

A nightmare world worse even than the EU

The world would be far more stable and prosperous with a thin veneer of international cooperation superimposed on strong national regulations than with attempts to construct a global regulatory framework

Readers may find it hard to comprehend a worse political nightmare than the European Union, but there is one and it is called world government. Moreover, it is one which in his day-dreams our prime minister imagines himself to be principal architect and even project manager. The project of world government reflects the same trans-national progressivism as the EU but it is one which for personal and political reasons Mr Brown finds considerably more congenial. Were world government to come about it would be run by people more privileged, more distant and less accountable than the Brussels bureaucracy. The principal building blocks are at hand: the agencies of the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the International Criminal Court. Its creation would sound the final death knell for self-government more certainly and comprehensively than the EU treaties.

Harmless Dreams

It would be naïve to conclude that Gordon's plans are simply the harmless dreams of a failed political leader who wishes to distract attention from his own failings. For the clarion call for a global system of financial regulation and for greater powers and resources for the IMF and the World Bank can be heard everywhere. The demand has come from Bernard

Bernanke, the chairman of the US Fed, from members of Obama's administration as well as from Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy, academic experts and newspaper editors in the US, Europe and Asia.

Like the Commission, the advocates of global political integration have used the financial crisis as their pretext for change (and done so rather more successfully than Mr Barroso), having exploited the widespread conviction that the international banking crisis requires a tightening of global regulation and supervision.

Global College

In an article in the *Economist* on 14th March Dani Rodrik, an economics professor at Harvard, accepts that there must be better supervision and regulation but also grasps where current trends are leading:

"If we have learned anything from the crisis it is that financial supervision needs to be tightened and its scope broadened. It seems only a small step to the idea that we need much stronger global regulation as well: a global college of regulators, say; a binding code of international conduct; or even an international financial regulator".

Professor Rodrik argues that this view is flawed because it presumes that leading countries will be prepared to surrender significant sovereignty to international agencies. Britain may

have done exactly that but he evidently sees no prospect of America, China, or India doing so.

"It is hard to imagine that America's Congress would ever sign off on the kind of intrusive international oversight of domestic lending practices that might have prevented the sub-prime mortgage meltdown, let alone avert future crises. Nor is it likely that the IMF will be allowed to turn itself into a global lender of last resort."

The far more likely outcome, he asserts, is that the mismatch between markets and the scope of governance would prevail, leaving global finance "as unsafe as ever". Even if leading nations agreed there would still be a distinct possibility that they would end up converging on the wrong set of regulations.

Regulatory Framework

Global financial regulation, he concludes, is neither feasible, nor prudent nor desirable. The world, he points out, would be far more stable and prosperous with a thin veneer of international cooperation superimposed on strong national regulations than with attempts to construct a global regulatory framework.

He cites the example of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). This was less ambitious than its successor body, the WTO; its genius

Continued on p.2

Protectionism: the beating heart of the European project

Politicians cannot get serious about “reducing protectionism” without grasping the EU nettle

The recession, if nothing else, is serving to throw the internal contradictions of British and EU policy into sharp relief. Take protectionism.

How odd that the current “British” government pontificates about the need “not to go back to protectionism”. On paper, the EU Single Market, with around seven per cent of world population, is, internally, more or less barrier-free when it comes to tariffs and quotas on trade in goods. But externally, vis-a-vis the world outside the EU, with ninety-three per cent of world population, the whole point of the EU Single Market is to “protect” its citizens against the rest of the world, through a Common External Tariff, quotas, technical standards and restrictions on the “free movement of peoples”. At the World Trade Organisation the EU is the single biggest instigator of anti-dumping measures, designed to keep non-EU products out. Lord Mandelson’s tenure at the Trade Commissioner post was characterised by ‘bra-wars’ and ‘shoe-wars’ during which, to protect Southern European manufacturers of those products, swingeing tariffs were imposed on Chinese and Vietnamese products. In addition, EU intransigence played a major role in the failure of the

Doha Round, the tortuous set of negotiations aimed at making global trade less unfree.

Admittedly, most EU tariffs on non-agricultural products are now quite low, and the EU is not worse, or not much worse, than other self-proclaimed champions of free trade such as the USA. When it comes to agricultural produce, however, it’s a different kettle of fish altogether: the EU, like the USA and Japan, is highly protectionist. The EU practises protectionism internally on another front too: through the grotesquely redistributive mechanism of the EU Budget. As Nigel Farage rhetorically enquired several months ago, “*Why should British taxpayers fund sewers in Budapest?*” Why indeed? Why should Brussels promote Spanish fishing interests by severely penalising British fishing? Why should Brussels prop up French farmers at the expense of German and British taxpayers?

Let us note too that individual member-states - France in particular - continue to pursue overtly protectionist policies against both other member-states and the outside world. Under Chirac, various large French companies were officially declared to be “strategic” and therefore off-limits

as takeover targets (including Danone, best-known for its yoghurts). Sarkozy has followed suit: his French “sovereign fund”, specifically designed to protect French firms against foreign takeovers, has just made its first investment, in the car-parts company Valeo, while the government’s bail-out of French car makers clearly (if unofficially) discriminates between plants located in France and plants located outside.

All of these are examples of EU involvement in outright protectionism and deliberate trade distortion, a game which British policy-makers have never understood, with consequences for the British economy ranging from the merely inconvenient to the utterly devastating.

The fact is that protectionism is the beating heart of Fortress Europe: protectionism against the non-EU world, and protectionism within the EU which specifically favours one member-state over another. Will the British Prime Minister, at his famous G20 jamboree next week, call for the slightest, faintest, feeblest diminution in EU protectionism? We fear it is time for that herd of pigs with gold trotters, platinum tails and diamond eyes to take to the air.

Continued from p.1

A political nightmare worse than the EU

was that it left national governments to craft their own social and economic policies as long as they did not follow blatantly protectionist policies.

Although it might seem paradoxical, an architecture that respects national diversity does more to promote globalisation than ambitious plans that wish it away.

Many of these arguments can be applied with equal validity to the European Union. For the moment, however, global integration offers better prospects for those who wish to pursue the trans-national agenda than

the EU whose shortcomings are more and more apparent. Like the European project, the project of world government is one which can never be completed, but the attempt to create it has the potential to greatly damage world economic prospects and to erode democratic institutions; indeed it arguably poses a greater threat to the latter than Islamic fundamentalism.

As Margaret Thatcher has written:

“...a sound and stable international order can only be founded upon respect for nations and for nation states. Whatever the flaws of particular

nationalisms, national pride and national institutions constitute the best grounding for a functioning democracy. Attempts to suppress national differences or to amalgamate different nations with distinct traditions into artificial states are very likely to fail, perhaps bloodily. The wise statesman will celebrate nationhood - and use it.’

The EU serves as a monument to the great folly of ignoring these basic political truths.

MEPs seek to limit role of President - and member states

MEPs have approved a report calling for a narrow role for the future EU president, in stark contrast to the broad flag-carrying post that some member states have envisioned, or so Honor Mahony of the *EUobserver* reported on 11th March.

Deputies in the constitutional affairs committee on 9th March agreed that the president of the European Council envisaged in the Lisbon Treaty should not speak for the EU as a whole on political issues.

Euro-sceptics might conclude that this is all for the good. But the report makes clear that the reason is that MEPs are trying to make sure member states do not become too dominant in future EU decision-making.

The MEPs want the person to be restricted to representing the EU at leader level on Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) issues. The EU's planned foreign minister would deal with CFSP issues at ministerial level and should be allowed to "conduct political negotiations in the name of the Union".

MEPs foresee a stronger role for the European Commission president saying that this person would assume "the representation of the Union at the

highest level in relation to the whole of the external relations of the Union", including specific areas such as foreign trade.

Past discussions have seen countries split on whether to stay true to the largely administrative role foreseen by the treaty for the president or to expand the post - something most MEPs fear would undermine community-level politics in favour of inter-governmentalism. And they don't want that.

Some member states, particularly smaller ones, fear that the EU president post could be used by big countries to push their own agenda with the treaty description saying that the president should "ensure the external representation of the EU" on CFSP issues but also "drive forward" the work of the European Council - the forum for EU leaders.

Admitting that the treaty's solutions for representation of the Union are "complex" the report indicates that whether it will succeed will be largely due to the "political trust" that the foreign ministers and presidents of the European Council and Commission manage to attain.

The report, due to be voted on in

plenary session in the coming weeks, also warns that the parliament will use its budgetary powers to get its way on issues such as the composition of the diplomatic service, meant to back up the foreign minister.

Drafted by Belgian centre-right MEP Jean-Luc Dehaene, it speaks of the "intention to fully exercise its budgetary powers in relation to the setting-up of the EEAS" [European External Action Service].

Threatening to tighten the purse strings veto is a way for MEPs to ensure that the diplomatic service is not dominated by member state officials and run by national governments.

The parliament is also suggesting a timetable for nominating the next Commission president - a process complicated by the fact that the Commission's composition will depend on the outcome of the Irish referendum - set for autumn - on the Lisbon Treaty.

MEPs suggest the next president should be chosen directly after the June European elections but that nomination of the team of commissioners only be done after the Irish result is clear.

Libertas says it will promote democracy - but it hasn't the faintest idea how to do so

Libertas - Declan Ganley's new pan-European political party - launched its British campaign on 10th March.

The party plans to field candidates in all 27 EU member states and claims to be on course in all but a handful.

The UK party leader is Robin Mathews, a former director in the Army's department of corporate communications who has served in Cyprus, Bosnia, Iraq and Afghanistan. Like many communications experts Mr Mathews doesn't seem to have much of substance to communicate.

Asked by the BBC's European editor Mark Mardell why people should vote for Libertas he replied: "It sends a very clear message to those unelected elites

and bureaucrats in Brussels, who seek to daily interfere in our lives more closely that this cannot go on without proper accountability. The EU needs to change. Libertas believes in a strong Europe but also believes unless democracy is at the heart of that we'll never be able to deliver".

Mardell then put the obvious question: Well, how would you do that, Mr Mathews?

"Give people a clear platform and give them a chance to vote for you knowing that because of your pan-European approach you can bring democracy to the heart of Europe."

But what does that mean?

"Whatever you do with elected

commissioners or an elected Commission, they must be accountable to the people. Libertas is seeking such a mandate at the ballot box, and that is our first task before we look at exactly ways to reform the Commission, president or whatever."

In other words, Mr Mathews doesn't know how to make the EU more democratic. He has not grasped the fact that the EU is incapable of democratic reform by virtue of the ideas and interests on which it is based.

In the absence of a European people and a European demos Pan-Europeanism is not a guarantee of democracy but a recipe for despotism.

The Great European Rip-Off

The title says it all, as does the book's own synopsis:-

It has been estimated that the EU costs us around £ 1,000 billion a year - an incredible £2,000 for every man, woman and child in Europe. So what do we get for our money? Politicians and administrators selflessly working to bring us efficient government? Well-targeted regulations that promote economic prosperity.....Or is our money being squandered by a self-serving euro-elite of unaccountable politicians and incompetent bureaucrats, or else devoured in a feeding frenzy of fraud and corruption where a few lucky insiders become unimaginably rich at our expense? And is the tsunami of regulation pouring out of Brussels in reality strangling industry, destroying jobs, restricting personal freedom, desecrating the environment and further impoverishing the developing world?...[the authors] smash through the secrecy and disinformation that are the Brussels hallmark to reveal what our European rulers are really getting up to. The result is a horrifying story of bureaucracy, hypocrisy and kleptocracy...

Most *eurofacts'* readers lean no doubt to the negative view, but even here the book has new things to say. David Craig, one of the authors, is an experienced international management consultant with several best-sellers to his credit - last year's being *Squandered: How Gordon Brown is Wasting Over*

The Great European Rip-Off
How the Corrupt Wasteful EU
is Taking Control of Our Lives

By David Craig
& Matthew Elliott

Random House Pbk 330 pp 2008

Available from *The June Press*
Price £8.99 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978 1 8479 4570 9

One Trillion Pounds of Our Money. Before writing *Rip-Off*, he knew very little about the EU; what he learned shocked him deeply. Matthew Elliott is one of the founders of *The Taxpayers' Alliance*, now five years old, whose success can be measured by the vituperation it is now getting from *The Guardian* and the BBC.

In the course of writing the book, Craig and Elliott undertook a detailed estimation of the annual cost of the EU, the results of which are set out in the chapter headed "Sharing the trough". This was an EU-wide exercise using the EU's own statistics and those of eminently reliable national and international bodies. As far as the UK is concerned, the cost of the EU works out at £2,000 per person per year, equivalent to between 8 and 9 per cent of UK GDP, depending on which

euro/pound exchange rate is used. (In 2008 UK GDP was roughly £1,400 billion, so 9 per cent is £126 billion - annually - more than the entire NHS budget.) Staggering those these figures are, their orders of magnitude are consistent with serious cost/benefit and other analyses carried out in recent years, including by bodies which have no particular position on whether the EU's a good or a bad thing. Indeed, a proportion of GDP in double figures for the net annual cost of the EU is now looking increasingly probable.

The book's last chapter looks at reforms which - in theory anyway - could make the EU function better and cost all of us a lot less money. For example, the CAP and the CFP should be abolished; so should MEPs, the European "Parliament" reverting to what it used to be: an assembly in which national MPs spent the odd week discussing matters European. The authors don't say whether they think the UK really would be Better Off Out, though the logic of their preceding chapters certainly points in that direction.

In summary, then, an excellent easy-to-read description of what the EU is actually like, which should serve to open the eyes of anyone who's "agnostic" about it, but would like a "primer" to confirm or otherwise whether agnosticism is an option. For the more *parti pris* reader, there is also a huge amount in this book which they were probably unaware of. To be heartily recommended.

France gets it VAT cut - after 14 years of trying

As reported over the years in *Aeurofacts*, President Chirac promised - twice - that if elected/re-elected the rate of VAT charged on meals in restaurants in France would be lowered from 19.6 per cent to 5.5 per cent. Both times he omitted to make clear to the electorate that he was powerless to effect such a change, since it was Brussels, not Paris, which had the power to decide. Two years ago, Sarkozy made the same promise.

Now, thanks to the economic crisis,

Brussels has agreed that such a reduction can take place across the EU (but not until 2010). The news is a bit awkward for Paris, because such a reduction would be equivalent to the French treasury giving up between 2 and 3 billion euros a year - tax revenues it desperately needs to fund bail-outs to the banks, the car industry and so on. (Unlike the current British government, the French government, commendably, is actually worried about increasing its borrowing.)

Those of us who like eating in restaurants in France can look forward to less expensive *additions*.

Those of us who follow the workings of the EU stand in amazement that a relatively benign and unimportant measure such as VAT on restaurant meals - in, of all countries, France, with the greatest cuisine on earth - should a) be taken by Brussels, not by nation-states, and b) should take 14 years plus the greatest crisis since the 1930s to obtain.

EPP: the Tories finally announce a divorce

But what will happen if after the June elections it becomes clear that a Tory defection will produce a socialist majority?

The Conservative Party has finally confirmed that it is to leave the European People's Party and to proceed with its plan to form a new political grouping in the European Parliament.

According to the BBC, Mark Francois, the Conservative spokesman on Europe, William Hague, the opposition spokesman on foreign affairs, and Timothy Kirkhope, the leader of the Tories in the European Parliament visited Joseph Daul, the chairman of the EPP, in Strasbourg on 11th March to inform him of their intentions.

"The meeting was amicable and during the course of it we confirmed to Mr Daul our long-standing intention to leave the EPP and establish a new grouping in the European Parliament after the 2009 elections", Mr Francois was quoted as saying.

There has been speculation that if the Tories finally fulfilled David Cameron's 2005 leadership promise to quit the pro-integrationist EPP it would join the *Union for a Europe of the Nations* (UEN). This presently includes Italy's Northern League and Fianna Fail which has said it plans to leave the grouping after the EP elections.

However, without identifying future members of the group the BBC reported that the Tories were preparing to form a new political family that might be called "European Conservatives".

Conservative MEP Geoffrey Van Orden, a Cameron ally, told the BBC that negotiations are ongoing with *"mainstream parties of government and serious politicians who are not happy with where they're sitting in the parliament at the moment"*.

The online news service *European Voice*, reported on 12th March that plans are already advanced for a grouping that would bring the UK Conservatives together with the Czech ODS party, which is also planning to leave the EPP-ED, and the Polish Justice and Law Party, currently within the *Union for Europe of the Nations* group. Based on current numbers, this would give the new group at least 71 MEPs.

Other parties that might form part of a new grouping include the Belgian right-wing liberal Lijst Dedeker, the Danish People's Party, Italian Lega Nord MEPs and a number of Latvian and Lithuanian MEPs currently part of the *Union for a Europe of the Nations* group. This could mean as many as 84

MEPs and eight nationalities if the election results do not bring significant changes to the EP make-up. The new group would then be the fourth largest after the Liberals, who currently have 100 members.

The Tory decision was warmly welcomed by Daniel Hannan who has long campaigned for withdrawal from the EPP and by *ToryHome* which described the news as "tremendous".

Not untypical of the many bloggers who commented on the development was one who contributed to Dan Hannan's *Telegraph* blog: *"...credit should be given where credit is due. Coming out of the EPP is one small step for Britain but a giant leap for a politician in the Conservative Party. The acid test is yet to come - withdrawal from the EU (including their 12 billion heist on the British taxpayer) and then renegotiation with a clean sheet of paper"*.

But perhaps not surprisingly the Tory decision has not entirely satisfied those who fear that the party might still rat on his promise: several bloggers have speculated as to whether the decision might be reversed if, after the June elections, it became clear that a Tory defection would result in a socialist majority in the EP chamber.

EU bans 'Miss' and 'Mrs'

Using 'Miss' and 'Mrs' has been banned by the European Union because they are not considered politically correct. Members of the European Parliament have decided the words are sexist and issued new guidelines in its bid to create 'gender-neutral' language.

A pamphlet from the European

Union warns European politicians they must avoid referring to a woman's marital status. This also means Madame and Mademoiselle, Frau and Fraulein and Senora and Senorita are banned.

Instead of using the standard titles, it is asking MEPs to address women by their names.

The rules also prohibit MEPs from saying sportsmen and statesmen, advising that athletes and political leaders should be used instead. Man-made is also considered to be taboo - it should be artificial or synthetic, firemen is disallowed and air hostesses should be called flight attendants.

Ireland 'may have to leave EU if it votes No again'

The British MEP and leader of the Liberal group in the European Parliament Graham Watson has warned that Ireland may have to leave the EU if it votes No for a second time in a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty.

The *Irish Times* quotes him saying, *"It is very difficult to see any country being able to stay in if they have had two No's from the people"*. He also warned that, *"It would be very difficult to get large companies to invest in a*

country that looked as if it might be leaving the EU. I think it would have a social impact as well and, of course, it would call into question the future of the EU agency that is based in Ireland".

LETTERS

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

Euro-scepticism: the Next Phase

Dear Sir,

Your lead article of 13th March entitled "Recession poll shows that crisis is fanning anti-EU sentiment" is a useful pointer to how the next phase of euro-scepticism might proceed.

Problems arising from the supervision by the EU, together with the crisis within Britain's domestic economy, may be seen as a single phenomenon. Therefore, solutions in both spheres must be inter-related.

Beginning with the repeal of the 1972 Treaty of Accession to the EU, nearly four decades of legislation since that

fateful date would have to be reviewed.

During that time governments have loaded Britain with laws that restrict, oppress, undermine and confuse.

Having cast off such laws, Britain would then be able to build its future as a free, independent, innovative nation state.

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Don't Dilute our Efforts!

Dear Sir,

Perhaps Mr. Ogilvie, letters 27th February and previously Mr. Maddern, instead of propagating a 37th anti-EU

group, with roughly the same aims as the rest, should work toward combining the efforts of the other 36 thus preventing a further dilution of effect.

JAMIE BYE
Leicester

More than just Talk

Dear Sir,

Further to Mr Ogilvie letter about anti-EU organisations, if he thinks that belonging to the UKIP is all talk and no work, perhaps he should start his work by checking his facts.

CATHARINE STRAKER
Sussex

European corporatism: an American view

The global governance movement is the most serious challenge today to constitutional democracy and its only compatible home, the sovereign democratic nation-state. It is no less a challenge because it is Western, internal, "soft", and indirect, rather than Eastern, external, hard, and direct. Global governance in general and the European Union in particular represent a conscious ideological rival to American constitutional democracy, because the EU is both a post-democratic and a post-liberal project. Under EU rules, legislation begins in the European Commission (the bureaucracy), not the European Parliament, which has only limited authority. About 70 per cent of

Britain's laws today come from the European Commission, not from that "mother of parliaments" the British House of Commons - so much for representative democracy. Moreover, based on the UN Convention on Eliminating All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the EU is promoting gender proportionalism in parliamentary and local elections across Europe, recommending a certain percentage of seats reserved for women. This is not liberalism but classic corporatism, in which representation is based on the ascribed group to which one belongs. To make matters worse, EU institutions restrict free speech by outlawing "hate speech" in ways that would be

inconceivable to Americans with our First Amendment guarantees.

This is not to suggest that we abandon Europe, but it is to argue that we support those forces in the EU who are seeking to repatriate sovereign powers back to the democratic nation-states. De Gaulle was right - and he was more of a genuine constitutional democrat than today's EU-crats - when decades ago he advocated a "Europe of Fatherlands". The present EU philosophical framework is, ultimately, incompatible with liberal democracy. It is time to stop engaging in politesse and say so openly.

John Fonte, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute writing in the summer 2008 issue of the Claremont Institute.

Solana 'could spend billions without scrutiny'

The European Parliament's budgetary committee has indicated that it will not approve the budget of the EU's 'High Representative' for foreign policy, Javier Solana, according to *Spiegel*. The paper reports on inconsistencies in the budget of the European Council, and notes that, after turning a blind eye for the past 30 years, the European Parliament has now for the first time demanded an inspection of Solana's accounts.

According to the paper, a 'Gentlemen's Agreement' dating from

1970 means that the European Parliament has traditionally not scrutinised the Council's budget.

The Committee's Chairman, Herbert Bösch is quoted saying, "For now, we do not want to formally approve the budget of the Council." Referring to the 'Gentlemen's Agreement', he said: "We have looked for it but did not find an agreement." The only reference to it was contained in the protocol of a Council Meeting on 22nd April 1970.

Danish MEP Søren Bo Søndergaard is quoted saying, "You normally need two

sides for a 'Gentlemen's Agreement'. But the Parliament never agreed on that."

Spiegel reports that "a lot of money is involved. Solana and his Council administration could spend about 650 million Euros... And if the Lisbon Treaty is ratified, and Solana, or his follower, built up their own diplomatic service, these millions could well soon turn into billions - and without parliamentary control."

Source: *Open Europe* press survey, 13th March.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **31st March**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: Bill Clinton”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE FBA, Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

Tuesday **28th April**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency: George W. Bush”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor, CBE FBA, Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

FREE BRITAIN - The Campaign for an Independent Britain
0116 2874 622

Saturday **4th April**, 2.30 pm

“Freedom and Democracy not European Union Dictatorship”

Frank Keoghan
Dele Oguntimoju
Sir Teddy Taylor
War on Want spokesperson

PUBLIC MEETING
The Friends Meeting House, Large Hall, 173 Euston Road, London NW1 28J
Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Budget	22nd April
European Parliamentary Elections	4th June
Sweden takes over EU presidency	1st July
Irish 2nd Referendum on Lisbon Treaty	10th October
2010 Spain takes over EU presidency	1st January

UK Independence Party
(Taunton Deane Constituency Ass.)
01823 332820

Monday **6th April**, 7.30 pm

“Can Britain Afford the EU?”

Nigel Farage MEP, UKIP Leader
William, Earl of Dartmouth, PPC
Stephanie McWilliam, PPC

PUBLIC MEETING
The Priory Suite, Holiday Inn, Taunton
Admission Free

Democracy Movement
(Southeast Sussex Branch)
01424 848964

Thursday **16th April**, 7.30 pm

Stephen Booth, Researcher for Open Europe
Nigel Farage MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
High Beech Hotel, Eisenhower Drive, Battle Road, St Leonards-on-Sea, East Sussex TN37 7BS
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01626 831340

Saturday **18th April**, 10.00 am

Nigel Farage MEP
Further details including Speakers to be announced shortly

SOUTHWEST CONFERENCE
The Great Hall, Exeter University, Exeter, Devon
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(East Devon Constituency Ass.)
01395 276130

Wednesday **29th April**, 7.00 pm

“Let’s Govern Ourselves”

Marta Andreasen, UKIP Treasurer
Trevor Coleman MEP
William, Earl of Dartmouth, PPC

PUBLIC MEETING
Bicton College, East Devon
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(South Dorset Constituency Assoc.)
01929 439099

Thursday **30th April**, 7.30 pm

Tim Aker, Taxpayers Alliance
Marta Andreasen, UKIP Treasurer
Trevor Coleman MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Committee Room, The Mowlem Building, Swanage, Dorset
Admission Free

British Weights and Measures Ass.
020 8922 0089

Saturday **9th May**, 10.00 am

Further details including Speakers to be announced shortly

ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Victory Services Club, 63 Seymour Street, London W2 2HF
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(North Cornwall Branch)
01579 362385

Monday **11th May**, 7.30 pm

Trevor Coleman MEP
Nigel Farage MEP, Leader of UKIP
Stephanie McWilliam, PPC
Malcolm Wood

PUBLIC MEETING
White Hart Hotel, The Square, Launceston, Cornwall
Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **31st March**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into EU Financial Regulation* from Mr Paul Tucker, Deputy Governor, Financial Stability, Bank of England.

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

How much does the European Union cost Britain?
by Gerard Batten MEP. **£3.00**

This shows amongst other costs that the accumulated trade deficit since joining the EU in 1973 is £383.7 billion.

Germany's Fourth Reich
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Beckhough a former code-breaker and intelligence officer, shows how the EU is being formed by the needs of Germany.

The End Of The English
The European Superstate
by David Brown. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The Plan

Twelve Months to Renew Britain
by Douglas Carswell and Daniel Hannan. **£10.00**

Britain is heading in the wrong direction. This book shows how to put our country on the right track to self-governance.

A Tribute to Ralph Harris 1924-2006
by CRCE. **£9.95**

Lord Harris of High Cross was one of the leading figures in the fight against the EU and injustice everywhere.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money
by David Craig. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the tax-payers expense.

The Great European Rip-Off
by David Craig & Matthew Elliott. **£8.99**

How the corrupt wasteful EU is taking control of our lives.

After Tamerlane The Rise & Fall of Global Empires 1400 - 2000
by John Darwin. **£10.99**

Rise and fall of empires continues, but the nation state is still more powerful.

A Life of Mayhem, Money and Unintentional Treason
by J Brian Heywood. **£9.99**

This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

The Return of History & the End of Dreams
by Robert Kagan Hdbk. **£12.99**

A new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, has now returned in Europe the EU model is now in decline.

Lost Illusions: British Foreign Policy
by Ian Milne. **£4.00**

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

Warning: Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth
by Anthony Scholefield. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

The Principles of British Foreign Policy
by Philip Vander Elst. **£4.00**

Should BFP reflect political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest?

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
FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE**

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£18
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 Weights & Measures Assoc.
020 8922 0089
CIB 0116 2874 622
Democracy Movement 020 7603 7796
Freedom Association 0845 833 9626
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
Global Vision www.global-vision.net
Open Europe 0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative 020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP
English Democrats 01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)
Green Party 020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender
Labour 020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP
Liberal 01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft
Liberal Democrats 020 7222 7999
Nick Clegg MP
New Britain 020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield
UK Independence Party 01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006