

UK's EU relationship

Professor Tim Congdon CBE

A major debate about the future of Europe took place in France in the late 1950s and 1960s, with de Gaulle's supporters insisting that its membership of the (EEC) European Economic Community must not end France's national sovereignty. (The EEC became the European Union in 1993.) Against the Gaullist conception of European cooperation between sovereign governments and parliaments, the followers of Jean Monnet proposed an eventual United States of Europe. In Monnet's federal structure national governments and parliaments would be subordinate to *both* a supranational bureaucracy in the European Commission *and* a federal judiciary. De Gaulle resisted the Monnet approach, which was of course backed by elite German opinion, in the celebrated Empty Chair Crisis of 1966.

Almost fifty-years later it is clearly obvious that Monnet has won. As, Intergovernmental-ism, national sovereignty and the veto have been defeated by supra-nationalism, federalism and qualified majority voting. The EU bureaucrats have outclassed and outmanoeuvred democratically-elected politicians from the member states, including Britain. (Monnet despised democracy, as did many of the architects of 'the European construction' in the 1950s and 1960s.)

The only EU now on offer is one that is destined to become a United States of Europe, in which all member states would cease to exist as separate independent nations. (Indeed, that is more or less what has happened already, apart from defence and

foreign policy, which remain national, well, 'national, sort of'.) *And the only way for an EU member state to avoid that fate - the fate of becoming a state in the future United States of Europe - is to leave the EU.*

I say these things are obvious, and so they are, but they seem greatly to puzzle many top Conservative politicians, including David Cameron, Boris Johnson and others. For them the subjects are tedious and irritating, like gadflies, cranks etc. They wish all these pesky mavericks like Douglas Carswell would stop 'banging on about Europe'. Cameron, the appalling Cameron, said in his January 2013 Bloomberg speech:

Firstly, that he believed in national parliaments as the source of democratic legitimacy in the EU, and secondly, that he would campaign 'heart and soul' for the UK to stay in the EU after his (assumedly triumphal) renegotiation of membership after 2017.

However, the whole purpose of the European construction, as envisaged by Monnet and his disciples, was to relegate national parliaments to semi-oblivion, to the level of regional administrative bodies. We must hope that, when Douglas Carswell has won Clacton for UKIP with a thumping majority, David Cameron has the decency to resign as leader of the Conservatives and to move on. He has never, properly and convincingly, organised his thoughts on the right relationship between the UK and its neighbours. He has made things up from day to day. (The Bloomberg speech was the result of vacillation, equivocation and muddle extending

over many months.) Unfortunately, the likelihood - the thoroughly depressing likelihood - is that he will remain the Conservatives' leader and PM until the general election in 2015.

'What kind of Europe do you want? Do you want a Gaullist *l'Europe des patries* or Monnet's United States of Europe? They are utterly different things. Cameron and his ilk must decide.

Almost certainly most Conservatives, and indeed most members of the old political parties, do in fact want *l'Europe des patries*. They don't want Britain to cease to exist. Then how, after a membership renegotiation, could Cameron campaign in favour of an EU which has undoubtedly developed according to Monnet's blueprint? Will Cameron (or Johnson, or any of them) give their heart-and-soul support to Monnet's supranational United States of Europe, with its denigration and bypassing of national parliaments? Let's have a straight answer, please. And it would be nice if these people - who have in fact badly let down their country - had the decency to recognise that the gadflies and cranks, and great Britons like Douglas Carswell, were right all along to be 'banging on about Europe'. (I say 'great Briton', but it is worth mentioning that Carswell's home was in Uganda until his late teens.

According to Wikipedia, 'his father, Wilson Carswell, a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, diagnosed the first confirmed cases of HIV/AIDS in Uganda in the early 1980s, and was one of a number of people engaged in drawing the world's attention to the unfolding pandemic.'

EU generosity!

Following Russia's actions in Ukraine the West started an economic war against Russia. This promoted the Russians to put a ban on food imports from the EU.

In reply the EU has announced emergency help for dairy producers hit by the ban.

This move follows EU aid worth £100 million (125 million euros) announced earlier for fruit and vegetable exporters.

Furthermore, the European Commission will help pay storage costs for butter and skimmed milk powder. The aid is also to extend to certain cheeses, which last year had sales of nearly £1 billion to Russia.

Unsurprisingly, aid to the UK's City of London has of course not been mentioned.

So who actually pays, not the EU but just those EU members that contribute to the EU budget.

The EU is not known for being efficient with tax payers money, so how much of the so-called aid will be lost by fraud we will never know.

Meanwhile while the UK through the City of London are negatively affected by the decisions made by the EU and the UK government, the French under extreme pressure only suspended the sale of the ships they are producing for Russia, in other words they will not be permanently damaged.

Negligence?

At last the French authorities have formally opened a negligence investigation into Christine Lagarde, the head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

She has been questioned about her role in awarding 400 million euros (£318 million) in compensation to

businessman Bernard Tapie in 2008.

The 58 year old Ms Lagarde was finance minister in President Nicolas Sarkozy's government at the time of the award.

Mr Tapie supported Mr Sarkozy in the 2007 presidential election.

What is even more surprising is that

Ms Lagarde was ever given the job at the head of the IMF considering that these allegations have been going on for years.

Why it was not sorted before she was given her job considering its importance and the influential position will be for historians to find out.

UKIP gain

The jumping ship from the conservative party by Douglas Carswell to UKIP has to be admired.

Over the last few years the idea that a parliamentarian will speak-up and stand-up for his real convictions has been sadly missing from the UK parliament.

Not only jumping ship but giving his constituents of Clacton the opportunity

to vote him in or not by forcing a by-election to take place on Thursday 9th October is truly remarkable. Carswell had at the last General Election a conservative majority of 12,000.

The comment he made that the Prime Minister David Cameron, is not "serious about the change we need" in the European Union strikes a familiar cord with many of the electorate who

no longer trust any of the political parties currently in Westminster when it comes to supporting the UK instead of the EU.

Unlike politicians the public can remember the so called promises implied about referendums and red-line issues pumped out by the political classes when it suited them to get voted into office.

More Brussels Interference

The European Commission is taking the UK to court in a long-running row over its policy of allowing leisure boats to use lower-taxed red diesel.

Brussels is disputing laws which

permit recreational boats to buy the fuel commonly used by fishing vessels.

The UK government does require boats using red diesel to pay full duty and acknowledges they may face

penalties for using it outside its waters.

Meanwhile, the Commission says the UK is "not properly applying" European excise rules. Will we end up paying a large fine? Probably yes.

Power problems

There was a rush in sales of vacuum cleaners in August to beat the European Commission ruling on vacuum cleaners limiting the power to 1600W from 1st September 2014 as detailed in eurofacts 15th November

2013.

We feel we should remind readers that this limit will be lowered again in 2017 to 900W,

The reason used is that of saving energy per minute regardless of how

many minutes you use the cleaner for!

However, that is not the end. Work is continuing on lower levels for kettles, lawn mowers, hair dryers and who knows how many more household appliances.

What to do after an EU referendum

Derek Stirling

This book with a foreword by Professor Tim Congdon, looks into the real issues facing the UK should the country decide to leave the EU.

Batten describes the EU process of 'ever closer union' to be fashioned like the jaws of a shark. The teeth slant backwards. Once inside the mouth the only route is onwards down the gullet to digestion.

What if you wish to leave, only one route is offered by the EU that is to engage Article 50. This route hands over to the EU full control of the terms and conditions of this exit. These terms he argues will never be favourable to the country leaving for many reasons but mainly to discourage any other EU member from ever thinking of leaving.

In this well thought out and detailed analysis of Article 50 he looks into the conditions that will most likely result in using this type of exit.

Firstly, will the exit referendum be accepted or will we be asked to vote again after a little tinkering with our membership conditions. A process well established in the EU until the result they want is achieved.

Secondly, how the time scale of withdrawal can easily be extended,

The Road to Freedom
by Gerard Batten MEP

Bretwalda Books pbk 74pp 2014

Available from
The June Press
Price £8.99 + 10% p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978-1-910440-02-5

especially if the UK government is not fully behind the decision to leave, bearing in mind that the UK will not be included in the EU discussions concerning our future. This will result in the financial contribution as well as all the rules and regulations of membership remaining in force throughout this time period.

Thirdly, how and why the EU will make very high demands on the UK, probably resulting in the continuation of allowing EU immigration, large financial costs and a transitional period of any length, throughout which we would still be bound by EU law and perhaps some additional onerous costs.

Fourthly, why the Norwegian and Swiss options are also not advisable because immigration and heavy financial costs plus the continued pressure to adopt EU rules of one sort or another would still be applied. The UK would still not be an independent country.

Batten explains that if the UK want to have a real independent future outside the restrictions imposed by the EU then the only way is for the UK Parliament to bring forward a Bill to repeal the European Economic Act of 1972. (It would also be necessary to establish in our law that 'EU law' had been illegal and void from the outset.) He goes on to show how some historic precedents by other countries have been used to revoke similar 'legal' situations, by making these acts null and void within days instead of years of protracted arguments.

The result of this act would restore the supremacy of national law over EU law, and remove the EU Treaties and legislation from the body of our law.

This is a well laid out plan that shows clearly why 'Article 50' is a trap and not a route for a safe exit from the jaws of the EU.

Incorrect use of European Arrest Warrant?

What kind of country are we living in?

Following the controversial use of the European Arrest Warrant used for imprisoning the parents of Aysha King, Lord Stoddart of Swindon demanded to know "what kind of country we are living in when doctors report their patients' families to the police, if they disagree with the doctor's diagnosis".

Lord Stoddart said: "I am deeply concerned that a European Arrest Warrant has been issued against British citizens, leading to their being separated from their children and their mortally sick child, Aysha and incarcerated in a Spanish jail. By all accounts, these poor parents were

simply trying to get the best possible treatment for their son, which wasn't available in this country.

"I have always opposed the EU's European Arrest Warrant (EAW) but we were told they were for chasing after organised crime, people traffickers and terrorists etc, not the desperately worried parents of a very sick little boy, who, according to the NHS, has been diagnosed with a terminal illness.

"A very worrying precedent has been set here, which could lead to people being afraid to take their children to a hospital in case they disagree with the doctors and end up having half of Europe's police forces

hunting them down."

"We really do need to start asking what kind of country we are living in when we see the appalling way these deeply troubled parents have been treated. They are not common criminals and they shouldn't be treated as if they are."

Except for Lord Stoddart the slow response from our politicians to what was clearly an incorrect use of the EAW should be of concern to all, not only in the UK but throughout the EU.

The EAW is not the only control that has been put into place using the pretence that it is to protect the country against so-called terrorists.

A clear aim, a clear plan

Anthony Scholefield

What is the present political situation concerning the United Kingdom's future relationship with the EU?

The Conservatives have promised that, if they have an absolute majority in 2015, they will renegotiate the basis of British membership in certain, as yet unspecified, areas but possibly including restrictions on free movement of people, benefit seeking, reining back the powers of the EU Court, and regulatory reform.

They have promised that they will hold an in-out referendum by the end of 2017, although this means there is not enough time for a Convention and an Intergovernmental Conference to assent to Treaty changes followed by the ratification processes in the member states.

Therefore, the constricted timetable, and the limited nature of the changes being sought, are unlikely to be effective in securing the electorate's approval of what will be seen to be limited and half-baked. The Conservatives' position is thus very weak, but its promise to negotiate and then have a referendum has been politically effective in delaying any decisions. Clearly the electorate sees a renegotiation, whatever the outcome, as a necessary precursor to a referendum.

Should the Conservatives win the election there will, therefore, be two alternative scenarios. Either the renegotiations will fail and the government fails to achieve its objectives or there will be agreement to some weak reforms which will not have gone through the full EU negotiating process and by the end of 2017 will be provisional.

It seems highly unlikely that even in the event of a failure in the negotiations, the present Cameron leadership would advocate exit from the EU and more likely that minor concessions will be put forward as satisfactory.

Meanwhile the Labour Party's

position is not to have a referendum unless there is a new Treaty and the EU timetable means that this would take at least three years if it takes place at all. Labour regards the EU as a distraction and would not want its administration to be overshadowed by the EU issue and a referendum. This puts it also into a weak position vis-à-vis the EU.

What about the withdrawalists? At present they point to all the problems connected with EU membership and advocate leaving the EU, and will continue to do so. However, should there be a referendum it will be absolutely necessary for the withdrawalists to outline in some considerable detail exactly what their proposal for a post-EU situation would be. The weakness of the Alex Salmond approach of simply making assertions but without detailed plans has been ruthlessly exposed in the Scottish referendum campaign.

It is not possible to campaign on the assertion that 'it will be alright on the night'. That is why withdrawalist opinion is hardening behind the Norway Option, that is, to explain to the electorate that the Single Market and EU membership are two different things. It is possible to be in the Single Market and outside the EU if Britain became a member of EFTA and the EEA. This is an existing and tested, up and working solution, ready on the shelf. There are certain problems with the EEA but these are grossly exaggerated by the Europhiles. Both Robert Oulds of the Bruges Group and Richard North of the EU referendum campaign have done magnificent work in this area in showing the real nature of the EEA.

As Dominic Cummings' report for Business for Britain remarked after focus group research: *"The Out Campaign has one essential task, to neutralise the fear that leaving may be bad for jobs and living standards"* and, further: *"If those who want to leave the EU neutralise the economic arguments, then the people will vote to*

leave as there is nothing else to support membership."

Leaving the EU but remaining in the Single Market will remove the economic arguments and also any opportunity for the big business lobby to intervene. After all, economic life will continue as before.

In the past, withdrawalists have allowed themselves to get bogged down in a lot of economic arguments with europhiles as to whether this or that EU activity was beneficial or not, and whether this or that future trade relationship was beneficial or not.

In other words, instead of a tightly focussed attack on the real objective the battlefield has been widened and hostile forces allowed to multiply.

Remaining in the Single Market drastically simplifies matters. Withdrawalists need to be very clear about their aim. **That aim is to leave the judicial and political structure of the EU.** The EEA membership would entail leaving the foreign policy of the EU, justice and home affairs, the EU Court and Commission, the CAP, the CFP, the Customs Union, regaining our seat at the WTO, massively reduced budget contributions, etc.

There is disagreement among withdrawalists about the desirable future nature of the trading relationship with the EU, which is about 40% of British export trade. While some withdrawalists may consider the EEA not the best solution, it achieves the aim and comes with all the benefits of leaving the judicial and political structures of the EU and **that is the aim**, not identifying the best trading relationship with the EU or others in the future. After all, all possible trading relationships have some drawbacks. It is a matter of degree.

So, the withdrawalists are moving to a clear aim and a clear plan.

This clarity will also undermine the two other prongs of Europhile attack in a referendum, that is other than playing on the economic fears of the electorate.

Continued on page 5

A clear aim, a clear plan

Continued from page 4

Reading and analysing the two leaflets put out in 1975, one by the YES side and one by the government, there were two other arguments they relied on and they are still relevant.

One whole page of the YES leaflet was devoted to ridiculing the divisions on the NO side. *“Ask them what positive way ahead they propose for Britain. You will get some very confusing answers.”* In the same way, attacking the plain weakness and incoherence of the YES campaign in Scotland, with all its shifting and different proposals for Scotland’s future currency, has paid dividends for the NO side.

A clear united aim and a clear united plan will kill this argument.

Message discipline is essential and we do not want to hear any more of the alleged benefits of fanciful trade arrangements with the USA or the Commonwealth.

The other argument, put at length in both leaflets, was direct quotations from Commonwealth leaders and prime ministers and indirect quotations from other leaders applauding Britain’s role in the then Common Market.

“The old Commonwealth wants us

to stay in. The new Commonwealth wants us to stay in.”

We have also seen how President Obama, Prime Minister Abbott, the Pope and even the Chinese President, have issued statements effectively opposing Scottish independence.

These are the political counterparts of the big business assertions on the economic side and they should not be taken lightly or scornfully. Presumably the 1975 politicians, and those who commented on Scotland recently, each thought that those statements would be effective.

However, one attraction of Britain leaving the EU political structure and being a member of the EEA and the Single Market is that this change is far less dramatic. Economic and investor relationships are simply not affected. It is doubtful if any of these leaders will want to get involved in pursuing the differences between EU membership and EEA membership when their own country’s economy is not affected. Any possible comment is also risky as ill-informed or incorrect comments on a complex legal and political situation would be personally damaging.

The tactic of bringing in interventions from respected outside

political leaders will, therefore, be much harder if Britain stays in the Single Market.

In a poll conducted by Survation for Robert Oulds of the Bruges Group in July 2013, 71% said they would prefer Britain to leave the EU and join EFTA/EEA.

Because of the status quo effect, any referendum for change needs a substantial lead going into the campaign.

The clear aim and clear plan provides it and will lead to victory.

It has one further advantage. With the government still likely to be in the hands of europhiles, it is a clear instruction of the electorate as to exactly what action to take - not an expression of wish which the Executive can implement in a way it wants - and narrows the possibility of a fudged implementation of the referendum result. This danger should not be under-estimated.

Needless to say, if withdrawalists can focus on the agreed clear aim and clear plan, this will exert great influence on opinion regardless of whether a referendum takes place, as voters react to a clear aim and a clear plan.

Acting like a ‘dictator’

According to Jean-Claude Juncker, the new head of the European Commission that a Commission without a strong female representation would “neither be legitimate nor credible”.

The UK is among a number of governments to have nominated a man for one of the top jobs in the EU’s executive body.

Responding to Jean-Claude Juncker’s public statement that the UK Government must nominate a woman for the European Commission, the independent Labour peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon has accused the European Commission President of acting like “a dictator” in telling an elected government what to do.

In his statement to an Austrian newspaper, Mr Juncker said “Unfortunately, and despite my repeated requests, most of the governments insist on sending male candidates. A Commission without a significant number of women is, in my view, neither legitimate nor credible. That is why I am continuing to insist with several heads of state and government that they send me a female candidate”. He made it quite clear that the UK risked losing a prominent post on the Commission, if it persisted with its nomination of Lord Hill of Oareford.

Lord Stoddart said: “This unelected President of the Commission is behaving like a dictator. He clearly

thinks it is appropriate for him to override the wishes of the democratically elected UK Government. His behaviour is unacceptable and the Prime Minister should not kowtow to this jumped up bureaucrat with delusions of grandeur. Unfortunately, Mr Juncker’s attitude is all too common among EU officialdom which, in general, has contempt for democracy. The EU is not an organisation to which this country should belong and its ever increasing dominance over our affairs is lamentable”.

It appears that Mr Juncker has not been in touch with No 10 directly to raise concerns about the gender of the UK’s male candidate, according to a No 10.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

An individuals viewpoint

Dear Sir,

Most *eurofacts* articles come from well known - highly educated and/or specialists in a given subject; so I felt that a view from an ordinary 'Joe Public' might not go amiss.

My personal view is that Parliament and associated bodies have been heavily infiltrated by people who do not have the best interests of this country at heart! I ask all who want to be ruled by the EU this question:-

"Would you pay your neighbour to tell you how to run your home and who you must allow to come into it? No, then why ask the EU and pay 53 million pounds a day to it?"

Have you noticed Conservative, Liberal and Labour leaders consistently refer to 'Britain' and they all use the term 'Democratic'?

Mr Cameron quite properly upheld the right of both the Falklands and Gibraltar to determine their own political future (Democratic stance). However, for this country he holds off with the promise of a referendum 'If' he wins the next election!

This is unnecessary anyway, as I will outline later! Meantime our other 'Democratic' leader Miliband states he will not allow it. So we will call ourselves a Sovereign Democracy whilst being ruled by a Federation of states headed by Germany.

Are we in the EU or even the "Common Market? I had always thought that for any politician to betray his country by giving of it to another would surely be treason. An article appeared in the *Daily Express* stating that Edward Heath had lied to Parliament. He later lied again in a televised speech indicating that it was simply a trading agreement then finally admitted that he had always known that a federation of Europe was the intention! How many of the governments of so-called EU member states have been infiltrated by 'Heath' equivalents.

In the Jeffrey Archer case where, when it was learned that Archer had lied to the court in the original trial, the case was made null and void and a prison sentence was imposed on Mr Archer. How much greater then the lies to Parliament, the nation and by television to the entire viewing world?

Recently I learned from a pamphlet "Britain Abolished", that a case of treason had been won against Mr Hurd and Francis Maude for their signing of the Maastricht treaty in a magistrates court, but the case had to go to a higher court. At this point the Attorney General in the Conservative government exercised his power to take over any private citizen's right to go to law, and having replaced Norris McWhirter, he failed to take it any further, thus ending the treason procedure. This apparently closed the matter.

However, again to my mind, if no appeal was lodged should not the decision of the lower court have stood?

Then I read that Peter Tapsell MP who was at that time "The father of the House" had voiced the opinion that Tony Blair should be "tried" for misleading Parliament! A polite way of saying he lied to the house.

Even if Mr Cameron could renegotiate any part of the terms of EU membership - He will not be 'Prime Minister' for ever - So as soon as he is no longer in office it could all be changed. Remember that no British government can hold a new government to everything that the previous government had agreed to. Furthermore, has anybody given the slightest thought to the position that if Germany, as Mr Haigh has said holds the strongest position in the EU - What happens if a new Hitler type dictator rules Germany - He or she has all Europe under his or her control and nobody able to protect the oppressed.

Has nobody noticed - Britain has been smoothly parted from its kith and kin in the old British Empire and that

.... far from being a united Europe the EU is an invasion of Europe without a shot being fired.

As that great old comedian Jimmy Edwards used to say "Wake up at the back there"!

HARRY G. ASHBEE
Suffolk

MPs pay

Dear Sir,

The Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority (Ipsa), the body overseeing their salaries and expenses have said that MPs should get a 9% pay rise next year, as planned.

Their chief executive Marcial Boo has said that MPs did an important job and should NOT be paid a "miserly amount".

Considering the MPs have been giving away their authority to decide on the major issues facing the UK to another institution namely the EU, then this decision is truly amazing.

MPs basic salary would increase from £67,000 to £74,000, not bad for a job which should be more accurately compared to loading shelves at a supermarket.

Last year the leaders of the main Westminster parties called the increase unacceptable. However, after a General Election the public outcry can be ignored and more likely than not they will quietly take the money.

Luckily as MPs always tell us that "we are all in this together", we can all expect a 9% increase or are we NOT all in this together? Maybe its only our EU contribution that will be increased?

The increase is said to be needed to bring MPs salary into line with others with similar jobs. Unfortunately these jobs they are compared to are probably already overpaid ones and more likely to be paid for by the public purse and not by the private sector. We can all find someone paid more than us for similar work but cannot claim a rise!
HEATHER RICHARDS
Manchester

MEETINGS

FRINGE MEETING LABOUR CONFERENCE

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
020 7388 2259

Monday **22nd September**, 5.45 pm
(immediately after the last Labour
Conference Session)

“Why Labour should now support an
EU referendum”

Kate Hoey MP
Kelvin Hopkins MP
Graham Stringer MP
Chairman, **Austin Mitchell MP**

FRINGE MEETING
The Palace Hotel, Corner of Oxford
Street and Whitworth Street,
Manchester M60 7HA
(Close to the Conference Centre)
Admission Free

Bruges Group
(In partnership with Bloomberg)
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **24th September**, 6.30 pm

*“The City of London in retreat: The
EU’s attack on Britain’s most
successful industry”*

Lars Seier Christensen, *CEO and
founder of Saxo Bank*
Professor Tim Congdon CBE, *A top
Economist and author*
Dr Gerard Lyons, *Chief Economic
Advisor to the Mayor of London*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Auditorium, Bloomberg
Headquarters, 50 Finsbury Square,
London EC2A 1HD

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **29th September**, 6.00 pm

*“Sleepwalkers: How Europe went to
war in 1914”*

Christopher Clark, *St Catharine’s
College, Cambridge*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London Wall,
London EC2
Admission Free

FRINGE MEETINGS CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Sunday **28th September**
until Tuesday **30th September**

The Freedom Zone

Three days of a collection of approx.
50 speakers from all backgrounds on
Britain and Europe and other freedoms.

FRINGE MEETING
The Birmingham Repertory Theatre
(Right next to the ICC), Birmingham
Admission Free (No Conference Pass)

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **29th September**, 1 - 3 pm

*“UKIP and the future of the
Conservative party”*

Speakers to be announced

FRINGE MEETING
Lyttelton Lecture Theatre, The
Birmingham and Midlands Institute,
Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **15th October**, 6.00 pm

*“Human Rights: Philosophy and
History”*

Professor Sir Geoffrey Nice QC

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

Labour Party **21st-24th September**
Conference, Manchester

UKIP Conference **25-27th September**
Conference, Doncaster Race Course

Conservative Party **28th Sept.-1st Oct.**
Conference ICC Birmingham

Lib-Dems Party **4th-8th October**
Conference, Glasgow

USEFUL WEB SITES

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.freebritain.org.uk

Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk

English Constitution Group
www.englishconstitutiongroup.org

EU Observer
www.euobserver.com

EU Truth
www.eutruith.org.uk

European Commission (London)
www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org

EU Referendum Campaign
www.eureferendumcampaign.com

Freedom Association
www.tfa.net

Futurus
www.futurus-thinktank.com

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

Labour for a Referendum
www.labourforareferendum.com

New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe
www.openeurope.org.uk

Sovereignty
www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch
www.statewatch.org

Team
www.teameurope.info

The People’s Pledge
www.peoplespledge.org

The Taxpayers’ Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

The Road to Freedom

by Gerard Batten MEP. **£8.99**
How to exit the EU and regain a proper future for an independent UK.

Germany's Fourth Reich

by Harry Beckhough. **£8.00**
Code-breaker and spy explains the real drive by Germany for control over Europe without war. Re-produced from his original 2008 pamphlet.

How much does the EU cost Britain?

by Tim Congdon. **£6.00**
This 2013 edition finds the costs of EU membership to be £165 billion or 11% of GDP.

A Pocket Book Of Freedom

by Christopher Gill. **£5.00**
The stupidity of abandoning fundamental aspects of our common law to the EU.

A Doomed Marriage: Britain and Europe

by Daniel Hannan. **£12.00**
Why the European dream that was meant to unite us, bring peace, prosperity, freedom and democracy, has failed.

Time for the UK to Face the Facts

by Christopher Hoskin. **£7.99**
An analysis of how and why the UK has lost its way by a lack of concern for the people whilst trying to appease the EU.

The Norway Option

Re-joining the EEA as an alternative to membership of the EU
by Dr Richard North. **£5.00**

Time To Say No:

Alternatives to EU Membership
by Ian Milne. **£8.00**
Ian examines the cost and implications of EU Membership and considers positive alternatives.

Sail On, O Ship of State

Edited by Johanna Möhring & Gwythian Prins. **£12.00**
A collection of writers including: Roger Scruton, Daniel Hannan, Frank Field and Tom Kremer, set out why the nation state should be preserved and cherished.

Everything You Wanted To Know About the EU

But Were Afraid To Ask
by Robert Oulds. **£9.99**
Oulds answers all the questions and outlines all the problems associated with EU membership.

Too 'nice' to be Tories?

How the Modernisers have damaged the Conservative Party
by Anthony Scholefield & Gerald Frost. **£10.00**
New edition- Why they forgot their true beliefs and drove away their core voters.

Spyhunter

by Michael Shrimpton. **£25.00**
A fascinating alternative view of history, including the EU, exposes the secret world of German intelligence.

From Ur to Us

Everything you need to know about History
by Hugh Williams. **£20.00**
A wonderful reference book for all those dates and facts you can never remember.

DVDs

The Norway Option

by Bruges Group. **£12.99**
Full analysis, run time 34 mins.

Voices for True Democracy

by Bruges Group. **£12.99**
Improving the governance of Britain
Run time 33 mins.

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 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.
01738 783936
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
Fishing Association 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 Camaron MP
English Democrats 01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)
Green Party 020 7272 4474
Natalie Bennett
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