



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Abdel Hamid Ibn Badis University of Mostaganem
Faculty of Foreign Languages
Department of English

Britain and the European Union: From Correlation to Separation
(1950s-2016)

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master in British Civilization Studies

Submitted by : CHERETI Wafa

Supervised by: Mr. LARBI Youcef

Board of Examinars:

Chairperson : Tegua Chrief

University of Mostaganem

Examiner : Aissat Djamila

University of Mostaganem

Academic Year: 2016/2017

Dedication

This simplest work is dedicated

To my dearest parents

For love, pray and support.

To my dearest sisters Malika and Karima

For their sacrifices and help in unpleasant moments.

To my lovely nephews and nieces

To my beloved friend Hadjera and Fatima Belabassi

CHERETI Wafa

Acknowledgment

All praise is to Allah alone who gave me spirit, strength, patience and the capacity to complete this work.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Mr. ARBI Yousef Abdel djalil who has been generous in giving me his time and knowledge and for his perfect sense of understanding and patience during the progress of this work.

Moreover, my special thanks go to my teacher Mr. MCURI Djelali for his help.

Also, my gratitude is to the board of examiners for reading and evaluating my work.

CHERETI Wafa

Abstract

The period between 1950 and 2016 knew a kind of defect among the European Union and United Kingdom. The purpose of this study is to illustrate the main causes of the British leaving and the relationship between the two after separation. This research paper has started with an introduction of the topic, and then three problematic issues have been raised. The first one is about Britain and the European Union integration before the departure. The second one concerns causes and consequences of the British exit. The third one is life after the divorce. To answer these questions; classifications and identifications of events research design has been adopted to find out the growth of the relationship between Great Britain and the European Community from correlation to separation which identified with causes, consequences and the relation after separation.

List of Abriviations

EAAC: European Atomic Energy Community

ECSC: European Coal and Steel Community

EDC: European Defence and Community

EEC: European Economic and Community

EU: European Union

UK: United Kingdom

Table of content

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgment.....	II
Abstract.....	III
List of abbreviations.....	IV
Content.....	V
General Introduction	1

Chapter One: the European Union and the British Correlation

introduction :	3
I.1. The Origins and Development of The European	3
I.1.1. The European Coal and Steel Community:	3
I.1.2. The European Economic Community	4
I.2. The Institution of the European Union	4
1. The Commission:.....	4
2. The European Council:	5
3. The Council of Ministers:.....	5
4. European Parliament:	6

5. The Court of Justice:.....	6
6. The Committee of Regions and The Economic and Social Committee:	6
7.The European Ombudsman:	6
I.3. The Reluctant European	7
1.4. Britain on the Edge of the European Union.....	8
1.4.1. The Conservative and the Labour Unsuccessful Applications	9
1.4.1.1.The First Conservative Application of 1961-1963	9
1.4.2.The Labour Application of 1967	9
1.4.3.The Successful Application of 1973	9
I.5.The contextual Factor (factor of correlation.....	10
I.6.Supranational vs Intergovernmental.....	11
I.7Margaret Thatcherand the European Community.....	14
I.8.Conclusion	15

chapter two: The Influence of the European Union on the UK

<u>Introduction.....</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>II.1.1 The European Union and the United Kingdom Parliament:</u>	<u>17</u>
<u>II.1.2 The European Union and Regional Government in The United Kingdom.....</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>II.1.3 Local Government and the European Union</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>II.2 The Eurozone Crisis and Rise of Disagreement between the UK and the EU</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>II.3 Conclusion.....</u>	<u>25</u>

chapter three: British Exit

Introduction.....	26
III.1. British Problem in the EU.....	27
III.2. British toward the Exit.....	29
III.3. The EU's Response.....	32
III.4. Reasons for leaving.....	34
III.5. The impact of the British exit.....	35

III.5.1. British Trade	35
III.5.2. Immigration	36
III.6. Life After the Divorce	36
III.7. Post-withdrawal Relations between the EU and UK.....	37
III.8. Conclusion.....	39

General Introduction

Britain was one of the dominant European Union memberships since 1973. However, from the beginning, the United Kingdom had a little interest for being part of the European Union. Thus, the relationship between them was incredibly complex. Britain membership has long been surpassed by doubts about its commitment and whether it may one day leave, also known as a ‘‘Brexit’’.

This work examines the situation of Britain as a member of the European Union. Besides, to discover factors and circumstances that cause to Brexit. Ultimately, to discuss the life after divorce.

Looking for the relationship between the UK and the EU is debatable, and has been long highlighted by many historians and politicians. Yet, it seems to be frequent that before the British exit David Cameron called for a referendum and constructions for the European Union. In deed the major purpose motivated this study to identify the result of this referendum.

This research paper aims at addressing the following questions,

- How was the relation between Britain and the European Union during the European integration?
- What are the main causes of separation?

-What are the consequences of this separation?

In order to provide the previous questions with relevant answers, the following hypothesis are suggested,

-The relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union may have always been problematic.

-Separation may have been due to many reasons such as immigration.

-Brexit may have economic consequences.

In this study, general logical methods were used: classification and identification of material. Through the event illustrations of key points of development of relation between Great Britain and the European Community from correlation to separation which identified with causes and consequences.

The work consists of three chapters, and all of them are theoretical parts. The first chapter discusses the origin of the European Union and the treaties that establish the European Community. In addition, it has been attempted to identify the reluctant European. This chapter shed light on the conservative and the Labour applications and the factors of British correlation with the European Union. Then, supranational versus intragovernmental.

The second chapter focuses on the influence of the European Union on Britain and the constitutional relationship between the United Kingdom and the European Union. This chapter also focuses on the Eurozone crisis and the rise of disagreement between the EU and the UK.

The third chapter discusses the British problem, the causes and consequences of Brexit. It is also discussing the life after divorce.

Introduction

The history and the development of the European Union during the 1950s saw a lack of Britain involvement. Britain was considered as a reluctant because it had no interest to join the European Union. Winston Churchill and other British politicians were never expected to drag down to the level of the European Union. However, in the 1960s the vision was changed under the conservative and the liberal leaders, Harold Macmillan and Harold Wilson for any factors.

I.1. The Origins and Development of The European Union

The European Union has developed gradually from a collection of states pooling their coal and steel resources through to the more integrated union that existed today. The history of the European Union (EU) has been marked by a period of rapid change. The European Union saw many varieties, through various stages from the ECSC to the EEC to the EU.

I.1.1. The European Coal and Steel Community

According to Jones Alistair Says:” the origins of the European Coal and STEEL Community (ECSC) can be seen not just in the ruins of the Second World War but really from the aftermath of the First World War. The fear of repeating the same mistakes, leading to the rise of fascism in Europe, haunted many politicians. Mixed into this were the memories of two world wars fought across the European Continent and the carnage left their aftermath. Nobody wished to endure such devastation again.”¹

The European Coal and Steel Community was proposed by the French minister Robert Schuman. The ECSC was established by the Schuman Plan² or the Treaty of Paris which was signed in 1951. The first president of this Supranational community was Jean Monnet, the ECSC was signed by the six founder of organization; France, Belgium, Italy, Luxembourg, West Germany, and the Netherlands. These Six members were integrated without any difficulties, they established the Institution of the community such as the assembly, the court and the council.

The purpose of ECSC was to unify Europe, it would to avoid the conflict between the members of the continent and to spread peace among them. The treaty of Paris

¹Jones, Alistair. Britain and the European Union. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press 2007.

² (9 May 1950) Is a governmental proposal by French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman.

purposes was to integrated and correlated French and German economies. With the success of ECSC, the European Defence Community (EDC) was created by the French president of the Council René Pleven in 1950 to promote co-operation on defence matters. The treaty did not sign because of the French problem with Germany³.

1.1.2. The European Economic Community

In 1957, the six members of the community signed the Treaty of Rome which creating the European Economic Community (EEC). The EEC members' purposes was to unify and to create a common economic and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC)⁴. The EEC was the result of the development of the ECSC. The European Economic Community was designed to create a common market among its members through the elimination of most trade barriers and the establishment of a common external trade policy. The treaty also provided for a common agricultural policy.

1.2. The Institution of the European Union

1. The Commission

The European Commission is the executive organ of the European Community. The Commission was set up under the Treaty of Rome which established the European Economic Community. The commission currently consists twenty-five members, one from each member state. The commission is involved in the decision-making processes of the European Union at all level. It draws up legislative proposals but these are for the consideration of the other European Union Institutions.

As well as involved in the law-making processes of the European Union, the commission is also known as the "guardian of the treaties". This means that the commission attempts to make sure that all member states support the various treaties of the European Union, the commission is based in Brussel.

The commission meets as a body every Wednesday morning, and if there is a heavy agenda the meeting may be resumed after lunch, additional meetings are frequently scheduled, occasionally in more relaxed surrounding, to discuss particular topic or long term

³Wikipedia. <http://en.Wikipedia.org>. 2010 . 2010 May 2010 http://en.Wikipedia.Org/wiki/Schuman_Declaration

⁴Thody, Philip. Historical Introduction to the European Union. London: Routledge, 1997. Xii chronology.

perspectives. Decision within the commission are normally adopted on the basis of a simple majority vote, and subsequently the principle of collective responsibility applies⁵.

2. The European Council:

The European Council has a large extent replaced the commission as the motor of the community. The European Council is sometimes perceived to be little more than an extension on the Council of Ministers.

The European Council is far more powerful than the Council of Ministers. It can set the agenda for the council of Ministers and for the Commission, and can reject or ignore the European Parliament as well. The European Council is not a part of the Council of Ministers. It merely has the power and authority to override the Council of Ministers.

Under the projected of European Union constitution, the European Council will have a permanent president elected by its members a renewable term of two and a half years. The member will preside over its meeting and coordinate its work. This individual will probably be a current or former prime minister, and may well assume a highly important role and increase the impact of the European Union on the world stage.

The European Council sets the strategic policy direction for the European Union. In a number of areas, the European Council is able to make key decisions. These areas include political and economic integration.

3. The Council of Ministers:

The council of Ministers is the dominant body of the European Union. It is assisted by a body known as Coroper (Committee of Permanent Representatives). The council consists of representatives from each of the member states, and every council has a sector for example, when agriculture is under discussion, each member state's agriculture minister will be present.

The Council is the legislative part of the European Union. It has to share some aspects with the European Parliament. The council meets around 80-90 times a year, usually for one day, sometimes for two or more. Decisions are taken by the majority (Jones; 2007;35).

⁵Leonard, Dick. Guide to the European Union: The definitive guide to all aspects of the EU. 3A Exmouth House, Pine Street, London EC1R 0JH, 2005. P 62.

4. European Parliament

The European Parliament is the only body in the European Union is directly elected. The Member of the Parliament could discuss whatever issues or problems they liked but the other institutions were under no obligation to listen to those advices.

The elections of the European Parliament are held on a fixed five year. The elections are not even held on a single day. Some countries hold their elections in a day they want, for example: France on Tuesday and Germany may on Wednesday.

Though it is not a legislative body, the European Parliament has also increased its role in the legislative process, it can suggest new policies or even new laws.

5. The Court of Justice:

The court is including 25 judges and nine advocates-general, each one from member state. The judges are chosen by the council of ministers, they are appointed for a renewable every six year, half the court being renewable every three years.

The judges selected one of their number to be president of the court for a renewable term of three year. The Court Justice role is to make sure that all member states support the European Union laws as the different treaties of the European Union(Jones;2007;46)

6. The Committee of Regions and The Economic and Social Committee:

The Committee of Region was coming into began in 1994. It includes 317 members, with each country having membership corresponding to its population size. It has to be consulted on any policy proposals relating to local or regional government.

Unlike the Committee of Regions, the Economic and Social Committee was not created in the Treaty of Rome. Its role was adopted by the various treaties. It is the advisory body (Jones; 200;47,49) .

7.The European Ombudsman:

The European Ombudsman was created in the Treaty of European Union. During the treaty negotiations, Britain was one of the member state most enthusiastic about creating such a

body. It came into being in 1995. The idea of the Ombudsman was to help bring the European Union closer to the people.

1.2. The Reluctant European

“We are with Europe, but not of it”⁶, “I love France and Belgium, but we must not allow ourselves to be pulled down to that level”⁷.

Winston Churchill

During the early of European Coal and Steel Community, and the European Economic country, Britain was a Reluctant European. This concept is one that has been given to Britain during the 1950s. The reluctant European is a country which doesn't to be a part or a member of the European Economic Community. Long before the Second World War, British interest in the European affairs was very limited. After war, when the EESC and the EEC was established neither the Labour nor the Conservative parties aimed to United Britain with the European contentent. They agreed that they did not want a foreign group to have a power over Britain. The prestige of the long history of British empire and the special relationship with the United State were seem to be of far greater importance than the relationship with Europe. The United Kingdoom was invited to participate the Treaty of Paris or the Schuman Plan of 1951, wich established the European Economic and Steel Community, and the Treaty of Rom in 1957 that established the European Economic Community.

The British goverment refused to signed neither the Schuman Plan nor the Treaty of Rome the decision was taken by Clement Attlee s Labour government, and it was confirmed by Winston Churchill. This later claimed that the British people love France and Belgium, but they must not allow themselves to be pulled down to that level. Britain would never be dragged down to be to the European level. Britain want to be isolated herself from the European Community

During the 1950 s Britain refused to integrated for tworeasons:

⁶ Quoted in Zuricher, Arnold J 1975. The Struggle to Unite Europe 1940-1958, Westport(CT): Greenwood, p6.

⁷ Ibid.

1. In Massena Conference Britain proposed a Free Trade Area around the customs union of the European Economic Community, but this was rejected⁸.

1. The importance of its commercial, political and other relations with its colonies most of them integrated in Commonwealth.

Although the UK was absent and still reluctant during the 1950s, the supranational organization did not find difficulties to raise up.

I.4. Britain on the Edge of the European Union

In the 1950s, Britain was a reluctant. The United Kingdom was not interested to join the European Economic Community, the UK did not then regard itself primarily as being a part of European Economic Community, however, In the 1960s the UK started to change its mind about the European Community.

During the 1960s, the United Kingdom became aware of the isolation it had brought on itself during the last period, especially since the special relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States cooled after the 1956 Suez crisis.

The empire on which Great Britain's status as a world power had rested until the Second World War collapsed and the links between the British and former colonial economies declined steadily throughout the 1960s (Commonwealth). In the aftermath of the treaty, the six founder of the European Economic Community members flourished and developed economically however Britain suffered continuous economic collapse.

The 1960s were an essential decade in the history of Britain's relationship with the European Economic Community. Britain opened negotiations about applying for membership of European Economic Community for the first time under Harold Macmillan.

In the 1961-1967 the government led by both parties; Harold Macmillan's conservatives and Harold Wilson's Labour tried to join the European Economic Community, it was only after the flourished and the most success of the community⁹.

Macmillan and Wilson's participation was rejected, the only obstacle was the French president Charles De Gaulle who said twice "no" to British membership in 1961 and 1967. Britain could enter to the European Economic Community only when George Pompidou came in

⁸ European Union EFTA. 15 May 2010 http://europa.eu/abc/treaties/index_en.htm.

⁹ . Chalmers, Damian, and Adam Tomkins. European Union public law: text and materials. Cambridge: Cambridge up, 2007.13

power and this done under a conservative government, led by the Prime Minister Edward Heath in 1973.

I.4.1. The Conservative and the Labour Unsuccessful Applications

I.4.1.1. The First Conservative Application of 1961-1963

In 1961, the conservative government led by Harold Macmillan arrived to the conclusion that it was not a bad idea to be a member of the European Economic Community. The British reluctant was gradually replaced by a will to participate more actively in the European Economic Community.

The European Free Trade Area been characterized by some as a British means of securing European Economic Community membership by negotiating entry as part of a trading bloc rather than as an individual nation. The cabinet had decided that Britain should be closer to the EEC but it was rejected. In 1963, The president De Gaulle rejected Britain entering to the EEC stating that Britain is not in it appropriating time for Britain to be accepted as apart of the European Community. He argued that their strong link to the USA as well as the British Commonwealth could hinder the British in their dedication to the EEC¹⁰.

I.4.2. The Labour Application of 1967

The new Labour government, which came to power in 1964 was headed by Harold Wilson. Harold also did not reach success. In 1967 its attempt to enter the community again failed with the rejection of De Gaulle. The failure of the two British application flowed from fundamental policy contradictions. Treasury Secretary Fowler Complained: "France is trying to expel us completely from Europe or at least to diminish our power there". The vice president: "Europeans have rejected the world after the loss of their colonies. They resent US power". These two quotes explain how De Gaulle expelled and rejected the United Kingdom from the European Community¹¹.

¹⁰ David Gowland ,Arthur Turner and Alex Wright. Britain and the European Integration Since 1945. New York: Routledge, 2009

¹¹Rolling, Neil. British Business In The Formative Years of the European Integration 1945-1973.UK: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS? 2007

I.4.3.The Successful Application of 1973

After when Charles, De Gaulle replaced by the new French president George Pompidou, the United Kingdom had the chance to integrate and to be a part of the European Community. George Pompidou lifted his country's opposition to British membership. Membership was secured on 1 January 1973 under the conservative government of Edward Heath.

As soon as the European Communities Act or the accession treaty of 1972 was introduced in Britain, after only a small majority voted in favor for it, it became clear that the countries integration would encounter the so-called sovereignty barriers. According to the communities Act, the Europeans law has supremacy over all domestic sources of law of the individual member countries. However, one of the basic principle unwritten constitution of the United Kingdom is the sovereignty of parliament. this later means that the parliament is the supreme power of the state and it has the legal right to pass the status laws that are the principle for the British laws. Edward Heath took the view that parliament was most important support vote on the form of European Communities Act¹².

I.5.The contextual Factor (factor of correlation)

The United Kingdom integrated the European Union after it reluctant for a several reasons, its decision did not come like that, Britain was always developed its economic under other countries such as its colonies (India, Some part of Africa and others). Britain does not act for nothing it was always had an interest and privileges, the United Kingdom made the Commonwealth and the commonwealth of nation to protect its economy in the country and in its colonies even though they were independent, Britain tried to lost colonies so with an indirect way it gathered them under the commonwealth¹³.

At the end of 1950s and during the 1960s the UK economy was declined, the economy property of the community on the other hand largely influenced British politicians, who radically change their mind about the relationship with Europe. It was the economic motivation that argued Britain to be a membership of the European Union.

The United Kingdom does not strive for political integration, it is reluctant to transfer its sovereignty and it opts for the intergovernmental cooperation structure. In order to become a member of the European Union Britain had to accept the communities act as a legal basis

¹² George, Stephen. Britain in the European Community. Oxford: Oxford University press, 1998.

¹³ .Pickard , Sarah. Civilisation britannique. Paris : Pocket, 2003.

of its membership, however Britain continued to define its cooperation with Europe as an intergovernmental and not as a supranational.

1.6. Supranational vs Intergovernmental:

Before at all the European Union is considered as a Supranational organization rather than an Intergovernmental one. All the six formers were support and prefer the supranationalism. However, Britain wanted to be governmental. This title is a good example to show the correlation between Britain and the European Union, between the intergovernmentalism and the supranationalism. It is also a good example to understand the difficulties that may arise in the integration process between the United Kingdom and the European Union. This title may also explain the fundamental distinction between the two concept in the European Union and the United Kingdom. The concept of Supranationalism and Intergovernmental were essential to understand the discussion surrounding sovereignty in the European Union.

At the beginning of the European Integration Two concept were emerged about how integration could be implemented one of this was the supranationalism. As the term implies Supranationalism refers to governance arrangements where state decide to delegate some responsibility for decision making forum that stands above the nation state. Here state lose the right of veto and agree to be bound of majority decisions of cooperating states and thus lose some control. As Nugent notes "Supranationalism takes inter-state relations beyond cooperation in to integration, and involves some loss of national sovereignty." Alistair Jones was another one who agree with the same definition of Supranationalism "supranational means the loss of national sovereignty".

The first impetus who realized supranational correlation was came mainly from the France and specially from Jean Monnet. the idea of the supranational was presented during the establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community. Monnet presented his concept to Robert Schuman, the French foreign minister, and suggested how the European Coal and Steel Community could be created and managed by a higher authority with a Supranational power.

In other hand, there is also another system which is Intergovernmentalism, as Nugent Suggests, Intergovernmentalism refer to arrangement "whereby nation state, in situation and conditions they can control, deal with one another on matter of common interest". Under such

circumstance states are free to cooperate and are able to set the level of cooperation. Normally, this is ensured through a veto, where a state, when so choosing, can block any proposal presented by any other parties. Such circumstances involve no loss of sovereignty. States cooperate when they want and don't cooperate when they don't want to.

The sovereignty of British parliament means that parliament is the supreme power of the state and that it has the legal right to pass statute laws that are the principal form of British laws. Britain doesn't strive for political integration, it is reluctant to transfer its sovereignty and it opts for the intergovernmental cooperation structure instead.

In order to become a member of the European Community, Britain had to accept the Communities Act of 1972 as legal basis of its membership. However, the United Kingdom continues to define its cooperation with Europe as intergovernmental and not as a constant process of political integration in which supranational institutions take precedence over all domestic government. Intergovernmentalism, which is the British system preferred and followed, seeks to reduce the creation of new institutions and policies.

The difference between Supranational and Intergovernmental is very clear. Supranationalism sees some aspects of sovereignty ceded to a higher body. Intergovernmentalism focuses upon the different governments working together (while they are protecting their national interest) without ceding of any sovereignty.

Some institutions of the European Union are Supranational in nature, for example; the Commission. Others such as the Council of Ministers are Intergovernmental. All European Community institutions are a mix of a Supranational and governmental.

Within British politics, the idea of the European Union as a predominantly intergovernmental organization was to be more comfortable rather than a supranational system. The British government is able to portray itself as protecting British interests within the European Union, sovereignty is protected, and the British parliament remains supreme. There is a time when Britain does not get its own way in the European Union but the same applies to all member states. If there appears to be a threat to national interest, however, any member state can attempt to veto the policy proposals. Thus, in the negotiations on the Treaty of European Union, the British position on single currency was to opt out, but not to block such a move. There was a similar position with the social charter. Any plans to make

the European parliament into legislative body, however, were blocked with the treat to veto the entire treaty. This was one of the British red lines, it was non-negotiable.

The intergovernmental aspect of the European Union mean that the British government has to negotiate with other governments to get legislative proposal accepted. Thus, intergovernmentalism is often about negotiation and compromise, of ‘ pressing the flesh ‘ as ministers or the prime minister visit their counterparts in other European Union states.

Britain was very wary and faire of any aspect of Supranationalism. This is often portrayed as ‘Surrendering‘sovereignty. Many people are far more comfortable with the intergovernmental aspect of European Union membership, the idea of the British government working with others but ultimately protecting British interest. Much of the British print media is virulently opposed to almost any aspect of European Union Supranationalism.

The fact that Supranational entails a loss of sovereignty raises the question of why states would agree to enter in to such governance arrangements. Indeed, this is the question that animates a very large part of the theoretical literature on the European Community integration. There is no short answer (as will be seen throughout the rest of this unit),but at this stage we can posit three areas to look at that are worth keeping in mind as reading about the different theories of integration :

1-The benefits to be gained from pooling sovereignty (often thought of it terms of efficiency and increased ‘agency ‘or the capacity to act.

2-The costs involved in not combining sovereignty.

3-What is considered normatively or ethically the ‘right’ or most’ appropriate’ thing to do.

In sum,the European Community represent a mix of supranationalism and intergovernmentalism. The different institutions carry examples of each, as has been noted above. The Supranational aspect of the European Union appear to be working towards greater integration. where intergovernmentalism dominates, the emphasis is far more upon the interests of the individual member state.

From a British perspective, the supranational institutions and common policies of the European Community are sometimes portrayed as being a threat to British sovereignty. An

intergovernmental approach sees a greater emphasis placed upon protecting British interest. Different British prime ministers have come back from intergovernmental conferences and treaty negotiations proudly proclaiming to have got the best possible deal for Britain.

1.7. Margaret Thatcher and the European Community.

Margaret Thatcher has been one of the most influential politicians in the European building process. Margaret Thatcher voted for the legislation that secured British entry to the European Economic Community in 1972, she campaigned for “yes” voted in the referendum of 1975.

Margaret Thatcher, who became prime minister in 1979, openly expressed her very negative attitude towards the European Economic Community. The period of her service was marked by an increasing political isolation of Britain from Europe. She was ardently against complete economic, political and social integration. Her Chancellor of the Exchequer, sir Geoffrey Howe, argued that Britain contributed much more to the European budget than the other countries and he thought that something had to be done about it. In response, in 1984 Margaret Thatcher government negotiated a rebate on the British contribution, and thus received some of its money back. The main reason for this was the fact that a great share of the European budget is spent on the common Agriculture policy and since farming does not represent a major sector in the United Kingdom economy , Britain felt that it benefited much less than other countries. Also, for Margaret Thatcher , Britain was losing its independence and sovereignty by transferring the power of decision-making to Brussels. In her “ Bruges Speech” in 1988 she started that:” To try to suppress nationhood and concentrate power at the center of a European conglomerate would be highly damaging and would jeopardize the objectives we seek to achieve. Working more closely together does not require power to be centralized in Brussels or decisions to be taken by an appointed bureaucracy “¹⁴.

Throughout the 1980s Margaret Thatcher was not ready to let the United Kingdom join the European Monetary system and adopt a common social policy because she regarded them as steps towards the formation of a closer political union. For Britain, the European Union project is seen merely as something made out for economic reasons, a union supposed to create a common European Market, not a political community. Turning back to Thatcher, she was particularly reluctant to adapt to revolutionary changes, such as the collapse of

¹⁴ Thatcher, Margaret. The Bruges Speech. Bruges , 1988

communism in Europe and the fall of the Berlin wall, that took place on the world political scene in 1989 and 1990, and this was the main reason for her downfall.

Margaret Thatcher was replaced by John Major, whose government ratified the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, which led to the formation of the European Union in 1993. However, John Major opted out of the section of the treaty dealing with social policy, as well as of joining the Monetary and Economic Union. In this way the reluctance position of Britain was once again reinforced¹⁵.

1.8. Conclusion:

The European unity may have appeared after the Second world war, during the 1950's Britain was invited for many times to join the six founding and the other countries, however, the United Kingdom government decided against participation in establishing the European Coal Steel community and the European Economic Community. In the 1950's Britain considered as a Reluctant European, Churchill did not believe that the United Kingdom would be a part of the united states of Europe, he never expected to drag down to the European Community. However, in the 1960's Britain changed their mind toward the European integration. Unfortunately, Britain was refused to join by the French president De Gaulle. Britain did not have the chance to be a member of the community until 1973. In the mid of 1980's Britain started activating Thatcher approach to the European Community

¹⁵<http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=107332>

Introduction

The European Union has a great and a deep upon not just parliament, but also on the regional assemblies in the United Kingdom, and upon local government. The constitutional relationship between Britain and the European Union may be a little blurred at times but membership has had a huge impact upon how the different tiers of government across Britain operate. It has been subnational government that has taken up the baton in developing more positive link with the European Union.

The way to strengthen Britain position in the European Union can include ensuring the reform of the European Union budget, the deepening of the single market, the strengthening of constitutional safeguards to ensure proper protection of the economic interest of Britain in the face of the Eurozone core of the European Union.

II.1. The constitutional relationship between the EU and the UK:

The underpinning of the British constitution is parliamentary sovereignty. The British parliament is the supreme laws of parliament. Only the parliament can makes the own decisions that helped the country No power or other institution can challenge the laws of the parliament or takes the decision on it place. In effect, this means that the success or the fail

British power is related to the parliament decisions. The parliament can give powers or authority to others institutions such as the local government or regional assemblies. The British parliament is considered as only one source of power. The judiciary may be able to challenge parliament on some of its decisions.

Membership of the European Union has also provided a challenge to the British constitution. By joining the organization, the British government accepted that EEC law overrides British law. In effect, if there is any legislation in the UK that runs counter to that of the EU, it must repeal. Thus it could be argued, that Britain has surrendered sovereignty to the EU in any areas where the EU has the right to legislate. In effect, parliament is no longer the supreme law-making body in all aspects of British law.

While powers have been ceded to the EU, however this does not mean that Britain has lost its sovereignty. All of the laws imposed by the EU can be repealed if Britain was to withdraw from the EU. The British government may have ceded some aspects of law-making to the EU but any subsequent parliament can reverse such a decision. The problem here is that it is rather unlikely that Britain will withdraw from the EU¹⁶.

The way in which European Union membership has been incorporated into the British constitution can be seen by examining the different component parts of the constitution. Decisions taken by the European Union are still only one aspect of the British constitution. Admittedly, it may be a growing part, but statute law and common law are still prominent as well.

II.1.1. The European Union and the United Kingdom Parliament

Membership of the European Union has changed some of the ways in which the British parliament operates. As many directives, decisions and regulations are issued by the European Union, they still, technically, have to be ratified by parliament. Thus, there is a number of select committees that now exist which scrutinise EU legislation. On average, more than 1,000 documents are scrutinised each year by the House of Commons select committee on Europe. As with all select committees, this is a multipartisan body although there is an in-built government majority. This means that all parties with MPs on such a committee work together as opposed to against each other although, if the government so wished, it could force any decisions through the committee.

It is not just scrutiny of EU legislation, however, that is performed by the select committee on Europe. It also scrutinizes the performance of British ministers in the Council

¹⁶Jones, Alistair. Britain and the European Union. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press 2007.

of Ministers. This is on top of the scrutiny that is performed in the House of Commons through such procedures as ministerial (or prime ministerial) question time.

The role of keeping ministers in the Council of Ministers accountable for their actions is very important. Arguably, the Council of Ministers, collectively, is not accountable to anybody. Thus, keeping to the British parliament in an attempt to hold the Council of Ministers accountable for their actions.

Yet is not only the House of Commons which has a select committee dedicated to the European Union. The House of Lords also has a select committee on Europe. It also has seven subcommittees, each dedicated to a particular part of the European Union. The formal European Union select committee of the House of Lords covers European Union documents and other matters pertaining to the EU. The subcommittees are the specialists.

Like the House of Commons, the House of Lords select committees are likely to operate beyond party lines. The House of Lords has a distinct advantage over the commons, however, there is less party political pressure within the chamber. This means that the party whips have far less influence. The Lords also tends to be far more thorough with their scrutiny. Much of this is to do with the pressures of time. Members of the House of Lords are able to spend far more time examining legislation from the EU or the actions of British ministers in the council of ministers than their House of Commons counterparts.

As well as select committees on Europe, there are also standing committees. A standing committee examines legislative proposals between the second and third reading of a bill. A standing committee will examine the legislation in fine detail. As with select committees, standing committees are cross party.

In the past, there were three standing committees to cover EU legislation. However, it increases to five in 2005. The idea of having five such committees is to allow greater specialization in scrutinizing EU legislation.

British central Government has a number of different committees to scrutinize EU legislation as well as the actions of the British government within the council of ministers. There are committees from both chambers of parliament. The select committees are particularly influential, as they are able to call ministers and civil servants to explain their actions.

II.1.2.The European Union and Regional Government in The United Kingdom

When we examine the relationship between the EU and regional government in the UK, it is rather difficult to examine it all as a single block. The Scottish parliament has

significantly greater power than either the Northern Ireland or Welsh Assemblies. Added to this, regional government in England is wholly unelected outside of the Greater London Authority. As a result, their relationship with the EU may differ. Therefore, it is somewhat easier to examine each region separately. Specific issues with regard to each region will be addressed after highlighting aspects common to them all.

One of the first things to note is that there is regional representation at the EU in the committee of regions. This body is purely advisory body. Its recommendation and opinions are not binding. This body, however, does highlight the importance of regional government representation across the EU. The nomination to the committee of regions are coordinated at the regional level in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. Nominations are sought in consultations. There are twenty-four British delegates, and a further twenty-four alternate members. An alternate member is substitute if the full member is unable to attend.

At regional level, elected and unelected governments have opened up offices in Brussels. From these; the different regions of Britain are able to promote their own interest as well as attempting to influence policy making.

The Committee of Region is the body which tries to promote and defend local and regional interest of the EU. Although it is only an advisory body, there is a compulsion for its opinions to be sought in specific policy areas.

II.1.3. Local Government and the European Union

During the 1980s and 1990s, local government across Britain saw its powers being reduced by central government a part of Thatcherite ideal of rolling back of frontiers of the state. Through access to the EU, however, local authorities were able to access new monies to develop infrastructure or to create new employment opportunities. These monies came from the various structural funds particularly the Regional Development Fund and the Social Funds.

Today, local authorities work with EU in aspects of service delivery as well as policy formulation. The most notable point of access in the policy formulation process is via the committee of region. As noted earlier in this chapter, the committee of region gives regional and local government input into the policy making processes of the EU. This enables all tiers of government to have the opportunity for input into EU decisions. Currently, of the United Kingdom's twenty-four members of the committee of regions, eighteen are local government representatives from across Britain.

What is interesting about the relationship between local government in Britain and the EU is that there has been a marked development in collaboration. This collaboration is not

only between British local government and the EU but also between the different tiers of local government particularly on a regional basis to further their collective interest.

The local government in Britain has benefited from extra funding from the EU through the structural funds. These are monies in addition to that received from central government¹⁷(Jones;93).

II.2.The Eurozone Crisis and Rise of Disagreement between the UK and the EU

Already in year after coming, the coalition government had to face a sever crisis in the European Union, the epicenter of wich became the Eurozone. There was a real danger of bankruptcy not only of banks, but of the whole countries, in particular, Greece, Spain and Italy. A thorny question of survival of the Eurozone as such arose. The behavior of Great Britain in this crisis, the measures proposed by the government to overcome it demonstrated again that the country takes a position different from that of its European partners.

The Eurozone crisis strained the relation of the UK with the European partners. Certainly, London was interested in the stability of the euro, but it was not satisfied with the ways to overcome the crisis suggested by Brussels. Britain did not support the measures adopted by Belgium, France, Italy and Spain aimed at combating the speculative game. Crisis-fighting implied consolidation of EU states, the adaptation of common rules of financial operations, which in turn meant the movement towards a genuine fiscal union.

The preparation for an emergency summit of the Eurozone states (August 2011). Revealed profound differences in the approaches of the member countries to combating the crisis. At the meeting of parliament on August 2011, the chancellor of the Exchequer G. Osborne sought to justify the measures of the coalition government to slash public spending stressing that thanks to these measures, the country was turned into a financial stability.¹⁸

He allowed the creation of a fiscal union as the only possible response to the Eurozone crisis. At the same time, G Osborne pointed out the necessity to uphold British national interests. London did not rule out the probability of the collapse of the Eurozone and, along with some other EU countries, it worked out action plans in case of emergency.

The revival of the Franco-German tandem in the European Union, wich previously determined the direction and speed of development of the integration process, and in the period of EU enlargement to the east considerably weekend, greatly worried London. The

¹⁸ Statement by the chancellor of the of the Exchequer, G. Osborne, on the global economy(2011).

power of the tandem was clearly manifested at the EU summit in Paris in August 2011: France and Germany managed to elaborate common course and to offer the rest of the 15 countries of the Eurozone the program of its stabilization.¹⁹ In essence, it was a question of a so-called “economic government” headed by the president of the European Council H van Rompuy, which was aimed to develop a single tax policy for the Eurozone state. There were fears in London that this would inevitably be followed by a single economy, single minister of finance and economy minister. It was offered to include in the constitutions of the member states provisions on cost to income ratio of a state budget as well as on holding regular summit of the Eurozone countries to coordinate macroeconomic policies. These measures designed to create a closer economic and monetary union, caused aversion in Great Britain. Reflecting the views of Eurosceptic, some of the British media including the “Daily Mail” were talking about “ the rise of the Fourth Reich”²⁰, when Germany as the major economy power in Europe would dictate policy to its partners. It was emphasized that Germany would not have to use military means, as it was at the time of Hitler, it can achieve the same goals subjection with the help of economic and financial measures.

In the past two years, the dominance of Germany in the Franco German tandem, its transformation into a political heavyweight became more tangible, especially after the resignation of N Sarkozy. There is an illustrative article in the “financial times”, in which Berlin was named “the capital of Europe”²¹ despite the fact that the main EU institutions are located in different cities and the Chancellor A. Merkel still has to go to summits in Brussels and seek a compromise there, all key decisions in fact are already made in Berlin. The Eurozone crisis only accelerated this process.

The prospect of a single “economic government” of the Eurozone does not suit the UK because, in essence, it moves the country to the periphery of the EU, where it is alongside with Poland, Sweden and other states outside the Eurozone. Getting rid of a necessity to look back to London and thus further strengthening its position in the EU, the Franco-German tandem can accelerate the process of integration in the Eurozone. Faced with the threat of the EU turning into a multi tiered structure and the formation of a federal Europe controlled from Berlin, some British analysts started supposing just too utopian option of the rescue of the

¹⁹ Shipman, T (Paris and Berlin launch a coup to control Eurozone, demanding rights to dictate economic policy. 2012. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2026540/Euro-debt-summit-Angela-Merkel-Nicolas-Sarkozy-want-dicate-economic-policy.html>.

²¹ Richard, G. Welcome to Berlin, Europe’s new capital. 2012.

Eurozone: France's refusal of a special relationship with Germany and exit of the latter from the Eurozone.²²

The threat of marginalization of Great Britain in the EU was confirmed at summits held in Brussels on 23 and 26 October 2011, which made a reality Europe of “two speeds”, “economic core” of 17 members of the Eurozone and 10 remaining member states of the EU with a reduced opportunity to influence economic decision. For the British side was that the rescue plan was developed without the participation of European countries outside the Eurozone, which were simply asked to leave the meeting. Thus, the Europe of “two speeds”, the possibility of which the conservative allowed back in the mind of 1990s, became a reality. A new balance of power in the EU was evidenced by an open debate between David Cameron and French president Nicolas Sarkozy on October 24, in the course of which the latter strongly rejected the claims of Britain to take part in meetings of the representatives of the Eurozone states²³.

The British Prime Minister failed to create a coalition of countries left behind the Eurozone (Denmark, Hungary, Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czech Republic, Romania, Sweden), as at least seven of them voiced their intention to join. It does not allow London to form inside the EU, in contrast to the seventeen participants of the Eurozone, an influential group, which they would have to take into account. Moreover, the United Kingdom generally runs the risk to remain alone. It was virtually confirmed at the emergency EU summit in January 2012, during which, after London vetoed an intergovernmental fiscal agreement; it was nevertheless adopted by the Eurozone states and eight other EU countries. The agreement, against which only the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic voted, set new stiff terms of fiscal discipline.

London demanded to protect the activities of British companies and banks against the financial control of the European institutions, so as not to undermine the position of the city as a world financial center. At the EU summit in December 2012, Cameron started the intention of Great Britain to stay out of the Banking Union (together with Sweden and the Czech Republic)²⁴. Great Britain's anxiety was caused by information about Germany's preparation of a profound reform of the EU labor market and its social programs. The UK also was not satisfied with the plans to strengthen the role of the European Parliament, in particular with an

²². Kaletsky, A. How to save the euro-Kick out Germany. 2011, August 17.

²³. Rainy, S., Jones, L. EU referendum debate: as it happened October 24, 2011.

²⁴. Cameron seeks “better deal for Britain” at EU banking summit 2012.

interinstitutional agreement on strengthening coordination of the council of the EU, the European Commission and the European Parliament in dealing with the crisis.

In summer 2011, the British parliament passed a law on a “referendum lock”. Under this act, any treaty that involves the delegation of powers from Great Britain to Brussel, must first get an approval of the citizens in a referendum (failing under the law are adoption of the euro).²⁵

In autumn 2012 Great Britain reverted to the threat of veto when discussing the seven-year budget of the EU. In contrast to Germany, London insisted on freezing the EU spending. Back in December 2010 the leaders of Britain and Germany reached an agreement to limit the EU budget with rise in inflation. Contrary to this arrangement, the European Commission insisted on increasing the expenditure by almost five percent. In this case, the British contribution would have to rise substantially in 2014 from already big sum of around ten billion pounds’ sterling²⁶.

Complication of relations with the EU partners has led to a marked growth of Eurosceptic attitudes. There is a growing public opinion skeptical about the European integration. Britain has always stood out from among the leading European Countries by its entrenched Euroscepticism. Consistently negative attitude of citizens in relation to the EU as a whole and to its institutions in particular, demonstrated during public opinion polls, is expressed both at the mundane and at the political level. The skeptical attitude towards the EU and to its institutions is an indicator of a member of features and problems both in the country and in the community as a whole. Euroscepticism can also be viewed as a restraining factor of centralization, which may happen with a rapid and hasty transfer of powers to the supranational level. Euroscepticism can serve an indicator of success of a particular stage in the development of European integration and to show that for the transition to a new level, further refinement of supranational institutions is necessary. Skeptical moods are not only a deterrent, but a resource for future evolution of the EU in search of new guidelines and direction for development.

During his visit to Germany in October 2012 the head of foreign office William Hague announced the intention of Britain to regain part of the powers transferred to Brussel. He outline the British vision of the reform of the EU towards minimization: the Union should be primarily a single market with a few common political objectives. Thus, the British are in

²⁵ . European Union Act 2011. [http://www.gov.uk/government data/file/35460/eu-act-11-5page-fact-sheet.doc](http://www.gov.uk/government/data/file/35460/eu-act-11-5page-fact-sheet.doc).

²⁶ . The Prime Minister’s Statement ON THE European Council . October 2012.

favor of convergence and coordination of the member states in the field of foreign policy. Meanwhile, differences on many international problems in the last decade including the split into “old” and “new” Europe during the Iraq crisis complicate the task. The foreign secretary also questioned the need of further centralization of the EU and increasing of its budget.²⁷

The British position on EU enlargement is in favor of it and remains unchanged. In this matter, Great Britain assumed that the enlarged Union would have greater weight in world politics. However, the main expectation was that the EU enlargement by member countries of the European Free Trade Association and then countries of eastern Europe would prevent intensification of the integration processes. These countries, as was believed in London, for objective reason, for a long time would not be able to participate in a number of the most advanced forms of integration, in particular, to join the single European currency, which could lead to the desired slowdown of the integration processes. The further enlargement of the European Union means for Britain not only the solution of security issues, but also protraction of transferring powers to the supranational bodies. However, it seems that Britain advocating for the expansion of the EU involuntarily contributed to approximation of the Eurozone crisis, which ultimately had a serious Union. The position of the government on the EU with the growing Euroscepticism in the country remains fixed: Britain will abstain from further integration, intends to keep its national currency and is not ready to exchange the access to decision making in the Eurozone for infringement of the sovereignty of parliament. Moreover, the government of David Cameron is going to return part of the national sovereignty, which the previous Labour government sacrificed to the EU; It is the withdrawal from some of the programs that relate to domestic affairs (the fight against crime, the European arrest warrant) and to legal norm, like in the field of the labor market (the rejection of mandatory 48 hour work week). In December 2011, the UK refused to contribute its share of 30 billion euros to the International Monetary Fund to fight the debt crisis in the Eurozone. In summer 2012 the coalition government announced a kind of audit of the country's membership in the EU : before the upcoming parliament elections 32 reports should be prepared. This was agreed between the membership and the coalition at its creation in 2010. The research will not include direct recommendations of the government. However, some estimates will have a critical nature with all consequences concerning the country's participation in individual programs (the conservative faction of the British Parliament has

²⁷ . Parker, G. Hague presses for audit on EU law. 2012.

already demanded a free hand in the field of immigration, human rights, refusal to comply with 130 standards of the EU in the fight against crime).

In summer 2012 David Cameron trying to bring down moods in the party against its leader and responding to the requirement of 100 Tory MPs to hold a referendum on the membership in the EU, supported this idea²⁸. In February 2013 he repeated the proposal and expressed hope that Britain will not leave the EU, as the Union can regain trust of the British, if it will conduct reforms. David Cameron stipulated holding a referendum for the victory of the conservative party in the parliament in the election in June 2015. Only after the victory and negotiation with the European partners the government offer a referendum, which will decide whether to remain in the EU or leave. The Prime Minister suggested that the new treaty should be made between all the EU member states, or that a separate agreement should be provided for the UK, which would give it more powers than the current one. Liberal Democrats were not enthusiastic about the idea of the referendum. David Cameron was guided by the desire to appease Eurosceptic in his own party, who threaten to dismiss him from his post of the Tory leader.

It appears that the offer of D Cameron about the referendum is a blackmail of the EU: return some of the powers, otherwise we will withdraw. Great Britain expects that this will work as it was in 1974-1975, when the threat of a referendum helped the Labour government of Harold Wilson to revise the terms of membership in the EEC in favorable direction for the UK. Thus, in such statements Britain came close what M Thatcher offered in her political will the book "statecraft" namely, to the exit from the EU, she explicitly stated that the British should stop deceiving themselves believing that they can slow down or stop the development of the integration towards the creation of a European superstrate, and so she encouraged to withdraw from the EU. The government then considered her views extreme and distanced itself from them. Making another attempt under John Major) and faced with the prospect of inevitable weakening of British influence in the EU on the new stage of integration, the current government returned to Thatcher position.

Actually, the British establishment is not interested in leaving the EU, as this will inevitably lead to a significant reduction of influence not only on European, but on world affairs as a whole. So, the government of any party is unlikely to push the issue to a referendum, the outcome of which may be regretful. It can be expected that under the growth of serious disagreements with the EU partners on key issues related to the unwillingness of London to

²⁸. Helm, T. David Cameron pledges referendum .If EU demand more powers.
[Hhttp://www.the-guardian.com/politics/2012:Jun:30/david-cameron-referendum-eu](http://www.the-guardian.com/politics/2012:Jun:30/david-cameron-referendum-eu)

go to further infringement of the national sovereignty, a likely shift to the periphery in a” multispeed “Europe, Great Britain, as already happened in the past, can try to compensate this loss of influence through comprehensive relations with countries outside the EU²⁹.

II.3.Conclusion

It has been the subnational government that has taken up the baton in developing more positive links with the European Union. The underpinning of the British constitution parliamentary sovereignty. The British Central Government has a number of different committees to scrutinise EU legislation as well as the actions of the British government with the council of ministers.

At the regional level, elected and unelected governments have opened up offices in Brussels. From these the different regions of Britain are able to promote their own interests as well as attempting to influence policy making.

The Committees of Regions is the body which tries to promote and defend local and regional interest of the EU. Although it is an advisory body, there is a compulsion for its opinions to be sought in specific policy areas.

Local government in Britain has benefited from extra funding from the EU through the structural funds. These are monies in addition to that received from central government.

The way to strengthen Britain position in the EU can include ensuring the reform of the EU budget . the deepening of the single market, the strengthening if institutional safeguards to ensure proper protection of the economic interests of Britain in the face of the Eurozone core of the EU, becoming increasingly integrated.

Introduction

Britain has an uncomfortable relationship with the European Union that has become a clear image and decision that Britain is sooner or later led towards an in or out referendum that will result in its withdrawal. Such a development would present both Britain and the EU with unprecedented challenges.

III.1. British Problem in the EU

The development of the relation between the UK and the EU have led to a difficult situation where a referendum on the UK's membership now appears progressively expected. Most clearly, Prime Minister David Cameron has committed the conservative party, should it win the general election of 2015, to renegotiate Britain's relationship with the EU. This would then be put to the British people in a referendum expected to be around 2017. Broader political is rising for other party leaders to make similar commitment. Recent opinion polling points to strong and growing support for removal. While we should be careful not to assume the UK is destined to withdrawal, the possibility of this happening is now stronger than ever before.

A UK withdrawal would have deep implications and prices for the UK, far greater than for the EU. Nevertheless, the rest of the EU would face both the unprecedented of a withdrawal of one of its largest member. This could bring about significant changes to the EU. For some, the loss of one of the most economically liberal members could tip the EU towards protectionism, or perhaps trigger a crisis in European integration leading to the EU's separating. Others see the possible for the EU to free itself of its most difficult member, making the EU easier to lead, aiding a solution to the Eurozone's crises, in turn strengthening the basis for an ever nearer union among the people of Europe. While there has been some discussion of the implications for the EU of deciding to a renegotiated relationship for the UK within the EU.

Most analyses on a UK withdrawal focuses on the decision for the UK. As such, a possibly more dramatic and damaging event possibly far more than a renegotiation in the development of the EU is being under discussed. The danger of withdrawal also underpins David Cameron's hopes to secure a renegotiation within the EU. As such, there is a need for better examines of the possible decision of a withdrawal.³⁰

A British Withdrawal would activate three unified series of challenges to the EU:

First, there is the problem of how to achieve the process of a British exit. For a long time discussion of a member state withdrawing from the EU was something of a taboo. To a certain extent this remains so. Despite the conclusion of article 50 in the treaty on European Union, setting out a withdrawal process, the process is something of an unopened Pandora's Box. Negotiations would not only take a place between the UK and the EU. Negotiations would need to take place within the EU to modify the EU's institutions 1

The second problem is how to form continuing EU integration around a British withdrawal. The absence from the EU's formal decision making structures of one of the largest and arguably one of its most influential member states, could change the stability of power within the EU, in turn changing its nature and direction. Numerous situations exist: some point towards an EU that is more toward looking; others toward an EU that is more easily led and therefore better able to deal with its internal and external problems. Here we should be careful not to overplay the part the UK plays in the EU's problems, or overlook its contributions. The Eurozone crisis shows how with the UK out of the room the EU has still

³⁰ . Oliver, Tim. Europe without Britain: Assessing the Impact on the European Union of British Withdrawal. Stiftung Wissenschaft und politik, 2013.

struggled to find the necessary solidarity and leadership to manage the crisis. The Eurozone crisis itself is both exacerbating Britain's feeling of detachment from the EU, while also distracting attention by the rest of the EU from the possibility of a British withdrawal.

The final problem is how the EU should achieve relations with the UK after a withdrawal. Article 50 requires any withdrawal agreement include a framework for future relations with the withdrawing states. Despite what British Eurosceptic and Britain's critics in the rest of the EU might wish, Britain and the EU will remain deeply interconnected. Indeed, the withdrawal could never mean the end of Britain in Europe, only of the united kingdom's membership of the European union. A withdrawal itself may take several years to action, and there exist the possibility of formal relations continuing after words in some ways³¹. The interconnections between the EU and UK, along with the likely desire of the UK to continue close relations with the EU as a means to an end of bolstering its own power and security, mean future relations could easily become competitive.

While discussing a British withdrawal may seem to play into the hands of those who seek it, it is important to begin thinking about these issue as soon as possible so that they might be better handled if they do appear. Not only would a UK withdrawal pose problems and opportunities for solving the Eurozone crisis, it could also become something to address sooner than perhaps expected. This is not because a referendum may be triggered earlier than 2017, although this remains a thin possibility. It is because any renegotiation of Britain's relationship inside the EU would almost certainly need to include discussion of what would happen should the British people vote to reject that renegotiated relationship and elect for withdrawal.

III.2. British toward the Exit

David Cameron's announcement committing a future conservative government to renegotiating Britain's relationship with the EU, to then be put to a referendum, generally expected to be around 2017, did not come completely as a surprise. Britain has struggled in its relationship with European Integration since it began in the 1950.³² As a victory of the second world war , Britain thought of its self as more than a European power. Europe wasn't see as the choice Britain wanted to make, more a requirement of survival. This sense the EU is there to serve British ends, rather than as a means of serving the whole of Europe, lives on. As

³¹ .Ebid

³² See Andrew Gamble, *Between Europe and America : The future of British politics* (London, 2003)

Cameron himself made clear, for Britain the EU is a “means to an end” with the “end” not being “ever closer union.”³³.

Despite this, Britain has contributed significantly to the EU, albeit in an often Janus faced way. In formal government to government relations the British have often shown themselves to be constructive players, pushing forward European integration. That this has happened without the British people fully realizing rest, in no small part, on the desire of successive governments to publicly play down the degree of cooperation they have pursued. A failure of the wider political class to explain Europe and challenge misconceptions has meant a growth in Euroscepticism that today is a norm of British politics.

The Euro crisis has reduced further the British public’s faith in the EU. Steps towards further integration, to help solve the crisis, have caused alarm the EU no longer reflects something the British are comfortable with. A common refrain in British politics is that the UK joined , and in a 1975 referendum on membership voted for, a “common market” as opposed to some form of political union.³⁴

Added to this is a sense that a declining EU holds Britain back from dealing with the opportunities and threats the modern world. As one conservative MP put it, in joining Europe “ we shackled ourselves to a corpse,”³⁵ The situation has reached a point where some conservative party MPs even support UK withdrawal from the single Market, often seen the mainstay of British membership.

As Cameron himself noted, a combination of changes to the EU that have taken it out of the UK’s “ comfort zone”, along with a repeated failure to consult the British people over this, has led to a situation where the” democratic consent for the EU in Britain is now wafer-thin”. Ignoring this, he argued, will only allow support for withdrawal to grow making the situation worse. The only solution, he argued, is not only to consult the people, but to seek a renegotiated relationship, settling Britain’s place in a changed EU. Once a new relationship has been outlined, it would be put to the British people to choose whether, in their opinion, it or leaving the EU is the best future for their country.

³³. David Cameron, « The future of the EU and the UK’s relationship with it, speech, London, January 23, 2013, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/eu-speech-at-bloomberg>.

³⁴ Christopher Brooker and Richard North, *The Great Deception : the Secret history of History of the EU* (London: continuum, 2003)158-73.

³⁵ Douglas Carswell, Hansard, October 26, 2012 : Column 1257, <http://www.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121026-0002.htm>.

Numerous recent opinion polls indicate a growing willingness of the British people to vote for withdrawal.³⁶ While such polling results have been seen in the past(in 1980 one opinion pool found 71 percent wanted the UK to withdraw³⁷). This rise had been accompanied by the growth of the UK Independence party, staunchly committed to securing the withdrawal of the UK from the EU.³⁸ The rise of UKIP can be attributed to a number of factors such as immigration, the economy and as a protest vote exercised by an electorate that for more than thirty years has shown a decreasing willingness to support two party politics.³⁹

It has also taken votes from all three main UK parties.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, the pressure it has brought to bear on conservative party MPs helped such Cameron into making his speech. His speech and commitment failed to stem the rise of UKIP, leading instead to further efforts by some Eurosceptic for a referendum within the current parliament, due to end in 2015, or for legislation to be passed enabling the government, elected in 2015, to hold a referendum soon after coming into office.⁴¹

While Cameron wants Britain to remain a member of the EU, he did not rule out the possibility of his backing a withdrawal should a renegotiated relationship not be possible. Development within the conservative party should not lead the to the assumption that arguments about Europe are confined solely to it. Europe was one of the driving issues behind a split in the Labour party in the early 1980s. So far, current Labour leader Ed Miliband has avoid committing to a referendum, preferring not to distract media attention from the conservative infighting on the issue, which also serves to hide Labour's own divisions on the issue. Pressure on him is slowly growing, but Miliband has ruled out a commitment to a referendum for the time being. He fears committing a referendum with a Labour government would have to fight midterm, when the popularity of most government is at their lowest.⁴² Deputy Prime Minister and Liberal Democrat party leader Nick Clegg has voiced his opposition to Cameron's approach. But while his party is often portrayed as the most pro-

³⁶ Rowland, Watson, " Most Voters Want Britain to Quit EU, poll Shows, " The Times, January25, 2013.

³⁷ See Ipsos MORI'S " European Union Membership-Trend ".

³⁸ "How UKIP Became a British political Force", BBC News, may, 3, 2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-22396689>.

³⁹ Simon Usherwood, UKIP's political strategy: opportunistic Idealism in a Fragmented Political Arena, paper presented to the university Association for contemporary European studies, Bruges, September 2010, <http://www.academia.edu/2312702/>

⁴⁰ Philip Webster, « Not an Earthquake . But UKIP's Tremors will spread through All parties, " The Times, may3, 2013.

⁴¹ " EU Referendum : Tory MPwill take forward Bill," BBC News, may 16,2013,<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-22542207>.

⁴² John Rentoul, " Ed Miliband on Europe", The Independent, May 12,2013.

European party, it has also committed itself an in-out referendum to manage internal party tensions over the issue.⁴³

Cameron's call for a referendum drew support from people on both left and right, Eurosceptic and Europhile. Pro-European Timothy Garton-Ash, writing in the lead up to the speech was impatient: "Bring it on, I say, and may the best argument win".⁴⁴ Professor Vernon Bogdanor, Cameron's former Oxford tutor, urged the Labour party to back the referendum: "The EU is an elite project without popular support. Labour can bring it back to the people".⁴⁵ In a speech backing Cameron's plan, former conservative Prime Minister Sir John Major best captured the hopes for a referendum: "the relationship with Europe has poisoned British politics for too long, distracted parliament from other issues and come close to destroying the conservative party. It is time to resolve the matter."⁴⁶

A fight back by pro-Europeans has begun. There is still a good chance that when presented with a choice, and a campaign countering a Eurosceptic message which has so far dominated British politics, the British will vote to stay in the EU, even if on modified terms that puts them in some outer-circle of the EU. Nevertheless, the outlook is not encouraging. Compared with the last time the UK held a referendum in 1975 support from the business community, the media and the political parties is not as united. Pro-European campaign groups are weak in comparison to the large number of the Eurosceptic groups who are well organized and funded.⁴⁷ As David Rennie notes: "An idea, the possibility of British withdrawal is becoming normalized."⁴⁸

This combination of largely unchecked Eurosceptic agenda, moves by the EU towards closer political union, growing public dissatisfaction, EU partners resigning themselves to Britain's departure and David Cameron's strategy, which only seems to have further whetted

⁴³ George Eaton, "When Clegg Supported an EU referendum, "New Statesman, october 22, 2011.

⁴⁴ Timothy Garton Ash, "A referendum on Europe ? Bring It On, For All Our Sakes, " The Guardian, December 20, 2012.

⁴⁵ . Verno Bogdanor, "Why the left Should Support a referendum on Europe", The Guardian, January 27, 2012.

⁴⁶ Jhon Major, The Referendum on Europe : Opportunity or Threat ?(London: Chatham House, February 14, 2013)

⁴⁷ Simo, Usherwood and Nick Startin "Euroscepticism as a president phenomenon,"journal of common Market studies51, 2013,1-16

⁴⁸ David, Rennie . Has Britain Have a European Future ? London, 2012,75

the appetite of Eurosceptic, led Labour leader Ed Miliband to warn Britain may be sleepwalking towards the exit door from the EU⁴⁹

III.3. The EU's Response

Responses from across the rest of the EU to Cameron's commitment, ad to the wider British debate its membership of the EU, divide into four groups. First, while there were wide differences of opinion on what Cameron set out to achieve, there was a general recognition that parts of the speech were constructive.

Finnish EU Affairs Minister, Alex Stubb , described the speech as one which has," opened the door for an honest debate, and I hope those people who really care for Europe, and for the UK, for that matter, come out and have an honest debate."⁵⁰Second, the majority of responses critique the type of relationship would mean for the EU, which most focus being on how such a change could unleash destructive centrifugal forces that would weaken wider European unity. For Carle Bildt, the Swedish foreign minister, "Flexibility sounds fine, but if you open up to a 28 – speed Europe, at the end of the day there is no Europe at all. Just a mess."⁵¹Joschka Fischer, former German foreign minister, best summarized most such opinion when he said: "For the EU, Britain's exit would be a heavy blow , but for the British it would be real disaster ..."⁵²Finally only a few responses focused on the potential impact on the EU of a UK withdrawal, rather than a renegotiated relationship. For Franco Frattini, former Italian Foreign Minister," the UK is an indissoluble part of the European Integration process. I wish London will decide to remain in Europe. " Sweden's Aftonbladet newspaper made clear a British exit would be: "to Britain, Europe and Sweden's disadvantage. For Swedish part, we would lose an important partner in the EU, we are close to the UK on many issues, and it would be unfortunate for the Swedish political interest. The EU as a whole is losing a strong and important state. As the UK is one on the heavy-weight countries in the EU, The whole union hit hard by an exit. With Britain outside the EU would be a weaker Europe. It brings economic strength, military reach and credibility in international politics.

⁴⁹ Nicholas Watt," David Cameron Risks "sleepwalking" UK out of EU, warns Miliband", The Guardian, January 24, 2013.

⁵⁰ Cassel Bryan-low, "UK's Cameron Draws Fire over Europe Plan, " The wall street journal, January 24, 2013.

⁵¹⁵¹ Carsten Volkery, " referendum Reactions : Cameron Faces Heat over Continent," Spiegel Online, January 24,2013.

⁵² Cameron referendum speech : EU Reaction, "BBC News, January 23, 2013.

Some have concluded Britain headed for the exit whatever the rest of the EU does⁵³. Yet even those resigned to the idea that Britain is on its way out, have not outlined what this could mean for the EU. As not above, most discussion has focused on the implications for the EU of a renegotiated relationship for the UK inside the EU. The implications of a withdrawal tend to be caught up in such discussions, often being mentioned as an after-thought. This is hardly a surprise. The exact process for a member state to withdraw is vague. The political implications are even vaguer. Discussing withdrawal of any member state has long been a taboo. In Britain's case this might also be fueled by fears such talk could become self-fulfilling, or play into the hands of those in Britain who argue Britain could not be let go and so the rest of the EU must meet its demands.

It would be wrong for the EU to shy away from discussing openly and in detail the implications of the withdrawal of one of its largest members, given the potential knock-on effects of such an event could be similar to those of agreeing to a renegotiated relationship. Indeed, whether the rest of the EU likes it or not, any British renegotiation will inevitably touch on the sensitive issue of a withdrawal. While neither the British nor the EU representatives will likely relish such discussions, they will need to be had. First, the British

people, media, business and civil society will need to know what voting to leave will mean, leading the British government to at least have some form of outline to put to them. Second, the British and the EU representatives will need to agree an arrangement to provide at least some limited political and economic stability for both the UK and the EU, should the British vote to withdraw. Failure to do this would lead to a myriad of political, economic and legal questions exploding onto the agenda the moment it became clear the British had voted to withdraw.

That the prospect of a British withdrawal is overshadowed by the problems of the Euro crisis should not detract from what would be an historic event in European integration. The rest of the EU cannot repeat the concern the UK is sleepwalking towards an EU exit, when the EU itself may be asleep to what this could mean for it.

III.4. Reasons for leaving

⁵³ " UK's Slide to EU Exit Door Will be Difficult to Reverse ", The Irish Times, November 2012.

The principle and the main reason for leaving the EU centered on many reasons such as: immigration and national autonomy. Thus, the authority of European laws over British laws as represented by the court of justice was supposed unacceptable⁵⁴. Moreover, another related issue is the incapability of the UK to stem the flow of immigrants coming from another EU. One objective of the leave camp appears to be to maintain access to the single European market in goods, services and capital hence protect the interest of the city and the manufacturing sectors while reducing the flow of immigrant coming mostly from Eastern Europe.

The counterargument made by those who wished to remain within the EU. Was that free migration was one part of the four freedoms that define the single Market set up in the Treaty of Maastricht in 1993. The 27 remaining countries within the EU. Would never allow the UK to withdraw from one of the four markets having access to the common market in goods, services and capital while not being a part of the common Labour market. In addition, participation in the single market through the European Economic Area would requires the UK to adopt the EU. Rules and legislation that apply to the single market without having any say in setting these rules as well as to pay an annual sum to the EU. Thus, leaving the EU would not bring any rewards while increasing uncertainly about future trading arrangements, which would lower investment, employment and growth.⁵⁵ These arguments can be framed in the context of the literature on the optimal size of countries. As argued by Alesina and Spolaore (1997), there are economies of scale in country size in that expanding the size of a country reduces the fixed cost per inhabitant of providing public goods, laws and regulations, operating government institutions and, in the absence of trade with other countries, having access to a larger market. The cost of expanding the size of a country, in contrast, consist of increasing the heterogeneity of population, making it more difficult for the government to provide the type of goods and service that each ethnic or cultural groups demands. But the trade-of is altered by membership in the European Union because free trade reduces the benefits of size by making it possible for a small country to enjoy access to a larger market than its own and enjoy economic integration without political integration.⁵⁶ Gancia et al (2016) argue that the political response to globalization in recent decades is to remove borders by

⁵⁴ By passing the European-communities Act 1973 parliament recognized the primacy of EU law over law. this principle was in the following decades depend and extended by the decision of the European Court of justice.

⁵⁵ The following quotes are good examples of the argument for and against leaving the EU: Napoleon, Hitler, various people tried this out, and it ends tragically. The EU is an attempt to do this by different methods. Boris Johnson , 2016.

⁵⁶ Alesina et al.(200) argue that under free trade and global markets even small cultural or ethnic groups can benefit from forming small, more homogenous, political entities while Alesina (1998) show that empirically smaller countries are more open to trade.

creating economic union, leading to a reduction in country size. In the context of the European Union, each country has to accept the common rules and regulations that apply in the Single Market.

In the context of the Brexit debate, participation in the European Union and the Single Market has allowed the UK to benefit from access to a large market without giving up political independence as the remain side argued. This applies particularly to Scotland, having only about 5 million inhabitants, and ability to satisfy the wishes of its population, in particular when it comes to immigration. Set in this context, the decision by the English region to leave the EU could be explained by their inhabitants having different attitudes towards immigration or facing more immigration than other regions.

III.5. The impact of the British exit

III.5.1. British Trade

Advocates of 'Brexit' claim that Britain would have a little trouble negotiating a free trade agreement with the EU once it left, because the UK has a large trade deficit with the rest of the Union: if trade barriers between Britain and the remaining member-states were erected upon exit, the EU would lose more exports earning from Britain than vice versa. At the same time, the UK would be freed from the burdens of EU regulation and hence able to increase trade with faster growing parts of the world, by eliminating tariffs and signing trade agreements without the constraints of EU membership. Underpinning this assertion is the belief that the UK is a big enough economy to be an effective trade negotiator in its own right. These arguments are simplistic and misleading.

The EU is certainly a less important market for the UK than it was, and likely to remain so for as long as the eurozone fails to engineer a sustained economic recovery. The UK's trading relationship with the EU is imbalanced. But the UK would be wrong to assume that it could dictate terms in any negotiation with the EU by virtue of the fact that it is running a trade deficit. First, the EU buys half of Britain's exports whereas the UK accounts for little over ten percent of exports from the rest of the EU, so the UK would be in a weak position to negotiate access on its terms. Second, half of the EU's trade surplus with the UK is accounted for by just two member states: Germany and the Netherlands. Most EU member states do not run substantial trade surpluses with the UK, and some run deficit with it. Any agreement would

require the assent of the remaining 27 members, some of whom buy more from Britain than they sell to it.

To reflect what sort of EU trade agreement might realistically be on offer to Britain, an overview of current arrangement for non-EU countries is needed. It is clear that only one of these would be politically realistic for a post- EU Britain, and it would have potentially far reaching implications for the country's trade and investment.

III.5.2. Immigration

Britain's EU immigrants are a blessing, not a burden. They are young and more likely to be in work than Britons, and thus pay more in taxes than they take out in benefits and political services. They do, however, push up housing cost a problem Britain must confront.

Contrary to popular opinion, EU immigrant are far less likely to take up benefits than the British population.' Benefit tourism 'is a canard: the great majority of EU immigrants come to Britain to work. Being net contributors to Britain's public finances, they help the country to deal with the costs of an ageing society.

If Britain left the EU, future British governments would be more likely than not to curb immigration from the rest of Europe.

III.6. Life After the Divorce

Concluding a withdrawal agreement and framework for future relations would only be the end of the beginning of a much longer relationship with the UK outside the EU. This second stage would require the EU to make four sets of adjustments to come to terms with Britain's absence. First, the EU's leadership and coordination would be faced with a period of change. Second, the UK will not disappear completely from EU political discussions or networks. Both sides will need to reach an agreement on how to manage the agreed framework for future relations. Third, the EU will have to face the wider geopolitical implications of a UK withdrawal. Finally, the EU will need to handle the potential a British withdrawal has for challenging current forms of European integration and European cooperation.

III.7. Post-withdrawal Relations between the EU and UK

Article 50 requires any withdrawal agreement with a member state takes into account, "the framework for it future relation with the Union. " Both the UK and EU will be compelled by geography, economics indeed, by sheer realpolitik to develop a working relationship for

managing their common problems. It is clear that four options exist. Each poses a series of problems for the EU.

the EU could negotiate a relationship with the UK akin to that which it has with Norway. The EU-Norwegian relationship has been relatively smooth, in large part thanks to Norway's political and policy compliance.⁵⁷ As a result of its membership of the EEA, Norway has limited influence over the making of EU policy and laws, yet subject itself to them. Norway therefore subjects itself to all EU laws relating to the single market, including areas such as the working time directive, a sensitive issue in the UK. Compliance is monitored by the Brussels based supranational EFTA surveillance authority and adjudicated on by the EFTA court based in Luxemburg. Their work mirrors that undertaken by the European Commission within the EU. It is unlikely the EU will find the UK will be as compliant and placid in its relations with the EU.

The UK could adopt a position of WTO member, with no special links to the EU, EFTA, EEA or through some form of new relationship or free trade agreement. This would be the relationship the UK would be forced into if it decided to withdraw unilaterally without negotiation, or fail to reach agreement with the EU regarding a withdrawal agreement and framework for future relations. Even Eurosceptic groups admit such a move would be extremely damaging for the UK economy.⁵⁸ For the EU, the economic shock would also hit it, although not in as large a way as the UK would feel it.

Whatever relationship was, there exist the possibility it would further complicate the maze of existing frameworks governing relations between European states. Here lies one of the bigger political problems of handling a British withdrawal: that other EU, and EU connected states such as Norway, deem the UK's arrangement unfair and seek to emulate them. That said, some might also see weaknesses and prefer their own individually tailored relationship.

Whatever the relationship is adopted, it is likely that the UK will expect to be treated in some special way. Cameron made clear that while he admired both Norway and Switzerland, he saw Britain as a admirable and desirable more than the relationship they held with the EU. This, he hopes, will be within the EU.⁵⁹ But should the relationship be from the outside, it is likely the UK would expect more than to be granted with Norway and Switzerland.

⁵⁷ Buchun, outsider on the Inside ; Swiss and Norwegian lessons for the UK, 2.

⁵⁸ Booth and Howarth, Trading Places : Is EU Membership Still the Best Option for UK Trade ?, 45.

⁵⁹ Cameron, "The future of the EU and the UK's Relationship with it ".

This can reflect a high and great opinion of Britain's place in the world, and also its reflect the UK's much larger demographic, economic and military size compared to Norway and Switzerland.

III.8. Conclusion

A British exit from the EU is not something to be unconcerned overlooked. Developments in Britain and the EU have increased the possibility of the referendum leading to a vote to withdraw. Britain's problems with the EU long pre-date the current government and reflect deeper problems in Britain's party politics, political economy and place in the world. Many causes could also push the UK to the borders or out of the EU. The Brexit may have many result and consequences to both the UK and the EU.

General Conclusion

What seems to be apparent across much of the European Union is that the Great Britain is not overly enthusiastic about the Community from the beginning. Britain's relationship of the European Union has long been overshadowed by doubt about its commitment and whether it may one day leave, also known as a "Brexit".

In the 1950's Great Britain had no interest to join the Community, it was considered as a reluctant. Churchill did not believe that the United Kingdom would be a part of the United State of Europe; he never expected to drag down to the level of the European community. However, years after Britain changed their mind toward the European Integration. Unfortunately, Britain Was refused to join by the French president De Gaulle in 1960's. Britain did not have any chance to be a member of community until 1973. In the mid of the mid of 1980's Britain started activating Thatcher approach to the European community.

The European Union has an influence on UK, the relationship between Britain and the EU may be a little unclear at times but membership had a huge impact upon how the various levels of government across Britain work. It has been subnational government that has taken up the baton in developing more positive links with the EU. This can be seen at every level of subnational government. Central government seems to have a less close relationship with the EU. Much of this could be do with money. Britain is a net contributor to the EU, budget. Thus, central government loses money. The various levels of subnational government are able to access funds from the EU, over and what they receive from central government.

The way to strengthen Britain position in the EU can include ensuring the reform of the EU budget. The deepening of the single market, the strengthening if institutional protections to ensure proper protection of the economic interest of Britain in the face of the Eurozone core of the EU, becoming increasingly integrated.

Forty-five later, Britain is no longer considered as member of the European Union, a British leave from the EU is not something to be casually overlooked. Developments in Britain and the EU have increased the possibility of the referendum leading to a vote to withdrawal. Britain's difficulties with the EU long pre-date the current government and reflect deeper problems in Britain's politics, economy that could push the UK to border or out the EU. David Cameron the conservative leader ship and the prime minister in his referendum called Britain for the European Union and to stay, he was completely against the British exit from the Union However many minister vote for the Brexit. Britain decide to leave and join the European economic community(EEC), wich it gives it the right to enter the European single market, with access to some financial services but to be freed from the rules of the European Union of Agriculture and Justice and international affairs. Britain also negotiating trad agreement with the EU and conclude a free trade agreement in return for the benefit of the British right to movement with the European Union.

EBooks

Alistair, Jones. Britain and the European Union. Edinburgh: Edinburgh university press 2007.

Andrew, Geddes. Britain and the European Union. PlagraveMacmilllan in the UK, London, 2013

Cameron, Fraser. The future of Europe: Integration and enlargement. London: Routledge, 2004.

Chalmers, Damian, and Adam Tomkins. European Union public law: text and materials. Cambridge: Cambridge up, 2007 pdf

Christopher, Broker and Richard, North, the Great Deception: the Secrete history of Historyof the EU (London: continuum, 2003

Gowland, David ,Arthur ,Turner and Alex Wright. Britain and the European Integration Since 1945. New York: Routledge, 2009 Pdf

Leonard , Dick. Gide to the European Union: The definitive guide to all aspects of the EU.3A Exmouth House, pine street, London EC1R OJH,2005 Pdf

Oliver, Tim. Europe without Britain: Assessing the Impact on the European Union of BritishWithdrawal. StiftungWissenschaft und politik, 2013

Pickard , Sarah. Civilisation britannique. Paris : Pocket, 2003.

Articles

Cameron, David « The future of the EU and the UK's relationship with it, speech, London, January 23, 2013, [https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/eu- speech-at-bloombe](https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/eu-speech-at-bloombe)

Carswell,Doglas Hansard, October26,2012 : Column 1257, <http://www.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmhansrd/cm121026-0002.htm>

European Union EFTA. 15 May 2010 [http:// europa. Eu/abc/treaties/index_en.htm](http://europa.eu/abc/treaties/index_en.htm)

European Union Act 2011. [http://www.gov.uk/government data/file/35460/eu-act-11-5page-fact-sheet.doc](http://www.gov.uk/government/data/file/35460/eu-act-11-5page-fact-sheet.doc).

George, Stephen. Britain in the European Community. Oxford: Oxford University press, 1998

How UKIP Became a British political Force?”, BBC News, may, 3, 2013, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-22396689>.

Pisan, Jean. Et al .Europe after Brexit: Aproposal for a continental paternership. Embargoed until August 29, 19:00 CET. 2016

Shipman,T (Paris and Berlin launch a coup to control Eurozone, demanding rights to dictate economic policy. 2012.<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2026540/Euro-debt-summit-Angela-Merkel-Nicolas-Sarkozy-want-dicate-economic-policy.html>.

Thatcher, Margaret. The Bruges Speech. Bruges , 1988[http://www.margaretthatcher.Org/speeches/displaydocument.asp ,docid=107332](http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=107332)

Journal

Simo, Usherwood and Nick Startin ‘’Eurosceptism as a president phenomenon,’’journal of common Market studies51, 2013

Theses

Bouzakara, Rima. The British problem in the Early History of the European EconomicCommunity., 2010

Sorokina, Maria. Great Britain and the European Integration. 2014

Further Reading

Wadsworth, Jonathan. Brexit and the Impact of Immigration on the UK. Center for Economic Performance London School of Economic and Politic Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK.

