

UK exports less to the EU than the wider world

Extract of Global Britain Briefing Note No 108 dated 2nd November 2015.

According to the latest figures from the UK 2015 Pink Book the UK made a Gross Contribution to the EU of £19,994 million in 2014 (£55 million per day). It received back from EU Institutions £7,665 million (£21 million per day), therefore the UK's Net Contribution was £12,329 million (£34 million per day).

[If, the UK had retained that £12,329 million and assuming that in 2014 the average cost of employing a qualified nurse was £35,000 per annum, that same contribution could have paid for 352,257 new NHS nursing staff.]

UK Gross and Net Contributions to the EU began rising sharply from 2009 onwards as a result of the

abandonment by Mr Blair, then Prime Minister, on 17th December 2005, of part of the Fontainebleau Abatement:

2010 Gross £18.5 bn/Net £10.7 bn

2011 Gross £19.7 bn/Net £11.5 bn

2012 Gross £19.9 bn/Net £12.6 bn

2013 Gross £21.5 bn/Net £14.4 bn

2014 Gross £20 bn/Net £12.3 bn.

A Cumulative Gross Contribution of £99.6 bn from 2010 until 2014.

UK Exports (Goods, Services, Income, Transfers) 2010 to 2014 in £ bn

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Exports to EU-27	289	323	291	297	289
Exports to Rest of World	349	393	401	395	390
Exports to whole World	638	716	692	692	679
Proportion EU-27/World*	45%	45%	42%	43%	43%

* Not adjusted for the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect or the Netherlands Distortion.

From the table above in 2014, 57% (390/679) of British exports went to the world outside the EU. Furthermore, only 43% of British exports went to EU-27.

When adjusted for the Rotterdam-Antwerp and Netherlands factors, probably more like 60% and 38% respectively.

(Taking 60% as the real

proportion, this means that UK exports OUTSIDE the EU are already 50% higher [60 minus 40 divided by 40] than UK exports TO the EU).

UK Current Account Balance with EU-27 and Rest of World in £ bn

Year	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Cumulative 2010-2014
Balance UK/EU-27	(45)	(43)	(74)	(89)	(107)	(358)
Balance UK/Rest of World	+1	+16	+19	+11	+14	+61
Balance UK/Whole World	(44)	(27)	(55)	(78)	(93)	(297)

From the table above cumulatively, between 2010 and 2014, the UK trade surplus with the world outside the EU

was £61 bn. Over the same period, the UK deficit on trade with EU-27 was £358 bn.

Furthermore, the UK traded in deficit with twenty-seven EU partners in 2013. *Table 9.2, Pink Book 2015.*

The table on page 2 shows the extent of the UK structural surplus on its trade with the USA. In 2014 alone,

the UK surplus with the USA was £26 billion. With Germany, the UK has a structural deficit. The table also shows

that the UK has a structural surplus on its trade with Switzerland, Australia and South Korea. **Continued on page 2**

UK exports less to the EU than the wider world

Balances: Largest UK Surpluses and Deficits in 2014 in £ bn

Surpluses	USA	26
	Switzerland	10
	Australia	7
	South Korea	4
	Ireland	4
Deficits	Germany	38
	China and Hong Kong	17
	Norway	14
	Spain	14
	EU Institutions	14

UK Current Account by category in 2014 in £ bn

	Goods	Services	Income	Transfers	Total
Exports:-					
To EU-27	148	81	52	8	289
To Rest of World	147	139	92	11	390
Exports to World	295	220	144	19	679
Exports to the world by type as %	43%	32%	21%	3%	100%
Imports:-					
From EU-27	226	64	86	19	396
From Rest of World	193	67	92	25	376
Imports from World	419	131	178	44	772
Imports from World by type as %	54%	17%	23%	6%	100%
Balances:-					
With EU-27	(78)	17	34	(11)	(107)
With Rest of World	(46)	72	-	(14)	12
With World	(124)	89	(34)	(25)	(93)

Notes and Data Sources

The Pink Book 2015, 30th October 2015.

www.statistics.gov.uk>Economy>BalanceofPayments>ThePinkBook2015>PinkBook2015detailedGeographicalData.pdf, from which the statistical data summarised in this Briefing Note is extracted.

Payments to and from supra- & international organisations, and remittances by expatriates, which are included in “Transfers”, are not

strictly-speaking “Trade”, but a large proportion of them are trade-related. HM Government itself justifies UK payments to the EU on the grounds (unsupported by any evidence) that “the UK needs to be in the EU for trade”.

The data above is not adjusted for the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect or the separate Netherlands Distortion. [www.globalbritain.org] (See *Global Britain Briefing Note No 64, “The Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect and the Netherlands Distortion”* 7th January

2011). [www.globalbritain.co.uk]. The effect of these two statistical distortions is to significantly overstate (in *The Pink Book*) the value of UK exports to EU-27, and to significantly understate the value of UK exports OUTSIDE the EU.

In the tables, brackets mean “minus”. Due to rounding, columns and rows may not sum exactly.

BN108 : PinkBook : 2015 UK Exports OUTSIDE the EU already 50% greater than the UK exports to the EU.

Falling EU handicaps UK exports 2004 - 2014

Extract of Global Britain Briefing Note No 109 dated 2nd November 2015.

Table 1: Value of UK Worldwide Exports¹ in £bn

Year	Col.1: UK exports ¹ to EU	Index	Col.2. UK exports ¹ to RoW ²	Index	Col.3 UK exports ¹ to World	Index
2004	225		239		464	
2005	262		292		554	
2006	324		340		664	
2007	332		374		706	
2008	353	100	380	100	733	100
2009	275	78	320	84	595	81
2010	289	82	349	92	638	87
2011	323	92	393	103	716	98
2012	291	82	401	106	792	94
2013	297	84	395	104	692	94
2014	289	82	390	103	679	93

¹ Exports of Goods, Services, Income, Transfers

² “RoW” means “Rest of World”: i.e. the World outside the EU

Source: ONS “*PinkBook2015detailedGeographicalData.pdf*”: 31st October 2015

Pre-2008: Global “Good Times”

In the four years before the “Great Recession” of 2008, UK exports (of Goods, Services, Income and Transfers) to both the EU and the Rest of the World grew rapidly.

Exports to the “RoW” - to the Rest of the World outside the EU - (Col 2 in

Table 1) increased in value by 63% between 2004 and 2007, from £239 bn in 2004 to £374 bn in 2007. During the same period, exports to the EU itself (Col 1 in the Table) grew at a slower rate, by 48%. Exports to the World plus non-EU, (Col 3) grew by 52% (£464

bn to £706 bn).

In 2008 itself, UK exports still grew, both to the EU and RoW, but only slightly. That year, 2008, can be regarded as far as UK exports are concerned as the last year of the “good times”.

Post-2008: Recession in EU markets, revival in Rest of World

In the following year, 2009, the value of UK exports to both the EU and to the RoW declined compared with 2008.

But in 2010, only a year later, the growth in value of UK exports to the RoW (Col 2) resumed. From 2011 onwards, their value has exceeded that of 2008, the last year of the “good times”, peaking in 2012 at £401 bn, then declining to £390 bn in 2014.

In contrast, in 2014, the value of UK exports to the EU (Col 1) had still not recovered its 2008 level. In fact, the value of UK exports to the EU in 2014, of £289 bn, was slightly less in terms of value than almost a decade earlier, in 2005/2006. (The average of 2005 & 2006 export values to the EU was £293

bn.)

In 2014 the value of UK exports to the EU was 18% lower than in 2008.

In contrast, indexed on 2008, UK exports to RoW in 2014 were greater by 3%. Overall, UK worldwide exports in 2014 were still 7% in value below their 2008 level, due to the decline in demand for UK exports from the EU.

Consequently, in 2014, the value of UK exports worldwide (to both the EU and RoW) was still below its 2008 “Great Recession” level.

Based on the official ONS figures, the share of UK exports going to the EU as a proportion of UK exports to the whole world shrank from 48.5% in 2004 (£225 bn divided by £464 bn) to 42.6% in 2014 (£289 bn divided by

£679 bn).

In 2014, based on the official data reproduced in the table, 57% of UK worldwide exports went to the RoW. Such official data does not take into account the Rotterdam-Antwerp Effect or the Netherlands Distortion. These statistical distortions, are recognised by the ONS and its sister bodies overseas.

Source - *The Pink Book 2015*, 30th October 2015.

www.statistics.gov.uk>Economy>BalanceofPayments>ThePinkBook2015>PinkBook2015detailedGeographicalData.pdf, from which the statistical data summarised in this Briefing Note is extracted. See: www.globalbritain.co.uk

The Referendum Bill

Extract of the House of Lords debate on the European Union Referendum Bill

Lord Forsyth of Drumlean: I know that the Liberals find it easy to occupy two opposite positions at the same time on a number of occasions but we cannot ask the Prime Minister to do that. Subsection (2) of the new clause proposed by the amendment states that this has got to be done no later than 12 weeks prior to the appointment date of the referendum. I should like to think that 12 weeks before the referendum the Prime Minister will have decided whether he is going to rule anything out. The Prime Minister will have a position, so that point simply falls.

In Committee, I used the analogy of the European Union being like a bear trap. No one in Britain today would want to put their foot in the bear trap and join the European Union as it is. The question is how to get your leg out of the bear trap. People like the noble Lord, Lord Kerr, say that it is just going to be too painful to remove our legs from the bear trap and therefore we must just accept the risk that we might be bleeding to death but that is much less painful. In this amendment he has now come up with the proposition that because of Article 50 it is not just one bear trap: if you take your leg out of the bear trap there are 26 others to get through, each one of which could cause enormous grief, so it is better to stay in the one bear trap. This is a ridiculous position. I am deeply shocked that he should put forward an amendment of this kind.

Perhaps the Minister can tell us whether Ministers going to be bound by collective responsibility in respect of the Government's position. If they are, it is asking a lot of them that they not only have to stand up and support something in which they may not believe, but they have also got to go out and explain what would happen if the opposite happened.

Lord Garel-Jones (Con): My noble friend has just referred to something called "the Government's position".

Does he accept that if the Government have a position, they owe it to the country to campaign on that position?

Lord Forsyth of Drumlean: No, I would not accept that. If the Government are people who genuinely have differences of view as to what is right for the country, then those members of the Government should be free to argue their case. As the noble Lord, Lord Stoddart, said, this is matter for Parliament, not for the Government and not for the Executive. It is for Parliament to decide what is in the best interests of our country. I hope that Parliament, by passing this Bill, will decide that the people should have an opportunity to express their view. That will then be advisory for the Government and I would expect the Government to carry on on the basis of what is suggested.

I shall make one other point. Even if the Government wanted to do it, it would be impossible to report on the relationship with the European Union that the Government envisage in the event of a referendum vote to leave the European Union. We do not even know what the European Union will be like. It is the European Union that is leaving us as it struggles with the disastrous consequences of monetary union. It is the European Union that will have to move towards a more integrated fiscal arrangement if the euro is to survive. The amendment is asking the Government to predict what it will do to maintain the stability of the euro and at the same time to predict what they will do.....

Lord Willoughby de Broke: Unless we have control of our own borders - our own Border Force properly controlling our borders, not subject to the EU free movement of people directive - we do not have control of our borders. I am very sorry that he does not agree with that, but it is a simple fact.

I shall move on, if I may, to the regions of the UK that receive structural funds. I draw noble Lords' attention to the fact that we have £20 billion at our disposal. It is entirely possible that structural funds, infrastructure applications, can be judged on their merit by the British Government of the day and allocated accordingly. It is very simple. Our money should not be sent to Brussels with a label on it saying how we are going to spend it. It should be a matter for the British Government and the British people how that is done and not a matter for Brussels at all.

On agriculture, I declare my interest as a farmer in receipt of UK taxpayers' funds recycled through Brussels and coming back to me. At the moment, UK agriculture gets about £3.5 million in support nominally from the EU but actually from the British taxpayer. With £20 billion at our disposal, we could, as the noble Lord, Lord Grocott, implied, afford to support British agriculture at the current level and have £16.5 billion left over. I should have thought that would be quite a good deal. British farmers would be happy with that - I certainly would - and I think that the British Treasury would be happy as well because at the moment part of our funds goes to support "*la France profonde*". The noble Lord, Lord Kerr, has referred to that in previous debates. France is a wonderful country, but I do not see why we should support its agriculture.

On research and universities in the United Kingdom, it would be really embarrassing and unthinkable if the fifth-richest economy in the world could not afford to support its own research institutions and its own higher education. Therefore, none of these points raised has much import.

The problem that we should look at in a report relevant to the referendum and giving people an informed choice,

Continued on page 5

The Referendum Bill

and on which I thought of tabling an amendment, is the implication of remaining in the EU. After all, there are a lot of implications of remaining in the EU, as we can see. Just looking at the EU, the ice is cracking under it. Look at the chaos in the eurozone and, on free movement of people, at the Schengen agreement coming apart daily - it is getting worse, so what is Britain's future in the EU with the way the EU is heading now? What is the future for the British Parliament if the EU goes on making more and more laws in which Parliament, whether this House or the other House, has absolutely no say? Parliament just has to rubber-stamp EU law - bang! - and it becomes UK law. That can only get worse. That is what the Commission does: it makes the laws, it implements them and we have to put them into UK law without any debate and without so much as a single comma changing.

What will be the consequence of our being unable to control our own borders? If we remain in the EU, the consequence will be uncontrolled immigration for an unknown period into the future.

Therefore, we should look carefully at what remaining in the EU means for us and for our economy. The cost of the EU goes up every single year. It is £20 billion now, it will be £22 billion next year and £25 billion in three years' time. I am not sure that the United Kingdom can afford to give away those sort of sums to the EU willy-nilly.

On factual information, it is important to remember that the EU's whole *raison d'être*, its reason for existence, is to form a United States of Europe: the "ever closer union" of the peoples of Europe. There is no mechanism for returning powers to member states, none at all. I defy anyone, anywhere - Europhile or non-

Europhile - to tell me what power has ever been given back to a member state from the EU. None ever has. None is ever going to be. That is factual. That should be in any report that the Government put out about the EU - that once you are in, the laws are coming your way, you cannot do anything about it, they are there for good and they are going to get worse.

I welcome the idea of the report. I hope that it will be even-handed and take account of the dangers inherent in our continuing membership of the EU as well as the manifold problems that we have with it now anyway. Therefore I support the amendment, although I am not sure that the mover of the amendment will support what I have just said....

(Parliamentary copyright 2015- House of Lords Hansard 23rd November 2015)

BBC pledges to be neutral on referendum debate!

Can we trust the BBC to be even handed over the promised referendum on our membership of the EU?

BBC Trust chairman, Fiona Fairhead has told the European Scrutiny Select Committee that neutrality was 'absolutely critical' for

its coverage of the debate.

According to Ms Fairhead training will allow BBC reporters to be 'as fair and as impartial as possible'.

This is the same BBC that has received substantial complaints and criticism for its coverage of the UK/EU situation for the last 40 years.

During the Scottish referendum the corporation received heavy criticism from the SNP activists over its perceived bias against independence.

Only time will tell if the BBC coverage will be 'impartial', but based on past performance it does not seem very likely, talk is cheap.

Britain is failing on 'Free Speech'

In May 2014 the publication 'Freedom of the Press' reported that Britain had slipped down the global rankings for freedom of the press from 31st to 36th place. The organisation said press freedom and therefore free speech, had fallen to its lowest level for

over a decade. The report's project director Karin Karlekar said: "We see declines in media freedom on a global level, driven by governments' efforts to control the message and punish the messenger." Of the 197 countries and territories assessed during 2013, 63

were rated free, 68 partly free and 66 not free. The 2015 report states that Britain's freedom of the press has declined further, straddled now by Uruguay and Slovakia and now just 6 points from being classed as 'partly free' alongside Kazakhstan.

Right to reside

Atop EU legal adviser has backed the UK government in a court battle with the European Commission over the UK's right to reside test for migrants.

The Commission argues that the test, introduced in 2004, discriminates against EU migrants, by setting extra conditions for certain social benefits.

The EU advocate general has said

such unequal treatment was justified by the UK's need to protect the state budget.

Whether the UK will win this case remains to be seen.

EU Ideology: Supranational *versus* International

Extract of “Tackling the EU Empire” by Anthony Coughlan

Supranationalism - from Latin *supra*, is where Nation States surrender their authority to a superior entity which rules them and has legal primacy over them, at least in the policy areas surrendered. An example is a multinational Federal State where sovereignty is divided between a superior federal level and inferior national or regional states. Such contemporary Federations as India, Pakistan, Russia or Nigeria are instances. Or it can refer to imperial arrangements like the Austro-Hungarian Empire, once known as a “prison-house of nations”, where different countries are ruled by a centralized bureaucracy in a far-away capital.

The EU has features of both these forms of supranationalism, which is a benign and progressive concept. Internationalism - from Latin *inter*, “between” - implies the pre-existence of sovereign Nation States. It refers to relations of co-operation between the States that constitute the international community, but with each controlling and deciding its own domestic and external affairs in accordance with the wishes of its people. Recognition of States based on the right to self-determination of nations and peoples is a basic principle of modern democracy and international law.

Supranationalism, in contrast to internationalism, implies a hierarchy, with the supranational level on top. Internationalism implies legal and political equality between the parties. Properly understood, internationalism is opposed to all forms of chauvinism and xenophobia. It implies coexistence among progressive “nationalisms” - that is, broad nationalisms rather than narrow, using the positive rather than the negative sense of that word in English. It implies patriotism and love of country, combined with respect for the many national communities into

which humanity is divided and admiration for their varied cultural and other achievements.

Internationalism delights in the diversity of nations. Supranationalism seeks to erode national differences, either because they threaten the dominance of a particular ruling power or they make it more difficult for transnational Big Business to establish a world of homogenized consumers and employees. Supranationalism seeks the erosion of State sovereignty. Internationalism seeks to establish and maintain it.

The glory of European civilisation has been the diversity of its national components - In culture, science, political institutions, economic actors, legal systems, education systems, tax codes, fashion. In classical Europe emulation and competition between nations, communities and individuals spurred creativity and innovation. The peak of Europe’s cultural achievements occurred when its political units were numerous and small - In Athenian Greece, Renaissance Italy, 17th century Netherlands, 18th century Germany. This classical Europe, which is synonymous with much of what is best in human civilization, is the opposite of the centralised “Europe” of the Brussels bureaucracy, with its mania for imposing uniformity and “harmonization” by means of its supranational laws.

Supranationalism means rule by technocrats, supposed experts who are not elected, without democratic control. The EU Commission is a good example. Supranationalism leaves ordinary people cold. In the EU it means “*Brussels talking to Brussels*” as the elite groups concerned get ever more removed from citizens and voters in the different national communities they come from. It means the governments of the bigger Member States using the EU’s supranational

institutions to impose their hegemony on the smaller, while at the same time seeking to leverage the EU bloc as a whole into becoming a world power through which the government of each Big State hopes to wield more influence externally than it can ever do on its own. Lust for world power is the mainspring of EU supranationalism. National democracy is to be sacrificed to that end, while economic, *laissez-faire* is made a constitutional imperative everywhere in the interest of powerful national economic elites, particularly those of the big countries. Supranationalism and internationalism offer quite opposite visions of different ideal “Europe”.

The historical and moral guilt of those pushing the European “project” is great. They work to subvert the democracy and national independence of their own peoples and to transfer control of their societies to supranational elites with whom they identify and who reward them generously. Their own peoples meanwhile become disillusioned and depoliticized, while the economic prosperity they have been promised if they shift to supranationalism proves a mirage for many.

The European Union, is the ghost of the real Europe. When it calls itself “Europe” and believes it is Europe it is acting out a fiction which future historians will surely compare to the fiction of the Holy Roman Empire, the ghost of imperial Rome, which the French philosopher Voltaire once said was neither holy, Roman nor an empire, and which for centuries spoke German and was ruled from Vienna.

Three years after the abortive European Defence Community of 1954 came the 1997 Treaty of Rome. This established the European Economic Community (EEC), popularly referred to at the time as the

Continued on page 7

EU Ideology: Supranational *versus* International

“Common Market”. In the preamble to the Rome Treaty the six original signatories - France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg - stated their determination “*to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe*”. There is no legal or political limit to ever closer union, so the words imply a commitment to indefinite further integration.

The European Economic Community existed side by side with the original 1951 Coal and Steel Community, as well as the Atomic Energy Community, based on the European Atomic Energy Treaty (Euroatom), which was signed in 1957 at the same time as the Treaty of Rome. The Euroatom Treaty coordinated nuclear energy production and distribution amongst the EU States. The institutions of these three supranational communities - Coal and Steel, Atomic Energy and Economic (EEC) - were amalgamated to the 1965 Merger Treaty. The name “European Community” was used thereafter to cover the combined three communities, of which the economic Community (EEC) had the widest remit.

In 1963 France and Germany signed the Elysée Treaty with one another. This provided for regular meetings of the French President and German Chancellor, and their respective Foreign Ministers, as well as monthly meetings of officials from each side and the embedding of civil servants from each country in the government ministries of the other for long periods. Although this was - and is - a bilateral treaty outside of and independent of what is now the European Union, it underpins Franco-German cooperation in exercising hegemony over the EU. The main change since 1963 is that Germany has replaced France as the politically and economically stronger of the two.

A half-century passed following the

rejection of the 1954 European Defence Community Treaty before European Political Union, and all-out Euro-federalism were openly talked about again. This happened in 2004 when the EU States, led by Germany and France, proposed to establish the European Union on the basis of its own Constitution. *The Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe*, just as the American Union, the USA, had been set up in 1778. After some ratification hiccups, the new supranational European Union based on that Constitution replaced the previous European Community and was brought legally into being by *The Treaty of Lisbon* in 2009.

Historically therefore the EU is a spin-off of the Cold War, which was pushed by the USA and its allies in the 1950's and subsequently to provide an economic underpinning in Europe for the NATO military alliance. Following the 1956 Suez debacle, when the USA foiled the attempt of the British, French and Israelis to overthrow the Egyptian government by force, the Americans urged British Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan's government to apply to join the EEC. By doing that Britain would regain America's favour, as well as to obtain from America the guided missiles which alone would enable her to continue as the world's third thermonuclear power. Britain had detonated her first H-bomb in 1957, but had no independent means of delivering atomic weapons to possible targets.....

The Euro as a response to German reunification: Forty years after the 1951 Coal and Steel Community and the 1957 Treaty of Rome setting up the EEC which followed, another major shift occurred in Franco-German power. This was Germany's reunification as a side-effect of the collapse of the USSR in 1991. It led these two countries to establish EU Economic and Monetary Union (EMU)

and its single currency, the Euro. Eurofederalist circles had for years been canvassing a currency union to give the EU bloc this essential features of statehood. West Germany's absorption of East Germany and the establishment of a unified German State now gave the political opportunity.

The increase in Germany's territory and population consequent on its reunification greatly alarmed France. But France possessed nuclear weapons, which Germany is precluded from having under its reunification treaties. The deal between the two of them, set out in the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, was EU Monetary Union for Political Union, or, put crudely, the Deutschemark for the Euro-bomb. Germany would give up its national currency, the symbol of its post-war economic achievement, and share the running of a new supranational currency with France, while France agreed to work jointly with Germany towards a supranational EU political union, with its own common foreign, security and defence policy, and in time a common European army.

This would give Germany a central role in running a potential EU world power, with its finger eventually on a European nuclear trigger. France in turn hoped that the Euro would give it a political lock on Germany. A Franco-German army brigade with joint officers and a joint command was simultaneously established as a symbol and prototype of the European army of the future. Belgium, Luxembourg and Spain have since joined this common “Eurocorps”. American support for German reunification was contingent on the reunified Germany remaining a member of NATO, even though NATO's counterpart, the communist-bloc Warsaw Pact, had vanished with the dissolution of the USSR and the end of the Cold War.....

Anthony Coughlan is Director of The National Platform in Dublin, Ireland

EU myths exposed

The campaign organisation "Get Britain Out" sets the record straight on what would happen if Britain gets out of the EU

MYTH 1: - Brexit would damage trade with our European neighbours. Europhiles claim leaving the EU would sour diplomatic and trade relations with other Member States, making it harder for Britain to trade within the Single Market.

TRUTH: - British Businesses do not need the EU to trade. In addition to the lucrative trade and investment deals with the rest of the world, Britain imports more from the EU than it exports to the EU.

This means we are the EU's biggest customer – larger than China and the US – and no business – let alone the EU – would want to cut off ties with such a valuable customer as Britain.

Can you imagine France wanting to damage sales of French cheeses, wines and champagne to Britain; Germany damaging sales of BMW and Mercedes cars to Britain? No! Trade will carry on as normal, without the political interference we currently suffer from Brussels.

MYTH 2: - Britain cannot survive economically outside the EU. We are told Britain cannot compete in the world without help from the EU, and without EU membership we would not have access to the Single Market. Europhiles argue we need to be part of a trade bloc in today's globalised world, ignoring successful independent countries all over the world.

TRUTH: - Britain WILL thrive economically outside the EU. Britain is a global trading power and exports more to the rest of the world than it does to Europe.

Britain has the world's 6th largest economy and is set to become the largest in Europe by 2035.

The EU's share of world GDP is in terminal decline. In 1980, the EU's world share of GDP was 26%. It is now just 20%, and will have fallen to 15% by 2020.

Currently all Britain's trade deals

must be negotiated by the EU, which on average take twice as long or more to agree and finalise than those negotiated by independent countries, such as Switzerland.

MYTH 3: - Britain's membership of the European Union can be substantially reformed. For the past 40 years, successive British Prime Ministers have tried to make our EU membership work for Britain. So far, whether it was Margaret Thatcher's hard-line stance, or Tony Blair's supine grovelling, none have succeeded in positively changing the terms of our long-term EU membership.

TRUTH: - Substantial change to our relationship with the EU can only be achieved by Brexit. David Cameron has already stated his intention to stay within a 'reformed' EU. Many fear this to be a replay of Harold Wilson's ill-fated 1975 Referendum, in which largely cosmetic 'renegotiation' misled the public into staying.

EU leaders have already ruled out any weakening of the principle of Freedom of Movement and want to retain 'open borders'.

Once Britain states her intention to leave the EU – by using Article 50 – a 2-year negotiation period will take place. This will include, reinstating border controls for all citizens coming into Britain. Britain will be free to negotiate the more favourable terms we want and need.

Research by Open Europe estimates a free-trading Britain outside the EU could increase its GDP by 1.6%.

MYTH 4: - Britain will lose its influence in the world. The pro-EU lobby say Britain will lose its influence on the 'world stage'.

TRUTH: - Britain would have more say on trade and regulation. Britain has opposed 55 EU Directives since 1996, and has been outvoted every

time – so the myth Britain currently wields any influence in Brussels is nonsense. Our EU membership gets us nowhere.

In addition, it is estimated around 70% of decisions made in the EU Council of Ministers are already implemented before they reach the voting stage.

An independent Britain would regain its own seat within international institutions such as the World Trade Organisation, in which Britain can pursue its own national interests. (there are no other major international organisations which the EU fully represents us, largely smaller fisheries bodies etc)

MYTH 5: - Britain would lose three million jobs. This myth originated from a report by the National Institute for Economic and Social Research in 2004. The report incorrectly stated 3.2 million British jobs 'associated' with exports to the EU would be lost if we come out of the EU.

TRUTH: - Leaving the EU will create far more jobs for Britons in the long-term. This myth assumes the £228 billion worth of goods and services Britain exports to the EU would drop to zero the day after Britain leaves the EU! This was comprehensively refuted by Treasury civil servants in August 2014. Moreover, the Director of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research in 1999, Martin Weale, has since confirmed the report does not claim 3 million jobs rely on our EU membership, denouncing this Europhile propaganda as "pure Goebbels".

MYTH 6: - Britain will be isolated on the 'world stage' if we leave the EU. We are told Britain must be a member of the European Union in order to have influence in the world.

EU myths exposed

TRUTH: - Britain will be able to work closer with our natural allies in the Commonwealth – and the rest of the world. The EU is not the sole international organisation in the world. Britain is already a leading member of NATO, and we have a seat on the UN Security Council.

We have cultural and historic links with countries all over the world and are regarded as the world's leading "soft-power" state. All of this is unrelated to our membership of the EU.

The United States; Australia; Canada; New Zealand; India; Hong Kong – Britain has strong ties with all of these important global, self-governing nations.

By leaving the EU, we will have the independence of action to co-operate more with our allies within the Commonwealth, whilst still retaining friendly relations with Europe.

MYTH 7: - The EU protects democracy in Europe. The European Parliament portrays itself as the guarantor of the democracy in Europe.

TRUTH: - Westminster protects democracy in Britain. The European project destroys democracy by replacing nationally elected politicians with unelected bureaucrats.

On the rare occasion the EU has consulted the electorate's of Member States, such as in referendums held by the Netherlands and Ireland to ratify the Constitutional Treaty, the results were rejected by the EU. The Constitutional Treaty was repackaged as the Lisbon Treaty, with minor alterations. Brussels then forced the Netherlands and Ireland to vote again to approve the Lisbon Treaty.

The European Parliament cannot propose legislation. It is only able to approve or reject legislation proposed by the unelected European Commission – as such, it is a toothless institution. The European Commission's rulings bypasses Westminster ensuring laws voted through the European Parliament are

forced upon Britain, furthermore our limited influence in Brussels ensures European laws can be implemented even if all British MEPs voted against them.

MYTH 8: - The EU has stopped seeking greater political powers for Brussels. Many believe we have reached the high water mark of EU authority. Margaret Thatcher signed away many of our vetoes through the Single European Act, because she was led to believe the Single European Act was the last European treaty Britain would have to sign up to – though this was not the case.

TRUTH: - The EU will not stop until Europe has become a federal superstate. All treaties of the European Union clearly set out the principle of Member States continuing to seek "ever closer union", which means the EU gradually evolves into a single unified state, while the Member States are reduced to mere provinces of a federal Europe. The only way to prevent the UK from becoming a European province is to Get Britain Out of the EU.

MYTH 9: - Brexit would drive European Premier League footballer's out of the UK. This claim by the *Guardian* newspaper suggests that two thirds of European football stars in England wouldn't meet the criteria used for non-European overseas players to automatically qualify for a work visa. This led the paper to predict that Premier League football squads would be "decimated" if the UK voted to leave the EU.

TRUTH: - Leaving the EU would enable the Football Association and the government to loosen the requirements for foreign footballer's to play in Britain. The FAB itself has recognised the recent restrictions on skilled immigration from non-EU countries are the direct consequence of the EU's freedom of movement rules. Leaving the EU would enable the UK to relax the current requirements for

foreign footballer's to obtain a sponsorship licence from the FAB. This would enable more top footballer's from both inside and outside of Europe to play in Britain.

MYTH 10: - Many EU rules will still be in place after leaving. Some civil servants and Europhiles are saying the UK will be beset with legal difficulties following our exit from the EU. They say it will take up to 10 years for us to completely unravel ourselves from the EU. In addition to the current lengthy renegotiation process, they claim Britain will be forced to retain many EU rules, regulations and directives.

TRUTH: - A managed withdrawal from the EU will place British interests first. Reports on Brexit for the Institute of Economic Affairs have identified over 3,000 pieces of EU legislation which would ideally need to be reformed or repealed following Britain leaving the EU. Britain would still retain membership of the World Trade Organisation, the World Customs Organisation, and its countless United Nations appointments concerning international regulation.

We would simply remove the most negative aspects of EU red tape. While 10 years might sound long, it is likely to be an overestimate – which also demonstrates the appalling amount of interference Brussels has over Britain. Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty states a Member State leaving the EU will undergo 2 years to negotiate its terms. Being one of the biggest customers of EU goods, such talks will go favourably. Even pro-EU Prime Minister Tony Blair admitted Britain would have access to the Single Market just "as Norway and Switzerland do". Brexit should be as cordial as possible, keeping former laws until they are gradually replaced, reformed, or repealed will result in the most stable outcome.

Source: www.getbritainout.org

LETTERS

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

Protection

Dear Sir,

With cuts to the British armed services and to the police, we are left seriously to doubt the level of protection provided. It is penny wise to base "austerity" cuts on lower reported crime figures whilst bullets fly and on street beheading, rioting and looting occur.

Regardless of the Declaration and Bill of Rights, if we cannot even carry a screwdriver in our car or a penknife in our pocket without the risk of arrest, we are without personal protection remaining reliant on reduced levels of protection.

As with French people recently, we can lie on the ground when attacked when ordered to do so or hang by our fingertips high above ground on window ledges outside invaded buildings.

British civilians look towards the armed services, police, fire brigades, ambulances and hospitals who in turn look to George Osborne's billions austerity cuts whilst obeying the government's bidding.

We could have been over-run in 1940 and waited anxiously for that to happen. The fact it didn't was more to do with Hitler's military misjudgement than the defence misjudgements of British government.

With the supply of money being reduced as our safety is threatened, our ancestors had a cheap and sensible idea and that was to pull up drawbridges and not let unwelcome people simply walk or ride in to carry out evil acts.

But what do I know. For 80 years I have watched it all unfold via successive British government decisions notably surrendering powers to the European Economic Community. The sounds and experiences (incessant explosions,

heavy artillery, Bofors and Lewis machine guns) and the aftermath of strafing and bombing in the 1940s on our homes and streets remains vivid in my memory. To this we add the IRA and more recent other attacks upon our country and way of life. It all fades for a while but never, never really goes away.

Does it make any sense to give away £33 million net every day to the EU? Of course not. Has the EU kept peace in Europe? Don't be silly. Should we bolster our defences? Of course we should and must.

GEORGE WEST
CIB President

What next?

Dear Sir,

Anthony Scholefield ("The EU Referendum, What Next") assumes that the public votes to Leave, but 95% of MPs want to stay in. How on Earth could we win the referendum with the main parties united against us, and the Prime Minister and 95% of MPs dominating the Press with dire warnings of a leap into the dark?

Fortunately this is highly unlikely. Both major parties are potentially split on the issue. The Left has seen the EU prevent a democratically elected Greek government from carrying out its Left wing mandate, and force it back into line. We may soon see a repeat performance in Portugal, where a Left-wing majority is being prevented from taking power. Corbyn is already suspicious of the EU as a "bosses ramp".

Surveys of Tory MPs' voting intentions show a huge majority for "waiting to see what deal Cameron comes up with". A few of these may actually mean it. The rest are keeping their powder dry. If Cameron campaigns to remain and loses, he will

have to resign. His successor would almost certainly have campaigned to leave. Two of the three front runners have said publicly that we should leave if we don't get a good deal. By no stretch of the imagination are Cameron's "demands" a good deal - even if he gets them all. Moreover, what he gets will depend on dubious EU promises rather than treaty change. A poor deal would give Cameron's rivals their opportunity. Six of the Cabinet have been identified as Eurosceptics. Senior Tories outside the cabinet have mostly declared for leaving. In previous Tory EU battles, several "big beasts" were vociferously pro-EU. There are no equivalents today of Clarke and Heseltine. No senior Tory speaks up strongly for the EU except Cameron, and he says it needs fundamental reform. Even if Cameron succeeds in getting all he seeks, the chances of a united party voting to Remain are zero.

Gerard Batten's excellent book "*The Road to Freedom*" sets out the case against Article 50. The exit process would be controlled by the EU. If instead we repeal our own European Communities Act, EU law will no longer apply to us and we negotiate with the EU as a sovereign state rather than a supplicant.

A second referendum is a recipe for disaster. If the public votes Leave, it means they want to leave, not to restart negotiations in the hope of getting a better deal from our masters. Normal EU democratic practice is to insist on countries voting again and again until they get the right answer. Jean-Claude Juncker himself has said that "there can be no democratic choice against the European treaties". We need to show him that, for the British, No means No.

KEN WORTHY
Surrey

eurofacts wishes its readers the compliments of the season.

Our next issue will be published on 12th February 2016.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **26th November**, 1.00 pm

“The Equity Premium and Low Interest Rates”

Jugit Chadha, *Gresham Professor of Commerce*

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **12th January**, 1.00 pm

“The American Way of War in History and Politics”

Professor Brian McAlister Linn,
Texas A & M University and the University of Birmingham

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **18th January**, 2.00 - 5.30 pm

“Cyberspace: Security and Democracy”

Alderman Professor Michael Mainelli, Sir John O’Reilly, Adrian Lappard, Professor Tim Connell and others

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London
Admission Free
(Reservations Required)

FREE
Advertising Space

Meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **19th January**, 6.00 pm

“The International Monetary Fund Crisis of 1976”

Vernon Bogdanor, *Visiting Professor of Political History*

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

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Friday **11th March, 2016**

until

Sunday **13th March**

The Freedom Festival

“A series of talks about the big political issues including a questions and answers session”

Full range of speakers from a number of political parties

FREEDOM FESTIVAL
Marsham Court Hotel, 3 Russell-Cotes Road, East Cliff, Bournemouth BH1 3AB

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Parliament **17th December**
Commons Recess Starts

UK Parliament **22nd December**
Lords Recess Starts

2016

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

UK Parliament **5th January**
Commons Recess Ends

UK Parliament **11th January**
Lords Recess Ends

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

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.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

Stawatch

www.stawatch.org

Team

www.teameurope.info

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.

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 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 leave 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.

Britain's Global Leadership

by Ewen Stewart. **£5.00**

Why membership of the EU is holding back the UK in terms of growth and trade with the wider prosperous world.

101 Reasons

Why We Should Leave the EU

by Hugh Williams. **£3.00**

An updated version of his successful pamphlet, showing in simple terms a list of 101 reasons for Brexit.

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
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	www.conservativesforbritain.org
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
Leave-the-EU	www.Leave.eu
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

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
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Tim Farron MP	
New Britain	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006