

UK Independence Party Comes of Age

*The party of fruit-cakes, loonies and closet-racists
has joined the mainstream*

As readers know, the European Parliament is not a parliament, but a sort of consultative assembly with no right to initiate legislation and severely constrained ability to amend proposals for new laws put to it by the unelected Commission.

Voting weights

In this so-called “parliament” the UK currently has less than ten per cent of the total number of seats (72 out of 736). Even Germany, the EU’s most populous nation (until Turkey joins) has only 99 seats or 13.5 per cent of the total number of 736.

What this means is that, when it comes to shaping EU policy and legislation (let alone blocking it), the influence of British MEPs is close to zero. Even if all 72 British MEPs came from a single British political party and always voted in Brussels and Strasbourg as a bloc, it wouldn’t make the slightest difference to the way the EU “works”. The British electorate is fully aware of this: consequently, turnout in Euro-elections is low and in long-term decline (as it is in other member-states as well).

Nevertheless, viewed as a domestic internal UK matter, Euro-elections are highly-significant. They are national UK elections, treated as such by the electorate, the media and the political parties. They reflect public opinion as

a whole - however imperfectly. At least as important, the media treatment of the pre-election campaigns, the elections themselves and the aftermath reflects how the British *bien-pensant* “commentariat” is thinking. This in turn rebounds on and to some extent changes public opinion.

So UKIP’s success on 4th June, coming second to the Conservatives and beating Labour into third place, is significant. Even more significant is the reversal in the way the media regards UKIP. Now, even the BBC treats UKIP with respect, with its leading figures appearing regularly, as sane, serious contributors, on the BBC premier league political programmes, including *Question Time* and *Any Questions?* UKIP, in short, has come of age. It has joined the ranks of the “respectable” mainstream parties (though the latter seem to be vying with each other in testing the definition of “respectability” to destruction at the moment).

Leadership

UKIP’s leader, Nigel Farage, has played a key role in propelling UKIP into the mainstream. He also has come of age. His performances on the stump and on television and radio were highly-professional and highly-effective. One example: on the last *Question Time* before the elections, he stood out amongst his fellow-panellists

almost as an elder statesman with his mature and level-headed interventions and responses. He has two indispensable qualities for public speaking and TV and radio: he sticks to his subject and knows when to shut up.

Much less publicly-visible, but just as indispensable for UKIP, are two members of the House of Lords, Lord Pearson and Lord Willoughby de Broke. Their courage in breaking their life-long links with the Conservative Party three years ago, and in defying the obloquy of their fellow-peers, is not to be underestimated. Nor is their subsequent sheer hard work in helping to move UKIP into a position where it has been able to transform solid grassroots opinion into real political influence.

And when it comes to sheer hard work, the party’s thousands of supporters and backers must not be forgotten. It took “boots-on-the-ground” to organise the hundreds of meetings and thousands of billboards and posters throughout the country, and UKIP “out-advertised” the other parties a thousand-fold.

There are good grounds for believing that on 4th June UKIP achieved breakthrough. Where next? All one can say is that in rugby terms a try has been scored, but not yet converted. To paraphrase a well-known British statesman, this is not the end; it is not even the beginning of the end. But it might well be the end of the beginning.

INSIDE: Missing - The strong man of the EU p.2 - Pitfalls ahead for Cameron p.2 - Falling support for EU integration p.2 - eurofacts to be re-launched? p.3 - Transparency and openness Cameron style p.3 - UKIP Peer’s Bill for reform p.3 - Lost in space p.4 - L’Indépendance to close p.4 - No way to run an army p.5 - Why the Foreign Office has no backbone p.5

Missing - The strong man of the EU

Anthony Scholefield looks at Cameron's missed opportunity

David Cameron missed his opportunity during the European elections. He could have become the arbiter of EU politics, the 'strong man' of Europe.

Tory policy is to demand a referendum now on the Lisbon Treaty and then to vote against it. However, simultaneously, they refuse to promise a post-ratification referendum on the Treaty and, despite its supposed unacceptable contents, shelter behind the mantra '*we would not leave matters there*'. Even UKIP concedes that the promise of a post-ratification referendum would have gained the Tories many votes on 4th June.

Even in terms of their own stance on the EU, in favour of economic integration but against further political integration, it is difficult to see the advantages of the Tory strategy. Suppose they had agreed a post-ratification referendum and won it. David Cameron would have attended European Councils as the man who made the political weather, mandated by his electorate to rid the Treaty of its obnoxious contents. Would the Europhiles dare to ignore the referendum result? That would be a step too far even for the EU elites, especially if the Tories had then raised the question of UK financial

contributions to Brussels.

As it is, Cameron has given away the valuable card of being backed by a popular mandate and will be reduced to accepting the Treaty with its obnoxious contents and vainly seeking modifications - which will be contemptuously brushed aside.

A bad decision and one that turns David Cameron from the potential 'strong man' of Europe into a weakened supplicant. It is also likely to mean a festering sore at the heart of Tory policy from the moment an election is won. It will then be Tory ministers standing up to justify each and every EU complication.

Pitfalls ahead for Cameron

If the Prime Minister's current difficulties deepen, the prospect arises of a British General Election taking place within a few days of a second Irish referendum on Lisbon, which appears to be pencilled-in for this October. In that event, one scenario - unlikely, but conceivable - could be as follows:-

- An Irish referendum votes Yes to Lisbon on 15th October.
- Lisbon comes into force on, say, 20th October.
- UK General Election resulting in victory for Cameron on say, 22nd October.

Cameron goes on prime-time television on 23rd October and says, "*Sorry folks, Lisbon came into force three days ago, so no British referendum.*" That would be the

consequence of the Conservatives' current stated policy on the referendum.

The date of the second Irish referendum, if it is to take place at all, would have to be fixed several weeks in advance, in line with the Irish Constitution, to give time for both sides to conduct their campaigns. It could not be sprung out of a hat and fixed ten days or so in advance.

Given the terminal weakness of the current government, no one can predict when a British General Election might have to be held. "Events" would precipitate one. The Irish requirement for a decent referendum notice period, combined with the unpredictability of the timing of the next British General Election, would mean that whether Cameron's referendum "promise" (conditional on Lisbon not being "*in*

force" when he takes office) were carried out would depend on a mere accident of the calendar. A couple of days one side: a British referendum on Lisbon and (assuming a No) a massive geo-political shake-up; a couple of days the other side: "*oh all right then, we'll accept Lisbon and hope to negotiate a few minor opt-outs later - probably in our second term*".

The Lisbon Treaty/Constitution would be a monumental step forward for the European Project and an equally monumental threat to the survival of the British nation-state, and therefore of British parliamentary democracy. That the Conservatives regard Lisbon with such carefree insouciance speaks volumes. They simply cannot be regarded as serious.

Falling support for EU integration

The *Economist* reports on a new YouGov poll which shows that support for greater European integration in Britain has dropped from one in three in 1995 to one in five

today. Those within that group who favour a fully-fledged European government make up only 5 per cent of the total, down from 10 per cent in 1995. Over the same period support for

loosening Britain's ties to the EU has risen from 36 per cent to 51 per cent, and those who want Britain to withdraw from it have almost doubled, from 12 per cent to 21 per cent

eurofacts to be re-launched?

Since the announcement of *eurofacts'* ceasing publication we have been inundated by letters, emails and phone calls from donors and subscribers. We are immensely grateful for your expressions of appreciation of our work over the last fourteen years and have taken on board your disappointment at our not being able to continue, at least in the immediate future. We really had no idea how valuable, and hopefully influential, you all found us to be!

At present we are having discussions with a number of

groups with a view to re-launching *eurofacts*. Whilst there is no certainty that they will lead to anything, there are grounds for hoping that the *eurofacts* story is not over yet, especially as euroscepticism, since the Euro-elections on 4th June, is no longer a minority sport. Be assured that we will make an announcement as soon as we can.

Meanwhile, *eurofacts Ltd*, the company that produces *eurofacts*, will continue to exist and to maintain the subscriber base. Back issues of *eurofacts* and data sheets and fact sheets since Vol 9 No 1

dated 24th October 2003 will continue to be available at **The June Press** web site. (www.junepress.com>*eurofacts*) *eurofacts Ltd's* parent company, **The June Press Ltd**, will continue to operate as a publisher and distributor of books, and its website will continue to maintain its "Notice Board" of meetings, lectures and other events.

Once again, to all our readers, thank you for your interest and encouragement, which are very much appreciated.

Transparency and openness Cameron style

The most robust statement to date of the Tory leadership's intentions regarding the Lisbon Treaty was contained in a speech by David Cameron at the Open University in Milton Keynes on 26th May, nine days before the elections to the European Parliament. The paragraph below is the one that he will need to be reminded of in the event of backsliding by a future

Tory government. The title of the speech, which will no doubt be brought to the world's attention if such were to occur, is "Mending Broken Promises".

"We will therefore hold a referendum on the Lisbon Treaty, pass a law requiring a referendum to approve any further transfers of power to the EU, negotiate the return of powers, and require far more detailed scrutiny in

Parliament of EU legislation, regulation and spending."

Mr Cameron forgot - no doubt inadvertently - to remind listeners that stated, written Conservative policy is that the referendum promise remains conditional on the Treaty "not being in force" on the day that he becomes Prime Minister.

UKIP Peer's Bill for Reform

On 2nd June 2009 Lord Willoughby de Broke's *Constitutional Reform Bill** had its first reading in the House of Lords. It would repeal the European Communities Act 1972 and the Human Rights Act 1998; subject all UK declarations of war or hostile military actions to the prior authorisation of

Parliament; reduce the number of constituencies in the UK to 250; introduce five-year fixed-term parliaments; and subject reform of the House of Lords (with complete abolition being one option) to a referendum.

It would also bring in binding

referendums at national and local level, including those requested by petition of electors; transfer much tax-raising powers from national to local level; and provide legally-binding mechanisms for abolishing quangos.

**www.globalbritain.org>Parliamentary Activities*

Flint flounces off

Caroline Flint MP flounced out of Brown's cabinet on 3rd June. She was Minister for "Europe", having been put in that elevated position a few months before. Those who saw her on television, on *Question Time* for example, will have been struck by how

little she "actually" (that favourite New Labour word which signifies an evasion is coming) knew about the EU. However, in all the baroque farce of that fateful weekend one clue to her ignorance came out: during all her time in charge of "Europe" she had only

ever once been invited to a meeting of the Cabinet.

Of course, with Lord Mandelson now in the driving seat, there's really no need for a Minister for "Europe"...or even a Prime Minister.

Lost in space

Lord Stoddart of Swindon: To ask Her Majesty's Government whether they will make available to members of both Houses of Parliament the minutes of meetings of the European Commission. [HL3586]

The Minister of State, Foreign and Commonwealth Office (Lord Malloch-Brown): The Foreign and Commonwealth Office does not receive minutes of all European Commission meetings. It is for the European Commission to decide what it does with internal records of meetings attended by its officials. The Government recognise the need for officials to have space for original thought, and it is not our policy to seek publication of such documents. Access to such documents can be sought through the regulation 1049/01 on access to documents of the EU

institutions.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: To ask Her Majesty's Government whether the European Commission keeps and publishes minutes of all its meetings; and, if not, whether they will seek to persuade it to do so. [HL3587]

Lord Malloch-Brown: The European Commission does not publish internal records of meetings attended by its officials. The Government recognise the need for officials to have space for original thought, and it is not our policy to seek publication of such documents. Access to such documents can be sought through the regulation 1049/01 on access to documents of the EU institutions.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch: To ask Her Majesty's Government whether

they receive minutes of all European Commission meetings; and, if so, whether they will publish them. [HL3588]

Lord Malloch-Brown: The Foreign and Commonwealth Office does not receive minutes of all European Commission meetings. It is for the European Commission to decide what it does with internal records of meetings attended by its officials. The Government recognise the need for officials to have space for original thought, and it is not our policy to seek publication of such documents. Access to such documents can be sought through the regulation 1049/01 on access to documents of the EU institutions.

Hansard 20th May 2009; Parliamentary Copyright

L'Indépendance to close

The last, 51st issue of *L'Indépendance*, the French equivalent of *eurofacts*, came out in April 2009, after six years of existence. Its founder, Paul-Marie Coûteaux, the inventor of the word "*souverainiste*", was a French MEP, who decided not to stand this time. There are, apparently, plans to revive *L'Indépendance*, which was a monthly, in another form. So in France, as in the UK with the closure of *eurofacts*, an era comes to an end.

L'Indépendance gave a powerfully-argued alternative voice to the soggy, blind europhilia which still dominates what passes for "policy" in France. French euroscepticism is different from the British version - and let us congratulate its French exponents for articulating a view which casts the European project in a notably different, even uncomfortable light for Britons. The French version - how could it be anything else? - is much more "intellectual" than the British; anti-American; distrustful of the free-

market; in favour of protectionism; inclined to support the idea of a strong state. We in the UK often forget that French history is different from ours, and consequently, that French eurosceptic attitudes cannot ever be identical to the British.

Even before the current economic crisis, there were parallels between France and the UK: a sense that the so-called mainstream parties have lost contact with reality; that parliamentary democracy has been degraded; that eurosceptics have struggled to find a political leader and party around which to coalesce; that the EU has failed, and that only the nation-state, with all its faults, can begin to provide answers to our problems. In both countries, the mass of the public knows this. The French voted decisively "No" in their referendum on the Constitution; nevertheless, because of the decomposition of the main opposition party, Sarkozy (using the same disgraceful lie as Gordon Brown, that

Lisbon is different from the Constitution) has been able to ratify the Lisbon Treaty. But that "No" is not forgotten by the French: eventually, French voters will ensure that their will is respected.

French democracy (I never thought in a million years I would say this) is much more vigorous than ours, especially at the local level. The great French public (like ours) regards the European Parliament as a joke. (This is partly because the French political class regards the European Parliament as a dumping-ground or parking-lot for clapped-out or disgraced French politicians, and of course a job-creation scheme for the citizens of Strasbourg). So it may be that, as far as the defunct European project is concerned, sanity breaks through in France before it does in the UK. When it does, Paul-Marie Coûteaux and *L'Indépendance* will be recognised as having kept the flame alive when all seemed lost.

No way to run an army

EU urges MoD to consider sending women into battle

Tests carried out by the US marine corps in the 1980s showed that 45 per cent of female recruits could not throw a grenade beyond the point at which they would blow themselves up. At the time it seemed likely that the conclusion to emerge from the tests would be that women should be excluded from front-line roles. Instead, influenced by the rising tide of political correctness, the US Defence Department commissioned studies to see whether it would be possible to produce lighter grenades.

There are grounds for fearing something similarly absurd may be about to happen here. As a result of the Equal Treatment Directive (76/207/EEC) the MoD has begun a review to see whether it is possible to employ service-women in combat roles. At present women are excluded where they are likely to “deliberately close with and kill the enemy face to face”.

In 2002 when a similar review was carried out a number of officers complained that the more physically demanding tests had been watered down so that women could meet them. As a result, the review process was

widely derided in the press and women were kept out of front-line roles. However, speaking on the *Politics Show* on 24th May Brigadier Richard Nugee, the Army’s director of manning, confirmed that the MoD was presently responding to an EU requirement to repeat the review.

“This is a very open-minded review, we have no conclusions yet”, he said.

It is disturbing to learn that Whitehall warriors like Brigadier Nugee should be “open-minded” about this matter. Unless warfare has changed to the point where agility and physical strength no longer count it should be clear that women soldiers will be at a disadvantage in front-line roles as a result of their inferior physical strength and that their use in these roles will consequently damage operational efficiency, military cohesion and morale.

An average 30-year-old woman has the aerobic capacity of a 50-year-old man and is more likely to damage herself in training. A female recruit possesses not much more than half the male’s upper body strength, and only 72 per cent of the male’s lower body strength. On average women recruits run less fast and can perform fewer

physical exercises in training and female recruits are more likely to be sick, perhaps as the result of pregnancy.

The MoD already knows these things, but evidently lacks the courage to point them out, and the EU Commission is famed for its tendency to ignore inconvenient aspects of reality whenever this suits its purpose. Its only aim is to see that its foolish Directive is put into effect and to ensure that the MoD lives up to its obligations as an equal opportunities employer. It conveniently overlooks the fact that front-line war-fighting is not exactly an equal opportunities activity, but one which still favours the quick and the strong, as experience in Iraq and Afghanistan has amply demonstrated.

It is possible, of course, that the traditionalists in the MoD (who believe that gender integration in the forces has already gone too far) will prevail and women will continue to be excluded from front-line roles. In which case the Commission will simply repeat its demand again and again until such time as it gets its way. It is surely no way to run an army.

Why the Foreign Office has no backbone

The Foreign Office’s Europhilia has been demonstrated conclusively in the article headed *“Foreign Office concerned about Tory position on Europe”* (*eurofacts* 15th May 2009).

With the Foreign Secretary, David Miliband formerly an MEP and his sidekick, Lord Malloch-Brown, once deputy secretary-general of the UN, we could expect this support for a distant bureaucracy rather than for their own country. Indeed this is the same Foreign Office attacked in 2002 by John Nott, the former Secretary for Defence for *“not having the backbone to stand up for British interests”*.

Recently these criticisms have been confirmed comprehensively by an official “Cultural Audit Report” for the Foreign Office by the Couraud consultancy. Significantly, though this

was completed in August 2008, it was only slipped into the House of Commons Library in March 2009.

It is a damning catalogue of criticisms; e.g. *“The Foreign Office is not very good at taking decisions and making things happen”* (p.6). Consequently; *“agreed projects are either never or only partly followed up or are delayed for months or years....The FO suffers far too much from uncertainty, political jockeying and vacillation”* (p.7). Overall this is *“a very bureaucratic organisation”* (p.22) *“under-estimating the financial impact of its decision”* (p.10). Despairingly the report exclaims *“How can the FO get so many obvious common sense things wrong”* (p.22), adding incredulously *“the Office’s culture is rather an insular one”* (p.39).

Given such blatant inadequacy it is not surprising that foreign bodies such as the French *énarques*, who are naturally devoted solely to French interests, dance rings around our officials so that if they make tentative compromises we are sure to be compromised.

The Foreign Office’s final massive folly is their being unaware that in supporting the EU they are destroying their own *raison d’être*, since Brussels intends to have *“a common policy covering all areas of foreign policy and security which member states will have to support actively and loyally”*. This will, of course, be implanted by its own EU High Representative and his EU staff (Lisbon Treaty Chapter II Section 1 Article III 294/5).

Article by C. Francis Warren.

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

Constitution

Dear Sir,

As Mr. Scholefield points out, the Swiss Constitution requires a series of referendums before that country can be politically integrated with its neighbours and it is the case that the British Constitution contains no such requirement. There is no need for one because our Constitution, in the form of the 1689 Bill of Rights and the various treason acts, specifically prohibits any diminution of the sovereignty of the monarch, the power of Parliament and the freedom of the people.

The political class has largely ignored our Constitution and has deluded itself into believing that it can do what it likes. When the Rule of Law returns to England, many of them will learn something rather interesting. Whether they will live long enough to profit from it is open to speculation.

PETER HOWELL
Wiltshire

New Beginnings

Dear Sir,

On the day UKIP came second in the euro poll (8th June) your directors may wish to take stock for the final issue of *eurofacts*.

Your article of 29th May by Anthony Scholefield and Gerald Frost is incorrect in its main proposition: "...there must be a substantial conversion among the British elite if euroscepticism is finally to triumph".

One question: Why is Britain not in the euro?

Answer: Because the British electorate - basically eurosceptic - would not agree if the question were put.

Although UKIP's success is welcome, the party is regarded by the electorate as single issue. What is needed now is the development of a broad political movement dealing with a full range of policies, a movement

that can ultimately replace the discredited parliamentary parties. Such a movement would, of course, include UKIP. Could you not secure funding for this new eurosceptic venture?

eurofacts has done a really significant job since 1995 - the directors deserve utmost congratulations and sincere thanks.

All this work can help nurture the kind of future for our country that eurosceptic readers of *eurofacts* seek. I would like to suggest that the directors:

* Make secure the subscriber list for future use.

* Retain the June Press together with its records and data.

This need not be an end moment. Let it be a moment for a new beginning.

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

{Readers will be glad to know that discussions are already under way to re-launch *eurofacts* see page 3 - *Editor*}

Parliamentary Supremacy

Dear Sir,

I trust that when MPs come to elect a new Speaker, they will choose a member who is totally committed to the supremacy of Parliament.

Those who failed the "New Clause 9" test on the evening of March 5th 2008 (the occasion on which just 48 MPs supported an amendment to the Lisbon Treaty asserting the supremacy of the Westminster Parliament) should automatically be excluded from this office.

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

Killer Facts

Dear Sir,

Sadly, *eurofacts* will be missed, but you can be proud of the massive contribution you've made towards turning public opinion.

There are two 'killer facts' that I hope readers will continue to use.

First, the European Court conveniently decided (Case 22/70) that wherever a common ('internal') policy has been made, a related 'external' (foreign) policy exists. We therefore only really have a veto over foreign policy measures that are explicitly proposed under the CFSP pillar (e.g. sensitive defence issues).

Secondly, meaningful renegotiation of EU membership is a non-starter.

Under the binding small print (the '*acquis communautaire*' ratchet confirmed by Cases 6/64, 161/78 and 44/84), national sovereignty has been permanently lost, and it would be against the spirit of the Treaties for our EU neighbours to even discuss 'EU lite' with us.

Withdrawal to a more constructive relationship becomes attractive once people realise the sheer EU stranglehold over our lives. I am pleased to see increasing resistance to 'renegotiation' in comments logged on influential websites such as *John Redwood's Diary* and *Conservative Home*.

BRIAN MOONEY
London

Clegg's Broken Promise

Dear Sir,

Your lead article of 29th May entitled "*Public rage is not just about MPs' expenses*" is spot on. Nick Clegg, Liberal Democrat leader, has been on the media continually for the last few weeks stating that the institutions of parliament must be reformed. It is not the institutions of parliament that need reforming but the moral compass of its members.

One of the first to do this should be Nick Clegg. This is the man who, along with Gordon Brown, promised the British people a referendum on the EU constitution, then after being elected as leader, says we cannot have one. Reform yourself Mr Clegg and keep your promises!

D.E NIXON
Staffordshire

MEETINGS

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Wednesday **8th July**, 6.30 pm

The Rt Hon. the Baroness Thatcher of Kesteven LG. CM. FRS

SUMMER RECEPTION

Further details to be announced

Monday **5th October**, 2.30 pm

“Are the Political Parties failing the voters of Britain?”

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

The Radisson Edwardian Hotel (Free Trade Hall) Peter Street, Manchester M2 5GP

Saturday **21st November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to be announced

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS

Admission details to be announced

(Includes, tea, coffee, water, juice and lunch)

**New Alliance
and
NO2ID**

0797 641 4913 & 0207 385 9757

Wednesday **22nd July**, 7.00 pm

“The Surveillance Society: what's in store?”

Tony Bunyan, *Statewatch*

PUBLIC MEETING

Upper Function Room, Dartmouth Castle Public House, 26 Glenthorne Road, London W6

Admission Free

The 3rd Goldsmith Lecture
020 7247 2524

Thursday **10th September**, 7.00 pm

“The State of the Nation”

Dennis Delderfield, *National Chairman of New Britain*
Simon Heffer, *Associate Editor of The Daily Telegraph*
Chairman, **Sir Teddy Taylor**

PUBLIC MEETING

Wilkins Gustav Tuck Lecture Theatre, University College, London, Gower Street WC1

Admission £5 by ticket only

(From New Britain, 10 College East, Gunthorpe Street, London E1 7RL)

FREE

Advertising Space

Although the *eurofacts* newsletter is ceasing production, publication of meetings is continuing on the June Press web site at:
www.junepress.com

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

June Press: 08456 120 175

or Email: info@junepress.com

DIARY OF EVENTS

Sweden takes over EU presidency **1st July**

UK Parliamentary Recess starts **21st July**

Irish 2nd Referendum on Lisbon Treaty **10th October** (provisional)

2010

Spain takes over EU presidency **1st January**

Belgium takes over EU presidency **1st July**

USEFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.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.cibhq.co.uk

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

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

I Want a Referendum

www.iwantareferendum.com

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste. That's the strap line.

How much does the European Union cost Britain?

by *Gerard Batten MEP*. **£3.00**

This shows amongst other costs that the accumulated trade deficit since joining the EU in 1973 is £383.7 billion.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by *David Brown*. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The Plan

Twelve Months to Renew Britain

by *Douglas Carswell and*

Daniel Hannan. **£10.00**

Britain is heading in the wrong direction. This book shows how to put our country on the right track to self-governance.

Central Banking in a Free Society

by *Tim Congdon*. **£12.50**

Congdon argues in this lucid and very readable book, that the Bank of England should act as the lender-of-last-resort.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money

by *David Craig*. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the taxpayers' expense.

The Great European Rip-Off

by *David Craig &*

Matthew Elliott. **£8.99**

How the corrupt wasteful EU is taking control of our lives.

After Tamerlane The Rise & Fall of

Global Empires 1400 - 2000

by *John Darwin*. **£10.99**

Rise and fall of empires continues, but the nation state is still more powerful.

A Life of Mayhem, Money and Unintentional Treason

by *J Brian Heywood*. **£9.99**

This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

The Return of History & the End of Dreams

by *Robert Kagan Hdbk*. **£12.99**

A new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, has now returned in Europe the EU model is now in decline.

Lost Illusions:

British Foreign Policy

by *Ian Milne*. **£4.00**

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

Warning:

Immigration Can

Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

An Environmental Audit

by *Tom Wise MEP*. **£2.00**

The strap explains this pamphlet well.

How membership of the EU has changed the face of Britain.

Send payment to

THE JUNE PRESS LTD

PO BOX 119

TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@juneypress.com

WEB SALES www.juneypress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)

20% for Europe 30% Rest of World

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

LATEST BOOKS

Cool Thinking on Climate Change

by *Roger Helmer MEP*. **£4.00**

Why the EU's climate alarmism is both mistaken and dangerous.

Why Did Britain Take The Wrong Path?

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£9.99**

Just about to be released. How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government, resulting in democracy being exchanged for the EU dream of a superstate.

FROM JUNE PRESS AS ABOVE

eurofacts

PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Back issues of *eurofacts* can be viewed and downloaded by visiting The June Press web site

www.juneypress.com/eurofacts

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.

020 8922 0089

CIB 0116 2874 622

Democracy Movement 020 7603 7796

Freedom Association 0845 833 9626

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

020 7691 3800

New Alliance 020 7386 1837

Save Britain's Fish 01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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 David Cameron MP

English Democrats 01277 896000

Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)

Green Party 020 7272 4474

Richard Mallender

Labour 020 7783 1000

Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP

Liberal 01562 68361

Mr Michael Meadowcroft

Liberal Democrats 020 7222 7999

Nick Clegg MP

New Britain 020 7247 2524

Mr Dennis Delderfield

UK Independence Party 01626 830630

Nigel Farage MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006