

# WHY WE LEFT THE EU - a summary

- A) The democratic deficit.** The UK joined a "Common Market"; the people did NOT sanction a federal state, but THAT is what the CPE (Continental Political Elite) has relentlessly tried to develop over the last 40 years. Each successive Treaty has increased the power and control of Brussels over British life. The British wish to remain within a sovereign state with control over its own government and laws.
- B) The euro has been a disaster.** This opinion may surprise those who have grown up with it and known nothing else. Not everyone shares my opinion, but I have given the reasons fully in the online article at the site below. Basically:
- A) There has never been a successful common currency without full fiscal union = the same legal, taxation and other financial regulations.
  - B) It could not work long-term with such imbalanced economies as Germany at one end of the spectrum and Greece at the other.
  - C) The CPE (Continental Political Elite) knew this, AND that there would be a major crisis at some time down the line, but they hoped to USE such a crisis to force further steps towards a federal state.
  - D) THIS IS EXACTLY WHAT THEY ARE DOING AT THIS VERY MOMENT: it is obvious that Greece must leave the euro, but Herr Schulz has said this is not going to happen. Nobody knows how he is going to square this circle, as the German public will (probably) not accept the writing off of Greek debt with German taxpayers' money (but they may not be asked for their opinion).
- (see the fuller article on the euro here: <http://www.cs-efl.net/eu/euro.pdf>)**
- C) The cost: we pay 35 million euros NET per DAY in Foreign Aid to the EU.** In the end, we are not convinced it is value-for-money. In addition, immigrants (including from EU countries) place a massive additional net cost burden on welfare, schooling, health and housing. SOME immigrants do jobs that many Brits might not do (intensive fruit-picking and so on), but we cannot operate a system of importing only workers NEEDED: we have to accept ALL EU citizens who can enter freely.
- If everything else were OK, perhaps these costs would be acceptable, but everything else is NOT OK.
- D) Employment:** incoming EU workers (and there are many) are prepared to work for much lower incomes than native Brits - this is because the standard of living and value of the currency in their own countries are much lower than in the UK. **This obviously depresses wages for the indigenous people.**
- E) Trade:** we are not allowed to make our OWN trade deals with ANY country outside the EU and we have little choice over what the EU decides. The EU is basically protectionist, and this leads to our food bills in particular being higher than they would be outside the EU. The rationale for this is to protect French farming from more competition. To put it another way, **the British taxpayer subsidizes French farming**, which is not something easy to sell to the British consumer. It also penalises producers from poorer countries such as in Africa.
- F) Fishing:** on joining the EU the UK GAVE UP 66% of its national fishing rights - before we joined we owned 80% of the fish in EU waters; now we can land only some 25% of the permitted EU catch. Dutch, French and Spanish boats take most of the fish in British waters.
- G) Freedom of Movement:** another fundamental element of a unified state. The problem is that South-East England is horrendously overcrowded: **France would have to take in ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-MILLION IMMIGRANTS to have the same population density.** 200,000 Roma gypsies have moved from Rumania to England, and so on. WE ARE FULL. Despite this, the EU wants to get Turkey, Ukraine and the Balkans into the EU, which many LEAVERS consider to be insane. (remember the Coudenhove-Kalergi conspiracy!)

- H) **Border Controls:** for EU citizens we have NO control over who enters the country - **KNOWN serious criminals cannot be refused entry:** many British citizens have had their lives ruined by known foreign criminals - we are not prepared to accept this “collateral damage” for the sake of a federalist obsession.
- I) **Laws:** up to 80% of British law is now proposed and passed in Brussels and we usually have NO CHOICE but to accept what is proposed. **MOST of these laws are NEVER debated in the British parliament in London.**
- J) **Bureaucracy:** the obsession with regulation and paperwork is absurdly high in France and France’s concept of bureaucracy was the model used when the EU was set up. The French “Code du Travail” is some 3,600 pages; in Switzerland it is 60 pages ..... Regulation and paperwork mean CONTROL and POWER: the more of the former you have the more of the latter. The British are more pragmatic; since we joined the EU, the tsunami of regulations from across the Channel has been constant and stifling.
- K) **Waste:** Brussels receives VAST sums from the net donors (Germany, Britain and a few others). Much is spent on moronic schemes of which examples abound. This is all hard-earned taxpayers’ money, but bureaucrats use other people’s free money in a different way to that used by the people who actually earned it.
- L) **Corruption & Venality:** the EU has NEVER had its accounts fully signed off by auditors: examples of fraud are widespread and legendary. In addition, they pay themselves vast and low-taxed incomes with innumerable expenses. **It is said that TEN THOUSAND EU employees earn more than the British PM.** Unfortunately, venality and cronyism are rife in Brussels, a place where failed national politicians can get a highly-paid sinecure when thrown out by their own governments.
- M) **Expansion:** the EU is determined to expand its power and numbers; it is obsessed with bringing the Balkans, Turkey and Ukraine into the EU. We do not agree that this is desirable or wise; **we certainly NEVER signed up to that in 1972.**
- N) **Defence:** the EU is now actively planning to build an EU-army, unified defence forces being another fundamental part of a federal state. It prides itself on having “saved Europe”, which is a disgusting LIE. It is NATO that “saved Europe”: the American, British and French forces stationed in Germany for decades deterred the Soviet Union from an attack that they would dearly like to have made; the EU had NOTHING to do with it. Many claim that the EU has deterred Germany from making war again, but this is a different issue. Germany started two world wars not because Europe was not a federal state but because democracy in Germany was too weak (which is NOT the case now). **What is needed is stronger democracy, not federation. Ironically, the EU has brought WEAKER democracy, and THIS has led to deep divisions within Europe. (HINT - for stronger democracy, look at the SWISS model!)**

The HEART of NATO is obviously the United States, which therefore bears the greatest cost. **EU countries are supposed to spend 2% of their GDP to support NATO, but most NEVER HAVE.** Now the USA under the very non-PC Trump is complaining. From his point of view, why should the USA endlessly subsidize the defence of Europe if European countries are not prepared to pay themselves?

In my opinion, Frau Merkel is putting the security of Europe at risk by downplaying NATO and talking about a European Army. And what are the Russians going to make of such an army dominated by Germany but without the ultimate protection of NATO (aka the USA?). And this in a Europe which is trying to bring Ukraine into its orbit, a country which the Russians actually consider to be part of Russia. It is all INSANE.

**SUMMARY:** Not EVERYTHING the EU does and has done is bad, but it is OUTWEIGHED by the above, which is why we voted LEAVE..

**PROGNOSIS?** When something goes wrong, it often has to get worse before it gets better. My own feeling is that ultimately the EU will be forced to reform and something better will come out of all this. People used to say to the British (even the Germans said this): **“Stay in the EU and reform it from inside.”** But the federalist obsession is TOO STRONG. Britain has been in the EU for FORTY YEARS and been able to change NOTHING.

If the Continent wants a federal state, fine - good luck. But we do not agree that this is the best way forward. Or if it is, it CANNOT BE FORCED on the peoples of Europe in a few decades and above all not without a democratic vote.

For us, the idea that people should be obliged to give up their sovereignty without being able to vote on it is totally ABSURD. I would go further and say that an attempt by a “We-know-best” elite to take control of a country from its people is a key element of fascism. Sadly, the EU became a mechanism for an elite which thinks it knows best to force its opinions onto the masses. The British have said “NO”, and we will not be the only ones.

**POSTSCRIPT: In my personal opinion, historians of the future will judge Frau Merkel very harshly for these reasons:**

1. Herr Jean-Claude Juncker was basically imposed on the EU by Frau Merkel against British objections (nothing much happens in the EU without German approval). He has been a very bad President of the EU Commission, particularly in terms of Public Relations: arrogant, overtly and obsessively pro-federation and condescending and insulting towards the British. He personally has had a very negative affect on British public opinion.
2. Frau Merkel unilaterally invited millions of fit, young Muslim males to Europe. As far as I am aware, she did not consult either her neighbours or her own people about this decision, which had a similarly bad press in Britain.
3. Germany has not paid its AGREED way in NATO for many years and is now openly planning a European Army to replace NATO. This is in my opinion absolutely stupid and not in the best interests of Europe’s security.

The LEAVE campaign won decisively but by only some 4%. My belief is that if someone wiser and more conciliatory than Frau Merkel and Herr Juncker had been running the EU then the British might well have voted to REMAIN - WE WILL NEVER KNOW .....

Chris Snuggs - February 2017