

Is a referendum under David Cameron worth having?

Ken Worthy

A referendum on the United Kingdom's EU membership is the Conservatives' great promise to eurosceptics for the next election. No Conservative victory, no referendum. However, it is very clear that David Cameron's intention is to lead a campaign to stay in the EU, on the basis of whatever deal he is able to make with EU leaders. All the signs are that EU leaders will not agree to major changes. So, for eurosceptics, is a referendum under Cameron worth having? With the Prime Minister campaigning to stay in, is there any realistic chance of a vote to leave the EU? Will his renegotiation achieve worthwhile changes? If you want to leave the EU, is it worth voting Conservative?

What does Cameron Want from Renegotiation? - All the signs are that Cameron is not serious about real change in the EU. The aims he declared were limited and vague; he has thrown away his only strong weapon - a credible threat to leave if we don't get what we want; and he does not seem ready to use the most significant element of his case - the complete divergence between the interests of eurozone and non-eurozone countries.

Cameron's declared aims (set out in a *Telegraph* article in March 2014, and never since mentioned by him) sounded good but are vague. Conservative MEP Dan Hannan has pointed out that they carefully didn't

include anything that would require treaty change and ratification by national Parliaments. They did include abandoning "ever-closer union", the founding principle of the EU. How could EU leaders, who recently elected an extreme federalist as Head of the Commission, agree to anything so drastic?

The eurozone is the great divide across the EU. It needs more central control to defend the stricken euro. This is the last thing Britain and other non-euro countries want. Cameron ignores the strength of his position, and the interests of potential allies. EU leaders will not agree to the changes he wants, but they might (under extreme pressure) be prepared to define a different type of EU membership, rather than have a major country leave. The different memberships would have different rules. There is a precedent for this. The Single Market (the European Economic Area or EEA) includes both EU and EFTA countries. Effectively, the EU proposes rules for the EEA, and EFTA countries decide whether or not to accept them (after a bit of arm-twisting). Among the things that EFTA countries do not accept are the euro, the Common Agricultural Policy, the Common Fisheries Policy, the European Court and any other interference with their judicial systems. They can make trade agreements with the growth regions of the world, whereas we have surrendered that power to the EU.

Nevertheless the Single Market works for both EFTA and the EU. This model could also work within the EU, and would not put EU countries constantly at odds with one another on the direction of change. However it is not even under discussion.

EFTA in fact points the way for us. If EU leaders are too arrogant or too set in their ways to accept major change, we could achieve most of the greater freedom we want by leaving the EU and re-joining EFTA. With us, EFTA would be much stronger, and much more able to reject EU measures and EU arm-twisting.

A Bogus Referendum - Douglas Carswell identified the trigger point for his defection to the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP). It was hearing a Cameron aide let it slip that the game is to get just enough concessions from the EU to justify staying in. How would you measure success in aims like "less business regulation and more free trade agreements" or "less interference from the European Court of Human Rights"? None of them address the real problem, which is that the EU already controls most of what we do, and is moving towards more and more control, to protect the euro. EU law would continue to override British law, and we would not reclaim the right to make our own trade treaties. However, minor concessions could easily be presented as victory - a move in the

Continued on page 2

Is a referendum under David Cameron worth having?

Continued from page 1

right direction. Most people don't understand how the EU works, and don't really want to.

Will Cameron Succeed? - The crunch point will come towards the end of the renegotiation, as the referendum date approaches. As it becomes clear that the concessions gained add up to no real change in the relationship between Britain and the EU, how will senior Conservatives react? Some have said bluntly that if we don't get the deal we want we must leave. There are probably at least eight eurosceptics in the Cabinet. They will have support in

the party, partly depending, of course, on just how threatened MPs feel by the rise of UKIP.

Cameron doesn't want his premiership defined by a battle with the EU, but he does want to stay in office. He is not a conviction politician - driven by a need to get us out or keep us in. He may find himself with a choice of a big fight within the Party, or a big fight with the EU. Those ambitious for the leadership would see an opportunity to challenge him. Most party members and many Conservative voters want to leave. The EU is looking less and less like a promising future for

Britain, with the eurozone paralysed by austerity, high unemployment and little or no growth, all to protect the euro.

So the promised Conservative EU referendum does have something to offer eurosceptics. If Cameron will not take it seriously, others will. eurosceptic voters therefore have a dilemma. Do they vote UKIP, encouraging the election of UKIP MPs who will keep Tory minds concentrated, but risking a Miliband led Labour government? Or do they vote Conservative, so as not to lose the chance of an early Referendum? Hard to call, just like the election.

Talk is cheap

Asked by Lord Stoddart of Swindon: To ask Her Majesty's Government, further to the Written Answer by Baroness Anelay of St Johns on 16th December 2014, whether recent statements by the Prime Minister stating that during negotiations on European Union reform nothing can be ruled out mean that the United Kingdom could withdraw from the European Union if the Government's objectives cannot be met.

The Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Baroness Anelay of St Johns): I refer the Noble Lord to my answers of 20th November 2014, 4th December 2014 and 16th December 2014. The Government's position has not changed: the European Union must reform to become more competitive, democratically accountable and fair for those inside

and outside the Eurozone. I also refer the Noble Lord to the speech by the Prime Minister, my Right hon. Friend the Member for Witney (Mr Cameron), on the 28th November 2014; and the speech by the Deputy Prime Minister, my Right hon. Friend the Member for Sheffield, Hallam (Mr Clegg), on the 5th August 2014.

(Hansard 15th January 2015. European Union Question)

In response to the answer to his question Lord Stoddart of Swindon said: "the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Baroness Anelay of St Johns has once again failed to provide an answer on whether the Government will consider leaving the EU if it cannot obtain its objectives through negotiation". Her response has triggered scathing criticism from Lord Stoddart, in which

he has called into question David Cameron's strategy for re-negotiating Britain's EU membership."

Commenting further on the Government's response, Lord Stoddart said: "It is quite clear that the bashful Baroness is avoiding giving a proper answer to my questions on withdrawal from the EU and is not going to clarify what exactly the Prime Minister meant when he said that 'nothing can be ruled out' in negotiations with the EU. Simply giving me a copy of the PM's speech is not clarification of anything.

"I am forced to conclude that the Prime Minister's words on this were just so much propaganda - misleading and without any real substance. He obviously has no intention of withdrawing from the EU, if his negotiations fail, which disastrously weakens his negotiating stance. As the saying goes - 'talk is cheap'."

Migration to the UK rises

It has been revealed that the net migration to the UK rose to 298,000 according to the final set of quarterly figures for September 2014, just released.

The figure is calculated by taking away the number of people leaving the

country from the number coming in.

This figure has exposed how the promise made by David Cameron to get net immigration below 100,000 before this year's general election has failed badly. A further example of how easily promises made are often not

kept especially when EU membership allows open access for EU citizens.

Net migration is now higher than when the Conservatives/Lib-Dems came into power in 2010 when it was 252,000 the figure peaked in June 2005 when it reached 320,000

BOOK REVIEW

The deceit behind the UK's application to join the EU

Edward Spalton

Many books have covered the ideological origins of what is now the EU. This book describes the manoeuvres of the principal post war actors whose guile, determination and deceit contrived progressively to deprive our country of its constitution and liberty whilst pretending to engage in mere facilitation of trade ("The Common Market") and international co-operation. It is a thorough job, backed by detailed research with frequent facsimile documents from public archives.

From the early post war years, it traces the growth of the European Movement, saved from bankruptcy by substantial CIA funds and by American corporate money. Whilst the subjects will be familiar to most independence campaigners, the author's angle of approach is refreshingly different.

The first part (of 11 chapters) begins with the lie of "no essential loss of sovereignty" and covers the conversion of the civil service from its politically impartial role to an agency of "government against the people". The Foreign Office devoted much of its energy to promoting the foreign European project to the British people whilst using public money to frustrate and discredit those campaigners, who knew what was really at stake.

The EU: A Corporatist Racket by David Barnby

David Barnby Pbk185pp 2015

Available from
The June Press
Price £9.99 + 10% p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978-0-9569815-8-5

Drawing on official records, the author makes a strong case on the balance of probabilities that Britain's abandonment of the Black Arrow satellite launcher was part of the price of entry to the EEC, giving the French a monopoly in the European space programme. He also covers the subversion of the apparently innocent business of town twinning into a scripted process requiring participating towns to declare allegiance to the European project.

The second part (9 chapters) "European Integration, the broader picture 1948 -2014" begins with a review of the ACUE (American Committee for a United Europe – funded by corporate donations) and the European Movement. It includes an in-depth study of the 1975 referendum, how the process was skewed and was

certainly open to electoral manipulation. Whilst this is informed conjecture, similar complaints by those taking part in later Irish referendums should alert any independence campaigner. There is an extremely interesting piece on "85 Frampton Street", the media centre for Britain in Europe which the author visited in 2003 when a referendum on the euro currency was in the air. Campaigners should know of the scale of publicity machine available to our foes and its cosy existing relationship with the media. Bilderberg is covered in a matter-of-fact sort of way and the attempts within the Conservative party to discredit their eurosceptic MPs.

The end-piece, entitled "The Rats" makes some proposals to break the power of the supranational corporations in the supranational state but the author has not yet fully developed his ideas. Few who experienced the reality of nationalised industries would wish to revisit them.

This highly original account will be extremely useful both as a readable record and as a mine of verified quotations for anyone speaking or writing on our country's present state.

Edward Spalton, is the Secretary of the (CIB) Campaign for an Independent Britain.

More eastern European workers

The number of Romanians and Bulgarians working in the UK has risen by 15% (22,000 people) year-on-year according to the Office for National Statistics (ONS).

In the last 3 months of 2014 the number of people working in the UK from these countries alone was 172,000 people.

The number for the same period in

2013 was 150,000.

The advantage of EU membership allowed Bulgarians and Romanians the same rights to work in the UK from January 2014 as other EU citizens.

Disaster threat

The response was by EU Trade Commissioner Cecilia Malmstrom to a question asked about the

implications of the UK voting to leave the EU in a national referendum.

Asked whether it would be a

"disaster" if the UK voted to quit the EU, she replied "Yes. For us and for you".

The Scottish referendum

Anthony Scholefield

Regardless of the result, Scotland would not have become independent as a result of the 2014 referendum, so it was not a referendum on Independence. The Scottish people were being sold a false prospectus.

The fact is that the nature of the 2014 referendum was misunderstood. It was purely consultative; it was an 'expression of wish' not a referendum on any actual concrete, practical proposals for an independent Scotland, as there were none. There were, of course, plenty of aspirations.

This misreading by the political class of the nature of different referendums cropped up repeatedly during the euro referendum that never was around the year 2000. At that time Tony Blair seems to have thought a referendum vote in the UK would decide British entry to the euro regardless of the EU treaties, rates of entry, ERM membership, etc., etc. when agreement to entry required consent from other participants. Alex Salmond seems to have also thought that winning a referendum would be decisive. But a referendum is an instrument, it isn't an aim or a plan. The final terms and the consent of other parties, especially the UK government, was not in Salmond's control.

Indeed, the YES campaigners went to great lengths to keep the Scottish electorate from hearing contrary views or thinking about hard facts. One remembers the assault on Nigel Farage in Edinburgh. It was infantilising and patronising for the YES campaign to suggest that Scotland could break away from the rest of the UK without pain but would flourish in the EU.

Nor did the Westminster parties treat the electorate as adults. Unlike the Spanish government, which stated the truth, that the independence of any part of the country was a matter for the whole country, the Westminster parties refused to allow any electoral participation in the rest of the UK, nor

were English politicians encouraged to campaign in Scotland – apparently the logic was that the Scots would be 'upset'.

Types of Referendum Available - Referendums fall generally into three categories. First, there are those that ask for confirmation of decisions already taken and implemented by the Executive (confirmatory).

Among these would be classified the French referendums which confirmed the various governmental constitutions during the French Revolution – the changing regimes of the Directory, the Consulate and the Empire.

Hitler's referendums, which covered such matters as the merging of the Offices of Reich President and Reich Chancellor after the death of Hindenburg, approval for the reoccupation of the Rhineland and leaving the League of Nations, also fell into this category.

A second type of referendum is the enabling type. This is where the general proposition is put to the people with the details to be filled in by the executive at a later date. Classic cases of this type were the referendums in the 1990s in Scotland, Wales and London. In these cases, the details were on subordinate matters, not essentials.

The third type is the seeking of popular consent ("consent") to a fully worked, proposed law. A referendum of this type was conducted in Denmark in 1992, where the government sought approval of Denmark's consent to the Treaty of Maastricht after making available a million copies of the treaty. A similar referendum was held in Denmark in 2000 on whether or not Denmark should join the single currency. In this case most of the facts were in the public's hands. The treaty had been distributed, the rate at which Denmark would enter the euro and all the conditions were known and Denmark complied with the conditions for entry to the single currency,

including being in the ERM for over two years. There were defects in the actual question, but the basis for the question was reasonable.

The basis of the "consent" referendum is generally acceptable, provided the public receive balanced information and each 'side' has equal resources.

Some referendums have somewhat hybrid characteristics. The British referendum of 1975 fell partly in the "consent" category in that the Treaty of Rome was available to the electorate, though not distributed. Nevertheless the matter in question, membership of the Common Market, had already been decided by Parliament and enacted previously so that it also had many elements of the "confirmatory" type. What has been objectionable is the pretence that the consent obtained in 1975 applied to all the various subsequent amending treaties that have turned the Common Market into the EC and now the EU with far greater powers than those given consent to by the British people in 1975.

Unique Referendum - Once the types of referendums are classified, it is easy to see that the Scotland referendum of 2014 was unique. It was a classic referendum of the enabling type where the electorate gives approval to a general proposition with the details later filled in by the Executive. What was unique in Scotland was that the details were to be filled in by agreement between the Executive and a regional government.

Because of the necessity of negotiations, the Scotland referendum exhibited a further uniqueness, it could not be executed by a single Executive but fulfilment was dependent on the outcome of negotiation between two parties and, to some extent, outsiders such as the EU institutions.

This is the first part of an article by Futurus, January 2015 entitled "The Scotland Referendum and the Lessons For 2017."

Why the UK would be richer outside the EU

The article below is the summing up for the pro-group after a debate in London on the 23rd February, between the Federal Trust and Global Britain delivered by Richard Tice, Chairman of Global Britain Business Group

We should reflect on what is so great about the UK, and why it is so admired and respected around the world:

- * We are known for our sense of fair play and abiding by the rules.

- * We have one of most trusted and transparent legal systems in world.

- * We are a permanent member of NATO, UN Security Council, the G8 and leader of the Commonwealth.

- * London is the global financial services centre of expertise.

- * We are the 5th largest economy in world and forecast to be larger than Germany by 2030.

- * We have a hard working labour force with good industrial relations.

- * We also have safest, most transparent and most liquid freehold property market in the world in London.

- * Our education sector, with independent schools and universities being a major export of human knowledge.

- * We have one of most respected and best trained military forces.

- * The English language is the global language of business.

- * None of these fine attributes have any thing to do with EU.

Yet we still have important challenges that hold us back:

- * Too much regulation much of which is expensive and unnecessary.

- * No control over many laws imposed on us such as employment laws eg Working Time Directive.

- * Every household suffers some £500 per year on unnecessary import duties that we charge and send onto the EU.

- * Whilst we welcome good immigration, we have no control over quantity and quality of labour coming into the country.

- * We cannot negotiate our own Free Trade agreements with other countries around the world.

- * We cannot maximise our Commonwealth strengths.

- * All of these problems are thanks to our membership of the EU and none of them will be resolved by the much talked about reform negotiation which will be a fig leaf process.

The UK is full of promise and ambition, but has become an economic and political subsidiary to an undemocratic, unaccountable overlord. The EU is crippled by inward looking compromises, and bureaucracy. It is a single market in regulation and subsidies, but after 20 years it is still far from a single market in services which is the bulk of our exports to the EU.

Don't listen to the supposed experts, like the CBI, the FT, BBC, Goldman Sachs and numerous Lords and Knights of the realm – they all said we must join the euro or be left isolated and the City would move to Frankfurt. They were wrong then, they are wrong today, and they will still be wrong tomorrow.

When we leave the EU, contrary to what EU supporters will have you believe:

- * We will have more trading influence as we regain our own seats on global trade bodies such as the WTO, and numerous UN Trade bodies that operate above the EU in setting trade standards.

- * Our economy will grow faster as we become a beacon of global free trade, being the largest zero tariff nation in the world.

- * We will save over £10 billions per year of our net contribution to the EU and tens of billions more saved from unnecessary costs through regulation.

- * We will thus create more, better jobs.

- * We will have better access to global markets by negotiating our own free trade agreements, whilst retaining full access to the EU market who will still be very keen to sell their goods to us, since they export twice as much to us than we export to the EU.

- * The City will prosper even more as an offshore haven of global excellence in financial services – more banks and financial services firms from around the world will set up in the City to take advantage.

- * We will secure more Foreign Direct Investment: an EY report 2013 of 2,000 multinational companies shows 72 % of US companies and 66% of Asian companies think UK will be more attractive for FDI when Britain leaves the EU, not less attractive.

- * We will regain control over ourselves as a sovereign nation, able to determine our own laws.

- * Let's not remain handcuffed to the EU container ship spluttering slowly in reverse, when we can leave and become a fast, sleek, luxury cruiser accelerating forwards through the waves.

{We feel we should also mention that those in favour of the UK remaining in the EU implied that:

- * *Ever-closer Union was not part of the treaty just the pre-amble and therefore could be ignored.*

- * *Germany does better in world trade than the UK even though it is inside the EU.*

- * *Small players at risk in the wider world of blocks.*

- * *The euro will be good in time.*

- * *The potential for the UK to increase its trade with countries outside the EU was limited.*

- * *The UK would loose its influence.*

LETTERS

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

Time to capture the imagination!

Dear Sir,

Your article "Winning the referendum" makes a powerful case, but a flaw in the broader campaign to restrict the EU to trade and good neighbours seems to me to be the absence of a positive message.

Let me explain what I mean. The EU debate is largely conducted as a contest between a vision of an EU going forward together toward some noble objective of integration and relevance in the world and "little Brits" wingeing at the constant erosion of sovereignty and the ever increasing burden.

The advantage of having a vision, a sense of purpose and direction is that it has an ability to capture the imagination in a manner that a curmudgeonly "no" has not. Ergo, the anti EU space badly needs a vision of its own, to provide a picture of where Britain can and should be going as a Sovereign State. The lead player in the debate is the one who does have a vision; the opposition are mere snipers at the grand idea.

If the UK has a Sovereign Vision, then this can be sold to the public in a very positive way, by creating a story and an image of something more desirable, something better, something emotionally uplifting, something to aspire to. Not just something to object to, though that has its place as well. Look where the SNP now finds itself.

What might such a vision look like? I make some suggestions below:

1. The sovereign nation state is the legitimate entity for all governmental activity and Britain aspires to be such an entity. (Rather than a sub component of a federal EU.)

2. Britain's place in the world is to be a dynamic, thrusting wealth creating entity with a rising GDP per head generating personal wealth for all, and thus able to meet the welfare aspirations of the nation and to impact upon the world. That is, a giant

Singapore. (Rather than a dependant of a sclerotic EU whose principal energies are inward looking.)

3. A nation who trades with the world, finds opportunities wherever they may be and who engages with other entities (including the EU) from a position of economic strength as and when it is to Britain's advantage to do so. (Rather than being heavily dependent on inter EU trade, which whilst a valid market is slow or non growing and anyway only one market of many).

The essence though is that we need a vision to capture the imagination. Sadly, I see non from the politicians. Can you provide it?

TIM WADE
Wiltshire

Leaving the EU

Dear Sir,

I'm delighted Ken Worthy (*eurofacts* letters 14th February - Article 50 question) acknowledges that while we both want to leave the political EU we will need, for the time being, to stay in the Single Market. This is often called the 'Norway Option' and would see us joining EFTA to remain in the EEA. This alone will shoot the Establishment's use of Fear, Uncertainty and Doubt (FUD) and their repeated lie that 3 million jobs are at risk if we negotiate our departure from all aspects of our political union with the EU.

So our only disagreement now is whether we invoke Article 50 or Repeal the ECA 1972 to start the process of leaving. The case for Article 50 is that it is legally recognised in the Lisbon Treaty and gives us an official frame for the two years made available to negotiate our exit. After 42 years of EU membership and integration we will need every bit of those two years in order to negotiate our exit. Many aspects, as explained in Richard's North's Flexcit document, will take

considerably longer to settle.

On the other hand Ken Worthy wants to gamble with the 'wild card option' of repealing the ECA 1972 which offers no structure, frame work or timetable for the complex negotiations necessary to leave.

In the real world of International politics following treaty obligations is the only plausible route to go.

NIALL WARRY
Somerset

[This debate over Article 50 or repealing the 1972 European Communities Act has been aired thoroughly in the letters section of eurofacts and we will not be returning to this debate unless the situation changes. - Ed.]

The future of Greece

Dear Sir,

Having followed the recent events regarding the Greek bail-out it has become quite clear that the survival of the euro is all that matters.

The eurozone countries and their pay-master Germany are determined that the euro is more important than democracy and any considerations of the effect it may have on the lives of the citizens of any EU member state.

The Greek people we are assured wish to stay in the euro but can they afford it?

The answer is simple, "No" however, the EU will continue to prop up Greece because it is afraid of what would happen if one country left the euro and in doing so managed to improve its economic future. Such a result could lead to other members deciding that if it worked for Greece then it would definitely work for them.

Germany would then lose its financial control over the EU which could escalate into the break-up of the EU itself. Is this the real reason why the euro has become sacrosanct?

RICHARD ELLIOTT
Norfolk

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **17th March**, 6.00 pm

“Politics and the First World War”

This lecture explores the reasons for the radical political changes that made the First World War the seminal catastrophe of twentieth-century Europe.

Sir Richard Evans FBSA, *Emeritus Professor of Rhetoric; Provost of Gresham College*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **26th March**, 6.00 pm

“The Science of Monetary Policy”

Jagjit Chadha, *Gresham Professor of Commerce*

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain
0116 2874 622

Saturday **11th April**

AGM 11.30

Public Meeting 2.15 pm

“Stronger together - Looking forward”

Petrina Holdsworth, *Chairman of CIB*

John Mills, *Secretary of the Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign*

Robert Oulds, *The Bruges Group*

Simon Richards, *The Freedom Association*

Edward Spalton, *Secretary of CIB*

PUBLIC MEETING

Upper Hall of the Emmanuel Centre, 9-23 Marsham Street, Westminster, London SW1P 3DW

Admission Free

UK Independence Party (Southport Branch)
01704 531012

Tuesday **14th April**, 7.30 pm

Terry Durrance, *PPC for UKIP*
Neil Hamilton
Paul Nuttall, *Deputy Leader of UKIP*

OPEN MEETING

Royal Clifton Hotel, Promenade, Southport PR8 1RB

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **21st April**, 6.00 pm

“Six General Elections: 2010”

Vernon Bogdanor, *Visiting Professor, Political History*

PUBLIC MEETING

Museum of London, London Wall, London EC2

Admission Free

FREE Advertising Space

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

Contact Details

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: eurofacts@juneypress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

2015

UK Budget Day **18th March**

UK General Election **7th May**

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

2016

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

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

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.juneypress.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 EU: A Corporatist Racket

by David Barnby. **£9.99**

How the EU was created by global corporatism, he includes details about Edward Heath's real involvement.

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.

A Dinosaur's Guide to Libertarianism

by Godfrey Bloom. **£9.99**

Why we are governed in a hopelessly inefficient corrupt and incompetent way.

How much does the EU cost Britain?

by Tim Congdon. **£6.00**

Congdon finds the annual direct cost of EU membership to be £13 billion or 1% of GDP is just the tip of the iceberg.

The City of London in retreat

by Tim Congdon. **£5.00**

Why the UK's most successful industry, the city is under attack from the Lisbon Treaty and the EU's regulations.

The Democratic Imperative

by Robert Corfe. **£12.99**

The reality of power relations in the nation state and why democracy is only possible in a nation state.

A Pocket Book Of Freedom

by Christopher Gill. **£5.00**

The stupidity of abandoning fundamental aspects of our common law to the EU.

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 trying to appease the EU.

Zero Plus:

The Principles of EU Renegotiation

by Martin Howe QC. **£5.00**

Why Britain must be in a position to withdraw if its priorities are not met.

The Norway Option

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

Why EEA and EFTA are available.

Everything You Wanted To Know About the EU But Were Afraid To Ask

by Robert Oulds. **£9.99**

All the questions answered and the problems of 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.

The 'Dispossessed', the 'Never Possessed' and the 'Bastards'

by Luke Stanley. **£5.00**

This book shows the reasons why some MPs rebelled and others did not about the EU and points a way to the future.

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