

Robbing the poor to help the rich?

Despite the aspirations of Social Europe there is no evidence that EU policies help the poor - if anything the reverse is the case

Economic convergence between regions and EU countries has always been the goal of the European Union. Ministers of member countries and members of the Commission have consequently reiterated their desire to use EU funds to help the least well-off by closing the gap between the poorest regions and countries and the richest. More recently they have declared their intention to assist the ten members admitted in 2004 in catching up economically with the EU-15. Members of the UK government, desperate to identify an EU achievement, have highlighted the 'success' of EU enlargement and its economic impact on Eastern and Central Europe.

Professed Goal

Together with other data and information the EU's annual publication *Allocation of expenditure by member state*, published last month, helps us to reach an answer to the question: Has the EU lived up to its professed goal of helping the poor? The picture is a complex one but there is a strong case for saying that far from redistributing money from rich to poor the EU operates in such a way as to achieve the opposite.

The bulk of the EU's income comes from contributions from members according to a formula based on national income; these, in turn come from taxation. The structure of taxation is such that most tax revenue comes from relatively poor people and those

on average incomes - simply because there happen to be many more of them than there are high earners; the very rich - the Abramovichs and the Bransons, of course, usually manage their affairs in such a way as to avoid paying tax altogether.

Where does the money go? As the EU Financial Report 2005 demonstrates, nearly half of the EU budget still goes on agriculture. Incredibly, total farm spending rose by 11 per cent last year (see page four). Who received it? As the result of work by campaigning journalists and NGOs we now know that the vast majority of the funds go to large landowners - such as the Queen, the Crown Prince of Monaco, Ted Turner, Prince Charles, the Duke of Westminster etc - and to large scale-agri-businesses such as Nestlé. There have also been embarrassing revelations about the receipt of CAP funds by ministers and their families. But even in France, which receives one in five of the euros allocated under the CAP, only a modest trickle of funds reaches small farmers with 60 per cent of income going to the 14 biggest French farm companies, according to figures published by Oxfam in October 2005.

In as far as these transactions represent a redistribution of wealth it is from the relatively poor to the very rich.

Rapid Growth

If there is no reason to believe that EU membership assists poor

individuals can it be argued that it boosts the economic growth of the poorest states? EU countries which were relatively poor such as Ireland and Spain at the time of accession plainly have grown more rapidly than established members, although the economic policies pursued by Spain under Aznar and by Ireland under successive governments, appear to have been the most significant factors in their growth. Other countries which were relatively poor at the time of accession, notably Greece and Portugal, have grown less rapidly.

All the EU '10' are net beneficiaries in terms of the EU budget but it is striking how little they received in 2005 in relation to the EU 15. In terms of allocated expenditure the 15 'old' member states received 87 billion gross (89.4 per cent) while the new members received only 9 billion (10.6 per cent). **Four 'old' member states - Germany, France, Spain and Italy - each received more than the ten new states taken together.**

The figures are more striking in per capita terms. In 2005 the EU spent 227 per capita on the old members but only 123 on the EU '10'.

Same Criteria

These figures will change. Eventually the new members will receive funds from the CAP according to the same criteria as other members which will inevitably affect total receipts from the EU, but by this time those criteria will

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: EU to ignore British objections over business tax p.2 - EU Court rules against Tillack p.2 - EU heading for a single UN seat p.2 - 'Anxious' Europe abandons the idea of victory in military conflict p.3 - Huge increase in CAP spending p.4 - Prodi power: judges save Italy from an economic crisis p.5 - Hague's referendum pledge p.5

EU to ignore British objections over business tax

Plans to create a pan-European corporate tax system are to go ahead - despite the opposition of Britain and six other EU member states, according to László Kovács, the EU tax commissioner.

Like the euro or Schengen agreement on internal borders the scheme could be adopted by a limited group of countries he said in an interview with the *Financial Times* on the 6th October.

Mr Kovács said he was determined to overcome both the technical and political obstacles in the way of the

scheme which involves a common consolidated business tax base. Currently this had the strong support of ten member countries and the "cautious support" of eight.

"If it does not reach a consensus [in 2008] we can go for a second round under enhanced cooperation with 18 countries, which would be a great step forward", he said.

According to the *FT* one of the most difficult issues is how to carve up revenues between different tax jurisdictions. The Commission's tax experts are also struggling to find an

acceptable definition of taxable profits and grappling with issues arising from income earned outside the EU. It quoted Chas Roy-Chowdhury of FEE, the European accountancy body, as saying that the construction of an international tax system was so complex as to resemble the creation of Esperanto.

In an interview with the *Sunday Telegraph* on the 6th October Nicolas Sarkozy, the French interior minister and presidential hopeful called for EU-wide taxes to pay for EU expenditure.

EU Court rules against Tillack

The EU Court of First Instance has rejected German reporter Hans-Martin Tillack's claim that the European Commission punished him for exposing EU fraud by using the Belgian police to snatch his files. The decision clears the way for the EU-anti fraud office, OLAF, to examine the

reporter's contact books - currently in Belgian police hands - in its hunt for an internal leak that helped Mr Tillack break major stories about EU corruption in 2002. It also cleared OLAF of allegations of smearing Tillack's name with bribery allegations between 2002 and 2004. Tillack

criticised the judgment, saying, *"It's a licence for OLAF to lie. It's astonishing that the court allows an EU institution to present rumours as facts. This is damaging to journalists' rights and to the rights of European citizens as well"*. (Source: *euobserver*, 5th October).

EU heading for a single UN seat

The European Commission will in future represent the EU in the United Nations as the 'voice of Europe worldwide' according to Mark Malloch Brown, the UN deputy general

secretary in an interview with the *euobserver* on the 3rd October. Mr Malloch Brown said this would happen gradually with the EU replacing member states institution by

institution. Javier Solana, the EU High Representative has argued in favour of a single European representative at the EU as the means to end divisions over foreign policy among EU members.

Continued from P.1

Robbing the poor to help the rich?

also have changed and it is consequently very difficult to make a judgement about how well they will do in future. Last year, however they received only 7.7 per cent of total CAP payments.

When it came to pay-outs from the EU's structural funds the ten newcomers received only 5.5 per cent of the funds compared to Spain (24.4 per cent), Germany (14.1 per cent) and Italy (13.2 per cent). Poland, the member state with the highest unemployment received only 4.2 per cent of the EU's allocated expenditure despite the fact that its population of 38

million represents 8.3 per cent of the EU population and that it faces the biggest structural problems in Europe.

Europhiles might argue that membership is good in itself, pointing to the relatively high growth rates of the new members, both since joining and in the preparatory period. But some European and Eurasian economies that remain outside the EU grew just as quickly during this period; the crucial factors appear to have been privatisation following the collapse of communism and the level of foreign inward investment. Moreover, the new members have had to meet the

demands of the *acquis* and have consequently had to meet a dramatic increase in regulatory costs. Given all of this, it will be a long time before it is possible for the EU '10' to make objective cost-benefit analyses of EU membership.

What is clear is that despite Europe's much vaunted social conscience how much members get out of the EU depends on their political clout and their ability to work the system; there is no evidence that the EU has done well by the poor or that decision-makers have been greatly swayed by a desire to help them.

'Anxious' Europe abandons the idea of victory in military conflict

A report from the European Defence Agency demonstrates that Europe will find it increasingly difficult to defend itself

In several previous articles *eurofacts* has pointed out that EU membership locks Britain into a needless process of economic inferiority and relative decline. It is now clear that membership similarly locks Britain into an inferior European security system that is unlikely to meet the challenges it will face.

This is made abundantly obvious by a report* from the European Defence Agency which suggests that traditional ideas of "victory" will now have to be abandoned in favour of limited multi-national campaigns to achieve "stability". This stands in marked contrast to attitudes in America where it is widely accepted that the fight against terrorism can ultimately be won.

The report paints a deeply pessimistic picture in which recruitment to the armed forces becomes more and more difficult as the result of shrinking populations, in which it is ever more difficult to maintain defence spending against a background of burgeoning pension liabilities and in which armies are unwilling to risk casualties. But, as the authors accept, the threats to our security are likely to grow as the result of a crescent of instability running from Africa through the Middle East into the former Soviet bloc.

More Anxious

"The global context is sobering, with the central predictions of demography and economics foreshadowing a Europe which two decades hence is older, relatively poorer and surrounded by regions (Africa, Middle East, Russia) which may struggle to cope with the consequences of globalisation", they say.

"Relatively poorer, older and more anxious about its security, Europe may also find itself increasingly alone in

confronting the problems of a difficult neighbourhood as the focus of US foreign policy, following economic and geopolitical developments, shifts towards Asia."

In the view of the authors, voters will insist on UN backing and the creation of large coalitions of forces before being prepared to support military operations. They will even want military operations to be "environmentally friendly".

In most respects the report extrapolates from existing trends. EU members are already struggling to maintain defence spending at levels which are adequate to meet existing commitments. With the exception of Britain, EU governments are already most reluctant to put their armed forces in harm's way - witness the reluctance of European NATO members to expose their soldiers to risk in Afghanistan. Recruitment is already a problem for many EU countries.

Opposite Conclusions

One of the report's recommendations is for greater European 'cooperation' and 'integration' as well as for smaller, more professional armies equipped with high-tech weapons. But there are several reasons for thinking that for Britain, at least, the analysis leads to opposite conclusions:

■ Cooperation over procurement has already led to Britain purchasing inferior weapons - most famously the Eurofighter - at sky-high prices. The increasing influence of the European Defence Agency will almost certainly mean that our armed forces will be less well-equipped, not better equipped and that their weapons will not be compatible with those of the US, our most important military ally.

■ Members of our armed forces are

still willing to risk loss of life in the national interest. The ethos of the British armed-forces is likely to be damaged if they are locked into multi-national forces in which most national units seek to avoid danger.

■ Recruitment prospects are most likely to be enhanced if the British military ethos is maintained; if our armed forces are turned into a risk-averse, environmentally-friendly band of international peace-keepers and tree-huggers the quality of recruits may well decline.

■ The emergence of an integrated European defence capability in the service of a European foreign policy is more likely to encourage the process by which America is becoming estranged from Europe than the reverse. Britain has special reasons for supposing that it maintains a close security relationship with the US and that it can build on existing relations with other anglosphere nations.

Defeatist Europe

As a consequence of these and other factors Britain has opportunities to protect its national security interests that are denied to the countries of Continental Europe. Why lock ourselves into a security relationship with a defeatist Europe which is becoming older, lonelier, poorer and 'more anxious' when there are far more appealing opportunities?

* The European Defence Agency's *Long Term Vision Report*, available on the EDA's website (<http://eda.europa.eu/news>), was approved by European Defence Ministers in Brussels on the 3rd October.

Huge increase in CAP spending

France takes one euro in five as farm spending rises - but we still don't know where most of the money goes

The Common Agricultural Policy may be the most reviled system of agricultural support ever devised...but there is no doubting its survival powers. 2005 was a year in which the CAP was widely blamed for starvation and malnutrition in Africa and in which the French refusal to permit reform of the Common Agricultural Policy brought the world's trading system to the brink of destruction. But spending on the CAP jumped to a record 48.5 billion - up 11.2 per cent over the previous year.

In total the EU spent 104.8 billion - a 4.7 per cent increase over 2004.

Non-agricultural spending fell very slightly to 56.3 billion. Thus, if present trends were to continue spending on the CAP could soon be back above 50 per cent of total

EU spending

France, Germany, Spain and Italy were the biggest recipients of CAP payments last year (and, indeed of EU payments generally). These four combined received 58.6 per cent of payments under the CAP. The figures confirm the truth behind the jibe that the EU remains a western farming club - although to be more precise most of the money goes to big landowners and agri-businesses rather than farmers.

Predictably France took the lion's share of the CAP payments (20.7 per cent), followed by Germany (13.5 per cent), Spain (13.3 per cent) and Italy (11.4 per cent). Britain was in fifth place receiving 9 per cent of CAP funding.

The figures, which are contained in the EU's *Allocation of 2005*

expenditure by member state, also demonstrate how well existing members, led by France, ensured that the transitional arrangements governing payments to the new EU members kept payments to the EU '10' at a low level while France itself maintained number one position at the feeding trough. Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic - the three largest new members - accounted for 3.2 per cent, 1.3 per cent and 0.9 per cent respectively.

Despite the drive for greater transparency many countries, like Germany, refuse to name the individual recipients, or like France and Britain, release only partial information. The exact destination of the bulk of the funds consequently remains a mystery.

EU farm subsidy expenditure by member state in 2005, millions

Country	Total payments	% of Total	Country	Total payments	% of Total
Belgium	1,047.7	2.2	Luxembourg	45.4	0.1
Czech R	428.5	0.9	Hungary	651.5	0.3
Denmark	1,228.3	2.6	Malta	9.0	-
Germany	6,522.3	13.5	Netherlands	1,286.3	2.8
Estonia	76.5	0.2	Austria	1,237.3	2.6
Greece	2,755.7	5.6	Poland	1,542.2	3.1
Spain	6,432.0	13.3	Portugal	896.5	1.8
France	10,011.5	20.7	Slovenia	220.6	0.5
Ireland	1,821.5	3.7	Slovakia	220.6	0.5
Italy	5,528.1	11.4	Finland	904.1	1.9
Cyprus	44.5	0.1	Sweden	956.9	2.0
Latvia	118.4	0.2	UK	4,347.2	9.0
Lithuania	265.6	0.5	EU-25	48,462	100

Source: Allocation of 2005 expenditure by member state, EU Commission 2006

Prodi power: European judges save Italy from an economic crisis

Thanks to the European Court of Justice the Italian Government will not have to repay billions to business taxpayers

By Christopher Arkell

In an extraordinary reversal of precedent, the European Court of Justice ruled, in a decision released on the 3rd October 2006, that Italy's regional tax, known as IRAP, does not contravene European law. The Court's decision went against two previous opinions of its Advocate General, itself a rare event, and against years of rulings against member states who have retained, or attempted to introduce, forms of turnover taxes in opposition to the specific rules set out in the Sixth VAT Directive. The government of Italy, headed by Romano Prodi, the former President of the European Commission, no longer faces the prospect of having to repay £82 billion to business taxpayers.

Real Surprise

Many commentators are puzzled by the ruling. Jonathan Bridges, senior manager in the EU Law Group at KPMG, said: *"This is a real surprise and an unprecedented move..... [The] decision is completely contrary to not just one but two Advocate General's Opinions....We did not expect the Court to overturn the fundamentals of earlier Opinions....It is open to speculation whether the Court's interpretation of the rules has been influenced by the vast sums at stake and the economic difficulties Italy would have had if the decision had gone the other way...."*

Bridges has put the matter too delicately, and it is worth drawing a bolder conclusion. If the Italian Government were to have lost the case,

and been forced to repay £82 billion, it would have breached its Eurozone budgetary limits, not just this year, but for an indefinite number of years ahead. The Euro would have come under such strain that either Italy would have been forced to withdraw from the currency, or the exchange value of the currency itself would have collapsed. It would also have suffered a huge blow in international confidence. Alternatively, the Prodi government would have been forced to put up other national taxes, such as income and corporation tax, by substantial margins which would have brought about its fall, and a severe deflation in the Italian economy.

Personal Connections

Yet the Italian government has got away with it. In this respect, the Prodi connection cannot be emphasised too much. Prodi is an academic economist by training; he was head of several industrial enterprises in Italy in which the Italian State was a major shareholder; he is the Italian most favoured by the European Commission's grandees (the permanent heads of the administration rather than the Commissioners); and he has excellent relations with Merkel in Germany and Chirac in France. He has the technical, political and personal connections to bring influence to bear on the Court. Though he will never admit doing so, we do not need his admission to see the result of his influence. The Court has decided in Italy's favour against its own long line

of precedents and against the opinions of its own advocate.

The Italian tax in question is specifically prohibited by the EU Treaties and the Sixth VAT Directive. These permit one, and only one, turnover tax - VAT. There is no other way to interpret the texts involved, and several other member states have had their own turnover taxes overturned. Others are regularly brought before the Court.

Substantial Income

The United Kingdom itself faces a challenge on its waste disposal tax (a form of VAT on landfill sites) which it was previously expected to lose even though the UK has designed its tax regulations to fit into the EU's VAT regime extremely carefully. Landfill tax not only generates substantial income for the Treasury (though nowhere near as much as Italy's IRAP), but it supports the environmental policies of the EU. To overturn it, especially after the IRAP decision, will demonstrate with astral clarity that the European Court of Justice is not a court of law, but a chamber of political convenience.

It will also demonstrate that the UK will never have any influence whatsoever in the decisions of the European Union and its institutions - until it announces its timetable for withdrawal.

Hague's referendum pledge

"We will give up no more of the powers and rights of this country . . . The British people believe that political integration has gone far

enough and so do we....Under a Conservative government there would be no treaty changes that transfer more competences to the EU without a

referendum." William Hague, the Tory Foreign Affairs spokesman addressing the Conservative Party Conference at Bournemouth on the 4th October 2006.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Swiss Example

Dear Sir,

Your report (*eurofacts*, 22nd September) on the findings of the cost-benefit analysis for Switzerland of EU membership, commissioned by the Swiss government, prompts one to wonder what if anything will induce any likely British government to do the same for Britain.

One piece of data which would, I believe, resonate well with the British public is that for the last several years the aggregate trade with the EU of the United States, Canada and Australia is broadly the same as Britain's. If you add in Japan, the aggregate comfortably exceeds Britain's, yet these four countries pay precisely nothing to the EU for the privilege. Their trade relations with the EU are subject only to the rules of the World Trade Organisation to which virtually all countries and organisations involved in trade, including the EU, belong.

The so-called 'Single Market' may or may not be an advantage for those countries selling into EU countries but it is not something countries outside the EU feel they should pay for.

When put this way, a very wide range of people would, I believe, actively question our EU membership and its colossal annual fee (£12 billion and rising), particularly when this government cannot, apparently, afford proper provision for the care of our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan or pay them properly.

PROFESSOR STEPHEN BUSH
Cheshire

Timid Tories

Dear Sir,

It is surprising that Frederick Forsyth thinks that the Tory Party has changed its spots and that the current batch of Conservative MPs should not be tainted with the sins of their predecessors.

It is unlikely that the supposed new breed of eurosceptic MPs would be prepared to challenge hard-line whips

in any future Tory government for fear of curtailing their political careers. And you can be sure that they would have to face the party whips because there is no sign that the Conservative Party under the leadership of greenish-blue David Cameron is going to produce a manifesto that states categorically that, if elected, it would prepare the ground for the United Kingdom to disengage itself from the tentacles of the European Union.

Let's look at one or two facts. David Cameron has hardly mentioned 'Europe' and is too timid to espouse his views on this issue, especially in public. Is the man honest? Well not exactly, as when demonstrating his "green" credentials by cycling to work with his chauffeur, briefcase and car following close behind. Have present-day Tory MPs made any efforts in the House of Commons to oppose the unending stream of EU Directives or to change the laws that made a hard-working greengrocer a criminal for selling a pound of bananas, or deprived fishermen of their living because of insane EU-inspired interference and meddling? I think not. When have Tory MPs shown any guts by attacking the government over its uncritical attitude towards the EU?

No, Mr Forsyth, I would not trust a future Tory Government to get Britain out of the EU, even if it promised to do so. As for the loss of a possible twenty five Tory MPs in the last General Election because of UKIP's participation, all I can say is: "So what!". Just one UKIP MP would make more noise on EU issues in the House of Commons than all the Tory MPs put together. It's not just the history of earlier quislings in the Conservative Party, it's also the lack of any coherent withdrawal policy by its leaders and their timid acquiescence in rule from Brussels.

DEREK NORMAN
Huntingdon.

A Second French Referendum?

Dear Sir,

Since the French voted against the EU

Constitution many people have assumed that it is 'dead'. It has certainly suited some British politicians to spread that idea.

However, that is far from the case. The Germans, especially, are still determined that the Constitution will eventually come into force.

Paradoxically, because they want to install the Constitution in its entirety rather than just 'cherry-pick' parts of it, they came out strongly against the abolition of national vetoes on Justice and Home Affairs when that was proposed.

Next January Germany will take over the EU Presidency, and in the spring one obstacle will be removed when French President Chirac comes to the end of his term.

It is probable that the French will then be told to vote again, in the hope that they can be persuaded to correct their previous error. If they did, our referendum would follow.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

What's Wrong with Britain?

Dear Sir,

As your readers will be aware, thousands of protesters recently stormed the headquarters of Hungary's state television company, furious over a leaked recording in which the Hungarian prime minister admitted that his government "lied morning, evening and night" in order to win the election in April.

On 'Europe' the British electorate has been lied to morning, evening and night. And there seems no good reason to omit the afternoon from the timetable of deceit. But the public remains seemingly passive, inert, indifferent.

What is wrong with it? Is it now so supine that it is incapable of expressing even a squeak of protest at the lies told over half a century to conceal the betrayal of its fundamental interests?

HECTOR BOFFEY
London

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **24th October**, 6.00 pm

“The Referendum: Direct Democracy and the Constitution”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Thursday **26th October**, 6.00 pm

“The age of dictatorship: Europe 1918-1989 - Hitler”

Richard J Evans FBA, *Visiting Gresham Professor of History*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Australian Monarchist League
00 61 (02) 9327 4582

Friday - Sunday **27 - 29th October**

“The Queen, the Realms and Europe”

Speakers to be announced
The Rt Hon Lord Tebbit CH to address the Dinner on Friday 27th October

CONFERENCE
The Skempton Building, Imperial College, Kensington, London
Admission £100 (2 day conference) (Opening Dinner plus £75)
For further details contact Australian Monarchist League, PO Box 1068, Double Bay, NSW 1360 or by Email: secretary@monarchist.org.au

Democracy Movement
Louth Branch
01507 601699

Friday **27th October**, 7.30 pm

“Stop the Cheques”

Rodney Atkinson, *Author*
Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director, Democracy Movement*
Roger Helmer MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
Conoco Room (Above Louth Library), Northgate, Louth, Lincolnshire
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
South Dorset Branch
01929 422036

Friday **3rd November**, 7.30 pm

“New Policies for a Free Britain”

David Campbell Bannerman, *Deputy Leader*

Gerard Batten MEP
Piers Merchant, *General Secretary*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Purbeck House Hotel, High Street, Swanage, Dorset

UK Independence Party
Newcastle/Stoke on Trent Branch
07900 438489

Thursday **9th November**, 8.00 pm

“Leave the EU: The Real Way to Make Poverty History”

Mark Wallace, *Freedom Association*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Butchers Arms, Audley, Staffordshire (Junction 16 M6)

United Kingdom Independence Party
0151 426 1784

Friday **10th November**, 7.00 pm

Speakers to include;
Godfrey Bloom MEP, *UKIP*

NORTH WEST RALLY
Tower College, Rainhill, Merseyside
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **18th November**,
10.30 am to 6.15 pm

Speakers to be announced

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
The Great Hall, King's College, London
Admission £20
(Includes lunch and refreshments)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **24th October**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Management and Audit of EC Expenditure and Accounts* from Rosalind Wright, Supervisory Committee, OLAF.

Tuesday **24th October**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Economic Affairs* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **25th October**, 10.40 am
Evidence will be heard on *The Second Generation Schengen Information System (SIS II)* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **25th October**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *CAP Simplification* from Lord Rooker, Minister of State (Sustainable Farming and Food) Defra.

Thursday **26th October**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *The European Commission Green Paper on EU Mental Health Strategy* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Note: Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

Germany takes over EU presidency **1st January**

Accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union **1st January**

Berlin Declaration on the Future of Europe **27th March**

French Presidential Election **22nd April**

French Parliamentary Election **June or July**

Portugal takes over EU presidency **1st July**

2008

France takes over EU presidency **1st January**

The European Question and the National Interest

by *Jeremy Black*. **£16.99**

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

The Great Deception:

Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker*. **£9.99**

This is the latest version (Nov 2005) of this comprehensive history of the EU.

The Truth They Won't Tell You (And Don't Want You To Know)

About the EU

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**

A further 269 useful facts you need to know about the development of the EU.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of the UK Independence Party.

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

The Future is a Foreign Country

by *Matthew Illsley*. **£10.00**

Full of useful detail and quotes on how and why we got into the EU mess. It leads to the conclusion that withdrawal from the EU is the only way forward.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of Local Government by *Lindsay Jenkins*. **£14.99**

The detailed Brussels agenda for the break-up of the United Kingdom.

Resolving the European Crisis

Perspectives on the future of the EU.

Edited by *Paul Jervis*. **£9.99**

Authors include; Daniel Hannan MEP, Ruth Lea, Lord Pearson, John Redwood MP and Gisela Stuart MP.

The Missing Heart of Europe

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?

by *Thomas Kremer*. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish? A European businessman's view of the impact of divergent national cultures.

The Referendum Roundabout

by *Kieron O'Hara*. **£8.95**

A lively and sharp critique of the role of referendums in modern British politics, includes the 1975 vote on Europe, devolution, and a possible Constitution.

EU: Papacy Reincarnated?

by *Mark Stout*. **£9.99**

This book explores the origins and functioning of both the EU and the Medieval Papacy from a legal/political/historical perspective and unearths a startling number of parallels.

Corruption - The World's Big C

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures by *Ian Senior*. **£12.50**

Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

The Benefits of Tax Competition

by *Richard Teather*. **£12.50**

Teather argues that EU attempts to harmonise taxes will damage the world economy.

Video

Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. DVD or VHS Video **£5.00**

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

Send Payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£16
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

Please send me *eurofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *eurofacts*: PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020 7973 1992
European Movement	020 7940 5252
Federal Trust	020 7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Housewives League	020 8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071 663876
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 7491 3072
Freedom Association	01746 861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684 891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	08705 900 200
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006