

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Amar Telidji University of Laghouat

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English



A Historical Study of the Origins of Brexit

Dissertation submitted to the department of English in partial fulfilment
for the requirements of Master Degree in English Language.

Submitted by:

- Mr. Hachem Allane
- Mr. Abdelkader Zebda

Jury Members:

President: Mr. Ahmed Mihoubi

Supervisor: Prof. Mohamed Afkir

Examiner: Mr. Yacine Kais

Academic Year 2016-2017

Declaration

This work's main idea is our own initiation. We confirm that this assignment is our own work, is not copied from any other person's work (published or unpublished), and has not previously submitted for assessment either at Amar Telidji University or elsewhere. Other works are involved either by paraphrase, summary, or direct quotation; accompanied with full acknowledgments to their contributions to our research. Thus, we declare as we consider that any kind of plagiarism will result in the failure of our project.

Dedication

"To our parents with love"

Acknowledgements

Foremost, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to our supervisor Prof. Mohamed Afkir for his guidance, motivation and immense knowledge. Also, we would like to thank our former teachers who helped us throughout our educational career. A big Thank you to our friends, brothers, sisters and all those who stood beside us to the end of this scientific journey. Finally, we would like to thank our parents in particular for providing us with unfailing support and continuous encouragement. This accomplishment would not have been possible without them.

Abstract

The central objective of this dissertation is to examine the reasons and the circumstances that led to Brexit. The British have never considered themselves Europeans. Since WWII, Britain has always been described as the awkward partner of the European Union. She refused to join the Union in its first years, only to be humiliated by the French veto before the 1973 accession. The 1975 referendum, the rebate negotiations of 1979 and the opt-out of the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 show that the British hostility towards the European Union didn't change. Furthermore, Britain preferred to be closer to the Americans rather than the Europeans, especially after the 9/11 US Attacks. Later on, the UK independence party (UKIP) called for a complete exit from the Union providing plenty of arguments and promising a better independent United Kingdom. Therefore, the party was supported by a great number of Eurosceptics. As a result, the Conservative government of David Cameron succumbed to deep-seated desires and held an in-out referendum on the 23rd June 2016. The people chose to leave the EU and Britain gained her sovereignty back.

Table of Contents

General Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Britain's Relationship with Europe 1945-1973.....	4
Introduction.....	4
1.1. Britain and Europe after the Second World War.....	4
1.2. Britain and the Creation of the EEC 1957.....	8
1.2.1. Britain's Refusal to Join the ECSC.....	10
1.2.2. British Reaction to the Creation of the EEC.....	13
1.3. The UK's Process of Accessing the EEC 1973.....	15
1.3.1. The Failure of the Early British Applications 1963 and 1967.....	15
1.3.2. The Success of the British Application 1973.....	18
Conclusion.....	19
Chapter Two: The Growth of Euroscepticism 1975-2006.....	20
Introduction.....	20
2.1. Euroscepticism from 1975 to 1990.....	20
2.1.1. The EEC Membership Referendum 1975.....	20
2.1.2. The Eurosceptic Thatcher Years.....	23
2.2. John Major and the Maastricht Treaty of 1992-1993.....	27
2.2.1. The British Opt-out of the Maastricht Treaty.....	27
2.2.2. The ERM Problem.....	29
2.3. Britain Closer Relations with the US after the 9/11 Attacks.....	30
2.3.1. Britain-US Coalition and the War on Terror.....	32
2.3.2. Blair away from Europe.....	33
Conclusion.....	34
Chapter Three: UKIP and The Road to Brexit 2006-2016.....	35
Introduction.....	35
3.1. UKIP Leading the Brexit Campaign.....	35
3.1.1. UKIP's Discourse on Brexit.....	37
3.1.2. UKIP's Social Manifesto.....	39

3.2. Reactions towards UKIP and Brexit	41
3.2.1. Supporters of UKIP against the EU.....	41
3.2.2. The “Remain” Campaign in Favour of the EU.....	42
3.3. The Final In/Out Referendum 2016.....	45
Conclusion.....	49
General Conclusion.....	50
Bibliography.....	52

List of abbreviations

AFL	Anti-Federalist League
BOAC	British Overseas Airways Company
CAP	Common Agricultural Policy
EAEC	European Atomic Energy Community=EURATOM=CEEA
EC	European Commission
ECMT	European Conference of Ministers of Transport
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
ECU	European Currency Unit
EDC	European Defence Community
EEC	European Economic Community
EFTA	European Free Trade Association
EFTA	European Free Trade Area
EMS	European Monetary System
EMU	European Monetary Union
EPU	European Payments Union
ERP	European Recovery Program
ERM	Exchange Rate Mechanism
EU	European Union
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LSE	London School Economics
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
OEEC	Organisation for European Economic Cooperation
PPERA	Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act
UK	United Kingdom
UKIP	United Kingdom Independence Party
VAT	Value-Added Tax
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WWII	Second World War

General Introduction

Topics dealing with modern political issues in relation to historical background of events in civilization and culture have been always interesting fields to explore. This research is concerned with the exit of Britain out of the EU. Brexit¹ is new contemporary subject with long deep roots connected to a clash of interests between the EU and the UK. It is the popularity of Brexit which made this work researchable.

The inceptions of Britain's shaky relation with the EU lie in the aftermath of post-war Europe. Compromise amongst France and Germany, asked by Winston Churchill in 1946, prompted the production of the six-part European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 and the European Economic Community in 1957. However, a careful Britain, quick to save herself, joins with the Commonwealth and America and stood beside both. It was just in the 1960s when the British, looking for a more stable and grounded economy, attempted to join. In the end, since the accession, the British Prime Ministers were always sceptical and divided on the issue of Europe. It started with the 1975 UK-EC referendum. Also, Margret Thatcher's famous Eurosceptic approach was followed. John Major on her steps too strengthened the unease UK-EU relations. Furthermore, Tony Blair shaped his premiership with the Anglo-American Special Relationship rather than Europe. Finally, up to the 21st century, a strong Eurosceptic United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) rose up to put so much pressure on the Prime Minister, David Cameron. So the latter held an in-out referendum in 2016 which resulted in a total and final Brexit.

Thus, as a broad aim of this research we shall trace the roots of Brexit. The purpose of this research is to determine the causes and circumstances that led to Brexit. It examines the kind of relations between the EU and the UK before and after the accession of Britain to the EEC.

In order to understand the journey of Brexit many questions arose in need of answers: What led Britain to join the EEC in the first place? What was the nature of the relationship between the UK and the EU since 1973? What led to the 2016 Referendum? What issues led Britons to vote to leave?

¹ Brexit is an abbreviation for British Exit From the European Union.

A number of works have already dealt with the subject of Brexit and the UK-EU relations. For example, Maria Sorokina's Master thesis (2014) entitled *Great Britain and the European integration* explains the way Britain developed an idea to join the EEC and identifies the three applications of accession. In addition, Denis MacShane, has an unfamiliar perspective on Thatcher in his book *Brexit: How Britain Will Leave Europe* (2015). He deals with the famously known Eurosceptic Margret Thatcher as being pro-European. Moreover, Matthew Goodwin tackles the influence of UKIP on the British society in the article: "Explaining the Rise of the UK Independence Party" (2014). He examines the secrets behind UKIP's success in gaining Briton's support. Finally, the BBC article written by Alex Hunt and Brian Wheeler "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU" (2017) covers the whole campaign process of 2016 referendum. The article includes the stand of public figures and the detailed statistics such as the vote results. So in the light of such works, the present investigation will attempt to bridge the British historical Euroscepticism with the modern issue of Brexit.

The methods used in this research are based on a chronological analysis of the various historical stages of the Brexit issue. This research in fact analyses each period of time starting by the end of WWII in 1945 to the last referendum of 2016. The data are collected mainly from primary sources, such as speeches, reports and surveys. It is also acquired from other secondary sources, like books, documentaries and articles. The choice of these sources is due to the nature of the topic and its novelty. Using the historical method, all the data collected are examined by two different approaches: descriptive and analytical in order to shed light on issues that eventually contributed to Britain's getting out of Europe.

The dissertation is organised into three chapters. The First Chapter is a background to Britain's relationship with Europe from the end of WWII in 1945 until the 1973 official accession of the UK to the EEC. Following the post-war era Europe needed a full recovery. So to maintain peace and strengthen the political and economic relations between its countries, the EEC was created by signing the treaty of Rome in 1957. This community was mainly established for a common free market in order to benefit from the easy transportation of goods and workers. Due to the noticeable success of the EEC simultaneously with the remarkable decline of the British economy in the 1960s, the UK joined the community in 1973.

The Second Chapter is a demonstration of the governmental administrative Euroscepticism. Since the accession, the British parliament's actions towards this membership have been marked by a striking paradox. Two years after the UK's accession, the labour government held the 1975 in-out referendum and Britain voted for a continuous membership. Furthermore, Thatcher's Euroscepticism campaign assured that the uneasy relations between the UK and the EEC are in distress. Later, Euroscepticism grew rapidly in John Major's premiership with the emergence of the United Kingdom Independence Party in 1991(UKIP). In addition, the Maastricht Treaty of 1992 changed the name of the EEC to the EU and witnessed a British opt-out of the currency (Euro). Finally, the years of Tony Blair were marked by a close relationship with the US. The 9/11 US Attacks had a huge impact on Blair who favoured America's interests instead of Europe's.

The Third Chapter deals with non-governmental progression towards Brexit and people's reactions to the latter. Due to the pressure of the Eurosceptic UKIP led by Nigel Farage, The Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron in 2013 promised Britons to hold an in-out referendum. Britain was divided and many arguments were provided from both The Leave and the Remain campaigns. Although people were confused about which choice to make, the 23rd of June 2016 marked a final decision of Britain leaving the EU.

Chapter One: Britain's Relationship with Europe 1945-1973

Introduction:

This chapter examines Britain's relations with Europe from 1945 up to 1973. It traces back the British stand in a rapidly changing Europe. Britain's ties with continental Europe in the last half of the twentieth century have been a mystery full of ups and downs. After the Second World War, European countries were looking for a way to rebuild the continent via unions and collaborations. But, a sovereign Britain refused to join both the Coal and Steel Community in 1951 and the following established European Economic Community of 1957. Yet, due to her economic decline, Britain within a matter of years applied and failed twice to enter the Common Market because of Charles De Gaulle's opposition. Then, the British managed to access the EEC in 1973 when they accepted the regulations and the French veto was no longer present.

1.1. Britain and Europe after the Second World War:

Europe in the period after 1945 saw a progressive move towards collaboration over clash, but Britain never did. The uneasy relationship between Europe and the United Kingdom was shown gradually since then. Britain wanted to be the third power after the US and USSR at that time. So the UK looked for any means to alter any European state in the first place, even though there were times when she had to comply with European integrations. Surprisingly since the eighteenth century, Britain for the first time turned into an indebted country. The credits it had taken out from remote countries to back the war surpassed the cash it could bring up in duties and different incomes.² So while other European Countries were all about unions and collaboration, Britain's focus was on the empire she was losing rather than Europe. On the political scene, at the astonishment of the world, Churchill was cleared out of office as his Conservative Party lost to the Labour Party in the elections of 1945.

The Labour government under the leadership of Clement Atlee set out upon a programme of nationalisation. This programme brought about government responsibility for the Bank of England, for the coal, energy, and gas enterprises.

² Tejban Pettinger, "UK post-war economic boom and reduction in debt", January.2016 (accessed March 26,2017); available from <http://www.economicshelp.org/blog/11697/debt/post-war-boom/>.

Furthermore, the administration merged the railways into British Rail and the carriers into British Overseas Airways Company (BOAC). Yet, the most disputable takeovers were the iron and steel businesses. In 1948 the broadest of Britain's social welfare projects were set up. The National Insurance Act of 1946 strengthened advantages including maternity, unemployment, incapacity, maturity, and Death Grants. The National Health Service, set up in 1948, gave free restorative administration to Britons. However, the sticker price for both projects was far more noteworthy than anybody had foreseen.³

British pioneers undoubtedly assured that Britain must maintain her status as the third extraordinary power. So avoiding Europe as much as they could was the plan since ever. Attlee's government trusted Britain's monetary recuperation since the survival of sterling as extraordinary exchanging cash was required by joining with the old white territories, particularly Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Also, Britain's vital protection against the new Soviet risk required forward air bases. That implied remaining on in the Middle East even after the breakdown of British control in Palestine and its fast clearing in 1948. In Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, and the Gulf, the British were obliged to hold tight to their settlements and bases, including the immeasurable Suez trench zone. They needed assistance from Australia and sought after Indian support against Soviet impact in Asia. European countries; however, didn't know that the British were drowning in debt and they saw The Commonwealth Interface as a zone of financial and political shortcoming. On the other hand, British pioneers believed that it was Britain's abroad resources that would safeguard her and not Europe.⁴

Furthermore, rivalry between the Western countries (counting the United States, Great Britain, France, and Western European nations) and the Communist Eastern alliance (drove by the Union of Soviet Socialists Republics or USSR) shows that Britain was more joyful to minimize her European ties for the Atlantic Alliance and Commonwealth. The European division in 1949 and the possibility of further Communist development provoked the United States and 11 other Western countries to shape the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). As an opposition, The

³ Derek Brown, "1945-51: Labour and the creation of the welfare state." *The Guardian*, March, 2001 (accessed 30 Mar, 2017); available from <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2001/mar/14/past.education>.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Soviet Union and its allies Communist countries in Eastern Europe established an opponent partnership, the Warsaw Pact, in 1955. The fact of joining each European country into one of the two contradicting camps formalized the political division of the European mainland as it is called, the Iron Curtain.⁵

Moreover, The US-UK ties strengthened in 1948 with the Marshall Aid Program. Besides the Anglo-American loan of 1946,⁶ Britain was the first to agree to the Marshall Plan because she saw the United States always as a saviour rather than Europe. US pioneers presented the Marshall Plan, a political activity that gave support to well disposed European countries to help them restore their war-harmed frameworks and economies. The American Secretary of State, George Marshall, proposed his European Recovery Program of four years 1948–1952. The United States government dispensed US\$13 billion for the reproduction of Western Europe only. In July 1947, The European nations met up to look at Marshall's proposition at Paris. The help was initially offered to all the European nations, including those under military occupation by the Soviet Union. The latter assaulted the exposure of the budgetary record of every beneficiary nation to America since it infringes their monetary autonomy. They additionally criticized the Marshall Plan as a plan to offer insignificant US products to Europe and as an imperialistic strategy to extend American business quality into the socialist market. The Soviet Union and its allies pulled back from the meeting and did not get any American help. On the other hand, the Western countries believed that the United States was helping them to accomplish a fast monetary recuperation. In Britain, the country's debt rose up with all the work done by Atlee's government to recuperate the country's status in Europe and the world after spending more than a fourth of her national riches.⁷

The help provided by the US through the Marshall Aid Programme was not equally divided among the beneficiaries. It is clearly shown in the following table that there was discrimination in Europe and a game of interests between America and Europe was in play.

⁵ "Formation of NATO." *History* (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/formation-of-nato-and-warsaw-pact>.

⁶ The Anglo-American Loan Agreement was a post World War II loan made to the United Kingdom by the United States on 15 July 1946, and paid off in 2006. The loan was negotiated by John Maynard Keynes.

⁷ Yong Ho Roh, "The Impact of the Marshall Plan on the United Kingdom ", 2017 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <https://www.zum.de/whkmla/sp/0708/yongho/yongho1.html>.

Table1

The Marshall Plan Aids in Total (000 \$)

Country	Total	%	Grant	%
Total	12,992.50	100	9,290.20	100
England	3,165.80	24	1,956.20	21
France	2,629.80	20.2	2,212.10	23.8
Italy	1,434.60	11	1,174.40	12.6
West Germany	1,317.30	10.1	1,078.70	11.6
Holland	1,078.70	8.3	796.40	8.6
Austria	653.80	5	556.10	6
Greece	628.00	4.8	34.40	5.5
Belgium	546.60	4.2	217.30	0.3
Denmark	266.40	2.1	196.00	2.3
Norway	241.90	1.9	62.40	2.1
Turkey	184.50	1.4	18,00	0.7
Ireland	146.20	1.1	-	0.2
Sweden	107.10	0.8	5.50	-
Portugal	50.50	0.4	15.90	0.1
Spain	26.80	0.2	-	0.2

Source: OZER, Mehemet Halis. "The Effects of the Marshall Plan Aids to the Development of the Agricultural Sector in Turkey, the 1948-1953 Period." *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2014, pp. 4.

Between the end of World War Two to the late 1950s, occasions, especially in Europe, pushed both Cold War sides as far as possible towards war. No real fights happened between the two; however, the five years set a tone that was preceded until the Cold War was formally finished in the 1980's. The NATO, The Warsaw Pact, and The Marshall Aid helped in the partition of Europe, between those countries that acknowledged US help and those countries that had it declined. Britain never liked the idea of a United Europe due to this clear division between the East and West mainly and also because of her sovereignty matters. She exploited the good relationship between her and the US by taking the biggest share of any European country in the Marshall Aid plan with \$3.190 ahead of France who had \$2.714. So The United Kingdom only cared for her own recovery rather than Europe's by, first strengthening ties with the Commonwealth to keep the Sterling as high as possible in markets and later, by increasing the good relationships with the US to ensure the latter's protection and aid.

1.2. Britain and the Creation of the EEC 1957:

The British Prime Minister Winston Churchill explained his political perspective that Europe must be politically and economically united in order to improve the situation after the war that nearly destroyed the whole European continent. These economic ties would bring the European countries closer, strengthen their relations and prevent any military disputes from happening. In his speech in the University of Zurich in 1946, Churchill declared:

We must build a kind of United States of Europe. In this way only will hundreds of millions of toilers be able to regain the simple joys and hopes which make life worth living. The structure of the United States of Europe, if well and truly built, will be such as to make the material strength of a single state less important. Small nations will count as much as large ones and gain their honour by their contribution to the common cause.⁸

⁸ "Gold Mercury International, "Churchill - United States of Europe". Online Video clip. Youtube. 19 January 2015 (accessed 24 March, 2017).

On 9 May 1950 the French foreign minister Robert Schumann proposed to merge the coal and steel industry of both France and West Germany under the control of one single authority, because France was rich of Iron and Germany was rich of coal. France left the door open for Britain and other European countries to join the cooperation. The Schuman declaration aimed at different objectives. First, keeping peace in the continent and making war impossible to happen between the members; second, overlooking the bloody history between Germany and France when they both agreed on handing the control of the industry to a supranational authority; third, increasing the trade between the members by reducing the tariffs and removing barriers. Finally, unifying Europe and creating one single market.⁹

The six founding members (France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Belgium, and Netherlands) agreed on the Schumann Plan and signed The Treaty of Paris on 18 April 1951 creating the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) which was the first step towards a united Europe and the basis of the future European Union. The most critical body of the Community was the High Authority. All the members had to give the complete control of the community to this body which its headquarter is located in Luxembourg. This means that this community is the first in history to be founded on the standards of supranationalism. The role of the High Authority consisted of:¹⁰ controlling the production and the free flow of coal and steel in the Community, fixing the prices among the states and removing the tariffs and barriers between the state members, and creating a free market within the Community.¹¹

From the beginning, the Plan was an incredible financial achievement. By gathering their fundamental resources, the members could deliver coal and steel and their items competently at less expensive value. Pointless exchange rivalry in coal and steel items was discarded. Commonly productive exchange was supported. In the initial five years (1952-1957), exchange steel increased over 150%, exchange coal over 20%. Rich supplies of coal and steel at sensible costs helped the industrial

⁹ Svne Norberg and Matin Johansson, "The History of the EEA Agreement and the First Twenty Years of Its Existence", *The Handbook of EEA Law*, 2015.

¹⁰ Bruce Carolan, "The Birth of the European Union: US and UK Roles in the Creation of a Unified European Community," *Tulsa Journal of Comparative & International Law* (2008): 7-9.

¹¹ Matthew J Gable, "European Union (EU)." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1998 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/European-Union/The-euro-zone-debt-crisis#toc334513>.

prosperity of the late 1950's and 1960's. The coal and steel community was very successful which made the members motivated to search for more economic union.¹²

1.2.1. Britain's Refusal to Join the ECSC:

The United Kingdom had a different stand from the other Western countries. She refused to join the ECSC for several reasons that can be classified as political and economical. The political reasons are shown in the fact that Britain was not consulted during the realisation of the Schumann Plan, which indicates the strong Franco-German relationship rather than the Franco-British relations. Furthermore, The British government decided to concentrate on its political relations with its former colonies and the Commonwealth; besides preserving the strong bond between Britain and the US. On the other hand, the community was designed mainly to keep peace between the members, whereas Britain had ensured collected security through the NATO alliance and from supporting America in career. Moreover, Labour Prime Minister, Clement Attlee, refused the public invitation by the ECSC officials stating that “not going to join a group of nations in which we have just saved four of them from the other two ...”.¹³

Historically speaking, Britain had seen herself a quite different state from the other Western European countries; she saw herself as a great power standing next to the USSR and the US. Apart from that, this island had never been conquered nor invaded, which pushed the British to feel totally different from the rest of Europe. Therefore, Britain was strongly against the supranational management of the authority which gone completely against her principles of sovereignty. The British were fundamentally against the possibility of a technocratic association with limiting powers which would endanger to interfere in the nation's economic strategy. They considered the community as a designating portion of the nation's sovereignty to a risky final point along the European path.

¹² "Economic Co-operation in Western Europe." *The corner home*, (accessed 26 March, 2017); available from <http://www.funfront.net/hist/europe/econ-coop.htm>.

¹³ Bruce Carolan, "The Birth of the European Union: US and UK Roles in the Creation of a Unified European Community," *Tulsa Journal of Comparative & International Law* (2008): 7-9.

From an economic perspective, Britain refused to join the ECSC for multiple reasons.¹⁴ First, The Labour Party took over the government after winning the first general election in 1945. The financial and social changes that contained the nationalisation of key segments of industry and the formation of a National Health Service by Labour Government was accepted to the point that it was acknowledged by the leader of the Conservative party Winston Churchill, when they won the following elections in 1951. There was a discussion in the House of Commons on the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), the Labour Government and the Conservatives agreed on dismissing the engagement in a very tight union. Furthermore, Britain had recently finished the nationalisation of the coal and steel industries. Having struggled over years for the latter, the Labour Party was not really prone to give up control once it had been accomplished, and the economic ministries were claiming that it would harm the British steel industry.

Second, Britain depended less on European markets than on her broad business relationships. In 1947, British exports were more prominent than the whole exports of the six members of ECSC who overwhelmingly exchanged with each other. Britain didn't need Europe to the range that it was ready to give up any level of sovereignty.¹⁵

Third, London did not want to have a similar role like the other European members. The British government was focusing on their trade with its former colonies to boost the economy. The Empire still had an economic value. Despite the fact that India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon won their freedom in Africa; South-East Asia and the West Indies were still fine like before as was the informal empire in the Middle East.¹⁶ Relations with the Empire were strengthened by trade and immigration. The major goal was to make Sterling an international currency next to the Dollar and creating one-world economy. Winston Churchill spoke of this relation in 1951 in the House of Commons:

¹⁴ Chris Gifford, *The making of Eurosceptic Britain: identity and economy in a post-imperial state*, (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008), 27.

¹⁵ "Rebuilding Europe: 1950s - 1960s." *International School History* (accessed 26 March, 2017); available from http://www.internationalschoolhistory.net/western_europe/europe/rebuilding_europe.htm.

¹⁶ Informal empire is the extensive reach of British interests into regions and nations which were not formal parts of the Empire, in that they were not colonies and were not directly ruled by the British.

Where do we stand? We are not members of the European Defence Community, nor do we intend to be merged in a Federal European system. We feel we have a special relation to both. This can be expressed by prepositions, by the preposition "with" but not "of", we are with them, but not of them. We have our own Commonwealth and Empire. One of the anxieties of France is lest Germany, even partitioned as she is now, will be so strong that France will be outweighed in United Europe or in the European Defence Community. I am sure they could do a lot, if they chose to make themselves stronger. But, anyhow, I have always believed, as an active friend of France for nearly 50 years, that our fortunes lie together.¹⁷

a) From the ECSC to the EEC:

After the successful launch of the ECSC, came the objective of creating the European Economic Community. On the first of June 1955, the six member states of the ECSC held a conference in Messina (Italy). The Foreign Ministers showed their desire to begin negotiations at both levels at the same time: while types of new partial union essentially in the domains of transport, conventional and nuclear energy should have been studied; another aim was the creation of a common market. The conference created an Intergovernmental Committee led by the Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henry Spaak. This Committee, known as the Spaak Committee, consisted of delegates from the members of the ECSC who draw up a report which would portray the wide schedule of a future European Economic Community (EEC) and European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC). The Spaak Report was published on 21 April 1956 by the secretariat of the intergovernmental committee. It was separated into three sections: the first handled the common market, the second dealt with Euratom, and the third dealt with problems that should be fixed and solved urgently in different areas.¹⁸

¹⁷ "Later life of Winston Churchill." *Wikipedia*. N.p., 05 Mar. 2017. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Later_life_of_Winston_Churchill>.

¹⁸ "Spaak Report" (accessed March 14, 2017); available from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spaak_Report.

On 25th of March 1957, the leaders of the six European states signed the treaty of Rome founding the European Economic Community (EEC). The latter aimed to create a common market, to promote the European economic unity and the European Atomic Energy (EURATOM), and to enhance peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The EEC Treaty set out the aim and the details of a customs union; supports the framing of a common agriculture policy (CAP); and sets out standards for the free movement of people, services, and capital. Concerning the standardisation of competition, the EEC Treaty includes provisions on the standards applicable to commitments and state help. Lastly, it resumes a common transport strategy.¹⁹The EEC Treaty was established on the traditional qualification between the three powers: a legislative power, an executive power, and a judiciary. These were the Assembly, The Council, The Commission, and The Court of Justice.²⁰

1.2.2. British Reaction to the Creation of the EEC:

Britain was invited to take part of the Spaak Committee and approved to do so on the understanding that they had special difficulties with any proposition for a European single market. The British Prime Minister Anthony Eden refused to attend and send an observer instead, Russell Bretherton, who was an Under Secretary in the Board of Trade, which demonstrated the low priority awarded to the participation. Bretherton reported to the Spaak Committee that Britain was concerned about the shift in the road of economic integration because of her obligations to the Commonwealth and Empire. Specifically, there was the problem of whether the Treaty of Rome would include the abroad territories of the member states. The reaction of other states was that they were ready to negotiate on British conditions for access and desired to see Britain's participation in a customs union. The British hold a position where they can shape the negotiations. In November 1955, The British government chose to pull out its representation from the Spaak Committee arguing that it was a duplication of the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation.²¹

¹⁹ "Treaty of Rome (EEC)", March, 2017 (accessed March 20, 2017); available from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3Axy0023>.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Gresham College, "The Decision to Seek Entry into the Common Market - Professor Vernon Bogdanor." Online Video clip. Youtube, 2014 (accessed 24 March, 2017).

After the withdrawal from the negotiations, the ECC was created without the participation of Britain. In opposition, Thorneycroft, the president of the Trade board committee, and Macmillan created a plan known as the Plan G. The plan aimed at integrating Britain in a common market with the Inner Six.²² It was drafted by seven departments: the Foreign office, the Treasury, the Customs and Excise, the Board Trade, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Commonwealth Relations Office, and the Colonial Office. The plan was made to save British Commonwealth trade and secure British agriculture while keeping up the markets of the Six to British industry.²³

As further reaction towards the EEC, talks were launched between the United Kingdom, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and Austria (the Seven), on the creation of a free trade arrangement between them. The arrangement had two main objectives: First, to avoid economic segregation from the recently created EEC; second, to initiate free trade between the Seven in parallel to that inwards the EEC, with the possibility of making a future agreement with the Six.²⁴

On the 4th of May 1960, the United Kingdom, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland, these countries were often referred to as the Outer Seven,²⁵ signed the Stockholm Convention creating the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). Its central aim was to guarantee free trade in industrial products accordingly with a timetable parallel to the one of the ECC. In the case of fish and agriculture goods changed relying upon whether they were processed (and so generally subject to free trade) or non-processed (in this case they are not included in the scope of the Convention); However, on-processed goods were the subject of reciprocal agreements and preferential systems. In parallel, the opening up of public procurement and the approximation of technical specifications completed the system. EFTA had no supranational bodies, did not state any type of financial integration or lay any external customs tariff, nor did it seek after any common policy. As initially stated in the convention, the cancelation of tariffs and quantitative limitations was to take 10 years, which would permit parallelism with the similar procedure going ahead

²² The Inner Six are the founding member states of the European Community. They are: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands and West Germany.

²³ GreshamCollege.

²⁴ GreshamCollege.

²⁵ The Outer Seven are those European countries in opposition of the EFTA.

in the EEC. When the EEC chose to fasten its timetable, EFTA did the same and this brought about taxes on industrial goods being cancelled, three years before the timetable. It was on 31 December 1966, which was actually one and a half year before of the EEC.²⁶

1.3. The UK's Process of Accessing the EEC 1973:

Britain's relationship with the EEC has been crucial in the 1960's. When accession was starting to sound reasonable, Britain began negotiations to apply for membership of the EEC under Harold Macmillan in 1963 just to be refused by General De Gaulle's veto. A second application under Harold Wilson was also opposed by the French. It was until 1973 that Britain finally gained an access to the EEC under Edward Heath premiership.

1.3.1. The Failure of the Early British Applications 1963 and 1967:

During the 1960's, the British will to be more engaged in the European Economic Community was replacing the general refusal of joining a European Community. The public opinion and the political parties were divided by the issue, but the Tories were more pro-Europeans than the other parties.

After the creation of the EFTA, soon it was known that the Outer Seven couldn't contend with the Inner Six concerning economic production and prosperity. The first reason was that the Inner Six had more population than the Outer Seven. So the former had a bigger market for the sale of their merchandise than the latter. The second reason was that the Inner Six were industrially modernized countries, while the Outer Seven, aside from Britain and Switzerland, were industrially a bit backward. The third reason was the long distance between the Outer Seven, which held back the growth of trade. Britain recognized that EFTA couldn't convey much economic advantages to her.

After the empirical decline and the economic recession caused by both the Suez Crisis 1956 and the failure of the EFTA,²⁷ The British Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, realized that his country is somehow isolated from the international scene,

²⁶ GreshamCollege.

²⁷ The Suez Crisis was an invasion of Egypt in late 1956 by Israel, followed by the United Kingdom and France.

and the only way to drive the country to her natural status is by entering the EEC. Thus, Macmillan started preparing the application to join the Common Market. First, he appointed many pro-European officials in the crucial government posts. Second, he visited the capital cities of the Inner Six and the Commonwealth countries to promote the benefits of the United Kingdom's membership to the EEC. Despite some opposition from the Labour Party, the Government's proposal was agreed on by the House of Commons on 4 August 1961.

Edward Heath, Lord Privy Seal, was appointed to lead the negotiations with The Six in Brussels. His job wasn't easy because London had many demands and called for many exceptions from some Community Regulations. For instance, she had a problem in accepting the Common Customs Tariff for apprehension that it would collapse her special links with the Commonwealth countries. Remarkable advance was accomplished in the summer of 1962, especially concerning Britain's move far from the idea of imperial priority. However, the British continued returning with an increasing number of demands for exceptions. To win the British mass opinion, Harold Macmillan started a public campaign. Yet, Canada and New Zealand showed their objection to the accession of Britain to the EEC at the conference of the Commonwealth Countries in September 1962.²⁸

Britain's application to join the European Economic Community was vetoed by the French President Charles De Gaulle. He held a press conference on 14 January 1963, where he announced his objection to Britain's application to enter the EEC. He indicated to contradictions between the European Continent and the British economic interests. De Gaulle requested that the United Kingdom should take every one of the provisions stated by the Six and cancel her obligations to countries inside her free trade zone. On 28 January, the other members of the EEC were forced by the French government to close the negotiations of the accession.²⁹

General de Gaulle was worried about the possibility that Britain may endanger the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) and change the European Economic Community (EEC) into a big free trade zone. Most importantly, he viewed the United Kingdom as a Trojan horse hiding US interests. He thought that Europe would be

²⁸ Maria Sorokina, "Great Britain and the European Integration", (Ma. Thesis. Masaryk university, 2014).

²⁹ Maria Sorokina.

americanised if Britain entered the EEC. He announced his support for a developing and an increasing speed of Common Market incorporation instead of enlargement, and raised questions on Britain's obligation towards Europe. De Gaulle's motive behind the veto did not relate to just economic reasons, but he was worried about the cooperation between Britain and the US in the nuclear field.³⁰ The Franco-British relations were shaken after the British received Polaris Rockets from the American, which led De Gaulle to strengthen the Franco-German relations.³¹

The Labour party won the general elections of 1964 and a new Prime Minister, Harold Wilson, came to office replacing Harold Macmillan. The new Prime Minister was against the first application to join the EEC, but after reaching Downing Street, Wilson followed a more pro-European path. The reason behind this obvious change in policies was that the British economy had suffered a lot in the mid 1960's. In addition, the trade with EFTA countries was not increasing as expected and the relations with the Commonwealth countries were getting weaker and weaker. On the other hand, the trade between the EEC countries was increasing and reaching an unprecedented numbers. Moreover, the participation in the European Communities would grant Britain an active role in the international scene, which will reduce her dependence on the US. At that time, the EEC sounded as the best salvation to revive the British economy.

After an easy win in the general elections of the 1966, Wilson had the support of his party to apply again to join the EEC. Accompanied with his foreign secretary, George Brown, Wilson paid multiple visits to the leaders of The Six where he encountered positive reactions expect from France, but Wilson declared that he will convince De Gaulle with the importance of Britain in the EEC.³²

Wilson declared to the House of Commons that the government had agreed to apply for accession to the EEC and the majority approved the step. On 11 May 1967, Ireland, Norway, Denmark and the United Kingdom applied to join the EEC, where

³⁰ "BBC ON THIS DAY | 21 | 1962: America to sell Polaris to Britain" (accessed March 24, 2016) available from

http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/21/newsid_3815000/3815251.stm.

³¹ A Polaris Rocket is designed to be fired underwater from a submarine. It carries a half-megaton nuclear warhead at a speed of 17,500 mph.

³² British Pathé, "Harold Wilson In Holland For E.E.C. Talks. (1967)" Online Video clip. Youtube, 2014 (accessed 24 March, 2017).

they submitted their applications in Brussels.³³ Negotiations started between the applicant countries and the Six in July 1967. The opinion of the commission of the European Communities was requested by the Six. The opinion of the commission resulted in: the necessity of respecting the decisions made by the community before the enlargements, reviewing the British economic problem of payments equilibrium, and identifying the role of the Sterling Pound.³⁴

On the 27 November 1967, the French president Charles De Gaulle held a press conference where he revealed his objection to the British accession to the EEC for the second time in 4 years. He justified his country's veto with multiple reasons. First, the British Economic problem, especially when the British government decided to devalue the pound sterling on 18 November; second, the British insisted on the involvement of the US in the European defence and rejected the creation of a European nuclear force. Lastly, the accession of Britain to the EEC would change the community fundamentally and will push it to take the road of a single free trade area.³⁵

1.3.2. The Success of the British Application 1973:

The general elections of 1970 resulted in the surprising win of the Conservative party and its leader Edward Heath. The latter was known for his pro-European sentiments. The British new government of Heath seized the opportunity when De Gaulle was no longer the president of France, and started the negotiations to enter the EEC on 30 June 1970.

The two sides of the negotiations had to deal with three major obstacles. First, the British Financial contributions were the most difficult part of the negotiations. Britain did her best to reduce her contributions, but eventually agreed to the financing of the EEC budget. Second, another obstacle was dealt with which was the international role of the pound sterling. France wanted the British to abolish the pound sterling as an international reserve currency, but a compromise was reached later including many ambiguities. Finally, another compromise was reached when Britain

³³ The headquarter of the EEC was located in the Belgian capital.

³⁴ "Why did Britain join the EEC in 1973, and not before or later?", *Ankara University Faculty of Political Science*, (accessed 20 March, 2017); available from <http://80.251.40.59/politics.ankara.edu.tr/hdogan/essays/essay1.html>.

³⁵ Ibid.

accepted to be formalised in agreements between the Community and the countries of the Commonwealth. The negotiations lasted from the end of June 1970 until 22 January 1972.³⁶

On 28 October 1971, the House of Commons agreed on the accession to the European Economic Community. Then, the United Kingdom signed the Accession Treaty on 22 January 1972 in Brussels. On 6 October, the Royal Assent was given by the Queen to the accession of the United Kingdom to the EEC and later came into effect on 1 January 1973. Not everyone back in Britain was satisfied with the European integration. They believed that the British government agreed on many policies and regulations that went against the British interests such as the high contributions to the EEC funds and the agreement on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) because the cultivating industry of Britain was not that big, yet efficient. So in this way Britain didn't profit highly, contrasted with the other members of the EEC whose agricultural industry was bigger and more incompetent.³⁷

Conclusion:

The British-European relationship from 1945 to 1973 was marked by a remarkable contradiction and unsteadiness from both sides. After The Second World War, most of the European countries were left in ruins. Britain was trying to get the country back to the path of prosperity by accepting the American financial and political aid. Britain chose a different road than other European countries which were heading towards union. Her Prime Ministers never supported the UK access to the ECSC and EEC; they believed that Britain should focus on her own Empire-centred partnership with the Commonwealth of Nations. However, the economic difficulties in the 1960's made Britain reconsider the ability to join the Common Market, yet her applications were refused twice by Charles De Gaulle. On 1 January 1973 Britain finally joined the EEC, but the two main political parties, the Conservative and Labour, were each heavily divided over the question of Europe.

³⁶ Chris Gifford, "The making of Eurosceptic Britain", (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 60.

³⁷ GreshamCollege, "Entry into the European Community, 1971-73 - Professor Vernon Bogdanor." Online Video clip. Youtube, 2014(accessed 24 March, 2017).

Chapter Two: The Growth of British Euroscepticism

Introduction:

The aim of this chapter is to show that Euroscepticism in Britain became strongly apparent since the 1970s. First, the British Labour government under the leadership of Harold Wilson held a referendum on the EEC membership. Later, the Conservative leader, Margret Thatcher, who became Prime Minister in 1979, negotiated a rebate on the British contribution to the EEC budget and paradoxically signed the Single European Act. She ended her premiership with a real face of Euroscepticism in her speech of Bruges (1988). Furthermore, John Major, after Thatcher, was greatly praised for his negotiations with the EC and getting Britain the right to stay out of the Eurozone in the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. Finally, Britain was moving far away from Europe to the West. Since 1997, Tony Blair, as a British Prime Minister, had a Special Relationship with the American President, George Bush. The strongest US-EU ties ever were clearly indicated in Blair's help to Bush in the War on Terror. These several Eurosceptic events that Britain witnessed from 1975 to the end of Blair's membership plainly contributed to the Growth of Euroscepticism in Britain.

2.1. Euroscepticism from 1975 to 1990:

The newly appointed government of 1975 did not wait long to show its refusal to the EEC membership. The labours kept their already given promise and held a referendum that prolonged the membership of Britain in EEC. This feeling of Euroscepticism continued to appear when the new Prime Minister, Margret Thatcher, asked for a British rebate and refused the social and political union in her speech of Bruges.

2.1.1. The EEC Membership Referendum, 1975:

In 1975, The British held a referendum on whether the UK ought to stay in the EEC. The majority of political parties and media upheld continuing membership of the EEC. For the second time, Harold Wilson came back as a Prime Minister on March 4, 1974. The economy was wrecked and Wilson had to lead a divided government. His initial move was to name Jim Callaghan as foreign secretary. The

fiercely Eurosceptic Tony Benn was assigned as Secretary of State for Industry. While Roy Jenkins, who led the Remain campaign, was moved to the remote Home Office. On the other hand, Michael Foot was the leader of the Leave camp.³⁸

Labours won The United Kingdom's general election of 1974 and British expectations about another Conservatives victory were wrong. Wilson had the larger part of 42 seats. Some Labour members were pressing forward with renegotiation, threatening with a referendum on the result. The Wilson government's main move was not to withdraw from the Common Market, but rather to renegotiate the terms of January 1973 membership. If the administration didn't like the new deal, then Wilson will definitely have no choice but to recommend a way out for the British people.

The anti-marketeters³⁹ demands were demonstrated in a form of meeting with EEC leaders in Paris in December 1974, addressed the same sensitive areas that would describe British tension over Europe for the following four decades: the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), Britain's spending commitment, minimizing opportunities of any move to Economic and Monetary Union, assuring parliamentary sovereignty, and restricting trade to poorer member states.⁴⁰

However, neither Conservatives nor Labours were happy with Wilson's renegotiations and no good intentions were shown from the EEC at that time. So in January 1975 Wilson advised the House of Commons that a decision for Britain's membership of the EEC would take place in April. Thus, he handed the terms of the renegotiation to the cabinet on March 17.

Back then, Conservatives were generally united over an EEC membership, while Labours were profoundly at discomfort. There was a remarkable split, though, with 16 ministers in favour, and seven against. Those on the left of the Labour Party were most definitely against the EEC, while those members who are more to the middle were for the membership of the Common Market. Actually, the individuals who on a very basic level contradict the Government must leave from Ministerial

³⁸ Vaughne Miller, "The 1974-75 UK Renegotiation of EEC Membership and Referendum", *House of Commons Library Briefings*, 2015 (accessed 26 March, 2017).11.

³⁹ anti-marketeter (plural anti-marketeters) someone who was opposed to Britain joining the "Common Market" (European Union).

⁴⁰ Vaughne Miller,9,10.

office. However, Wilson favoured suspending the convention on imploding his party.⁴¹ “Europe has been a toxic issue in British politics, and it has caused divisions, unlike most issues, it has caused divisions not only between the parties, divisions which perhaps could have been handled, but also deep divisions within the parties”.⁴²

On 5 June 1975, British citizens were asked to vote yes or no on the question: Do you think the UK should stay in the European Community (Common Market)? Ironically, the “Yes” campaign was supported by Harold Wilson and more than half of the cabinet, including James Callaghan, the Foreign Secretary; Roy Jenkins, the Home Secretary and Denis Healey, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was also supported by most of the Conservatives and its recently chosen leader Margaret Thatcher. Furthermore, the Liberal Party, the Social Fair, the Alliance Party of Northern Ireland, and the Vanguard Progressive Unionist Party, were all in favour of the Remain vote.⁴³

On the other hand, the "No" campaign was supported for the most part by the very left of the Labour party including Tony Benn (cabinet minister), Michael Foot (state secretary of Industry), Dwindle Shore, and Barbara Castle. Besides, only a few individuals from the right Conservative Party were for the Leave vote. Almost everyone in the Ulster Unionist Party supported the "No" campaign, especially the previous Conservative minister Enoch Powell. Moreover, Ian Paisley of the Democratic Unionist Party declared his opposition in a public way. The campaign additionally gained support from the extreme right National Front of the UK, and the extreme left Communist Party. Finally, it was the same case for The Scottish National Party and Plaid Cymru.⁴⁴

The 1975 referendum resulted in 67.2 % voting "Yes" and 32.8 % voting "No."⁴⁵ In the light of this event, the British people, they either felt afraid of an

⁴¹ Suspending the convention means to set aside its normal rules to do something that it could not do otherwise. However, there are rules that cannot be suspended.

⁴² Gresham College, “The Decision to Seek Entry into the Common Market - Professor Vernon Bogdanor.” Online Video clip. Youtube, 29 January 2014 (accessed 24 March, 2017).

⁴³ Vaughne Miller, 21.

⁴⁴ Vaughne Miller, 22.

⁴⁵ Roy Greenslade, “Did national papers' pro-European bias in 1975 affect the referendum?”, February 4, 2016 (accessed March 26, 2017); available from <https://www.theguardian.com/media/greenslade/2016/feb/04/did-national-papers-pro-european-bias-in-1975-affect-the-referendum>.

unstable economy or they simply kept an ear to the ground on pro-European arguments, in the end, they remained in the Common Market. Following the referendum, Labour's internal divisions over the EEC reached new levels of severity, as the Left side slowly but surely strengthened its position within the party and drove it towards a ruthless anti-European direction. The anti-marketiers could not accept the referendum final decision, especially with Benn and Foot in the front lines.

2.1.2. The Eurosceptic Thatcher Years:

Now, the real cause behind Wilson's call for a referendum was never clear. Yet, similar to Thatcher, he campaigned for a Yes vote. Thatcher; on the other hand, had zero passion within and little interest. It has been always a problem with Thatcher in her early years, her vision seemed unsteady.

In order to understand Margaret Thatcher's European view, it is necessary to have a look at the main events in her European agenda. Thatcher, who ended up noticeably Prime Minister in 1979, straightforwardly expressed her extremely negative character towards the EC. The time of her administration was set apart by a remarkable political isolation of Britain from Europe. She was against the full and complete financial, political, and social integration. Yet, she found herself already in Europe and she couldn't withdraw her nation's economy from the European Communities. At that time, she was aware of the advantages for her nation as an individual from the EC. Therefore, she couldn't destroy the European building process completely. She simply wanted to divert Britain's path from a supranational progress to national collaboration.

Margaret Thatcher of the 1980s was not in favour of joining the European Monetary System and she was not willing to participate in a common social policy. She considered them as projects towards the development of a closer political and social union rather than economic. In fact, the united Europe, for her was seen only as something made out for financial reasons only, a typical European market, not a political group.

a) The British Rebate:

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) was the main reason behind the first Eurosceptics signs. When the UK joined the EEC, the CAP was already initiated (That's why De Gaulle was delaying Britain's access). The CAP is based on the farming sector and the UK had a small part in farming then. Therefore, the Value Added Tax was higher for the UK than any other member state at that time.⁴⁶ So the policy was more a burden on Britons than an advantage. Margret Thatcher was famous for her diplomatic style. It was well shown through her state of mind at the Fontainebleau Summit in 1984 when she negotiated a rebate on the British contribution to the EEC budget.

Thatcher started the negotiations for the rebate in November 1979 at the meeting of the Council of Ministers of the EEC. She asked for Britain's tax money back from the Community budget. Although, the president of the European Council sets the schedule of the meetings, but the British matter was often avoided. Therefore, Thatcher insisted many times on examining it. She even threatened to pull back her nation from the European Communities if there was no solution or compromise, "I need my cash back!" she shouted.⁴⁷ So due to her stubborn strategy, the issue of reducing the UK commitment to the Community budget took over all the EEC Council meetings until 1984.⁴⁸

June 1984, at the meeting of the European Council in which Thatcher took part, in Fontainebleau; a bargain as a solution was finally adopted. Compensation to Britain will be equivalent to 66% between the sum of her commitment to the Community budget and the amount of spending from the EEC to Great Britain. As well as, 1 billion ECUs was paid for the UK that year;⁴⁹ and about more than one billion in 1985 and 1986.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ A value-added tax is a type of consumption tax that is placed on a product whenever value is added at a stage of production and at final sale.

⁴⁷ Statement at a press conference when Thatcher was trying to renegotiate Britain's EEC budget contribution at the EEC Summit in Dublin (30 November 1979). Often quoted as "I want my money back".

⁴⁸ Chung Hee Lee, "The UK's negotiation of its EU budget rebate", (Phd.Thesis, Univeristy of Glasgow, 2011).82.

⁴⁹ The European Currency Unit (ECU) was the precursor to the Euro, the shared single currency of the European Union's member countries.

⁵⁰ Chung Hee Lee, 98.

b) Britain and the Single European Act:

The real intention behind Thatcher's policies and actions was hard to decipher. In 1986, she signed the Single European Act (SEA) which was somehow considered as an improvement to the Treaties of Rome 1957. Therefore, it is the pragmatism within Thatcher's administrative leadership that was shown in her willingness to sign the Single European Act. The main revision for the Act was the establishment of the necessary legislative programme to eliminate trade barriers. Ironically, however, it was the Eurosceptic Prime Minister Thatcher herself who signed the Single European Act in 1986. The latter is considered to be as a landmark treaty from which a significant part of the EU's future integration has been drawn. Thus, Thatcher's argument was to have a real single market working in the European Communities because there were still many barriers to free trade between the member states.

c) Thatcher's Eurosceptic Speech of Bruges:

Definitely, Margret Thatcher's vision of Europe laid out in the Bruges speech of 1988. It was quite a Thatcherism ideology of a liberal, intergovernmental Europe, in which Britain could remain a free and sovereign nation. In the speech, Thatcher was seen as Eurosceptic as she has ever been:

It is ironic that just when those countries such as the Soviet Union, which have tried to run everything from the centre, are learning that success depends on dispersing power and decisions away from the centre, there are some in the community who seem to want to move in the opposite direction. We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain only to see them reimposed at a European level with a European superstate exercising a new dominance from Brussels.⁵¹

Margaret Thatcher was against the mastery of any state over Europe or any privileged position inside the Community. For instance, the impact of France in the EC since its establishment was clear with such decisions as the CAP. Second, On EU

⁵¹ "Speech to the College of Europe ("The Bruges Speech")." Margaret Thatcher Foundation. (accessed 24 March, 2017). <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/107332>.

laws, for Margaret Thatcher, Britain was losing her freedom and sovereignty by transferring the power of decision-making to Brussels. Therefore, the EC should not move towards the formation of a supranational state.

Furthermore, the Prime Minister of the UK had also mentioned the Cold War division and the US. She declared that the European Commission was one indication of the European identity; however, was missing a critical piece of Europe that was behind the Iron Curtain. Additionally, the long-established connection between the UK and the US made Thatcher a supporter of American collaboration. Moreover, she argued that Europe is a wider concept than EC and another sort of Europe, a better one, is possible. Finally, on the European Market, Thatcher called the European Communities to consider enterprising and to improve the economical condition of its individuals.

Thatcher was determined to go up against the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) of the European Monetary System, no matter what, at least until October 1990. That year, with much hesitance and pressure on Thatcher's shoulders she gave her agreement for the ERM. It was a decision that pushed away some of her cabinet members including Geoffrey Howe.⁵²

Also, reunification of Germany was looming by the end of the Cold War. A bigger and stronger Germany meant a break in balance between the European Communities. Margaret Thatcher was afraid that the possibility of reuniting Germany would lead to its mastery over Europe and EC in particular. She opposed the reunification with her partner in this issue Françoise Mitterrand, a previous enemy. But, the French changed their minds very soon after and they favoured stronger Germany inside the EC rather than outside. Also, the United States preferred reuniting Germany. Thus, Thatcher found herself alone and she couldn't prevent it from happening.⁵³

⁵² Howe was Margaret Thatcher's longest-serving Cabinet minister, successively holding the posts of Chancellor of the Exchequer.

⁵³ Carsten Volkery, "The Iron Lady's Views on German Reunification: 'The Germans Are Back!' - SPIEGEL ONLINE - International", 2009 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <<http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/the-iron-lady-s-views-on-german-reunification-the-germans-are-back-a-648364.html>>.

Finally, Howe's resignation, Thatcher's growing Euroscepticism in a Conservative party and the opposition she witnessed in her late years, paved the way to her resignation from the party and Downing Street. So ironically again, It worked out that Europe was the stone which sank the Thatcher premiership. Thatcher resigned on the 23rd November 1990 after her Cabinet refused to back her for a second leadership election.

2.2. John Major and the Maastricht Treaty 1992-1993:

After Thatcher, John Major's membership was famously known with the signing of the Maastricht Treaty in 1992. Hence, The Anti-Federalist League (AFL) in 1991 was mainly established to oppose the Maastricht Treaty. The League emerged by the historian Alan Sked, Professor in London School of Economics (LSE), previous Liberal Party candidate and member of the Bruges Group. Sked had changed his ideals over to Euroscepticism while teaching the LSE's European Studies programme. Later, he became only known as Eurosceptic AFL leader.⁵⁴

Sked stood as a prospective Member of Parliament in Bath at the 1992 general election under the Anti-Federalist League's name. But, he didn't gain much of the vote. Many members of the AFL knew that the only choice is to be hostile as anti-federalists against the Maastricht treaty in place. They wanted to campaign for a complete exit from the European Union. Therefore, at a League meeting held in the LSE on 3 September 1993, the party was renamed the UK Independence Party (UKIP).⁵⁵ Not all members embrace the change and followed Sked's steps into the new organisation, yet the party did successfully take the place of the League by following a Eurosceptic approach since.

2.2.1. The British Opt-out of the Maastricht Treaty:

It was hard for Thatcher to stop Europe's march towards political union; and when the Maastricht Treaty was signed by her successor John Major in 1992, she wasn't even there to oppose. Major's first test was at the intergovernmental conference in Maastricht, December 1991. The Dutch summit of the EEC member states was called to create influential incorporation and deeper integration through,

⁵⁴ Denis MacShane, "Brexit: how Britain will leave Europe" (London: I.B. Tauris, 2015), 88.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

among other strong measures, Economic and Monetary Union. The Prime Minister guaranteed that Britain would be out of the Monetary Union, would have an exemption in the European Social Charter, would decide its own particular foreign defence and immigration strategy, and would oppose any move towards federalism. Following two days of negotiations, Major had secured basically all that he had promised to accomplish.⁵⁶

The Prime Minister received a hero's welcome in the House of Commons. At the point when parliament voted in the first meeting of the Maastricht Treaty in December 1991, only seven conservatives rebelled. Some media journalists note that the image of competence and aptitude developed by John Major amid the Maastricht negotiations were a great deal for him in the 1992's general election campaign. Therefore, regardless of The Labour strong famous beginning, the Conservatives won, and John Major remained a Prime Minister. Yet, he had won with only a majority of 21 seats.

After John Major's win in the 1992 general elections, the European Communities (Amendment) Bill was introduced to Parliament. The Labour administration, Liberal Democrats and all supporters of the Maastricht Treaty, criticized Major's opt-out of the Social Protocol and the EMU.⁵⁷ It is, ironically, significant that, a majority of those who were disloyal to the Prime Minister were conservatives.

The Maastricht Treaty is formally called The Treaty on European Union. It was mainly a major ratification of the 1957 Treaty of Rome. The treaty was signed on 7 February 1992 and came into force on the first of November 1993. The Treaty established the so-called three pillars of the European Union which are: the European Communities, a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), and cooperation on Justice and Home Affairs (JHA). Also, the treaty included terms for establishing a Common European Citizenship, expanding the role of European Parliament, setting up Economic and Monetary Union and adopting a Social Protocol. Finally, the

⁵⁶ Maya Sion, "The Politics of Opt-Out in the European Union: Voluntary or Involuntary Defection?" *Proceedings of the IWM Junior Fellows' Conference*, 2003,11,9.

⁵⁷ Martin Holmes, "John Major and Europe: The Failure of a Policy 1990-7", (accessed March 26, 2017); available from <https://www.brugesgroup.com/media-centre/papers/8-papers/801-john-major-and-europe-the-failure-of-a-policy-1990-7>.

Maastricht Treaty officially changed the name of the EEC to the European Union (EU).⁵⁸

There was a hard process in ratifying the treaty mainly in Denmark and France besides the Eurosceptics UK. The first Danish Maastricht Treaty referendum was held on 2 June 1992 and the treaty was rejected by only a margin of 50.7% to 49.3%. Furthermore, in September 1992, a referendum in France with 50.8% in favour barely came as a support for the ratification.⁵⁹

The years of chaos and instability that the EEC witnessed led to the turmoil of the European currency markets in September 1992. Firstly, Margret Thatcher as a conservative Eurosceptic was forced to sign the ERM. Also, the reunification of Germany disturbed the order within the European Communities. Furthermore, the British Tories opposed John Major's negotiations over the Maastricht treaty, as well as, the Danish and French referendums which were divided on the matter. All these sequent reasons led to the British Pound withdrawal from the ERM.

2.2.2. The ERM Problem:

In addition to Major's developing conviction inside his own party, the problems were seeped out from Westminster to Brussels. The British Prime Minister's troubles on Europe were represented in the UK crash out of the Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM). The Danish referendum rejecting the Maastricht Treaty and the French referendum accepting it mattered to Britain in a whole different way. They were the reason behind John Major's late Parliamentary Bill. So during this delay, a huge pressure was put on some European currencies within the ERM. More particularly, the heavy weight on the British pound caused a full humiliation for Major and his Chancellor of the Exchequer, Norman Lamont.⁶⁰

After an overflow of selling the British Pound on foreign stock trades, Britain couldn't keep the pound over its agreed on limit in the ERM. 16 November 1992 was called Black Wednesday, crushed the Government's economic credibility, put those

⁵⁸ "Three pillars of the European Union", *Wikipedia*, 2017 (accessed 15 April, 2017); available from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_pillars_of_the_European_Union>.

⁵⁹ "Referendums related to the European Union." *Wikipedia*. 2017 (accessed April 26, 2017); available from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Referendums_related_to_the_European_Union.

⁶⁰ John Todd, "The UK's relationship with Europe: struggling over sovereignty", (Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2016), 59.

opposing the Maastricht Treaty ahead of John Major as Prime Minister. So on 17 September 1992, the Government was forced to suspend its membership of the ERM and devalue the pound.⁶¹

Finally, the Maastricht treaty was put into force after modifications and ratifications were made due to the Edinburgh Agreement which granted Denmark four exemptions.⁶² So the following year on 18 May 1993, a second Danish referendum resulted in approval of 56.7% of voters; even though, Britain and Denmark were the only two members to negotiate an opt-out and stay outside the Eurozone.⁶³

On June 22nd 1995, John Major announced his resignation as Leader of the Conservative Party, though not as Prime Minister. His resignation was a reaction to a deep division in the party over the highly contentious EU.

In 1997 Britain; however, regardless of the general public thoughts of Europe and the single currency issue in particular, the British completely neglected the Conservatives at the polls, choosing instead the Labours. The United Kingdom general election that year was held on 1 May 1997. So under the administration of Tony Blair, the Labour Party won the general election after being far away from Downing Street for quite a long time. Blair, with a landslide victory, he secured 418 seats. It was the highest number of seats the Labour has ever held and the most seats guaranteed by a party after WWII.

2.3. Britain Closer Relations with the US after the 9/11 Attacks:

It was clear that Britain's image as an EU member state was much better with the Labour party under Tony Blair leadership than it used to be. However, there was an issue becoming mostly apparent to everyone in Europe which is the UK's Special Relationship with the US. The European Union communities considered the union which they are part of as parallel to America. But, The UK never thought the same because that notion may hamper the Anglo-American relationship and hinder Britain's foreign policies.

⁶¹ "Three pillars of the European Union", *Wikipedia*.

⁶² The Four exemptions concluded Citizenship, Economic and monetary union, Defence policy, Justice and home affairs.

⁶³ "Referendums related to the European Union." *Wikipedia*.

In April 1999, Tony Blair made the most courageous and appealing speech in all his years as PM.⁶⁴ That discourse of Chicago was almost two years before George Walker Bush would become US President. Blair had no idea of the latter and most crucially he had no idea that the 9/11 will change the years of his premiership. The foreign policy of Liberal internationalism that he set out became the main delusion that led him straight to Baghdad. It started on Tuesday, 11 September 2001. About nineteen of the Islamic terrorist group Al Qaeda, under the leadership of Osama Bin Laden, launched a hellish devastating attack. The Suicide bombers crashed planes into the Pentagon and the World Trade Centre, killing thousands of people in the US.

The incident of 9/11 was the most important impact behind the progression of the Anglo-American relationship. It even changed the circumstances in the UK and Europe. Bush and Blair were mainly bonded by war. Without those 9/11 Attacks, and the Wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that took after, their relationship would have had none of the close intimacy that portrayed it.

After 9/11, addressing Congress,⁶⁵ President Bush had declared: “Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists”⁶⁶. However, Blair was a creature of compromise. His vision to the world was different from those terms. He always considered Britain as a bridge between the US and Europe in foreign affairs.

Tony Blair response with full support, was clear in the conference he held soon after the 9/11 attacks. He stated: “It was not America alone who was the target, but all of us who shared the same values. We had to stand together. We had to understand the scale of the challenge and rise to meet it. We could not give up until it was done”.⁶⁷

Furthermore, as another sign of the close Anglo-American relationship, Great Britain reacted with noble actions which will be eternally remembered. Queen Elizabeth; therefore, expressed her shock and grief by ordering the US national

⁶⁴ The British Prime Minister Tony Blair speech in Chicago 1999 on the doctrine of international community.

⁶⁵ President Bush's address to a joint session of Congress on Thursday night, September 20, 2001.

⁶⁶ Branko Marctec, "Blair to Bush on Day After 9/11: “Co-opt” Sympathy for the U.S. to Support Military Action", *In These Times*, 2016 (accessed 03 March, 2017); available from <<http://inthesetimes.com/article/19292/chilcot-report-uk-tony-blair-regime-change-iraq-war>>.

⁶⁷ Marctec Branco.

anthem to be played as kind of memorial at the Buckingham Palace. Also, a Service of Remembrance was held at St. Paul's Cathedral in which The Queen and the Prime Minister Tony Blair attended.⁶⁸

2.3.1. Britain-US Coalition and the War on Terror:

The blood friendship started immediately between Blair and Bush with the Afghanistan War. Blair told Bush that the plan is to ask the Afghans terrorists to deliver Bin Laden or they should endure the consequences. So following his clear statement on helping Bush, the seventh of October 2001 triggered the official beginning of the war in Afghanistan. There was much pressure on Blair at home to take some steps back. He knew that Britain's interests are not fully within this war. Yet, he was ready to sacrifice the British ideas in favour of the American will. "There is a real willingness in the Middle East to get Saddam out but a total opposition to mixing this up with the current [Afghanistan] operation," Blair wrote, "I have no doubt we need to deal with Saddam. But if we hit Iraq now, we would lose the Arab world, Russia, probably half the EU".⁶⁹

The Iraq War was the reason behind strengthening the Special Relationship soon after. On March 19, 2003, Blair recruited the UK armed forces to participate in the US invasion on Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Blair and Bush objective was to overthrow the latter who was Iraq's dictator. The reason they held behind the invasion was that Saddam possessed the weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Blair was quick to offer support to the United States. He dedicated 40,000 troops ready for any possible intervention in the Iraq War.⁷⁰

Thus, following the Iraq issue, secret notes and messages were revealed by the Chilcot Inquiry. In July 28, 2002, Blair writes to President Bush. "I will be with you, whatever." Then, Blair mentioned other Britain's participations in Wars with the US which summarizes the strong relationship between the two. "The planning on this and

⁶⁸ A memorial service was held for the victims of the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center in New York City and on the Pentagon in Washington, DC.

⁶⁹ Marcotec Branco.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

the strategy are the toughest yet,” Blair writes “This is not Kosovo. This is not Afghanistan. This is not even the Gulf War. The military part of this is hazardous”.⁷¹

2.3.2. Blair away from Europe:

On the other hand, significantly, it was important to Blair to control things at home since there were doubts on his ability among Labours. The Labour MPs felt that they were too close to the US due to Blair's Special Relationship with first Clinton and then Bush. Neither Both the British media and public nor Europe were satisfied about the type of such alliance.

So to avoid divisions at home, Blair asked for UN interference on the matter. He advised Bush to allow more time for UN resolutions: “I want to take the Europeans with me, so Friday might be a little early,” he added, “We’ve got to make people understand we are not going to war because we want to, but because there is no alternative”.⁷²

Although Blair himself has declared that he has no responsibility regarding administration regime change in Iraq, everyone around him knew for sure that there would be no looking back, just as they felt a significant change in Blair. Furthermore, this change may go far from war collaboration to an unreachable Special Relationship between UK and the US.

Saddam Hussein's possession of WMD is considered to be the only legitimate reason for Blair’s help to Bush. So when the truth was revealed stating that no WMD were found, Blair lost his credibility. He lost his ability as war leader and his capacity to lead foreign affairs in the future.⁷³

Blair believed that by keeping himself closer to the US, he would not just take advantage of a global leverage. But, he additionally would keep both Europe and America in his hands. Thus, Blair has favoured to join the US on a key issue like Iraq War in order to increase Britain’s influence and to hold the alliance between both the EU and Bush.

⁷¹ Marctec Branco.

⁷² ⁷² Sarah Helm,” Blair knew Iraq would be his epitaph. But he dared not defy Bush”, *The Guardian*, 4 July 2016. (accessed 24 March,2017)

2017).<<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jul/04/phone-call-bush-blair-failed-iraq>.

⁷³ Marctec Branco.

Addressing the Liaison Committee of senior MPs in 2007, Blair said “. . . The relationship with America is what opens lots of doors everywhere”⁷⁴. Thus, the 9/11 Attacks pulled Britain far to the West and the circumstances made the Eurosceptic country on the edge of withdrawal.

Conclusion:

The British governments from 1975 to 1997 were the most Eurosceptic in the history of the country. The fact that the UK joined the EEC only for economic reasons at an economically difficult time resulted in political and social discontent. But the 1975 referendum showed that people wanted Britain in Europe rather than out. From 1979 until 1997 Conservative Governments contributed to a high level of British isolation in the Community. Thatcher’s rebate and the imperative Eurosceptic Speech in her last years were the best representations of Britain’s doubts. Furthermore, John Major ratified the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 and opted out of the treaty section dealing with social policy. Thus, the Conservatives in this way reinforced once again the awkward position of Britain within the EU. On the other hand, Labour Governments have generally showed much more interests in Europe. Yet, a different Labour premiership of Tony Blair had the strongest Anglo-American relationship and seemed to exceed the UK-EU relations in some points. Thus, Britain as always was in favour of the western Block rather than Europe.

⁷⁴ Heidi Blake, “How the ‘special relationship’ between Britain and the US became something to fret over”, *The Telegraph*. 20 July 2010. (accessed 24 March, 2017).
<<http://www.thetelegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/789992/how-the-special-relationship-between-britian-and-the-US-became-something-to-fret-over.html>.

Chapter Three: UKIP and The Road to Brexit 2006-2016

Introduction:

The aim of this chapter is to show that Euroscepticism shifted away from the parliament to reach the British masses. The latter were behind the final vote of the British exit from the EU. Voices from every nook and cranny started to appear asking for Britain to leave the European Union when the strongly Eurosceptic United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) took the torch to lead the Brexit Campaign. UKIP was different from the other three prominent parties in the UK. Under Nigel Farage's leadership, from 2006, the party embraced wider goals and exploited social and economic issues. UKIP has also put a huge focus on limiting immigration, contradicting multiculturalism and supporting the British sovereignty. Yet, division and different reaction towards UKIP and Brexit were all over Britain. People started to ask questions on which to follow, who to believe, and which to vote for. It was until the 2016 referendum that the British faith in Europe became clearer than ever.

3.1. UKIP Leading the Brexit Campaign:

The real success of UKIP started with Nigel Farage leadership in 2006 due to his different political approach and his close relationship with the people. Nigel Paul Farage was born on 3 April 1964. He is a British politician considered to be a talented speaker to the Eurosceptic UK Independence Party (UKIP) since 1994. His famous motto in his 20-year crusade to remove the UK from the European Union was “We want our county back”.⁷⁵ He has been a Member of the European Parliament speaking to South East England since the 1999 election, winning re-election three times. Farage was chosen UKIP leader in the September 2006 administration elections, and drove his party in the 2009 European Parliament race in which UKIP won the second-most high number of votes and seats after the Conservative Party and crushing Labour and the Liberal Democrats with more than two million votes.⁷⁶

⁷⁵ A speech delivered by Nigel Farage on the 20th of June 2016 in UKIP's party conference in Doncaster.

⁷⁶ Rosa prince, "Nigel Farage: the maverick leader of the UK Independence Party", *The Telegraph*, 2015 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/nigel-farage/11437453/Nigel-Farage-the-maverick-leader-of-the-UK-Independence-Paty.html>.

UKIP leader, Nigel Farage, became so famous in the British media. Yet, he knew that the party could do little to achieve its objective of getting Britain out of the EU from Brussels and Strasbourg in this way. So in a strategic way, Farage resigned as pioneer to focus on challenging the public Speaker, John Bercow in Buckingham,⁷⁷ held by the House of Commons, at the 2010 general elections. Mr Farage came third, but the experience raised his profile.

So Farage was re-elected as UKIP's leader in that same year. He led the party to second place in local elections, taking 23 per cent of the vote. Sooner the triumph came as he drove UKIP again in the 2014 European Parliament elections, in which his party won the most votes and seats; this was the first time since December 1910 general election that neither Labour nor Conservatives got the majority of seats in Britain across the country election. The importance of Euroscepticism in the UK was strengthened when Mr Farage turned UKIP from a periphery to the third greatest party in UK legislative issues as far as votes at the 2015 general election, and he influenced more than 17 million individuals to vote to leave the EU.⁷⁸

As the party's name recommends, UKIP has dependably had the legislative issues of national personality at its core. The party's fundamental claim was that the most elevated need for the British country is to guarantee that it is completely administered by the national state as a patriot one. UKIP sees itself as to be a British unionist party. UKIP leaders presented a backup statement saying that they are coming from the previous failures of the earlier parties that let the British people down, time and time again. So the party today came as a change, close to people than any other party ever been.

UKIP concentrated on major issues of the present day, immigration, the economy, the health service and living standards. First, they believed that the British people, and the British Parliament in Westminster, should have the right to determine their own immigration policy. Second, they argued that the EU's policies are harmful for their economy and that they should stop sending the taxation money to the EU because it is nothing but an exploitation policy with no clear benefits. Also, they have

⁷⁷ Buckingham (UK Parliament constituency) is a constituency represented in the House of Commons of the UK Parliament since 1997 by John Bercow, who later became Speaker of the House of Commons.

⁷⁸ Rosa prince.

insisted on the matter of sovereignty and its importance to the patriot British people. Finally, UKIP leaders have put forward so many other ideas for better living conditions. They explained their motives with more arguments which are based on gaining a total freedom, nowhere else but outside the EU. Thus, Nigel Farage addressing people in “UKIP Manifesto 2015” said: “If you believe that in this year, the 800th anniversary of Magna Carta, we should seize the opportunity for real change in our politics, rebalancing power from large corporations and big government institutions and putting it back into the hands of the people of this country, then there really is only one choice”.⁷⁹

3.1.1. UKIP’s Discourse on Brexit:

UKIP has set incredible emphasis on the issue of immigration in the UK. In 2013 Farage portrayed it as the greatest single issue confronting his party.⁸⁰ They hold the EU responsible as the centre reason for immigration, referring to the Union's open-outskirt approaches. Since a huge number of Western and lately Eastern Europeans have come to Britain to carry out an occupation, this has undercut the local working populace. There is huge pressure on public services such as schools, hospitals, transport networks, power, and water supplies. The UK ingested 333,000 new individuals,⁸¹ on net, in 2015. That is a huge number for a nation of Britain's size.

EU laws ensure that residents of one EU nation have the privilege to travel, live, and take occupations in other EU nations. It is one of the primary standards of EU enrolment, the free development, which implies you don't have to get a visa to go and live or work in another EU nation. UKIP and Farage claimed that the NHS (National Health Service) is overstretched because of the huge number of immigrants which costs more than Britain can afford. So UKIP is totally committed to keep the

⁷⁹ “The UKIP Manifesto 2015”, *UKIP*, (accessed 10 March, 2017); available from <<http://www.ukip.org/manifesto2015>>.

⁸⁰ “Nigel Farage predicts Ukip 'earthquake' in European elections”, (accessed March 26, 2017); available from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/ukip/10322589/Nigel-Farage-predicts-Ukip-earthquake-in-European-elections.html>.

⁸¹ “Net migration to UK rises to 333,000 - second highest on record”, May 2016 (accessed March 26, 2017) available from <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36382199>.

NHS free for UK citizens and they are willing to spend in the near future about £12 billion on the NHS.⁸²

It is far too great as UKIP stated that immigration should be controlled. For example, few Poles after the WWII came to Britain. They were at first limited to working in small and handicraft businesses. But after their accession to the EU in 2004, their lifestyle evolved and they became a danger to British jobs and occupations. In 2014, the Poles living in Britain were registered in about 853,000; too great than the amount of 69,000 in 2004.⁸³

Another big issue that UKIP introduced as reason behind their campaign to leave the EU is a financial one. If the big nations, all together in the EU, move towards full financial and political union to make the euro work better, it will be exceptionally awkward for the UK to be inside the EU; however, outside that alliance of the currency. They added that whatever troubles they had over those late years in making their voice heard in Brussels will undoubtedly deteriorate.

Also, UKIP argued that Britain was kept down by the EU tight regulations. The EU put so many laws on their business and charged billions of pounds and that the EU also limits their chance for getting stronger deals with other nations. So on this issue of trade it is believed that the UK outside the EU would be free to negotiate her own trade deals. They explained the latter saying that some deals are negotiated for them by the EU Trade Commissioner and that Switzerland for example, has more free trade deals than the UK does. Leaving the EU will increase the ability to trade with other non-EU states. In parallel, this choice will not hamper any relation between the UK and another EU member. They added that Britain is a G7 member country.⁸⁴ She is the fourth largest exporter of goods worldwide and the fifth largest economy as well as top ten in the largest manufacturing countries. Therefore, the EU needs her more than she needs it.⁸⁵

⁸² "The UKIP Manifesto 2015", *UKIP*, (accessed 10 March, 2017); available from <<http://www.ukip.org/manifesto2015>>.

⁸³ Oliver Hawkins and Anna Moses, "Polish population of the United Kingdom, *Commons Library Briefing*, July 15, 2016. Accessed March 26, 2017.

⁸⁴ G7 is an informal bloc of industrialized democracies--the United States, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom.

⁸⁵ The UKIP Manifesto 2015 (ukip.org).

On taxation, they explained that the EU doesn't have the ability to straightforwardly gather charges; however it requires each member state to make a yearly commitment to the general EU spending plan. The UK's commitment is worth about £13 billion every year,⁸⁶ which is about \$300 per individual in the UK. They believed in low taxation, enterprise and fairness. Some of their plans are resembled in making reasonable cuts to the overseas aid budget, reviewing the unfair Barnett Formula and cancelling HS2 (High Speed railway).⁸⁷ Therefore, they illustrated in a clear view that their plans will be completed with the savings they will make from leaving the EU.

One of the main catchphrases that anyone could hear, among UKIP members, is that they want back control. It means that Britain has lost her sovereignty as a member of the European Union. They argued that a membership of the EU stops them from taking critical decisions which may affect democracy; they claim that the European Commission isn't specifically responsible to constituency members in Britain or any other individual. They even added that the laws themselves are imposed by unelected bureaucrats.⁸⁸ Also, there is the hard concept of parliamentary supremacy, because an EU membership means that European laws are superior to national laws inside the UK.

3.1.2. UKIP's Social Manifesto:

UKIP's manifesto of 2015 was a plan to gain a big support from the masses in order to guarantee their back up on Brexit, especially the social changes they promised to make. Starting by the elderly, it is fully committed to provide social care for old people between the ages of 65 and 89, since almost 900,000 of them are suffering shortage in their needs.⁸⁹ Also, UKIP wants to maintain a strong and encouraging safety net for disabled people by fulfilling their needs of work and social care in general.

⁸⁶Nick Gutteridge, "EU demands Britain pays £12 BILLION into Brussels budget despite Brexit vote", July, 2016(accessed March 26 , 2017); available from <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/686048/EU-referendum-Brussels-Britain-pay-12billion-budget-Brexit-vote>.

⁸⁷ The system that sets public spending in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

⁸⁸ Jennifer Rankin, "Is the EU undemocratic? ", June, 2016(accessed March 26 , 2016); available from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/13/is-the-eu-undemocratic-referendum-reality-check>.

⁸⁹ John Bingham, "900,000 elderly needing care left to fend for themselves", August, 2014 (accessed March 26 ,2017); available from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/health/elder/11030930/900000-elderly-needing-care-left-to-fend-for-themselves.html>.

Furthermore, the party leaders believe that supporting families and their children in education and housing will create a better society for better living conditions. They will provide educational system for every child, regardless of their academic ability, race or social background. They promised to build houses to meet demand, despite the fact that homelessness is increasing. In addition, UKIP guaranteed a lucrative and reliable transport network. It complained about the energy high prices, ensuring better reforms for a consistent cheaper supply of it.⁹⁰

On defence and safety matters, UKIP leaders pointed out to take back the full control of their Justice system from the EU. They put forward solutions in which they will fund the armed forces, especially the air force and the navy. They said to provide about 6.000 posts for Border Agency and the local police.⁹¹ Also, they mentioned some humanitarian activities such as honouring the military covenant in Britain and supporting poor people in the world by overseas aid.⁹²

UKIP covered all the aspects of British people by tackling the countryside and its importance to them. They said that they will always be in favour of British farmers. They explained that outside the EU there will be none of the extreme regulations, especially the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). UKIP mentioned the animal welfare and fishing industry and the EU policies imposed on the latter; yet they assured a better future for both if only they leave the EU. Many people were calling for a way back to customs and traditions. UKIP promised to stand-up for it and fight anything threatening Britain.

Finally, the core subject of Brexit is Freedom. In all fields, commerce and business to trade, agriculture to tourism, health services to education, criminal justice to transport, it is the Westminster Parliament that should take the final decisions not the European Parliament. Therefore, UKIP promised many welfare commitments to the British, all revolving on the clear statement that the UK is better off out of the EU.

⁹⁰ The UKIP Manifesto 2015 (bbc.com).

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

3.2. Reactions towards UKIP and Brexit:

After the gradual success of UKIP in the British Elections and the Brexit Leave campaign, people in Britain were divided and confused on what to choose, which parties are in favour of remaining in the EU or which parties want to leave. The British thought of going with those whom they have the most sympathy with. Or simply, choose those parties which have the competence to run the country. Yet, not all people could understand. The situation was hard and not easy to follow because it had to do with politics, economics, geopolitics, finance, even nationalism and sovereignty.

3.2.1. Supporters of UKIP against the EU:

The supporters of UKIP were happy with the party's unprecedented approach and they favoured its manifesto. Those Brexiteers were either strengthening UKIP's arguments for leaving the EU or adding more reasons sometimes.⁹³ The party's success was due to its close ties with the masses. Some of the parties in favour of the Leave vote were: the BNP (British National Party), the EDL (English Defence League), and the DUP (Democratic Unionists, Ulster). Some of the famous politicians were: Boris Johnson, Nigel Lawson, George Galloway, and Michael Gove.⁹⁴

The striking aspect regarding UKIP is its interest in older people, working class former Tories. They are individuals who may seem to be Labour voters, yet have tended to look for tax cuts in favour of social solidarity to draw a better future. People with crushed expectations due the three famous British parties' failure helped UKIP's share to rise up. Furthermore, UKIP's additional voters are the individuals who might back the party in the Euro-elections yet not a general election.

So those in favour of the Leave campaign backed up UKIP's ideas of Brexit. They highlighted that if Britain leaves the EU, this will hamper the union and prop up Eurosceptics in different nations to ask for referendums as well. The new EU that rises up out of this will be significantly weaker and less appealing than the UK. So the

⁹³ Brexiteer is called on someone who supports Brexit.

⁹⁴ Alex hunt and Brian Wheeler, "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU." *BBC News*, (accessed 30 April, 2017); available from <<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>>.

latter will profit more by being out. In this new European atmosphere, the Scots will favour staying with a stronger free UK, than with a disputed European Union.⁹⁵

Some rational Eurosceptics in the UK expected harsh consequences on the stock market and a temporary decline of the sterling value. Yet, they added that a fall in the latter will make British merchandise less expensive and the British exporting companies will be more present in universal markets. This will require more products; therefore, the government will create more jobs.⁹⁶

Analysts trust that Britain could progress by leaving the EU. British business is restrained by bureaucratic formality from Brussels. Indeed, even the 80% of British companies that don't export need to follow the EU policies,⁹⁷ worker rights, union representation, welfare, security, and other bureaucratic red tape.⁹⁸ Business companies around Europe and the world will trust their operations in the UK, as Britain without EU red tape will be a more appealing spot to do business in.

3.2.2. The “Remain” Campaign in Favour of the EU:

Before the final referendum and the voting time, many people were against UKIP and its campaign. The majority of individuals in the famous parties were in favour of the EU, Conservatives, Labours, and Liberals. Also, the Scottish Nationalist Party and the Green Party were entirely against the Leave campaign; politicians also such as David Cameron, Jo Cox MP, Jeremy Corbyn, George Osborne, and almost all the living former Prime Ministers. It has been quite remarkable that all those who were against Britain leaving the EU gave logical, strong, and evidential arguments, when they were asked. Many against UKIP exposed the party and its false case. Finally, facts and rational incidents swung the cuff of the EU.⁹⁹

The Scots, in particular, and Welsh people will definitely vote for staying in the EU. Any triumph of the Leave campaign in the UK would open all doors towards

⁹⁵ Andrew Rossiter, "Brexit - the people and arguments for and against", *About-Britain*, 2016 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <http://about-britain.com/institutions/compare-brexit-arguments.htm>.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Shawn Tully, "What Brexit Voters Should Know About Free Trade", June, 2016(accessed March 26 ,2017); available from <http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/686048/EU-referendum-Brussels-Britain-pay-12billion-budget-Brexit-vote>.

⁹⁸ Red Tape means excessive bureaucracy or adherence to official rules and formalities.

⁹⁹ Alex hunt and Brian Wheeler.

Scottish patriots for another Scottish independence referendum. Thus, it will lead to a harsh breakup of the United Kingdom in about five years or less. Indeed, Nicola Sturgeon, Scotland first minister, already said that another referendum could be soon organised. This will leave Britain considerably more isolated out of Europe and even no longer a United Kingdom.¹⁰⁰

The Remain campaigners argued that UKIP is the same as the other three British parties. UKIP has old rich contributors; although, Nigel Farage portrayed it as “The people’s Army”.¹⁰¹ Yet, For instance, Mr. Robin Birley runs a private club in Mayfair, which costs £1,875 a year to join and he gave UKIP £55,000. Also, Stuart Wheeler is a spread betting tycoon who used to be UKIP’s treasurer and he gave the party about £200,000. Furthermore, the Daily Express had its front page shouting with how their millionaire gave the party more than a million. So UKIP’s leaders say they are fighting for the little guy; however, they are certainly supported by the big shots.¹⁰²

Some people standing in favour of the EU explained that Britain is considered as the third best-represented country in the EU with 73 MEPs. Therefore, to state that European laws are strangling the British people is practically similar to stating that the British government strategies are the ones constrained on the citizens themselves. When it comes to EU laws, the European Union is a democratic confederation of nations, in which people choose MEPs to represent them in The European Parliament. Pro-Europeans against UKIP pointed out to the MEPs Nigel Farage, Godfrey Sprout, and Paul Nuttall, which are among the last five most participants at the European Parliament; in spite of being paid £60,000 a year. Therefore, a vote in favour of UKIP MEPs is obviously not a vote in British favour.¹⁰³

It has been argued that over the previous 40 years, the membership of the EU has really been exceptionally fruitful to the UK because Britain became part of the world’s largest economic union of states. Brexiteers are in fact against the EU way to

¹⁰⁰ Andrew Rossiter.

¹⁰¹ Nigel Farage declaration in the second debate with Nick Clegg over the UK's membership of the EU.

¹⁰² Martin Belam, "8 reasons not to vote for Ukip", *Mirror*, 2015 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <<http://www.mirror.co.uk/usvsth3m/please-do-not-vote-ukip-5645906>>.

¹⁰³ Hugh Muir, "10 good reasons not to vote for Ukip", *The Guardian*, 2014 (accessed 30 March, 2017); available from <<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/apr/29/10-good-reasons-not-vote-ukip-nigel-farage-europe>>.

protect the rights of middle-class individuals, to protect the environment and the nations' wealth, to protect customers, to restrain bad organizations, to cut illegal taxes, and to penalise tax evasion. Moreover, the EU mainly ensures peace and stability in a continent that has for quite some time been broken by wars and national rivalries. So the UK has witnessed the longest time of peace in Europe for many years.

Most businessmen and economists in Britain warn that leaving the EU would be an economic disaster. As indicated by the IMF (International Monetary Fund), a British exit from the EU would probably have genuine consequences for both Sterling and the UK stock market. They recommend that sterling might quickly fall by 10 - 20 % against the dollar which will make everybody in Britain poorer.¹⁰⁴ Also, the EU consumers are worried about the UK leaving the EU. There have been calls already in Europe to boycott British goods if Brexit harms the European Union economy. Besides, if Britain leaves the EU, the rest of the nations will surely lay out the red carpet to draw attraction in global international investment markets far away from Britain. Finally, the UK out of Europe will have to accept the EU rules and regulations in the case they want to trade with it. But, they will not be able to affect or change any of these rules.

However, specialists against the Leave vote demonstrated figures on the subject of EU membership taxes. First, only 0.5% of UK government spending goes on its EU membership whereas UK gets 52% of all her trade from the EU, worth more than £400billion a year. Second, having a place in the EU costs UK 0.34% of her own wealth whereas local tax collection in Britain costs 35% of her wealth, which is 100 times more. Also, the figure of “£13 billion a year” that UKIP has put forward is wrong, as it doesn't assess what Britain gets back. The real figure is not as much as half. Thus, the advantages gained from the EU membership really compensate this little cost of the UK's wealth.¹⁰⁵

On immigration, the Remain campaigners clarified that The NHS benefits from the EU's research contributions and the free movement of doctors and

¹⁰⁴ Mehryn Khan, “Sterling could fall 20% after EU vote – NIESR”, (accessed March 26 , 2017); available from <https://www.ft.com/content/3dbdbda7-32d5-3d0c-a0d3-dacdc6fa3189>.

¹⁰⁵ Good Morning Britain “Harold Nigel Farage Admits NHS Claims Were A Mistake | Good Morning Britain” Online Video clip. Youtube ,2014 (accessed 24 March, 2017).

specialists. A significant number of Britain's main specialists are from other EU nations. In fact, the NHS is overstretched only because the British government decides to spend less on it. Other real EU nations have better financed and staffed health services than the UK does. Britain has less GP, less hospital equipments, less medical staff and maternity specialists per population than other EU nations. Yet, still UKIP's manifesto plan is based on more spending cuts. The idea of EU immigrants breaking the NHS is a lie. Because, due to the EU Health Care agreement, a huge number of UK citizens have a free EHIC card,¹⁰⁶ and in this way they can get treatment on health services in different EU countries. Deals are equal and everybody benefits.¹⁰⁷

3.3. The Final In/Out Referendum 2016:

The case of Britain leaving the EU was all over the country and people had to look for convincing answers to their questions. Months before the referendum, many seemed uncertain about the right choice to make. Things escalated quickly and some voters changed their minds while others reassured their views. Mr David Cameron the conservatives' leader since 2005 and the British Prime Minister after 2010 needed a plan to undermine the Eurosceptic UKIP and its leaders. Therefore, the reason behind Britain having a choice on her EU membership could be that David Cameron guaranteed one in the Bloomberg speech of January 2013. Yet, the more profound rational reason is to be found in the rise and ascent of British Euroscepticism.

The plan was a deal stating that if the Conservative Party would win the 2015 elections, then a referendum for the British citizens will be held soon after. David Cameron guaranteed the referendum not on the grounds that he had confidence in it, or considered it particularly important or felt people in general requesting it; but only to mollify and appease conservative "Eurosceptics" in his party. But this plan of his own did not work in his favour. Indeed, Cameron won the elections. Yet, he found himself wound up battling for Britain to stay in the European Union. At that point a greater part of the British were willing to do the exact opposite. So by the mid 2015 the odds of UKIP and Brexiteers appeared to be closer than ever.

¹⁰⁶ A valid European Health Insurance Card gives you the right to access state-provided healthcare during a temporary stay in another European Economic Area.

¹⁰⁷ Andrew Rossiter.

The Queen's Speech on 27 May 2015, which set out the new UK Government's legislative agenda following the May 2015 UK Parliamentary General Election, included a commitment to legislate for a referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union:

My government will renegotiate the United Kingdom's relationship with the European Union and pursue reform of the European Union for the benefit of all member states. Alongside this, early legislation will be introduced to provide for an in-out referendum on membership of the European Union before the end of 2017.¹⁰⁸

So Following the May 2015 UK Parliamentary general election, the UK Government published its programme for government, which included a commitment to introduce a Bill to hold a referendum on whether the United Kingdom should remain a member of the European Union. The Bill was introduced to Parliament on 28 May 2015 and passed into law on 17 December 2015.¹⁰⁹

Since the start of 2016, preparations for the referendum started under the Electoral Commission supervision. The latter is an independent body which reports directly to the UK and Scottish Parliament. The Commission's members regulate parties and election finance and set standards for elections and electoral registration. They are responsible for publishing reports on the administration of referendums and elections. Thus, their main duty was to ensure that the UK-EU membership elections could take place at a time that would allow the full participation of voters and campaigners.¹¹⁰

Given the strong views that had been expressed, especially from Scotland, Ireland and Wales, regarding the proximity of the referendum and the scheduled elections in May 2016 and May 2017, the Electoral Commission expected that the UK

¹⁰⁸ "Queen's Speech 2015-full text and government programme." *Independent*. 27 May. 2015. (accessed 24 March, 2017). <<https://telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9820230/David-Cameron-eu-speech-in-full.html>.

¹⁰⁹ "Referendum on the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union," *The Electoral Commission* (2015): 2.

¹¹⁰ Jenny Watson, "The 2016 EU referendum." *The Electoral Commission*, 2016 (accessed 30 March, 2017).7.

Parliament would consider these issues carefully when the secondary legislation is debated which specified the date of the referendum.¹¹¹ Therefore, there was a common satisfaction when the proposed date of the referendum was held on 23 June 2016 under the framework of the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (PPERA).¹¹² So the decision did not pose any significant risk to a well-run referendum.¹¹³

There was a considerable TV coverage throughout the campaign and the referendum voting day. Mainly the BBC, ITV and Sky News all provided live coverage of the counts and the reaction to the result. One of the main disturbances that were noted is the killing of Jo Cox.¹¹⁴ The campaign stopped for two days and everyone in Britain was in shock after this accident.

TV channels also depicted the eligibility to vote, with the help of the Electoral Commission, as the minimum age for voters in the referendum was set to be 18 years. Natives in Gibraltar, an English abroad region, can vote. Residents of the United Kingdom who were either Commonwealth citizens under the British Nationality Act 1948 or those who were citizens of the Republic of Ireland have the right to vote.¹¹⁵ Members of the House of Lords were also able to vote in the referendum. British citizens who had once lived in the United Kingdom, who had since and in the meantime lived outside of the United Kingdom, but for a period of no more than 15 years, can vote. Whereas those who can't vote are obviously immigrants and residents of the European Union living in Britain, unless they are nationals of Cyprus, Ireland or Malta.¹¹⁶

The EU withdrawal process is represented by Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty of the European Union, whereby the procedure of withdrawal by a part state begins

¹¹¹ The Commission allows the Government to make changes to the law using powers conferred by an Act of Parliament. Statutory instruments form the majority of delegated legislation.

¹¹² PPERA is an Act of Parliament of the United Kingdom that sets out how political parties, elections and referendums are to be regulated in the United Kingdom.

¹¹³ Jenny Watson.

¹¹⁴ Ian Cobain, "Jo Cox killed in 'brutal, cowardly' and politically motivated murder, trial hears", November, 2016 (accessed March 24, 2017); available from <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/14/jo-cox-killed-in-politically-motivated-murder-trial-thomas-mair-hears>.

¹¹⁵ It was an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom that created the status of "Citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies" (CUKC) as the national citizenship of the United Kingdom and its colonies.

¹¹⁶ "EU referendum", *GOV.UK*, 2016 (accessed 30 March, 2017) ; available from <<https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/eu-referendum/about>>.

with a transaction period that is restricted to two years, unless reached out with the agreement of all EU part states. Negotiations should be held on plans and agreements of the UK withdrawal considering the system of her future relations with the Union. It is considered to be the first time in the EU history that Article 50 will be triggered. The British government has reported that it will activate Article 50 on 29 March 2017; this would put the nation on course to finish the withdrawal procedure by 29 March 2019. If no withdrawal understanding and structure for their future relations were concurred inside the two years, then the UK would leave the EU to be such as any other state from the World Exchange Association that has no particular relationship with the union.¹¹⁷

The results of the 2016 referendum were a victory for the 'Leave' campaign, amassing a total of 51.9% of the vote, on a national turnout of 72.2%, the most elevated ever for any elections and the most noteworthy for any national vote since the 1992 General Election. A lion's share in England and Wales voted for leaving the EU in about 52%, outstandingly the eastern part and aside from London and Grains voted in their dominant part to Leave. On the other hand, a larger part in Scotland and Northern Ireland voted to remain in about 48 %. Britain's capital city London and the British Overseas Territory of Gibraltar additionally had a greater part of votes for remaining. It wasn't an overwhelming victory, yet what explains the Brexit triumph more is that only 64% of eligible people aged 18–24 voted in favour of the EU, whereas 90% of eligible individuals over 65 voted in favour of the Leave campaign.¹¹⁸

There were some immediate reactions in the major parties which were fully involved throughout the Brexit years. The in-out referendum resulted in Britain leaving the EU. First, Nigel Farage resigned as leader of UKIP in July, expressing that his political desire has been accomplished. He was later succeeded by Paul Nuttall. Also, in the Scottish independence issue, Nicola Sturgeon explained that the Scottish government and authorities would put forward a second independence referendum as

¹¹⁷Alex hunt and Brian Wheeler.

¹¹⁸ "Results of the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum, 2016", *Wikipedia*, 2017 (accessed 11 May, 2017); available from <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Results_of_the_United_Kingdom_European_Union_membership_referendum,_2016>.

a choice to be with the EU rather than the United Kingdom.¹¹⁹ Furthermore, the British Prime Minister David Cameron, after his defeat, reported on 24th June that he wants to resign from office in the autumn. “But the British people made a different decision to take a different path. As such I think the country requires fresh leadership to take it in this direction”.¹²⁰

Conclusion:

After fighting for more than twenty years, UKIP finally managed to get Britain out of Europe. Some people think that Britain will be out of the EU as an independent, sovereign and free nation with her own domestic and foreign affairs. In contrast, for others, the UK will be out of the whole Europe not just the EU. She will lose her ties with the union and she won't be able to widen up her Empire as the golden years gone with no return. It doesn't really matter for politicians, economists, scientists and all famous people within an area of leverage, whether the UK sided with the US or with Communities in the EU. What is important for those in power is nothing but their own egocentric desires. Furthermore, the question of Brexit didn't start with UKIP nor with Thatcher; although, it was reinforced by time, Europe never floats Britain's boat throughout the history of their relationship. Thus, the seeds and the roots of Brexit came all together as a reason behind the 2016 referendum. Therefore, only history, that marked David Cameron's premiership as the reason behind the referendum, will mark the lasting impact behind Brexit.

¹¹⁹The Scottish Parliament has authorised the Scottish Government to seek to hold a second referendum on Scottish independence.

¹²⁰“David Cameron's EU speech in full.” *Telegraph*. 23 jan.2013. (accessed 24 March,2017).
<<https://telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9820230/David-Cameron-eu-speech-in-full.html>.

General Conclusion

The origins of Brexit are to be traced in the history of the sense of differentness that characterised Britons' collective psychology. Britain has always been Eurosceptic as it has constantly seen herself different from Europe and Europeans. In contradiction to other European countries, the British people had always been less passionate to the EU and to more European projects of integrations. That is because of their special identity and their unique psyche. Moreover, Britons had always described themselves as British not European, even after their accession to the EEC in the 1970s. They are always proud of their uniqueness and sceptical attitude towards the European Union.

Britain's geographical location, sovereignty, political system, and foreign links, differentiate it from Europe. Ages ago, the continental historical split totally contributed to the most recent political break of Britain with Europe. The geography of lands touched the minds of the British people. The idea that Britain is not part of Europe goes back to the glorious days of the Empire, when Britain ruled a quarter of the globe and was a rival to the other European colonial powers. The psychology of the golden age Britain is transmitted from father to son. Thus, it was hard for Britons to integrate with the continent of Europe and the European ideology. Surprisingly, even the pro-European British Prime Minister David Cameron consolidated Britain's real position as he stated: "Our geography has shaped our psychology. We have the character of an island nation - independent, forthright, passionate in defence of our sovereignty".¹²¹

Britain's Eurosceptic years were characterized by political divisions within the parties, mainly the two parties the Labours and the Conservatives that dominated the political scene since the end of WWII. Through history, the Conservative party, the political right-wing, was believed to be in favour of the EU. Yet, with the coming of Margret Thatcher and John Major as Conservative leaders and PMs respectively, the Pro-European notion of those Conservatives on the right changed. Furthermore, this change in balance was seen afterwards with The Prime Minister, Tony Blair, as a Labour who should be totally in favour of the EU. However, the PM was too focused

¹²¹ "David Cameron's EU speech in full." *Telegraph*. 23 jan.2013. (accessed 24 March,2017). <<https://telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9820230/David-Cameron-eu-speech-in-full.html>.

on the left side of the world. His premiership was characterized by his Special Relationship with the US rather than Europe.

The huge empire that Britain used to control made her gain indispensable trading markets with the Commonwealth countries and the US. Britain had bigger global market than the EU ever had. The economic ties made Britain more close to the US and the Commonwealth countries than to the EU. The great man of Britain, Winston Churchill, described the political site of Britain as the centre of three circles of influence, the empire, the special relation with the US then Europe, in that order. The importance of the second circle was clear in the history between the US and Britain, especially after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, where Britain showed a tremendous support morally and militarily. Britain's special relationship with the US grew stronger when Blair sent British troops to fight with the Americans in Afghanistan and Iraq and then declared that he was supporting George Bush in every decision.

By the early 1990s, the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) emerged to take a superior rank in British politics. Under the leadership of Nigel Farage, the party was strongly advocating for the UK's withdrawal from the EU. The Party had so much pressure and influence over the other famous parties in Britain throughout the 20th Century general elections. UKIP's campaign for leaving the EU succeeded to gain a huge British support and finally led to Brexit. It tackled highly important issues such as limiting immigration, eliminating EU regulations, enhancing the British economic situation and regaining sovereignty. The party's campaign was the practical non-governmental last reason in a series of arguments. So it is considered to be as the last piece of Brexit puzzle and a natural result of a deeper British psychology of difference.

As a conclusion, Britain's differentness from Europe pushed her away from a deep political, economic and social integration with the European Communities. Although, Britain lost her empire, the British never forgot the idea of sovereignty. Since the WWII, harsh circumstances led to Britain's accession to the EU. Yet, it was unsteady and troubled relationship. Therefore, the latter prompted the British final withdrawal from the European Union and resulted in the so-called Brexit.

Bibliography

Books:

Gifford, Chris. *The making of Eurosceptic Britain: identity and economy in a post-imperial state*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.

MacShane, Denis. *Brexit: how Britain will leave Europe*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2015.

Todd, John. *The UK's relationship with Europe: struggling over sovereignty*. Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, Springer International Publishing, 2016. PDF.

Articles:

Carolan, Bruce. "The Birth of the European Union: US and UK Roles in the Creation of a Unified European Community." *Tulsa Journal of Comparative & International Law* (2008): 7-9.

Ellison, James R.V. Explaining British Policy Towards European Integration in the 1950s. *AEI Banner*. N.p., 01 Jan. 1995. Web. 10 May 2017.

Hawkins, Oliver, and Anna Moses: "Polish population of the United Kingdom." *House Commons Library Briefing* (2016). Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

Goodwin, Matthew. "Explaining the rise of UK Independence Party." *HEBRICH BÖLL STIFUNG* (2014). Web 26 Mar. 2017.

Miller, Vaughne. "The 1974-75 UK Renegotiation of EEC Membership and Referendum." *House of Commons Library Briefings* (2015). Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

OZER, Mehemet Halis. "The Effects of the Marshall Plan Aids to the Development of the Agricultural Sector in Turkey, the 1948-1953 Period." *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, vol. 4, no. 2, 2014, pp. 4.

"Referendum on the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union." *The Electoral Commission* (2015): Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

Sion, Maya. 2004. "The Politics of Opt-Out in the European Union: Voluntary or Involuntary Defection?" *In Thinking Together. Proceedings of the IWM Junior Fellows' Conference, Winter 2003*, ed. A. Cashin and J. Jirsa, Vienna: IWM Junior Visiting Fellows' Conferences, Vol. 16.

Watson, Jenny. "The 2016 EU referendum." *The Electoral Commission* (2016): n. pag. Web. 30 Mar. 2017.

Websites:

"Access to European Union law." *EUR-Lex - xy0023 - EN - EUR-Lex*. N.p., 14 Mar. 2017. Web. 20 Apr. 2017. <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv%3Axy0023>>.

"BBC ON THIS DAY | 21 | 1962: America to sell Polaris to Britain." *BBC News*. BBC, n.d. Web. 25 Mar. 2017. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/december/21/newsid_3815000/3815251.stm>.

Belam, Martin. "8 reasons not to vote for Ukip." *Mirror*. N.p., 06 May 2015. Web. 30 March 2017. <<http://www.mirror.co.uk/usvsth3m/please-do-not-vote-ukip-5645906>>.

Bingham, John. "900,000 elderly needing care left to fend for themselves." *The Telegraph*. N.p., 14 Aug. 2014. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/health/elder/11030930/900000-elderly-needing-care-left-to-fend-for-themselves.html>>.

Blake, Heidi, "How the 'special relationship' between Britain and the US became something to fret over." *The Telegraph*. 20 July 2010. Web 30 March 2017. <<http://www.thetelegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/789992/how-the-special-relationship-between-britain-and-the-US-became-something-to-fret-over.html>>.

Brown, Derek. "1945-51: Labour and the creation of the welfare state." *The Guardian*. N.p., 14 Mar. 2001. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2001/mar/14/past.education>>.

Cobain, Ian. "Jo Cox killed in 'brutal, cowardly' and politically motivated murder, trial hears." *The Guardian*. N.p., 14 Nov. 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/nov/14/jo-cox-killed-in-politically-motivated-murder-trial-thomas-mair-hears>>.

"David Cameron's EU speech in full." *Telegraph*. 23 Jan. 2013. web. 25 Mar. 2017. <<https://telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9820230/David-Cameron-eu-speech-in-full.html>>.

"Economic Co-operation in Western Europe." *The corner home*. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

"Election 2015: UKIP manifesto at-a-glance." *BBC News*. N.p., 15 Apr. 2015. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/election-2015-32318683>>.

"EU referendum." *GOV.UK*. N.p., 2016. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/eu-referendum/about>>.

"Formation of NATO." *History*. N.p., 2010. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/formation-of-nato-and-warsaw-pact>>.

Gabel, Matthew J. "European Union (EU)." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

Greenslade, Roy. "Did national papers' pro-European bias in 1975 affect the referendum?" *The Guardian*. N.p., 04 Feb. 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

Gutteridge, Nick. "EU demands Britain pays £12 BILLION into Brussels budget despite Brexit vote." *Express.co.uk*. N.p., 04 July 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/686048/EU-referendum-Brussels-Britain-pay-12billion-budget-Brexit-vote>>.

Helm, Sarah. "Blair knew Iraq would be his epitaph. But he dared not defy Bush" *The Guardian*, 4 July 2016. Web 30 March 2017. <<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/jul/04/phone-call-bush-blair-failed-iraq>>.

Holmes, Martin. "John Major and Europe: The Failure of a Policy 1990-7." N.p., n.d. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.brugesgroup.com/media-centre/papers/8-papers/801-john-major-and-europe-the-failure-of-a-policy-1990-7>>.

Hunt, Alex, and Brian Wheeler. "Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU." *BBC News*. N.p., 25 Apr. 2017. Web. 30 Apr. 2017. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>>.

"Later life of Winston Churchill." Wikipedia. N.p., 05 Mar. 2017. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Later_life_of_Winston_Churchill>.

Marctec, Branko. "Blair to Bush on Day After 9/11: "Co-opt" Sympathy for the U.S. to Support Military Action." *In These Times*. N.p., 13 July 2016. Web. 3 Mar. 2017. <<http://inthesetimes.com/article/19292/chilcot-report-uk-tony-blair-regime-change-iraq-war>>.

Mehreen, Khan. "Sterling could fall 20% after EU vote – NIESR." *Financial Times*. N.p., 10 May 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.ft.com/content/3dbdbda7-32d5-3d0c-a0d3-dacdc6fa3189>>.

"Messina Conference." Wikipedia. N.p., 05 Mar. 2017. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Messina_Conference>.

Muir, Hugh. "10 good reasons not to vote for Ukip." *The Guardian*. N.p., 29 Apr. 2014. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/apr/29/10-good-reasons-not-vote-ukip-nigel-farage-europe>>.

"Net migration to UK rises to 333,000 - second highest on record." *BBC News*. N.p., 26 May 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36382199>>.

"Nigel Farage predicts Ukip 'earthquake' in European elections." *The Telegraph*. N.p., 20 Sept. 2013. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.

<<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/ukip/10322589/Nigel-Farage-predicts-Ukip-earthquake-in-European-elections.html>>.

Norberg, Sven, and Martin Johansson. "The History of the EEA Agreement and the First Twenty Years of Its Existence." *The Handbook of EEA Law* (2015).

Pettinger, Tejvan. "UK post-war economic boom and reduction in debt." *Economics Help*. N.p., 28 Jan. 2016. Web. 11 May 2017.

<<http://www.economicshelp.org/blog/11697/debt/post-war-boom/>>.

Prince, Rosa. "Nigel Farage: the maverick leader of the UK Independence Party." *The Telegraph*. N.p., 03 Feb. 2015. Web. 30 Mar. 2017.

<<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/nigel-farage/11437453/Nigel-Farage-the-maverick-leader-of-the-UK-Independence-Party.html>>.

"Queen's Speech 2015-full text and government programme." *Independent*. 27 May.2015. web. 25 Mar.2017.

<<https://telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/9820230/David-Cameron-eu-speech-in-full.html>>.

Roh, Yong Ho. "The Impact of the Marshall Plan on the United Kingdom ." *WHKMLA*. N.p., 2007. Web. 30 Mar. 2017.

<<https://www.zum.de/whkmla/sp/0708/yongho/yongho1.html>>.

Rankin, Jennifer. "Is the EU undemocratic?" *The Guardian*. N.p., 13 June 2016. Web. 26 Mar. 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jun/13/is-the-eu-undemocratic-referendum-reality-check>>.

"Rebuilding Europe: 1950s - 1960s." *International School History* . N.p., n.d. Web. 26Mar.2017.

<http://www.internationalschoolhistory.net/western_europe/europe/rebuilding_europe.htm>.

"Referendums related to the European Union." *Wikipedia*. N.p., 18 Apr. 2017. Web. 26 Apr. 2017.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Referendums_related_to_the_European_Union>.

"Results of the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum, 2016." *Wikipedia*. N.p., 09 Mar. 2017. Web. 11 May 2017.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Results_of_the_United_Kingdom_European_Union_membership_referendum,_2016>.

Rossiter, Andrew. "Brexit - the people and arguments for and against." *About-Britain* . 2016. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<http://about-britain.com/institutions/compare-brexit-arguments.htm>>.

"Spaak Report." *Wikipedia*. N.p., 05 Apr. 2017. Web. 25 Mar. 2017.
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spaak_Report>.

"*The UKIP Manifesto 2015*." *UKIP*. N.p., n.d. Web. 10 Mar. 2017.
<<http://www.ukip.org/manifesto2015>>.

"Three pillars of the European Union." *Wikipedia*. N.p., 31 Mar. 2017. Web. 15 Apr. 2017. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_pillars_of_the_European_Union>.

Volkery, Carsten. "The Iron Lady's Views on German Reunification: 'The Germans Are Back!' - SPIEGEL ONLINE - International." *SPIEGEL ONLINE*. N.p., 11 Sept. 2009. Web. 30 Mar. 2017. <<http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/the-iron-lady-s-views-on-german-reunification-the-germans-are-back-a-648364.html>>.

"Why did Britain join the EEC in 1973, and not before or later?" *Ankara University Faculty of Political Science*. Web. 26 Mar. 2017.
<<http://80.251.40.59/politics.ankara.edu.tr/hdogan/essays/essay1.html>>.

Dissertations:

Lee, Chung Hee. *The UK's negotiation of its EU budget rebate*. Thesis. Glasgow, 2011. *University of Glasgow*. Web. 26 Mar 2017.

Sorokina, Maria. *Great Britain and the European Integration*. Thesis. Brno. 2014. *University of MASARYK*. Web. 26 Mar 2017

Videos:

British Pathé. "Harold Wilson In Holland For E.E.C. Talks. (1967)" Online Video clip. Youtube, 13 Avril 2014. Web. 26 March 2017.

Good Morning Britain. "Harold Nigel Farage Admits NHS Claims Were A Mistake | Good Morning Britain" Online Video clip. Youtube, 24 juin 2014. Web. 30 March 2017.

Gold Mercury International. "Churchill - United States of Europe". Online Video clip. Youtube. 19 January 2015. Web 26 March 2017.

GreshamCollege. "Entry into the European Community, 1971-73 - Professor Vernon Bogdanor." Online Video clip. Youtube, 16 April 2014. Web. 26 March 2017.

GreshamCollege, "The Decision to Seek Entry into the Common Market - Professor Vernon Bogdanor." Online Video clip. Youtube, 29 January 2014. Web. 24 March 2017.

Résumé:

L'objectif principal de cette dissertation est d'examiner les raisons et les circonstances qui ont mené à ce qu'on connaît par le Brexit. Les Britanniques ne se sont jamais considérés comme des Européens. Depuis la Seconde Guerre Mondiale, la Grande-Bretagne a toujours été décrite comme le partenaire gênant de l'Union Européenne. Elle a refusé de rejoindre l'Union au cours de ses premières années, seulement pour être humiliée par le veto français avant l'adhésion de 1973. Le référendum de 1975, les négociations de remboursement de 1979 et l'exclusion du traité de Maastricht de 1992 montrent que l'hostilité Britannique envers l'Union Européenne n'a pas changé. En outre, la Grande-Bretagne préférerait être plus proche des Américains plutôt que des Européens, surtout après les Attaques contre les Etats Unis le 11 septembre 2001. Plus tard, le parti de l'indépendance du Royaume-Uni (UKIP) a appelé à une sortie complète de l'Union en fournissant de nombreux arguments et promettant un meilleur Royaume-Uni indépendant. Donc, le parti a été soutenu par un grand nombre d'Eurosceptiques. En conséquence, le gouvernement conservateur de David Cameron a succombé à des désirs profonds et a tenu un référendum (in-out) le 23 juin 2016. Les Britanniques ont choisi de quitter l'UE et la Grande-Bretagne a pu récupérer sa souveraineté.

مُلخَص

الهدف الرئيسي من هذا البحث هو دراسة الأسباب والظروف التي أدت إلى خروج بريطانيا من الاتحاد الأوروبي. لم يعتبر البريطانيون أنفسهم أوروبيين أبداً من قبل حيث وُصفت بريطانيا دائماً بأنها شريك غير ملائم للاتحاد الأوروبي منذ الحرب العالمية الثانية. رفضت بريطانيا الانضمام إلى الاتحاد في سنواته الأولى ليتم إذلالها لاحقاً من طرف الفيتو الفرنسي وهذا قبل انضمامها في عام 1973. إن استفتاء 1975، ومفاوضات الخصومات لعام 1979، والتنازل عن معاهدة ماستريخت لعام 1992، تُظهر أن العداوة البريطانية تجاه الاتحاد الأوروبي لم تتغير. وعلاوة على ذلك، فضلت بريطانيا أن تكون أقرب إلى الأمريكيين بدلاً من الأوروبيين، خاصة بعد هجمات 11 سبتمبر بالولايات المتحدة. في وقت لاحق، دعا حزب استقلال المملكة المتحدة إلى خروج شامل من الاتحاد الأوروبي وذلك بتقديم كثير من الحجج واعداء باستقلالية أفضل للمملكة المتحدة. لذلك حظي الحزب بدعم كبير من معارضي الاتحاد الأوروبي. ونتيجة لذلك، خضعت حكومة المحافظين ورئيسها ديفيد كاميرون للترغبات العتيقة ضد الاتحاد، وأجرت استفتاء في 23 يونيو 2016. اختار على اثره الشعب البريطاني مغادرة الاتحاد الأوروبي واكتسبت بريطانيا سيادتها مرة أخرى.