eurofacts

11TH NOVEMBER 2016 THE REALITY BEHIND EUROPE MONTHLY £3.50

The ugly face of the Euro-fascist left

Extract of an article by **Rodney Atkinson**

The former European Union Commission President Jose Barroso, whose corporatist career has now landed him a well paid job with the US Merchant Bank Goldman Sachs once said that "The Czech Republic has signed the treaty and so the Czech Republic has an obligation to ratify".

In other words what a clique of politicians sign is more important than the will of the people on whose behalf they signed. In 2008 he also showed contempt for the voters in the UK: "people who matter in British politics" he said were thinking about giving up the Pound. Barroso's "people who matter" did not of course include the voters who rejected the Euro by some 80 per cent.

... Goldman Sachs was responsible for the farcical claim that Greece's finances qualified the country to join the Euro in 1999. The figures were fudged and complete fiction – and Greece has since been destroyed on the altar of the Euro....

This contempt is shared by the Brussels bureaucrat and even those formally elected – in very low turnouts – by "European citizens". In an interview with European Report, Annemie Neyts-Uyttebroeck, President of the European Liberal Democrat and Reform Party (represented in the European Parliament by the ALDE group) said:

"...No, these are people against the EU, there is a real confrontation that we should dare to come to terms with. Even within the European Parliament, these opponents represent 5 per cent of the total with their silly little flags. Why do we let them do it? They have the right to have stupid opinions in a democracy, but these people should be attacked by telling them that they are stupid."

These "silly little flags" did not include the preposterous EU flag of course to which so few feel any allegiance but the display of which has been forcibly bought by the EU Commission in return for grants to member states. In the UK of course the grants (plus a lot more) were paid for by the British taxpayer! And it turns out that most of the electorate's are increasingly "stupid". Contempt for the voters is a prime characteristic of fascist institutions where absolute power allows the "leaders" to determine what is truth, what is wise – and who are "stupid". People they disagree with should not be persuaded but "attacked".

....On a state visit to Switzerland the German President Joachim Gauck criticised the Swiss system of direct democracy, saying that it is 'dangerous when citizens vote on highly complex issues". He was referring to the very understandable issue when the Swiss (given that immigrants account for 25 per cent of the Swiss population) voted to stop free movement from the EU.

....David Cameron ... was ironically often attacked by his "partners in Europe". But nothing roused their anger against him more than offering the British people a vote on leaving the EU. The former Danish Finance Minister, Mogens Lykketoft, of the Danish Social Democrat Party said that it was very wrong of Cameron to have asked the people! Of course in the EU it is States, not people who decide. That is why the whole corporatist edifice was set up through International Treaty Law which bypassed Parliaments – a system developed when Kings and Queens and a few Ministers decided matters of importance! – and so very adaptable to the modern world when only big business and Ministers decide!

... Finally the Euro-fascist attitude in tooth and claw was uttered by the revolting President of the European Parliament no less! Martin Schulz, the German Social Democrat:

"The British have violated the rules – it is not the EU philosophy that the crowd can decide its fate".

For the fascist left, defeat at the polls for their supranational imperial ambitions is blamed on "populism" – meaning the democratic will of the people they hate! They are, they say, not democrats led by principle but fools led by "demagogues" (as the German Social Democrat Thomas Oppermann called Boris Johnson and Nigel Farage)...

VOL 22 NO 3

The history of EU accounting

Jackie Williams

Second part of article, first part in the October issue of eurofacts

The following is a continuation of the article by Jackie Williams in last months *eurofacts*.

By 1999 the Luxembourg auditors estimated that ten years of fraud of CAP funds amounted to the entire EU budget of 60 billion GDP (No 971 5th March).

The inability of commissioners to control finance, the lack of personnel to verify expenditure and the huge reluctance within the commission to accept responsibility was highlighted in an internal report that year signed by the Director General of the EU's financial sector DGXX, Isabella Ventura, but later buried.

The commissioners' refusal to act led Court auditor, Paul Van Buitenen, to inform MEPs that that their own commissioners had blocked inquiries into EU fraud. His move led to death threats and his suspension on half pay on the orders of Ventura who ignored EU rules regarding her own role.

MEPs dutifully voted by 286 votes to 238 against his reinstatement on the grounds he followed the wrong procedure by informing the head of a political party instead of the head of parliament (1999 No 968).

As a result of more rigorous efforts to uncover fraud by the European Parliament's Budgetary Committee the entire executive Commission of Jacques Santer was finally toppled the same year (1999) and the EU's anti-fraud agency, OLAF, the only body with investigatory powers at EU level, branded as useless.

While other organisations might have changed its practices, former Director General of the Commission's Internal Audit Service, Jules Muis, in charge of reform, has described it as "an autocratic body with an incestuous *esprit de corps*" ... "in persistent denial of the real nature and depth of the problem".

Ironically it was Commission Vice President in charge of reform, Neil Kinnock, who ordered the dismissal of the Commission's first professional Chief Accountant, Marta Andreasen, after she had warned of the lack of audit trails and inadequate IT systems in its 200,000 bank accounts and refused to sign off the 2001 accounts.

Although Andreasen had submitted a report to the Commission's Chief Accountant, Michaele Schreyer and President Romano Prodi they had ignored her forcing her to go public and approach the EU Parliament's Budgetary Control Committee.

But the EU's civil service still refused Andreasen's claim for wrongful dismissal and accused her instead of violating Articles 12 and 21 of staff regulations with "failure to show sufficient loyalty and respect". "The general interest of the Community" was more important than the "right to freedom of speech".

In doing so they ignored the Court of Auditor's report supporting Andreasen's claims on the inadequacy of the Commissions own systems "in mitigating the risk of error over most of the budget". The Court also dismissed attempts by the Commission to blame member states instead.

The Court of Auditors themselves became embroiled in a scandal when one of their own auditors, Douglas Watt, called for the dismissal of 15 of its members after finding "systematic corruption and abuse". Though supported by 40 per cent of staff in a secret ballot he was later sacked by the Commission. The death of an Italian commissioner at the time who fell out from an EU office building was never resolved.

The Commission's consistently abusive reaction to whistle-blowers should ring alarm bells. When investigative journalist Hans Martin Tillack exposed massive looting of EU funds in Eurostat OLAF ordered armed Belgian police to arrest him and seize his files and computers. After four years Tillack won his case in the European Court of Human Rights with costs but though the Eurpean Ombudsman criticized OLAF, the director involved, Nicolas Illett, was later promoted.

Internal whistle-blower and auditor with the EU's Committee of the Regions, Robert McCoy, was so harassed by his bosses when he tried to expose bogus travel claims and other abuse of funds by 222 members of the Committee that he was finally invalided out of his job, although six years later his allegations were also verified.

To date, officially appointed and professional EU reformers at the highest level have been hounded by the Commission for exposing what auditors recently described as a "current budgeting financing system (which) is complex and lacks transparency" with "management and financial information poor, not used properly or misused".

Now there are calls for a Directive for whistle-blowers and the European Parliament's Scrutiny Committee has called for more transparency. But safeguarding EU taxpayers money has been shown to be low on the EU's agenda. Former EU Director General Jules Muis, has explained how to understand the EU's sloppy spending.

"Mandatory reading of Machiavelli...a few life courses in street fighting...and a frontal lobotomy".

If a lesson is to be learned from all of this investigation it is that those unelected bureaucrats that run the European Union have not the slight interest in "Democracy" or true "Accountability".

[We have included a reminder of Marta Andreasen's 2009 book "*Brussels Laid Bare*" on the opposite page.}

BOOK REMINDER

Hugh Williams

Exposure of EU accounting

Brussels Laid Bare
How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste
by Marta Andreasen

St Edward's Press Pbk 128 pp 2009

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

ISBN 978-0-955418-81-5

I first became aware of the existence of the newly-appointed EU's chief accountant, Marta Andreasen, when her name started featuring in the Press in 2002. To my horror, I learned that she was being punished for refusing to sign off the EU's 2001 accounts, which had been prepared by her predecessor, and which she could see contained a glaring error (in fact probably not an error but a fraud) of €200 million.

Her initial punishment for refusing to gloss over this matter was to be suspended. Her criticisms of the accounts were then investigated for two years; they were found to be fully justified but, instead of being rewarded and thanked for her integrity and courage, she was sacked. I as an accountant was appalled at this injustice, both as an accountant (naturally) and also as a Christian. I could hardly believe my eyes as her brave fight for honesty and justice was being so ruthlessly trampled on by the EU.

Nonetheless I was working away in Plymouth and these events were taking place in far off Brussels, and there was little I could do about her plight - or so I thought at the time.

In 2003 the magazine, *Accountancy Age*, ran a poll amongst its readers to choose the "Accounting Personality of the Year". Every year this magazine runs an awards evening in London - a huge event attended by over 1,000 accountants and their guests. I am please to report that Marta won the award for that category in 2003, I being one of those who voted for her.

An accountant friend of mine, Andrew Hamilton, who at that time, ran his own practice in Edinburgh, wanted to put on a talk about EU accounting for his clients in 2006, so he invited Marta and I was privileged to give the vote of thanks at the end. Later I suggested to her, as indeed had others, that she ought to write her story of what happened while she was in Brussels.

She started writing in 2007 and in the spring of 2008 she gave me the manuscript to read. I was not disappointed - even in that early form, it was a devastating tale, a real jaw-dropper,. But it was clear that, while Marta's English is excellent, her first language (of many) is Spanish, and that if the book was to have the appeal it deserved, we would need to get a professional wordsmith to do some work on the script. Marta and I agreed that I should hand the manuscript to someone who knew a retired journalist and the result, as you will see, was a really first-rate page-turner. The story now reads like the thriller it was in real life.

The book was finally launched on 11th May 2009, at a party at St Stephen's Club in Westminster.

Although this book describes the devious goings-on in Brussels' accounting in the first half of the "noughties", with the EU auditors still reporting that they were unable to "overcome the extraordinary lack of controls in administering EU funds" (to quote Jackie Williams - no relation to me in *eurofacts* October and November 2016 issues). This book is as relevant a read now as ever.

The Ashcroft Poll

According to Lord Ashcroft's poll of 12,369 voters on the 24th June 2016.

"Nearly half (49%) of Leave voters said the biggest single reason for wanting to leave the EU was 'the principle that decisions about the UK should be taken in the UK'.

One third (33%) said the main reason was that leaving 'offered the best chance for the UK to regain control over immigration and its own borders'.

Just over one in eight (13%) said remaining would mean having no choice 'about how the EU expanded its membership or its powers in the years ahead'.

Only just over one in twenty (6%) said their main reason was that 'when it comes to trade and the economy, the UK would benefit more from being outside the EU than from being part of it'.

From this poll it is quite clear that nineteen out of twenty (96%) of the electorate was fully aware of the possible short-term hit to the British economy as a result of Brexit.

The main reason for leaving the EU is the need for the UK electorate to be able to to decide by the democratic voting system the type of future it wants. The electorate has quite clearly and democratically instructed the government to leave the EU, should the elected government fail to accept this principle then the UK will no longer be a democratic country.

Understanding regulatory equivalence

First published on the Open Europe *web site - an effective fall-back option for UK financial services after Brexit?* by **Vincenzo Scarpetta**

Regulatory 'equivalence' with the EU is often cited as the main fall-back option for UK financial services after Brexit. *Open Europe's* Vincenzo Scarpetta (Senior Policy Analyst) explains what equivalence is, what it does (or does not) cover, and how it works in practice.

Open Europe's new report, *How the UK's financial services sector can continue thriving after Brexit,* has drawn widespread attention among media, practitioners and policymakers alike. This is the first of a series of blog posts presenting in a bit more detail some of the key findings of what is, admittedly, a hefty piece of research.

I will now look at regulatory equivalence, which is often being cited as the main fall-back option should UK-headquartered financial firms lose their 'passporting' rights – the ability to do business across the EU either via branches or on a cross-border basis – after Brexit.

What is equivalence?

Certain EU financial regulations envisage the possibility for third countries to obtain 'equivalence'. In practice, this means the EU acknowledges that the legal, regulatory and/or supervisory regime of a third country is as good as its own. Equivalence is outcome-based – that is, the regulations of the third country do not need to replicate the EU's word-by-word as long as they achieve the same objectives – and can bestow passport-like rights in some cases.

Equivalence is not granted to individual firms but to countries. The European Commission's Directorate General for Financial Services (DG FISMA) is responsible for carrying out technical assessments of equivalence. These are usually based on advice from the three pan-EU financial supervisors – EBA, ESMA and EIOPA. Only after such an assessment is successfully concluded can the Commission make a formal decision to grant equivalence.

While this may sound like a purely technocratic process, it can easily trespass into politics – not least because the Commission can wait as long as it wishes to issue its final verdict. In fact, previous experience shows it can take a third country several years to obtain equivalence. This being said, the UK starts from a very different baseline – as it currently has the exact same regulations as the EU. This should make equivalence much easier to achieve.

Several third countries have already obtained equivalence in some areas. The US, Australia, Canada and others have been judged equivalent with regard to Central Counterparties (CCPs) for the clearing of over-the-counter derivatives, for instance. Switzerland and Bermuda have obtained full equivalence under Solvency II – the EU directive setting out prudential requirements for the insurance sector.

What does equivalence cover?

Equivalence is a more piecemeal approach than the passport. The EU grants it on specific aspects of individual regulations. There are currently nearly 40 equivalence requirements in place in total. For example, there are three separate areas for evaluation under Solvency II (calculation of capital requirements, group supervision and reinsurance) – meaning that equivalence in all of them is needed in order for a third country's regulatory regime for insurers to be considered as fully equivalent to the EU's.

Secondly, and linked to the previous point, some EU regulations offer no equivalence at all. The largest 'hole' is arguably the Capital Requirements Directive (CRD IV) – which covers a number of key wholesale and retail banking services such as deposit-taking, commercial lending, and payment services. This explains why the UK should aim for bespoke deals to replicate passport-like arrangements in areas where equivalence is not available. The EU has done it in the past – see the bilateral agreement with Switzerland on the provision of direct insurance (not including life insurance) via branches.

Retaining the CRD IV passport for wholesale banking should be a top priority for the UK Government, as there are currently no effective alternatives to it.

In fact, the Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities Directive (UCITS V), which covers investment funds targeted at retail clients, makes no provisions for third-country access either. However, as we point out in our study, asset managers are generally less exposed to the loss of the passport as they have a wider range of fall-back options at their disposal. It is already common practice, for example, to keep EU clients' assets in funds domiciled in another European hub – mostly Dublin and Luxembourg – and then delegate their management to the UK. In theory, this kind of arrangement could continue after Brexit.

Similarly, Solvency II only offers equivalence for re-insurance services but not for direct insurance. However, insurance is a globally diversified industry and tends to make much less use of the passport. The overwhelming majority (87% according to research by the *Bruegel* think tank) of insurers that operate across borders do so via independent local subsidiaries – which are not reliant on the passport.

Further details at www.open.org.uk

Customs duties in the real world

Ian Milne

Calm down everyone. *In the real world managements don't spend time obsessing about customs duties*.

Before UK accession to the EU in 1973, when customs duties ("tariffs") were significant, the writer worked for a couple of years as a sales & marketing executive in a British multinational and its Belgian subsidiary, a manufacturing company making industrial products. Much later, around the turn of the century, he spent a decade or so as non-executive chairman of a medium-sized British manufacturing company making equipment for ocean-going military and commercial ships. (A key component was manufactured in the Indian sub-continent.) That equipment was sold to more than 80 countries, the biggest customer being South Korea.

In all that time he can hardly recall any discussion, whether with overseas customers or internally amongst board members and executives, about customs duties. Customs duties were regarded as just another cost of doing business that (to exaggerate only slightly) it was up to the "Despatch" or "Goods Outward" department of the manufacturer to sort out.

He does recall on the other hand discussions about currency movements and how to mitigate or benefit from their effects.

In the real world, managements, minute by minute, hour by hour, day by day, have to juggle with varying costs of inputs and outputs, often in a multitude of currencies. When the CEO of Renault and Nissan hinted that the Sunderland plant might "suffer" if on Brexit one of its markets (Continental EU) "suddenly" slapped a ten per cent duty on its exports to that market, he was trying to pressure not so much the UK, but Brussels, to come up with a mutually-satisfactory post-Brexit deal on customs duties. Meanwhile, other costs of "inputs" into the car-manufacturing process - steel, aluminium, plastic, rubber, copper, energy, taxes etc - are probably varying by at least ten per cent: and that same CEO (Carlos Gohn) is no doubt pressuring suppliers of those inputs to keep their prices down too. Gohn, as the French say, is *"dans son rôle"*.

Rules of engagement

UN resolutions that may affect EU negotiations

Brian Mooney

The media is full of stories on how gung-ho EU politicians might like to punish us for leaving the EU.

Hopefully this will help provide some reassurance.

A legal commentator, P. Szasz, has identified a UN Resolution or Declaration that would appear to rule out bullying, such as forcing us to choose between a punitive arrangement and not leaving at all. [1]

His key paragraphs are given below, and I've verified the Resolution on the UN website. [2]

Over the years, various international organs, and particularly the UN General Assembly, have adopted a series of solemn resolutions that, inter alia, are designed to delegitimize the use of economic force by individual States. One of the first of these was the 1965 "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty", which declared that; No State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or other types or measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights or to secure from it advantages of any kind.

Precisely the same text was repeated in the 1970 "Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in Accordance with the Charter of the United Nations", which is widely accepted "as an authoritative interpretation of the UN Charter".

Under international law, the EU27 will need to negotiate with us in good faith. In particular, heeding commitments at higher bodies such as WTO and UN.

The WTO stresses trade liberalisation positives, such as reciprocating benefits. It also insists that regional unions must boost trade internally without creating adverse effects for other WTO members. The EU is corporately a member.

All EU27 members are members of the UN. The Lisbon Treaty formally commits to respecting the UN Charter and wider international law.

Source
1) In Pdf format at;
https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/721cb2a7-876b-4cbf-91a3-4cbc19f1a593/The-Law-of-Economic-Sanctions.aspx
2) In Pdf format at;
http://legal.un.org/avl/ha/dpilfrcscun/dpilfrcscun/dpilfrcscun.html
http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/2625(XXV)

LETTERS

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

Hypocracy

Dear Sir,
Pro-remain MPs are complaining about Parliament being overridden by the Government and are demanding a vote on the Brexit deal. However, had they got their way and Britain had voted to stay in the EU, Parliament would have then been permanently overridden by the EU as all its laws, under the 1972 European Communities Act override all laws made in Parliament. The word hypocrites come to mind.
DEREK BENNETT
Walsall

How trade operates

Dear Sir,
The trouble with Christopher Gill's 'Wake-up call' article on the front cover of the last edition of '*eurofacts*' is that he clearly has NO understanding of how world trade operates these days.

For many years the EU has been a rules receiver rather than a rule maker because to trade in the world's markets requires adherence to a host of rules of regulations which are unavoidable and necessary for such issues as safety standards.

So we are deceiving the public if we try and pretend that leaving the EU and or Single Market (EEA) will reduce the level of regulations we will need to adhere to.

If we get Brexit wrong we will adversely affect our trade and so it is very dangerous to advocate that, after 43 years of integration, we will not need to negotiate our new relationship as any amicable divorce always requires.
NIALL WARRY
Somerset

Norway's EU contribution

Dear Sir,
Tim Congdon (*eurofacts* September) stating that the countries, Norway, Iceland, Lichtenstein and Switzerland have to pay into the EU for tariff free access is incorrect. These countries gave voluntary grants totalling approx. £14.8 million only in 2014. Norway gave 55% of this money voluntarily which was £8.1 million.

In comparison for the same access for the single market the U.K. for the same period in 2014 the U.K. after our rebate gave £12 billion which was compulsory according to the Office of National statistics.

(From Richard North's E.U. Referendum blog)
DAVID NIXON
Staffordshire

Trade WTO style

Dear Sir,
Neil Warry (*eurofacts* letters October) sets out a splendid plan for staying in the European Economic Area as an interim measure, until we can help to create a genuine single market involving all 58 countries in Europe. What a brilliant vision. Just one small point seems to have been overlooked. Didn't we have a Referendum recently? I seem to recall something about leaving the EU. How does that square with this new plan?

There is no need for a bespoke agreement if it takes too long to negotiate. We have a ready-made template for our future. We can leave the single market and trade with it freely under World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules, as China, the USA and over 150 other countries have done for many years. You don't need a trade agreement to trade. We could offer the EU a zero-tariff free trade agreement instead, but on a take it or leave it basis, not as a supplicant. If they don't want it, OK. The EU probably needs the City more than the City needs the EU. How will European banks manage without their passporting rights in London? They do a lot of business here, and many of them are not in a good shape to withstand the economic shock of losing it.

If they do want an FTA, it shouldn't take long to negotiate because there are no non-tariff barriers to negotiate over - we all start with the same business, trade and labour market rules. Once you rule out the EEA, it needn't be that difficult, though of course the politicians will make it so.

But I do love the idea of a single market involving all 58 European countries. After all, the present one with 28 has worked out so well, hasn't it? The EU's cumbersome procedures, and fundamental inability to agree on anything, have left it unable to deal with any of the four existential crises currently facing it - the migration crisis, the terrorist threat, the everlasting Euro crisis, and finally the unemployment crisis. Total unemployment in the Eurozone has for some time been a lot higher than in comparable countries, as has long-term unemployment and youth unemployment. This year youth unemployment is 39% in France, 43% in Italy, and 50% in Greece. If the EU cannot even offer its youth a future, what is it for?
KEN WORTHY
Surrey

Safeguarding the Referendum result

Dear Sir,
We eurosceptics thought we had won, but we hadn't.

The result of the 23rd June Referendum was only the first victory in a long war which may last four, five, or more years - as in wars of old.

In the time before that first victory, the Remainers had all the big guns on their side. They lost because the foot-soldiers - the voters were well mobilised.

However, the foot-soldiers are outside all key instruments of command and control. So pullers of power strings know that in due time the 23rd June result can be neutered.

Only continuing organisation and activity by the Leave campaign - as in the lead up to the Referendum - can safeguard the Referendum result. That campaign showed that the tangled web of law, regulation, institutional authority etc, can be defeated.
RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

MEETINGS

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

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **24th November**, 1.00 pm

"Employment and Unemployment"

Jagjit Chadha, *Gresham Professor of Commerce*
PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **30th November,** 7.00 pm

"Brexit: where next on immigration"

Philip Davies MP
Lord Green of Deddington, KCMG
Steven Woolfe MEP
PUBLIC MEETING
Royal Over-Seas League, Royal Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR
Admission charge £10
(Includes drinks reception)

The Economic Research Council

Wednesday **30th November,** 6.30 pm

"Economic Predictions of 2017"

Oxford vs. Cambridge vs. LSE
Chair - **Andrew Sentance,** *Senior Economic Advisor to PwC and former member of the Bank of England's Monetary Committee*

SIXTH ANNUAL CLASH OF THE TITANS
Royal Institute of Great Britain, 21 Albermarle Street, London W1S 4BS
Admission Full price £20
(please contact www.ercouncil.org)

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **6th December,** 6.30 pm

"From Bruges to Maastricht to Brexit"

Drinks Reception 6.30 - 7.00 pm
Buffet Dinner 7.00 - 8.00 pm
Speeches 7.30 pm
Followed by Auction
A CELEBRATION OF THE INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENT
Dress Code: Lounge suit
Shelbourne Room, The Lansdown Club, 9 Fitzmaurice Place, London W1J 5JD
Admission charge £65

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 Freedom Association

DIARY OF EVENTS

UK Government Autumn Statement — **23rd November**

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
Gonservatives 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

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

ISSN 1361-4134

9 771361 413006 03