitled to expect at least some positive results:

DITCHED PLEDGE 1
‘to restore social and employment legislation to national control’
(The Guardian, 6 March 2007)

DITCHED PLEDGE 2
‘limiting the European Court of Justice’s jurisdiction over criminal law to its pre-Lisbon level’
(Speech on EU, 4 November 2009)

DITCHED PLEDGE 3
‘treaty change that I’ll be putting in place before the referendum’
(Daily Telegraph, 5 January 2014)

DITCHED PLEDGE 4
‘a complete opt-out from the Charter of Fundamental Rights’
(Speech on EU, 4 November 2009)

DITCHED PLEDGE 5
‘we want EU jobseekers to have a job offer before they come here’
(speech at JCB, 28 November 2014)

DITCHED PLEDGE 6
‘if an EU jobseeker has not found work within six months, they will be required to leave’
speech at JCB, 28 November 2014

DITCHED PLEDGE 7
‘revising the [working time] directive at EU level to give the NHS the flexibility it needs’
(Hansard, 18 January 2012, col. 746)

DITCHED PLEDGE 8
‘the European Parliament must end its absurdly wasteful practice of meeting in Strasbourg as well as Brussels’
(Conservative Party European Election Manifesto)

DITCHED PLEDGE 9
‘further reform of the EU’s Common Agricultural Policy’
(Conservative Party Manifesto 2015, p.21)

DITCHED PLEDGE 10
‘further reform of … Structural Funds’
(Conservative Party Manifesto 2015, p.73)
Contemptible: (Cameron, Clegg, Corbyn & Co.)

It should be completely clear from all of the above what continued EU membership involves: EU institutions steadily displacing and replacing our own; the EU increasingly deciding what happens in OUR country, the laws we have, who crosses our borders, how highly we are taxed.

No re-negotiation outcome - no matter how skilfully or cunningly presented - is going to change that.

However, it leads to one further and final conclusion.

It is intellectually respectable to believe in these things and want the UK to pass ever more powers to Brussels.

I and millions of others are against it - but it is a reasonable position.

It is, broadly, the stance of most of my non-British opponents amongst the EU's elite.

I profoundly disagree with them but I CAN still respect people like Mr Brok, Mr Juncker and Mr Verhofstadt with their view that: 'yes, being in the EU does mean this but it is a good thing'. If you have the history of Germany or Belgium, let alone Croatia or Romania, who is to say that they are not right - for their country. Their politicians are at least being honest.

But the British political class is not saying this.

They are being dishonest. They are trying to conceal from the British people that this is what continued EU membership must

In 1975, most voters still had the experience of war and, for the oldest voters, two world wars. In those times and crises, the country came together as one.

Voters believed that politicians of the stature of Attlee and Churchill, whatever their political differences, sought to act in the best interests of the nation. The result was a sense of trust in the British political class, a trust Edward Heath and Harold Wilson were able to draw upon and exploit ruthlessly.

Forty years on, we live - thankfully - in a different world.

Each successive generation is less prepared to take them at their word or give them the benefit of the doubt without questioning. The public spectacles of lying politicians, 'dodgy dossiers', refusals to resign under any circumstances and expenses scandals have all eroded public belief in the trustworthiness of our political class.

Additionally and even more profoundly, we are experiencing a 'media revolution'. In 1975, the media was limited to a few TV and radio stations and the national newspapers, which could be collectively influenced.

Today, a massive growth in the number and multiplicity of outlets - the social media revolution - has broken exclusivity and the ability to restrict and control information. (It is only through such new media as YouTube that I was able to make Herman van Rompuy famous: I hope he is grateful!)

In short, they can no longer limit as they once could what we think, know and say.

As a result, we no longer trust them as we once did.

Deference is dead. And, this whole argument depends upon that. I believe that the UK is better able now to question authority than it ever has been before - and, for that reason, see through the lies, damn lies and statistics of those we used to defer to but trust no longer.

We see them as they really are.
mean. It was the lie of Wilson, Heath, Jenkins etc. in 1975 and it the same falsehood being peddled today.

You cannot have your cake and eat it.

You cannot save your money and spend it.

You cannot remain in the European Union and not be subsumed within it.

The ‘stay-in’ side could make an honest argument and say this is what EU membership inevitably means - and then seek to explain why it is the best option for the people of this country.

They could, but they do not - because they know their arguments are weak, and that British people do not believe them and will not be taken-in.

In the commercial world where, unlike most politicians, I made an honest living for twenty years or so, this is actually a crime. It is known as ‘issuing a false prospectus’.

Like Heath, Jenkins and Wilson before them, that is exactly what Cameron, Clegg Corbyn & Co are trying to get away with - and all using your taxpayers’ money. If they succeed it will be at your expense both metaphorically and literally.

That is why I believe they are contemptible - and why this time, I believe there will be not be a repeat of the 1975 result on 23rd June 2016 – independence day...

The referendum is on 23rd June 2016. Be sure to vote as it may our last chance to walk away from the EU.

HOW TO FIND OUT MORE

Have a look at the EFDD website
Europe of Freedom and Democracy
http://www.efddgroup.eu

Have a look at UKIP’s website
United Kingdom Independence Party
http://www.ukip.org/
Not worth the paper
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The EU Referendum Deal

In this damning assessment of the machinations and falsehoods that have accompanied Britain’s membership of the European Union, Nigel Farage, Co-President of Europe of Freedom and Direct Democracy, and leader of the United Kingdom Independence Party, examines the role of the EU and British establishment in pulling the wool over the eyes of the British electorate. His particular focus is twofold. Firstly, he examines the 1975 Referendum on membership of what was then called (misleadingly) the ‘Common Market’ and how in the forthcoming referendum, the same old spin will be used to try and mislead or mesmerise us, and, secondly, how a vote to remain in the EU will not be a vote for the status quo, but a vote to continue the decline of this nation’s sovereignty.