



The Euro Realist Bulletin

An occasional bulletin

campaigning for an EU free Britain &

Parliamentary sovereignty

Edition 41

SEPTEMBER 2017

JOLLY EU JUNKETS

While small to medium sized businesses struggle to cope with the plethora of mind numbing, job losing, EU legislation, which in turn pushes up costs to the general public, the EU President, Jean Claude Junker and his EU merry minions have been having a jolly old time at the expense of EU taxpayers.

Revealed in the press on the 10th August, it was reported just how extravagant Mr Junkers senior bureaucrats had been. Without any embarrassment or consideration they have been staying in luxury hotels and hiring private jets for their travels, at great cost. As the Daily Telegraph reported, this included Jean Claude Junker himself. This extravagance is on top of his reported income in excess of £275,000. Added to this it was also reported in the Daily Express Mr Junker also claims a half day allowance of £44 to meet the former EU Parliament President, Martin Schulz.

As the UK is preparing to escape the EU's clutches, it is trying to claim an exit fee of several billion despite the fact the EU owes the UK for its substantial investment in EU buildings.

MOWING MISERY

Even further proof that the majority of the people in the UK made the right decision in June 2016 was the revelation of more proposed EU madness, as reported in August in the Daily Mail.

News has broke that the EU is planning to make people who own motorised lawnmowers to take out insurance on them in case of accidents, this will also cover off road vehicles such as golf buggies, farming vehicles and even mobility scooters. Insurers are currently confused regarding this and calling for clarification, a spokesman said this is "unnecessary and unfair".

DOING THEIR WORST

Despite the majority of British people voting to escape the EU, the remainiacs and the EU itself are doing everything in their antidemocratic ways to scupper the UK's escape from it. The Labour party are happy to betray their voters with a change in policy, now calling for the UK to stay in the single market and customs union, others too are doing their worst to undermine the will of the nation.

However, revealed in the Daily Telegraph on the 30th August 2017, the EU itself is putting obstacles in the way of our exit. One of these is a strict timeline regarding the transition deal which cannot last more than two years or it will risk being challenged in the European Court of Justice, either that or, as the Telegraph put it: "shot down in the German parliament".

According to the Telegraph article both sides in the Brexit talks have signalled that a transition period is necessary to implement the Article 50 divorce deal. It was also revealed in the Telegraph that the EU's chief negotiator, Michel Barnier, is earning £72,000 a year more than David Davis who is negotiating for the UK.

The Freedom Association

IF YOU BELIEVE IN FREEDOM JOIN THE FREEDOM ASSOCIATION

Membership (cost £30 per annum)

**Contact: The Freedom Association,
Richwood House, 1 Trinity School Lane,
Cheltenham, Gloucestershire, GL52 2JL**

Tel: 01242 235333

WEB-SITE: www.tfa.net

E-MAIL: mail@tfa.net

For page 2 scroll down

A CARLAMATOUS CARFUSION

BY DEREK BENNETT



Derek Bennett and his diesel car.

With the announcement by the Government that the manufacture and sale of all conventional petrol and diesel cars will have to cease from 2040, just twenty-three years from now, I have to wonder if our Ministers know what they are doing and if they realise the calamitous confusion they have just set in place.

As a driver of a large engine diesel car I must confess to a vested interest in this. Like many other motorists I am now wondering just how much the value of my car has plummeted since this announcement and what vicious penalties lie in wait for wanting to own such a vehicle. How much will our road fund licence increase, will we find many main roads to work and other routes are barred to us meaning we will have to divert taking longer journeys and, ironically, add to pollution by the additional mileage and increased fuel use? Have these chauffeur driven Ministers thought through what they are unleashing?

Since this announcement, as well as reading articles and letters in the press regarding the problems and impracticality of all electric vehicles, I have been trying to do my own Google based research. The first thing to come to mind is, can I afford to purchase an electric car? Considering my second hand, eight-year-old, reasonably low mileage, in good condition, three litre diesel car is now only worth scrap value since the Government declaration, looking at the current prices regarding the cost of an electric car replacement, which is considerably more than a conventional petrol or diesel car, the answer is no, I can't afford one - I am stuffed!

In effect I will have no option but to keep my diesel car until the day either I, or it, falls to bits, whichever comes first. It will be a case for many of us in the same financial position to carry on polluting regardless, especially as we are to face heavy fiscal penalties for driving such vehicles which will mean any money we could have saved towards a new none polluting car will have been taken from us in an array of so-called green taxes.

There is another irony in this announcement, this is being done for us to comply with EU set pollution levels, by the time this comes into force in 2040 we will have been free of the EU's mad bureaucracy for over twenty years and nothing it does will apply to us. That is if the EU even exists by then as it is already in a parlous state due to the enormous economic problems created by the euro and the burden of its mountain of mind numbing, job destroying, regulations and directives. It will not just be the UK heading towards the escape hatch, soon other nations will have no choice but to follow. Despite this we are still planning to implement this EU ruling.

One of the things I have been trying to pin down, but remain well and truly confused over, is what is the range of an electric car? It seems that the Tesla has the best range of around 250 to 300 miles per charge. Other cars do less, the Nissan leaf for example is being quoted at around 125 to 150 miles per charge. This however, is affected by other conditions. In cold weather battery performance is reduced giving fewer miles, added to the fact in these wintery conditions more electricity is drained from the battery due to using the car heater, de-misters, windscreen wipers, headlights and of course, listening to the radio. What the manufacturers may give as a generous range could, during true motoring conditions, be drastically reduced making a nice new, shiny and expensive electric car very impractical indeed. Added to this will be the problem of hanging around for ages, several times on a long journey, to charge up.

This leads on (excuse the pun) to the matter of charging. Already many people are asking relevant questions. These are: "Will my house need rewiring to allow my wife, two kids and I to charge up four vehicles all at the same

Continued on page 3.....

For page 3 scroll down

Carlamatous Carfusion continued:

time?" "Will there be enough electricity generated to power all these cars?" "How many more power stations will have to be built and how many windmills will destroy and blight our green spaces?" "Will there be enough charging places for all these vehicles?" On the matter of power generation what sort of power stations will we need to cope? Do we need more nuclear which are costly and won't be ready in time? Will they be gas fired or, ironically, diesel generated which then defies the whole reason to go through this massive upheaval?

These are but a few questions that so far have not been adequately answered. One that came to my mind is the question of people queuing up at charging points. At busy times many of us have had to wait at a petrol station to fill our cars, this is a bit inconvenient but considering it does not take long to fill up, pay the bill and drive off, it is something we can put up with. However, imagine a line of vehicles all waiting to charge up with each one, on rapid charge, taking 20 to 40 minutes to charge up to 60% or 80% respectively. The thought does not bear thinking about.

Unless battery technology can improve drastically and not have to use extremely expensive and rare materials in them, as well as the cost of electric cars being reduced substantially, all this looming expense and inconvenience is coming our way so we in the UK can reduce our levels of global pollution despite the fact the UK, reputedly, only contributes around 4% towards global warming and does not feature in the World Economic forum list of polluters

Euro Realist Bulletin September 2017 ([link](#)) on this matter. According to a report in the Daily Telegraph dated 2nd January 2017 ([link](#)), a global map shows the UK as one of the least polluted nations, so why has our Government decided to inflict what will be an increasing amount of misery and inconvenience upon us?

As is often the way, a better alternative is being ignored and not spoken about by those peddling battery operated vehicles, this of course is the hydrogen fuelled car. From my Google studies these vehicles can be refuelled as easily and as quickly as a conventional vehicle, the only waste they produce is water and they are not a drain on the national grid. One person writing in the letters page of the Daily Telegraph even suggested they could be plugged into the owners home to use the power coming from their car. Why is this option not being considered or discussed?

At the beginning of August it was announced by British Gas that their prices for electricity were to increase, what are the chances others will follow. When you think about it, if petrol and diesel is phased out the Government will be losing a vast revenue stream in not only the road fund licence, which all electric cars are exempt from, they are also losing the revenue on fuel duty and the VAT which is added to the total cost of fuel at the pumps, of which VAT is added to cost of the fuel duty (a tax on tax). The revenue sums they are going to lose are vast. If you think electricity costs are bad now just wait and see what is to come when the Government needs to make up the shortfall. The only way to describe what is coming is nothing less than carlamitous carfusion!

TAKING A MINNOW TO TASK

The independent Labour Peer, Lord Stoddart of Swindon has taken the new Prime Minister of the Irish Republic, Leo Varadkar to task about his contribution to the ongoing debate over Brexit and advised the "stripling leader of a mini-state" to "learn his trade" before presuming to lecture the United Kingdom.

Lord Stoddart said: "The British people must be getting fed up with EU minnow countries telling them either to stay in the EU or agree to conditions like remaining in the Single Market and the Customs Union, which would effectively keep our country in the EU. The latest culprit is the Prime Minister of the Irish Republic (population



Lord Stoddart: *Eire a minnow state.*

4.7million) Leo Varadkar. He should be reminded that the United Kingdom is the Republic's good friend and a substantial trading partner –indeed, such a good friend and partner that that it gave Ireland a loan of £3billion to save it from bankruptcy caused by its membership of the single currency, during the last recession (I wonder if they have paid it back yet?).

"This stripling leader of a mini-state should learn his trade before presuming to lecture substantial and successful countries like the United Kingdom on how to proceed on Brexit, particularly after its people have voted in a democratic and free referendum to leave the European Union."

For page 4 scroll down

READING THE SMALL PRINT

BY JOHN PETLEY

We're now beginning the season of mists and mellow fruitfulness, to quote John Keats. For some of us, it's a chance to lighten our trollies when doing the weekly shop at the supermarket. Instead of buying six neatly-packaged Braeburns, we can enjoy apples for our own trees – or indeed, in some areas, our neighbours. “£1 a bag” says the sign outside the house down the road, or in some cases, if the tree has been particularly prolific or the neighbour is feeling particularly generous, “Help yourself”. Tesco and Sainsbury's can't match this for price!

If you live in an area like this and regularly benefit from your neighbours' surplus produce, I doubt if it crosses your mind that you are engaging in a very informal transaction. There's no contract between you and them and thus no small print to read although even if there was, would you bother? After all, we all know what's involved in eating an apple. If you ended up with a stomach ache or worse, you'd be unlikely to get any redress from your neighbour in a court of law, but so what? We're talking about a pretty small risk to which few people give any thought whatsoever.

By contrast, anyone buying a house will want to engage the services of a lawyer to make sure there will be no nasty surprises. A good solicitor will go through all the deeds with you and point out any areas of potential concern – more than that, even the strangest idiosyncrasies are often gone through in meticulous detail.

When I bought my present house, I was duly informed that I had the legal right to draw water from my neighbour's well but that I may not allow any gypsies to camp on my land. I'm highly unlikely either to take advantage of the first stipulation or to infringe the second, but it's part of a conveyancer's job to make you aware even of these obscure points in the small print and I'm pleased that in this case, she did her job thoroughly.

The UK's accession to the EU, or more correctly, EEC, in 1973 would logically resemble buying a house rather than a pound of apples. It involved signing treaties and introducing a number of previously unknown features into the political

process. Of course, Edward Heath didn't want the UK electorate to read all the small print as they otherwise would not have supported our membership. In a white paper circulated to every household in 1971, we were informed that “There is no question of Britain losing essential sovereignty”, even though this was a blatant lie.

You can find plenty of evidence that MPs knew a lot more – certainly that some “pooling” of sovereignty was involved - but few of them read the accession treaty before the critical vote that took us in to the Community. In other words, we had engaged in a far more complex legal process

than buying a house, but most of our elected representatives had read about as much small print as they would have done when collecting a free bag of apples from their neighbours.

Opponents of our membership knew enough to realise that it was a very bad thing, but more interestingly, some significant supporters of the European project did not fully understand what they had joined. Yes, it was a project to create a European superstate and whatever Heath may have told the electorate in 1971, they knew that some loss of sovereignty was involved. The actual mechanism by which our political system was to be emasculated – in other words, the inner workings of the EU – nonetheless remained something of a mystery.

Minutes of a Cabinet meeting held in March 1975 make for fascinating reading. This was the period **in** the run-up to the first referendum on our membership of the European club, The Labour government at this time included a wide range of opinions on the European project, from Roy Jenkins at one end of the spectrum to Tony Benn and Michael Foot at the other. The majority favoured continuing membership, but with reservations. However, there was an expectation that somehow, our presence could move the European project in a different direction.

This sounds more like later Conservative party thinking on the same subject and displays astonishing naïveté. But let's stop and think:- how much do senior politicians really

Continued on page 5.....

.....
Of course, Edward Heath didn't want the UK electorate to read all the small print as they otherwise would not have supported our membership.

Reading the small print continued:

understand the workings of the political systems in other countries? A recent article by Simon Shuster in *Time Magazine* claims that Vladimir Putin's disappointment over his failure to build a good relationship with Donald Trump boils down to his inability to understand how democracy works in the USA. The separation of powers which has been a feature of US politics from its earliest days means that the President Trump cannot act in the same unilateral manner as his Russian counterpart. If an overwhelming majority within both houses of Congress insist on tighter sanctions on Russia, the President's hands are tied. According to Shuster, Putin cannot accept that under the US Constitution, Trump does not possess the same power to override these curbs on his authority as he enjoys.

This may seem an astonishing claim to make, but another example of seemingly remarkable ignorance by a head of state was mentioned briefly by Derek in August's *Euro Realist*. Margaret Thatcher signed the Single European Act in 1986 genuinely believing it was about trade rather than further political integration. She had been hoodwinked by Lord Cockfield, whom she had chosen as the UK's European Commissioner, hoping that he would push for a liberalisation of European trade rules. Cockfield managed to pull the wool over her eyes and persuade her to support the ending of a number of national vetoes, not appreciating that her support for Qualified Majority Voting was eroding national democracy. She regarded the renewed commitment to ever closer union by the EEC in Stuttgart in 1983 as "grandiloquent language" with no force in law. How wrong she was!

Even John Major, who forced the Maastricht Treaty through Parliament, may not have fully understood what he was doing. On one occasion, he was told by Helmut Kohl, the former German Chancellor, to "go and read the treaties" – implying that he hadn't. I would suspect that Roy Jenkins, the only Briton ever to become President of the European Commission, is one of few senior UK politicians who ever fully understood the small print – in other words, the nuts and bolts of the workings of Brussels.

The root of the problem, to put it

.....
Margaret Thatcher signed the Single European Act in 1986 genuinely believing it was about trade rather than further political integration.

simply, is that we have been doing things differently from our continental neighbours for centuries and haven't appreciated how great the differences are. Our concept of inalienable freedoms, our Common Law legal system and the scale of the checks and balances within the state to prevent power being over-centralised are not replicated across much of Continental Europe.

Unfortunately, in dealing with the EU, our politicians have failed to appreciate that these differences in the approach to running a country leads to a different mindset. The EU, which reflects the Continental mindset, will legislate where we would probably not. The concept of obeying the letter but not the spirit of a law is not easily grasped across the

Channel. I recall reading about a German motorist who was fined for driving at well over 100mph in his Porsche on an English motorway. Seeing other motorists driving at over 70mph without seeming anyone bothering, he assumed that the speed limit did not apply. Full stop. He failed to understand that historically, we prefer latitude to rigidity – a bit of "give and take" in other words.

Unfortunately, in seeking to leave an organisation which few of our senior politicians have ever understood, we are forced to deal with people who think along rigid lines and for whom flexibility doesn't come easily. What is more, the wording of EU treaties encourages a rigid approach.

This is the heart of the conundrum with which I have struggled in correspondence with assorted leave supporters who have expressed seemingly irreconcilable views about the progress – or lack of it – in the Brexit talks. One the one hand, I hear much talk of the EU deliberately being difficult while on the other, a respected leave supporter described Michel Barnier, the EU's chief negotiator, as a reasonable man.

All Barnier is doing is negotiating according to the EU's rules. After all, as he has pointed out, it was or decision to leave. By March 2019, however, we will have to have settled for one of two choices – to leave without an agreement or to leave on terms compatible with the EU's treaties. Our politicians signed us up to them and we can therefore only exit the club

Continued on page 6.....

For page 6 scroll down

Reading the small print continued:

according to its rules. However sympathetic Barnier may be, he cannot show us much flexibility because the rules for any divorce settlement do not allow him to do so. The EU just doesn't do "give and take."

The frustrations which David Davis and his team are facing are thus a legacy which goes right back to Heath's dishonesty in the 1970s. Roy Jenkins apart, we have never read the small print and got to grips with the nature of what we have joined. Of course, if more politicians and more ordinary people had done so, we would probably have held a referendum years ago and the result would have been a far more resounding vote to leave, especially if it had been held in the days before our young people had to suffer the barrage of left-wing politically correct unpatriotic claptrap that is endemic in all too many of our schools today.

For the present, however, this confrontation with the very different EU mindset

in the person of M. Barnier proves the point that we were right to vote to leave. On this very day when I started writing this piece, I noticed a poll by YouGov which suggested that over 60% of leave voters believe that damage to the UK economy would be a price worth paying if it meant that we could leave the EU.

Of course, no one wants a recession and in the longer term, freedom from a political system so alien with our historic values will unquestionably bring benefits, including economic benefits. In the shorter term, however, it's going to be another eighteen month of tough talking before some sort of deal will most likely emerge. There will be a lot of posturing on both sides but if we are to stand a chance of a decent deal, our negotiators need to understand the mindset of their opposite numbers.

Or to put it another way, they need to do what John Major signally failed to do a quarter of a century ago – go and read the treaties.

A SEA CHANGE IN ATTITUDES

BY COLIN BULLEN

In an attempt to inject a positive note, following the debacle of the general election, I believe that there has undoubtedly been a sea change in attitudes to membership of the EU since the referendum.

I remember when I first became politically aware to any extent, at about the time when Heath became leader of the Conservative party in 1965. Those of us who took an interest in these things knew that he was a supporter of the European project and even then feared for the country were he to become Prime Minister, as at that time the Labour party was still basically opposed to involvement. When he did succeed in winning the election in 1970 it became obvious that he was determined to take the UK into the embryonic single European state and the first organised resistance came into being.

However those of us who spoke or campaigned against EU membership were treated as eccentrics, or worse xenophobes, who did not understand the issue. The Conservative party, at one infamous conference, declared itself to be the party of Europe, with only four delegates opposed,



Colin Bullen: anti-EU views now in the press

while almost every media outlet either ignored our warnings, or looked upon us as not worthy of consideration, or inclusion in any debate on the subject. Those politicians who did take our side were ignored or dismissed as extremists. This was never more true than in 1975 when the truths spoken by Enoch Powell on the right, and Tony Benn on the left, were derided, while smug, complacent social democrats like Roy Jenkins offered us inducements such as cheap wine, without admitting that the cost would eventually be our democracy.

These attitudes continued to hold sway for many years, despite the efforts of first Michael Foot to convince the electorate of the dangers of involvement with Brussels, and the later, somewhat belated conversion of Margaret Thatcher to the anti EU camp. We who tried, via organisations such as 'Operation Out' and the Campaign for an Independent Britain, to place the true nature of the ambitions of the architects of the European project before the public were dismissed with contempt, not least, even in those days, by

Continued on page 7.....

For page 7 scroll down

A sea change in attitudes continued:
the talking heads of the BBC.

So it continued for decades, with the anti EU voices being sidelined and, for those of us who were not public figures, such as the MPs opposing Maastricht, finding that our letters to the press went unpublished, and that there was no avenue to success within the main political parties, unless one accepted involvement with Brussels as a given, not to be disputed. Of course once we had established UKIP this climate changed but, nevertheless, we were still treated as outsiders and our arguments scorned by those who claimed to know better.

When UKIP made significant inroads in various elections the Europhiles had to admit that their efforts to pretend that there was no alternative to EU membership could not be sustained, but of course they ridiculed every statement we made about the dire effects of continued involvement and the main stream media, led again by the BBC, refused to give any credence to the optimistic forecasts we made

INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT SLUMP

Writing in the business section of the Daily Telegraph on Tuesday 15th August, Dan Wallace reported that: "Industrial output in the eurozone fell in June in an uncomfortable drop that suggests the economic boom may not be as strong as analysts hoped."

He reported that in the larger economies output fell by 0.6pc in June compared with May. He pointed out that the production of capital goods and consumer durables took a tumble.

Also reported in Dan Wallace's article was that: "Britain's economy has been growing more slowly than that of the eurozone in recent months, but in June the industrial picture changed.

UK growth accelerated from 0.1pc in April and in May to 0.5pc in June."

JOIN UKIP

The UK's only fully dedicated anti-EU
political party.

TEL: 01626 830630

Write to: PO Box 408

Newton Abbot, TQ12 9BG.

www.ukip.org



about life outside the EU. Almost every political commentator, and the self appointed spokesmen for business interests, continued to sing from the same song sheet, that it was imperative that we remained within the EU.

However, since the referendum, despite all the efforts of the Remainers to undermine Brexit, we at last see the arguments we have been putting forward for so long appearing in the press, hear commentators now accepting the truths about the EU, which were once denied, and read many articles by those involved with businesses, other than those of the CBI, declaring that the future can be bright post Brexit.

Although we always knew what we said to be correct it still seems almost a fantasy that at last we are believed and that our cause has been recognized by those not of the liberal elite as being right. There is a long, hard road ahead, and the Remainers have had successes in the past months, but, after many years of being a voice crying in the wilderness, we can no longer be dismissed as irrelevant.

WHY I SUPPORT JANE COLLINS

By Derek Bennett

In June this year I celebrated 20 years as a member of the UK Independence Party. Over those years I have done many things for UKIP from running a branch, organising six conferences, serving on the NEC and being a RO. On top of that as well as standing for UKIP in countless local elections, I have also stood in five Parliamentary elections for UKIP - I feel I have served my time and my party.



Jane Collins MEP: UKIP
leadership candidate.

There are many too who have served their time in UKIP and proved how loyal and dedicated they are, one of which is leadership candidate, Jane Collins. She too has worked hard for UKIP, served as an excellent RO in Yorkshire, stood in two of UKIP's remarkable Parliamentary by-elections coming second and in recent times she now serves UKIP as one of its MEPs.

I know Jane and served with her as an RO and know how strong she is and how she will be a leader who will make UKIP presentable.

VINCE THE WINCE

The old age pensioner in charge of the EU fanatical Liberal Democrat's, Vince the Wince Cable, made a cringingly embarrassing statement during August that older voters (like him) "shafted" young people.

The silly old duffer, now in charge of his shambolic party, has strangely reasoned by voting 'leave' the older voters have ruined the futures of the younger voters. What Vince, who is old enough to know better, should realise is that not only did many young voters support 'leave', the older voters have the wisdom and experience of being lied to and cheated by the likes of Mr Cable in the 1975 referendum - hence the reason they voted 'leave'. They may be old like Vince the Wince, but definitely much wiser.



JOIN THE BRUGES GROUP
214 Linen Hall, 162-168 Regent
Street, London, W1B 5TB.

Tel: 020 7287 4414

E-mail: info@brugesgroup.com

JOIN



Membership is £20 a year or £10 for OAPs
Write to:

78 Carlton Road, Worksop
Nottinghamshire S80 1PH.

Contact

admin@campaignforanindependentbritain.org

Web-site: www.eurosceptic.org.uk

Tel: 0845 5197254

Join the British Weights & Measures Association: BWMA

Membership is £12 pa, please make payments to 'BWMA', post to: 29 Chart House Road, Ash Vale, Surrey, GU12 5LS.

Web-site: www.bwmaOnline.com

THE JUNE PRESS BOOKS

Tel: 08456 120175

E-mail: info@Septemberpress.com

Seizing the moment. The opportunities for UK fisheries after Brexit by John Ashworth £4.00. Brexit a golden opportunity. Why the UK must not allow the CFP to be replicated into British law as proposed with the Great "Repeal" Bil, for political convenience or short term vested interests. UK withdrawal can automatically restore control over the UK(EEZ) out to 200nm/midline and all resources therein.

The Road to Freedom by Gerard Batten MEP, £8.99. In this updated book, following the 2016 Brexit Referendum result, Batten with well argued points explains how Article 50, the Article for leaving the EU is a trap and that joining the EFTA or the EEA will not give the UK true independence. He shows why the only true way to leave the EU is for parliament to repeal the European Economic Communities act 1972.

The Real Stirling Crisis, Why the UK needs a policy to keep the exchange rate down by Roger Bootle & John Mills, £9.00. How the devaluation of sterling after Brexit has been good for the economy following years of an overvalued currency.

Britain's Referendum Decision and its Effects by Stephen Bush, £8.99. Fact based and clearly written for now and the future, this book will help you to make an informed decision about EU membership.

SEND PAYMENTS TO
THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon, TQ9 7WA.

TO CONTACT THE EURO REALIST BULLETIN

Send your e-mails to: eurorealistnl@aol.com
 The Euro Realist is published by WAEC, write to: "WAEC, 53 Daisy Bank Crescent, Walsall, WS5 3BH. Tel: 01922 631970, or, 07813 153897

The Euro Realist Bulletin is sent out by e-mail only and is free to those who wish to receive it