

# **RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE**

## **EUROPEAN PLEBISCITE SPECIAL; No 4**

### **EDITORIAL**

**DeGAULLE WAS RIGHT  
TO THE HEADMASTER'S STUDY  
THE END AND THE BEGINING**

### **CONTENTS**

**OUT – AND INTO THE WORLD: WHY THE SPECTATOR IS FOR LEAVE**

*The Spectator; via Sonya Porter*

**LABOUR'S VOTE-TO- LEAVE CAMPAIGN**

*Labour Leave*

**OPEN BORDERS IN CAPITAL AND TRADE**

*Van Gelis; Campaign against Euro-federalism; via John Newell*

**NEOLIBERALISM INFECTS THE EU DEBATE**

*Chris Shaw; Libertarian Alliance Blog*

**ANOTHER EUROPE IS POSSIBLE**

*A World to Win*

**END OF EU: LEFT-WING CAMPAIGNERS BEG BRITS TO WIN BREXIT AND  
BEGIN FALL OF EUROPE**

*Zoie O'Brien; Daily Express; via John Newell*

**JP MORGAN WANTS EUROPE TO BE RID OF SOCIAL RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY,  
EMPLOYEE RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO PROTEST**

*Richard Murphy; Tax Research UK; via John Newell*

**PROTECT OUR DEFENCE AND SECURITY – VOTE TO LEAVE THE EU**

*Colonel Richard Kemp and The Bruges Group*

## POWERS OF THE EU

*Rodney Atkinson; Freenations*

## GUARDIAN PEDDLING LIES

*Richard North; EU Referendum*

## EU COMMISSIONERS OATH & PRIVY OATH

*talk2ktc@yahoo.co.uk*

## 'RIGGING' THE UK'S EU REFERENDUM ... HOW TO COUNTER CHEATING AT THE COUNT.

*Sonya Porter and Rodney Atkinson; Freenations*

# EDITORIAL

## DeGAULLE WAS RIGHT

Using the Five Presidents' Report as a blueprint, the EU seems set to press ahead with its final run towards the continental megastate. It was always the intention that this final step towards so-called 'fiscal integration' ... effectively removing the last *de facto* vestige of national independence from the states of Europe ... would be built around the Euro. That is why the Euro is sacrosanct; no price is too high, in the suffering inflicted upon the economies of peripheral Europe, to save the Euro.

So even if we vote to Remain, we will have to confront this conundrum sooner rather than later. What intensity of pressure will be put upon us to become a province of the megastate? If we remain obstinate, what future is there going to be for us anyway in being a marginalised, peripheral bolt-on, half in and half out of a new Carolingian empire?

So a Remain vote will resolve nothing in our relationship with the rest of Europe. In a few short years it is inevitable that we will be right back to square one.

When General DeGaulle refused our first application to join more than half a century ago, he pointed to our wholly different tradition and outlook. Indeed, for long periods we have been relatively detached from the affairs of continental Europe. Uniquely amongst the major European states, we have never sought territorial conquest or hegemony. Our legal, political and constitutional structures and traditions are different. We have a blue water history and a blue water outlook on the world.

In that last regard the EU likes to think of itself as the great *Caput Mundi*. It isn't. When all said and done ... and this crucially impacts on issues such as the environment, financial regulation, 'security', energy security, and the Tobin Tax ... it is only 7% of the global population on 5% of its landmass.

De Gaulle was right.

## TO THE HEADMASTER'S STUDY

As remarked in the last editorial we hear little from the Remain camp about any of the alleged 'benefits' of the EU and much about the fist being waved in our faces from the neoliberal global oligarchy. As the polls tighten these threats have become

increasingly hysterical.

Osborne's threat of a 'punishment budget' scrapes the barrel. At least it was treated with howls of derision from many in his own party.

But perhaps these threats are not as incredible as they might seem. The oligarchs have some powerful economic tools at their disposal ... destabilisation of the currency, disinvestment and trade war being three that come immediately to mind.

As Chris Shaw's article wisely points out, virtually all of the mainstream debate (including *Brexit the Movie*) has been predicated on neoliberal economics. The trouble is that such views are engraved into the rock of received dogma and any challenge to them has still not progressed far beyond a few intelligent margins.

So the cart has been put before the horse. First, challenge the neo-liberal dogma and its simplistic lies regarding 'free trade' and the nature of 'wealth creation'.

In the event of a Brexit vote, there is every chance that we will be called to the headmasters' study and given a sound whacking. Can we take it?

## THE END AND THE BEGINING

Having been present at, or witnessed on television, many election counts, I always feel a little bemused at the cheering for the winning party. The thought is always present that such jubilation should be reserved for the end of a parliamentary term ... that this is just the start rather than the end. If the winning party has got it 30% right by that time, it will have done well.

So it is with the plebiscite. If the vote is to Remain the pressure to become part of the Euro megastate will be intense and Leavers will be able to say, 'I told you so', whilst actively resisting further measures at 'integration'. The SNP have shown that one adverse result is not necessarily the end of the story.

If, on the other hand, the result is for Brexit, no effort will be spared by the oligarchs to ignore or circumvent the result, so constant vigilance will be needed, if necessary organising civil resistance.

So, to underscore a point made by Richard North the task will just be starting on June 24th. It is therefore vital for Leave camp to remain organisations in being.

*Frank Taylor*

## OUT – AND INTO THE WORLD: WHY THE SPECTATOR IS FOR LEAVE

*The Spectator; via Sonya Porter*

***We were right in 1975, and we're right again now***

The Spectator has a long record of being isolated, but right. We supported the north against the slave-owning south in the American civil war at a time when news-papers (and politicians) could not see past corporate interests. We argued for the decriminalisation of homosexuality a decade before it happened, and were denounced as the 'bugger's bugle' for our troubles. We alone supported Margaret Thatcher when she first stood for the Tory leadership. And when Britain last held a referendum on Europe, every newspaper in the land advocated a 'yes' vote. Only two national titles backed what is now called Brexit: the Morning Star and The Spectator.

Our concern then was simple: we did not believe that the Common Market was just about trade. We felt it would be followed by an attempted common government, which would have disastrous effects on a continent distinguished by its glorious diversity. The whole project seemed to be a protectionist scam, an attempt to try to build a wall around the continent rather than embrace world trade. Such European parochialism, we argued, did not suit a globally minded country such as Britain. On the week of the 1975 referendum, *The Spectator's* cover line was: 'Out – and into the world.' We repeat that line today.

Since 1975 the EU has mutated in exactly the way we then feared and now resembles nothing so much as the Habsburg Empire in its dying days. A bloated bureaucracy that has outgrown all usefulness. A parliament that represents many nations, but with no democratic legitimacy. Countries on its periphery pitched into poverty, or agitating for secession. The EU's hunger for power has been matched only by its incompetence. The European Union is making the people of our continent poorer, and less free.

This goes far beyond frustration at diktats on banana curvature. The EU has started to deform our government. Michael Gove revealed how, as a cabinet member, he regularly finds himself having to process edicts, rules and regulations that have been framed at European level. Laws that no one in Britain had asked for, and which no one elected to the House of Commons has the power to change. What we refer to as British government is increasingly no such thing. It involves the passing of laws written by people whom no one in Britain elected, no one can name and no one can remove.

Steve Hilton, David Cameron's chief strategist for many years, gave an example of this institutional decay. A few months into his job in No. 10, he was dismayed to find his colleagues making slow progress because they were all bogged down by paperwork that he didn't recognise. He asked for an audit, and was shocked by the results: only a third of what the government was doing was related to its agenda. Just over half was processing orders from Brussels. To him, this was more than just a headache: it was an insidious and accelerating bureaucratic takeover.

With the EU's fundamental lack of democracy comes complacency on the part of its leaders and the corruption of those around them — which has led us to the present situation. Voters are naturally concerned about the extraordinary rise of immigration, and their governments' inability to control it. Free movement of people might have been a laudable goal before the turn of the century, when the current global wave of migration started. But today, with the world on the move, the system strikes a great many Europeans as madness. The EU's failure to handle immigration has encouraged the people trafficking industry, a global evil that has led to almost 3,000 deaths in the Mediterranean so far this year.

In theory, the EU is supposed to protect its member states by insisting that refugees claim asylum in the first country they enter. In practice, this law — the so-called Dublin Convention — was torn up by Angela Merkel when she recklessly said that all Syrians could settle in Germany if they somehow managed to get there. Blame lies not with the tens of thousands who subsequently arrived but with a system hopelessly unequal to such a complex and intensifying challenge.

The *Spectator* was, again, alone in the British press in opposing Britain's entry to the Exchange Rate Mechanism from the beginning. Why, we asked, should the Bundesbank control another country's interest rates? When the single currency came along, the risks became greater: what if a country's economy crashed, but it was denied the stimulus of a devaluing currency?

The answer can now be seen across Europe. Sado-austerity in Italy. Youth unemployment of about 50 per cent in Greece and Spain. The evisceration of these economies, in the name of a project supposed to bring people together, has been a tragedy.

Last week, a Pew poll showed how far dismay about the EU extends across the continent. In Greece, 71 per cent now view the EU unfavourably; in France, it's 61 per cent. In Britain, it was 48 per cent — about the same as Spain, Germany and the Netherlands. This was why David Cameron had a strong case for renegotiation: the demand for change was widespread, and growing. A recent poll has suggested that Swedes will vote to leave the EU if Britain does. The absence of a deal worth the name was final proof that the EU is structurally incapable of reform.

Jean-Claude Juncker, the unelected president of the European Commission, sees intransigence as a great strength. His priority is the survival of the EU and the single currency: the welfare of Europeans and even the notion of democratic consent seem distant concerns. When he dismisses the ever-louder voices of protest as the shriek of 'populism', he echoes the Bertolt Brecht poem: 'Would it not be easier... to dissolve the people/ and elect another?' When Britain asked for reform, he took a gamble: that we were bluffing and would not dare vote to leave.

All this has placed the Prime Minister in an impossible position. Unable to make a positive case for staying in the EU, he instead tells us that Britain is trapped within it and that the penalties for leaving are too severe. His scare stories, peppered with made-up statistics, have served only to underline the emptiness of the case for remaining. It also represents a style of politics that many find repugnant. The warnings from the IMF and OECD and other acronyms have served only to reinforce the caricature of a globalised elite telling the governed what to think.

Talk of anyone being made 'worse off' by Brexit is deeply misleading. Of the many economists who have made projections for 2030, none have suggested that we'd be poorer. The question is whether we'd be, say, 36 per cent better off or 41 per cent better off by then. Not that anyone knows, given the monstrously large margin of error in 15-year predictions. So these studies offer no real reasons to be fearful. This is perhaps why George Osborne had to resort to concocting figures, such as his now notorious claim that households would be £4,300 worse off. If the economic case against Brexit were so strong, why would the Chancellor have to resort to fabrications?

As the world's fifth-largest economy, Britain has a reasonable chance (to put it mildly) of being able to cut trade deals with countries keen to access our consumers. The worst-case scenario is to use World Trade Organisation rules, tariffs of about 4 per cent. That's a relatively small mark-up, and the effect would be more than offset by a welcome drop in the pound. And if house prices fall, as the Chancellor predicts, then so much the better. A great many would-be homeowners have been praying for just that.

There would certainly be turbulence, which would be the price of our leaving the EU. This would affect City financiers more than the skilled working class (two thirds of whom support Brexit). This week, we're being invited to panic at the prospect of a falling pound. But why? A weaker currency would give our exporters the stimulus they need.

The question at this referendum is not whether Britain should co-operate with our European allies; the question is how. Sir Richard Dearlove, former head of MI6, has explained how our intelligence alliances are bilateral. Our closest is with the 'five eyes' of the United States, Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The Lancaster House agreements with France over military co-operation is another example. Alliances work when they are between nations with a shared agenda, with the ability and (crucially) the will to act.

The EU is an alliance of the unwilling, which is why it is useless on security — as we saw with Bosnia and Libya. Even the migrant crisis has to be handled by Nato, which has been the true guarantor of western security. It's sometimes claimed that Vladimir Putin would want Britain to vote for Brexit. This is unlikely: what could suit the Kremlin more than European security being entrusted to the most dysfunctional organisation in the West?

As David Cameron rightly says, the British way is to fight rather than quit. Given that the EU has proved that it is structurally incapable of reform, we now have a choice. Do we cave in, because we're too scared to leave? Or do we vote to retrieve our sovereignty, walk away from the whole racket and engage with the world on our own terms? A vote to leave would represent an extraordinary vote of confidence in the project of the United Kingdom and the principle of national self-determination. It would also show reform-minded Europeans that theirs is not a lost cause. And that we stand willing to help forge a Europe based on freedom, co-operation and respect for sovereignty.

The value of sovereignty cannot be measured by any economist's formula. Adam Smith, the father of economics, first observed that the prosperity of a country is decided by whether it keeps its 'laws and institutions' healthy. This basic insight explains why nations thrive or fail, and has been the great secret of British success: intellectual, artistic, scientific and industrial. The principles of the Magna Carta and achievements of the Glorious Revolution led to our emergence as a world power. To pass up the chance to stop our laws being overridden by Luxembourg and our democracy eroded by Brussels would be a derogation of duty to this generation and the next.

No one — economist, politician or mystic — knows what tumult we can expect in the next 15 years. But we do know that whatever happens, Britain will be better able to respond and adapt as a sovereign country living under its own laws. The history of the last two centuries can be summed up in two words: democracy matters. Let's vote to defend it on 23 June.

# LABOUR'S VOTE-TO- LEAVE CAMPAIGN

## *Labour Leave*

### **6 reasons to leave the EU**

- The UK gives Brussels £50m every day, £350m every week, £19bn every year – nearly 20% of the EU's budget
- The UK Parliament is not allowed to decide how best to support key sectors like manufacturing, farming & fishing
- UK exports to the EU have shrunk from 51% to 43%
- Freeing our NHS, railways and public services from inefficient private contractors is under threat from the USA TTIP trade treaty
- Agriculture is 1.6% of the EU economy, employs fewer than 5.5% of the population but the CAP swallows 40% of the EU budget
- Animal welfare – page 7. CAP adds £7 a week to our food bills and causes poverty in Africa – page 6
- The benefits of life outside the EU

*“As a former Labour Defence Minister I believe that our security, defence and industry are best protected by taking an independent position outside the EU.”*

***Lewis Moonie, MP for Kirkcaldy 1987-2005 Baron Moonie of Bennoch***

### ***Toyota pledges to stay in the UK after EU exit***

*“We will continue to make cars in the East Midlands if Britain were to leave the EU. We want to deepen our roots in the UK.”*

***Toyota Chief Executive Aido Toyoda***

The EU is delivering 6 body-blows to UK Workers' Rights. Six actions by the EU and the European judges are delivering hammer blows to workers here in the UK:

- Zero hours contracts are being promoted under EU Flexible Labour Market rules.
- Collective bargaining has been attacked and weakened in Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Romania as an EU bailout condition.
- The 'Viking-Line' case in the ECJ threatens to impose lower wages than the UK minimum wage – allowing companies using an HQ address of convenience in Poland or Romania to impose the overseas minimum wage on their UK workers.
- The EU's free movement of labour rules are exploiting workers, allowing unscrupulous employers to import cheap labour and force down UK wage rates.
- TTIP will block a Labour government taking back control of privatised NHS and rail facilities. The EU/USA Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership toughens the EU's ability to fine Governments that remove hospital services, railways and other contracts from private companies.
- Compulsory competitive tendering of all railway networks will be mandatory from 2019 under new EU laws – over-ruling our UK Parliament.

### ***The EU's latest attack on workers' rights***

What Trade Union Leaders are saying about the EU's TTIP Treaty

*“Anyone who thinks the EU is protecting UK workers in 2016 is living in the past.”*

***Ian Hodson BFAWU President***

*“Make no mistake, we are in the fight of our lives to save the NHS from being sold off lock, stock and barrel. You need to be worried about TTIP.”*

***Len McCluskey, UNITE General Secretary***

*“TTIP will lower social and environmental standards.”*

***Paul Kenny, GMB General Secretary***

*“Public services should have exemption from the controversial TTIP trade deal between the European Union and the US.”*

***Dave Prentis, UNISON General Secretary***

Alan Johnson MP, Leader of the 'IN' Campaign gave their game away: "*Austerity, Greece, the manifest lack of democracy and accountability all are spreading disillusionment about the EU among the left.*"

### ***Toxic TTIP Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership – the latest Brussels sell-out***

FOI requests show Brussels is concluding secret negotiations with the USA to remove restraints on US & EU companies. These will be legally binding on the UK – but we are shut out of the negotiations. The EU/USA Transatlantic Trade & Investment Partnership can block a Labour government taking back control of privatised NHS and Rail facilities. TTIP toughens the EU's ability to fine Governments that remove hospital services, railways and other contracts from private companies.

#### **Six Reasons to Reject TTIP**

- The NHS: Public services, especially the NHS, are in the firing line. One of the main aims of TTIP is to open up Europe's public health, education and water services to US companies. This could essentially mean the privatisation of the NHS.
- Food and environmental safety: TTIP seeks to bring EU standards on food safety and the environment closer to those of the US. But US regulations are much less strict with far laxer restrictions on the use of pesticides and other toxic products. The EU currently bans 1,200 substances from use in cosmetics while the US bans just 12. The US allows growth hormones in its beef which are restricted in Europe due to links to cancer.
- Banking regulations: TTIP can be used to remove the tough new banking regulations, effectively handing powers back to the bankers.
- Privacy: TTIP is pressing for laxer data privacy laws and a restriction of public access to pharmaceutical companies' clinical trials.
- Jobs: TTIP will cause unemployment as jobs switch to the US, where labour standards and trade union rights are lower. The US bilateral trade agreement with Mexico and Canada caused the loss of one million jobs over 12 years.
- Democracy: TTIP's biggest threat to society is its inherent assault on democracy. Its Investor-State Dispute Settlements (ISDS), allow companies to sue governments if their policies cause a loss of profits. In effect it means unelected transnational corporations can dictate the policies of democratically elected governments.

"TTIP is an assault on European and US societies by transnational corporations. Over 3m people have signed our petition." John Hilary, War-on-Want

### ***A great future, marketing to the World***

Our percentage of UK/EU trade is shrinking, but expanding globally. Our EU trade deficit is a staggering £62bn – but we have a £27bn trade surplus with the rest of the world.

- When the UK joined 43 years ago, the nine EEC countries accounted for 37% of world GDP. This figure has been shrinking and EU GDP will fall to 22% by 2025.
- In 2013 the EU countries exported £292bn worth of goods and services to us – we are their biggest market - not the other way round. The UK is the fifth biggest exporter and economy on the planet. The performance of EU economies is poor.
- The EU depends on the UK buying their goods. Germany exports £11.5bn cars to the UK; Italy exports £363m shoes; France exports £940m wine; Spain exports £537m fruit.
- The UK's share of exports to the EU has tumbled from 51% twenty years ago to 43% now – while our exports to the rest of the world are soaring.
- The EU will continue to be an important market but they sell far more to us than we do to them. Now the world has become our best market.
- 43 countries outside the EU, like Mexico, have EU trade agreements so that they don't have to pay tariffs on goods. We will join them.
- The EU forced us to give up our separate seat at the WTO – and now wants our seat on the UN Security Council. We say "no".
- When we leave the EU, we will get our seat on the WTO back. Unshackled from the EU, we will be free to make our own agreements with new powerhouse economies such as Brazil, the Phillipines and Commonwealth members like India.

Inward investment into the UK by overseas businesses is driven by the strength of the UK economy and by our far better prospects of growth than the stagnating EU. Freedom from Brussels will make the UK an even more attractive place to invest in.

Neither side would have any appetite for a trade war. We are their biggest export market.

5 million EU jobs depend on exports to the UK including 1m German jobs, 309,000 Italian, 494,000 French and 421,000 Spanish jobs. The UK is their biggest market.

## ***We'll take control of EU Structural Funds***

The UK gives £19bn pa to Brussels and gets back less than £1.2bn pa in Structural Funds:

• England gets £726m • Scotland gets £94m • Wales gets £253m • NI gets £54m. And Brussels dictates to us how all this is spent

Our Security is vital – and best safeguarded by our Parliament free from Brussels interference

The UK's security is best protected by us having our seat on the UN Security Council, and remaining members of NATO, Interpol, OSCE and the OECD – not being tied to the coat tails of Brussels.

## ***Reasons why the UK will thrive out of the EU; EU support for tax-dodging multinationals***

*"We have to end EU visa discrimination against our Commonwealth Citizens. It is a matter of justice."*

***Khalid Mahmood MP***

Leaving the EU gives us £19bn pa to spend on OUR priorities. UK is strong enough to be a self-governing democracy.

- For farmers, our Parliament will decide on the support they need – not Brussels.
- Our fishing communities will be supported to harness a great renewable resource.
- Our industries will get the help they need – including tough anti-dumping laws.
- Once outside the Common External Tariff, we will sign multiple free-trade agreements with India, Australia, the USA and other leading economies. A new free-trade deal with China will give us cheap solar panels – banned by the EU. Cheaper energy means lower UK production costs and competitive exports.
- Scrapping EU restrictions on clinical trials will ensure we become again a world leader in medical research.
- EU bans on vitamin supplements and herbal remedies were sponsored by Big Pharma and closed down many health shops. We'll reverse the ban.
- We'll back our universities which attract the world's brightest students, but suffered £2bn cuts in the EU's Horizon science budget to fund the Euro-bailout.

Tax dodging multinationals are running rings round Brussels

- McDonald's, Starbucks and Amazon do the bulk of their business in the UK, but EU has allowed Luxembourg to become the tax-haven of choice for tax-dodging multinationals.
- The European Court of Justice enforces the rights of EU states as tax havens.
- It outlaws attempts by the UK to crack down on these tax cheats.
- And the architect of Luxembourg's tax-cheat regime was their Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker – now the President of the European Commission.

After we leave the EU, we'll be free to levy a fair tax on companies that are making hundreds of millions here in the UK.

## ***The immoral Common Agricultural Policy***

EU Agriculture is just 1.6% of the EU economy, employs fewer than 5.5% of the population, but Brussels gives the CAP 40% of the entire EU budget. Import controls and red tape add £7 a week to our food bills.

- The UK Parliament has very little say on what Brussels gives to our farmers.
- The Common Agricultural Policy costs British taxpayers £5bn a year BUT UK farmers get back less than £3bn a year.
- The CAP adds £361 a year to the average family of four's food bill because of import restrictions from non-EU countries and artificially high prices.
- The CAP gets £43 billion every year – 40% of the entire EU budget. This is after 54 years of so-called 'reform'. We are sick of hearing promises to reform CAP.
- This £43bn EU subsidy to agriculture is a larger sum than the entire GDP of each of 123 countries out of 193 countries in the United Nations like Bulgaria or Uganda.
- The immoral CAP drives farmers in developing countries into poverty through EU dumping and tariff barriers.
- The WTO slammed Brussels for operating an illegal £1.3bn sugar regime to undercut African farmers spreading poverty and misery to the poorest countries.

Leaving the EU will cut the cost of our weekly shop by £7 - 'reform' has achieved nothing

The CAP gives the richest land owners the biggest subsidies – including multinational agri-businesses. A fishing industry destroyed by the EU 60% of fish consumed in the EU have to be imported from outside the EU. Gross mismanagement of EU fishing policy has all-but-destroyed our once-thriving

fishing industry. We need to take back control.

- In 1972 Brussels estimated the UK owned 4/5ths of the Europe's fishing stocks.
- Since we joined the EEC, the number of jobs in fishing has halved.
- Catches from the North Sea have dropped by 2/3rds in the past twenty years.
- Cod stocks have declined by 70% in the past ten years.
- Today 75% of EU fishing stocks are overfished.

It is time to take back control of our territorial waters and reverse 44 years of EU failure. Iceland whose territorial waters are one ninth the size of the UK's, has overtaken the UK fishing catch thanks to Brussels.

### ***UK animal welfare standards at risk***

The drive to improve the conditions that animals are reared in has been undermined by lax enforcement and blatant non-compliance.

The EU has put animal welfare and UK farmers into second place. Other EU nations are not adhering to legislation. This compromises the welfare of animals, the livelihoods of our farmers and the health of consumers.

- From Horse Passports to the Pet Travel Scheme, lax EU enforcement puts us all at risk.
- The UK banned sow stalls in 1999, but 17 EU countries continued to use them. The British Pig Executive estimated that over 70% of imported pork and pork products were produced in conditions that would be illegal in the UK.
- Compassion in World Farming found animals held at borders in inhumane conditions for days. Over 3 million cattle, sheep and pigs have been exported to non-EU countries, many in disgraceful conditions.
- The UK ban on intensive battery cages was ignored by other EU states.
- The lack of transparency in labelling means that consumers are being deceived.
- All these abuses increase the pressure to use factory farming methods.

### ***Why Norway is not begging to join the EU?***

Norway values the right of its parliament to decide what is best for Norwegians without EU interference. Norway decides its contribution to EU programmes and what rules it accepts or rejects. We are told by EU grandees that Norway has to accept a terrible deal from the EU– so why do the Norwegians not want to join the EU under any circumstances?

Why is the EU against the £ and forcing the Euro on countries?

Brussels desperately wants the UK to share the cost of bailing out failing EU economies. Every country joining the EU is forced to accept the Euro.

We oppose joining the Euro and will never scrap the pound.

***Ian Hodson Trade Union Leader says:*** “Brussels takes more powers year on year – it never accept the status quo. EU Zero hours contracts are the latest disgrace.”

***President, Bakers Union David Tang Founder ST Fashions says:*** “As Europe's economic power declines in the new world order, this country needs the confidence to go it alone. Britain should look east for a prosperous future outside the EU.”

***Kate Hoey MP says:*** “Staying IN the EU is costing us jobs – not leaving it. We have a global market at our feet if we can free ourselves from the EU.”

Labour LEAVE is campaigning to...

- Protect UK workers from unscrupulous employers hiring cheap migrant labour – staying in the EU is costing us jobs – not leaving it.
- Stop Brussels attempts to promote zero hours contracts and suspend collective bargaining
- Invest in UK manufacturing, farming and fishing

LEAVE - Brussels waste and interference

Make YOUR voice count

Help us LEAVE the EU

Write to Labour LEAVE General Secretary Brendan Chilton at 72 Albert Street, NW1 7NR or email [brendan.chilton@labourleave.org](mailto:brendan.chilton@labourleave.org) or call 07827 649 342

• [www.labourleave.org](http://www.labourleave.org) • [@labourleave.org](https://twitter.com/labourleave)

# OPEN BORDERS IN CAPITAL AND TRADE

*Van Gelis; Campaign against Euro-federalism; via John Newell*

*(Below a shocking roll call of UK companies moved overseas with EU aid, and also of the extent of EU penetration into UK public utilities. That UK taxpayers' money is being used, via the EU, to de-industrialise our country is beyond audacity. There has been much yapping about 'workers' rights' ... as if nations cannot decide such matters for themselves and within their own mandate. The trouble is that to have 'workers' rights' you first of all have to be a worker!! - Ed)*

OK,.. here's a short list of financial and industrial FUBARs from the EU then;

Cadbury moved factory to Poland 2011 with EU grant.

Ford Transit moved to Turkey 2013 with EU grant.

Jaguar Land Rover has recently agreed to build a new plant in Slovakia with EU grant, owned by Tata, the same company who have trashed our steel works and emptied the workers pension funds. Peugeot closed its Ryton plant and moved production to Slovakia with EU grant.

British Army's new Ajax fighting vehicles to be built in Spain using Swedish steel at the request of the EU to support jobs in Spain with EU grant, rather than Wales.

Dyson gone to Malaysia, with an EU loan.

Crown Closures, Bournemouth (Was Metal Box), gone to Poland with EU grant, once employed 1,200.

M&S manufacturing gone to far east with EU loan.

Hornby models gone. In fact all toys and models now gone from UK along with the patents all with with EU grants.

Gillette gone to eastern Europe with EU grant.

Texas Instruments Greenock gone to Germany with EU grant.

Indesit at Bodelwyddan Wales gone with EU grant. Sekisui Alveo said production at its Merthyr Tydfil Industrial Park foam plant will relocate production to Roermond in the Netherlands, with EU funding. Hoover Merthyr factory moved out of UK to Czech Republic and the Far East by Italian company Candy with EU backing.

ICI integration into Holland's AkzoNobel with EU bank loan and within days of the merger, several factories in the UK, were closed, eliminating 3,500 jobs.

Boots sold to Italians Stefano Pessina who have based their HQ in Switzerland to avoid tax to the tune of £80 million a year, using an EU loan for the purchase.

JDS Uniphase run by two Dutch men, bought up companies in the UK with £20 million in EU 'regeneration' grants, created a pollution nightmare and just closed it all down leaving 1,200 out of work and an environmental clean-up paid for by the UK tax-payer. They also raided the pension fund and drained it dry.

UK airports are owned by a Spanish company.

Scottish Power is owned by a Spanish company.

Most London buses are run by Spanish and German companies. -

The Hinkley Point C nuclear power station to be built by French company EDF, part owned by the French government, using cheap Chinese steel that has catastrophically failed in other nuclear installations. Now EDF say the costs will be double or more and it will be very late even if it does come online.

Swindon was once our producer of rail locomotives and rolling stock. Not any more, it's Bombardier in Derby and due to their losses in the aviation market, that could see the end of the British railways manufacturing altogether even though Bombardier had EU grants to keep Derby going which they diverted to their loss-making aviation side in Canada.

39% of British invention patents have been passed to foreign companies, many of them in the EU.

The Mini cars that Cameron stood in front of as an example of British engineering, are built by BMW mostly in Holland and Austria. His campaign bus was made in Germany even though we have Plaxton, Optare, Bluebird, Dennis etc., in the UK.

The bicycle for the Greens was made in the far east, not by Raleigh UK but then they are probably going

to move to the Netherlands too as they have said recently.

Anyone who thinks the EU is good for British industry or any other business simply hasn't paid attention to what has been systematically asset-stripped from the UK. Name me one major technology company still running in the UK. I used to contract out to many, then the work just dried up as they were sold off to companies from France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, etc., and now we don't even teach electronic technology for technicians any more, due to EU regulations. -I haven't detailed our non-existent fishing industry the EU paid to destroy, nor the farmers being paid NOT to produce food they could sell for more than they get paid to do nothing, don't even go there. -I haven't mentioned what it costs us to be asset-stripped like this, nor have I mentioned immigration, nor the risk to our security if control of our armed forces is passed to Brussels or Germany.

## NEOLIBERALISM INFECTS THE EU DEBATE

*Chris Shaw; Libertarian Alliance Blog*

As a libertarian anarchist, I will most likely vote to leave the EU on June 23rd. The EU, with its supranational corporatism and affirmation of legislation writ-large, goes against my fundamental principles, that of popular litigiousness expressed through common law and a belief in freed markets and radical decentralism. However, none of these principles are captured in the prevailing debates and discourses that currently surround the question of whether the UK should leave the European Union.

Instead, both the Leave and Remain campaigns are infected with neoliberal ideology, and both argue for some version of the economic status quo. The Remain campaign talks of the success of the UK economy, with extremely high levels of private debt and a developing housing bubble just waiting to burst, and how such success would be jeopardised if we were to exit the EU. Equally, the Leave campaign talks of similar economic successes but instead makes them out to be a sign of British economic strength that would last if the UK were to leave the EU. Thus both campaigns believe in the economic track the UK is on. The continuation of highly indebted individuals and businesses, and of highly leveraged banks who are not loaning capital. There is no radicalism in this debate, and little in the way of anti-establishment sentiments. Under this regime, if the UK were to leave things would be broadly the same, with Boris Johnson as the potential Prime Minister (a frankly frightening thought).

Further, the kind of individuals and groups that are backing both campaigns represent the crème de la crème of corporate capitalism. On the Remain side, you have the Confederation of British Industry, the definition of corporate vested interests. If there are onerous regulations (such as the minimum wage, restrictive health and safety codes, workplace 'liberalisation', etc.) you can guarantee this group fawns over it and pays good money to see it implemented. However, the Leave camp has an assorted list of hedge fund managers and multinationals backing it as well. The kinds of policies Leave campaigners are pushing include things like continued farm subsidies (which subsidise large, inefficient farming and land ownership), R&D investment (which is usually funnelled into corporate research and IP monopolies) and the development of a TTIP-like "free trade" agreement with America and assorted other countries.

The referendum debate has been moulded round these status quo policies. Unfortunately, many voters will go to the polls not with an ideological clarity of what they want to see in their communities and nation, but rather with the muddled lies of these campaigns which hold very similar opinions on most of the major issues. If we were to leave the EU on the current terms, government legislation (much of it being in line with European law) would dominate over common law. The regulatory harmonies that exist between the UK and the EU would not be removed, thus maintaining the entry barriers to a whole range of new firms and ownership regimes.

On June 23rd, I will be voting to leave, because I hope that if we were to exit the EU it could potentially kickstart a whole raft of decentralist ideas, moving toward community empowerment,

voluntary taxation and freed markets. This is already being expressed in the Flexcit campaign. However, this debate over the EU is farcical, and proves that power is vested in the elites of both the UK and the EU. Neoliberal establishments won't be brought down by one vote, as this referendum blatantly shows.

# ANOTHER EUROPE IS POSSIBLE

## *A World to Win*

We're calling for a 'Leave' vote in the EU referendum on the basis that those who reject the present corporate-driven set-up should re-imagine a Europe that is internationalist, democratic, non-capitalist and in the hands of the people.

Many people have genuine misgivings, not to say fears, about the consequences of the United Kingdom voting to leave the European Union when the referendum on membership takes place in June. The authorised alternatives on offer are so reactionary that the best option, it would appear, is to vote to remain.

Understandably, no one with a progressive thought in their heads wants to end up in the same political camp as the anti-immigrant, nationalist Ukip. Or the Tory eurosceptics whose vision harks back to the days of Empire and to a fanciful time before Britain joined the EU when the UK's Parliament was allegedly sovereign, with supreme powers over its own affairs. By the same token, voters may not want to align themselves with the Tory government, especially as it is such a reactionary government intent on reinforcing inequality, attacking EU migrants, undermining health and social housing and destroying democratic rights. They may consider abstaining as an option.

Of course, with the propaganda from both official camps focused on our so-called "national interest", "what's best for Britain" (Labour's Andy Burnham even said that voting to remain was patriotic) and other nationalist phraseology, it seems impossible to get a word in edgeways.

But none of this should prevent us campaigning for a considered, truly democratic alternative to the EU founded on a plan for economic and political transformation. Why should the right-wing claim the sole right to think about a future outside the EU? Why can't we re-imagine a Europe and a UK that is internationalist, democratic, non-capitalist and in the hands of the majority?

Concerns range from a right-wing, racist backlash if the remain camp is defeated, loss of key employment rights on leaving the EU, a rise in unemployment as industry relocates, political isolation, a Tory government in the hands of Boris Johnson and company and the danger of another European war. While these are legitimate anxieties, they should not be allowed to paralyse us, politically speaking into a plague-on-both-your-houses approach.

### ***The 'grasping at straws' camp***

In the absence of a coherent alternative, the referendum has thrown up some peculiar, if not downright contradictory, positions in the light of these anxieties. Some who have little time for the EU still believe, on consideration, they should vote Remain. One such person is Adam Ramsay, co-editor of openDemocracy which as the name suggests, champions democracy against existing power structures. "I hate the EU. But I'll vote to stay in it," he writes: "... much of my experience of the EU has been negative: TTIP [Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership] and Greek austerity, the failure of the emissions trading scheme and the disaster of the Common Agriculture Policy, rules enforcing privatisation of services and procurement laws pushing public contracts towards big business, the racist policing of the Schengen agreement within Europe and the murderous enforcement of the external border. Free movement of capital has proved to be a mistake, and I'm not convinced by free trade in general.

Despite this excoriating, absolutely correct, assessment, Ramsay says his fear is that workers from Poland and other member states will be at risk of exclusion and harassment if the UK leaves the UK. So he will be voting to remain.

### ***The lesser evil***

Environment, anti-corporate campaigner and writer George Monbiot also rejects what the EU has become, describing himself as a "pro-European Eurosceptic". He says, "The more I see, the more it seems to me that the EU's problems are intrinsic and systemic. The organisation that began as an industrial cartel still works at the behest of the forces best equipped to operate across borders:

transnational corporations (TNCs). The European Commission remains a lobbyists' paradise: opaque, sometimes corruptible, almost unnavigable by those without vast resources.

He adds, "If you wish to remain within the European Union because you imagine it is a progressive force, I believe you are mistaken. That time, if it ever existed, has passed. The EU is like democracy, diplomacy and old age. There is only one thing to be said for it: it is not as bad as the alternative.

So why vote to remain, you might well ask? Monbiot has little to say in the EU's favour apart from his claim that "though the EU's directives [on the environment] are compromised and under threat, they are a lot better than nothing". The headline on his blog describes the EU as "The Lesser Evil". Hardly a ringing endorsement!

The logic of the arguments put forward by both Ramsay and Monbiot is to vote against but, seeing no alternative and fearing the worst, they advocate a remain vote. They are formative members of the clutching-at-straws group.

The Trades Union Congress back in the days of Thatcher were wooed by Jacques Delors, then president of the European Commission, into seeing the EU as a bulwark against a reactionary UK government. Today, the TUC is more circumspect. Their report says the EU has delivered "significant employment rights" which continuing membership will reinforce. However, the TUC notes:

*There has been some recent concern that the European Commission's social policy agenda has become increasingly restricted. For example, recent European Court of Justice (ECJ) cases have limited the ability of unions to organise industrial action in cross-border disputes, and in some Eurozone countries the Commission has actively undermined sector-wide collective bargaining agreements.*

It should also be noted that the EU has done absolutely nothing to prevent the virtual abolition of trade union rights in the UK.

### **Can the EU be reformed?**

There is another camp which believes that an EU behaving badly can be reformed along democratic lines. One of its most thought-out advocates is Yanis Varoufakis, former finance minister in the Syriza government in Greece who resigned after the European Commission, European Central Bank and International Monetary Fund (the infamous Troika) enforced a new round of austerity on his country. Professor of economics at Athens University, he recently helped launch the Democracy in Europe movement (DiEM25) which describes the EU as a "democracy free zone".

Its manifesto claims that the EU has two decades to democratise or disintegrate. DiEM25 focuses on what it claims is the de-politicisation of decision making, which is in the hands of technocrats rather than elected politicians. The manifesto calls for a pan-European constitutional assembly made up of representatives elected on a trans-national basis. The assembly will be "empowered to decide on a future democratic constitution that will replace all existing European treaties".

There is a basic flaw in DiEM25's approach which is its separation of the politics of the EU, from its economics and administration. While Monbiot talks of domination of the EU by TNCs, Varoufakis is more concerned about process, for example, transparency which, while important, does not get to the heart of the matter. DiEM25 sees the political elite as unwilling prisoners of the corporate elite because of a democratic deficit which, if remedied, would strengthen their hand against corporate power. There is absolutely no evidence for this.

DiEM25's proposal to repair/restore/rehabilitate the broken democratic European process is doomed to suffer the same fate as the failed Syriza experiment. The democratic will of the Greek people expressed in elections and a referendum made no impression on the Troika. The EU is in fact a neo-liberal institution set on maintaining the euro at any cost, deregulating markets and public services so that it can compete on the world stage.

Varoufakis is a left social democrat reformist and a Keynesian in economics. As a result, his focus is on an abstract democracy which avoids/ignores the actual capitalist content of the undemocratic EU. Perhaps that is why Varoufakis counts among his political friends one Norman Lamont, chancellor in Margaret Thatcher's government. He says they have a shared "commitment to parliamentary democracy, to liberalism, to the sovereignty of parliament".

The corporate-driven globalisation process has made nation-states, and associations of nation-states including the EU, the playthings, playgrounds, and battlefields for competing TNCs. They are also under the sway of financial markets. Nation-state structures, which once spoke and operated for national capitalisms, now express the interests of the TNCs. Parliaments which formerly had a measure of sovereignty have ceded that not just to the EU, but to these all-powerful global economic agents which operate at will across borders.

## ***Down with the monopolies***

Free-market, deregulated capitalism is an expression of this irreversible process. National and EU decision-making has followed the money to facilitate cross-border movement of capital as well as labour. The EU itself is not simply a technocratic apparatus – it is a nascent transnational capitalist state that has come into existence to facilitate the globalisation process which is now in a deepening crisis.

Every government body and regulatory agency nationally and globally from the Houses of Lords and Commons to the European Parliament, and the World Trade Organisation has been undermined, penetrated, infiltrated, infected by this process of corporate-driven globalisation. Democracy as we have known it, has been hollowed-out by the vulture funds, lobbyists and staffers of the TNCs. State power and capital are in a symbiotic relationship with each other, where the crisis in one has repercussions in the other. In fact, the UK referendum is just such a moment.

The drafting of the TTIP and the accompanying Trade in Services Agreement is being done in secret by officials who in turn get their marching orders from the TNCs. As is well documented, the proposal is for corporations to obtain the power to sue national governments if they hesitate in implementing TTIP/TiSA. The demands of the corporate sponsors of the TTIP/TiSA assault on democratic rights are presented to MEPs who have to read the document in a secure room and are sworn to secrecy.

## ***Another Europe is possible***

But what of our vision of an alternative to the EU which we could campaign around over the next few months? There is absolutely no reason why we must lose the fluid borders and right to work in different countries that exist within the EU. We should retain every social and political gain made within the EU, such as environmental, health and safety, workplace rights and the free movement of labour.

But while another altogether more democratic Europe is possible it is inconceivable without achieving a fundamentally different economic model. The objective is to liberate the power and technological resources of TNCs from their present shareholders. Instead, they could function along co-operative, democratically-controlled lines. Ending the treadmill of the built-in need of capitalist firms to turn in higher year-on-year profits would enable enterprises to produce goods and services in a sustainable way and to meet defined social need. Co-ops do not have to be small-scale affairs, as Mondragon in Spain shows.

European banks similarly should be converted into people's banks. Models abound of not-for-profit financial types, including credit unions and the original form of building societies before they were commercialised and integrated into financial markets. With the ending of speculation in stock and commodity markets as well as somewhat fictitious securities, co-operatively owned and run finance could deploy pension funds and other savings in a progressive way to finance social developments.

Naturally, none of this will be possible without a co-ordinated political campaign to replace the neoliberal institutions of the EU with structures that are democratically-run and controlled.

What these should be and how they would work is something that European people themselves need to decide. By meeting in constitutional conventions, for example, proposals could be worked up and set before voters by a network of democratic assemblies and other popular bodies.

To achieve a free association of states along these lines, taking Europe beyond capitalism politically and economically, is a big task. Yet the momentum for change is building, even if it lacks a coherent strategy. This can be addressed by the building of an organisation that can co-ordinate actions and take them beyond resistance into thinking and acting on the basis of system change.

## ***Troika go to hell***

We can and must build on the cultural revolutions of the last decades, in which people far and wide have left behind their little-England mentality and embraced the benefits of, not only European, but global culture, embracing among other things, workers from eastern Europe, world music, and not least, chicken tikka masala. The upcoming referendum offers a chance to hold on to those gains by developing an independent, revolutionary view of our capacity, not only in Europe, but in the wider world.

In Portugal, Greece, Spain, Catalonia, Ireland, Scotland and other countries, there is a hunger for democratic change, an end to austerity that flows from the economic crisis, for urgent action on climate change. In Germany, there is popular support for Syrian and other migrants left wandering on the border of Fortress Europe.

In England, the mass movement that brought Jeremy Corbyn to power as leader of the Labour Party reflects this process. More is the pity, therefore, that Corbyn and Labour are backing the

government's remain recommendation while putting forward policy ideas that the EU in a million years will never accept.

Action against the EU has to be both pan-European and national. There is a common enemy – transnational capitalism. It permeates our social being, whichever country we happen to live in.

Our opportunity to fight back comes on June 23, referendum day. We should vote Leave on the basis that another democratic Europe is possible as suggested above.

All those groups on the left who in one way or another are opposed to the EU as a regional arm of global capitalism and are calling for a vote to leave should come together in a joint campaign. These include the Socialist Workers Party, the Communist Party of Britain and the Socialist Party in England. Let's not be restricted by the existing political framework, adapting to one side or another of the ruling class in a kind of reactionary Popular Front that deprives us of our political independence. In any case, we cannot support a remain vote on the basis of depriving migrants of in-work benefits, encouraging more deregulation and a vote which will hasten the introduction of TTIP.

The original ideas behind the formation of the EU as a bulwark against war have long been superseded by its role as a governing body for the capitalist classes in the epoch of globalisation. Indeed there are those like Oliver Guez, writing in the New York Times, who says that "across the European Union anxiety and division are brewing in a way not seen since the 1940s". The social charter, which the UK always refused to sign even under Labour, has been shredded.

Of course, the risks in leaving the EU are high. But not as high as those we face if we don't challenge the corporatocracy that rules in Brussels and London. The EU has contributed to the break-up of Syria, Libya and Iraq with British and French jets pounding Syria, in competition, it seems with Putin's Russia. And of course, the EU has utterly failed to take decisive action to tackle climate change.

### **Fortress Europe**

The EU itself is in crisis over migration. A new alliance has been formed against Greece, leaving the country to deal with the migrant crisis on its own, while Poland and Hungary and two adjacent states are forming another opposition power block. If we are against racism, fascism and xenophobia we must be against a European Union which is a fortress against the oppressed peoples of the rest of the world. Meanwhile, the Franco-German commitment to the euro straitjacket backed up by the dreaded Troika is impoverishing smaller member states. In the face of the global economic and financial crisis - which is potentially far deeper than in 2008 - those who are already being made to pay in the EU are the ordinary people. As a new crash looms, the prospects are grim for most people in Europe if things stay as they are.

Neither should we shy away from addressing the issues about sovereignty that both camps in the Tory party are raising. They raise significant questions about the British constitution that governs the way the state operates, both in the UK and within the EU.

The UK's constitution was altered in an historic way on membership of the EU. Parliament agreed to transfer key law-making powers to Brussels and to abide by its judicial system. This was the price to be paid for accessing the single market and it has played a part in creating the present constitutional impasse which is likely to become a crisis whichever way the vote goes. Of course, the sovereignty being talked about is that of Parliament, which long ago lost its powers to the executive and other state/international institutions. The eurosceptics are deluded if they think a leave vote will return these powers. Yet their argument is attractive to those left behind by globalisation in the absence of a radical alternative.

Nevertheless, a debate about where real power lies is an opportunity to make the UK's broken constitution an issue for people. While no one in Parliament talks about the sovereignty of the people, who as usual are excluded from the equation, we should do so in terms of power and the state.

In Scotland, the SNP government is hoping that a leave vote in England could justify another independence referendum. But in Scotland too it is essential to answer the question of people's right to rule themselves not in the context of a capitalist pro-business parliament at Holyrood, but in terms of real democracy. It was right to vote Yes in the independence referendum, not because it answered these democratic questions but because it would open up opportunities to challenge the status quo and start talking about a people's constitution. A people's constitution is more likely to recognise and support the rights and demands of Scottish people, than Brussels ever will.

Using the referendum to campaign for a citizens' convention on the constitution should form part of our alternative, democratic programme and approach. Encourage people to talk about how the present constitution enforces the power of big business and finance and how a new constitution would aim to transfer economic and political power into the hands of the majority in the UK as a step towards a Europe that works for people and not profit.

# END OF EU: LEFT-WING CAMPAIGNERS BEG BRITS TO WIN BREXIT AND BEGIN FALL OF EUROPE

*Zoie O'Brien; Daily Express; via John Newell*

***EUROPEAN campaigners have admitted there are thousands of left-wing voters across the main bloc hoping Britain will achieve a Brexit causing a crack which will start to bring down the Union.***

Speaking at a meeting in London this week, political activists from Greece, Catalonia and Ireland spoke of a growing movement from the left within many member states, hoping the EU will break up altogether. The reasons included interference in law making, the treatment of the people of Greece and constant cuts and austerity measures.

Argyri Erotokritou, Greek doctor and leader of Antarsya spoke passionately about how the working class in Greece is desperate to see the union fall. She said: "I believe that you can win this fight, "A win for Brexit or Lexit will be a great internationalist help for us, to be an example that we are not alone in this fight as EU leaders and our Government tells us." The campaigner and junior doctor said the feeling among Greeks was pro-EU before the financial crisis, something which has changed "dramatically" in the last five years. Now they are facing extreme cuts and austerity to pay the European Central Bank back for the bailouts - and it is the poorest in society who are suffering.

The decisions made by the Government and the EU leaders surrounding both the financial and refugee crisis are turning the country away from Europe. She said: "Working class don't want to be in the EU and pay for the 'capitalist' crisis. Today this feeling grows stronger, "When we see the EU policies on the refugee crisis. The true face of this institution was revealed with the latest agreement with Turkey. It's a shameful and deeply racist agreement that hits the refugees and aim to press the solidarity movement."

Miss Erotokritou revealed refugees in camps have no medical care or education, and there have been thousands of deaths, just off the coast of Greece. According to the campaigner there can be a 'different Europe' which is supported by people, if left-wing voters speak up for change in the UK.

Her comments were made at a 'Lexit' rally in London this week at which representatives of the Communist Party and socialist action groups urged left wing voters to support a campaign to leave Europe. Speakers at the event told over 100 people who gathered in Euston it is hard to be truly left and support Europe because of policies of cuts and austerity, as well as the treatment of migrants coming from the Middle East.

British Labour voters are being urged to leave, not by joining the Brexit movement, but "from the left" - coining the term "lexit".

Rob Griffiths, general secretary of the Communist Party spoke as well as Brid Smith, for People Before Profit in Ireland and Alex Callinicos of the SWP.

Despite confidence in their leader who they claim has been "boxed in by the right wing in his party" they want voters to go against his official line and quit the Union.

At the meeting Quim Arrufat, international secretary of left-wing Catalan party CUP, said Spanish voters in Catalonia are watching the referendum with interest. He said Europe was once a beacon of freedom and democracy for Catalonians, who lived under a "dictatorship". In 2004 when they voted in favour of Europe, he said the country were fighting against a feeling of oppression, and were confident Europe would be the way forward. But for many reasons, including the refugee crisis, the far right growth, austerity policies and the treatment of Greece, many now want out. He said: "The European Union is not a democratic structure, it is not a democratic ideology. They are playing in each country in southern Europe as if they were another political party. As if they were elected. They modify positions of the Government, they impose their measures. They play as though they were another democratic party and they are not. The European Union is dividing Europe in different economies and societies. Among the countries, and inside each country, it is dividing societies between very rich people and the majority of the poor people in every country."

Mr Arrufat also believes a union can be formed in the future which is better than the current European

model. He said: "They are separating everyone - and we want the people to unite, "What they will use to convince the working class to stay is always two things, they use a not justified truth about EU is the only way the only future and the only way for progress. The other thing is fear, they will use fear, they use fear against our people every time. In principal I believe in European democracy, or EU maybe, as long as it means institutions are under the control of people; It is the opposite case now."

Speakers from France were unable to attend the meeting

## **JP MORGAN WANTS EUROPE TO BE RID OF SOCIAL RIGHTS, DEMOCRACY, EMPLOYEE RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO PROTEST**

*Richard Murphy; Tax Research UK; via John Newell*

In late May J P Morgan issued a chilling review of what they saw as the state of progress on tackling the Eurozone crisis. As they put it:

*"The narrative of crisis management in the Euro area has two dimensions: first, designing new institutions for the next steady state (EMU-2); and second, dealing with the national legacy problems, some of which were there at EMU's launch and some of which arose during the first decade of the monetary union's life."*

Their assessment of progress is:

- Sovereign deleveraging—about halfway there.
- Real exchange rate adjustment—almost there for a number of countries.
- Household deleveraging in Spain—about a quarter of the way there in stock terms, but almost there in flow terms.
- Bank deleveraging—hard to say due to heterogeneity across countries and banks, but large banks have made a lot of progress.
- Structural reform—hard to say but progress is being made.
- Political reform—hardly even begun.

I could comment on the first five issues, but it is the last that is most chilling. They argue of 'the journey of national political reform' as they see it:

*"At the start of the crisis, it was generally assumed that the national legacy problems were economic in nature. But, as the crisis has evolved, it has become apparent that there are deep seated political problems in the periphery, which, in our view, need to change if EMU is going to function properly in the long run. The political systems in the periphery were established in the aftermath of dictatorship, and were defined by that experience. Constitutions tend to show a strong socialist influence, reflecting the political strength that left wing parties gained after the defeat of fascism. Political systems around the periphery typically display several of the following features: weak executives; weak central states relative to regions; constitutional protection of labour rights; consensus building systems which foster political clientalism; and the right to protest if unwelcome changes are made to the political status quo. The shortcomings of this political legacy have been revealed by the crisis. Countries around the periphery have only been partially successful in producing fiscal and economic reform agendas, with governments constrained by constitutions (Portugal), powerful regions (Spain), and the rise of populist parties (Italy and Greece)."*

*"There is a growing recognition of the extent of this problem, both in the core and in the periphery. Change is beginning to take place. Spain took steps to address some of the contradictions of the post-Franco settlement with last year's legislation enabling closer fiscal oversight of the regions. But, outside Spain little has happened thus far. The key test in the coming year will be in Italy, where the new government clearly has an opportunity to engage in meaningful political reform. But, in terms of the idea of a journey, the process of political reform has barely begun."*

What J P Morgan is making clear is that 'socialist' inclinations must be removed from political structures; localism must be replaced with strong, central, authority; labour rights must be removed, consensus (call it democracy if you will) must cease to be of concern and the right to protest must be curtailed. This is an agenda for hard right, corporatist, centrist government. There's another word for that, and it's what the bankers seem to want.

You have been warned. Amazingly, they had the nerve to issue the warning.

# PROTECT OUR DEFENCE AND SECURITY – VOTE TO LEAVE THE EU

## *Colonel Richard Kemp and The Bruges Group*

### **EU Militarisation**

The Ministry of Defence is becoming reliant on other EU countries for military equipment.

- They are purchasing French artillery, that fires German shells.
- German firms are supplying battlefield radar, built in Sweden, Germany and even Italy.
- Our military vehicles are now built in Sweden.

Surely they should be built in the UK.

- Britain is buying military transports and drones from the French, firing French-made missiles.
- Three aircraft carriers are to be shared between the Royal Navy and France, the French firm Thales is leading their design and build.
- The UK may even rely on purchasing its small arms from the Belgians.

Britain should defend its own defence industry. According to Colonel Richard Kemp Britain would be forced to join an EU army within five to 10 years if people vote to Remain in the EU.

*"An EU army is inevitable. As the EU has declared, it is moving to ever closer union, it intends to become a fully fledged superstate. That's the plan."*

*"We would essentially be giving up our right to sovereign self-defence. Control of the EU army would not rest with us but in a collective EU decision."*

*"There would never be consensus for an EU military operation to retake the Falklands. It could not happen."*

### **Brussels plans EU army; EU control over defence policy**

The EU's High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy has the authority to propose EU military missions. Currently the UK benefits from its permanent seat on the UN's Security Council. However, this can be taken by the EU. Other EU states can invoke defence clause 42.7 to embroil the UK into their armed conflicts.

### **EU controlling military technology**

The EU is mandating that our armed forces follow the technical standards of the EU Military Staff, the European Union Force (EUFOR), Eurocorps, the European Gendarmerie Force, European Maritime Force and the EU Battlegroups, the EU's emerging army.

Britain's forces will have to work alongside the EU's military. This will mean the UK's armed forces will only be able to operate alongside those of other EU states with the movement of military products controlled by the EU.

The EU's satellite navigation system, known as the Galileo program, is not only a major drain on the UK taxpayer costing Britain billions of pounds. It has no practical use that cannot be secured from existing systems, the only purpose must be to coordinate EU military missions.

The founding myth of the EU is that it prevented war between France and Germany after 1945. The Schuman Principles of equality in reconciliation – between victor and vanquished - to build peace are good.

But that was back in the 1950's. Today, the EU does not apply those same principles. Today's EU is a betrayal of those virtues. After the cold war the EU grabbed the spoils of war and lorded it over others as if Schuman had never lived.

As the EU expands ever eastwards, taking over more countries, it shows contempt towards its neighbours. The EU insists on expanding its power and shows hostility towards those that do want to live under its control.

Blair, Cameron, Hague, Juncker, Mandelson and their friends, are the out of touch people that want more EU control over both Britain and other European countries. That could mean more catastrophic adventures like in Iraq and Libya. EU expansion will drag Britain into conflicts caused by the EU; whose militarisation could trigger a new cold-war.

We do not want the EU bringing that back. It is not in the interests of Britain, it is the opposite of peace and stability. When the EU's supporters talk about EU security, they are attempting to justify the EU's provocations, expansion, militarisation and its growing belligerence.

We think that peaceful progress is a better way forward. We suspect that Brussels is seeking out external enemies to force an internal unity.

The EU of tomorrow is dangerous; it is not the organisation that they claim built peace in yesterday's Europe. Tomorrow's EU will have an army of its own. We cannot be part of that:

- The EU says that the purpose is to project its power beyond its borders, like an empire of old.
- An EU army will replace the democratic power of the nation state. We will just be vassals of Brussels.
- EU military forces could be used to impose its rule over dissenting popular movements for reform in Southern Europe and perhaps beyond.

***The EU has already established :-***

- Frontex, a border force that is being deployed to nation states, such as Greece.
- The EU's Common Foreign Policy is trying to interfere in other countries.
- Our armed forces are being standardized by the European Defence Agency so they can be controlled by the EU. This is just the start.

The EU is planning to create an EU army. A vote to remain will be taken as consent for more EU power grabs. Next our defence and security will be taken over by the EU.

*Read more, visit: [www.brugesgroup.com/leaflets](http://www.brugesgroup.com/leaflets). THE BRUGES GROUP was founded in 1989 to stop the EU taking power away from our democracy and set out an alternative that brings control over this country's affairs back to the British people. In this referendum campaign the Bruges Group provides support, leadership and resources to those on the front line of the campaign for Britain's independent future. Membership is drawn from all political affiliations in Britain and from the membership of prodemocracy organisations. Go to [brugesgroup.com](http://brugesgroup.com) to see links to learn more about our positive vision for an independent Britain.*

## **POWERS OF THE EU**

***Rodney Atkinson; Freenations***

***(No apologies for reprinting this list of EU powers, called 'competences' in the normal euphemistic language of that institution.***

***Jose Manuel Barosso once said that the EU had 'many of the attributes of an empire'. Those who talk of the EU aiming to be a 'federal state' do not take on board the sheer scope of existing EU powers, which already go far beyond what Canberra, New Delhi or Washington would be able to impose on the constituent states of their own federations. Thus the model is for a unitary not a federal European megastate. History teaches us that the trouble with empires is that they tend to do imperial things! - Ed)***

On the 1st November 2014 the right of Parliament to legislate over us in 43 areas, the important

ones, will be removed and be made subject to approval, by majority vote of the lying undemocratic and unelected bastards fronting the EU. They call it QMV, Quality Majority Voting, which translates in English to: You'll do what we tell you, or else.

Heath – Thatcher – Major – Blair – Brown, are all, by allowing this, acting in High Treason, but as every important Government post is now held by an EU Common Purpose trained thug, waiting to take over from elected local government officials from 1st November 2014, there seems to be little we can do about it.

Below, are the 43 areas of 'competence', areas we British have been declared incompetent to decide for ourselves.

Make a note of the last one because it says we cannot leave the EU unless the other members allow it. On 1st November 2014 the following areas of competence will switch from requiring unanimous approval of all member states to qualified majority voting only:

Initiatives of the High Representative for Foreign Affairs – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Administrative co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Asylum – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV

Border controls – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Citizens' initiative regulations – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Civil protection – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Committee of the Regions – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Common defence policy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Crime prevention incentives – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Criminal judicial co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Criminal law – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Culture – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Diplomatic & Consular protection – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Economic & Social Committee – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV

Emergency international aid – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Energy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

EU budget – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Eurojust – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

European Central Bank – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

European Court of Justice – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Europol – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Eurozone external representation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Foreign Affairs High Representative election – Lisbon: QMV

Freedom of movement for workers – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Freedom to establish a business – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Freedom, security, justice, co-operation & evaluation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Funding the Common Foreign & Security Policy – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

General economic interest services – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Humanitarian aid – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Immigration – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV

Intellectual property – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Organisation of the Council of the EU – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Police co-operation – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

President of the European Council election – Lisbon: QMV

Response to natural disasters & terrorism – Lisbon: QMV

Rules concerning the Armaments Agency – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Self-employment access rights – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Social Security Unanimity – Nice: QMV; Lisbon: QMV

Space – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Sport – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Structural & Cohesion Funds – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Tourism – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Transport – Nice: Unanimity; Lisbon: QMV

Withdrawal of a member state – Lisbon: QMV

A brief review of the Treaties confirms the substance of the above. Transitional arrangements allow, only on specific votes.

# EU COMMISSIONERS OATH & PRIVY OATH

***talk2ktc@yahoo.co.uk***

***(British EU Commissioners have always also been privy counsellors, as have been quite a number of EU parliamentarians and other official nomenclatura. Since they are swearing allegiance to two thrones, a constant conundrum has been as to whom they owe ultimate allegiance. EU pensions to such nomenclatura are conditional on the individual expressing nothing critical of the EU project. Any explanation as to why such payments should not therefore be taken as bribes is welcome. Also inherent in the Commissioners' Oath is the principle that the EU is sovereign... in other words a law ... unto itself - Ed)***

## ***Privy Councillor's Oath***

You have consistently chosen to evade and dismiss the following:

"I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. So help me God." –

Derived from the Declaration and Bill of Rights 1688/9

## ***EU Commissioners Oath***

"I solemnly undertake: to respect the Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union in the fulfilment of my duties;

\*to be completely independent in carrying out my responsibilities, in the general interest of the Union;

\*in the performance of my tasks neither to seek nor to take instructions from any Government or from any other institution, body, office or entity;

\*to refrain from any action incompatible with my duties or the performance of my tasks.

"I formally note the undertaking of each Member State to respect this principle and not to seek to influence Members of the Commission in the performance of their tasks"

I further undertake to respect, both during and after my term of office, the obligations arising therefrom, and in particular to duty to behave with integrity and discretion as regards the acceptance, after I have ceased to hold office, of certain appointments or benefits.

# GUARDIAN PEDDLING LIES

***Richard North; EU Referendum***

***(The item might also have mentioned Switzerland, also not in the EU, but a world leader in biosciences, pharmaceuticals and particle physics and also the home of CERN. That aside the item, typifies the role of 'news' as propaganda - Ed)***

The Guardian is peddling lies - transparent and unequivocal. Its narrative is one of disaster for the academic community. Even the possibility that we'll vote to leave the EU would be a disaster for British science. The EU, it says, directly pays for much UK research and innovation, the paper tells us, and if we leave the EU we lose all that money (which we put in, in the first place). Not to be swayed by tiny details such as these, the paper asserts that: "Given our public sector funding difficulties, and the understandably low priority research has in the political arena, we simply cannot afford to lose out on such a successful and empowering pot of EU money".

"Scientists love evidence, and the evidence is clear", the paper then asserts - thereby ignoring the evidence to the contrary. "Bluntly, if the UK were to leave the EU, we would massively and irreversibly damage an enterprise on which our future depends", it claims. And so the inference goes that, if we leave the EU, the EU research funds dry up. But this is a lie - and totally contrary to the evidence. There is no requirement for a country to be a member of the EU for it to be part of its research programme. For heaven's sake, even Israel is part of the programme.

Those of you who have read Flexcit, will have picked up details on the Seventh Framework Programme and EEA members. It tells you that more than 2,350 Icelandic and Norwegian participants, including many small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), were involved. Icelandic researchers contributed to 217 projects, receiving funding of nearly €70 million. The Norwegians took part in more than 1,400 projects, receiving €712 million.

If the UK leaves the EU and rejoins the EEA, it can continue participation in the research programme (currently Horizon 2020) without interruption. Even without EEA membership, it can participate - as does Switzerland. The Guardian is telling lies, indulging in outrageous FUD.

But this calumny goes beyond the Guardian and extends to a campaign website called Scientists for EU, where these propagandists can spread their lies.

This brings me to the broader issue that this piece illustrates. Talking yesterday to a senior politician, he observed that the "out" campaign should already have a rapid rebuttal unit up and running, to deal with this sort of thing. To my mind, it is an indictment of Ukip, which should already be equipped to handle false claims. Perhaps that's the sort of thing that Carswell's short money could handle, but for the fact that it would doubtless be wasted.

It is this sort of thing, though, that leads me to believe that we will lose the referendum. I don't see that we have any real chance of winning - for many different reasons, but all boiling down to the fact that the "eurosceptic" movement is too fragmented, has no coherent vision and - with particular relevance here - has left preparations too late. The Norway "no" campaign had five years to prepare for their 1994 victory.

I think the best (and only) thing we can achieve is damage limitation - doing what we can to avoid losing too badly. If the gap is narrow, then at least we can claim some legitimacy in continuing the fight.

There should also, in my view, be a secondary objective. We should use the campaign to build a standing, non-party-political organisation on the lines of the Norwegian "no" campaign, better to equip us to fight a "treaty lock" referendum should it come. That would be our real opportunity to force EU withdrawal. In the interim, though, we need to claw back the anti-EU movement from Ukip, and to organise it on a non-partisan basis, ready and capable to deal with the sort of lies the Guardian is trotting out.

That, maybe, is for the future, but what is so disturbing is that a newspaper can so easily trot out lies, without feeling any need to check the veracity of what it is saying. And if this illustrates how the referendum campaign is going to go, we're in for a long, hard couple of years.

## **‘RIGGING’ THE UK’S EU REFERENDUM ... HOW TO COUNTER CHEATING AT THE COUNT.**

*Sonya Porter and Rodney Atkinson; Freenations*

*(New electoral practises make voting fraud easier. The following contains some practical tips for scrutineers - Ed)*

Given the nearly 50 year history of lies, deceit and manipulation of the British people by the political class many are naturally concerned that the UK's EU referendum on 23rd June will be rigged. In recent years - since the Labour Government introduced unlimited postal voting - many have been convicted of vote rigging. Therefore it is vital that everyone involved in vote counting, monitoring, scrutinising and of course voting in this referendum should

1. be aware of the rules and how they are sometimes broken

2. alert to all officials and how they conduct the poll. 3. Ensure there is no manipulation of the postal vote, especially at the count.

The Government permitted gross manipulation of the postal vote at the Welsh Devolution referendum where the postal vote made the difference. The North east voted against an assembly but now the Government is imposing (by bribery) an elected Mayor. Such is the history of recent “democratic” elections in the UK.

Although it is supposed to give a balanced view on whether the country should Remain or Leave the EU, The Government has spent some £9 million of voters’ money on a booklet which favours the Remain side and says little about the benefits of Britain living as an independent country in control of its own affairs.

Even the leaflet put out by the Electoral Commission is psychologically skewed. The Remain argument appears on the favoured left hand page with large blue print, red sub-headings and family photos, leaving the less frequently read right hand side with small print and no photos to the case for leaving the EU.

The Electoral Commission has had to act to stop the mailing of voting cards to EU citizens in the UK – who CANNOT vote. The claim that they have stopped this and that a polling card does not give the right to vote – only the name of the electoral register – let us hope they have the right register i.e. NOT the one of EU elections!

Despite the daily dose of scaremongering the Great British Public are now coming down firmly for “Leave” BUT it will still all come down to what happens on the day of the Referendum, 23rd June 2016, which will be as important to England as the 14th October 1066 (the Norman Conquest).

So what should the Brexiteers beware of?

As the Austrians are apparently beginning to realise after their recent election, the most likely method of fraud will be through the postal vote. The postal vote, counted at the end (!) managed to overturn a 4% lead by the Freedom Party candidate.

Until the Representation of the People Act 2000 the categories of people who could use a postal vote in an election were restricted and mainly included those resident abroad and those who were unable to vote in person due to disability. But as from 16th February 2001, this was changed to allow postal voting on demand. No reason need now be given by the voters applying for them. There are various problems here.

For instance, voting lists for an area can be increased to an extraordinary extent with far too people apparently living in one small flat or house — the London Borough of Tower Hamlets is one example where thousands of ‘eligible’ voters suddenly appeared on the electoral roll just before the last two General Elections.

Another worry is who exactly is completing the form — it could be anyone at the given address. Who knows?

Also, just where the postal votes are kept before the Counting, and can they be tampered with?

Then we come to the Count itself and this will not be conducted in the same way as a By-Election or General Election where the votes are counted immediately after the doors are closed and the result usually announced that night — although in the last few elections, the boxes are kept overnight and the vote not counted until the following morning which can create suspicions of fraud. According to the Electoral Commission, the total of a local count will be passed to their Regional Counting Officer (RCO) who, if satisfied that they are accurate, will approve the figures.

More time is then needed for the Regional Officer to relay the regional total to the Chief Counting Officer (CCO) for approval and only after this the RCO will make a declaration of the regional total. Bear in mind that there will be 382 counting areas:

326 local authorities in England

32 unitary authorities in Scotland

22 unitary authorities in Wales

The final two counting areas will be Northern Ireland and Gibraltar.

And all this checking, passing on, checking again will take some time and pass through several hands so it cannot be said with absolute certainty that all is secure. We just have to hope that some officials will not 'revise' the final figures. Hopefully, our local council and their staff can be trusted with the local counts and it is also hoped that the auditors will find no errors or frauds after the local counts. But, for instance, one sub-agent at the General Election of 2015 discovered that after their verification, the votes were returned to the boxes and the boxes sealed with small pieces of plastic. He then found that there were many spare seals so that it might be possible to undo the boxes and later reseal them which would leave them open to tampering.

Then there are the exit polls to consider. Bearing in mind that the pre-election polls' statistics have varied a great deal and give the impression of having been manipulated by the Remain camp, perhaps the exit polls might also be viewed with caution.

Additionally, Electoral Commission has recently issued a brief which states that once declared, the national result will be final but not legally binding. According to the European Referendum Act 2015, there are no provisions to implement the result of the referendum and so although unlikely, legally, the Government is not bound to follow the outcome of the referendum.

It was also the Electoral Commission which decided that it would be the 'Vote Leave' group' lead by Boris Johnson, which would head the Out campaign in preference to 'Go — Grassroots Out', the cross-party group headed by Nigel Farage, Leader of the UK Independence Party, who therefore does not have to be invited to appear in the media during the Leave Campaign.

So all democrats must look out. And the Leave Campaign must beware:

1. Unusual numbers of postal votes per house must be discounted or checked physically.
2. Postal votes: after the polls close –  
Number issued declared  
Number cast declared  
Votes Counted and the postal result declared
3. Then the count of the non postal vote to begin as per normal – locked rooms,  
Number issued declared  
Number cast declared  
Counted and the result declared

If there is a large discrepancy between the result of the postal and cast votes, the postal votes must be scrutinised by both sides. Individual voters must be selectively contacted and their vote declared. This is the only way that we can remove the incentive to gerrymander the result using postal ballots. Any region where the postal ballot is found to have been doctored must result in the electoral officer being jailed.

**RUNNYMEDE GAZETTE EDITED BY:- FRANK TAYLOR.**  
**2 CHURCH VIEW, ST GILES TERRACE, CHETTON, BRIDGNORTH, SHROPSHIRE, WV16 6UG**  
**Tel: (01746) 789326 [frankinshropshire@hotmail.co](mailto:frankinshropshire@hotmail.co)**