

A new relationship for the UK with the EU: a British option

Ruth Lea

What should Britain's response be to the changing global economy?

In 1980 the EU28's share of world GDP was over 30% of world GDP (Purchasing Power Parity terms), which had fallen to 24% by 2000 and was just over 17% in 2014. By 2020 the IMF expects the EU28 to be around 15.5% of global GDP, a tad larger than the US (15%), but smaller than NAFTA (over 18%), the Commonwealth (18.5%) and China (nearly 19%).¹ Further out, the secular decline in the EU's share of world GDP can only continue, reflecting mature and stagnant markets and adverse demographics in key EU economies. Growth markets overwhelmingly will be located outside the EU.

The UK needs a new, looser relationship with the EU, which gives the UK freedom to fully benefit from the changing global economy. The UK needs to be better positioned to maximise growth potential and prosperity.

Firstly, Britain should be able to repeal and/or amend business regulations, including social and employment regulation, currently imposed by the EU in order to improve its international competitiveness.² Fortune favours the flexible.

Secondly, Britain should be able to negotiate its own trade deals with favoured trade partners. Membership of the EU's Customs Union currently precludes this.

And, thirdly, Britain should be able to adopt a non-discriminatory immigration policy, treating EU and non-EU citizens on an equal footing.

PM David Cameron has promised an in-out referendum on British membership by end-2017 following negotiations with our EU partners.³ I support these negotiations. But if the negotiations fail to deliver any substantive reforms, there is nothing to fear from leaving the EU ("Brexit"). On the contrary, if we achieved self-determination vis-à-vis business regulations, trade agreements and migration policy, as specified above, there is much to gain.

If there were a "Brexit", the key question then becomes what would be a desirable "British option".⁴

British option: the WTO option as default position - There are four main points to note relating to the WTO (World Trade Organisation) option. The first point is that it would be the default option for the UK if "Brexit", assuming no specific trade treaties. The UK would resume the full rights and responsibilities in all matters covered by the WTO Agreements including tariffs and other trade related matters. We would, of course, have to adhere to the WTO rules and trade internationally on non-discriminatory terms.

Secondly, Britain's goods exports with the EU would face the EU's Common External Tariff (CET), unless

there was some free trade deal with the EU. According to the House of Commons Library, however, the average weighted tariff is currently about 1%.⁵ And there are, of course, no tariffs on services (about 40% of UK exports of goods and services exports were services in 2013). But tariffs would probably be an issue for the car industry, for example, where the CET is nearly 10%.

Thirdly, trade under the WTO rules, without the benefits of preferential trade deals, is not unusual. According to trade expert Professor Richard Baldwin, quoting Carpenter and Lendle, "64% of world trade is covered by a Regional Trade Agreement (RTA) and 29.8% of world trade is subject to preference margins, with only 3.9% enjoying margins over 10 percentage points".⁶⁻⁷ A third of trade is, therefore, not covered by an RTA and a handsome majority of trade (70%) is not subject to preference margins.⁸ And as tariffs have fallen generally, the usefulness of RTAs in reducing tariffs has diminished accordingly.

By way of digression, it is worth noting the variety of Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs).⁹ They include:

Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) for goods, where there is no internal tariff, but nationally-decided external tariffs.

Customs Unions, for goods, where there is no internal tariff, but a Common External Tariff (CET) is

Continued on page 2

A British option

Continued from page 1

applied. In an FTA the members, therefore, retain the right to decide their own tariffs against third countries whilst in a Customs Union they do not.

Preferential Trade Agreements (PTAs) or Partial Scope Agreements (PSAs). These are trade pacts between countries that reduce tariffs for certain products. While tariffs are not necessarily eliminated, they are lower than countries not party to the agreement.

Economic Integration Agreement (EIA) is any agreement, including a basic PTA, which also covers services.

Fourthly, much is made of the benefits to trade of being inside the EU's Customs Union and Single Market. But the explosive growth of, for example, Sino-UK trade over the past decade suggests that economic factors, including buoyant, growing markets, are far more significant than membership of the EU. Taking the decade 2003-2013, UK's exports of goods and services to China rose by 398% (nearly 5-fold), whilst increasing by only 47% to the EU and 74% globally. The equivalent import data show UK imports of goods and services from China rose by 280% (nearly 4-fold), but increased by only 52% from the EU and by 69% globally.¹⁰⁻¹¹

In conclusion, trade under the WTO rules can flourish, providing the economic conditions are right. And let us note that China does not pay for "access" to the Single Market. Neither does China have to comply with the myriad of social/employment regulations imposed on the UK as a member of the EU. China does, of course, have to comply with the EU's product regulations, though these tend to be harmonised internationally.

British option: the UK would be in an excellent position to negotiate FTAs - The WTO option would not, however, be the optimal position for Britain or, indeed, for Britain's main trading partners. Britain would, however, be in an excellent position to

negotiate FTAs if "Brexit". And we would have "negotiating clout". We are a large, prosperous market and run substantial trade deficits with many of our trading partners. The notion that we are "too small" to negotiate deals, and we need the EU's clout to negotiate deals, is frankly bizarre. Iceland has agreed a trade treaty with China.¹² Moreover, the UK would surely find it relatively straightforward to negotiate its own FTAs bilaterally compared with the EU28, where competing country interests and sensitivities can dilute, disrupt and delay the negotiations. In the current US-EU28 TTIP (the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership), for example, France has insisted the audiovisual sector be excluded, as a "cultural exception".¹³

There are three groups of countries with which the UK should seek to negotiate trade deals. The first group would be the EU itself. We would be in a very strong position to negotiate an FTA. The UK is a huge market for EU products and runs a huge trade deficit with the EU. No EU exporter would wish to see any diminution in, or disruption to, UK-EU trade. In 2014 Britain had a visible trade deficit with the EU of £77.0bn. More specifically the UK recorded goods deficits with Germany (£30.4bn), Belgium-Luxembourg (£8.9bn), the Netherlands (£8.8bn), Italy (£8.1bn), France (£6.1bn) and Spain (£4.4bn).¹⁴ Negotiating an FTA with the EU should not be so difficult. Templates abound. A trade deal for services should also be on the agenda.

The second group comprises the non-EU counterparties in current EU FTAs, including Korea, Chile or Mexico.¹⁵ And, thirdly, there are several key non-EU countries that are not in currently operating EU FTAs. These include key Commonwealth countries, where we should have a potential trading advantage, and the US.

British option: re-joining EFTA - Britain, a founder member in 1960, left

EFTA (European Free Trade Association) on joining the EEC in January 1973. If Britain were to leave the EU, there would be a good case for applying to re-join EFTA. There would be a bonus in re-joining EFTA because EFTA has negotiated an impressive network of FTAs with third countries.¹⁶ Conditional on the agreement of the third countries in question, Britain would then have preferential access to these markets as well as the EFTA markets.

British option: resumé - In conclusion, my preferred "British option" would be:

- * The WTO option, under WTO rules, as a very viable default position.
- * Britain should consider negotiating FTAs with the EU, non-EU countries in current EU FTAs and a much more extensive list of FTAs with other non-EU countries, including Commonwealth countries and the US.
- * Britain should consider applying to re-join EFTA.

References

1. *IMF*, "World Economic Outlook", database, April 2015. NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) comprises the US, Canada and Mexico.
2. *Business for Britain*, "Landmark EU poll finds British business leaders demand treaty change", November 2013, found that, by 46% to 37%, British business leaders said the costs of complying with the Single Market outweighed the benefits of being in the EU.
3. "Prime Minister David Cameron discussed the future of the European Union at Bloomberg", www.gov.uk, January 2013.
4. This note is based on a speech by the author to the ECR EU conference, "Alternatives to EU membership: what are the UK's options?", 18th February 2015.
5. *House of Commons Library*, "The economic impact of EU membership on the UK", SN/6730, September 2013.

Continued on page 3

A British option

Continued from page 2

6. *Richard Baldwin*, "Multi-lateralising 21st century regionalism", Global Forum on Trade (Reconciling Regionalism and Multilateralism in a Post-Bali World), February 2014, on OECD website. Baldwin wrote "...around half of world imports are covered by an RTA. However, only 16.7% of world trade is eligible for preferences. Moreover, the preference margins are low: less than 2% of world imports enjoy preferences over 10 percentage points. These numbers do not consider trade inside the largest RTA of all, the EU. Taking world totals to include intra-EU flows, Carpenter and Lendle (2010, reference below) calculate that 64% of world trade is covered by an RTA and 29.8% of world trade is subject to preference margins, with only 3.9% enjoying margins over 10 percentage points."

7. Carpenter, Theresa and Andreas Lendle, "How Preferential is World Trade?", Working paper 2010-32, Graduate Institute, Geneva.

8. Baldwin, "Multi-lateralising 21st century regionalism", Global Forum on Trade, February 2014, on OECD website. Baldwin explains "...the margin

of preference created by an RTA is the difference between the tariff applied to imports from RTA partners as opposed to non-RTA partners, i.e. the countries' most favoured nation (MFN) tariffs. Tariff reductions in advanced economies (driven by GATT Rounds) lowered MFN tariffs to quite low levels, with the result that margins of preference automatically fell. [And] ...developing countries' MFN tariffs have dropped more recently, although largely outside of GATT Rounds. This means that the scope for 20th century RTAs to create large tariff preferences is now greatly eroded."

9. *OECD*, "Regional Trade Agreements", OECD website.

10. *ONS*, "The Balance of Payments Yearbook, the Pink Book", 2014.

11. *IMF*, "World Economic Outlook", database, October 2014. IMF data show that China's total exports of goods grew by over 250% (2003-2013), whilst the Eurozone's grew by 44% and globally 65%.

12. *WTO website*, Regional Trade Agreements, comprehensive list.

13. *France 24*, "EU reaches deal on French 'cultural exception'", 15th June

2013.

14. *ONS*, "UK trade, February 2015", 9th April 2015. Trade with Belgium and the Netherlands is distorted by the "Rotterdam-Antwerp effect" reflecting UK exports routed through these ports for other destinations.

15. According to the ONS's "The Balance of Payments Yearbook, the Pink Book, 2014", in 2013 the UK had a visible trade surpluses of £1.8bn (Korea), £0.5bn (Chile) and £0.4bn (Mexico). *European Commission*, "Overview of FTA and other trade negotiations", updated March 2015.

WTO website, Regional Trade Agreements. Note that Swiss-EU trade is governed by an FTA (1972) and subsequent trade related bilateral agreements. Trade relations between the other three EFTA members and the EU are governed by the EEA Agreement. Neither of these agreements would be applicable to the UK if Brexit.

Ruth Lea, is Economic Adviser, *Arbuthnot Banking Group*, and *Chairman, Economists for Britain*, June 2015.

Car production outside EU

Ian Milne

Contrary to the car producers' impression that the UK outside the EU would not be the place to produce cars, the facts do not appear to fit this suggestion.

Volume car makers already have dozens of plants outside the EU.

On Brexit, why would they leave the UK?

Toyota has plants in 21 countries that are not in the EU. On Brexit, that number would increase from 22 to 23.

In Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia, Sri Lanka, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, USA, Venezuela and Vietnam.

Renault-Nissan has plants in 12 countries that are not in the EU. On Brexit, that number would increase from 12 to 13.

In Algeria, Australia, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, India, Iran,

Morocco, Russia, South Korea and Turkey.

BMW has plants in 11 countries that are not in the EU. On Brexit, that number would increase from 11 to 12.

In Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, South Africa, Thailand, Russia and the USA.

Yet again we see that the threats about why we must be in the EU do not bear close scrutiny!

EU funds misspent!

The EU's anti-fraud agency Olaf has announced that it tried to recover 901m euros (£654m) of misspent EU budget funds last year, including 198m euros (£144m) that went to a

mismanaged Spanish port.

Furthermore, another 49m euros (£36m) earmarked by the EU for the port expansion at EL Musel, near Gijon in northern Spain, should not be paid

according to olaf.

EU member states managed to recover 206.5m euros (£150m) in 2014 acting on advice from Olaf, from a budget of 142.7bn euros (£104bn).

Patriotism is not enough

Edward Spalton

In the centenary year of her execution, independence campaigners would do well to recall the words of Edith Cavell. Thanks to UKIP, the controversy over our membership of the EU has moved from being a cherished hope amongst a small, slighted minority to the realm of political possibility. It will not go away.

In the wilderness years, one motivation for burning anger was the sly adroitness with which politicians of the main parties concealed the profound injury to our constitution, caused by their subservience to the alien authority of the EU. Ministers who, as Privy Counsellors, had assented to the oath "...You will to your utmost bear faith and allegiance to the Queen's Majesty and will assist and defend all civil and temporal jurisdictions ...granted to Her Majesty and annexed to the Crown....against all foreign princes, persons, prelates, states or potentates..." brazenly made the Queen and all of us into mere subjects of the EU. A soldier takes an oath of similar import, to be kept at the risk of his life and with the prospect of severe punishment if he should break it. Yet he is sent into battle by a minister who faces no penalty for dereliction of this most basic duty at the very heart of the state.

The sheer maleficence and treachery of British Europhile ministers - "Europe at the heart of Britain" rather than "Britain at the heart of Europe" - was a strong motive for many to keep going. Yet it found little resonance with the wider public. Much of the heated debate within the independence movement was conditioned by such righteous wrath and took very little account of opinion amongst the vast majority of our fellow countrymen and women or of our country's realistic role and opportunities in the wider world.

Only two years ago, Nigel Farage ventured the opinion that his ideal free trade agreement was "a blank sheet of paper". It may have gone down well

with his audience but it showed a John Bullish disregard of the way in which trade, not just with the EU but with the wider world, is now regulated. In that world Britain must make its living. Belatedly, UKIP and the wider independence movement is beginning to realise that it must have a credible strategy to deal with that world, if it is to win a majority for independence. Mere slogans and pent-up rage against our political class are of no use but rather a hindrance .

The world has changed enormously since 1972 and nowhere more so than in our schools. The Campaign for an Independent Britain has just published a booklet on the recently revised national curriculum for history, entitled "Generations Betrayed - Cutting the Roots of our National Identity" It is written by Christopher McGovern, a head teacher of thirty five years' experience, and explains how the teaching of our national story has been sapped and subverted by political correctness. This method of teaching, sometimes called "history lite" has been increasingly influential over the last forty years.

Schools and teachers will vary but frustrated defenders of our former happy constitution will find here one source of explanation for their lack of success. Without requiring that landmark events and personalities of our history be taught, those who hear them have no frame of reference.

In England, though not so much in Scotland or Ireland, many share Henry Ford's view that "History is bunk", summed up in the demotic by that West Country folk group, The Wurzels - "

*Never been to school,
Never been to college,
Sooner be dead than fill me 'ead,
With a load of useless knowledge.
Never couldn't see
No use in history,
'cos I weren't there,
So I don't care.
So don't tell I, tell 'ee!"*

With such a leaden, dispiriting, official framework and method of instruction, it is an opinion which is easy to understand. All credit to those teachers who manage to maintain a lively enthusiasm and interest in spite of the way they are told to work.

Against this background, independence campaigners have to produce a narrative which is true, lively, forward-looking and attractive. This requires a great deal of that most difficult effort, actually thinking outside our well-trodden paths of thought - not disregarding our knowledge but realising that it now mostly serves a niche market of opinion which shrinks with the years.

We actually have to get to grips with the way countries become independent in the real world and some of what happens is quite counter-intuitive. One of the first things which newly independent Ireland did was to repatriate nearly all of the laws which had been enacted in Westminster during the 120 years when Ireland was part of the United Kingdom. This was absolutely necessary for the continuation of orderly government and trade - county councils, district councils, criminal law, civil law, weights and measures, protection of public health and so on. Although they had a new flag and the post boxes had been painted green, the laws governing newly independent Ireland were overwhelmingly those which had come from England - but now able to be repealed or amended over time by their own parliament.

Something similar will need to happen when we leave the EU.

Taking just one example: if we simply repeal the European Communities Act 1972, we will have no laws protecting food hygiene. They come from EU Regulations which will no longer apply. Not only would this be an enormous public health hazard here but it would mean that none of our considerable food exports to the EU

Continued on page 5

Patriotism is not enough

Continued from page 4

could clear customs until they had been detained and found wholesome by detailed testing.

We often think of regulation as being a pain in the neck but we need it to keep us from food poisoning and it often promotes real convenience and practical freedom. Your mobile phone still works when you cross borders in

most parts of the world – but only because of very detailed regulation. Similarly, if you need a new battery on your travels, you can buy one that will fit. That did not happen by chance but because of regulation on a global scale. For twenty years now, the EU has been legally bound to accept global standards. Britain needs to be represented on the global bodies which make the rules – and where we can

have a veto. The EU keeps us off those top tables. So we must raise our sights confidently to wider horizons, persuading the majority to do the same.

A copy of “Generations Betrayed” is available from *The June Press* Price £2.00 (see back cover).

Edward Spalton is Secretary of The Campaign for an Independent Britain.

CBI anti-democratic

The independent Labour peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon has strongly criticised Mike Rake the President of the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) for his speech calling for the UK to remain in the EU, accusing the CBI of ignoring the General Election result and pursuing “corporatist and anti-democratic” policies.

Lord Stoddart said: “I find it deeply worrying that the President of the CBI has learned nothing from the recent General Election results in which political parties with EU-sceptic credentials were overwhelmingly successful in comparison to those parties who still believe in EU

membership; both in number of votes polled and in percentage terms. In other words, the CBI wants to ignore the democratically expressed will of the people in pursuing its corporatist objectives.

“Sending lobbyists to Brussels rather than every capital in Europe might suit the big businesses represented by the CBI but SMEs, the lifeblood of our economy, are hugely disadvantaged. We are seeing the results of this in the introduction of the EU’s heavy-handed new regulations that have forced small businesses which sell products online to register for VAT, even if they are well below

the national threshold for VAT. Many have simply abandoned online sales as a result.

“If the CBI wishes to continue to pursue its corporatist and anti-democratic policy on this issue, it needs to make clear precisely what the benefits are of staying in the EU and its approach to the problem that staying in the EU inevitably creates i.e. ever greater integration and much more red tape, which our country cannot afford. We would all do well to remember that the CBI was one of the siren voices that led the campaign to scrap the pound and join the eurozone. What a mess that would have landed us in!”

Lies and fear tactics

Following his remarks above about the CBI president, Lord Stoddart asks that we don’t be influenced by the “lies and fear” tactics used in 1975 that are now being used again!

Lord Stoddart has commemorated the 40th anniversary of the original referendum on British membership of the Common Market with some strongly worded comments on the tactics used in 1975 and suggested that similar tactics are already being used to frighten voters in the forthcoming referendum.

Lord Stoddart, who has campaigned against membership of the Common Market/EU since the 1960s, said: “It is forty years since the original referendum on Common Market membership but the memories are still

fresh. The British people were coerced into remaining in what was, in truth, a budding new country called ‘Europe’. Lies and fear were the weapons used 40 years ago and we should not be fooled again. We were even told in a Government leaflet that the threat of a single currency had been removed! Never in the history of British politics have so many lies been told for so little purpose.

“The very same sort of siren voices we listened to then are, even now, already at work attempting to frighten voters into thinking that Britain would be badly damaged by leaving. The truth is that we would thrive outside of the backward, corporatist and failing organisation that is now called the European Union. It is the only

Continent suffering from a continuous decline in trade.

“We need to free ourselves from its suffocating red tape, regain control of our own borders and take back the right to negotiate our own trade agreements across the world and in the process save ourselves £20 billion gross (£13.5 billion net), per annum. This would leave us free to invest in the NHS, British agriculture and many other things this country badly needs.

“In the interests of reclaiming our democracy and to ensure a decent economic future for our children and grandchildren, we must throw off the yoke of Brussels and vote to leave the EU in the next referendum. To do anything else is to wave the white flag and surrender our country.”

LETTERS

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

Who should vote?

Dear Sir,

When it comes to a vote on Britain's membership who votes matters!

Presently 1 in 10 of the current electorate were born outside the UK. In London 4 out of 10 voters are of ethnic origin.

The current school system is geared to producing young adults who have little knowledge of British history and are therefore, more likely to be in favour of EU membership.

Next there is the large number of EU immigrants that would for personal reasons insist on EU membership.

Considering all these problems and the fact that the question being asked will require a "No vote" from those who wish to leave the EU. While those who wish to stay in will have the "Yes vote" implying a positive future, the chances of Britain leaving will be greatly reduced.

ROLAND GREEN
Birmingham

Who decides?

Dear Sir,

Now the election's out of the way the EU Referendum is now the big issue. Boris Johnson is reported as saying that if David Cameron (my MP) fails to secure the EU reforms *he desires* then Britain should be unafraid to leave the Union.

That, on the face of it, is encouraging comment, but who is to decide what reforms are to be demanded? Not the Prime Minister, nor the Conservatives, in my opinion. With less than 25% of the electorate voting for the governing party, what mandate does the Party, or Cameron, have to negotiate the powers given or removed to/from our non-accountable rulers (Brussels). Make no mistake about it there will never be another referendum on the issue, so it has to be the people who decide the reforms *they* want.

Besides, the powers that Brussels are to have over us is a constitutional issue, and in the words of the celebrated 18th century political philosopher, Thomas Paine, "Government has no right to make itself a party in any debate respecting the principles or modes of forming, or of changing, constitutions".

In order to sound out the people properly on this vital issue, the Government should set up people's forums in each constituency where non politician delegates come together to decide on the reforms. This can be repeated at higher levels and the end result put to Brussels.

Of course some would say we don't need a referendum to leave, after all we didn't need one to go in in 1972, in spite of the demand for one.

DAVID BARNBY
Oxford

Cameron speaks!

Dear Sir,

We now hear that David Cameron is yet again playing games with the electorate.

When asking for votes at the General Election he made a lot about offering an EU referendum, but once in office - just like the Lisbon Treaty promise - he is now altering the criteria!

Cameron has now implied that ministers must support whatever position the conservative party take about EU membership, in other words his already stated position as staying in and voting for an "IN" vote. However, it gets worse, he now wishes to use the civil service to also support his objective, we should not be surprised if after his minor "EU-renegotiation" he threatens to use the government whips on the rest of the party members.

What has been made plain to the electorate is that when it comes to the EU and the democratic process the conservatives cannot be trusted.

Meanwhile, former conservative

Chancellor Lord Lawson has said Cameron is unlikely to achieve anything of significance as he seeks to renegotiate the UK's EU membership.

We must also remember that when Tony Blair gave up part of the UK's rebate won by Mrs Thatcher it was on the understanding that discussions on reform of the the CAP would be part of the EU deal, result nothing changed but the UK taxpayers' paid the EU more money.

DAVID SAUNDERS
Oxford

Blair still a threat

Dear Sir,

The news that the former Labour leader Tony Blair has resigned his position as Middle East peace envoy appears like good news but it has a sting in the tail. Blair now wants to form a club of former leaders, his stated intention, "I want to build a cadre of people. Why not come and help the president of this country or the prime minister of that country". From the trust me war loving Blair this must be a threat to stability across the world!

SUSAN DAVIES
Gloucestershire

Obama speaks!

Dear Sir,

The interference by the US president Barack Obama about the UK's EU membership shows how out of touch he is with reality. He is of the misguided opinion that the UK has influence over the decision making processes of the EU empire.

The UK does not have any significant influence over the EU, and as the EU grows any such influence diminishes. That is the true reality.

Outside the EU the UK has 100% influence of its decision making ability including its immigration policy, control of its law making and rulings.

MALCOLM BANKS
Bradford

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **25th June**, 6.00 pm

“Civil Litigation: Should the rules be simpler”

The Rt Hon Lord Justice Stephen Richards

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

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Saturday **5th September**,
9.00 am - 6.00 pm

Further details including full list of speakers to be announced

FREEDOM FESTIVAL NORTH
Best Western Plus, Cedar Court Hotel,
Harrogate
Admission Charge Delegates £95
(includes tea/coffee, bacon butties and 2-course lunch)

UK Independence Party
01626 831290

Starting in **September**

“A series of meetings about the UK’s in/out upcoming EU referendum”

Speakers and further details to be announced

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **22nd September**, 6.00 pm

“The National Health Service Crisis, 1951”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE FBA,
Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

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

The Freedom Association
01242 235333

Monday **26th October**, 6.30 pm

The McWhirter Memorial Lecture

Charles Moore

MEMORIAL LECTURE
Captain’s Lounge, HMS President,
London moored on Thames by
Blackfriar’s Bridge
Admission Details to be announced

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

During **November**

Further details and speakers to be announced

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-
Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James’s
Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission charge to be announced

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

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

UK Budget **8th July**

2016

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

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

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.campaignforanindependentbritain.org

Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk

English Constitution Group
www.englishconstitutiongroup.org

EU Observer
www.euobserver.com

EU Truth
www.eutruth.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.

Europe: In or Out?

by David Charter. **£8.99**

In short, concise chapters, the *Times* Berlin correspondent, explains the pros and cons of being part of the EU.

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.

Zero Plus:

The Principles of EU Renegotiation

by Martin Howe QC. **£8.00**

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

Generations Betrayed

Cutting the Roots of our National Identity.

by Chris McGovern. **£2.00**

A short booklet exposing how school education has been altered to remove parts of history and national identity.

Top 10 Reasons to Leave the EU

by John Petley. **£9.99**

A short explanation about the main issues clearly and succinctly spelled out. Furthermore, it details the benefits of regaining independence.

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 explained.

Too 'nice' to be Tories?

by Anthony Scholefield & Gerald Frost. **£10.00**

How the modernisers damaged the party and why they forgot their true beliefs and drove away many of their 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.

DVD - The Norway Option

by Bruges Group. **£12.99**

Full analysis, run time 34 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**

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 Cameron 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