

Could 'glasnost' destroy the European Union?

If successful a unique act of collaboration by British political parties in Brussels could lead to the paralysis of Europe's decision-making process

The Soviet Union collapsed after introducing *glasnost*. Could the EU follow a similar route to self-destruction?

The question is relevant because of a campaign to open up the debates of the European Council of Ministers which is backed by all the British political parties in Brussels. The campaign was launched by means of an official proclamation in the European Parliament on the 6th September and a letter to *The Times* on the same day. It was the first time that all British political groups in Brussels have joined forces.

Exceptional Powers

The signatories - the leaders of the Labour, Conservative, Liberal Democratic, UKIP and Green parties in the European Parliament - have placed the Prime Minister in an embarrassing position by demanding that he secures the goal of transparency during the British presidency. With the exception of the communist dictatorships of North Korea and Cuba the Council of Ministers is the only political decision-making body to reach its decisions in secret.

If the British campaign were to be successful could the EU survive?

At present each minister emerges from the Council of Ministers to tell waiting journalists that the decisions taken represent a triumph for the

people back at home and reflect his or her own quite exceptional powers of persuasion. Given the language problem and the limited curiosity of television journalists few hang around long enough to record this performance being repeated over and again, or to question how it is that seemingly irreconcilable differences have in fact been reconciled to the benefit of everyone. Opening up this process and requiring ministers to record how they voted would plainly end this dishonest charade.

It is here that parallels with the last days of the Soviet Union are instructive. In order to rival the United States, especially in the military sphere the Soviet Union, under the leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev, introduced *perestroika* (restructuring). But the reformers grasped that meaningful change was not possible without the parallel process of *glasnost* (greater openness). The reformers were trying to renew soviet communism, not replace it. But while the conservatives sought to prevent all change the reformers released forces that they were powerless to control. As a consequence, a process that was intended to breath new life into the ossified soviet system foreshortened its life.

Unrelenting Drive

The European Union also seeks to

rival the United States. It includes those who grasp that it cannot succeed without reform but who, like the reform communists of the Soviet bloc, do not grasp that its inherently anti-democratic nature precludes the possibility of fundamental change. Moreover, the reform process co-exists with the unrelenting drive to further integration which is reinforced by the Commission's determination to enhance its own interests.

To adapt Marxist ideology, opening up the political decision-making process would reveal the internal contradictions of the European Union as well as revealing to the European electorates the full extent of the sacrifices made in their names.

The British campaign for transparency is thought to have the support of most north European states - especially Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland. But it is opposed by France and other southern European states.

Crucial Differences

Defending the indefensible the leaders of southern European states have suggested that opening things up would prevent 'honest debate' and the ability to horse-trade. Writing in *The Times* on the 6th September, Anthony Browne, the newspaper's European Correspondent, pointed out that

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Thatcher put the consumer on a pedestal, but now the EU is knocking him off p.2 - UK presidency combines inertia with an element of high farce p.3 - French no vote does not stop European defence p.3 - Chirac's 'vision' survives referendum result - and so does his rhetoric p.4 - UK under pressure to go fully metric p.4 - Majority still favour EU superpower p.4 - Illiberal policies make countries poor p.5 - ECB is English p.5 - Tories 'hiding light under bushel' p.5 - 'Friend of poor' claim exposed p.6 - Euro-judges quash bid to halt pan-European parties p.6

Thatcher put the consumer on a pedestal, but now the EU is knocking him off

Investment in public utilities has risen since privatisation while in most cases prices have fallen substantially - but all of this is likely to be threatened as a result of a new EU utilities regime.

Despite some recent increases in electricity prices an average UK consumer now pays £95 per year less than in the days of nationalised utilities. In gas the comparable figure is £125 although greater savings have been possible for those who have switched suppliers. Ofcom has calculated that the price of a basket of residential telecoms services has fallen by 26 per cent - from £77 in 2000 to £57. An average basket of business fixed voice services has fallen by 21 per cent.

In the water industry annual investment has risen from an average of £1.7 billion in today's prices in the 1980s under nationalisation to an average £3.3 billion throughout the 15 years from 1990 to 2005. This has resulted in better quality water.

Cheaper and better quality utilities have underpinned Britain's relatively superior economic growth and reflect the Thatcherite vision of an economy in which the interests of the consumer would be paramount.

Currently, however, France, Germany, Belgium want to create a special regime for utilities that would subordinate consumer interests to those of the producer. The means of

achieving this would be to exclude paid-for public services from the Bolkestein services directive and to devise a new legal code for utility companies with a strong anti-competitive bias through a new Framework Directive.

In the debate about the future of public utilities Britain's role has been supine, according to Sir Ian Byatt, the author of a study from the European Policy Forum. He warns: "*The British should not repeat the situation in a debate on these issues in the European Parliament's Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs - the Germans and the Austrians were very vocal and the French did not become involved until the last phase...The British said almost nothing...*".

Sir Ian, the former water regulator, says it is imperative that Britain should join in the debate instead of allowing others to make all the running. He seems puzzled why Britain should have remained almost silent but he surely puts his finger on the root of the problem when he states: "*The language of general interest, general economic interest, missions, social models and social and territorial cohesion is unfamiliar and even alien to the UK's methods of thinking*".

Open competition in Britain's utility markets has allowed EU 'national champions', particularly those from France and Germany to buy a large

proportion of Britain's power industry as well as several local monopoly water suppliers. But as a result of the utilities regime now emerging in Europe Britain could be kept out of continental markets while its European rivals are protected from competition.

Meanwhile, the British Chancellor behaves as if it were Europe's protectionist ways, rather than the interests of British companies that are under threat: "*We are now seeing the last stand of this protectionist wing in the EU. You can't shelter your industries against competition any more. There has got to be an open and not protectionist approach*", he told European Finance ministers on the 9th September.

"*Europe has got to face up with America to the fact that protectionist policies are not only damaging the world economy, but damaging the European and American economies*".

Thus, the gulf between reality and Mr Brown's rhetoric grows ever wider. Protectionist measures can and do last for decades and have the potential to restrict growth and to impoverish millions in the process.

For a brief and glorious period Mrs Thatcher placed the consumer on a pedestal. Mr Brown's rhetoric cannot conceal the fact that the European Union is in the process of knocking him off - with the full acquiescence of Mr Brown.

Continued from P.1

Could the EU survive 'glasnost?'

exactly the same reasons were advanced by British MPs resisting the campaign to allow the reporting of the Westminster Parliament more than one hundred years ago. There are, however, crucial differences.

The most important of these reflects the absence of a genuine European *demos*. Lacking shared historical experience, common values and customs, the electorates of the 25 members are bound to find it difficult

to swallow deals that damage their national interests. If it is no longer possible to conceal what has been agreed ministers will be reluctant to sign up to such deals in the interests of an artificial political entity to which their countrymen feel neither loyalty or affection. The result can only be to paralyse the decision-making process on all controversial matters. Thus, at the very moment when the EU is trying to 'streamline' its affairs, the European

juggernaut would become permanently stalled.

Transparency surely spells doom for the Council of Ministers - the world's most secretive major decision-making body since the demise of the Soviet politbureau. The truth is that the European Union cannot long survive the full glare of public scrutiny - which explains why it is that *glasnost* will be fiercely resisted.

UK presidency combines inertia with an element of high farce

The British government has lowered or abandoned key priorities in order to avoid conflict

The prospect that any of the EU's declared aims might be achieved during the British Presidency was always remote - and a good thing, too - but the present situation appears to combine inertia with elements of farce. It is not just that there is no possibility of agreements on the most controversial issues that the EU must face up to, but that EU ministers cannot even agree about the subjects to be discussed.

Britain's reticence to show how it wishes to proceed at the extraordinary EU summit scheduled for October 27-28th is reported to be adding further to the sense of frustration among EU ministers. Describing this situation, the Polish President Aleksander Kwasniewski said recently: "*The weeks are passing and scepticism is growing all of the time: nothing is moving*". (*Le Monde*, 9th September.)

It has been clear for some time that there would be no meaningful discussion about the Constitution. It is also clear that there will be no deal on the Common Agricultural Policy - which will merely be "reviewed", despite the fact that reform of the CAP is, or was, listed as a top British priority. The British government now insists that when it comes to the CAP the last thing it wants to be is "prescriptive" - as the official website for the UK Presidency (www.EU2005.gov.uk) makes abundantly clear. How sensitive and kind to our French partners! And how supine!

Nor will there be a deal on the budget: many members would like one but the Government understandably wants to avoid discussions about the

British rebate for the simple reason that it is likely to find itself in a minority of one on this issue. The Government merely says it "wants to make as much progress as possible" in consulting other members on funding the EU budget a process which it acknowledges is bound to be complicated and lengthy - i.e. one which is not going to be concluded during the British presidency.

Just a few weeks ago the British Government said that it wished to use the presidency to define a new European social model which would combine generous social provision with the added ingredient of economic growth. It now says that it is working on a letter which is not yet complete (they don't like to rush things at the FO) which, rather than defining such a model, will simply describe the strong and weak aspects of each national model.

New ways of excluding Turkey

In its White Paper, *Prospects for the EU in 2005*, published in February, the Government promised to "drive forward" Turkish accession negotiations which are due to begin on the 3rd October. But since the French and Dutch referendum results almost everyone except Britain has been busy competing with one another to devise new ways of keeping Turkey out - so Turkish accession now enjoys a rather less prominent place in the Government's more recently published list of priorities, being dealt with in the same sentence as the application from Croatia.

Meanwhile, from his hospital bed

President Chirac has declared that he believes the present priority should be to push for "*a Europe of projects*" - almost certainly the ones contained in the constitutional draft so recently rejected by the French public (see page 4).

For its part, the EU Commission is busy drawing up its own list of priorities.

Never mind, Downing Street has its own unique approach to achieving harmony. According to a Downing Street spokesman, the Prime Minister has been considering including in the 27th October summit programme a "Relate-style" dinner with soft music, wine, candle-light and fine food in order to repair the fractured personal relations between ministers. No gentle readers, we did not make this up: it was reported in the *Financial Times* on 1st July.

Mr Blair is happily married. He is perhaps unaware that marriage guidance agencies such as Relate do not advocate reconciliation in all circumstances, warning that a marriage between incompatible partners can lead to protracted unhappiness, despair and even mental illness. Where partners are fundamentally incompatible they are advised to make alternative arrangements. To assist such couples, Relate runs a "Moving On Workshop".

We are not sure what the political equivalent of a "Moving On Workshop" would look like but there is certainly a case for creating one: more than ever Britain needs to move on.

French no vote does not stop European defence

"The French and Dutch no votes did not have direct consequences for the evolution of the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). We can continue to build on the foundations set down", Gottfried Timm, president of the defence committee of the Bundestrat interviewed in Le Figaro on 12th September.

Chirac's 'vision' survives referendum result - and so does his rhetoric

The French referendum result may have rocked the French political establishment but it does not appear to have caused the French President to modify in any significant way what he normally describes as his 'European vision' - or indeed his rhetoric:

"I will be strongly reaffirming the French vision of a political, ambitious, social and mutually-supportive Europe. This is a vision France shares with Germany and which our two countries, the irreplaceable engine of European construction, will continue jointly to support", he said in a speech to the

13th Ambassadors' Conference in Paris 29th August 2005.

"Europe is not destined to be a vast free trade area diluted in the globalised economy. Europe is first and foremost a political project based on common values; a project based on rules, the pooling of resources, cooperation and common policies.

"The heart of the European project is first and foremost a call for solidarity: solidarity to enable Europe to defend its interests more effectively in a world in which economic competition is becoming ever sharper; solidarity to support a European preference and

vigorously defend our trade interests against unfair competitive practices...

"The European project is also based on an imperative of harmonization. Europe is not a race to the bottom as regards taxes and social benefits. Europe stands for common rules to level up social legislation, defend consumers and public services and protect the environment...

"Let us do our utmost to foster research and innovation, as we have begun to do with Germany. Let us make the most of our industrial assets to create great European champions."

UK under pressure to go fully metric

EU officials are currently in "constant contact" with the British government in attempts to get a firm date by which Britain will go fully metric, converting miles to kilometers and pints to litres.

A spokesman for Günter Verheugen, the EU Enterprise Commissioner said: *"in legal terms it is clear they have committed themselves to the metric system - now we have to see how they deal with it. At the end of the day they will have to tell us how they want to*

play it". (*Sunday Times*, 28th August)

The spokesman said that Mr Verheugen is seeking clarity on the issue and that the EU Commission was coming under pressure from British pro-metric campaigners to act. However, a spokesman for the United Kingdom Metric Association denied that it was "strongly lobbying" the Commission to ensure that the Government stands by a 25-year-old commitment to go fully metric, preferring, he said, to rely on persuasion (*Financial Times*, 28th

August 2005).

Britain committed to full metrication in 1979, but won a derogation to delay some measures, including the changing of road signs and the abolition of the pint of beer and the acre.

In 200 it became illegal to sell products by reference to the pound, pint or gallon - with the exception of beer. In 2001 market trader Steven Thoburn, who died from a heart attack earlier this year aged 39, lost a famous court battle to continue labelling his products in pounds and ounces.

Majority still favour EU superpower

Seventy per cent of Europeans want the European Union to become a "superpower", and 55 per cent want a single European army, according to a poll by the German Marshall Foundation Fund of the United States. The poll also showed that Europeans continue to have "strongly positive" feelings about the European Union with an average of 67 degrees on a scale of 1 to 100, down from 70

degrees in 2004.

Sixty per cent of Europeans think that the EU should have a permanent seat on the UN Security Council, while 55 per cent of Americans are against the idea. Britain, the only European country with a majority against the EU having its own seat, also opposed the idea by 55 per cent. Sixty two per cent of French people would support it, even if it meant Paris giving up its

permanent seat.

The poll also found that support for Turkish membership of the European Union is falling. Twenty two per cent are in favour, 29 per cent are against and 42 per cent are undecided. In France, support for Turkish membership is only 11 per cent and in Germany it is 15 per cent. Thirty two per cent of the British support Turkish membership, and 19 per cent are against.

Illiberal policies make countries poor and conflict-ridden

Economic data from America also casts serious doubts about the alleged superiority of the EU social model

As the EU struggles to maintain its barriers against cheap textiles and cheap food the full costs of illiberal trade and economic policies are revealed in the annual index of economic freedom published jointly by the Cato Institute in Washington DC and the Fraser Institute in Toronto. As its authors show, it is not just that free economies enjoy the highest living standards, have the best record on human rights, jobs and life expectancy, but also that their prospects for avoiding conflict are better than those of countries with unfree economies.

According to the authors of *Economic Freedom of the World 2005*, nations with a low score for economic freedom are 14 more times more prone to conflict than states with a high score. They say adherence to democratic values diminishes the prospect of conflict with other democracies but economic freedom generally does far more to keep the peace: "When measures of both economic freedom and democracy are

included in a statistical study, economic freedom is about 50 times more effective than democracy in diminishing violent conflict".

In this year's index Hong Kong retains the highest rating for economic freedom, followed by Singapore. New Zealand, Switzerland and the United States tie for third place. The UK, Canada and Ireland are ranked sixth, seventh and eighth respectively. Australia, Estonia, Luxembourg and the United Arab Emirates tied for 9th position.

Germany is ranked 19th while France lags behind in 38th position and Italy in 54th. The rankings of other large economies are Mexico, 59; India, 66; China, 86; Brazil, 88 and Russia, 115.

Significantly the index casts doubt on the claims of high-taxing high-regulation states to provide superior social provision - a finding which has clear implications for the current debate on the most appropriate social model for the EU.

The publications shows that:

■ Unemployment in the top quintile

averages 5.2 per cent compared to 13 per cent in the bottom quintile.

■ In nations of the top quintile the average income of the poorest 10 per cent is \$6,451 compared to \$1,185 for those in the bottom quintile.

■ In nations of the top quintile, only 0.1 per cent of children are in the Labour force, compared to 22.6 per cent in the bottom quintile.

■ Life expectancy is 77.7 years in the top quintile compared to 52.5 in the bottom quintile.

■ The top quintile has an average per-capita economic growth rate of 2.5 per cent compared to 0.6 per cent for the bottom quintile.

The report, which underlines the strong economic performance of the Anglosphere economies also shows that economic freedom is increasing world-wide, with 96 states improving their score since 1985, only seven showing a decline and six no change.

ECB is English - well, almost

The euro's central bank, the Frankfurt-based European Central Bank, has over 1,300 employees. Despite the fact that the UK remains outside the euro the ECB has more British employees (151) than French (123), though the Germans, not surprisingly, are the most numerous (370).

One of the reasons for the strong British presence is that the ECB's working language is English - real English, not the slightly weird version

used by the EU, which looks and sounds as if it's computer-generated. So lots of native English speakers are needed in Frankfurt to render ECB texts and pronouncements into impeccable English.

The whole point of the euro was to turn the binary proposition "single currency equals single government" into reality. The same logic applies to language as well: "single currency equals single language". That single language can only be English. As one

distinguished French commentator remarked: "It would have avoided a lot of trouble if we'd simply adopted the pound or the dollar as the single currency in the first place".

Even more worrying for the French is that the *de facto* working language of the entire EU is now English, a reality that can only diminish the already feeble enthusiasm of the ordinary citizens of the Continental EU for the "Europe" their politicians have foisted on them.

Tories 'hiding light under bushel'

"...the Conservative Party now behaves as if its position on the future direction of the EU is something to be kept quiet about at all costs. It is as if the Party was still riven by the disputes

of a decade ago and any mention of the EU would plunge it back into chaos. It is not and it would not. Instead of hiding its light under a bushel, it should capitalise on one of the few

areas of policy where its position dovetails so well with the electorate's.

Stephen Pollard, *From Labour to...?* a Centre for Policy Studies pamphlet.

LETTERS

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

An Unbeatable Manifesto

Dear Sir,
eurofacts (9th September 2005) reports that "*Direct Democracy: An Agenda for a New Model Party*, written by 23 of the Conservative Party's youngest and brightest talents" is committed to the repeal of all measures transferring powers of the Parliament in London to the EU authorities.

Since, according to a recent *YouGov* poll, 50 per cent of electors in a referendum would vote to get out of the EU, a Conservative Party promising to do that and consequently being able to stop paying billions of British taxpayers' money into that corrupt bureaucracy in Brussels, would

be able to campaign on an unbeatable manifesto of huge tax cuts. And no opponent could even plausibly pretend that these cuts were being made at the expense of the British National Health Service or British pensioners. (The comparatively tiny amount going to British farmers could still be paid to them without any formidable reduction of the tax cuts to British taxpayers).

PROF. ANTHONY FLEW
Reading

Time for a Referendum

Dear Sir,
Ian Milne's booklet "*A Cost too Far*" (Special Price £5.50 incl P&P from The June Press) details the total cost of the UK of EU membership at about

£100 billion per year.

If people knew they would each be better off out of the EU to the tune of £16,500 a year they would want out!

We need a vote on EU exit now!

Mr C. BATEMAN
Cumbria

Is Clarke the Man?

Dear Sir,

Even if it is true Kenneth Clarke is more electable than the other candidates for the Conservative Party leadership what is the point of having a Conservative leader who is to the left of Tony Blair? .

JAMES TIDY
Lancashire

'Friend of poor' claim exposed by sugar deal

EU Commission President Jose Manuel Barroso could not have chosen a worst moment to claim - against all the evidence - that the EU is the world's best friend to the poor. Writing in the *Wall Street Journal Europe* on 12th September Mr Barroso declared: "*Today the EU is the most open market in the world for the poorest countries... the reality of our agricultural policy is rather unlike the caricature. After, a decade of reforms, the wine-lakes have dried up and the butter mountains have melted away*".

In the same day's issue of the *Financial Times*, however, Alan Beattie, that paper's world trade editor reported that the EU is about to push

more than 2 million tonnes of surplus sugar on to world markets in spite of a WTO ruling that such dumping is illegal.

The EU has been dumping subsidised sugar on the world market - to the huge detriment of other sugar producers - for 20 years or more. But the amount which it shortly intends to dispose of in this way is ten times the level in 2003 and more than twice that in 2002 representing a very large proportion of its annual production of 17mn tonnes.

The Commission, which this year submitted reform proposals to member states which would cut prices to sugar producers, argues that since in theory

there is still time to implement the WTO ruling, the current plans do not violate the rules. But aid organisations such as Oxfam have widely condemned the Commission's plans for exploiting loopholes.

Mr Barroso, who had the effrontery to "lay down the gauntlet to the United States" to follow the EU 'example' in its support for the Third World, did not mention the plan to rid itself of its current excess sugar. Nor, unsurprisingly, did he make reference to a recent, detailed and authoritative report by the American Congressional Budget Office which found that the EU is responsible for 90 per cent of the world's export subsidies.

Euro-judges quash bid to halt pan-European parties

A bid by 24 Members of the European Parliament to prevent the rise of state-funded European-wide political parties has ended in failure in the European Court of Justice.

The MEPs, who included just two from Britain - Daniel Hannan and Roger Helmer - mounted a legal challenge against a proposal that will permit the public funding of trans-national parties contesting elections on

a common and binding manifesto (see *eurofacts* for 30th January and 13th February 2004.) Meeting the costs of the legal challenge out of their own pockets they argued that the legislation discriminated against those who defined their roles in national terms and that the proposals were incompatible with the EU's commitment to democracy and pluralism.

Dismissing the challenge on a technicality the Euro-judges argued that since the case had been brought by individuals the plaintiffs did not have proper status before the court. In order to achieve such status they would have to turn themselves into a trans-national party - the very development that eurosceptic 24 are concerned to resist.

The legislation will now go ahead.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020-7831 0575

Wednesday **28th Sept. 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and Change:
Prime Ministers in the Post-War World”
Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*
Response, *Philip Ziegler*

PUBLIC MEETING
Staple Inn Hall, High Holburn, London
Admission Free

FRINGE MEETINGS

Labour Conference. Brighton

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
01692 402339

Monday **26th Sept. 2005**, 5.30 pm

“Britain, the EU and Democracy”
Tony Benn
Kelvin Hopkins MP
John Mills
Chairman, **Austin Mitchell MP**

Creations, 78 West Street, Brighton
Admission Free (Free refreshments)

Conservative Conference. Blackpool
The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **4th October 2005**, 12.45 pm

DEBATE

The Conservative Party, where next?
John Redwood MP
vs
Steve Richards, *Chief Political*
Commentator, *The Independent*

The Adam Room, The Claremont Hotel,
North Promenade, Blackpool
Admission Free

The Freedom Association
01746 861267

Tuesday **4th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“The welfare state we’re in”
James Bartholomew, *Author and*
journalist

The Regency Suite, The Ruskin Hotel,
Albert Road, Blackpool
Admission Free

The Fisherman’s Association Ltd
& Save Britain’s Fish
01224 313473

Tuesday **4th October 2005**, 6.30 pm

“Will the Tories ever introduce National
Control”

Speakers include;
John Ashworth, *Save Britain’s Fish*

Edward Suite, Claremont Hotel,
Blackpool
Admission Free (Fish and chip supper)

The Freedom Association
01746 861267

Wednesday **5th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“Why we should leave the European
Union”
Philip Davies MP, *Shipley*
Christopher Gill, *Hon Chairman, TFA*

The Regency Suite, The Ruskin Hotel,
Albert Road, Blackpool
Admission Free

Independence/Democracy
Group Rally
0121 333 1536

Friday **7th October 2005**
10.00 am to 5.00 pm

Speakers include;
Jens-Peter Bonde MEP, **Nigel Farage**
MEP, **Sir Teddy Taylor**, **Philippe de**
Villiers MEP, **Vladimir Zelezny MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING
Central Hall, Storey’s Gate, London
Admission Free

The Freedom Association
(City of London Branch)
0207 488 4533

Tuesday **11th October 2005**, 12.30 pm

Ruth Lea, *Economist and author*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Counting House pub, 50 Cornhill,
London EC3V 3PD
Admission Free

Tough Talking From The Right
0208 691 7495

Saturday **15th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“EU fraud and corruption”
Ashley Mote MP, *Author*

MEETING & BUFFET
The Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53
Whitehall, London SW1
Admission £15.00
(Tickets from Allan Robertson TTFTR,
PO Box 29208, London SE8 3ZU)

No2ID
0121 442 4514

Saturday **15th Oct. 2005**, 2.30 pm

Speakers include: Ron Dorman,
Campaign Against Euro-Federalism
Christopher Gill, *Freedom Association*
Chairman
Richard Shepherd MP
Chairman, **Michael Clark**

PUBLIC MEETING
Old Royal Public House, Church,
Birmingham (close to Snowhill Station)
Admission Free

United Kingdom Independence Party
01503 230055

Saturday **22nd October 2005**, 7.00 pm

“EU fraud and corruption”
Roger Knapman, *Leader, UKIP*
Malcolm Wood, *SW Organiser, UKIP*

MEETING & BUFFET
The Snooty Fox, Morval, Looe,
Cornwall
Admission Free
(Tickets for Buffet £7 from UKIP, 5
Battery Park, Polruan-by-Fowey,
Cornwall PL23 1PT)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

Labour Party **25-29th September**
Conference

Conservative Party **3-6th October**
Conference

United Kingdom **7-8th October**
Independence Party
Conference

**Britain and the European Union:
Alternative Futures**

by Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt and Philip Whyman. **£7.50**

A critical analysis of UK membership, with credible alternatives.

A Throne in Brussels

by Paul Belien. *Hdbk* **£25.00**

A penetrating historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

The Case for Commonwealth Free Trade

by Brent Cameron. **£11.26**

The Canadian author explores at length the pros, cons and practicalities of a Commonwealth Free Trade Area.

The Great Abdication

by Alexander Deane. **£8.95**

The strap line explains all. "Why Britain's decline is the fault of the middle class".

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

The ECB and the Euro:

The First Five Years

by Otmar Issing. **£10.00**

An upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the European Central Bank.

The Missing Heart of Europe

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?
by Thomas Kremer. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish in an integrated Greater Europe? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

The New Case for Europe:

The crisis in British pro-Europeanism and how to overcome it

by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**

Roger Liddle was the Prime Minister's policy adviser on Europe 1997-2004.

Who's Afraid of a European Constitution?

by Neil MacCormick. **£8.95**

This book by a member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes the nature and purpose of the European Convention.

Should Britain Leave The EU?

by Patrick Minford, Vidya Mahabare and Eric Nowell **£15.95**

An economic analysis of the relationship.

Alarming Drum

Britain's European Dilemma

by Peter Morgan. *Hdbk* **£19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU, Director-General of the IoD (1989-1994) proposes alternatives to current failing EU.

Plan B For Europe - Lost Opportunities in the EU Constitution

Edited by Lee Rotherham **£7.00**

A collection of key Eurocritical papers and speeches, which mark the path to an alternative Treaty for Europe.

A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by Stuart Sexton. **£5.00**

A layman's guide explains in simple language the essentials of the Treaty.

CD

EEC Entry Campaign 1970-72

by Independent compiler **£2.00**

Uses startling new source material showing how Parliament and the people were deceived into supporting entry. You will need a pdf reader such as adobe acrobat. Free Educational CD (charge is for handling).

Send Payment to

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

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

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"

European Commission	020-7973 1992
European Movement	020-7940 5252
Federal Trust	020-7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089

Campaign against the Single Currency
07071-663876

Campaign for an Independent Britain
020-8340 0314

Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
Freedom Association	01746-861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800

New Alliance	020-7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372-453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group 020-7287 4414
Global Britain

Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org

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