

## Why we voted to leave the EU

Derek Taylor

What if we had chosen to stay in the EU there would be problems. They would be a different set of problems to those we now face, but at least the UK government can now make the decisions that the electorate actually wants and can use the ballot box if it does not like what it sees.

There are lots of opinions about what all these future problems might be but the truth is that we can't see into the future and we don't really know.

If we had remained we would have had to accept that the policy described as "Subsidiarity" within the EU that every member state agreed to, this was meant to restrict the transfer of power from their own government to the EU.

The European Commission (a department of the EU) was created to carry out this transfer of limited power by making laws that are binding on every member state. But, as time went on, the Commission began to make laws that ignored the restrictions of "Subsidiarity".

Over the years the Commission has continued to choose which powers will be transferred and the policy of "Subsidiarity" has gradually been replaced by a policy of "Ever Closer Union" which has never been accepted by our government but has never-the-less been followed by the Commission. We have not been able to prevent this radical change of policy.

The European Commission now has very considerable power so the "European Parliament" was created to

represent each of the member states by elected "Members of the European Parliament" to oversee the Commission and ensure that it did not misuse its powers.

In the event the Parliament has not been effective as it has not been given the power to make laws. Laws are only created by the Commission and the Parliament cannot amend any of them but can only accept or reject them. Even this power is limited because nearly every MEP is in favour of "Ever Closer Union" so there is no effective Opposition Party; also the enormous volume of new legislation that the Parliament received from the Commission makes adequate debate almost impossible.

So the EU Parliament is not fit to ensure that the Commission does not misuse its power and the commission is accountable to no one. The principle of "Subsidiarity" has now effectively been replaced by the principle of "Ever Closer Union".

Another attempt to oversee the Commission has also not been effective. It is the European Court of Justice which was brought into being to resolve differences between member states and the EU departments. Since "Ever Closer Union" has emerged as the very purpose of the EU, this court now rules, not simply on which contender is right in accordance with the law, but which contender will best contribute to the EU purpose of "Ever Closer Union" thus always ruling in favour of

the Commission.

It has always been the long-term intention of the EU to replace the national governments of the member states by a single superstate Europe. The European Commission is contributing to this by continually transferring more power from national governments to the EU Commission.

However, the ambitions of the EU are far greater than this: the European Commission will continue to transfer power until national governments are left with practically no power at all. A government with no power cannot rule a Nation so the national governments will become irrelevant and will be replaced by about 250 "EU Regions" each governed directly by the European Commission or its successor.

In many member states the nucleus of some "Regional Governments" has already been created by the appointment of EU staff, ready to take up their role when the time comes. One example was the European regional institution that was set up in Exeter and is at present costing our taxpayers £5 million pounds a year to run!

The clear aim of the European Commission is to continually transfer more and more power from member nations to the European Commission in their quest for Ever Closer Union and the ultimate elimination of their member nations.

We are lucky to have missed out on this future path.

# Brexit - what now?

Ken Worthy

There are signs that Theresa May's idea of Brexit may not be what we voted for. For her, Brexit may mean Brexit, but what does Brexit mean?

It might look rather like staying in the European Economic Area (EEA), with some compromise on free movement of people. Boris Johnson said as much recently at the United Nations (UN). Big Business wants it. The City has started to look at alternatives, but for them control over our borders is not a priority. Commentators are pointing to it as a sensible compromise.

Project Fear has not ended. It has become less hysterical and more insinuating, but it has not lost its penchant for Apocalyptic claims. Some claim that without the 1300 page EU Customs Code "we would have no legal system allowing us to trade with anyone". The Chief Executive of the British Bankers Association says that "there is nothing in World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules allowing provision of banking services, so UK banks will overnight have to stop providing most services to EU countries". Really? How about the WTO's General Agreement on Trade in Services? Both of these wild claims assume that Britain would take no action in the two-year negotiation period. In other words, we would sit like rabbits in the headlights, watching oncoming disaster. This is in the finest tradition of George Osborne's Treasury papers, which specifically assumed no action by the Bank of England or the Treasury in the face of the coming Armageddon.

On Theresa May's visit to Germany, local commentators were puzzled that Britain seems to have no plan for Brexit - no real idea of what it wanted. If we have a recession, it will be caused by business uncertainty delaying investment and hiring. Yet the Government resolutely refuses to say

anything which might reduce the uncertainty. Has it decided on nothing at all that might help? For example, it is patently obvious that Britain cannot possibly send home the EU citizens living here, come what may. The economy, and particularly the NHS, would collapse without them. Also, about 80% of them will have completed five years residency by 2019 and be entitled to stay. Yet even this reassuring statement of the obvious is held back as a bargaining chip. Well, not a bargaining chip as such, of course, perish the thought, but if you send ours back we'll jolly well, er, well ..... Sounds like a bargaining chip to me.

It looks very much as if May is adopting a Cameron strategy - what we want is what we think we can get. Why else would she trail round the capitals of Europe without the slightest indication of what she wants to get out of it? Remind you of anybody?

Uncertainty is holding us back in starting preliminary trade talks with other countries. The US, not unreasonably, said that we it needs to wait until Britain's future relationship with the EU is clearer. The key issue is surely whether or not we will be in the EEA. We can make trade deals from within the EEA, but our starting position for such deals would be very different. This is important. Progress in preliminary trade talks with key markets would do a lot for business confidence.

Free movement of people is a central principle of the EEA. If we won't accept that, then membership of the EEA (i.e. the Single Market) is not for us. They cannot make an exception that would instantly appeal to other member states. If we are not in the EEA, then we must trade with the EU as an independent country. The easiest option is to trade under WTO rules, like the US and China and 150 or so other countries. They all have "access

to the single market", but they are not "in the single market". Given that, the only real question is whether we can agree a Free Trade Agreement that is better for both Britain and the UK than WTO rules. With so much mutual business at stake, we could find a better deal.

So why not announce that, and end so much uncertainty? It can only be because that's not what the government wants. It seems to want to stay in the EEA and agree a fudge on free movement of people. It needs the EU to agree on the fudge before it can announce what it wants. We are back here again.

This is not what we voted for. Most people voted Leave because they started to understand the power the EU has over us and, even more important, that we *can* do something about it. Before that, complaining about the EU was like complaining about the weather. We all do it, but we don't expect it to change as a result. Now we know that we can just leave. The EEA might possibly be useful as a half-way house to full independence, but who trusts our politicians to deliver that in the long term?

The EU has had a hard lesson, and so the free movement of people is now on the table, after a fashion, unlike last time. But what deal can they give us that would not destroy the Schengen Area - the second tarnished jewel in their crown? The government may not be able to reach an EU deal it thinks it can sell to Leave voters. That's why the negotiations will take so long, and the uncertainty will continue. That's why our precious opportunity to branch out successfully on our own is being squandered, by politicians who never believed in it. We need to pressure them.

All those connections built up during the Vote Leave campaign must not wither away. We may soon need them.

# The betrayal of British industry

**J. Brian Heywood**

The British media will almost always print tales of Westminster shenanigans, because they are newsworthy. Such a pity, then, that the real damage being done to our country makes for very dull copy. In a country where the easiest way for those blessed with little talent and less diligence to make a name for themselves is to be seen to be doing...something... anything, senior politicians and civil servants fall back on safe, short-term tactics such as endless department reorganisations. Meanwhile, the difficult and often politically risky task of making the long-term decisions required to safeguard British industry and jobs is avoided.

The culture of change for the sake of disguising incompetence now pervades all areas of the public and private sectors and is one of the great tragedies of the modern workplace. That private sector executives should waste precious resources chasing the latest management fashions is depressing. That it should happen in the public sector is unforgivable.

Many government departments have

become bloated with project managers and their ilk. Tasked with imposing fad management policies derived from entirely different organisations operating under entirely different conditions, they are given a status and respect that might be better directed towards the people who are actually fulfilling the function of the department.

Given this sorry state of affairs, perhaps I should not be surprised by a recent experience - I have just received an answer to a question raised with a Government department that only required a yes or no response. It took over three months to get that response and during that time they bombarded me with an enormous amount of irrelevant paperwork. One day I received a parcel nearly 2 inches thick containing 153 large sheets of paper that were all irrelevant to the question I was asking.

The British public are also becoming aware that over the last fifty years virtually all the major British companies have been taken over by foreign companies. The result has

already been disastrous for our economy and the consequences in terms of lost jobs for future generations will be even worse. What is not generally understood though, is that no other country has allowed such a disaster on this scale to happen. All our main competitors have a history of blocking takeovers of strategic companies.

Why then would a series of elected British Governments close their eyes to this disaster? Could it be stupidity, treason, criminality or the concentration on the type of projects described above? I would not rule anything out but the creation of these unnecessary projects has played a major part. Because of the job I was doing I saw evidence of our industry being given away as early as 1970 and I have been putting out pamphlets, writing articles, business books and novels dealing with this subject ever since. However, I have to admit that my efforts achieved nothing.

Can anyone think of a way to force the political elite to protect our country?

## Reply from UK car supplier following the EU referendum result

*Response to letter sent to SKODA - see eurofacts Vol 21 No 11/12 dated 22nd July 2016; Page 3 (A question for EU exporters to the UK)*

Thanks for your letter, dated 29th June 2016, regarding the result on the recent referendum concerning the UK's participation in the European Union. I'd also like to apologise for the delay in responding and take this opportunity to thank you for being loyal customers to our brand. We wouldn't be what we are today without advocates like yourselves.

Your correspondence expressed in your letter have certainly been noted, both by the PR and management teams

here at SKODA UK.

The result of the referendum was an unexpected one for many, but as with the wider nation it has been a hot topic. However, regardless of the interpretation of the result, it was a decision made by the British people and as such SKODA UK will stand by that result. The UK market always has been, and will remain, an important market for SKODA UK and we remain committed, and look forward to serving our current and future

customers here in Great Britain.

In the first six months of this year, the brand has experienced record sales, with unprecedented demand for models like our Superb and Fabia hatchback. Indicators suggest that demand for our forthcoming Kodiaq SUV will be just as strong, and we're looking forward to the future.

Graeme Lambert  
Product Affairs Manager, Press and PR  
SKODA UK

# Options available to the UK economy

Professor Tim Congdon, CBE

**W**e cannot celebrate yet. Brexit turns out to have many meanings, while the government remains one led by the Conservative Party (the party of Neville Chamberlain and Ted Heath. don't forget advised by civil servants.

Two alternative approaches are emerging:

## 1) The Single Market option

The UK recovers parliamentary sovereignty and judicial supremacy, but it remains 'in the Single Market' in order to have tariff-free access to its neighbours home markets. The UK does not have control of immigration from the EU - and may even have to pay some money ('danegeld') to the EU for tariff-free access, as Norway and Switzerland do.

## 2) The free trade option (the WTO option)

The UK recovers parliamentary sovereignty and judicial supremacy, and also leaves the EU/EEA Single Market. UK companies become subject to the common external tariff, unless specific arrangements are made by negotiation. (Cars, aerospace components; and agriculture and fisheries are priorities in such negotiations.) The UK has full control of immigration, including from the EU. It does not pay any 'danegeld' to the EU.

I think it is of the utmost importance that UKIP supports the free trade option. free trade works. (Compare Hong Kong and Singapore with North Korea and Cuba.) My fear is that the

government will favour the Norway option with variants. We recover full control over our borders only if we do not belong to the Single Market. Outside the Single Market (which is really an area of common regulation) we would continue to have access to the European market, even if tariffs (quite low tariffs by the way) were payable.

All the experience of the last 250 years - since the start of the Industrial Revolution - is that free trade is good for economic growth and living standards. By becoming the champion of free trade in the UK public debate, UKIP would be occupying the intellectual and emotional high ground, as well as appealing to one of Britain's most attractive and successful political traditions.

## The unique nature of the EU

*Extract of a Briefing paper on the referendum by the think-tank FUTURUS*

**T**he root problem we face is that the EU is an unusual organisation and the only one of its type in the world. It has a supranational uniqueness which is often not understood, with the participating states reduced to subordinate and limited influence.

As Margaret Thatcher said: *"That such an unnecessary and irrational project as building a European super state was ever embarked on will be seen in future years to be perhaps the greatest folly of the modern era. And that Britain, with her traditional strengths and global destiny, should ever have been part of it will appear a political error of historic magnitude. There is though, still time to choose a different and a better course"*.

There are of course, numerous international organisations which bring together representatives of independent governments and where these governments take decisions by unanimity not by majority vote. These include the Commonwealth and EFTA agreements in which the UK was a

participant from 1960 to 1972. They also include NATO. There is no supranational vote by majority in NATO. Each state decides for itself what action it would take against armed aggression. Moreover any state can leave NATO by giving one year's notice. The same applies to EFTA. The EU is not an organisation of this type. The complex problem of leaving the EU compared with other international agreements perfectly illustrates the unique problem EU membership has created.

The unusual nature of the EU emphasises a key point. The final aim of EU integration is an EU state, modelled on the unification of Germany in the nineteenth century. This unified Germany was a top-down construct in which the independent German states, hundreds of years old, were gradually suppressed, harmonised and squeezed of their independence and power. The final act was the dismissal and dissolution of the government of Prussia, the largest

German state in 1932.

The EU is trading in Germany's footsteps, imposing non-elected governments in Italy and Greece but also removing independence and democracy from the nation states.

On the continent, it has always been well understood, and openly proclaimed, that the purpose of the EU was political integration and economic links were simply a means to that end. British politicians and especially, British industry, find that hard to understand. Business has a legitimate interest in the political and economic structure of markets and trade but not in determining whether political power is removed from a democratic nation...

The EU is incompatible with a self-governing national democracy. A free democracy means that the people have the last word on government through their elected representatives. In the EU, Britain's elected representatives are subordinate to the European Court, the European Commission and have little role in the European Council.

# EU trade with the USA

*Extract of Global Britain Briefing Note No 117 dated 13th May 2016*

The USA is not an EU member and has never had a Free Trade Agreement with the EU.

Yet it sells more Goods and Services to “EU-minus-the-UK, than does the UK.

In calendar year 2014, according to the official US balance of payments statistics<sup>1</sup>, US exports of Goods and Services to “EU-minus-the-UK” were £238 billion (\$380 billion at the average USD/GBP exchange rate for

2014 of £1 = US \$1.60.)

In that same year, UK exports of Goods and Services to “EU-minus-the-UK” were £229 billion<sup>2</sup>.

So the USA, not an EU member, with no FTA (free trade agreement) with the EU, sells four per cent more in Goods and Services to “EU-minus-the-UK” than the UK does.

Notes:-

1. US Census Bureau, U.S. Bureau of

Economic Analysis, U.S. International Trade in Goods & Services, released 4th May 2016, page 26, “Seasonally Adjusted (by geography)”, Exhibit 20: [www.census.gov/foreign-trade/Press-Release/current-pressrelease/exh20.pdf](http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/Press-Release/current-pressrelease/exh20.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Table 5, Global Britain Briefing Note No 108, “UK Exports outside the EU already 50% greater than UK Exports to the EU.

[www.globalbritain.co.uk](http://www.globalbritain.co.uk)>Briefing Notes

## Time for action

The independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon, welcomed the result of the referendum with some strong words of advice for how to take Britain out of the EU. He said: “What wonderful people the British are to have resisted all the threats, the denigration of their country by their own rulers, big business, big bureaucracy and intervention by arrogant foreign leaders. Despite all this intimidation they still voted to get their country back. We must now ensure that they are not betrayed again by their leaders.

“The first step in this should be for the Government to introduce a bill to repeal the European Communities Act 1972 and all its amendments. This would give it the authority to negotiate our exit from the EU. While this Act remains in force, we have to go on

handing over vast sums of money to the EU and we are still subject to its demands.

“The preoccupation with Article 50 of the European Treaty is a red herring and requires the Government to go cap in hand to Brussels for permission to leave. We should seize the initiative and start the process of getting our country back now ...not wait several years while we await permission from Brussels to leave. The Government has the authority of the people to act and it should do so, not sit on its hands.”

On the 17th August commenting on the recent controversy over remarks made by some Peers suggesting a rebellion against the Brexit mandate said: “It would be quite outrageous for Peers, many of whom are former EU officials drawing EU pensions to try to

obstruct Brexit, which is the will of the people. It would put the Lords on collision course with the people of this country, which is a position in which they should never place themselves. If they were foolish enough to attempt to do so, I believe the next national referendum should be on whether or not to abolish the House of Lords!

“My colleagues in the Lords would do well to remember that the Brexit vote was the largest vote for anything in the history of our nation. According to a study by the University of East Anglia, had Vote Leave been a political party, it would have won a huge landslide of 421 Parliamentary seats. That would equate to 65% of all seats and 73% of seats in England and Wales.

“Mess with this massive mandate at your peril!”

## German minister speaks out

According to Germany’s junior Minister for EU affairs Michael Roth of the Social Democrat Party in the German coalition, speaking on the 16th August to *Reuters* news agency;

“Given Britain’s size, significance and its long membership of the European Union, there will probably be a special status which only bears limited comparison to that of countries that have never belonged to the European Union,”

Furthermore, he stated relations should be “as close as possible”, but he also said “there cannot be any cherry picking” on basic EU rights, such as free movement of workers.

“The free movement of workers is a highly prized right in the European Union and we don’t want to wobble on that,”

Asked by *Reuters* if the UK deal could include curbs on workers, Roth said: “I can’t imagine that.”

Michael Roth has also suggested that the UK should in order to end uncertainty in the market place should start the exit talks as soon as possible;

“Until the end of the year should really be sufficient time to get organised,” he said, adding that the UK should have formally left before the next European Parliament elections in mid-2019.

The Brexit result puts an obligation on politicians to get on with it.

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## The electorate must be respected

Dear Sir,

Surely we have to come out of the European Union by stages to help our exporters and by joining the EEA as an independent country, separate from the EU this should be the first stage of withdrawal. The EEA countries signed an agreement in the 1990's whereby the four principles of the EU of free movement of people, goods, services and capital could be stopped if any country felt threatened. Thus Iceland stopped the free movement of capital in 2008 because of the banking crisis, but the interesting one is Lichtenstein who in 1995 stopped all movement of EU citizens into her country. After four years Lichtenstein agreed with the EU in 1999 to accept just 72 EU nationals a year. So, by joining the EEA/EFTA as a half way house the UK can stop all movement of EU citizens into the UK while at the same time having free trade with the single market before disengaging completely. (From Richard North's *Flexcit* pamphlet)

DAVID NIXON  
Staffs

## Nothing changes

Dear Sir,

I understand that the EU leaders plan to meet in Bratislava in mid-September without the British PM to start talks on post-Brexit EU reforms.

The Italian prime minister Matteo Renzi hosted the French and German leaders in August on the island of Ventotene for a pre-Bratislava discussion.

Sandro Gozi, Italy's EU affairs minister, told the *Financial Times* newspaper that if Europe waits too long to make changes it risks feeding eurosceptic sentiment.

He said;

"If there is to be a delay, the priority for us is that it should not lead to immobility, to inertia on all the other

things we need to do at the EU level,"

"Europe has to give urgent, concrete answers which certainly cannot wait more than a year."

Italy is keen for the EU to step up integration on issues such as economic governance, pooling of financial risk, and joint migration policy.

But Germany has said the Brexit vote showed that European voters do not want to pool more sovereignty.

"Europe needs to change," Gozi said. "This means strengthening the fundamental rights, and the fundamental values, which pushed Europeans to stay together and should push tomorrow's Europeans to stay together even more."

He added that the Bratislava talks should lead to a new "political pact" on the EU's future, which could be enshrined amid festivities next year to mark the 60th anniversary of the Treaty of Rome, the 1957 accords that founded the EU.

In plain English the EU wants to continue on its path to become a superstate with no member country having any national power of any significance.

ANN DAVIES  
Surrey

## Single Market and open borders

Dear Sir,

The main argument about leaving the EU appears to be based around access to the so-called "Single Market". Surely it is not beyond the wit of any negotiator worth his or her salt to arrange a satisfactory agreement.

If the EU wants open borders as a prerequisite for entry to the Single Market, should the UK offer a simple compromise by allowing EU citizens access to the UK should they have a well paid job to go to. A job that pays them a living wage and one that pays tax to the British exchequer but does not allow them to obtain benefits of any kind from the UK tax payer for a

minimum period of five years employment has been attained.

MALCOLM SUMMERS  
London

## Political arrogance

Dear Sir,

The Labour party are convinced that if Jeremy Corbyn had been more strident about leaving the EU the referendum result would have been in favour of staying in.

It is hard to understand how the politicians that think like that are so out of touch with reality and the electorate. The arrogance of such a party is quite unbelievable. Clearly that's why they remain in opposition and will remain so. The Conservatives may have their differences but at least they express them and let the electorate decide the future direction.

Democracy is about the people not the politicians, they would do well to remember that at the next election.

RICHARD STEVENS  
Bristol

## Trade or Democracy

Dear sir,

It appears that the majority of politicians think trade at any price is better than democracy.

The result of the referendum was a vote for democracy and that the ultimate control of laws and regulation in the UK being in the control of the elected government not in the hands of any outside organisation or agency.

In order to trade goods and services with any country, the goods and services have to comply with that country's regulations on quality, safety and other minor rules relating to the product. This does not mean that you have to agree or abide by the policies or internal laws of that country. If that were the only way to trade, then world trade would cease immediately.

DAVID COLLINS  
Yorkshire

# MEETINGS

## FRINGE MEETING LABOUR CONFERENCE LIVERPOOL

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
020 7388 2259

Monday **26th September**, 5.45 pm  
(immediately after the last Labour  
Conference Session)

*“Why Labour should make sure that  
“Brexit means Brexit”*

**Brendan Chilton**  
**Paul Embery**, *Fire Brigade Union*  
**Graham Stringer MP**  
*Special Guest Speaker*, **Kelvin  
Hopkins MP**  
*Chairman*, **Kate Hoey MP**

FRINGE MEETING  
Meeting Rooms 6 & 7 Hilton City  
Centre, 3 Thomas Steers Way,  
Liverpool L1 8LW  
(Close to the Conference Centre)  
**Admission Free**

---

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Thursday **29th September**, 6.00 pm

*“Recession and Recovery”*

**Jagjit Chabha**, *Gresham Professor of  
Commerce*

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

---

## FRINGE MEETING CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE BIRMINGHAM

**Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

Monday **3rd October**, 1.00 pm

**James Delingpole**  
**Charles Moore**  
**Professor David Myddleton**

FRINGE MEETING  
The Birmingham Midland Institute,  
Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS  
**Admission Free**

## The Economic Research Council

Tuesday **11th October**, 6.30 pm

*“Economics”*

**Professor Sir Charles Bean**, *Former  
member of the Bank of England  
Monetary Committee*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-  
Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James’s  
Street, London

**Admission by ticket**  
(Non-ERC members £15  
(Students £10) please contact  
[www.ercouncil.org](http://www.ercouncil.org))

---

**Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

Saturday **5th 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**

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

UKIP **16-17th September**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Bournemouth  
International Centre

Lib-Dems **17th-20th September**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Brighton  
The Brighton Centre

Labour **25th-28th September**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Liverpool  
ACC Liverpool

Conservative **2nd-5th October**  
Party Autumn Conference  
Birmingham  
ICC Birmingham

UK Government **10th October**  
Conference Recess ends

---

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**British Constitution Group**  
[www.britishconstitutiongroup.com](http://www.britishconstitutiongroup.com)

**British Future**  
[www.britishfuture.org](http://www.britishfuture.org)

**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**  
[www.bwmaonline.com](http://www.bwmaonline.com)

**Bruges Group**  
[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**  
[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
[www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk](http://www.campaignforanindependentbritain.org.uk)

**Conservatives for Britain**  
[www.conservativesforbritain.org](http://www.conservativesforbritain.org)

**Democracy Movement**  
[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

**English Constitution Group**  
[www.englishconstitutiongroup.org](http://www.englishconstitutiongroup.org)

**EU Observer**  
[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

**EU Truth**  
[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**  
[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

**European Foundation**  
[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

**Freedom Association**  
[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

**Futurus**  
[www.futurus-thinktank.com](http://www.futurus-thinktank.com)

**Get Britain Out**  
[www.getbritainout.org](http://www.getbritainout.org)

**Global Britain**  
[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

**Global Vision**  
[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

**GrassRootsOut**  
[www.grassrootsout.co.uk](http://www.grassrootsout.co.uk)

**June Press (Publications)**  
[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

**Labour for a Referendum**  
[www.labourforareferendum.com](http://www.labourforareferendum.com)

**Leave.eu**  
[www.Leave.eu](http://www.Leave.eu)

**New Alliance**  
[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

**Open Europe**  
[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

**Sovereignty**  
[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

**Statewatch**  
[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

**Team**  
[www.teameurope.info](http://www.teameurope.info)

**The Taxpayers’ Alliance**  
[www.taxpayersalliance.com](http://www.taxpayersalliance.com)

**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
[www.ukip.org](http://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.

**Britain's Referendum Decision and its Effects**

by Stephen Bush. **£8.99**

Clear facts that explain the dangers we face inside or outside the EU.

**Elephant in the Room**

by David Challice. **£6.50**

Bite-sized nuggets of information regarding the UK/EU problem, covering the last 8 years.

**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 Doomed Marriage**

Why Britain Should Leave the EU

by Daniel Hannan. **£8.99**

Without EU membership, the UK can become the most successful nation.

**Generations Betrayed**

Cutting the Roots of our National Identity

by Chris McGovern. **£2.00**

How school education has been altered to remove parts of history and identity.

**The Market Solution**

FLEXCIT - Flexible Exit and Continuous Development

by Dr Richard E, North. **£5.00**

How the UK can leave the EU, through an orderly, plausible and practical way, that is practically risk-free.

**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.

**Mayhem In France**

by Cy Charles Ross. **£6.99**

A World War 11 adventure about life with the French resistance based on real experience in occupied France.

**The Dark Side of European Integration**

Edited by Anton Shekhovtsov. **£22.99**

Social foundations and cultural determinants of the rise of radical right movements in contemporary Europe.

**Spyhunter**

by Michael Shrimpton. **£25.00**

A fascinating alternative view of history, including the EU, exposes the secret world of German intelligence.

**A Life Most Ordinary**

by Ken Wight. **£7.99**

A UKIP activist reveals how his life in Slough has changed over the last 60 years, especially with the rise of the EU.

**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@juneypress.com

**WEB SALES [www.juneypress.com](http://www.juneypress.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
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622

Conservativesforbritain  
[www.conservativesforbritain.org](http://www.conservativesforbritain.org)

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 THINK TANKS

British Future	<a href="http://www.britishfuture.org">www.britishfuture.org</a>
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	<a href="http://ww.globalbritain..org">ww.globalbritain..org</a>
Global Vision	<a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a>
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Caroline Lucas MP and Jonathan Bartley	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Tim Farron MP	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
To be announced	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006