

Wake-up call

Christopher Gill

There is an old gag which goes something like this: Question: How do you know when politicians are lying?

Answer: When you see their lips move!

On 23rd June, 17,410,742 people voted to “Leave the European Union”.

The other question on the ballot paper was “Remain a member of the European Union” - nowhere on the ballot paper was there an option of voting to “Negotiate to leave the European Union” but that is what our duplicitous politicians are doing!

Leaving the European Union implicitly means the complete restoration of national sovereignty; the right to be governed solely by the laws made in our own Parliaments and Assemblies; the absolute right to control our own borders; the freedom to negotiate our own trading arrangements with whichever other countries we choose; for our armed forces to be deployed solely at the behest of the Westminster Parliament (and in concert with our NATO allies) and for the administration of justice to be in accordance with the law of *habeas corpus* and all the other traditional defences and protections against state-inspired coercion which are the genius of the British criminal justice system.

As far as we ‘Leavers’ are concerned these particular features are absolutely non-negotiable so what is there left to negotiate?

To this question there will be a chorus of voices saying ‘our future

trading arrangements, of course’!

What these people are saying is that we must be able to continue to trade with the EU on the supposedly favourable terms that we currently enjoy - tariff free ‘access to the world’s biggest market’ and all that jazz.

That being the case and if our Government was seriously intent upon honouring the unambiguous result of the Referendum it would simply tell Brussels that “We’re out, but if you guys want to continue trading with us on the current basis the choice is yours”.

Does anyone seriously believe that the EU would turn down such an offer given that, as is well-known, they sell far more to us than we sell to them and mindful of the fact that their economies are becoming increasingly sclerotic, whilst ours, contrary to all the doom-laden predictions’, continues to grow, making it an increasingly attractive destination for EU exports.

During the Referendum campaign the ‘Remain In’ made much of the fact that it had taken the EU over 7 years to make an incomplete trade deal with Canada. By the same logic a trade deal with the UK is not going to be settled any time soon, simply because getting the agreement of 27 other countries to every dot and comma is verging on the impossible. On the other hand the present trading arrangements are apparently acceptable to all concerned so why would both parties not settle for what

they have already got instead of opening a veritable Pandora’s box?

Those who wish to play the negotiation card have nothing to lose. The ‘Remain In’ will be content to see us perpetually ensnared by the EU. Similarly, the hundreds of civil servants drafted into the new Brexit department and the Ministers themselves have no incentive to make themselves redundant and, perish the thought, even our pro-EU Prime Minister may be secretly harbouring the thought that if the charade of negotiation can be kept going long enough we may never actually escape the Brussels straightjacket!

With so many non-EU countries apparently now clamouring for trade deals with the UK we must call the EU’s bluff and see, when push comes to shove, how many German car-makers, Italian wine-makers, French cheese-makers etc. etc. wouldn’t, on a reciprocal basis, want to perpetuate the current terms of trade with their best customer.

‘Wake up England’ - you’re being conned!

Playing Brexit long by agreeing to negotiate our way out of the EU is not what we voted for!

Playing it long may well suit the nefarious purposes of the ‘Remain In’, but for us ‘Leavers’ it threatens to be the kiss of death.

Christopher Gill, Freedom Association President and former Conservative MP for Ludlow

INSIDE: The history of EU accounting p 2 – **Book reviews** “Brexit Revolt” and “The Road to Freedom” p 3 - Trade agreement unnecessary p 4 – **Brexit means leave** p 4 - EU still wants military power p 4 – **UK must leave EU aid schemes** p 5 - Tariff threats irrelevant p 5 – **Letters** p 6

The history of EU accounting

Jackie Williams

Whether or not the EU accounts have been signed off has become a debatable question with politicians asserting they were for ‘Remain’ and were not those favouring ‘Brexit’.

In fact the Court of Auditors explained: “The phrase used in the UK media is ‘the accounts have been signed off’ but it is not a technical auditing term. It’s an informal way of saying something. What we say is that the EU accounts present a true and fair view.

“Informally” you could say they have been signed off as at the bottom of the document there is a signature of the President of the Court of Auditors, Vitor Manuel da Silva Caldeira, followed by the words in French “*Lu et approve*” meaning “read and approved”.

In fact, he said, the President of the Court has been writing this since 2007 before which there was a “problem with methodology” and the budget accounts were “qualified” meaning not approved at all.

Despite this approval, EU taxpayers might wonder why auditors admit to an average of 4 per cent errors in the budget, now 142 billion euros, making an annual loss of around 5.69 billion euros.

They would be even more confused by Mr Caldeira’s comments after he signed off the last budget:

“We have signed off the accounts... the collection of revenue was free from material error... there is a persistently high level of payment errors which means too much money is still not spent in accordance with the EMU financial rules.”

Undaunted the Court President called for a “wholly new approach” especially in regional policy and agriculture where “there were hundreds of thousands of complicated transactions”.

In fact under EU rules none of the accounts have ever been fully audited.

Article 287 of the Treaty of the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) leaves no margin of error and refers to ALL revenue:

“The Court of Auditors shall examine whether all revenue has been received and all expenditure incurred in a lawful and regular manner...” Mr Caldeira himself even reaffirmed this in a document last year when the word “ALL” was underlined. (European Court of Auditors Opinion No 4/2015).

No wonder the auditors tied themselves in knots when they tried to explain the financial management of the EU budget in an explanatory review of 106 pages the year before (Making the Best Use of EU money - a landscape review):

“The ECA’s (European Court of Auditor’s) negative Statement of Assurance opinion on EU spending for each of the last 19 years poses a problem for the EU. In particular, the negative opinion can inadvertently promote the perception that the errors reported indicate that the spending of the EU budget is seriously affected by fraud and corruption, adversely affecting public confidence in the EU Institutions.”

Clearly the “signing off” of the EU accounts is not an audit under the EU rules and it is not reassuring for EU taxpayers to know that since 2007 alone the “margin of error” amounts to some 100 billion euros.

Beleaguered auditors have struggled for years to make sense of the Commission’s accounting Financial regulations drawn up in 1997 oblige the Commission’s financial controller to disclose to other commissioners any failure to recover debts and publicly name the Director General responsible. But after 20 years of “tinkering” with the aid budget, auditors concluded in their 1993 report: “In the Court’s opinion the essential elements of a reliable system are likely to be put in place either in the foreseeable future or at reasonable cost”.

After spot checks on 43 aid projects auditors had found the Commission had no idea who was in charge or knew that in some cases there was nobody in charge at all. In the case of Italy, the astronomical sum of 9 trillion lira (4.22 billion GDP) had been given in “miscellaneous aid” to projects although there were no details about any of them. The sum was later found to be 11 trillion (5.35 billion GDP).

This did not stop Commission President Jacques Delors demanding an extra 30 per cent for the EU budget the following year.

Perhaps to assuage auditors for their frustrations in trying to sort out the EU’s missing billions the European Council elevated the status of the Court of Auditors to an EU Institution three months later bringing its staff and translators under the EU budget and more importantly enabling them to benefit from the extraordinary immunity afforded to EU civil servants not only in their work but even after they have retired - a privilege that even extends to their premises, buildings and archives “which shall be inviolable” but which is hardly conducive to unravelling fraud. (Protocol: No 7 on the Privileges and Immunities of the European Union).

Even with its new elevated status auditors failed to overcome the extraordinary lack of controls in administering EU’s funds - in particular the agricultural CAP payments where producer organisations failed to submit proper bank statements, had no identifiable bank accounts or if they had, refused to disclose what was in them. On the spot control visits of 5,500 olive oil producers in 1993 showed half did not appear in the oil cultivation register. In the case of Greece and Portugal there were no land registers and Greece had stopped checking its aid payments in 1987.

To be continued in the next issue

BOOK REVIEWS

Derek Stirling

The Referendum victory explained

The shock to the world following the UK's decision to leave the EU and the unseating of the British Prime Minister, has called into question Europe's future and will define British politics for years to come.

This is the first attempt at trying to understand how it was that the UK actually voted to leave the EU on the 23rd June 2016.

It covers the Thatcher years and the problems encountered by the slow rise of euroscepticism within the Conservative party. The various organisations and people that were involved with trying to establish a fully working and financed organisation for leading the eurosceptic case are also investigated at great length.

Starting with the Sir James Goldsmith's act of setting up the Democracy Movement, and the rise of the United Kingdom Independence Party from its early beginnings to become the leading voice and political party prior to the announcement of an

Brexit Revolt

How the UK voted to leave the EU
*by Michael Mosbacher
& Oliver Wiseman*

New Culture Forum
Pbk 133 pp 2016

Available from
The June Press
Price £10.00 + 10% p&p)
(see back cover)

ISBN 978-1-904803-68-7

In/Out EU Referendum.

David Cameron who had announced he wished to stay in the EU, before trying to get a better deal for the UK from the EU and then returning with a very weak collection of minor changes is also investigated.

The most intriguing part for many will be how after the referendum announcement the two new large organisation's "Vote Leave" and "GO/Leave.EU" fought each other.

This was despite the efforts of many businessman and politicians to try and bring them together. This resulted in both organisation fighting for the government funds which were finally paid over to the "Vote Leave" camp.

Project Fear employed by the major political parties and the so-called experts in various field is fully dealt with in terms of the why it was used and how it clearly back-fired on David Cameron and all those involved with it.

This book in its own words, tells the story of how a once fringe idea, dismissed by many as a foolhardy leap in the dark, captured the imagination of the British people.

Based upon access to unseen emails between senior Leave campaigners and interviews with a wide array of Leave figures, making this a truly interesting read for all those in years to come who will ask the question. How did the 'Leave' side win this battle when all the so-called experts were quietly confident that the UK would vote to stay in?

Brexit means Brexit

This is an updated publication following the 23rd June Referendum result, where 17,410,742 UK voters decided its time to leave the EU.

In this pamphlet with a foreword by Professor Tim Congdon, Batten makes the case for the British Government to immediately "**Repeal the European Communities Act (1972)**" and return supremacy of law-making to the UK Parliament, and then to implement the necessary measures to disentangle the UK from the EMU legislative web.

His argument is based on what he calls the mistaken belief by politicians and commentators that the only option to leave the EU is by invoking Article

The Road to Freedom

by Gerard Batten MEP

Bretwalda Books
Pbk 74pp 2016

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

ISBN 978-1-910440-02-5

50 of the Lisbon Treaty which states "*Any Member State may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional*

requirements".

Article 50 sets out a lengthy, complex and costly procedure for doing so in accordance with Article 218 (3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. The process may take up to two years, but can be extended by mutual agreement of the British Government and the other 27 Member States.

He fears that this time scale could be extended beyond the next UK general election, and that the new government in power could refuse to implement withdrawal on the grounds that it has a new mandate.

Gerard Batten MEP for London UKIP

Trade agreement unnecessary

Extracts from House of Lords 5/6th July debate on the European Referendum result

Lord Lawson of Blaby (Con):the people decided, on a massive poll, that we should leave.

It is regrettable that some, unhappy with the result, seek to prevent its implementation, whether by way of a second referendum or some other device. It is difficult to imagine anything more irresponsible, either democratically or politically. I can only assume that living in an elitist London bubble they are blithely unaware of the alienation of a large and growing section of the British people from the London-based political and banking establishment. Any attempt to overturn the referendum result would invite mayhem of the most grievous kind. It would not only be dishonourable, it would be playing with fire. I invite those who entertain this desire to consider the consequences.

Incidentally, they might also reflect on what their response would be had the referendum produced a majority to remain in the European Union and the disaffected losers then demanded that it be re-run.

The only question before us is how best to implement our departure from the European Union. Our starting point should be that we wish the best possible relationship with the peoples and Governments of Europe, against whom we have no grievance whatever and a multiplicity of mutual interests. One important point that follows from this is that we must respect the EU doctrine that to remain a member of the so-called single market we would have to accept the freedom of European citizens to live and work here. That is something the British people have made clear is not on, so we must accept

that we will be outside the single market. That is scarcely a disaster. The rest of the world is outside the so-called single market and trades happily and profitably with the European Union. You do not need a trade agreement to trade. Moreover, if we were to seek some special trading relationship with the EU, not only would we be adopting the position of a supplicant—which I do not like—but it would be a futile quest.

Following the invocation of Article 50 of the Lisbon treaty, it is important that our negotiations with the European Union are completed as speedily as possible. A prolonged period of uncertainty can only be damaging for British business and the British economy. By ruling out the chimera of trade negotiations, a speedy process becomes practicable....

Brexit means leave

Speaking in a debate on the Government's statement about the G20 Summit on the 7th September, the independent Labour Lord Stoddart of Swindon reminded the House of Lords that "Brexit means leave" and that the referendum vote was an instruction to the Government "to get on with it".

Lord Stoddart made his remarks after listening to a number of Peers

making speeches spreading doom and gloom about Brexit and the state of play regarding the preparations for withdrawal. He added that the "electorate 'were asked whether they wished to remain or whether they wished to leave'. They decided that they wanted to leave. That was an instruction to the Government to get on with it. The great disgrace is that the Government and the Civil Service had

not prepared for either alternative. That, of course, is the problem we are facing now".

"But it is not all doom and gloom. There is a great future ahead, as there has been a great, historic past. We should take hold of that. We should not be supplicants; we are a great country and we should use our power for the good of this country and the rest of the world...".

EU still wants military power

Should the UK have decided to remain inside the EU then it would soon be expected to contribute towards the EU army, this was denied by many pro-EU politicians before the Referendum.

According to the European Commissions President Jean-Claude Juncker, speaking to MEPs in Strasbourg in September, "The EU needs a military headquarters to work towards a common military force" he went on to say the lack of a "permanent structure" resulted in money being

wasted on missions.

The UK Defence Secretary Sir Michael Fallon has said that the UK will oppose any attempt to create an EU army because it could "undermine" the role of NATO. He went on to say NATO must remain the cornerstone of our defence of Europe and that the UK was not alone in opposing a common EU defence policy.

Meanwhile if still in the EU the European Parliament President Martin Schulz has said "the UK would not have a veto over closer defence co-

operation".

But what do other EU members think?

Italy has laid out plans for the creation of a "European force" that goes beyond Franco-German proposals on defence integration.

Finland's plan for EU defence integration, goes less far than Italian or French "visions", while quietly designating Russia as a threat.

The future direction of the EU in terms of the defence is clear it wishes to be a military super-power.

UK must leave EU aid schemes

A new research paper published by Global Britain has established that the UK would be able to direct greater resources to help developing nations and their peoples by ending its funding of European Union multi-billion aid projects following Brexit.

The paper "Making aid work outside the EU" found that EU aid was wasteful, inefficient and often used to support despotic regimes known for shocking levels of torture and corruption.

The paper also found that the combination of the EMU Customs Union tariffs and Common Agricultural Policy subsidies create a cycle of dependency whereby the EU's obstacles to trade create a demand for foreign aid.

Examples included punitive EU tariffs that ruined the tomato industry in Ghana and ensure that without growing a single coffee bean Germany profits more from processing coffee than the whole of Africa does from growing it. Similar tariffs, subsidies and quotas have hit the Caribbean sugar cane industry to the benefit of European sugar beet farmers. Commenting on the report its author Brian Monteith said,

"Anyone who reads this report cannot fail to be shocked and appalled at what has been done in our name by the EU over many years. The Customs Union has stopped developing nations prospering through trade, they then become dependent on receiving foreign aid which, in the case of the EU's schemes, are hugely inefficient and wasteful and often support regimes that have been shown to be undemocratic, corrupt and reliant on torture.

"It is vital that the UK ends its financial support to EU aid immediately following Brexit and directs those funds through its own departments. It is also vital the UK leaves the EU's Customs Union so that it can strike up trade deals with developing nations, helping them to prosper and become less reliant on foreign aid. Remaining in the Customs Union would consign millions of people in Africa and Asia to continuing life-threatening poverty and malnutrition. The UK has to take a moral lead and break this cruel cycle of dependency.

"The UK funding for EU aid is part of its legislative requirement to spend 0.7 per cent of GDP on international development, thus UK departments, primarily DFID and the FCO, will need to programme the new funds. The savings the UK can achieve by channelling the aid directly will mean millions more can reach the targets achieving far greater value for money.

"Due to the long lead times in planning the necessary interventions starting work on the new strategy should commence immediately."

The reports findings include:

* The UK's membership of the EU means Britain donates 17% of its EU contributions to the EMU various aid programmes. *On top* of this compulsory funding, Britain pledged to give the EU another 4.5 billion Euros (£3.5bn) for the 11th European Development Fund (EDF) from the period 2014-2020.

* The EU is the biggest recipient of UK multilateral aid spending – receiving £1.35 billion in British contributions in 2013, representing 30% of the UK's multilateral aid budget and 12% of the UK's total aid

spending.

* Administration costs at 5% for the European Development Fund and 5.4% for the European Commission compare with the UK's 1.57% administration cost (2013-14) for its Department of International Development (DFID). An efficiency saving equivalent to 154 million euros (£132M) would have been achieved if the UK's contribution to the 11th EDF had been dispersed through DFID directly.

* Leaving the EMU customs union and no longer being bound by its protectionist tariffs could provide new opportunities for Britain's aid programme to boost economic growth in the developing world.

The reports recommendations include:

* The FCO and DFID should start planning immediately for the use of the reallocated funds to support UK priorities, for example helping countries of strategic interest to the UK such as Egypt.

* The UK should end its contribution to the EDF the year it leaves the EU rather than wait until 2020.

* With the ability to sign trade deals unshackled by EU vested interests, the UK should integrate national security, development and trade policy to the benefit of both Britain and developing countries.

* DFID should assist developing countries to take advantage of better trade terms with the UK by helping develop their export industries, creating stronger, more stable and more secure economies.

Further details are available at www.globalbritain.org

Tariff threats irrelevant

In recent days much has been said about the possibility of car manufacturing leaving the UK just in case the EU applies a 10 per cent tariff against new cars and other products

from the UK.

However, what is not mentioned is that UK goods have already become almost 10 per cent cheaper in the EU due to the value of the pound dropping.

In other words including a tariff, UK goods including cars would still be at the same pre-Brexit price. But EU goods would be more expensive in the UK and therefore, less competitive.

LETTERS

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

A simple EU exit

Dear Sir,

David Nixon is absolutely right (letter in September's issue of *eurofacts*) that after 43 of integration we have to leave the EU in stages and need to work to a plan which Flexcit offers.

One thing I often find people get muddled over are the differences between the 27 countries of the political EU, the 31 members of the EEA or Single Market and the 58 countries making up the continent of Europe. So advocating staying in the EEA, as an interim solution, is not the same as staying in the EU. Another key point is that after triggering Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty, now thankfully mainstream thinking, we would only have two years to negotiate our deal and so in the time available the only realistic solution, that does not damage any of our existing trade, is to remain in the EEA. People who still talk about negotiating a 'bespoke' deal will be unable, in the time available, to come up with anything than is better than we currently have in the EEA. Also while in the EEA, but outside the EU, we will, under Article 112 of the EEA agreement, be able to negotiate on Freedom of Movement.

However as I say above staying in the EEA is only an interim stage until we can help create a genuine European single market involving all 58 countries in Europe. This is now being talked about in the context of an European Economic Space (EES) often referred to as the European Village where all the houses in it have equal rights while retaining their own individual sovereignty. The idea of a European trading village incidentally was the original vision that preceded the formation of the EEA but sadly cast aside by Jacques Delors who opted for the greater political control that an EEA of the 31 offered especially the 27 of the EU. One of the many benefits of Brexit is that it will hopefully provide the catalyst for 'Brussels' to take a

fresh look at the concept of a genuine European single market and, if they do, it will not be for the first time Britain has come to the rescue of Europe.

Tragically far too many pontificating on the EU don't understand many of the basics as outlined above.

NIALL WARRY

Somerset

Learning from history

Dear Sir,

Having once being young, I like most people voted to remain in the EU 'Common Market', even though we had never been asked if I wished to join the EU in the first place. The logic and information supplied by politicians told me too, it seemed clear cut.

The youth of today wish to remain in the EU because they have not yet learned about all its pitfalls and still believe the political elite.

DONALD SIMPSON

London

The next big push

Dear Sir,

On the night of June 23rd, we 'Leave' eurosceptics went to bed knowing we had lost.

We were experienced at that. We'd just carry on as always.

The following morning the world was upside-down. 'Leave' had actually won!

And by a reasonable margin!

Nobody - individuals, bureaucrats, government - could understand why, or what to do next.

That was three months ago. The same state of mind persists.

Some people are beginning to think something ought to happen to put into effect what the country had voted for - the most significant event in decades.

Oh yes, there is something known as Article 50. Actually, a short paragraph in your issue of 16th September offers a logical answer.

"The first step .. should be for the Government to introduce a bill to repeal the European Communities Act 1972 and all its amendments."

Seems like this should be the next big push.

RALPH MADDERN

Warwickshire

[Mrs May appears to agree, but getting this Bill through a pro-EU parliament will not be easy - Ed]

The fig leaf

Dear Sir,

The 'single market' is just a very big fig leaf for Big Business.

The dominant theme of any discussions in the media regarding Brexit is the cry that the UK must have access to the 'single market'. That seems to be the starting point of any discussion.

However, this is, at least a distraction, but more likely a deliberate ploy on the part of 'Remainers', in considering our future EU/UK relationship. That fact is, the UK does not need access to to the 'single market' to trade with the EU. Many countries sell more to the EU than the UK without being in the 'single market'. In fact, our position should be that the UK does not want to be in the 'single market' at all.

When Big Business claims it needs access to the 'single market' is a just a very very big fig leaf to hide the real motive and that is they want access to cheap labour via open borders. The importing of cheap labour keeps wages low and puts intolerable strains on our public services.

We should tell the EU we don't want the 'single market' in any guise. Trading with the EU under WTO rules would suit us just fine.

Because of the in-balance of trade between the UK and the EU, we would even make a profit on the tariffs!

ROBIN GREY

Dorset

MEETINGS

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Saturday **5th November**,
10.30 am - 6.00 pm

“What Brexit Means! A Bright Future”

Sir Bill Cash MP

Prof. Anthony Coughlan, *One of the Republic of Ireland’s leading EU-critics*

John Eliasch, *Chairman and CEO of Head, the sporting goods group.*

Rt Hon. Peter Lilley MP

Prof Patrick Minford, CBE, *Professor of Economics at Cardiff Business School*

Patrick O’Flynn MEP, *UKIP and former Political Correspondent for the Daily Express*

Richard Tice, *Businessman and Co-Founder of Leave.EU*

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

Admission charge £20

(Includes various refreshments and lunch)

The Economic Research Council

Monday **7th November**, 6.30 pm

“Europe isn’t Working: How the Failing of the Single Currency led to Brexit”

Dan Atkinson, *Author*
Larry Elliott, *Author*

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

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@junepr.com

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **17th November**, 6.00 pm

“In the Context of the Common Law: The European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg”

Bostjan M. Zupancic, *European Court of Human Rights*

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Friday - Sunday

17th - 19th March 2017

For all those who care about Freedom and Liberty

Further details including full list of speakers to be announced

FREEDOM FESTIVAL

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

Admission - Information details contact The Freedom Association

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Government **23rd November**
Autumn Statement

2017

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

UK Prime Minister’s **March**
suggested final date to
implement EU Article 50

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

2018

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

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Constitution Group

www.britishconstitutiongroup.com

British Future

www.britishfuture.org

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

Conservatives for Britain

www.conservativesforbritain.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

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Futurus

www.futurus-thinktank.com

Get Britain Out

www.getbritainout.org

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

GrassRootsOut

www.grassrootsout.co.uk

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

Labour for a Referendum

www.labourforareferendum.com

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

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 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.

The Road to Freedom

by *Gerard Batten MEP*. **£8.99**

A 2016 version following the vote leave result. How to exit the EU and regain a proper future for an independent UK.

Germany's Fourth Reich

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£8.00**

Code-breaker and spy explains the real drive by Germany for control over Europe without war.

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.

Brexit Revolt - How The UK Voted To Leave The EU

by *Michael Mosbacher &*

Oliver Wiseman. **£10.00**

This is an account of how the idea of leaving the EU took root and the battle of ideas and egos that took place before and during the campaign.

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.

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.

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
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
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 www.britishfuture.org
Bruges Group 020 7287 4414
Global Britain www.globalbritain.org
Global Vision www.global-vision.net
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

