

Public rage is not just about MPs' expenses

Changes to the political landscape should bring the objective of British withdrawal from the European Union somewhat closer

In these columns we have repeatedly pointed to the dangerous gulf that has opened up between the electorate and the political class. Since we first drew attention to this potentially explosive situation that gulf has yawned still wider. We had no inkling, of course, that the first occasion on which the growing mood of public alienation from the political system would threaten to boil over would be the issue of MPs' expenses, or that the principle beneficiary would be UKIP. Thanks partly to the mood of public anger and to some sage advice from Lord Tebbit, that party looks likely to be on the verge of an historic victory when the country votes in the European election in a few days time.

Disaffected Supporters

If this is indeed the case there will be those who dismiss the outcome as a protest vote which has nothing whatever to do with the issues surrounding Britain's membership of the European Union. They would be wrong. To begin with UKIP happens to be the only respectable political party taking part in the elections which, on the issue of British membership of the European Union, reflects the majority viewpoint. This explains why disaffected supporters of the three main parties are likely to vote UKIP rather than for some other small party. Second, while the public's moral sense has been offended by the recent conduct of MPs, the strong feelings

aroused are more complicated than a simple reaction to the way in which the latter fill in their expenses claims. It is one thing for the public to feel that it has been ripped off by greedy MPs, another for it to sense that it has been ripped off by an arrogant and self-righteous political class which treats its opinions with contempt and which appears to reside on a totally different planet.

The respective attitudes of the mainstream political parties and of the British public were reflected in a memorable edition of *Question Time* during which the three MPs taking part were loudly heckled. Asked whether she understood the reasons for public anger Mrs Beckett, the housing minister and former Foreign Secretary replied: "I understand that the public doesn't understand how MPs have behaved as they have". In other words the problem wouldn't exist if the public was not so stupid.

Above the Law

The shouts from the audience suggested that the reactions were based on more than anger about the greed of some Honourable Members. One member of the audience shouted "You're above the law", another simply yelled "Careerists!" A third shouted something which sounded like "Arrogant bastards!" Asked for his view on the matter by David Dimbleby another member of the audience commented: "What worries me is if

they behave like this over their expenses how can we trust them to run the country?"

As we go to press the long term impact of the *Daily Telegraph's* revelations are unclear. But it is apparent that the hand of those arguing for the repair and strengthening of democratic procedures has been strengthened. For years the parties have been trying to take away the power of local parties to choose their own candidates. Suddenly, it seems possible that local parties and associations will have the opportunity to kick out sitting MPs because of their conduct; this surely is a belated recognition that party headquarters do not always know best.

Political Mood

There can be no doubt that the political mood has been transformed. One consequence will be that the case for open primaries, which has been persuasively made by Douglas Carswell and Daniel Hannan (both advocates of British withdrawal from the EU) as part of a wider programme of devolving power will have to be taken very much more seriously. The eurosceptic Labour MP Frank Field, who is currently being tipped as a future Speaker, has argued for "a new constitutional settlement" which would give parliament greater powers while making MPs more responsive to their constituents.

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Italian millionaires are the biggest winners from the CAP p.2 - It's the same old story p.2 - It's a binary choice and 'reformers' are part of the EU 'in' group p.3 - eurofacts to cease production p.4 - Review of "The UK's Worst Financial Catastrophe Since the South Sea Bubble p.5 - Germans to reject Treaty? p.5 - Who can she be thinking of? p.6

Italian millionaires are the biggest winners from the CAP

Companies in Italy received the biggest single payments from the European Union's farm subsidies in 2008, with 180 of them provided with more than a million euros, according to a study released on Thursday 7th May.

Sugar producers Italia Zuccheri and Eridania Sadam, were also the only two companies winning more than a €100 million each under the EU's Common Agriculture Policy (CAP), being awarded €139.8 and €125.3 million respectively, according to a study by *Farmsubsidy.org* - a cross-border network of journalists, researchers and campaigners pushing for more transparency in the EU's

Common Agricultural Policy.

The only non-Italian company to rank among the top five "farm-subsidy millionaires" was Ireland's Greencore Group - a manufacturer and supplier of food and food ingredients - which came fourth, having received €83.4 million.

Some 165 companies in Spain, 47 in the Netherlands, 38 in Portugal, 22 in Belgium, 21 in the UK and 12 in both Bulgaria and Romania received more than a million euros.

In France - the top overall beneficiary of the CAP, with €10.4 billion out of the total €55 billion - 142 companies were granted more than a million.

The Doux Group, which sells chicken products worldwide, was the biggest

single recipient in the country, with €62.8 million and coming sixth in the overall millionaire ranking.

Altogether, the 707 millionaires received between 5 and 10 per cent of the total amount of the CAP in 2008, said *Farmsubsidy.org* co-founder Nils Mulvad, at a press conference in Brussels. He stressed however that full data from only 18 member states had been taken into account at this stage. Data from Cyprus, Germany, the Netherlands and Slovakia has not been included because these countries "have not yet published data on farm subsidy beneficiaries or have made it very difficult to access the data they have published", the organisation said.

It's the same old story

Amidst the latest revelations about MPs' expenses, the launch of Labour's "campaign" for the elections to the European Parliament wasn't exactly news. But ministers claimed that we had to be in the EU because "sixty per cent of our trade is with the EU".

Lord Heseltine was trotting out the same slogan twenty years ago and we've heard it on and off ever since no matter which party's been in power.

The claim is of course wrong - by a full fifty per cent. The real proportion of all "UK credits on current account" with the EU is now probably under 40 per cent (as we explained in *eurofacts* 28th November 2008, page 4, "UK plc's export growth is coming from outside the EU"). So ministers are exaggerating the real proportion by twenty percentage points (60 minus 40), which, divided by the real proportion, 40, equals 50 per cent.

In that same *eurofacts* article, based on the official UK trade figures, we showed that British exports, as a proportion of all British exports worldwide, are in long-term structural decline, and that, possibly by the end of the next parliament, around two-thirds of British exports will be going outside the EU. Over the eight years 1999 - 2007 inclusive, British exports outside the EU grew 37 per cent faster than British exports to the EU.

Continued from p.1

Public rage not just about MPs' expenses

Recent polling data has shown that the two issues which people believe an incoming Tory administration should tackle as a matter of priority are 'Europe' and immigration, matters on which the electorate has been effectively disenfranchised for decades.

If MPs are serious about rebuilding trust and narrowing the divide between the voters and the political elite it will not be possible for the latter to go on ignoring the will of the majority on

such fundamental issues, an outcome which should suit euroscepticism very well.

Of course, it is possible that in the heady mood of celebration that may follow a Tory victory at the general election old attitudes and habits will reassert themselves. Whether they do or not will depend on how much MPs have really learned from recent developments and the extent to which voters ram home those lessons when

they vote on 4th June.

Sadly, *eurofacts* will not be around to report on the longer term implications of all of this (see page 4). However, as we prepare to produce our final edition we take some consolation from the thought that it is possible to glimpse changes to the new political landscape which should bring the objective of British withdrawal from the European Union somewhat closer.

It's a binary choice and 'reformers' are part of the EU 'in' group

Anthony Scholefield analyses the failure of euroscepticism and speculates what it would take to turn reformers into full-blooded supporters of withdrawal

In a speech to the Bruges Group in summer 2008, *eurofacts* editor Gerald Frost addressed the question of why it is that euroscepticism had failed in its central objective of achieving Britain's withdrawal from the European Union. He suggested that its failure to date in this regard was not due to a lack of funds, nor to a failure of the eurosceptics to co-operate and certainly not to a lack of public support. He identified the prime cause of failure as being the lack of success in winning over a sufficient number of the political class and the intellectual, media and business elite.

Why is winning over the elite so important? Here we should contrast the situation in the UK with that in Switzerland. The Swiss elite is just as much in favour of the EU as the British elite, or the elite in any other European country for that matter. However, it cannot get around the Swiss Constitution which requires that a series of referendums must take place before Switzerland can be politically integrated with its neighbours. Attempts to win public approval for EU entry by this means have regularly failed. Britain does not possess this constitutional requirement. The British political class can act without a referendum and even in contradiction of its previous promises to hold a referendum, as the history of the Lisbon Treaty has amply demonstrated.

Given that the electorate has been effectively disenfranchised on the central question of British politics it follows, by a process of deduction, that there must be a substantial conversion among the British elite if euroscepticism is finally to triumph. Having established this important point, it is necessary to pose the following question: Why has it been so difficult to effect such a conversion?

Gerald Frost pointed out that this failure was in contrast to the achievements of the free market

reformers especially, but not exclusively, in the Conservative Party who succeeded in remoulding the climate of opinion in the late 1970s. The free market reformers were in a substantial minority in 1979. In fact, Sir John Hoskyns said of Mrs. Thatcher's first cabinet that she only had one supporter inside it - Sir Keith Joseph. There was some support for the free market revolution in the lower ministerial ranks, the back benchers and some business opinion. There was outside intellectual support from the IEA and the CPS as well as from individual journalists such as Peter Jay and Samuel Brittan. Nevertheless, support for Margaret Thatcher in 1979 was still more substantial than support for withdrawal from the EU in the political class today.

Public Space

Today there are a lot of people occupying the public debating space, including prominent Tories, who describe themselves as eurosceptics but whose euroscepticism is of a strictly limited nature. When analysed it consists of two components. The first consists of a desire for reform. They criticise some elements of the EU, for example, the Common Agricultural Policy or the Working Time Directive, but do so from a reformist point of view (this is rather like trying to improve the Dock Labour Scheme or the working practices of the Meriden motorcycle company in the 1970s). They have no intention of withdrawing from the EU and they frequently say so. David Cameron, William Hague, as well as Bill Cash, are part of that tendency which also includes a number of commentators and business spokesmen who are wheeled out as media eurosceptics. When their criticisms of the EU are ignored by the europhiles, they lapse into silence.

Euroscepticism of this kind also defines itself in terms of further

integration. Accordingly its adherents oppose the Lisbon Treaty and attempts to get Britain into the eurozone. It has manifested itself through the campaign to save the pound, the conversion of all three parties to hold a referendum on the EU constitution and the promise of the Tories to hold a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty, provided it does not come into effect before a Tory victory at the general election.

A further characteristic of this strand of euroscepticism is the refusal to develop a strong intellectual basis for policy. There have been no significant papers produced by the political class on fundamental EU matters, such as a cost benefit analysis of membership, or a clear statement of where the process of integration should be limited: its stance has been frivolous, reactive and tactical.

The key contrast between the free market revolution of the 1970s and euroscepticism today is that it was possible to buy into part of the Thatcher bundle of ideas but not all of them. In the 1980s gradually more and more of the political class could see the sense of the Thatcher ideas and were drawn into grudging support. This support never had to be total and there was never a Rubicon to be crossed. Indeed, the whole process of taming the unions was based on a step-by-step legislative effect, so that each new law seemed a natural development of what had gone before.

This is not possible with the EU question. In the end you have a binary choice. You are either 'in' or 'out'. Reformers of the EU are part of the 'in' group.

Success for full-blooded euroscepticism requires a clear cut decision to move from an 'in' to 'out' in sufficient numbers to reverse the political tide, rather than a gradual and partial acceptance of the kind that facilitated the Thatcher revolution.

A further impediment to change is

Continued on p.4

EU reformers are part of the 'in' group

that this requires not only an admission of error of some magnitude; it also means directly confronting the status quo. Analyses of referendum results has always shown there is a bias among all electorates to retain the status quo - this has been a barrier for europhiles to surmount in a referendum on sterling. However, this resistance to change also applies to politicians. As Alfred Sherman remarked, politicians carry on in a straight line until they hit a brick wall. In the 1970s in the economic field the brick wall came into view and forced a dramatic change in Tory Party policy. This change was acknowledged by the other parties in the 1980s and, no doubt, something similar may happen again. However, in these economic crises, it is possible to argue that the change of course involved a reversion to previous aspects of Tory Party thinking. In short, it was possible for Tory politicians to accommodate the new thinking within the broad Tory tradition of ideas. There was no point at which previous policy ever had to be directly confronted and reversed and the errors admitted.

It can be argued that David Cameron

and the Tories have not yet confronted the status quo in the present economic crisis. At Cheltenham David Cameron said he would let us know his plans before the general election. If it takes him a year to work out his policies, how long will it take to actually make his policies work? The acceptance of the enormous deficits appears fatalistic although quick and drastic action could shrink the problem dramatically. Yet the Tory leader has said his ministers will not act as "*flint-faced turbo-charged accountants*".

The final barrier to change lies in the pain of admitting error and acknowledging that the 'great unwashed', as well as the frequently lampooned minor parties and groups of the Left and Right, have been right all along. This is difficult for the political class to swallow.

What therefore could trigger a substantial part of the political class to make the intellectual leap in abandoning the status quo and cross from 'in' to 'out'? This sort of revolution in thinking among politicians is rare. The only example that comes to mind is the volte-face in British political opinion following the

Nazi occupation of Prague in 1939.

Even an economic global crisis and huge budget deficits have not been sufficient to force the Tory leadership to examine such EU commitments as Blair's rebate give-aways or the bipartisan support for Turkish membership.

If the recent economic events cannot produce a modicum of rethinking on the European Union, the only way to change the opinion of the political class would be an upheaval in British or EU politics. There are a number of possibilities which could trigger rethinking. One is a worsening of the British financial crisis forcing the political class to jettison sacred cows. However, by itself I do not personally believe that the arrival of the IMF is likely to open closed minds; thea trans-national organisation, would not acknowledge that the EU is part of the problem. Others might include big electoral success for UK Independence Party or the BNP (or both) or a financial or political collapse in a large EU country - because of its history, Italy is where I would place my bets.

eurofacts to cease publication

Very sadly, the next issue of *eurofacts* (Vol 14 No 17), which will appear on 19th June 2009, will be the last. After nearly 14 years of unbroken publication and 330 issues, *eurofacts* is to close.

The reasons are largely financial: we depend on a subsidy which in the present economic climate has become increasingly difficult to raise. We would like to take this opportunity to thank very sincerely those who have provided financial support. We would also like to thank our contributors and readers whose hopes and aspirations so often coincided with our own and whose best wishes and loyalty have been hugely appreciated.

It was never our intention that

eurofacts should exist in perpetuity; rather our aim was to go on explaining the economic and political realities of British membership until the pressure for British withdrawal had become irresistible. In this respect we sought to follow the advice of the Israeli foreign minister and wit Abba Eban: "*History teaches us that men and nations behave wisely once they have exhausted all other alternatives*". Our purpose has been to try to fast track this process

We have fallen some way short of our original ambition, but it is clear that British public opinion is far better informed about 'Europe' than when the first issue of *eurofacts* appeared on 20th October 1995. A clear majority

now favours withdrawal and dissatisfaction with the realities of membership is almost universal. We hope that we have played a useful role in explaining what British membership has cost this country in terms of loss of sovereignty and democratic accountability as well as in economic terms. Although to date eurocepticism has failed to achieve its central objective of withdrawal from the European Union (for reasons set out in the article above) we remain confident that within the next decade Britain will decide to pull out of Europe's political structures and to place its relationship with its continental neighbours on a fundamentally different footing.

Worst financial catastrophe since the South Sea Bubble

This is a brilliant, lucid and meticulously-researched work of scholarship. The author's wry humour also helps to make it immensely readable, even for the non-specialist. It is, says Congdon, a response "to very recent events, in particular the banking crisis that began in August 2007". He goes on: "Bluntly, the division of responsibilities and functions between the Tripartite Authorities, due to misguided legislation in 1998 and 2000, has led to the UK's worst financial catastrophe since the South Sea Bubble". His response includes a detailed account of the Northern Rock fiasco and the subsequent instability in the UK financial system, which the author sets in the context of the development of central banking over the centuries, especially in the US and the UK.

Congdon proposes that the Bank of England should be privatised, as it was between 1694 and 1946, when it was the most successful central bank in the world. Its shareholders would be commercial banks, as is the case in the USA, where the Fed is owned by banks. Congdon proposes that the two key functions removed from it by Gordon Brown in 1998 - bank regulation and gilt issuance - should be restored to it. This is no mere kite-flying: Congdon's proposal is carefully worked out. He sets out his calculations of the amount of capital the newly-privatised Bank would need, and describes precisely what operations it should carry out, and how: in other words, a full template or business plan.

Congdon's criticisms of Gordon Brown's decision "to dismember the Bank" in 1997, of the chaos resulting from the incompetence and fumbling

Central Banking in a Free Society

By Tim Congdon

IEA, Pbk 200 pp 2009

Available from *The June Press*

Price £12.50 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978 0 255 36623 6

of each of the "Tripartite Authorities" in the last two years, and of Mervyn King's inability to grasp what a central bank is actually for, are all the more devastating for being formulated in moderate, reasoned and dispassionate terms, backed up with pertinent statistics, quotes and references. This long (200-page) academic monograph is the opposite of a polemic.

The author shows that it was not the freezing-up of the inter-bank wholesale markets which caused Northern Rock to fail, but the Governor's refusal to allow the Bank to act as lender-of-last-resort. It was Robert Peston's "scoop" that the Rock was seeking a loan from the Bank, with the erroneous implication that it (Northern Rock) was "bust", that precipitated the run and the collapse of its retail deposits. The confused and shambolic reaction of each of the three "Tripartite" bodies: the Treasury, the Bank and the FSA (with a fourth looming in the background: the EU) meant that it was only six months later that it was decided to nationalise the poor old Rock.

The author also points out that one of the reasons that Northern Rock and

other banks had recourse to "structured finance" such as those involving bundles of US sub-prime mortgages was due to the "failure of the British Government and more specifically the Debt Management Office to issue significant quantities of short-dated government securities [gilts] in the middle years of the current decade".

Congdon believes that Mervyn King in particular, and much of the commentariat in general, are mistaken in believing that depositor protection (in which deposits with banks are partly or wholly insured, by governments and all banks) is the way to avoid future banking crises. Citing the pre-1997 Bank of England's success in dealing swiftly with various British banking crises, the author shows that the absence of depositor protection, coupled with the central bank's determination and ability to act promptly as lender-of-last-resort (when a bank is in trouble or likely to be so) is the best way to ensure banking systems' stability.

Congdon excoriates "the volume of media commentary that was hostile [in 2007 and 2008] to the British banking industry and, second, to the assortment of wholly misguided policy prescriptions arising from this commentary". It wasn't just the media, either: most ministerial pronouncements on the matter have ranged from the merely inane to the absolutely barking. This book, and its recommendations of where we go from here, are a draught of pure ice-cold mountain water after a diet of tepid porridge. Perhaps a future British government, after enacting his proposed reforms, should appoint him Governor?

Reviewed by Ian Milne, *eurofacts*

Germans to reject Treaty?

The German newspaper *Neues Deutschland* reports that there is some speculation that judges on the German Constitutional Court might decide to call for a referendum on the

Lisbon Treaty. According to a poll of voters initiated by the Left party in the German Bundestag, 70 per cent of the respondents want the Lisbon Treaty to be re-negotiated and another poll

undertaken by the *Institute Forsa* says that 73 per cent of Germans agree that "the EU takes too many powers from Germany".

Source: *Open Europe*, 15th May 2009.

LETTERS

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

Turkish Accession

Dear Sir,

In your 1st May issue, you refer in a lucid item to President Obama's open advocacy of Turkish accession. It may be recalled that President George W Bush interfered similarly in European affairs. What united them and what is their true motive? How far are their interests shared with politicians closer to home such as our own Foreign Secretary, David Miliband? In recent years our own media have borne unmistakable signs of an extended, coordinated public relations campaign designed to soften public opinion in favour of accession.

Some *eurofacts* readers may be aware of the old dictum that ruling elites and top managements are inclined to advance two reasons for promoting a given line of action - a good one and... a real one, the first pursued vigorously in public, the second kept under wraps.

Well publicised arguments for Turkish accession to the European Union over many years have claimed one or more of the following:

Turkey has long been, in reality, European.

Accession will send a positive signal to the rest of Islam.

Turkey has been a doughty ally within NATO.

The first of these claims forgets that the heritage of Ancient Greek (European) Civilisation and its Christian, Greek-speaking successor, Byzantium, were driven out of what is now Turkish territory by the Ottoman Turks' crushing of Constantinople in 1453.

The living Christian (European) presence is faint indeed.

The second claim is shallow and specious and shows little

understanding of Islam.

The third may have carried weight during the Cold War but is now arguably out of date.

All three propositions are, to say the least, weak.

Is it not curious that the distinguished persons mentioned above have either omitted or placed in the equivalent of small print the existence of the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline which traverses 1,000 miles of Turkish territory and through which BP began pumping oil last year? Could it be that Turkish membership of the European Union would go a long way towards squaring the Turkish leadership and, inter alia, securing the pipeline?

Turkish accession? It is not difficult to discern the potential winners. What about the losers? They would be those sections of the European population to be struck by huge new influxes of immigrants, including a massive expansion of new enclaves in Britain similar to those which have given rise to recent reversals of thinking on "multi-culturalism". We should not be fooled by the common presentation of Turkey as heavily secularised. Large numbers of immigrants would be anything but secularised. The dire consequences of a greatly expanded Islamic presence in an already overcrowded and socially fragmented Britain hardly bear thinking about. But it is not the likes of President Obama, the oil barons, or David Miliband that would have to pay the price.

DAVID JEFFRIES

Croydon

Fishermen in Prison

Dear Sir,

Like you, I was shocked and outraged

by the treatment inflicted on the McBrides (*eurofacts*, 1st May) and I wrote to Christopher Booker to say so. However he, like you, has missed the point. It is not that the fines are grotesquely disproportionate but that disproportionate fines are illegal. Article 20 of the Magna Carta is unambiguous. I quote from the British Library translation:

"For a trivial offence, a free man shall be fined only in proportion to the degree of his offence and for a serious offence correspondingly, but not so heavily as to deprive him of his livelihood. In the same way, a merchant shall be spared his merchandise and a villain the implements of his husbandry. None of these fines shall be imposed except by the assessment on oath of reputable men of the neighbourhood."

Once again, I urge you (and your readers) to acquaint yourself with our Constitution. In fact, if we are to stand any chance of extricating ourselves from the morass into which we are sinking, our Constitution is our only hope.

PETER HOWELL

Wiltshire

Can Readers Help?

Dear Sir,

I was horrified to read about the poor fishermen (*eurofacts* 1st May) who are in prison for only earning their living.

Can we please organise a fund on their behalf?

CATHARINE STRAKER

Sussex

Who can she be thinking of?

"We refuse to stretch out our hand to those who oppose the Lisbon Treaty....that allows the entry of new members [in the EU], but who at the

same time talk about enlargement...Those who want more [Europe] must cooperate".

German Chancellor Angela Merkel,

speaking on 10th May 2009 at a CDU campaign meeting in Berlin for the June European elections.

MEETINGS

The British Constitution
01752 312743 or 0781 352 9383

Saturday **13th June**, 10.00 am

“The British Constitution”

Speakers include:

John Bingley
Albert Burgess,
Chris Coverdale
Brian Gerrish
John Harris

CONFERENCE

The Friend's Meeting House, 173
Euston Road, London
Admission £12.50

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **17th June**, 7.00 pm

“Euro Vice - How the euro and the
Lisbon Treaty is putting the squeeze on
Europe”

Dr Anthony Coughlan, *Senior Lecturer
Emeritus, Trinity College, Dublin, and
Director of National Platform EU
Research Information Centre*
Edward Leigh MP, *Conservative*

PUBLIC MEETING

Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton
Terrace, London SW1Y 5AT
Admission £10
on the door or in advance
(Includes, wine, juice, water and nibbles)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **3rd June**, 4.00 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry
into People and Parliament* from
witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **4th June**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry
into EU and China* from Lord Patten.

Note:

*Committee Meetings can
change from Public to Private
without warning*

The 3rd Goldsmith Lecture
020 7247 2524

Thursday **10th September**, 7.00 pm

“The State of the Nation”

Dennis Delderfield, *National
Chairman of New Britain*
Simon Heffer, *Associate Editor of
The Daily Telegraph*
Chairman, **Sir Teddy Taylor**

PUBLIC MEETING

Wilkins Gustav Tuck Lecture Theatre,
University College, London, Gower
Street WC1

Admission £5 by ticket only
(From New Britain, 10 College East,
Gunthorpe Street, London E1 7RL)

FREE

Advertising Space

Although the *eurofacts* newsletter is
ceasing production, publication of
meetings is continuing on the June Press
web site at:
www.junepress.com

Should you be planning a meeting
and/or conference dealing with the sub-
ject of UK-EU relations we may be able
to advertise the event without charge.

Contact Details

June Press: 08456 120 175

or Email: info@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

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**

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

I Want a Referendum

www.iwantareferendum.com

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste. That's the strap line.

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.

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.

Central Banking in a Free Society

by *Tim Congdon*. **£12.50**

Congdon argues in this lucid and very readable book, that the Bank of England should act as the lender-of-last-resort.

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 taxpayers' 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