

Time to up the ante!

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of eurofacts Gerald Frost reflects on the changing nature of the debate about Europe's political future

The first issue of *eurofacts* appeared almost ten years ago to the day. Re-reading that issue one might conclude little has changed. One item refers to the demand of Lord Stoddart of Swindon for a cost-benefit analysis of the United Kingdom's membership of the European Union. In response to this demand Lord Henley, Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Defence grandly declares: "My Lords the Government have no intention of carrying out such an analysis, which would be time consuming, expensive and unnecessary. The Government considers the benefits of membership to be self evident". Another item concerns the admission of Douglas Hogg, the then Agriculture Secretary that the chance of improving the CAP quota system for milk was "remote".

Degree of Arrogance

Well, Lord Stoddart is still asking the same question and still not getting the answer he wants. The prospect of fundamental reform of the CAP is still remote. And yet much has changed - both for better and for worse.

The EU juggernaut has rolled on but as it has progressed public opinion has hardened until we have reached the point where Tony Blair, the most europhile British Prime Minister since Edward Heath, avoids all reference to 'Europe' whenever this is possible and the campaigning body, Britain in Europe, has been forced to shut up shop (see page 4). Moreover, Ministers can no longer risk displaying quite the degree of arrogance shown by Lord Henley; instead, their strategy is to run

for cover when the European issue is raised. Meanwhile, the British presidency of the EU has stalled and there is no hiding the fact that the EU is in a state of systemic crisis. Incapable of proceeding further along the paths of integration and enlargement, it is equally incapable of turning back.

Occasionally, Ministers or the Commission claim historic victories in overcoming the obstacles in their path, but such triumphs evaporate almost the moment they are proclaimed. Thus, only 24 hours after Jack Straw secured his 'truly historic day for Europe' when winning approval for talks to begin on Turkish accession the French President Jacques Chirac declared that Turkey would need to undergo "a cultural revolution" before it could join. This would take at least 10 or 15 years and might indeed not happen at all, he said. Although he did not point it out, both France and Austria are committed to holding referendums on Turkish entry and polling data suggests that the prospects of yes votes are negligible.

Public Alienation

As we have recently pointed out, political integration continues despite the collapse of the EU Constitution - but furtively and only in areas where the public does not grasp what is going on as, for example, in the case of European defence cooperation. Even in these instances it can only take place at the price of further public alienation at a later date.

In Germany and France members of the political elite continue to call for

new energy and vigour in completing the European project but, at the same time, ministers are forced to make concessions to an increasingly eurosceptic public opinion. In France an opinion poll has suggested that the country which designed the European project is now the most eurosceptic (see page 2); even if the data mis-states the extent of French public hostility to the EU there can be no doubt about the trend.

Ties of Solidarity

There are other important differences in the climate of opinion and ideas. Ten years ago the eurosceptic cause was weak and those in Britain brave enough to urge withdrawal were few and widely regarded as eccentric if not wholly deranged. Business as represented by the CBI still favoured integration and membership of the euro. The media was still sympathetic to the European cause. Today even those newspapers that have consistently championed the cause of political integration acknowledge the extent of opposition to their goal. Here is the *Financial Times*, that once proud advocate of European Union describing the extent of the problems that the EU now faces:

"After almost 50 years of closer integration, the EU is witnessing a resurgence of national self-interest at its core, in which the ties of solidarity between 25 diverse member states are slowly being loosened. The French and Dutch rejections of the constitution have reinforced the trend, signalling a rupture in the link between EU

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: French birth rate highest in Europe p.2 - French 'now most eurosceptic nation' p.2 - The British rebate: wrong-foot - ed yet again p.3 - Constitution 'needed for European core' p.3 - Why the German election result won't make much difference p.4 - Death through inactivity p.4 - Competition league; EU economies flounder p.5 - Real democracy - but not in the EU p.5 - Soldiers of the Queen - or Solana's infantry? p.5

French birth rate highest in Europe

France hasn't had much to feel pleased about recently, so the news that the French birth rate is the second-highest in the EU after Ireland's was greeted with relief.

Birth rate, or "fertility", is conventionally defined as the average number of children per woman. The French rate is currently 1.9, lower than the replacement rate of 2.1 but higher than that of Denmark and the UK (about 1.8) and way ahead of the calamitous rate - 1.3 - of Germany and Italy. The European Union average is 1.4.

The high-ish French rate is ascribed to their excellent childcare arrangements, with abundant crèches, free kindergarten places for almost all

children and mother-friendly employment legislation. Another factor seems to be an almost complete absence of social stigma attached to unmarried couples having children compared with other European countries. The government has just announced plans to encourage mothers to have a third child.

However, a number of French commentators pointed out that the overall average French fertility rate conceals some very big differentials amongst the various communities living in France. The fertility rate for women in France of European race is 1.6, while that of sub-Saharan African women in France is 4.0. For Turkish women the rate is 3.7; for North

African women the rate is 3.2. The non-European population of France (about 5 million) accounts for 9 per cent of total population today (about 60 million) and 16 per cent of births. Credible projections suggest that in 25 years' time those non-European populations will amount to around 10 million, representing 15 per cent of total French population and accounting for 30 per cent of births.

These figures help to explain the current mood in France, where anxiety about loss of French identity, and concern about Turkey joining the European Union, contributed to the colossal shock of the 29th May referendum which threw the EU Constitution out.

French 'now most eurosceptic nation'

If there is one thing that the French political elite is adamant about it is that the French rejection of the EU Constitution cannot be construed as the nation's verdict on the European project. But an extensive survey of opinion carried out by the polling

organisation Sofres on behalf of the TV channel, Arte and published in *Le Monde* on the 4th October suggests that the elite could not be more wrong. Asked whether they thought their lives were better thanks to the EU 41 per cent said no and only 22 per cent said

yes. By smaller margins German and Poles also rejected the suggestion that they are better off as a result of EU membership. If the figures are to be believed the French are now more hostile to the EU than any other nation including Britain.

Continued from P.1

Time to up the ante!

institutions and electorates.

"There are many manifestations of this new national assertiveness. ...perhaps most worrying for European Union solidarity is a new muscular nationalism that is calling into question one of the founding principles of the club itself: the operation of the single market."

And here, on the same day is *The Guardian*:

"The obsession used to be for ever deeper, federalist integration; now it is ever wider expansion. But if they pursue the new ambition the way they chased the last one, with scant regard for the people they claim to represent, it will meet the same fate: failure."

If perceptions of the European project have changed this is due to its inherent defects. To that extent, reality is the ally of the eurosceptic cause. For a

long time, however, the British champions of integration were able to conceal its innately anti-democratic bias and the extent to which membership was bound to damage fundamental national interests.

The fact that public opinion has changed is also due to the activities of a relatively small number of individuals, nearly all of them to be found outside the political establishment, most of them in fact instinctive outsiders, some famous, some less so. On one side of the battle have been the big battalions, on the other foot soldiers and little platoons but it is the latter side which has won the argument and consequently achieved the most converts.

We are proud that many members of this small and valiant force have contributed to *eurofacts*, either by

writing articles or letters, by providing information or by contributing to the subsidy on which this publication depends. We are sincerely grateful to all of them.

But the tenth anniversary of *eurofacts* perhaps provides an apt moment to point out that the job is not yet done. Denied the opportunity of a British referendum on the EU constitution some eurosceptics have relaxed when they ought to have been upping the ante. The near-paralysis of the EU surely provides the opportunity for even cautious eurosceptics to advance the argument for a fundamentally different kind of relationship with our continental partners and for devoting sufficient intellectual energy to this task in order to prevail.

The British rebate: wrong-footed yet again

The simmering row over the EU budget will soon break out again

By Ian Milne

Tactically, having got himself into a stand-off on the rebate (with a bit of help from Jacques Chirac) last June, Tony Blair linked giving it up to CAP reform, thus, temporarily, kicking the issue into the long grass. It was a Pyrrhic victory. Strategically, Blair's defence of the rebate repeats the mistake of previous British governments, which, ever since Mrs Thatcher secured it in 1984, have clung to it like shipwrecked sailors to a raft. They have thus perpetuated a system which has always been grotesquely unfair to this country. The reason is as follows.

In defending the rebate through thick and thin, all British governments have conceded in advance that Britain will always be a net contributor to the EU Budget. In theory, the rebated British net contribution need not be substantial; but in practice it always has been. The whole point of the rebate is that it mitigates (but does not remove) the amount by which the UK's gross contribution to Brussels (currently running at a quarter of a billion pounds a week) exceeds its receipts from Brussels. As a result, in the last ten years alone, British taxpayers have paid into the EU Budget, net, for no apparent benefit, the colossal sum £50 billion. A British government with an ounce of negotiating skill and determination would act differently.

First, it would question the very principle that subsidies for agriculture and infrastructure distributed by Brussels are a good thing. It would point out that the massive subsidies pumped into the economies of the former East Germany and the Italian

Mezzogiorno over long periods of time have simply not worked. It would point out that the Irish, while grateful for EU handouts, attribute their stunning economic performance to other factors such as education and an attractive tax system. It would point out that the economies of eight east European countries that joined the EU last year were already growing fast as a result of radical tax and labour-market policies - not EU subsidies. It would point out that the best-performing country in the European region - Iceland - is not in the EU at all and doesn't subsidise its industries. It would also point out that EU subsidies involve massive fraud.

Net Contributor

Second, it would point out that the problem with the present EU Budget goes way beyond agricultural subsidies (bad though the latter are). The EU Customs Union itself, with its Common External Tariff (CET), which EU countries levy on their imports of agricultural and industrial goods from outside the EU, is also a throwback to the 1950s. It discriminates against the booming world outside the EU (where 93 per cent of global population lives) in favour of the stagnating EU (where only 7 per cent of global population lives). This is the precise opposite of what the EU needs.

A pro-EU British government with an ounce of negotiating savvy would say this to its EU partners. *"There is no logical or rational reason why the UK should always be a net contributor to the EU Budget. If individual countries wish to keep subsidising their agriculture and infrastructure, let them*

finance it themselves, not through handouts from Brussels financed by all member states, but from their own national coffers. The EU Budget can then be slashed, and Britain would be perfectly happy to examine a funding structure in which, averaged over time, she is a zero net contributor".

A savvy British government would also read Nigel Lawson's evidence to the House of Lords European Union Committee (published on 9th March 2005), in which he explained how Mrs Thatcher won the rebate. Back in 1984, she "let it be known" that a Bill had already been printed to take the UK out of the EU if she didn't get satisfaction. That is the only way to get proper reform in the EU.

Starting with the Social Chapter, Mr Blair has spent the last eight years signing up to every "policy" from Brussels, giving up the veto in 47 areas so far, according to the Foreign Office. (Had the Constitution gone through, the veto would have gone in another 39 areas.) As recently as October 2002 he signed up to the Chirac-Schröder stitch-up to preserve the CAP in its current form to 2013. Yet Mr Blair now proclaims that the EU badly needs "reform". His position - let us be charitable - lacks consistency.

Gordon Brown's Pre-Budget Report (December 2004) and Budget Statement (March 2005) both forecast the UK's net contributions (after the rebate) to Brussels to grow on average at 25 per cent per year to 2007/8. So much for Prudence. The rebate question is an expensive technicality; but, in the terms in which Mr Blair is arguing it, EU reform - real reform - is as far away as ever.

Constitution 'needed for European core'

Like the Bourbons the French political elite seems to have learned nothing and to have forgotten nothing. Speaking in Paris on the 5th October French Foreign Minister Philippe Douste-Blazy called for an "avant-garde" of countries within the European Union with a view to pursue

"the objective of a political Europe". He said that in order to "pursue deepening, we need to allow an avant-garde to go further". He added, "This common project, this 'house within the house' will be more integrated, more demanding, more concrete... If we want to pursue the

objective of a political Europe, we must allow this avant-garde to constitute what others have called 'a federation of nation states'. This project must be the object of a particular treaty that is more demanding and more explicit."

Why the German election result really won't make much difference

*For the last six months, Daniel Hannan has been writing a regular column in the German daily newspaper **Die Welt**, which is the only eurosceptic voice in the mainstream German media. There follows an English translation of his article written immediately after the German general election.*

Let me be brutally honest. It really doesn't matter who emerges as Chancellor. Forget all the slogans you heard during the election about the magnitude of the choice facing the nation: that is what we politicians always say before polling day. On most questions, all the parties agree; and even if they didn't, it wouldn't matter, because the big issues are these days settled in Brussels, not Berlin.

None of the candidates talked about Europe during the campaign - except tangentially through the question of Turkish accession. But the EU made its presence felt none the less. There it sat like Banquo's ghost, invisible to most voters, but shaking its gory locks at the party leaders, who knew that they had to draw up their manifestoes within the parameters allowed by European law. Thus, no politician could honestly promise to revive your countryside (because of the Common Agricultural Policy) or overhaul labour relations (because of the Social Chapter) or regulate your borders (because of Schengen) or even adopt a radically different economic policy (because of the euro and the Stability Pact).

Extraordinary Statistic

You think I exaggerate? Then consider the following extraordinary statistic. Eighty per cent of German laws originate, not in the Bundestag or the Federal Government, but in Brussels. That is not my figure: it comes from your own Federal Justice

Ministry. In reply to a question by the excellent CSU MP Johannes Singhammer, the ministry was forced to concede that, out of 23,167 legislative acts passed since 1998, nearly 19,000 originated in the EU.

This proportion is not unique to Germany, of course. Similar studies in Britain, and elsewhere in the EU, have shown the same thing. What is peculiar to Germany is that none of the parties wants to talk about the subject.

Partisan Bickering

You might argue that this is a good thing: that consensus is better than division, and that it is nice to see all the politicians agreeing about something. But the idea that partisan bickering is bad for the country has been the argument of every dictatorship in history, from Bonaparte onwards.

Without all-party consensus, the Eurocrats would never have got to where they are. Again and again, the EU has extended its competence into a new area, and then, much later, regularised that extension in a treaty. In other words, the politicians have agreed among themselves to transfer a new area of policy to Brussels, and then presented their electorates with a *fait accompli*.

It is a strange thing. Whenever I ask my Euro-enthusiast friends what is the purpose of the EU, they say: "To spread democracy". Yet, for 50 years, we have been transferring power from elected national parliamentarians to

unelected Brussels officials. It is often pointed out that the EU's structure is undemocratic, in that only the Commission can propose new laws. What is less often remarked upon is the way in which the EU has devalued the electoral process within the Member States.

We have now reached a point where almost every area of political life is, to some extent, subject to European jurisdiction: transport, energy, trade, competition, agriculture, fisheries, regional government, immigration, asylum, foreign affairs, employment law, social policy, defence. Of all your national departments, only two are wholly in control of their own affairs: the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education.

Delightful Custom

Like most foreigners, I love the sight of Germans voting in traditional costume. But it occurs to me that this delightful custom is a metaphor for the state of European democracy. Voting is becoming a folkloric activity, as powers shift from elected representatives to standing bureaucracies. We carry on dutifully visiting the polling stations; but, in our hearts, we know that it will make little difference.

Daniel Hannan is Conservative MEP for the South East Region

Death through inactivity

"One of the least noticed political deaths of recent times was the demise of Britain in Europe, quietly put to sleep in August. Cause of death: the no votes in France and the Netherlands, which sealed the fate of the European constitution. 'Campaign operations have ceased because there is no campaign', says a spokesman, still manning the phones in what used to be HQ." The Guardian, 5th October 2005.

Competition league: EU economies flounder

New economic data shows that honesty pays off

Further evidence that the Lisbon goal of making the EU economy the most competitive in the world not merely remains as distant as ever but is actually receding is contained in some intriguing data from the World Economic Forum (WEF).

None of the major EU countries is ranked in the top ten in the Forum's Growth Competitiveness Index for 2005, and all of these, including Britain have lower places in the index than a year ago. Britain is ranked 13th (down two places), Germany 15th (also down two places), Spain 29th (down six places), France 30th (down three places).

Belgium is ranked 31st (down six places) while Greece and Italy are the

worst performers among the EU '15'. The former is ranked 46th (down 9 places) while Italy remains in 48th position - well below Kuwait, Thailand, Jordan and South Africa.

Many of the star performers are Nordic countries. Finland comes out on top with Sweden and Denmark falling into third and fourth places behind the US. Norway is ranked 9th. Denmark is the only 'Old European' state to have improved its position during the last 12 months.

The reasons advanced for the competitiveness of the Nordic countries are highly significant - according to the WEF they have economic policies that are sympathetic to the wealth-creating process and

honest governments.

Augusto Lopez-Claros, Chief Economist and Director of the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Programme put the matter only a little more diplomatically when the index was published on 28th September. "*The Nordic countries share a number of characteristics that make them extremely competitive, such as very healthy macroeconomic environments and public institutions that are highly transparent and efficient*", he said. In other words, honesty - not exactly a quality that the EU has striven to promote - pays off. Conversely, opaque government leads to relative economic decline.

Real democracy - but not in the EU

On 25th September 2005, by a referendum of its entire electorate, a European country approved (by 56 to 44 per cent) the granting of free movement into and out of its territory of the citizens of the ten accession countries* which joined the EU on 1st May 2004. The country in question was Switzerland, not an EU member, not even an EEA member.#

Switzerland is thus the only country inside or outside the EU to have asked its citizens whether they were in favour or not of opening their borders to the peoples (74 million of them) of the ten accession countries. The opinions of the citizens of the "old" EU-15, including the UK, were of course not sought.

In holding such a referendum, as the

Swiss government is obliged to do under the Swiss Constitution, Switzerland demonstrated once again that it is the only country in Europe - perhaps in the whole world - where the concept of "the sovereignty of the people" still actually means something.

Madame Micheline Calmy-Rey, the Swiss foreign minister, noted that "*Switzerland has chosen to conduct relations with the EU through bi-lateral sectoral agreements.....this provides a stable and predictable basis for the political and economic relationship with our European neighbours*". She also noted that this method of conducting relations with the EU had the support of the Swiss electorate. She was too diplomatic to point out that the fundamental point

about "*bi-lateral sectoral agreements*" is the complete absence of supra-nationality, which means that Switzerland retains full sovereignty at all times: it can veto them or cancel them without penalty.

Switzerland, which does a far higher proportion of its trade with the EU than does the UK, has a per capita GDP which is 74 per cent higher than that of EU-25.

**Poland and 7 other central European and Baltic countries, Cyprus and Malta.*

#European Economic Area, comprising EU-25, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein.

Soldiers of the Queen - or Solana's infantry?

"I've just returned from Bosnia-Herzegovina, where I spent a week as part of the Armed Forces parliamentary scheme. There are about a thousand British troops on duty out there alongside soldiers from Germany, France, Italy, Portugal and Sweden - all acting together as Eufor under an EU flag. Javier Solana is effectively the EU defence secretary, giving the orders to what is a single army under a European banner. It was fascinating to see it in action and it works", Chris Bryant, Labour MP for Rhondda quoted in the Daily Telegraph, 1st October.

LETTERS

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

Birthday Thoughts

Dear Sir,

Your heading in the issue of 7th October 2005 'Let the people decide' leaves one with a sobering thought as to whether sufficient has been done to enable 'the people' to make a rational decision.

Over the half century 1941-91, necessity encouraged the development of an attitude of mind that Britain could not succeed as an independent nation: to be successful it had to be part of a larger entity. This attitude needs to be overcome if confidence is to be felt that the British electorate would convincingly opt for full independence from the EU in face of pressures to the contrary.

Full independence means just that - no side glances towards NAFTA - the same issue of the 7th October revealed Canada's unfortunate experience with that body.

Therefore, in looking forward to the next decade let *eurofacts* give greater coverage to the benefits to be gained by Britain operating as a fully independent nation. Experience shows that in trying to persuade people against something (e.g. the EU) it is often more effective if a convincing alternative can be offered.

RALPH MADDERN

Warwickshire

[We intend to do just as Mr Maddern suggests. Suggestions from other readers about our future priorities and strategy are welcome - Ed.]

Referendum Concerns

Dear Sir,

Harry Randall (Letters, 7th October) warns that the petition for a referendum on the EU, run by UKIP's European parliamentary group 'Independence and Democracy' (ID), could play into the hands of Europhiles. It is true that even at their

most successful election UKIP's withdrawalist message won only 16.1 per cent of the vote. Hardly an encouraging basis for a referendum campaign.

There are further concerns, however. The petition is not for a straightforward 'in' or 'out' question, and Nigel Farage, co-leader of the ID Group, writes in *eurofacts* (7th October) that the ID campaign is for "a referendum on our future in the EU". UKIP members do not want a future in the EU. They want out, and passed a resolution at their 2001 conference regretting dilution of the party's withdrawal policy by advocacy of a referendum. Where is the democracy in 36 ID Group MEPs overriding thousands of UKIP members?

Nor does the petition state the name of the person or body to whom it is addressed. As the ID group is funding it they will presumably be entitled to use the results in furtherance of their own political agenda, which is not to leave or destroy the EU but to promote democracy and transparency within it. UKIP's website reported leader Roger Knapman telling party members that if one million signatures were collected the subject would have to be debated in the European parliament.

To what end? One might reasonably ask why, when British Eurorealists object to EU institutions making Britain's laws, they should tolerate the intervention of an EU institution in Britain's referendum?

BARBARA BOOKER

Sussex

Is Nigel Naive?

Dear Sir,

I'm afraid Nigel Farage is being very naive when calling for a referendum on the EU. Even if such a huge privilege was granted by our dear leaders, we can be certain that the question will be

completely skewed.

With a hopelessly ineffective and supine electoral commission doing absolutely nothing to earn their huge salaries, the question will be on the lines of, 'Do you want to leave the EU, starve, and be reduced to eating your children, or do you wish to remain in the EU under the wise and benign leadership of the uniquely caring and altruistic EU Commissioners, and be gloriously happy for ever, plus free beer six days a week (brewed in France)?'

Sorry, Nigel, forget it. The baddies would win by a motorway.

BRIAN BONE

Middlesex

Metric Confusion

Dear Sir,

As someone whose house was built in 1970 with half imperial and half metric plumbing, may I suggest that it might help to wrongfoot this "government" of ours over further unwanted and enforced metrication if the public was made more aware of the fact that:

In Italy, plumbers are continuing to use only pipes manufactured there in half-inch, three-quarters, and inch sizes, not m.m.

In France, another architect friend tells me, you can still buy timber described as 4 x 4 inch etc.

In the UK today we no longer know what we are getting for our money in metric measures, e.g. In my fridge are these near identical sized jars of marmalade, cranberry sauce, and (French) jam. They are marked, respectively, 454g, 350g and 370g. Only one corresponds in weight to the pound (16 ounces) jar of jam we used to buy: the Frank Cooper's Oxford marmalade.

DON BRIGGS

Cheshire

MEETINGS

United Kingdom Independence Party
01503 230055

Saturday **22nd October 2005**
7.00 for 7.30 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)

London Swinton Circle
0208 691 7495

Tuesday **25th October 2005**, 7.00 pm

“EU, Identity cards, a discussion on the
racial and religious hatred bill and
reform of the House of Lords”

Lord Stoddart of Swindon

PUBLIC MEETING

The House of Lords, Westminster,
London SW1

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

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

“Modernising Parliament: Reform of the
House of Commons”

Professor Vernon Bogdanor CBE
FBA, Gresham Professor of Law

The House of Commons is, as the popularly elected chamber, by far the stronger of the two Houses of Parliament. Yet many argue that the Commons has become ineffective as a check upon Government. What has been the impact of recent reforms of the Commons? How can the Commons be made more effective?

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **27th October 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and Change: Prime
Ministers in the Post-War World -
Attlee”

Dr Paul Addison, *Centre for Second
World War Studies, The University of
Edinburgh*

Response

Professor Peter Hennessy, *Queen
Mary, University of London*

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London
Admission Free

Democracy Movement
(Louth Branch)
01507 601699

Friday **28th October 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Vision Europe”
The Alternative to the EU

Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director,
Democracy Movement*

Ashley Mote MEP, *Journalist and
author*

Cllr. Steve Radford, *President of the
Liberal Party*

PUBLIC MEETING

Conoco Room, (Above Louth Library),
Northgate, Louth, Lincolnshire
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
(Salisbury Branch)
01722 790839

Monday **7th November 2005**, 7.30 pm

“Let the People Decide”

Christopher Gill, *Freedom Association*
Nigel Farage MEP, *UKIP*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Market Square, Salisbury
Admission Free

The Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

International Conference

Saturday **19th November 2005**
10.30 am to 6.15 pm

Speakers include:

Christopher Booker

Marc Glendening

Daniel Hannan MEP

Lindsay Jenkins

Ruth Lea

John Midgley

Professor Kenneth Minogue

Dr Richard North

PUBLIC MEETING

The Great Hall, King's College, London
Admission £20

(Includes lunch and refreshments)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

EU Summit **27-28th October**
London

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **21-22nd November**

ECOFIN meeting **24th November**

ECOFIN meeting **6th December**

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

2006

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

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

2007

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

Accession of **1st January**
Bulgaria and Romania
to the European Union

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

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 alternative options.

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.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of Local Government

by Lindsay Jenkins. **£14.99**

The author reveals the detailed Brussels agenda for the break-up of the United Kingdom.

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.

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