

Restore our national identity: get us out of the EU

David Cameron's call for an affirmation of Britishness ignores an obvious reason for our national malaise – the suffocation of our sovereignty by Brussels

So the Prime Minister believes that the United Kingdom needs a stronger sense of national identity. The idea proved to be controversial when he voiced it at the Munich Security Conference earlier this month, because he was seeing it in the context of Islamist extremism and what he called the failure of “state multiculturalism”. Yet he is absolutely right – though not, perhaps, entirely for the reasons he expressed.

For years now, we in Britain have been slowly sinking into a sort of collective depression, our once unshakeable sense of identity steadily fading, our self-confidence seeping away, our national pride pathetically linked to the patchy performances of our sports teams.

Part of this may be attributed to the process of post-imperial decline, to the waning of industrial and economic power. Much of the blame, however, can be attached to the failures of our political class and especially to a series of leaders lacking the vision, the nerve and sometimes the competence to reignite our pride in ourselves and reach boldly for a global future.

Some of us lived through the optimism, drive and self-belief of the

Attlee and Macmillan years, but those are distant memories now. Edward Heath, who did not know how to govern, misled us into the EEC on the lie that it was merely a trade bloc, perhaps as a cover for his own inadequacies. It has essentially been downhill ever since for national morale, among swirling mists of illusion and empty flag-waving.

Harold Wilson, who did know how to govern (if not how to manage the economy), smelt a rat and held our only referendum on Europe, but he ended up saying “Yes” on the basis of some half-baked “renegotiation” of the terms.

Even Margaret Thatcher was not enough of an Iron Lady to restore our independence, settling for a paltry rebate on our budget contributions and deceiving us into thinking that we could direct the European project to suit ourselves.

John Major meekly signed the Maastricht Treaty and led us into the humiliation of the pre-euro Exchange Rate Mechanism – an experience that should have immediately signalled “enough is enough”. Tony Blair surrendered a chunk of our rebate and tried hard to get us to join the single currency. Gordon Brown broke a

promise and signed the Lisbon Treaty without so much as a by-your-leave.

The kindest interpretation we can put on this sorry story is that serial subservience to the wishes of the Eurocracy results from the insidious myth that the EU is somehow essential to our national survival and our place in the world. That is not true. The EU is a burden on us in economic terms (*see page 3*) and what our membership has done is steadily to reduce our international influence.

If David Cameron is serious about rebuilding and asserting our national identity, there is one obvious thing he can do: create the conditions for our early exit from the EU and leave the European project into which we never fitted to collapse under its own weight.

As leading Tory Alastair McAlpine admitted on the thirtieth anniversary of the Wilson referendum, the successful campaign for EU membership in 1975 was organised on the basis that “it wasn’t so much that it was sensible to stay in, but that anybody who proposed that we came out was off their rocker”.

As the disastrous effect of our EU membership becomes ever more apparent, it is now also evident who was really off their rocker back in 1975.

INSIDE: *We're the ones who should impose "fines" p.2 – Make-up of the total UK deficit with the EU 26 p.2 – Why we don't need the Single Market p.3 – Cranking up the pressure p.4 – Benefits of EU membership stay hidden p. 5 – Brussels bends its own rules again p. 6 – New constitutional challenge to the Lisbon Treaty p.6 – The European idea of democracy p.6*

We're the ones who should impose 'fines'

The European Commission is currently withholding a little short of £400 million owed to the UK under various EU schemes meant to benefit us because it does not like the way we account for the money.

That's rich from an organisation whose own opaque accounts – riddled with incompetence and corruption – have been rejected by its auditors for each of the past 14 years.

What is worse, however, is that not only did the money come from British taxpayers to begin with, but those same taxpayers are having to fork out an equal amount because our Government

has to make up the shortfall. Nor does it end there. At a time of swingeing budget cuts and saving every penny, the Treasury has set aside more taxpayers' cash to cover the retention of a further £610 million it expects from Brussels.

And this situation is going to become even more disgraceful.

Local authorities across the UK, already slashing services and staff as a result of the government spending review, are bracing themselves for £1 billion worth of EU "fines" arising from Brussels directives for which they, rather than Westminster, will have

future responsibility. Are we now so supine, so in thrall to the Eurocracy, that we are prepared to allow a bunch of unelected bureaucrats with a disastrous financial record to treat us this way?

For the present we might lack the courage to get out of the EU, but we should at least have the strength and pride to face up to Brussels and tell the Commission that we are deducting the amounts it owes us from our budgetary contributions – or indeed withhold all that money altogether until such time as the EU puts its own financial house in order.

Make-up of the total UK deficit with the EU 26, 1997-2009 (£ billion)

In the 13 years 1997 – 2009 inclusive, the UK paid more than £173.6 billion to EU institutions and received back £103.4 billion, resulting in an aggregate net contribution of £70.1 billion. In addition, on its trade (imports and exports of goods, services and income) with the other 26 EU member states, the UK, over the 1997-2009 period, recorded an aggregated deficit of £147.5 billion. The combined UK deficit with EU Institutions and EU-26 member states over the period was, in aggregate, £217.7 billion, an average of £16.7 billion a year. The trade deficit reflects the hundreds of thousands (if not millions) of real British jobs effectively exported to the rest of the EU over this period. The contribution to Brussels is a direct burden on UK taxpayers and the British economy.

Year	<i>a</i> UK gross contributions to EU	<i>b</i> UK receipts from EU institutions	<i>c=a-b</i> UK net EU contribution	<i>d</i> UK deficit on EU 26 trade	<i>e=c+d</i> UK deficit with EU 26*
1997	9.01	5.8	3.2	2.8	6.0
1998	11.2	5.6	5.6	(3.5)	2.1
1999	11.8	6.8	4.9	3.9	8.9
2000	12.2	5.9	6.3	(0.7)	5.6
2001	11.3	8.3	3.0	(4.1)	(1.1)
2002	11.8	7.1	4.7	4.4	9.1
2003	13.0	8.0	5.0	17.1	22.1
2004	13.2	8.5	4.7	25.8	30.5
2005	15.1	9.1	6.0	34.6	40.6
2006	15.4	9.3	6.1	29.4	35.5
2007	15.8	8.5	7.3	31.2	38.5
2008	16.4	9.8	6.6	(1.1)	5.5
2009	17.4	10.7	6.7	7.7	14.4
1997-2009	173.6	103.4	70.1	147.5	217.7

*Total UK deficit with EU-26: UK net contribution to EU institutions plus trade deficit

Source: Table 9.2: UK Balance of Payments: Pink Book 2010; for 1997& 1998, Pink Book 2006: www.statistics.gov.uk

Why we don't need the Single Market

By Ian Milne

Director, Global Britain

The EC Customs Union dates from 1957. The Single European Act came into effect in 1992 and superimposed on the Customs Union a costly, tightly-regulated, supposedly harmonised internal market: the Single Market. The outsourcing to Brussels of the regulation of all the City's financial markets, the Social Chapter, the Working Time Directive, Health and Safety and Tax Harmonisation: all are part of the pursuit of the Single Market.

Membership of the Single Market is often said to be vital for British trade. The facts suggest that proposition is wrong. These are the eight reasons why.

1. Customs unions are redundant.¹

Over 90 per cent of British imports are tariff-free, and those tariffs that remain are very low. Tariffs are only charged on trade in goods; they are not charged at all on trade in services or income. UK trade in goods is well under half² of total UK trade, the rest being in tariff-free services and income. The cost of collecting those low tariffs on goods is greater than the amount of tariff actually collected. In other words, customs unions are redundant: they have lost their *raison d'être*. That is why, outside the EU, there are simply no significant customs unions at all, anywhere in the world.

2. Single Market membership is hugely costly³.

If, as many assert, the UK is in the EU to get "access" to the Single Market, it follows that the hidden costs of exporting to the EU – in effect, a tax paid by British taxpayers on UK exports – are absolutely colossal.

Recent studies³ put the net cost of EU membership at 10 per cent of GDP, equivalent to £139 billion in 2009. In

that year, the sterling value of UK goods exports to the EU was £124 billion. This means that for every £10 of UK goods exported to the EU, British taxpayers paid on top, for the privilege of belonging to the Single Market, a hidden tariff – an export tax – of £12.

3. The haemorrhage of skilled UK jobs to the Continent resulting from the trade deficit.

The UK has a massive structural trade deficit with the EU. In the five years 2005 to 2009, 88 per cent of the UK's alarming trade deficit with the whole world has been accounted for by the EU². Over those five years the cumulated UK deficit with the EU was £135 billion. The fact that the UK trades with the rest of the world more or less in balance implies a causal connection between Single Market membership and the UK deficit.

The consequence of this massive deficit with the EU is the haemorrhage of jobs to the Continent: huge numbers of skilled British jobs being exported over the Channel. It has been estimated⁴ that the result of this deficit is an extra two million or so jobs, many of them highly-skilled, in Germany, France and other EU countries, that might have remained in the UK were it not for the UK deficit with the EU. In the context our 30 million workforce and high unemployment rate, two million "lost" jobs is a huge number.

4. Over 90 per cent of the British economy is NOT involved in exports to the EU⁵.

Putting it another way: exports to the EU account for less than 10 per cent of British economic output. Within the

approximately 90 per cent NOT involved in exports to the EU, 80 per cent is generated by British residents trading with each other, 10 per cent in exporting to the world beyond the EU. Yet that 90 per cent still has to impose on its activities the whole of the hugely costly Single Market legislation and regulation.

5. British Export Growth: better outside the EU⁶.

British exports to the world OUTSIDE the EU are growing far faster than British exports TO the EU – 37 per cent faster since the turn of the century.

The main reason why British export growth is almost 40 per cent higher outside the EU is that most EU markets are anaemic, while many markets outside the EU are expanding rapidly. Excessive Single Market regulation may not explain all of EU economic anaemia, but, according to the *Conseil d'Analyse Economique*⁷ which reports to the French Prime Minister, it is a major factor in the EU's economic under-performance compared with the rest of the world.

6. British Import Growth: more from outside the EU⁶.

But maybe, for the British, Single Market membership makes it easier to import goods and services? Not so: British imports from the world beyond the EU are increasing significantly faster (18 per cent faster over the 10 years 1999-2009) than British imports from the EU.

So, whether British exports or British imports are concerned, the Single Market fails the acid test: overall, there is simply no objective evidence that the UK benefits from being part of it.

7. The proportion of British exports

continued on page 5

Cranking up the pressure

In the eyes of Michael Howard it was the home of “cranks and political gadflies”. David Cameron described its members as mostly “fruitcakes, loonies and closet racists”. Yet in spite of all the mockery and opprobrium, and notwithstanding the fact that it has so far failed to make the domestic political breakthrough it craves, UKIP has become popular with a significant current in the mainstream and a talisman of the opposition to the EU that is growing steadily not only in the UK but right across the continent.

That is a tribute to the determination, commitment, perseverance and sheer hard work of the party’s still relatively small membership – often in the face of odds stacked against them within as well as outside their ranks. The progress the party has made in recent years, however, also has much to do with the profile and style of its charismatic leader, Nigel Farage.

Mr Farage has become something of a media darling and standard bearer on behalf of the Euro-opposition (to call his constituency Eurosceptics doesn’t tell you the half of it). He is a frequent interviewee on television and radio throughout Europe and a regular guest on public participation broadcasts such as *Question Time*.

Such success, say critics of his message, has been achieved merely because he has learnt to be “media savvy”, but that is not the secret, as he makes clear in this frank, witty and revealing memoir.

“My media savvy consists in enjoying a drink or several with journalists and broadcasters, recognising that they, like me, have a tough job to do, speaking my mind and, I hope,

Fighting Bull

by Nigel Farage

Biteback, Hbk 246pp 2010

Available from

The June Press

Price £19.99 +p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 978-1-84954-039-1

being mildly entertaining.” To which must be added a visceral and resonant quality that informs his beliefs and that, by his own account, has been present since childhood:

“I was an alarmingly normal, cricket-loving Kentish boy – albeit a bolshy, argumentative and perverse one. I remain an alarmingly normal, cricket-loving Kentish boy, as bolshy and argumentative as ever.”

Always suspicious of “authority” and resentful of externally imposed rules, he found the distillation of his credo at the age of 14 in the words of John Stuart Mill: “The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant.”

It was this unshakeable desire to expose and oppose the abuse of power, together with a passionate attachment to freedom of speech and belief – also apparently present since childhood – that led Nigel Farage to campaign against the rampant statism and regulation of postwar Britain. Inevitably, he felt himself duty-bound to rise up and ultimately assume some leadership role against the institutional abuse of power which is all that

sustains the European Union. The title of his memoir covers both his own approach and the citadel of deceit, propaganda, misinformation, myth-making and authoritarianism that he attacks so vehemently and often so memorably.

There was his characterisation of “President” Van Rompuy as having “all the charisma of a damp rag and the appearance of a low-grade bank clerk”? There was the chicken-suit protest, the inflatable bulldozer symbolising the nature of the EU, the disruptive protests during the so-called debates in the European Parliament.

This was not media manipulation, but an outcry against both the lunacy and the menace of the European project.

Mr Farage’s book is an enjoyable account of his and UKIP’s struggle. He is good on the internecine warfare that has sometimes driven the party close to destruction, scathing about the Establishment conspiracy aimed at preventing it spreading its message, proud of its most recent achievements.

Equally, he succinctly exposes the madness, the hidden agendas, the corruption, the waste and the fundamentally dictatorial instincts of the EU in what he sees – and perhaps Brussels, too – as its war against the people. He stoutly defends UKIP’s oft criticised stance of sending MEPs, which he maintains is the only way really to draw people’s attention to the abuses to which they are subject.

What Mr Farage does not do is answer the question whether UKIP is a genuine political party or merely a pressure group obsessed – with every justification – by Europe. As the song has it, is that all there is?

Benefits of EU membership stay hidden

The Government has once again avoided the issue of whether a cost-benefit analysis of Britain's membership of the EU should be carried out. In the House of Lords, a Foreign Office minister, responding to a written question from Lord Stoddart of Swindon, could only manage to change the subject.

Hansard 19th January 2011

Lord Stoddart of Swindon: To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they will set up a royal commission to carry out a cost-benefit analysis of the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union and the impact on Parliament's ability to hold the Government to account.

The Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Lord Howell of Guildford): This Government have no plans to set up such a royal commission. This Government believe

that membership of the European Union is in the national interest, bringing with it significant economic benefits to the UK. This Government are committed to the principle of effective scrutiny of European legislation and there are already in place robust parliamentary processes to hold the Government to account on EU issues.

At a time when the Government are implementing deep budgetary cuts, we do not think spending money on a royal commission on this issue would be good value for money. Furthermore, if adopted, the EU Bill, currently under consideration by Parliament, would significantly strengthen Parliament's oversight of EU matters by providing, for the first time, that an Act of Parliament would have to be sought before the UK Government could agree to future treaty changes under either the ordinary or simplified

revision procedures. The Bill also provides for greater parliamentary control over the use of the so-called "ratchet clauses" in the existing treaties which allow changes to the treaties, or the exercise of one-way options, without the need to use the ordinary or simplified revision procedures.

Later, Lord Stoddart commented: "My next question to the Government will be, 'how do they know that there are significant economic benefits to the UK' if they refuse to carry out a cost-benefit analysis? Successive Governments have refused this simple request, which would deal with this vexed question once and for all. What are they afraid of? Do they have something to hide?"

"If the Government genuinely believe that EU membership benefits the UK, they should have the courage of their convictions and be prepared to prove it."

Why we don't need the Single Market

continued from page 3

going to the EU, already under half, is declining⁸.

At present, roughly 40 per cent of UK exports go the EU. And because of the faster rate of growth of UK exports *outside* the EU, by, say, 2020, the split of UK worldwide exports will be something like two thirds outside the EU, one third to the EU, rendering the justification of belonging to the Single Market even more tenuous.

8. A country doesn't have to belong to the Single Market to export to the Single Market⁹.

The USA and China, not EU members, with zero votes in the EU Council of Ministers, zero MEPs, zero

Commissioners, zero judges at the European Court of Justice, zero civil servants working in EU institutions, having to export to the EU over the EU tariff barrier, each sell more goods to the EU than the UK does, without paying a cent to Brussels or imposing one iota of EU regulation on their domestic economies.

Closer to home, Norway and Switzerland, not EU members, export far more in relation to their GDPs or populations than the UK – Norway about five times more goods per capita than the UK, Switzerland about three times more goods per capita than the UK.

Those eight stark economic facts

constitute a powerful argument for the UK to leave the EU altogether.

References

1. Global Britain Briefing Note No 70, EU Customs Duties, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org
2. Global Britain Briefing Note No 60, 88% of the UK Trade Deficit over the last five years was with EU-26, Table 4, 29th October 2010, www.globalbritain.org
3. Global Britain Briefing Note No 65, The Economic Cost of EU Membership, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org
4. Global Vision Perspective, UK-EU Trade creates far fewer jobs in the UK than in the rest of the EU, by Ruth Lea, 21st April 2008, www.global-vision.net
5. Global Britain Briefing Note No 67, Less than ten per cent of the British economy is involved in exporting to the EU, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org
6. Global Britain Briefing Note No 68, The non-existent "benefits" of belonging to the EU Single Market, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org
7. Global Britain Briefing Note No 43, France Assesses Costs & Benefits of EU Membership, 13th October 2006, www.globalbritain.org
8. Global Britain Briefing Note No 64, The Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect & the Netherlands Distortion, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org
9. Global Britain Briefing Note No 62, A country doesn't need to belong to the EU to trade with it, 7th January 2011, www.globalbritain.org

Brussels bends its own rules again

Even the generally useless European Parliament is finding it difficult to swallow the amendment to the Lisbon Treaty demanded by the European Council in the hope of staving off the demise of the euro and attaching some sort of credibility to the EU's misguided, ramshackle economic arrangements.

Last month, President of the Council Van Rompuy told MEPs that he had secured agreement on a two-sentence addition to Article 136 of the treaty:

"The Member States whose currency is the euro may establish a stability mechanism to be activated if indispensable to safeguard the stability of the euro area as a whole. The granting of any required financial assistance under the mechanism will be made subject to strict conditionality."

Although Article 136 gives the Commission the power to act in the eurozone, the addition of those two

sentences – particularly the reference to "required financial assistance" – conflicts with Article 125, under which it is illegal for member states to assume the debts of others. In other words, bailouts are not allowed.

Of course, the Eurocracy has long displayed its contempt for its own rules, and its willingness to ignore them when they prevent it from doing what it wants. The contradiction between the two parts of the treaty, however, was not in fact the source of objections to the change by MEPs.

The Parliament's Constitutional Affairs Committee doubted that the desired addition was actually constitutionally correct – though, as we all know, the EU does not have a constitution. At least, that's what we've been told. Anyway, the MEPs thought that the proposed alteration of the treaty was wrong because the stability mechanism was essentially an

intergovernmental wheeze, and not part of the EU system.

Some grumbled that changing the treaty without a constitutional convention first was a worrying precedent, giving the Commission or the Council a basis on which to tweak it again without any inconvenient legal considerations getting in the way.

So precisely what are the pretend parliamentarians going to do about these concerns? Well, nothing.

They decided that it was their duty not to hinder the Council in such a desperate economic situation and they had "no alternative" to "swallowing a bitter pill".

Isn't European democracy wonderful?

The suspect treaty change is expected to be adopted at the European Council meeting on 24th–25th March, but it will still need to be ratified by 27 member states, so there is still the opportunity to question its legality.

New constitutional challenge to the Lisbon Treaty

DANES HAVE BEEN given the right to sue their prime minister for ratifying the Lisbon Treaty without first consulting the nation via a referendum.

The treaty received the approval of the Danish parliament in 2008, but the ratification was contested by a group of citizens who accused the government of violating the country's constitution by refusing to call a referendum on the treaty.

In 2009, their lawsuit against Prime Minister Lars Lokke

Rasmussen was dismissed on the eccentric ground that the citizens did not have "a vital interest" in the ratification of the treaty. The court accepted the argument of the government that a parliamentary vote was constitutionally sufficient because the treaty did not cede powers to the EU.

Last month, however, the Danish Supreme Court overturned the judgement of the lower court, presumably recognising that people really have "a vital interest" in what their government does and what happens to their country.

THE INTERNATIONAL reaction to the ongoing political chaos in Egypt took an amusing turn recently when the European Union's High Representative for Foreign Affairs, Baroness Catherine Ashton, penned an article in The Guardian saying she wanted to see "deep democracy" take root in Egypt.

Baroness Ashton repeated the line emerging from Washington and London that there should be a swift "transition" from the reign of Hosni Mubarak to something as yet unknown. However she also warned that Egypt

should not become what she called a "surface democracy" with votes and elections, but should be a "deep democracy" with the rule of law, an independent judiciary, free speech, free trade unions etc.

The irony of this is of course that Baroness Ashton came to her present high office through neither "deep" nor "surface" democracy but by working her way up through the British quangocracy before finally being appointed one of the top jobs in the quango of quangos, the EU.

International Business Times, 4th February 2011

MEETINGS

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **20th February**, 2.00 pm
“Open Forum: What Next?”

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear Hotel, upstairs function room,
High Street, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

**The Cities of London & Westminster
Conservative Association**
020 7486 2753

Thursday **24th February**, 7.15 pm
“Where exactly is our country going,
and why?”

Frederick Forsyth, Author

PUBLIC MEETING

Council House, 97-113 Marlebone
Road, London NW1
(nearest tube - Baker Street)
Admission £15 - Members £10
(Wine and snacks included)

Freedom in the City
084520 7831 0575

Wednesday **2nd March**, 1.00 pm
“Can the City of London flourish if the
UK stays in the EU?”

Professor Tim Congdon CBE,
Economist

PUBLIC MEETING

The Counting House, 50 Cornhill,
London EC3V 3PD
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **8th March**, 6.00 pm
and

Tuesday **5th April**, 6.00 pm
“Leadership at a time of transition and
turbulence”

A series of conversations/discussions
with distinguished leaders.

**Kenneth Costa, Mercers' School
Memorial Professor of Commerce at
Gresham College**

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London
EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Thursday **24th March**, 7.00 pm
“Parliament, the EU and National
Sovereignty”

**Bill Cash MP, Chairman of the
European Scrutiny Committee**

**Peter Osborne, Columnist for The Daily
Telegraph and author of “The Rise of
Political Lying” and “The Triumph of
the Political Class**

PUBLIC MEETING

Princess Alexandra Hall, Over-Seas
House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street,
London SW1A 1LR

Admission £10

(Includes, wine, juice, water & nibbles)

**Campaign for an
Independent Britain**
0116 2874 622

Saturday **2nd April**, 2.30 pm
“Leaving the EU”

Ian Milne, Director of Global Britain,
*founder editor of eurofacts and The
European Journal, author of “A Cost
Too Far”*

**Patrick O'Flynn, Chief Political
Commentator, Daily Express**

**Dele Ogun, London based lawyer and
CIB National Committee Member**

**Mark Reckless MP, Member of the
Better-Off-Out Parliamentary Group
Chairman: George West, of CIB**

PUBLIC MEETING

Friends Meeting House, 173 Euston
Road, London NW1 2BJ

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Wednesday **2nd March**, 11.00 am
Evidence will be heard on the *EU
Internal Security Strategy* from James
Brokenshire MP, Parliamentary Under-
Secretary of State and Minister for
Crime Prevention, Home Office.

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Gazette

www.britishgazette.co.uk

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.euro sceptic.org.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.ccc.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

EU Referendum Campaign

www.eureferendumcampaign.com

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

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

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

Team

www.teameurope.info

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

The Real Global Warming Disaster
by Christopher Booker. Hdbk. £16.99
 Is the obsession with 'climate change' turning out to be the most costly scientific blunder in history? Booker concludes that the answer is 'Yes'.

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.

Minority Verdict
 The Conservative Party, the voters and the 2010 election
by Michael A. Ashcroft. £10.00
 Lord Ashcroft's analysis of the failure of the party to win an overall majority.

Britain Abolished
by James Carver; George Curtis & Torquil Dick-Erikson. £5.00
 The detail is in the sub-title; Democracy Dead, The Rule of Law Exterminated and Your Federal Future.

A House Divided
 Can Parliament serve two masters; the Nation and the European Union?
by CIB. £2.50
 This short pamphlet's answer is no.

Bloodless Revolution
by Vernon Coleman. £4.99
 Are political parties the cause of our problems? Why we would be better off without them and how to do it one day.

Fleeced
by David Craig & Matthew Elliott. £8.99
 How the corrupt and wasteful European Union is taking control of our lives and costing the UK tax payer a fortune in the process.

Fighting Bull
by Nigel Farage. £17.99
 Farage's engaging book on the ups and downs of his extraordinary life, plus his defence of the UK against the EU.

Europe on 387 million Euros a day
by Olly Figg. £15.00
 Why the world cannot afford the EU. The cost of running the EU on a daily basis is 387million, for an institution the UK taxpayers' never asked for.

While the Earth Endures
 Creation, Cosmology and Climate Change
by Philip Foster. £10.00
 A theological look at the earth, and myths associated with global warming with a foreword by David Bellamy.

Why Did Britain Take The Wrong Path?
by Christopher Hoskin. £9.99
 How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government, resulting in democracy being exchanged for the EU dream of a superstate.

A Lesson in Democracy
 Comparing the EU and the US response to climate alarmism
by Jeremy Niebor. £4.00
 How the EU uses threats to the environment as one way of gaining more power for itself over nations.

A Crisis of Trust
by Stuart Wheeler. £7.50
 Wheeler examines, the political culture that has grown up in Britain since EU accession and how it should be put right.

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

euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK £30
 Europe (Airmail) £42/€50
 Rest of World \$55/\$95
 Reduced rate (UK only) £20
 Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.
 Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *euofacts* and the occasional briefing papers.
 I enclose my annual payment of £.....
 to **euofacts: 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 7385 9757
 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
 Ed Miliband MP

Liberal 01562 68361
 Mr Rob Wheway

Liberal Democrats 020 7222 7999
 Rt Hon Nick Clegg MP

New Britain 020 7247 2524
 Mr Dennis Delderfield

UK Independence Party 01626 831290
 Nigel Farage MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006