

This Brussels spending spree has gone on long enough

The functionaries of the European Union cannot be trusted with the money they already extract from taxpayers, let alone anything more

Faced with howls of outrage over its demand for a 5 per cent increase in the EU budget after 2013, the Eurocracy has embarked on a determined propaganda campaign aimed at convincing the doubters that the Commission should get its way. Brussels functionaries and their supporters have been appearing all over the media putting their case for permitting the EU to spend, waste or lose even more of its citizens' money.

Vice-president of the Commission Viviane Reding came up with an argument that is, to say the least, curious. Having said that Brussels needed more money in order to fulfil increased obligations delivered to it by the Lisbon Treaty, Dr Reding went on to insist that the 5 per cent rise demanded actually represented a fall in the EU budget because of the effects of inflation. "It is a myth to say the budget goes up," she gnomically told the BBC *Today* programme.

Her boss, Jose Manuel Barroso, went straight for the UK, by offering a bribe of £22.8 billion cash down in return for large cuts in our budget rebate. That is worth some £2.7 billion this year and next and is expected to rise to more than £4 billion after 2013. Mr Barroso

is not keen on this, of course. He said: "We want to go back to the original principles behind the 1984 agreement that established the rebate, which said that any member state sustaining a budgetary burden which is excessive in relation to its relative prosperity may benefit from a correction at the appropriate time."

This would mean the UK rebate would not be linked to inflation or to the amount we pay annually to the EU. We could become its largest contributor while receiving the fewest benefits.

On a wider front, Brussels has launched a website designed to show the public in each member state the financial advantages of paying for the EU and to suggest that paying even more would mean that their own governments would have to spend less.

A glance at the page referring to the UK is instructive. According to this, in 2009 the EU spent €6.25 billion here while our budget contribution was €7.88 billion, allowing for our rebate of €5.66 billion. In the 10 years to 2009, the EU budget increased by 42 per cent, which – conveniently for Brussels – was about 5 per cent less than the increase in our government's own budget. In fact, that comparison is

meaningless. What the government of the UK spends reflects the range of its responsibilities. The EU has no such scope – though it would love to have it. Thus Brussels is attempting to persuade people that money spent on its behalf would mean less for national governments to find. It is an argument comprehensively rubbished by Tory MEP Martin Callanan:

"Nobody believes you when you say that more European taxes will result in less contributions from member states. This proposal is yet another wish-list by a European elite that every day becomes more and more distant from the concerns of ordinary people."

For decades the EU has thrown money about without regard for the people who provide it. So riddled are Brussels finances with incompetence, waste, corruption and fraud that the Eurocracy cannot be trusted with what it has, let alone anything more.

Some Europhiles suggest that David Cameron's rejection of the proposed increase could be a bargaining tool in seeking to reform the EU. That is nonsense. The EU cannot be reformed, certainly not from within. In its current state, it is a monumental waste of money and should be scrapped.

INSIDE: Celebrate 10 years of the euro – really? p 2 – The depth of Ireland's disillusion p 2 – An EU reading test for what you eat p 3 – From the House of Lords: Europhile blow to referendum pledge p 4 – Too nice to be Tories: the modernisers' mistake p 4 – Croatia is the next enlargement target p 5 – Letters p 6

Celebrate 10 years of the euro – really?

Whatever you think of the Eurocracy, you must be lost in wonder at its hubris. With the euro collapsing about its ears, the European Commission has been busy planning a celebration to “honour” the 10th anniversary of the single currency, which falls on 1st January 2012. The Commission seems to have ignored the possibility that the euro will not last that long, at least in its present form.

At the heart of the celebration is a commemorative €2 coin, its design chosen by the public via an online vote. The excitement this generated across Europe may be judged by the fact that of the millions of EU citizens on whom

the euro has been imposed, fewer than 35,000 showed enough interest to bother to vote. Not many, we imagine, were Greek, Irish or Portuguese.

Still, the Commission has never paid much attention to what ordinary people think, so on 30th June it sent out a breathless press release proudly announcing the winner of the competition. This was chosen from a shortlist of five selected by a professional jury from the 800 or so designs submitted. “The winning design,” said the press release, “received 34 per cent of the votes”. That’s a ringing endorsement, then.

Created by a designer from the

Austrian Mint, the commemorative coin features a ship, a factory, wind power and a few people.

“It symbolises the way in which the euro has become a true global player in the last 10 years and its importance in people’s lives, trade, industry and energy,” says the Commission.

Well, yes, the euro has certainly become a global player in financial crises, crippling austerity measures, public resentment and riots. We will be amazed if large numbers of eurozone citizens rush to join the Commission’s celebrations next January.

Meanwhile, the orchestra plays on while the ship goes down.

The depth of Ireland’s disillusion

Few people were more enthusiastic about the European project than the Irish. A hint of scepticism crept in over the ill-fated constitution and the Lisbon Treaty, but the country was persuaded into line. All that has changed now. The euro, the sovereign debt crisis and the EU bureaucracy’s disastrous response have provoked deep disillusion in Ireland, as shown in these extracts from an article by Vincent Browne in *The Irish Times*:

“The device at the core of the European project, the euro itself, has proved calamitous. The euro involved the creation of a European Central Bank which, at German insistence, was given immunity from any form of democratic control, however indirect. It was also given control over one of the key regulators of economies: the supply of money and of interest rates, with a brief to control inflation.

The ECB managed interest rate policy to the benefit primarily of Germany and to the detriment

primarily of Ireland. The ECB made it clear it would not countenance a member state allowing a bank to collapse, which was what partially inspired the bank guarantee here, although not its scope.

The ECB has insisted on member states absorbing the losses of its banks, even though the losses were in part the responsibility of agents in other member states. And along with the EU Commission and the IMF, it has imposed programmes of austerity on Greece, Portugal and Ireland, ravaging still further the lives of the poorest people of those countries.

The new institutional structure of the EU, which was one of the key points of the Lisbon Treaty, has failed to deal with Europe’s debt crisis, a crisis caused in large part by the EU itself. The new presidency of the European Council has been a joke, a joke made all the more bizarre by the recent row between Herman Van Rompuy, the president of the European Council and José Manuel Barroso, the president of

the European Commission, over the sharing of executive jets. The creation of a new position of high representative for foreign affairs and security policy to co-ordinate foreign and security policy has been another failure – the EU has been entirely wrong-footed by the revolts on its doorstep against squalid Arab dictatorships with whom it played footsie for decades.

For Ireland, the crisis has not been just transformative of the society brought about by the Celtic Tiger, it has also been transformative of our relations with the EU. Initially, we were the supplicants, pleading for favours via the Common Agriculture Policy, structural funds, regional policy. Then the model students, obedient and so appreciative.

Now, one of the problem children, truculent and resentful. And perhaps a little sceptical of a venture that is inherently contemptuous of ‘ordinary’ citizens of the union, exclusionary and instilled with an ethos we should never have signed up to.”

An EU reading test for what you eat

What do Brussels bureaucrats do when they are not taking advantage of their generous expense accounts? Well, it seems they spend a lot of their time dreaming up new, more complicated and more intrusive regulations. The latest tranche of them, approved by the European Parliament this month, concerns the warning labels we are all supposed to read before we buy food.

These are the main points of the “draft regulation on food labelling”:

Mandatory nutrition information on prepacked foods

The mandatory nutrition declaration (i.e. the energy value and the amounts of fat, saturates, carbohydrates, protein, sugars and salt) must be indicated in the same field of vision per 100g or per 100ml and may, additionally, be expressed per portion. The energy value and the amounts of these nutrients can also be expressed as a percentage of Guideline Daily Amounts, per 100g/ml, or per portion, or both.

The mandatory nutrition declaration can be supplemented voluntarily with the values of other nutrients (mono-unsaturates; polyunsaturates; polyols; starch; fibre; vitamins or minerals) and must be presented in tabular format or, where space does not permit, in linear format. Food operators may indicate the energy value and the amounts of the nutrients additionally by other forms of expression (e.g. graphics or symbols, such as the traffic light system) as long as they comply with certain criteria (e.g. they are understandable for the consumers and do not create obstacles to the free movement of goods).

The energy value may be repeated in

the principal field of vision alone or together with the amounts of fat, saturates, sugars and salt. The energy value must always be expressed per 100g/ml, but it may additionally be expressed per portion.

When the four nutrients are repeated with the energy value, their amounts can be expressed per portion alone. In this case, the energy value must be expressed both per portion and per 100g/ml.

Provisions on trans fats

The European Parliament and the Council agreed that further information, in particular on the impact of possible actions, is necessary before taking any measures. They therefore asked the Commission to submit a report within three years after the entry into force of the new regulation, assessing the impacts of possible measures concerning trans fats, including the provision of information on trans fats to consumers, and restrictions of their use.

Minimum font size for labelling

The draft regulation provides for a minimum font size for the mandatory information of 1.2 mm for the x-height. However, if the largest surface of a food package is less than 80 cm² the minimum font size is reduced to 0.9 mm. Also, if the largest surface of a food package is less than 25 cm², the nutrition declaration is not required.

In line with the internationally agreed standards within the Codex Alimentarius, food packages whose largest surface is less than 10cm² do not need to bear a nutrition declaration nor a list of ingredients; however, the name of the food, possible allergens, the net quantity and the date of

minimum durability must always be indicated, independently of the package size.

Mandatory labelling of country of origin

Currently, the indication of the country of origin is compulsory notably for fresh beef, fruits and vegetables, honey, olive oil and where the failure to do so misleads consumers.

The new legislation extends the compulsory country of origin labelling to fresh meat of swine, sheep and goats and poultry, subject to implementing rules to be adopted by the Commission within two years after the entry into force of the new regulation.

Furthermore, the Commission must submit a report examining the possible extension of the compulsory labelling of the country of origin to meat used as an ingredient. The Commission must examine the same question with regard to other types of meat, as well as milk, milk used as an ingredient, unprocessed foods, single-ingredient products and ingredients that represent more than 50 per cent of a food.

Allergens

Under the new rules, allergens have, as currently, to be indicated in the list of ingredients, but they have to be also emphasised through a typeset that clearly distinguishes them from the rest of the list of ingredients. Allergens will always have to be indicated for non-prepacked foods which are sold to the final consumer.

Vegetable oils

Under the new rules, oils of vegetable origin may be grouped together in the list of ingredients under the

continued on page 5

Europhile blow to referendum pledge

A self-confessed “pro European coalition” in the House of Lords has done its best to ensure that the UK never gets the referendum on the EU that it has been promised for so long.

Following a debate on David Cameron’s so-called sovereignty Bill, which was weak enough to begin with, the Bill was further watered down by a narrow majority, 209 to 203, in order to make it unlikely that the British people would be consulted about transfers of power from Westminster to Brussels.

“This was a victory for a pro-European coalition in the House of Lords,” crowed Lord Liddle of Carlisle, Labour’s spokesman on Europe and ex-European adviser to Tony Blair, after the vote in favour an amendment moved – perhaps not very surprisingly – by Britain’s former ambassador to the EU, Lord Kerr of Kinlochard. The amendment limits the sovereignty clause in the European Union Bill to the current parliament. If the Bill were to become law in its current form and no referendum were to be held in the next four years, the

sovereignty element would expire and could be revived only with approval by both Houses of Parliament.

An unholy alliance of naturally Europhile Liberal Democrats and old Tory Europhiles was prominent in the “victory”. This included usual suspects Baroness Williams and Lord Rodgers of Quarry Bank (remember the “Gang of Four” that conspired to form the short-lived SDP?) as well as Lord Heseltine, who, of course, famously brought down Margaret Thatcher in 1990 over her hostility towards the EU.

Other Tories who helped to slap down the sovereignty clause also have form on Europe: they were Lord (Leon) Brittan, who went native as an EU commissioner, Lord (Michael) Jopling and John Gummer, now Lord Deben.

The Bill also suffered as a result of an intervention by Lord Mackay of Clashfern, former Tory Lord Chancellor, who moved an amendment limiting any referendum provision to the European Communities Act 1972, under which the UK became a member of what was then the European Community. That would mean a

referendum could only be held on an “in or out” basis. Lord Mackay was supported by three peers who did well out of Brussels. They are the former secretary-general of the Commission, Lord Williamson, another former UK ambassador to the EU, Lord Hannay of Chiswick, and, naturally, Lord Kerr.

Earlier, their lordships had voted to ensure that no referendum would be binding unless 40 per cent of the electorate turned out to vote and to reduce the Government’s 56 potential transfers of power that would automatically provoke a referendum to a mere three. These would be joining the euro, or the Schengen open borders area, or a common defence policy.

It is perhaps not surprising that so many members of this unelected chamber might see nothing wrong with seeing power from an elected parliament transferring to an unelected bureaucracy, but what happens next – when the Bill goes back to the Commons – will be a test of the extent of the Euro-caution (we can hardly call it Euroscepticism) publicly espoused by Mr Cameron and William Hague.

Too nice to be Tories: the modernisers’ mistake

THE ATTEMPT to “modernise” the Conservative Party has been a disaster for both the party and the country, according to a study for The Social Affairs Unit by Anthony Scholefield and Gerald Frost. One of its consequences was that the party was ill-equipped intellectually for office in 2010 and unable to tap into the growing support for conservative ideas throughout the Western world.

The main aim of “modernisation”, which was accelerated under David

Cameron, was to enable the party to shed its “nasty” image, says the study. Its impact, however, was to stifle thought about policy on key issues such as immigration, trans-generational debt, environmental measures and “Europe”. At the same time, it prevented the Tories from drawing on new electoral support.

“Ironically, when the general election came, the public had no very clear image of the image-conscious Tory Party,” say the authors. “The final

humiliation for the conservative wing of the Tories was that, condemned to silence, they saw new parties arise which expressly proclaimed their own core beliefs in patriotism, the free market and social order. The activist base began to desert the Conservative Party.”

‘Too nice’ to be Tories?, by Anthony Scholefield and Gerald Frost (The Social Affairs Unit, £10) is available from June Press – see back page.

Croatia is the next enlargement target

It has been four years, thank goodness, since the EU acquired new members, but the Eurocracy has been working away doggedly in pursuit of its expansionist ambitions. Last month, Brussels announced it was expected that Croatia would join the Union on 1st July 2013. Meanwhile it is in talks with Albania, Bosnia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Will they never learn? The stresses and strains in the EU are evident enough and could ultimately bring down the Union, but the mad drive to spread the authority of Brussels across the continent goes on unabated.

Let us look at what Croatia will bring to the party. For a start, it has an unemployment rate of 17.6 per cent and last year its economy shrank by 1.25 per cent, following a fall of more than 5 per cent in 2009.

Just this month, the IMF reports: "With large external and foreign currency indebtedness and limited reserves, Croatia's economy is highly vulnerable to macroeconomic and financial shocks. While most of these

vulnerabilities were built up during the pre-crisis boom years, the crisis has further worsened the situation, exposing the Croatian economy's weak fundamentals...

"External debt reached 100 per cent of GDP in 2010... Empirical research shows that over one half of defaults on external debt in emerging market countries since 1970 occurred at levels of debt 60 per cent of GDP or less. Debt stock above this level also slows down growth performance... Croatia's external indebtedness stands far beyond what is prudent for an emerging market country.

"High indebtedness has also kept Croatia's debt service payments and external financing requirements large (particularly in light of low export base), exposing Croatia to adverse developments in the international capital market. Similarly, high and rising public debt poses medium-term sustainability concerns. At the same time, the level of foreign exchange reserves has fallen behind rising short-term liabilities. These vulnerabilities...

are further accentuated by a highly euro-ised domestic financial sector."

Ah, the good old euro again. Sounds as if Croatia is just what it needs. The same might go for struggling European banks. The IMF notes:

"Croatia's financial sector balance sheet is exposed to liquidity, contagion, and currency risks... As domestic lending exceeds domestic deposits, the gap is filled by banks' borrowing from abroad. The financial sector's net external debt stood at 10 per cent of GDP at end-2010, mostly owed to foreign parent banks... While the banking sector's net foreign currency position remains positive... the net short-term foreign currency position, at 15 per cent of GDP, exposes the sector to currency risks in the short run."

In the light of all this, we might ask why the EU is so keen to sweep up Croatia as quickly as possible. One answer might lie in the countries that export most to it: Italy and Germany, which between them account for almost a third of the goods Croatia buys abroad.

An EU reading test for what you eat

continued from page 3

designation "vegetable oils", followed by the indication of the specific vegetable origin. It will be possible to state that the proportions of the oils may vary.

Imitation foods (those that look similar to other foods but made from different ingredients, such as vegetable sources)

The new rules clearly stipulate that in the case of foods in which a component or ingredient that consumers expect to be normally used or naturally present has been substituted with a different

component or ingredient, the labelling shall bear a clear indication of the component or the ingredient that has been used for the partial or whole substitution. The draft regulation strengthens the requirement for all food information to be accurate, clear, and easy to understand for the consumer.

Alcoholic beverages

Alcoholic beverages containing more than 1.2 per cent by volume of alcohol are, for the time being, exempted from the obligation to bear a nutrition declaration and a list of ingredients. This includes also ready to drink mixed

alcoholic beverages (alcopops). The Commission must, however, examine within three years after the entry into force of the new regulation whether alcoholic beverages should in future be covered, in particular, by the requirement to indicate the energy value, and make legislative proposals, if appropriate. The Commission must at the same time consider the need to propose a definition of alcopops.

With eating, as with so many other aspects of our lives under EU diktat, if there's a way of taking the joy out of it, Brussels will find it.

LETTERS

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

Debtors' union

Dear Sir,

It has been said that the EU *nomenklatura* made a mistake by forming the single currency before the political union. Not so. These people are not stupid, like our own inadequate political class. They are cynical practitioners of realpolitik. They knew that the EuroFed could never be created by the nations "coming together". Indeed, by forming the euro first, the single currency would become a weapon to bring this about by financial coercion.

The economist Bernard Connolly, who had worked with these people at first hand at the EU Commission and thus knew them well, predicted even before the euro was launched that it would have to end as a debt union. That is exactly what is now happening. The so-called "loans" to the PIGS are not loans at all in reality and will never be repaid.

To avoid write-offs, mainly by German and French banks, and to exert leverage on the periphery, the loans will remain in legal existence for now. The PIGS will be required to impose grinding austerity on their people to give the existing "debt" credibility and so that even more can be lent by the IMF, which, under French leadership, has become a mere adjunct of the European Central Bank. Over time the bank loans will be quietly transferred to the ECB.

Just as the UK regions would be economically helpless without London and the South-East, so the periphery of the EuroFed will become dependent on the Franco-German core: a union by financial coercion, but a union just the

same. Have the political class of the periphery been rewarded for their treachery against their own people? If not, how have the *nomenklatura* achieved their aim? If so, then perhaps this explains why so much of the EU budget mysteriously "goes missing".

We have to hope that the people "wake up" and do something about this conspiracy. But I doubt they will. When have the people "spontaneously" risen up? In the end they have to be led and leaders can be nobbled.

PETER LINDSAY.
Surrey

Disunited states

Dear Sir,

The review of Christopher Hoskin's new title, *The Real Future We The British Deserve* ("It's a pity we're starting from here", *eurofacts*, May), deserves consideration for what it might start from here.

This work describes how we arrived where we are in relation to the EU. Some other topics are touched upon, including devolution within the UK, climate change, immigration.

Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, when asked how Conservative policies might turn out, said: "Events, dear boy, events!" Current events on the ground have been left out by Mr Hoskin.

The EU is actually in process of disintegration and the single currency is in terminal crisis. Common Market founders looked to the United States as a model. One essential point they missed was that America, up to 1787, was a new country evolving on virgin land – hardly a valid comparison to the ancient nations of Europe with their diverse histories and cultures.

Mr Hoskin offers a critique of alternative energy. It seems unlikely that wind power will be economically viable owing to variable weather conditions. Solar could be a significant power source if the millions of UK roofs were fitted with photovoltaic panels.

Mr Hoskin's review of "the threat of Islam" is in need of clarification. The crucial moment came at the end of the Second World War, 1945-47, when Islamists, under a charismatic leader, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, successfully challenged a depleted British imperial power and a Hindu-dominated Indian National Congress to establish the Muslim state of Pakistan. In Britain, meanwhile, a self-obsessed liberal elite, disenchanted with their own country, aided the spread of Islamism.

These issues – power generation, climatism, Islamism, etc. – are not central to the fundamental need for the UK to gain release from the EU. Relevant to this is what Britain should do following its liberation. When such a programme is shaped and disseminated, the ineptitude of the political class may begin to melt.

Two matters are pertinent:

1. What should be the role of the Commonwealth following Britain's liberation from the EU? More than 50 diverse nations across the world are Commonwealth members. Could their economies be coordinated for the benefit of all?

2. How might the many thousands of jobs exported to Asia be repatriated to re-industrialise Britain?

Here are vital matters for think tanks.
RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

MEETINGS

Democracy Movement
Southeast Sussex Branch
01424 848964

Thursday **28th July** 7.30 pm

Stephen Booth, *Open Europe Research Director*

Marc Glendening, *Democracy Movement Campaign Director & Co-founder of The People's Pledge*

Mark Seddon, *The People's Pledge Director & former editor of Tribune and Labour NEC member*

PUBLIC MEETING

Lansdowne Hotel, King Edward's Parade, Eastbourne

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **20th September**, 6.00 pm

"The Rise and Fall of European Empires: The Pre-Industrial World"

Professor Richard J. Evans FBA, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

FRINGE MEETINGS CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE

Conservative Way Forward
0207 403 3990

Monday **3rd October**, 12.30 - 2.00 pm

"Tax"

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Midland Hotel, Manchester

Admission Free

(Details: events@conwayfor.org.uk)

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **3rd October**, 2.30 - 4.00 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Comedy Store, Arches 3&4, Deansgate Locks, Whitmore Street West, Manchester M1 5LH

Admission Free

Conservative Way Forward
0207 403 3990

Tuesday **4th October**, 12.30 - 2.00 pm

"Defence"

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Midland Hotel, Manchester

Admission Free

(Details: events@conwayfor.org.uk)

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **5th November**, 10.30 am

Speakers to be announced

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College, London

Admission (details to follow)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2011

UK Parliament **5th September**
Commons Return
(for 2 weeks)

UKIP Party **9th-10th September**
Party Conference
Eastbourne, East Sussex

Lib-Dems **17th-21st September**
Party Conference
Birmingham

Labour Party **25th-29th September**
Conference
Liverpool

Conservative Party **2nd-5th October**
Conference
Manchester

2012

Denmark takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

Cyprus takes over **1st July**
EU Council Presidency

2013

Ireland takes over **1st January**
EU Council Presidency

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.eurosceptic.org.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

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 EU Referendum Pledge

www.eupledge.com

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

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.

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.

Bloodless Revolution

by Vernon Coleman. **£4.99**

Coleman explains why political parties are the cause of our problems? Why we would be better off without them and how to do it one day.

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.

German Economic Policy and the Euro 1999-2010

by Richard Conquest. **£4.00**

How Germany has gained with the Euro at the expense of other EU countries, especially Mediterranean-Rim countries.

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.

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.

The Real Future

We The British Deserve?

Time for the political class to wake up
by Christopher Hoskin. **£4.00**

A wake up call that spells out why the EU is bad for the British nation.

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.

Too 'nice' to be Tories?

How the Modernisers have damaged the Conservative Party
by Anthony Scholefield & Gerald Frost. **£10.00**

Why they forgot their true beliefs and drove away their core voters.

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

eurofacts

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 *eurofacts* and the occasional briefing papers.
I enclose my annual 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 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