

Free Britain

Newspaper of the Campaign for an Independent Britain

August/September 2011



BRITISH INDUSTRY BETRAYED

Yet again the Government has awarded a major engineering contract to a foreign supplier – in this case to the German conglomerate Siemens when it should have gone to Derby-based train-maker Bombardier. As a direct consequence, over 1,000 jobs have been lost in Derby and the building of railway rolling stock in the area looks set to come to an end after 150 years. This is entirely due to European Union procurement rules and the Government's failure to stand up for British interests and protect British jobs.

Edward Spalton, national vice-chairman of the cross-party Campaign for an Independent Britain (CIB), comments: "The de-industrialisation of Britain was foreseen as an integral part of the EU project from its earliest days. Time and again, our politicians award major contracts to foreign companies in preference to British ones. We can contrast the deceit and bad faith of Britain's political class with the devotion to duty of Britain's navy, army and air force which

we so recently celebrated on Armed Forces Day."

Mr Spalton points out that British soldiers swear an oath to "be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen ... and defend her against all enemies". Over 350 British military personnel have died in the last few years keeping that oath in Afghanistan. Cabinet Ministers also take an oath when they become members of the Privy Council and swear to "bear faith and allegiance

to the Queen's Majesty; and [to] assist and defend all civil and temporal jurisdictions ... granted to Her Majesty and annexed to the Crown ... against all foreign princes, persons, prelates, states or potentates and generally in all things you will do as a faithful and true servant ought to do to Her Majesty."

Mr Spalton says: "Ministers who took this oath made the Queen and all of us into subjects of the European Union, bound to obey dictates of its

officials whom we did not elect and cannot dismiss. This is the rottenness at the heart of the state which betrayed the workers at Bombardier and many other firms. The soldiers kept their oaths to defend the sovereignty of the Crown, and so of the country, against all comers. Yet the ministers who give them orders in the Queen's name do not keep theirs."

Whose side are ministers on?

Writing in the *Derby Telegraph*, Mr Spalton explains: "British governments have frequently preferred to give large orders to EU companies rather than to British ones. The army's biggest ever order for lorries went to MAN

Fahrzeuge when there were perfectly suitable British suppliers. They also bought an Austrian armoured vehicle, the Pinzgauer Vector, supposedly to provide extra protection for troops who were being needlessly killed in the Snatch Landrover. The Pinzgauer was withdrawn because it was even more dangerous. The driver sat over a front wheel arch, vulnerable to land mines and explosive devices.

"So Bombardier is in a long line of British companies and workers who have been consistently rejected by British governments in the name of 'EU rules'. We may well ask: Whose side are they on?"

Why are we bailing out the bankers yet again?

In a crucial vote in the House of Commons in early July, 32 Tory MPs rebelled against the Government and sided with the Labour Opposition by voting against Britain giving an extra £9.3 billion towards International Monetary Fund bailouts (almost doubling the British contribution). The names of these rebel MPs are given below. They deserve medals!

The IMF and the EU want to prop up the eurozone's "failing states" – Greece, Ireland, Portugal, Spain and Italy – purely in order to save the collapsing euro and subsidize the bloated banks. The fact is that the European Single Currency is dead in the water, and the British Government should recognize this. Instead, Treasury ministers insist that Britain still has "a strong interest in the continued stability of the eurozone" and therefore the UK must continue to pour billions of pounds into the bottomless pit of the EU. This is madness. It is "game over" for the euro and the Government should acknowledge the fact.

Debt-ridden Greece and Italy should cut themselves free from the eurozone and devalue. Instead of pushing themselves deeper into debt, these southern European countries should focus on rebuilding their economies through export drives, as London Mayor Boris Johnson has suggested. No country can escape from such a burden of debt while it still has a massively negative balance of payments.

We need a dose of reality and common sense – but unfortunately we are not hearing this from the British Government. Coalition policy on Europe is being dictated by the Liberal Democrats and by Conservative Europhiles. Unless and until the Government recognizes that the Eurozone experiment has reached the end of the line, hard-pressed British taxpayers will continue to be called upon to subsidize the EU and the international banks. But then that is what the European Union is all about. It is the bankers' Europe, not the people's Europe.

Andy Smith

Here are the names of those Tory rebels...

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Steve Baker | 17. Karl McCartney |
| 2. Brian Binley | 18. Nigel Mills |
| 3. Peter Bone | 19. David Nuttall |
| 4. Douglas Carswell | 20. Matthew Offord |
| 5. Bill Cash | 21. Andrew Percy |
| 6. Chris Chope | 22. Mark Reckless |
| 7. James Clappison | 23. John Redwood |
| 8. Philip Davies | 24. Simon Reeve |
| 9. David Davis | 25. Richard Shepherd |
| 10. Zac Goldsmith | 26. Henry Smith |
| 11. James Gray | 27. Graham Stuart |
| 12. Gordon Henderson | 28. Peter Tapsell |
| 13. Chris Kelly | 29. Andrew Turner |
| 14. Edward Leigh | 30. Martin Vickers |
| 15. Julian Lewis | 31. Charles Walker |
| 16. Anne Main | 32. John Whittingdale |

If your local MP is a Conservative, and his or her name does not appear on the above list, write to them and ask them why.

"The decision to raise our IMF subscriptions by 88 per cent was first mooted when Gordon Brown was in charge – but was okayed by the current government last October. While Canada, Switzerland, Holland and Belgium all managed to keep the increase in their subs low, whoever negotiated the deal on our behalf seems to have preferred to have UK taxpayers assume greater debt liabilities so that they could sit on a bigger chair at the various international summits they attend on our behalf. Alongside fiscal policy and monetary policy, our approach towards the bailouts and the IMF shows that there has been remarkably little change in economic policy at the Treasury since Gordon Brown was in charge."



– Tory rebel Douglas Carswell MP

Why the anti-EU movement should embrace Money Reform

A Personal View by Alistair McConnell

Money Reformers believe that the power to create money should be taken from the banks, and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs. We, the people, should enjoy, through our national political institutions, the privilege and profit of that money-creation power.

The policy we want to achieve is two-step:

Step 1: Commercial banks to be forbidden from creating money out of nothing. All money to be created by a national institution accountable to us democratically through Parliament.

Step 2: The commercial banks will then compete with themselves to attract that money into their savings accounts, and lend out only that money which they have acquired in that manner.

The nation's money supply is not, contrary to popular belief, created by the Bank of England. It is created overwhelmingly by the High Street banks, every time they make new loans, by multiplying upon the basis of their actual real reserves.

So, how is this relevant to those campaigning to get Britain out of the European Union?

Anti-EU campaigners believe in the concept of national economic sovereignty – the ability of a nation-state to control its own economy in response to its own needs. Therefore, it is a very short step to also embrace the Money Reform analysis.

For example, we point out that a key element of national economic sovereignty is ensuring our economy is free from the consequences of the disastrous decisions of the debt-based banking sector.

Another good reason is that this is a policy

which threatens the European Central Bank and indeed, the entire EU edifice, because it is something that can be done independently, by any country.

It would allow a country to declare unilateral independence. In short, this policy is another arrow, in our euro-realist quiver, to be put in our bow, and aimed at the bloated backsides of the Brussels bureaucrats.

It has been a long time coming, but 317 years after the founding of the Bank of England, we finally have the blueprint for the Bank of England, upon which it should have been established from the very start. Our proposed Bank of England (Creation of Currency) Bill can be read at www.PositiveMoney.org.uk

It is laid out as a proper Westminster draft Bill, complete with explanatory notes, and it describes the exact legal mechanism to affect the Money Reform proposal.

George Osborne, the Chancellor, is on record as saying there is no "Plan B". The Coalition may not have one, but we do. Money Reform is our "Plan B".

▼ *Alistair McConnell speaking at a Get Britain Out meeting in London, June 2011. Mr McConnell is Editor of the magazine Sovereignty.*



A message from the Editor

Several readers have written to me complaining about a comment that appeared in Dele Ogun's article in the last issue of Free Britain. Both Dele and I wish to apologise for any offence given and to assure readers that no offence was intended. The comment was ill-considered and should not have been made. Please accept our sincere apologies.

How much does the EU really cost us?

Britain is currently the fourth largest contributor to the EU. Our net contribution over the period 2000-06 was £21.3 billion and in the current period (2007-13) it will be over £42 billion – a staggering rise of 97 per cent! But this is only part of the story. There are billions of pounds' worth of indirect costs. According to Gerard Batten MEP, who has been monitoring EU costs closely for the past five years, the total cost in 2010 was actually £77 billion in that one year alone. Mr Batten is calling for an independent cost benefit analysis of Britain's membership of the EU. The report *How much does the European Union cost Britain?* can be downloaded from the website www.gerardbattenmep.co.uk or you can call Mr Batten's office on 0207 404 7175 to request a copy.



Another invasion of Britons' privacy – thanks to the EU

The Government has confirmed that information on interest payments made to an astonishing 588,361 UK bank and savings accounts has been handed over to EU member states in the past year, under the EU directive on the taxation of savings interest. France and Spain made the most requests with 123,492 and 101,735 respectively. Cyprus and Greece, whose legal systems have been considered by some to be less than reliable, have made 27,523 and 35,319 respectively.

Lord Stoddart, whose question in Parliament led to the admission by the Government, said: "These figures are a shock and I will be following up with further questions to see if the Government has any information on how this information has been used by the EU member states. I remain deeply concerned about the invasion of privacy issues involved and about the security of this information, once it has been handed over. Sadly, the Government doesn't seem to care about such matters."



Lord Stoddart

The undercutting of British manufacturers

By Edward Spalton

The EU is supposed to be an economic "level playing field" but it is not. One look at the number of European firms controlling British power stations and gas supply in comparison with the number of British firms controlling the same industries on the Continent will tell you that. With all the take-over expertise in the City of London there should be a large British presence in the profitable "mainland EU" energy market – but there is none.

The EU provides all sorts of grants which are supplemented by grants from member state governments. Britain gets far fewer of these because of the fine print in the arrangements for the EU rebate negotiated by Margaret Thatcher. The rebate was a marvellous relief of a monstrously unequal burden

but, as usual, British ministers and civil servants were complicit or complacent in accepting conditions which would place British industries of all sorts at a permanent disadvantage with their mainland EU competitors.

For Britain, many of these

grants were only available if they were offset against the Thatcher rebate. So instead of paying 50% of matching funds, the government would, in effect, be compelled to pay 100% through reduction in the rebate. So the British government simply did not make many of the grants avail-

able and British firms have to compete with firms which have received them.

A mainland EU company might want to build a new factory. It then gets massive grants from the EU, and from its own government, but the grants might not actually be required to boost an already viable project. The money can then be transferred within a large group to a strategic reserve to make export prices extremely cheap in markets where the group wishes to expand and to knock out foreign competition.

The softest and most open of these markets is Britain. Other EU countries find ways to protect their own manufacturing industries. Only Britain behaves as if the EU really is that "Common Market" which, we were told, would lead to a massive balance of payments surplus for British trade. The reverse has happened.

Cheapest bid

Using its accumulated reserves partly from grants not available to British firms, the mainland

EU company can subsidize bids for large, key contracts. As buyer, the British government then says that "EU rules" compel it to accept the cheapest bid. No other large country takes this rule seriously. They may make some token foreign purchases to show that they are "good Europeans" but that is all.

So by targeting reserves accumulated from grants, the EU company not only gets the business but destroys its British competitor with funds partly donated by the British taxpayer. The price will not be anything like so cheap the next time. In the meantime the British workers are on the dole, their skills dispersed and no further competitive threat to the continental predator.

This has happened for years again and again in British industries of all sorts and the British ministers simply plead "EU rules". Either they know what is happening and support it – or they simply don't know. I am not sure which is worse – to be ruled by devious treachery or by simple stupidity.

Free Britain

Further copies of *Free Britain* may be obtained by visiting www.eurosceptic.org.uk/free-britain or from Jim Reynolds, Brentwood House, Cornsland, Brentwood, Essex. CM14 4JL or 'phone 01277 219140 or fax. 01708 641211. There is no set charge; however any donations towards postage costs are greatly appreciated. Stamps are accepted for smaller quantities or cheques should be made payable to 'Campaign for an Independent Britain'. Please note that the 20p printed on the newspaper is only for the newsagent/stores where these are sold.

POSTAGE GUIDELINES

Up to 4 copies (98g)	47p	36-46 copies (986g)	£2.70
5-10 copies (220g)	76p	47-90 copies (1.90kg)	£4.41
11-23 copies (487g)	£1.04	91-182 copies (3.90kg)	£7.06
24-35 copies (733g)	£1.51		

Quantities over this are usually dispatched by courier at a charge of either £7.00 or £10.50 dependent on area.

The hollow cry of “Localism”

By Thomas Colpepper

The Coalition’s Localism Bill is currently winding its way through the chambers and committee rooms of the Palace of Westminster. It would seem remarkable and a cause for joyous celebration that any legislation aiming to strengthen local democracy should find the oxygen of existence at all, among the stifling smog of EU laws which our politicians rubber-stamp on a daily basis. Yet, while Brussels continues eradicating all traces of British parliamentary democracy, our Government appears to have succumbed to the lure of the local.

But has it truly embraced the cause of grass-roots democracy? While ministers try to talk up the Localism Bill as the chance for communities to protect precious countryside and local services, and to stop rapacious developers in their tracks, in fact the small print of the Bill suggests the opposite.

What “Localism” really means is finding new and ever more devious ways to let communities think they have power while actually circumventing them. Most worryingly, local authorities are to be “encouraged” (bribed?) with large financial incentives to keep the architects

and the men with bulldozers busy. This is what Chancellor George Osborne means when he talks about the Coalition’s “growth agenda” - and agenda that prioritizes commercial development at all costs, and sees planning controls and Nimbyism as “barriers to growth”.

A new high-speed railway, for example, threatens to tear up and through the Chilterns. And down in Kent, a number of housing, office and leisure-facility schemes are creating new towns in all but name, and circumventing many of the supervisory controls which we expect our local authorities to be able to exert.

Still, there’s one thing we can count on from our locally-minded Government: David Cameron and Nick Clegg are always ready, willing and able to magic out of nowhere (or rather, out of our pockets) mil-

lions of pounds for the “local” economies of Portugal, Ireland and Greece – money that could or should be spent here in Britain. Perhaps they are learning from Kent County Council, whose “advisers” guided millions of pounds of South-East England’s taxpayers’ money into Icelandic banks – a large proportion of that money never to be seen again.

We’ve all heard of offshore accounts, even in the most localised and yokelised parts of Kent. But we do wish that “offshore” meant the Isle of Sheppey!

CAMPAIGN FOR AN INDEPENDENT BRITAIN

Campaign for an Independent Britain is a non-party political campaigning organization, supported by membership subscriptions and public donations. We uphold freedom of speech for all people of goodwill from all countries, races, and creeds who share our objectives and values. Our members are people from all walks of life who recognize that continuing British membership of the European Union poses grave threats to our liberties, independence, and economic prosperity.

If YOU believe that Britain should leave the corrupt, undemocratic, obsolete and fraud-ridden European Union – why not join us?

Join our campaign

I wish to join the Campaign for an Independent Britain and enclose a subscription of:

£20 (recommended) £10 (minimum) £30 £40 £50

Cheques payable to ‘Campaign for an Independent Britain’

Title: Name:

Address:

Postcode:

Tel: Email:

Constituency: Date:

Campaign for an Independent Britain

78 Carlton Road, Worksop,
Nottinghamshire, S80 1PH

Tel/fax: 07092 857684

E: office@eurosceptic.org.uk W: www.freebritain.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

President: George West

Vice-Presidents: Lord Pearson of Rannoch (Conservative member of the House of Lords 1990-2007, UKIP 2007 to present); Leolin Price CBE QC; Nigel Spearing (Labour MP 1970-97); Sir Teddy Taylor (Conservative MP 1964-79 and 1980-2005); Sir Robin Williams Bt.

Hon. Life Members: Lord Stoddart of Swindon (Labour MP 1970-83; Currently an Independent Labour member of the House of Lords); Sir Richard Body (Conservative MP 1955-59 and 1966-2001).

© Campaign for an Independent Britain 2011. Editor: Andy Smith.

The views expressed in Free Britain are those of the individual contributors or Editorial Committee and do not necessarily reflect the corporate view of the Campaign for an Independent Britain.

Majority for leaving EU

An overwhelming majority of voters want Britain to withdraw from the EU, according to a recent poll by YouGov.

The poll shows that if given the chance to vote on Britain’s EU membership, the public would vote by 50 to 33 per cent – a huge lead of 17 points. This shows a hardening of public opinion against the EU. Among the over-60s the margin for withdrawal from the EU is more than two to one (61 per cent to 29 per cent).

JUBILATION IN JUBA



South Sudanese celebrate their independence day in the capital, Juba. If South Sudan can be independent, why not Britain?