

## EU is scorned by voters at home and marginalised abroad

*Two very different elections demonstrate the impossibility of completing the Federalist dream*

Two very different elections have demonstrated how difficult it is going to be to finish building a unitary European state that matches the grandiose vision of its architects.

The victory won by NESNO (North East Says No) in the referendum on a regional assembly was deeply impressive bearing in mind that it was forced to compete on a most unlevel playing field. Just how unlevel is apparent from the following account by Dominic Cummings of New Frontiers Foundation:

*"The Yes side looked to be holding the aces. They had years to prepare; the support of all sorts of state and pseudo-state bodies; a budget dozens of times the No campaign; the Tories had no significant forces in the region other than some grass-roots volunteers; the business organisations assumed a Yes vote and therefore almost entirely kept out of the campaign for fear of ruining political relationships; the BBC was manifestly on the Yes side and repeatedly tried to throw the campaign Prescott's way; the two biggest regional papers were pro; three months earlier headline polls suggested they had something like a thirty point lead..."*

And yet the yes side lost by a margin approaching four to one.

The Labour government chose the North East for the first of the referendums on English regional assemblies because of its strong sense of regional identity. It took it for granted that if an aye vote was achieved there, other English regions

would have no choice but to fall in with the grand strategy to create a Europe of the Regions - or suffer the consequences. Its mistake was to equate a strong sense of regional identity with a readiness to accept fundamental changes to Britain's system of governance. Indeed, dislike of the EU would appear to be strongest in areas and regions where a sense of identity is strongest and weakest among cosmopolitan elites who tend to regard such feelings as merely the product of atavism, and think of patriotism in much the same contemptuous light. But while hostility to the European Union was plainly a factor, so, too, was disaffection with the political process as a whole. The slogan of NESNO was "*Politicians talk, we pay*".

### Finest weapon

The result, which leaves government policy on the regions in total disarray, suggests that it will be even harder for it to win a referendum on the EU constitution than it has allowed for. Mobilising 'big names' probably won't work - that was tried in the North East but seemed only to reinforce prevailing antipathy to politics generally and to the politics of the EU in particular. Roll up Messrs Blair, Brown, Straw, Patten and Kennedy and Heseltine! You may turn out to be the finest weapon in the eurosceptic armoury!

If the referendum in the North East has demonstrated the deepening sense of public antipathy to the EU, Bush's

re-election is also very bad news for europhiles. John Kerry would have taken the European Union seriously, would sought to have engaged its leaders in a 'meaningful dialogue' as part of a new multilateral approach to international politics. Bush is unlikely to do either.

Moreover, subject to progress in Iraq, the Bush presidency is likely to begin the process of reforming international organisations to reflect the new realities of world economic and political power - which means that it will press for reform of the UN which it regards as both corrupt and eurocentric. In the case of the G-8 its aim is to reduce the role and influence of the failing European economies by including the burgeoning economies of China, India and Brazil.

The price of admission for China is likely to be willingness to float or revalue its currency - a move which would do much to reduce the US trade deficit to a sustainable level. Such a step has been firmly resisted in the past but there are indications that it is beginning to believe that revaluation of the renminbi will help curb inflation as well as achieving important political advantages.

As Europe's markets shrink and its growth falters *its* voice will count for less and less. The irony is that the policies that it currently pursues will only serve to accentuate that process.

# Hammer blows for the euro

The last couple of months have been a tough time for fans of the euro. A succession of economic reports has come out, each with gloomy conclusions for the euro:-

■ An article in the autumn 2004 *Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin* by Mark Dean and Maria Sebastia-Barriel, "Why has world trade grown faster than world output?" finds that most of the growth in the trade-to-GDP ratio over the last twenty years can be attributed to reductions in the real cost of goods and in the level of tariffs. Reductions in exchange rate volatility account for a derisory 3 per cent of the growth in trade-to-GDP. So much for the alleged trade-inducing effects of the euro.

■ In September, Dr Karl Sauvant, presenting UNCTAD's *World Investment Report*, the United Nations' annual round-up of world foreign direct investment (in other words inward and outward investment), admitted that there was no evidence that the advent of the euro had increased inward investment into the Eurozone. In fact, he noted, "lower growth prospects for the Eurozone, compared with the US and the UK, are likely to dampen foreign direct investment there". So much for the alleged inward investment-inducing

effects of the euro.

■ In October, the Commission issued its report on "progress" by the ten countries which joined the EU on 1st May 2004 in meeting the five criteria for joining the euro. "None of the ten is ready", said the Commission. (What it didn't say was that if it applied those same criteria to the twelve countries already in the euro, perhaps half would fail them).

■ In October, the authors of a report commissioned and paid for by the European Commission, "*The Euro Area and the Lisbon Strategy*," wrote that the Growth and Stability Pact is "in tatters"; that "there is little sign that Europe's economic decline is stopping or turning round"; and that "we do not find any evidence of a pro-competitive impact due to the creation of the euro area".

The amusingly-called "Growth and Stability Pact" may be in tatters, but Germany and France are still trying to cheat their way out of its legally-binding obligations. The wheeze consists of excluding various items of government expenditure from the calculation of the annual deficit (between expenditure and tax raised), supposed to be no higher than 3 per cent. The German wheeze, announced by Gerhard Schröder himself on 27th October, would be to exclude the

country's contribution to the EU Budget from the deficit calculation. The French dodge (announced by Jacques Chirac in a speech at CERN on 19th October) would be to exclude expenditure on research and development, and on their new aircraft carrier - the latter on the grounds that it wasn't really "French" expenditure at all, but "EU" expenditure because the aircraft carrier would be deployed in the defence of the whole of "Europe"! Meanwhile, France is once again "officially" practising accounting sleight of hand by having state-owned Electricité de France pay a one-off sum to the government in return for the latter's picking up the EdF's pension liabilities. If Schröder and Chirac were company directors they'd be in jail for doing this sort of thing - but then this is the "Europe" of values, human rights etc etc which Chirac particularly never tires of pontificating about.

A snippet in the business pages of the *Telegraph* of 23rd October sums it all up. "*Premier Oil, which has its headquarters in Britain, said it will report its financial figures in dollars.*"

No doubt Premier agonised for at least a millisecond whether to choose the euro as its reporting currency.

---

## FROM THE LORDS

---

### 'Red lines' to be breached?

**Baroness Noakes** asked Her Majesty's Government: Whether they believe that UK tax law complies with EU law.

**Lord McIntosh of Haringey:** My Lords, the Government are confident that our existing tax rules comply with Community law.

**Baroness Noakes:** .....I am sure [the Minister] will be aware that estimates of the amount of UK tax that is at stake in the cases currently heading for the European Court of Justice are up to £20 billion, and that member states lose 85 per cent of cases that go to the

ECJ. If we are to bow to Brussels with regard to our tax laws, does the Minister agree that that will open up another black hole in the Government's finances.....

**Lord Pearson of Rannoch:** My Lords, does the Minister agree that, under the anti-discrimination clauses of single market legislation - particularly Article 44 of the TEC - the Commission or another member state could go to the court and claim that our direct tax system was discriminatory? If the court were to agree with that,

would the Government accept that that would require us to change our direct tax system into a more European model?

**Lord McIntosh of Haringey:** .....there are, at the margin, a few measures which are subject to QMV.....If and when we are condemned by the ECJ, we shall take appropriate action, but we have not been condemned.

*Hansard, HoL, 20th October 2004, Cols 773-774, Parliamentary ©*

# UK Exports to the EU Down Again: Deficit Soars

British exports to EU-14 of all categories (goods, services, receipts of income, transfers) have been going downhill since 2001, despite the fact that the pound has weakened steadily against the euro over that period. Other things being equal, one might have expected British exports to the EU, becoming cheaper as a result of the £/€ rate, to have increased rather than declined. Meanwhile, British imports from the EU continued to rise. As a result, the UK deficit on all types of trade with the EU has ballooned, as shown in Table 1.

US exports to the EU have also declined from 2001 to 2003. What seems to be happening is that internal demand in Continental Europe, especially Germany and France, is so weak that imports are declining. In the other direction, in contrast, exports from Continental Europe are continuing to increase, pulled by strong demand in the UK, the USA and Asia.

When you look at the UK/EU deficit in more detail, it turns out that Germany accounts for a good half of it (Table 2). When you look at UK balances on trade outside the EU, there's a big surplus with the USA and a big deficit with the rest of the world. The resulting overall UK balance of payments deficit with the whole world is running at an annual average over the last five years of

around £20 bn.

Though £20 bn sounds like a lot of money (and it is), as a proportion of British GDP it's "only" about 2 per cent, well below the American level of between 5 and 6 per cent, widely assumed to be unsustainable in the medium term.

£ bn	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
UK Exports	177	204	217	209	204
UK Imports	187	210	218	222	226
UK/EU Deficit	(10)	(6)	(1)	(13)	(23)
£ buys	1.52	1.64	1.61	1.59	1.45

\*All categories: goods, services, income, transfers

Probing further into the make-up of the overall UK deficit on trade with EU-14, there's a big deficit on goods, smaller deficits on services and transfers (the latter being due to the UK net contribution - subsidies, a tax on British taxpayers - to "Brussels"), partly offset by a surplus on income. In the goods category, Germany

£ bn	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Deficit with Germany	(5)	(6)	(2)	(5)	(11)
Deficit with other EU	(5)	-	1	(8)	(12)
Total deficit with EU-14	(10)	(6)	(1)	(13)	(23)
Surplus with USA	4	10	8	15	19
Deficit with Rest of World	(18)	(28)	(29)	(20)	(16)
Deficit with whole world	(24)	(24)	(22)	(18)	(20)

\*All categories: goods, services, income, transfers

accounted for a deficit in 2003 of £13 bn, more than half the total EU deficit. In that year, for every £100 of goods the UK sold to Germany, she imported £162 from Germany.

Should that be of concern?

Professional economists tend to say no. Amateurs like this writer tend to say yes. Can German industry - with its deservedly high reputation - really be 62 per cent "better" than British industry, which is no slouch itself, having sold to the USA £6 bn more goods in 2003 than it bought from the

USA? Or is something more sinister going on? Is this an example of the famous tilted EU playing field in practice?

If the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry can tear herself away for a moment from promoting "gender equality" and "parental rights for fathers", perhaps she could explain. Except

of course she no longer has a say in the matter, such "competence" having been transferred to Brussels.

The year-on-year reduction in British exports to the EU is probably the start of a long-term trend. As a number of reports from the Commission, the IMF and the former Dutch prime minister

Wim Kok have pointed out recently, Continental EU is already in long-term structural economic decline. In other words its internal markets are shrinking. When will the current British "elite" wake up to the dangers of the UK having between 40 and 50 per cent of its trade - and heavily loss-making at that - with the fading regional bloc that's the EU?

Data Source: United Kingdom Balance of Payments: The Pink Book 2004: ONS: Autumn 2004: Tables 9.2 et sequ. [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk).

## Leaving the EU 'would be liberating'

*There is nothing right-wing, negative, frightening or extreme about leaving the EU and keeping our hard-won right to govern ourselves. As the fourth biggest economy in the world, as its*

*third largest trading nation, and as a major military power, leaving the European Union would be a liberating, refreshing, positive, modern thing to do. And we would be very much richer*

*as well!*

Lord Pearson of Rannoch, Memorandum to Opinion Formers, October 2004.

## Britain's global vocation

*Globalisation was made for Britain. It is in our DNA.* Digby Jones, Director-General of the CBI quoted in *The Times Business*, 8th November 2004

# Democracy's Trojan Horse

## *Why Europe is the model of post-democratic governance*

*"...the 21st century could well turn out to be not the democratic century, but the "post-democratic" century - the century in which liberal democracy as we know it is slowly, almost imperceptibly, replaced by a new form of global governance.*

*"...ultimately the greatest challenge to liberal democracy in the 21st century will come from within. ...this alternative regime would consist of networks of overlapping transnational institutions,*

*organisations, agreements, laws, regulations and rules; run by transnational elites and informed by a transnational progressive ideology. This ideology is an amorphous and eclectic mix of soft academic Marxism or Gramscian thinking, social democracy (minus its George Orwell-Tony Blair 'armed democracy' wing), multiculturalism, radical feminism, environmentalism, or whatever else constitutes the latest in progressive thought at a particular moment.....If this sounds incoherent, a good part of the strength of post-democracy lies in its incoherence. By disguising what and how political decisions are made, it renders them unstoppable and perhaps irreversible.....global governance provides no serious democratic means for the governed to repeal decisions that they may find repellent, but that their new 'governors' have, nevertheless, imposed on them.*

*"An entire industry of transnational agencies and non-governmental organizations ("NGOs") is pushing forward changes designed either to deny or override the national sovereignty of democratic states against surprisingly muted or inchoate opposition. Taken together, these changes amount to a serious political and intellectual challenge to democratic sovereignty vested in the liberal democratic nation-state."*

*"The ideology and institutions already exist in embryonic form and are developing rapidly. The philosophical basis for global governance begins with the premise*

*that all individuals on the planet possess human rights. International law is the paramount authority that determines those rights, while international agreements establish and expand new rights and norms. International institutions (for example, the UN, the International Criminal Court, the World Bank) monitor, adjudicate, negotiate, cajole and administer the international agreements and laws in varying degrees."*

### **Moral Basis**

*"The global governance regime is promoted and run by complementary and interlocking networks of transnational (mostly Western) elites including international lawyers, international judges, NGO activists, UN and other international organisation officials, global corporate leaders, and some sympathetic officials and bureaucrats from nation-states.*

*"In theory, human rights and international law are the moral basis for the global governance regime, but both of these concepts are fluid, porous and constantly 'evolving'. They are, at any given time, what transnational elites tell us they are. NGOs participate in the writing of global treaties alongside democratic and non-democratic governments, but they are essentially pressure groups, elected by no one and responsible only to themselves. How can these rulers be replaced? How can the 'governed' repeal bad laws and regulations that their 'governors' have imposed on them? There is nothing particularly 'universal' about the agenda of much of what passes for the 'international community'. On the contrary, their agenda (on group rights, new definitions of 'human rights', limiting democratic sovereignty, abolishing the death penalty and so on) is, for the most part, simply the views of 'progressive' transnational elites. These are very rarely the views of democratic majorities in democratic*

*nations.*

*"In some respects the European Union is the model of post-democratic governance. If there is one thing that both friends and foes of the EU agree upon, it is that the EU has a 'democratic deficit'....."*

*"The USA should be prepared to champion....the principle of democratic sovereignty within the institution of the liberal democratic nation-state. Hence, the concept of democratic sovereignty as a core American value should be officially incorporated into the National Security Strategy of the United States.....NGOs that consistently act as if they are strategic opponents of the democratic sovereignty of the American nation should be treated as such. They should not be recognized or supported at international conferences, not permitted to roam battlefields, and not given special briefings or access to US government officials.*

*"For the most part, European support for American policies comes from countries acting as nation-states (for example, Britain, Poland, Italy, Spain, Portugal or Denmark), in opposition to the policy of the EU.....Prudence and principle dictate that US policy tilt toward the democratic nation-states of Europe and against any further encouragement of the political (as opposed to the economic) integration of the EU."*

*\* This extract is taken from "Democracy's Trojan Horse" by John Fonte, Director of the Center for American Common Culture and senior fellow of the Hudson Institute, Washington DC, in the Summer 2004 issue of The National Interest. [www.nationalinterest.org](http://www.nationalinterest.org)*

# EU reform yes, EU Constitution no!

*Alex Hickman describes the strategic thinking behind the No Campaign and argues that the need now is for a nation-wide cross-party coalition*

What makes Tony Blair think he can win a referendum on the EU Constitution? Why did he retreat from his commitment to a referendum on the euro, only to concede a vote on an issue that appears to be just as unpopular with voters and businesses?

Many argue Blair's u-turn was driven by short-term domestic political considerations, or international ones (the need perhaps to drive a harder bargain during last-minute negotiations in Brussels). There is an alternative, more alarming explanation; Tony Blair decided to hold a referendum because he decided he can, and must, win it.

Hasn't the Iraq war revealed a leader willing to follow his instincts irrespective of public opinion or local political difficulty? Taking Britain into the heart of Europe, from where it can best exploit its role as a bridge with America, has always been the starting point of Tony Blair's foreign policy. This conviction was reinforced by September 11 and its consequences. For the Prime Minister, ending the "nonsense" of Britain's opposition to further integration is his political destiny. Winning a referendum in 2006 would shatter his political enemies, resolve Britain's ambiguous relationship with Europe and enable Mr Blair to re-assert his credentials as a good European, repairing his frayed relations with France and Germany into the bargain.

## **Iraq War**

But can Tony Blair still win a referendum? These days British voters contrast our economic success with the high unemployment and low growth in France and Germany; and two thirds of them currently oppose the Constitution. Tony Blair's relationship with Middle England has been damaged by the Iraq war, and Labour's majority will be reduced at the next election. Dissatisfaction with not just the prospect of European integration, but also with the status quo, is growing in Britain and across the EU. And there

is growing impatience with the political establishment - witness the extraordinary success of the No campaign in the North East referendum.

With eighteen months to go, we cannot be complacent. If Tony Blair wins the next election expect a propaganda blitz from the Government. Millions of pounds of taxpayers' money will be spent warning voters that a 'no' vote will force us out of the EU - triggering mass redundancies, political isolation and economic decline. Nine other countries will hold referendums before ours, and polls suggest all of them will vote 'yes'. Britain's referendum (expected in March 2006) will also follow the UK's EU Presidency, which will be carefully stage-managed to show voters that Europe is at last "going Britain's way". And when the referendum comes, the Government will have substantial advantages. While the No campaign's ability to spend money will be limited for up to six months before the referendum day, the Yes campaign's ability to spend taxpayers' money, and use the full machinery of Government, will be unlimited until just 28 days before the vote.

## **High Stakes**

We may care passionately about winning the referendum, but the stakes are just as high for our opponents. If Britain rejects the Constitution, Tony Blair's premiership will be finished. If we vote no, the Brussels elite has no 'Plan B'. So, we must start by acknowledging the determination, if not desperation, of the other side. We must also recognise the scale of our opportunity. The referendum is not just about stopping this Constitution; it is also our chance to force Europe to change. Dissatisfaction with the EU status quo is not confined to Britain. Demands for a more effective and democratic Europe, which is less vulnerable to fraud and fairer to the developing world, and where more

decisions are taken at a national level, are now being heard in every member state, and from across the political spectrum. Last month the European No Campaign (ENC) was launched to help No campaigners in every referendum country share intelligence and best practice, and co-ordinate their activities. Ask Thomas Rupp, the German Director of the ENC, to identify which country must lead the process of European reform and he will point to Britain.

## **Core Support**

Of course, there are different views in this country about how the EU, and Britain's relationship with it, should change. But these debates are academic if the Government wins. For now we must focus on the task at hand: building a nation-wide, cross-party coalition that is able to turn-out the largest possible No vote. That means targeting the majority of (undecided) voters, as well as mobilizing our core supporters, and using arguments that we know appeal to the concerns and aspirations of the middle-ground. Vote No has already started campaigning. Later this month our cinema advert will run alongside Bridget Jones II in London cinemas. The advert will target 1 million undecided voters.

By reaching out to the undecided majority we will add their number to the 30 per cent or so of voters who already support us, and ensure that our win is decisive. The larger the No vote, the greater the pressure on our politicians to start a proper debate about Europe's future.

*Alex Hickman is former Chief Executive of Business for Sterling, the NO campaign and Vote 2004. He is now Chief Executive of Vote No ([www.vote-no.com](http://www.vote-no.com)). For more information on the ENC go to [www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com).*

# LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Where does Forsyth Stand?

Dear Sir,

It is surprising that Frederick Forsyth continues to miss the one salient point (Letters, 5th November). The Conservatives can destroy UKIP at a stroke by promising a referendum on whether the UK should remain within the EU. Yet if Mr Forsyth asks his 'fiercely pro-British ex-SAS officer' Conservative parliamentary candidate whether he is urging Mr Howard to this, he will find he is not.

Why not? Why do the Conservatives not take this awesomely simple and honourable step? Partly, as Lord Pearson remarks, it is because 'politicians are not good at public confession'. But it clearly goes further. Mr Howard loses no opportunity to reassert, and remind us of, his commitments to the EU. The man believes in it.

I think Frederick Forsyth would agree that it is always worth studying previously unvarying historical trends to discern what is likely to happen in the future. I study Mr Howard's response to Maastricht, (what he did, what he said). I study the decades long Conservative perma-response to EU policies: vague scepticism, early objection, rolling obfuscation to the electorate, followed by appeasement and capitulation. Is there any reason not to expect more of the same?

I think Mr Forsyth should make clear where he stands. Does he believe in the constitutionally and democratically impeccable proposal of an in/out referendum? Or is he merely the roving media apologist for Conservative ambivalence, waffling about fierce SAS officers to conjure up a wholly fictional picture of uncompromising resolve?

S.H. MURRAY WELLS  
Gloucestershire

## Fact or Fiction

Dear Sir,

Frederick Forsyth attempts to have a go at the Leader of UKIP by suggesting that Mr Knapman is unaware of the

hidden truth of the Conservative Party. Surely it is axiomatic that if something is hidden neither Mr Knapman or anyone else can know anything about it.

If the hidden truth Mr Forsyth refers to is that the Conservatives really want to leave the EU, why does their leader, and every other member I have heard in public or read in print, perpetuate their stated position as wanting to stay in the EU but renegotiate their position. Does he know something the rest of them don't?

Mr Forsyth is a very skilful novel writer, but then Mr Knapman is a very wise politician more than able to tell the difference between the plot of a novel and life in reality. He needs no advice from Mr Forsyth on who to listen to.

ROGER WILSON  
Hants

## Marvellous Marr

Dear Sir,

Thank goodness for Andrew Marr! He may or may not be a eurosceptic, but unlike the rest of his colleagues at the BBC, he has the intelligence and objectivity to grasp that the emphatic vote on a regional assembly in the North East was not just a vote against more government - but a decisive rejection of a plan to carve up the UK in accordance with an EU diktat. And that the vote therefore represented a victory for euroscepticism.

HECTOR BOFFEY  
London

## Idealistic UKIP

Dear Sir,

Roger Knapman's article (*eurofacts* 22nd October) leaves an impression that UKIP remains more a single-issue pressure group than a political party. Mr Knapman seems to have an idealistic notion that education policy can be left to teachers and the parents and the NHS can be run by doctors and nurses. A UKIP government presumably should "merely assist them (teachers, parents, doctors, nurses) to attain their

ends..."

Were this approach put into practice the result would well be chaotic muddle. A government's job is to set strategy, that is it should decide in which direction education/health should go. Certainly, the personnel working in these departments should be drawn actively into implementation and modification of policy but this could not happen if government sidesteps its responsibility.

Before UKIP could be considered an alternative political party it would need to develop strategic policies on all the main areas of national policy.

RALPH MADDERN  
Warwickshire

## State of Denial

Dear Sir,

How enjoyable it was in the first week in November to see the palpable frustration, annoyance and disappointment of all those lefty, *Guardian*-reading BBC presenters and commentators when George Bush was re-elected with a convincing majority of the popular vote and the sensible folk of the North East gave Prescott and his disingenuous 'devolution' scheme a good kicking! They will be in a state of denial for a long time!

DAVID HEARNshaw  
Lincolnshire

## Naïve Policies

Dear Sir,

Michael Howard has promised that, if elected, the Conservative Party will renegotiate the common agriculture and fisheries policies of the EU. But renegotiation, like negotiation, requires at least two parties. Since the other EU members, especially France and Spain, benefit massively from these policies and entirely at the expense of the UK, Michael Howard's promise to renegotiate while insisting that he is not prepared to even consider withdrawal from the EU is unrealistic and absurd.

PROF. ANTONY FLEW  
Reading

# MEETINGS

**Gresham College**  
020-7831 0575

Tuesday **30th Nov. 2004**, 6.00 pm

“Europe and the old Constitution”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA**  
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*

How has our membership of the European Union affected our constitution? The European Union has been drawing up its own constitution and the Prime Minister has promised to call a referendum on it before ratifying it. What is the relationship between the European Union constitution and our own ‘unwritten’ constitution?

**PUBLIC MEETING**  
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020-7831 0575

Tuesday **25th January 2005**, 6.00 pm

“The Human Rights Act: cornerstone of a new Constitution”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA**  
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*

Tuesday **5th April 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Devolution and the territorial Constitution”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA**  
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*

**PUBLIC MEETING**  
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
01224-313473

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Defeating the EU Constitution”

**Speakers to be announced**

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3DW  
**Admission Free**

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**British Democracy Campaign**  
[www.britishdemocracycampaign.co.uk](http://www.britishdemocracycampaign.co.uk)  
**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**  
[www.footrule.org](http://www.footrule.org)  
**Bruges Group**  
[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)  
**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**  
[www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism](http://www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism)  
**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)  
**Congress for Democracy**  
[congressfordemocracy.org](http://congressfordemocracy.org)  
**Democracy Movement**  
[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)  
**Democratic Nations in Danger**  
[freenations.freeuk.com](http://freenations.freeuk.com)  
**European Commission (London)**  
[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)  
**European Foundation**  
[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)  
**Europe of Democracies & Diversities Group in EP**  
[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)  
**Facts, Figures & Phantasies**  
[www.eufactsfigures.com](http://www.eufactsfigures.com)  
**Foreign Affairs**  
[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)  
**Freedom Association**  
[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)  
**Freedom UK**  
[www.taylor.co.uk/eu/](http://www.taylor.co.uk/eu/)  
**Global Britain**  
[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)  
**June Press (Publications)**  
[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)  
**Keele Critical European Group**  
[www.keele.ac.uk/socs/ks40/ceghome.html](http://www.keele.ac.uk/socs/ks40/ceghome.html)  
**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)  
**New Alliance**  
[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)  
**Regional Assemblies**  
[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)  
**Save Britain’s Fish**  
[www.savebritfish.org.uk](http://www.savebritfish.org.uk)  
**Sovereignty**  
[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)  
**Statewatch**  
[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)  
**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)  
**Vote No**  
[www.vote-no.com](http://www.vote-no.com)

## DIARY OF EVENTS

**2004**  
EU Summit **17th December**

**2005**  
Luxembourg takes over **1st January**  
EU presidency

## SELECT COMMITTEES

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **30th November 2004**, 10.35 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Future Financing of the European Union* from Douglas Alexander MP, Minister of State for Trade, Investment and Foreign Affairs (with responsibility for Structural Funds), DTI.

Wednesday **1st December** 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *EU Counter-Terrorism Activities* from Ron Noble, Secretary General, Interpol.

Tuesday **2nd December** 10.30 am  
Evidence will be heard on *Assisted Dying for the Terminally ill Bill [HL]* from witnesses to be announced.

Tuesday **7th December 2004**, 10.35 am  
Evidence will be heard on *The Future Financing of the European Union* from Stephen Timms MP, Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

Tuesday **7th December 2004**, 3.40 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Scientific Aspects of Ageing* from witnesses to be confirm

Wednesday **8th December** 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *EU Counter-Terrorism Activities* from Hazel Blears MP, Minister of State, Home Office.

Thursday **9th December 2004**, 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *EU Strategy on non-proliferation of WMD* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **14th December 2004**, 3.40 pm  
Evidence will be heard on *Scientific Aspects of Ageing* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **16th December 2004**, 10.45 am  
Evidence will be heard on *EU Strategy on non-proliferation of WMD* from witnesses to be confirmed.

*Note:*  
*Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning*

**Germany's Four Reichs**  
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), who knew Adenauer well.

**What if we say No to the EU Constitution?**  
by Lord Blackwell. **£5.00**

Britain can and should settle an arrangement with the EU that preserves its political, economic and constitutional independence.

**The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union**  
by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£20.00**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

**Saving England**

The Case for Independence: Why England Should Declare UDI  
by Vernon Coleman. **£8.99**  
Coleman, inimitably and deadly accurately spells it out in 85 short chapters.

**Will the EU's Constitution Rescue its Currency?**

by Professor Tim Congdon, CBE. **£2.00**  
Could this constitution be easily adapted for taxation at an EU level?

**Britain and the European Project**  
by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

**The Essential Guide to the European Union**  
by Ruth Lea. **£12.50**

A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

**EUROPE**

**A Concise Encyclopedia of the European Union**  
by Rodney Leach. **£14.99**

The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary encyclopedia.

**A Cost Too Far?**

by Ian Milne. **£8.50**  
A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

**The Fate of Britain's National Interest**

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**  
The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

**Galileo - The Military and Political Dimensions**

by Dr Richard North. **£4.00**  
A European satellite positioning technology that has hidden implications for the whole world.

**The Need for Nations**  
by Roger Scruton. **£8.50**

Why the nation states of Europe need to regain their sovereignty, to keep peace, prosperity and defend human rights.

**VIDEO**

**Shockwaves**

by Sanity - Video **£5.00**  
A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the UK.

**Send Payment to**

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD**  
**PO BOX 119**  
**TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**  
Tel: 01548-821402  
Fax: 01548-821574  
Email: info@junepress.com  
**www.junepress.com**

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)** Ring for foreign rates

## eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£14
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

Please send me *eurofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....  
to **eurofacts: PO Box 119**  
**Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA**

Name .....

Address .....

.....

.....

Postcode .....

Date .....

Please print clearly in capital letters

**FOR "EU"**

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020-7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020-7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7735 4000</b>

**AGAINST "EU"**

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	<b>020-8922 0089</b>

Campaign against the Single Currency  
07071-663876

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
**020-8340 0314**

Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>01746-861267</b>

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign  
020-7691 3800

<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020-7386 1837</b>
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

Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk  
**New Frontiers 020-7808 7772**

## POLITICAL PARTIES

**Conservative 020-7222 9000**  
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP

**Democratic Party 01684-891700**  
Mr Geoff Southall

**Labour 020-7802 1000**  
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP

**Liberal 01562-68361**  
Mr Michael Meadowcroft

**Liberal Democrats 020-7222 7999**  
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP

**New Britain Party 020-7247 2524**  
Mr Dennis Delderfield

**UK Independence Party 0121 333 7737**  
Roger Knapman MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771 361 413006