

The EU and the fall of the Roman Empire

Franklin Dehousse

We are constantly told that the only future for the UK is for it to remain inside the European Union. However, the EU and the UK's pro-EU lobby could well do with taking a note of history regarding the formation and running of empires. Empires have a short shelf life and the EU is fast reaching its own demise as its internal problems regarding immigration, the euro crisis and many internal factors, including the rise of anti-EU organisations throughout the EU.

Below we reproduce an article on the Roman Empire.

"In 1988, Ramsay MacMullen published an interesting analysis about the fall of the Roman Empire, entitled 'Corruption and Decline of Rome'.

For him, the Empire had fallen because it was corrupt. Moral corruption was the essential concept. The rule of law was circumvented, or frankly ignored. All took care of their personal interest, and neglected utterly the general one.

Those Romans wouldn't feel disoriented in the present European Union (or the USA, for that matter).

Rule of law is dismantled in Hungary and Poland.

Journalists are killed in Malta and Slovakia.

Far-right Interior ministers promote discrimination in various member states.

Violating European commitments seems to become a badge of honour for many persons in charge.

The European institutions are not

spared, alas. So the recent European Parliament's 'democratic vote' about 'the rule of law's multiple violations in Hungary' looks like a noisy somersault to camouflage a long inertia.

It is difficult to explain why it took two legislatures (and many billions of euros paid by the taxpayers) to discover that there were evident violations.

It is also difficult to justify why Poland was immediately criticised while Hungary was long left in peace – apart from the fact that Fidesz was a member of the dominant party, and PIS was not.

Martin Selmayr's appointment as the European Commission's secretary general reveals the same hypocrisy (and the same dominant party's support).

It was obtained through (a) the fusion of two promotions in one single decision, (b) the absence of publicity, (c) the organisation of a fake competition with Selmayr's own adjunct, (d) Selmayr's direct participation to the process, and (e) the absence of preliminary information of the commission's members, in spite of the decision's collegial nature. (The fact that not a single of them protested reveals the extent of this generation's spinelessness).

In spite of five procedural defects and the total absence of precedent, the Juncker protege's appointment was declared 'perfectly legal' in an enormous mobilisation of the commission's press department.

Critics were presented as 'defenders of fake news', 'anti-European' or even 'opponents of women's promotion' (sic).

Still more interesting was the deafening silence that welcomed this appointment in various circles.

Apart from journalists, nothing was heard – in any direction – from the academics, think tanks, and multiple specialists of good administration.

The European Parliament meekly concluded there was a problem but did not impose anything.

The difference with the Jacques Santer commission's fall is striking. So is the difference between Pascal Lamy and Selmayr.

Lamy left the commission after 10 years, went to other ventures, and came back as commissioner in 1999.

Selmayr tricked his appointment for life. Nothing illustrates better than all this the moral degeneration of the commission's presidency, and generally the institutions', between Delors and Juncker."

Note: Franklin Dehousse is a former judge at the Court of Justice of the European Union, a former special representative of Belgium and currently professor at the University of Liege.

Source:

*This article by Franklin Dehousse was first produced on the euobserver web site in October 2018
www.euobserver.com*

EU export markets

Whilst the UK media has been focused on politics, the EU's official statistics agency recently released its latest trade figures.

The international trade figures published by the EU Commission's statistics agency last month were for 2018. It continues to report these as if the UK were not leaving: nowhere in the information released did the Commission's statistics agency refer to Brexit.

The reality is that when you take out the UK from the EU's 2018 figures, the conclusions drawn would be very different. The statistics agency was of course reporting on 2018, and so they were entirely correct in the data they

presented. However, last year this same agency started reporting 'EU27' data on many subjects, knowing that the UK was leaving and knowing that a large number of people worldwide would be starting to plan for an EU without the UK.

What would the figures have looked like if we had already left?

The data below show percentages of which countries represent the biggest buyers of EU goods. When the UK becomes an 'export market' to the EU27, these percentages change: the UK becomes the second biggest buyer of EU goods in the world.

The UK is set to rival the USA as the EU's largest export market in the

world, eclipsing even China. For the EU, based on its own 2018 figures, the UK's market would have been 71% larger than that of China. The UK market is thus vital to the EU27: almost as large as the USA and is far more important to the EU27 than China.

Top EU Markets with and without the UK as a member in % terms

	WITH	WITHOUT
USA	20.8	20.2
UK	0	18.3
China	10.7	10.7
Switzerland	8.0	7.8
Russia	4.4	4.7
Turkey	4.0	4.0
Japan	3.3	

EU's technocratic failure

Nigel Moore extract of an article for the Campaign for an Independent Britain

The misguided approach to the Brexit process by the European Commission and the Council represents a major failure of the EU's technocratic style of governance. A failure to understand or respond positively to the political dimensions of their actions; a failure to follow their own laws, treaty obligations and rules to mitigate the damage caused; a failure to learn from their mistakes. Rather than adapt, they appear set to double down on their agenda to create a homogenous European superstate through inflexible, centralised, top-down control. Ultimately, their ever-hardening attitude will lead to a destructive political schism in Europe, something they will find increasingly difficult to understand or control without coercion.

The Brussels Bubble ignores the political dimension - At the heart of the EU's whole approach to people (be it in policies, laws, regulations or behaviour) is to treat us as objects or resources, rather than 'flesh and blood' sentient and intelligent individuals. Thus, the feelings of the citizens in Member States, including anguish and stress, can be ignored in the interests of

servicing ideological or bureaucratic purposes. The EU may appear compassionate in theory, but is often far from it in practice. In particular, the EU refuses to respond compassionately to events that interfere with its chosen direction, namely its obsession with the 'European Project'.

The European Commission has built up considerable expertise in centralised top-down regulation, as a means of creating a homogenous European Superstate. Whilst often starting relatively unobtrusively, this approach inevitably leads to over-regulation as Eurocrats search for activities to bring under their ever more demanding control. Yet this does not occur in a vacuum, there is the wider or bigger picture where it all fits in. Each initiative has political, economic, public safety and security implications. The political dimension itself can be very wide-ranging including notions of cultural heritage, identity, democracy, freedom, law and social stability.

Bureaucrats commonly fail to look beyond their narrow specialisations. Their reality is limited to ideological premises, sacrosanct assumptions and concepts to be universally applied. The outside world then remains just that –

outside. The European Council of Ministers (political leaders of the Member States), whilst theoretically able to provide political insights, has outsourced much of their oversight responsibilities to the European Commission and German hegemony. Neither Eurocrats nor politicians saw Brexit coming and have been unable or unwilling to accommodate its political dimensions since (see e.g. Theresa May's Impossible Choice 30th July 2018 in *The New Yorker*).

The EU's technocrats had the expertise to run rings around Mrs May's negotiating team – yet they failed completely to understand the political dimensions. The backstop in the Withdrawal Agreement is a case in point. Few political leaders anywhere could accept the creation of a potentially indefinite internal border within their country to serve the interests of a foreign power. But this is not the only issue – handing over to the EU defence, defence procurement and fishing after Brexit are also issues where Brussels has made politically unreasonable demands. Such demands and more would obviously lead to political instability in the UK and a disorderly withdrawal.

Why sovereignty matters

The evolution of sovereign states around the world has been an uneven process. Some were founded on shared nationhood, language and culture, some on lines drawn by colonial rulers, others out of the chaos of war.

But sovereign states have this in common: they are all that now stands between the peoples of the world and utter domination by the transnational monopolies that think the world is rightfully theirs to exploit. The needs of monopolies are simple. They want to be able to shift goods, factories, people and investment anywhere in the world, and they want all countries in the world to sell the monopoly's products – whether it's a physical object like a computer or intangible, like insurance.

That's why these corporations – whether based in Europe, or the US, or China – love the EU. Not only does it constitutionally guarantee the free movement of capital, goods, services and persons (the term in the EU treaties), but it makes these principles paramount.

The word “persons” has a double meaning. On the one hand, it refers to people as workers: here free movement drives wages down, turning a whole continent into a reservoir of potentially cheaper labour.

But a company is also a “legal person”. Free movement here means the right to up sticks and relocate to a lower wage country – and in the

process outlaw workers' action to prevent this. (A ban enforced by the European Court of Justice). These principles are the free market made law, neoliberalism as a constitutional imperative. To call them freedoms is to make a mockery of the word, because the freedom of the people counts for nothing when it comes up against the wishes of capital.

And the EU has effectively enshrined these principles as permanent. The EU cannot be reformed. In fact, it has been built to ensure the eternal rule of the monopolies.

To reform its principles, to turn it into a weapon against the monopolies, would involve a treaty change approved unanimously by every member country. (Even the notoriously hard-to-change US constitution requires just three-quarters of its states to approve a change). Wander about the corridors of Brussels and you will hear corporate lobbyists criticise the EU. But it's a particular kind of criticism. They complain that it's not moving fast enough, that the single market does not (yet) cover health and education, that there's still too much red tape.

And they all complain about Brexit. Well, they would, wouldn't they? For them the ultimate dirty word is “nationalism”. Because, of all the different kinds of sovereign states, the ones based on nation are the hardest for them to crack. But they're not having it

all their own way. Their beloved EU-US TTIP “free trade” treaty, once within their reach, they thought, is languishing. They had hoped to use the combined force of the US? and EU to impose a new order on the world economy – to the detriment of all nations, especially developing countries. Now, since Obama has gone, they're back to square one.

The “free trade” treaties were designed to circumvent the refusal of countries in the World Trade Organization to accede to their demands. Now, people in Britain previously unaware of the WTO are saying we should leave the EU and follow WTO rules. Then we can trade freely around the world unshackled by EU trade rules. Our vote to leave the EU has been a huge blow to the transnationals. It came from the knowledge that sovereignty matters because without it we have no possibility of controlling our lives.

Those who think they can overturn the referendum yet still oppose the multinationals are indulging in an act of wilful self-deception. The EU stands not for progress but for reaction. And out of the Leave vote a new knowledge is developing, yet more dangerous for the corporate behemoths which think they can buy influence, politicians and power: that sovereignty must reside in the people, not in parliaments.

Source: www.brugesgroup.com

MEP power changes

The grand coalition of left and right lost its 40-year long majority to parties looking to upset the status quo. The centre-right European People's Party was down to 180 MEP's from 217 according to the parliament's calculations (it could lose 13 MEP's more if Hungary's Fidesz leaves the party family), and the Socialists &

Democrats will have 145 compared to 184 seats gained in 2014. The voters have opted for a more fragmented parliament, and the majority coalition will need to include more parties. European People's Party lead candidate Manfred Weber called for an EPP, Socialists, liberal and green alliance underlining “stability”, while

socialist lead candidate and Dutch EU commissioner Frans Timmermans called for a “progressive alliance” with liberals, the greens and the far-left, without the EPP - although that, for now, does not add up to half of the 751-seats. Weber said; “There is no stable majority against the EPP possible. My message is ‘join the EPP’ ”.

Real economic growth is outside the EU

Why for economic reasons its time to leave the EU. EU members

economies continue to struggle at low levels, the fastest growing economies

are outside the EU. India's economy is growing at 5.8%, China's at 6.0%.

Top EU jobs allocation

Zoe Alipranti

Following the European elections, an EU summit was held on Tuesday May 28th to discuss the candidates for the top EU jobs for the next five years. Positions at stake include the Presidents of the European Commission, the European Council and European Central Bank, and the EU High Representative of Foreign Affairs. Of particular importance is the selection process for Commission President, which is still not settled and will have a knock-on effect onto the other jobs. Overall, the selection of top jobs is likely to be a protracted and unwieldy process.

Will the Spitzenkandidat process be used?

The ‘Spitzenkandidat’ process was first used in 2014, despite being contested by UK Prime Minister David Cameron. According to this process, each pan-European political grouping nominates a leading candidate. The lead candidate of the group with the greatest number of MEPs is automatically nominated for Commission President by the European Council, and then has to be approved by a majority of MEPs in the European Parliament and a qualified majority of the Council (55% of member states, representing at least 65% of the EU’s total population).

However, the Spitzenkandidat process itself is not codified in EU law. It is based on Article 17(7) of the Lisbon Treaty, which simply states that the Council should propose a candidate to the European Parliament after “taking into account the elections to the European Parliament and after having held the appropriate consultations.” Although the Spitzenkandidat process was envisaged as a way to democratise the post of European Commission President, this is undermined in practice by the lack of name recognition for any of the top candidates. For example, the Spitzenkandidat for the centre-right European People’s Party (EPP), Manfred Weber, is only known by

26% of Germans – despite being German himself. An introduction of transnational lists in European elections next time might pave the way for a more accountable process that would fulfil the original Spitzenkandidat process aim.

If the Spitzenkandidat process is followed, the Manfred Weber would be proposed as the candidate for Commission Presidency, after the EPP won the most seats in the European elections, and elected 180 MEPs. However, this is a decline for the EPP compared to 2014, when they elected 222 MEPs. Weber is a German MEP from the Christian Social Union (CSU), Bavarian sister party of Chancellor Angela Merkel’s Christian Democrats (CDU). However, unlike Jean-Claude Juncker in 2014, Weber has little cross-party support – he is seen as a relative right-winger by EPP standards, and is also believed to lack sufficient political experience. Thus, Weber’s prospects might be killed off by the Council or the Parliament. German Chancellor Angela Merkel still defended Weber on the Tuesday summit, as it would be politically difficult for her not to do so, but this will not suffice to ensure his nomination.

The chances of the Spitzenkandidat being used arguably decreased after Weber was elected EPP Spitzenkandidat ahead of his competitor, ex-Finnish Prime Minister Alex Stubb – seen as a more unifying figure. One alternative candidate might be Frans Timmermans, current Commission Vice President and the Spitzenkandidat for the Alliance of Socialist and Democrats (S&D), which came second overall with 153 MEPs. Timmermans’ profile was boosted after his Dutch Labour Party won the European election in the Netherlands, but it is difficult to see how he could win the presidential nomination when the S&D finished second. Timmermans is also likely to be strongly opposed by Hungary and

Poland, due to his hard-line stance on violations of the rule of law by member states.

The Spitzenkandidat process also faces opposition from a number of European figures. European Council President Donald Tusk yesterday repeated that national leaders will not be bound by the Spitzenkandidat process. French President Emmanuel Macron was also sceptical, saying that candidates for top EU jobs need “experience at the highest governmental level or European Commission level” – interpreted as a thinly veiled criticism of Weber. Macron has talked up the prospects of fellow Frenchman Michel Barnier, the EU’s Chief Brexit Negotiator, describing him as “a man who has great qualities.” Barnier is respected in EU circles for his handling of Brexit, and has long been talked up as a potential alternative for the role of Commission President. As a member of the EPP, his appointment would also preserve the spirit of Article 17(7) of the Lisbon Treaty.

The ALDE group in the European Parliament has also opposed the process, having selected a team of candidates instead of a Spitzenkandidat. Group leader Guy Verhofstadt has said, “The EPP is pushing hard for the Spitzenkandidaten-system, but unfortunately they killed its legitimacy when they voted against transnational lists,” adding, “For us it is important that the next President of the Commission is representing a broad pro-European majority with a clear programme to renew Europe.”

Given the significant ALDE gains in the European elections – they increased their MEPs from 67 to 102 – it will be very difficult to appoint a candidate without ALDE support. Leading candidates that have emerged as potential choices that ALDE might accept include Danish Competition Commissioner Magrethe Vestager who

Continued on page 5

Top EU jobs allocation

Continued from page 4

is (a member of ALDE), as well as Barnier. Moreover, the body of Commissioners will be chosen for all areas, one from each member state.

How will this affect the other jobs?

Nationality, political affiliation and gender will be factors in the nominations of the other top jobs. Therefore, the choice of Commission President will impact the picks for other jobs. It is likely, for example, that a French-led Commission under Barnier would strengthen the case for a German ECB President to succeed incumbent Mario Draghi. German Bundesbank President Jens Weidmann is seen as Germany's strongest candidate. However, a perceived stitch-up by France and Germany would be resisted by other countries, such as the Netherlands and Spain, especially during a period of Franco-German disagreements. The new ECB President will still have to be approved by Germany, making Finland's Erkki Liikanen – a fiscal conservative – a possible candidate. France's Francois

Villeroy de Galha is also in the running.

The Council President selection process is also uncertain and ultimately depends on finding a geographical and ideological balance between all the top jobs. Angela Merkel has been suggested as an option, but it would be very difficult politically to have the German Chancellor leading the Council. Dutch Prime Minister Mark Rutte constitutes a more plausible option, if he can be persuaded to step down from his domestic position.

The current European Council President Donald Tusk clarified recently that "my intention is for the Council to nominate the new EU leadership in June." This would mean the Council electing both ECB and Council Presidents, and proposing candidates for Commission President and High Representative, during its meeting on 20–21 June. These dates will most probably not see the final selection, since the divisiveness of procedure and shifting intra-group dynamics seem likely to delay the

selection. The set dates ahead are:

July: the European Parliament will vote on the Commission President nominee

1st November, when the new Commission President, New ECB President and new High Representative take office

1st December, when the new European Council President takes office.

How could this affect Brexit?

Whoever is appointed Commission President will play a big part in the future of Brexit. This could include requests for further extensions of Article 50 and negotiations over the future relationship. A President Barnier would most likely cleave closely to the approach of Task Force 50 to date; he also adopted a tough approach on an extension in March. Nevertheless, it remains unlikely that a European Commission President would oppose an extra extension if this risked leading to a No Deal Brexit.

Source: www.openeurope.org.uk

EU commission changes

While we await the full outcome of the current EU's internal battles over who should get what jobs, one has been decided. The EU's deputy Brexit negotiator, Sabine Weyand, will lead

the trade unit in the EU commission from June, meaning she would oversee future trade negotiations with the UK, the US and help steer policy towards China. The 54-year old German has

raised her profile significantly as Brexit negotiator since 2016 and was widely credited for being the ultimate expert on trade and other practical aspects of the Brexit divorce deal.

European election results

Lessons can be learned from the results of the EU Parliamentary elections.

1. We had a referendum in 2016 and Leave won - **1st Leave win.**
2. We had a general election in 2017 where both Labour and Conservatives election manifestos were for a clean Brexit and for which they campaigned. Conservative came first and Labour came second - **2nd Leave win.**
3. We have just had an EU Parliament election, billed as an effective referendum.

Brexit Party (a Leave Party - with no other issues) won **29 seats**

Labour (officially a Leave Party (see above) won **10 seats**

Conservatives (officially a Leave Party (see above) won **4 seats**

Total leave seats 43

Lib/dems campaigned on Stop Brexit, a Remain Party, won **16 seats**

Greens campaigned on Green issues and remaining in the EU - give them benefit of doubt on what people voted for, won **7 seats**

Total Remain seats 23

Nationalist parties don't count as they want out of UK

Therefore, in the **3rd** effective referendum, leave won again, overwhelmingly this time, by **sixty-five** percent.

So Leave have won 3 referenda since 2016 - so what are we waiting for? a 4th referendum, a 5th referendum?

Note: Each time Leave wins, it's by a greater margin.

LETTERS

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

Treaty change

Dear Sir,

It is disappointing to still see the so-called Danish 'opt-outs' still being touted as legally binding ("Legal changes to the Brexit deal are possible", *eurofacts* 17th May). As the late, great Leo Price QC, Martin Howe QC and myself demonstrated in our Legal Assessment, which was translated into Danish and published in Denmark, the 'opt-outs' were worthless. They were not legally binding and lacked meaningful content. When the Danish people were forced to vote again they voted on precisely the same text which they had previously rejected.

The Walloons were sold a pup. The Joint Interpretative Instrument on the EU-Canada treaty is not legally binding. It merely has to be taken into account, that's all. It did not alter the text of the treaty and was simply a device to fool the Walloons into dropping their opposition to the treaty.

The only way to amend a treaty is to amend it. That will normally require reopening the treaty itself or adding an additional protocol, which to be binding must be assented to by each state party.
MICHAEL SHRIMPTON
Wiltshire

Leadership

Dear Sir,

What a joke Conservative, LibDem and UKIP all looking for leadership.
DAVID MILES
London

Political Declaration

Dear Sir,

Please see below a copy of a letter received from my MP Adam Holloway.
"The result of the Referendum was close but, regrettably, the current deal

negotiated by the Prime Minister does not honour the decision of 65% of our neighbours in Gravesham who voted in the Referendum, and a majority of the country.

I remain convinced that the Withdrawal Agreement and Political Declaration:

* represent an unconscionable loss of sovereignty (entering the Backstop would be the first time in Parliament's history that it could not undo something its predecessor had done. For me, that is not taking back control).

* have the potential to damage the Union (the Irish Backstop would impose regulatory differences between Northern Ireland and the rest of the UK and the Government's own legal advice makes it clear that we would be unable to exit the backstop if the future negotiations fail).

*fetter our ability to trade freely (the Withdrawal Agreement says the future relationship will "build on the single customs territory" outlined in the backstop - this means the UK and the EU must apply the same tariffs to imports from other countries).

* could lock the UK in EU defence and security structures for the first time (the Political Declaration speaks of a "broad, comprehensive and balanced security partnership...which respects the sovereignty of the UK and the autonomy of the Union". However, it is clear to me that these are mutually exclusive aspirations: the UK cannot pick and choose its involvement in EU defence initiatives - if we were to involve ourselves in this way we will be subject to strict participation criteria. Also, "structural cooperation" in intelligence could well spell the end of the "Five Eyes" intelligence relationship with America, Australia, Canada and New Zealand).

For these reasons and many more I will vote against the Withdrawal Agreement again if and when it is put to a 4th vote. Assuming the deal

remains broadly as it is currently constituted, this is not Brexit, but Remain, without vote, veto, voice or exit. The deal downgrades the UK from being an (albeit very restrained) rule maker to a subservient rule taker.

I most certainly do not agree with the likes of the *Daily Mail* that suggests that those of us standing against the Withdrawal Agreement are standing in the way of Brexit: Theresa May and the Civil Service have produced a Brexit in name only, with the serious problems I list above and at a cost of £39bn to the British taxpayer. I think my maths is correct, and this comes to £1950 per household reading this letter and every single household in the country in taxes we pay and borrowing the government makes on behalf of unborn generations.

Had the majority of people in Gravesham voted to Remain, I would be equally outraged if - say - a committed Leaver had been PM, who did not believe in Remain, had negotiated a "deal" that actually took us out of EU structures.

Now staggeringly, an out of touch Parliament has removed the one bill of leverage we had - the threat of NO Deal (which I never feared). On top of that, the PM is now trying to get her Deal (or some further diluted version of it) over the line with the help of the Marxist leadership of the Labour Party.

There is even talk of us remaining (note the word) in the Customs Union. This is nothing short of an insult to the 17.4m people who voted to leave.

If you have not already done so, (please have a look at:- <https://facebook.com/holloway.adam/>) amongst other material, to be reminded of what David Cameron declared a Leave vote would mean.

People in Gravesham voted to Leave and rightfully trusted that the will of the people would be respected. I will not rebel against their wishes."
MS BROOKER
Gravesend

MEETINGS

The Brexit Party
www.thebrexitparty.org

A number of public meetings are being arranged across the country

PUBLIC MEETINGS

Further details on dates and times are available by visiting the web site.
www.thebrexitparty.org

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **18th June**, 6.00 pm

"The Weimar Republic - Germany's first democracy"

Professor Sir Richard Evans FBA,
Provost

PUBLIC MEETING

The Museum of London, London Wall,
London EC2

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **20th June**, 6.00 pm

"Striking the Balance Between Common Sense and Legal Reasoning"

Lord Kerr of Tonaghmore PC, QC

PUBLIC MEETING

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

Admission Free

(Reservations by ticket required)

Liberal Democrats
Party Conference

14th - 17th September

ICC Bournemouth

United Kingdom Independence
Party Conference

20th - 21st September

Possible date
Details not yet announced

Labour
Party Conference

21st - 25th September

Brighton Centre

Conservative
Party Conference

29th September - 2nd October

Manchester

FREE
Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of the UK-EU relationship.

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175

or

Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

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

UK Parliament **Date awaited**
Summer Recess

At the time of going to press!
Current Official date **31st October**
for completion of
Article 50 negotiations
between the UK and the EU
and start of a possible 'Transition
Deal' due to end in December 2020

2020

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

Germany takes over **1st July**
Council Presidency

Should May's deal pass!
Current Official date **31st December**
for completion of EU/UK Transition

2021

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

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Party

www.thebrexitparty.org

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

Change Britain

www.changebritain.org

Concordance

www.concordanceout.eu

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

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.eurosafeguards.com

Leave means leave

www.leavemeansleave.eu

Leave.eu

www.Leave.eu

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Save Britain's Fish

www.ffl.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The Taxpayers' Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Special Offers

Handshakes Not Handcuffs

Edited by Lionel Bell.

£6.99 - Pbk 2002 - 96 pp.

An easy-to-read collection of proposals for co-operative alternatives, show a full depth of reasoned opposition, to the EU.
(NOW ONLY £3)

Anthony Fisher: Champion of Liberty

by Gerald Frost.

£20.00 - Hdbk 2002- 268 pp

Fisher founded the IEA, which influenced public policy and the views of Reagan, Thatcher and others.
(NOW ONLY £10)

Lost Illusions: British Foreign Policy

by Ian Milne

£4.00 - 2002 Pamphlet - 25 pp

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.
(NOW ONLY £2)

Vigilance:

A defence of British Liberty

by Ashley Mote

£12.95 - Pbk 2001 - 279 pp

What is done by the EU to Britain, why it matters and how Britain could emerge
(NOW ONLY £7)

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
(UK only)

Seizing the moment

by John Ashworth. £4.00

The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit with the restoration of the 200nm/midline resources zone.

The Democratic Imperative

by Robert Corfe. £12.99

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.

The Betrayal of British Industry

by J. Brian Heywood. £3.00

How government has failed to protect the UK industrial sector from foreign companies, putting at risk the long-term economic prosperity of the UK.

Costly Affairs

In British

Foreign Policy

The advantages of foresight

by Christopher Hoskin. £3.00

Why you do not need to go to war or take hostile action against any country whose regime you dislike

Tel: 08456 120 175

The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanisms of the European Union

by Bob Lyddon. £8.00

How the UK's exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and maybe more.

The Euro's Battle for Survival

Entering the Red Zone

by Bob Lyddon. £5.00

Why the eurozone and its policies are facing a further financial crisis.

Moralitis

A Cultural Virus

by Robert Oulds and

Niall McCrae. £5.00

How the forces of conformity are such that freedom is limited and the body politic has become infected with the methods of prevention and treatment.

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.

UK PLEASE ADD 10% P&P
Send payment to

JUNE PRESS LTD, PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Email: info@junepress.com

www.junepress.com

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
Acting leader Rt Hon Mrs Theresa May MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Jonathan Bartley and Sian Berry	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Jeremy Corbyn MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Acting leader Rt Hon Sir Vince Cable	
UK Independence Party	01626 831290
Acting leader Gerard Batten MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006