

‘Renegotiation’ is a slogan - and not a policy

The Commission would be ready to deal with demands for ‘renegotiation’ in certain areas by asking for major concessions in others

Renegotiation appears to be the policy of both candidates for the Tory leadership. Cameron wants to repatriate social and employment policies from Brussels; Davis wants a “*much more fundamental renegotiation*”.

We can be sure that these statements of intent are even now being carefully studied by our masters in Brussels. We can be equally sure that the eurocrats are working on a set of strategies for if and when a future Conservative government demands “renegotiation” from the EU.

The Commission, on this subject, is not stupid. It will do everything in its power to ensure that the ratchet goes on turning. When a British prime minister says, for example: “*Give us back fishing and employment law*”, Brussels will respond: “*But of course you can have those back. However, we’re sure you’d agree that we need EU-wide tax harmonisation, a single EU Director of Public Prosecutions*

and a unified EU police force to combat terrorism” (or other integrationist policies the damage from which would far outweigh any benefits gained from repatriation of things like fishing and employment law).

Almighty Crisis

So in practice, it won’t be enough for a British prime minister to go to Brussels and say: “*Give us back fishing and employment law* (or whatever)”. At the very least, he would have to say: “*These are our specific demands: and we will not negotiate on any quid pro quo whatsoever: and we are freezing - stopping the conveyor belt - all integration measures already agreed by previous governments and in the pipeline*”. Such a position would of course provoke an almighty crisis in the EU.

The fact is that as soon as a British government in what it thought was “renegotiation” mode got sucked into

the quid pro quo game, and/or into the “*OK, existing integrationist measures can continue*” mode, it would have lost its way. Conclusion: “renegotiation” is not a policy: it’s a slogan. If you’re serious about “*the future of our country as an independent nation state*” (the Davis position) there’s only one thing to do. Get out.

Of course some might reply that the Tory party has torn itself apart on this issue over more than two decades and it is therefore unrealistic for a Tory leadership candidate to say as much, whatever his intentions. Perhaps it is (although Mr Davis also promises a return to candour in our public life). But unless the victorious candidate possesses a deep and unshakable resolve to do whatever is necessary to ensure this country’s future as an independent nation the game will be lost. We repeat the assertion made above: whatever words are spoken the only way that national independence can be safeguarded is by getting out.

The evil origins of integration

The society that the professional EU politicians wish to create is woefully ill-conceived, a utopia based on school-boyishly simple and long-disproved presumptions about human nature and the course of our future. They are perpetuating the most dangerous of contemporary myths - a myth inherited from their days as fellow travellers of communist

ideologies. Reformed or closet socialists may not talk of socialism, Marxism or communism, but instead of the more pleasant-sounding ‘integration’, ‘unity’ and ‘perpetual peace’. But they are, nevertheless, spreading the most socialist trope of all - the myth of human perfectibility; a myth that led not only to the twentieth century’s camps and gulags,

but has always led such ways. In persistently seizing on simplified notions of collective guilt for the Nazi horror, they are in danger of overlooking the root causes of the other evil ideology.

Douglas Murray, *Neoconservatism: why we need it*, Social Affairs Unit page 177.

INSIDE: EU ‘uses KGB methods to sack staff’ p.2 - European Parliament breaks its own rules p.2 - Why the ‘completion’ of the single market is undesirable p.3 - Purpose of the EU spy satellite system? p.4 - Germans back constitution p.4 - Wisdom from Giscard p.4 - Wisdom from le grand Charles p.4 - After the bra war .. the shoe war p.5 - The reason for the EU’s dodgy book-keeping p.5 - Klaus refuses to fly the flag p.6

EU 'uses KGB methods to sack staff'

The European Commission is being taken to court over its practice of employing psychiatrists in its disputes with employees

In the Soviet Union dissidents were sometimes committed to mental asylums as a means of silencing them. The European Commission has been accused of something rather similar: of seeking to have troublesome staff declared mentally ill as an excuse for giving them the sack.

The claim is made by the lawyers of Jose Sequeira, a Portuguese official who is now taking the Commission to court over an attempt to sack him using psychiatric reports.

Mr Sequeira, who worked in the Commission's ministry for development, was placed on permanent sick leave after tests found that he suffered "verbal hyper-productivity" and "a lack of conceptual content" in his speech.

He told the *Sunday Telegraph* on 13th October: "I protested, and a few days later the doctor came to my desk with security guards to physically remove me from the building. There is a [a

system of] psychiatric trials in place in the Commission and I am a victim. I am not the only one, but the first to decide to fight the system".

Mr Sequeira said that his relationship with his superiors soured when they became wrongly convinced that he was planning to blow the whistle on an internal fraud scandal.

According to the *Telegraph* Mr Sequeira underwent tests at four psychiatric hospitals in order to prove that he was of sound mind. All four hospitals found nothing wrong with him, but their findings were declared inadmissible by the Commission as it would only accept testimony from its own accredited list of doctors.

Unwanted Employees

Mr Sequeira is not the only former employee to claim that the Commission had used false medical grounds to prise him from office.

Ataide Portugal, a colleague of Mr Sequeira, left the Commission two years ago after a long dispute. A third employee has also begun court proceedings after being summoned for psychiatric testing.

The method of getting rid of unwanted employees through psychiatric reports was described by Mr Sequeira's lawyers as "worthy of the KGB".

Mr Sequeira's case has been taken up by Paul van Buitenen, the Dutch MEP and former EU auditor who blew on the whistle on EU fraud and mismanagement in 1998.

Brussels insiders are no doubt wondering how it is that, if "verbal hyper-activity" is regarded as a sackable offence, Neil Kinnock managed to survive at the very top of the EU power edifice for an entire decade without attracting the attention of the men in white coats..

European Parliament breaks its own rules

By Gerard Batten

On the 17th November the European Parliament voted on the REACH (Registration, Evaluation and Authorisation of Chemicals) Directive. This is the largest piece of legislation that the EU has ever sought to implement and it will place enormous regulatory burdens on the pharmaceutical industry, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises.

The voting session was even more chaotic than usual and after voting on several hundred amendments we arrived at the final vote on the draft legislative proposal. At this point my UKIP colleague Derek Clark rose to make a point of order. He pointed out to the President of the Parliament that

under rule 53 of the Parliament's own Rules of Procedure "where the Commission proposal as a whole is approved, but on the basis of amendments which have also been adopted, the vote on the draft legislative proposal shall be postponed until the Commission has stated its position on each of the Parliament's amendments". Derek's intercession was greeted with stunned silence. The President asked the Commissioner present, Mr Stavros Dimas to comment. He replied, "The Commission would accept some amendments, reject others and had an open mind on the rest". The President then totally ignored the rules and

proceeded to the vote, despite UKIP's loud protests that the rules clearly stated that the Commission should first consider "each" amendment.

In order to force this piece of legislation through the Parliament blatantly broke its own rules. UKIP intends to demand a meeting with Josep Borrell, President of the Parliament to pursue this, and question the legality of the legislation. What this incident clearly shows, if another example were needed is the undemocratic nature of the European Parliament.

Gerard Batten is Member of the European Parliament for the London region.

Why the ‘completion’ of the single market is undesirable

The Chancellor’s economic analysis demonstrates that Britain is damaged by the low growth policies of the euro-zone

By Anthony Scholefield

Gordon Brown has finally let the cat out of the bag.

He now says that Britain’s low growth (low, that is, by international standards, if not by the standards of the EU) is due to the high proportion of trade which is carried on with the euro-zone. Yes, this is a statement of the blatantly obvious, but it is one which in the past has been far too embarrassing for Westminster politicians to acknowledge.

In an article in the *Financial Times* on 13th October 2005 just prior to the EU-China finance ministers meeting, he declared: “For 10 years, Europe (sic) has grown at not only one quarter of the rate of China and India but at half the rate of the US. And while the whole world is affected by the trebling of oil prices, Britain, exporting 50 per cent of its goods to the euro area, suffers more than most from low European growth. This year’s 1.2 per cent European growth is a wake up call we cannot ignore”.

We note that Gordon Brown displays ‘unconscious narrow nationalism’ in that his definition of ‘European growth’ excludes Britain. He carries on in the same vein, excluding Britain from Europe by referring to ‘European unemployment approaching 10 per cent’.

He draws the conclusion that with Britain’s growth suffering as a consequence of close integration with the eurozone, ‘European economic reform’ is the answer.

His analysis undermines some basic EU ideas.

‘The change we need is quite fundamental. For decades, the assumption has been that Europe’s nations would prosper as economic integration at a national level was superseded by economic integration at a European level.’

‘But globalization has brought challenges none of Europe’s founders

could foresee. It is global, not just European companies and global not just European brands, that now dominate. So pro-Europeans must honestly say that Europe cannot succeed as a trade bloc looking in on itself. Instead, Global Europe must be outward not inward looking, focussed on external competition and adjust its social model to combine flexibility with fairness.’

So, Gordon Brown is finally man enough to conclude that Britain suffers because of low growth in the EU! An unbiased observer might conclude that the solution was to disentangle Britain from the EU and cease to promote economic integration. Instead, the Chancellor has decided to push water uphill. He identifies the sclerotic Brussels set-up as bad for Britain but he believes he can reform every aspect of EU policy - from labour markets, to trade barriers, to monetary and fiscal affairs.

Fantastic Proposals

He does not question why Britain’s trade is artificially channeled to the European Union by means of the Customs Union and some of his proposals seem quite fantastic, including his plea for the removal of labour market rigidities at the very same time as his government is concluding gold-plated pension deals with public employees and preserving an early retirement age. He also calls for a euro- area ‘symmetrical inflation target’ - a call which it is impossible to believe will be taken even half seriously by those ministers of finance who are actually in the euro.

Finally, he joins David Cameron in calling for the completion of the single market, the ‘good thing’ all Westminster politicians can agree on because they evidently know so little about it (Cameron tells us in his

website that the most important EU issue is the completion of the single market). The achievement of this goal is as likely as the dismantling of the CAP. The presumed benefits have never been rationally examined while on the ground businesses complain that the single market at present is ineffective. Both Brown and Cameron should ask themselves the following question: If Britain suffers more than most from low European growth, why do they so ardently wish to complete the single market - a goal which can only have the consequence of increasing Britain’s share of trade with the European Union and of consequently further reducing our growth potential?

Britain has a permanent and large deficit in trade with the EU’s wonderful Single Market which can only be paid for by the surpluses earned from trade with the outside world. The reality is that a single market ruled by a unified set of complex and infinitely expanding harmonised economic regulations buttressed by a Customs Union with heavy protection for industry and agriculture and huge commercial lobbying is a guarantee of economic failure. But without offering the slightest shred of evidence, Brown (like Cameron) insists that an important part of the solution is the completion of the single market. But isn’t the single market idea precisely designed to increase the proportion of our trade with ‘Europe’?

Surely even Gordon and David cannot believe a ‘successful’ single market would reduce that proportion? But a reduction in that proportion is precisely what the national economic interest requires - and the Chancellor has implicitly come close to recognising this. Too bad his policies run in a diametrically opposite direction.

What is the purpose of the EU spy satellite system?

The European Union is currently building a network of spy-satellites. The multi-million pound scheme is known as Global Monitoring for Environment and Security (GMES) and although the project is behind schedule it should be up and running by 2010. The European Space Agency (ESA) has already spent £154 million on preparatory work, and expects the whole project to cost £1.54 billion between 2006 and 2013.

These facts were reported in the *The Daily Telegraph* on 15th November 2005. But as Richard North pointed out on the Referendum Blog on the same day none of this is new, even if there has been little publicity: the project was actually announced in 2002 and the details of the scheme were published in February of 2004.

What is interesting is the Commission's latest thinking about uses to which the system will be put. Its spokesmen have stressed that it can be employed to such humane and

obviously desirable ends as providing images of oil spills and forest fires and of helping to direct relief work and disaster relief operations.

But an EU memo also says that that GMES which is being constructed from national space assets will have a key role in implementing EU policies including boosting "internal security". In addition, it is expected to provide "the necessary elements" in the further construction of a European Security and Defence Policy.

Gregor Kreuzhuber, the Commission's spokesman for industry policy described GMES as "a little brother for Galileo, a sort of satellite system where you can better monitor what is happening on our planet".

If GMES was a national scheme there could be few reasons to doubt its usefulness. But the "little brother" in question will be under the control of an unaccountable and increasingly illiberal state with big power delusions - a kind of incompetent Big Brother -

and the purposes to which it will be put are being defined by the Commission, not by member states, even though it is being partly constructed out of national space assets.

The prospect of GMES being used to monitor the implementation of EU policies is therefore a disturbing one. So is the prospect that it will play a role in the creation of the ESDP. Even under the present europhile British Prime Minister, UK Defence and Foreign Policy has been at variance with that of other EU members and with the formal position of the EU. It is not inconceivable therefore that the system could be used to monitor British troop movements during crises in which our European Union partners had chosen not to become embroiled and that sensitive information could be passed to the enemy. Assuming, of course, that Britain retains the ability to act unilaterally in the military sphere - an increasingly doubtful proposition.

Germans back constitution

The new German government plans to use its 2007 presidency of the EU to revive the ratification of the EU constitution, according to a coalition deal struck on Friday 11th November.

The coalition agreement, signed by the German Christian Democrat CDU and the Social Democrat SPD parties, was struck as part of the deal to create a "grand coalition" government led by

CDU leader Angela Merkel.

The coalition deal revives plans for a ratification of the European Union constitution, which was put on ice by EU leaders in June following a rejection of the new treaty by French and Dutch voters.

"We stand for the European constitutional treaty", the text reads, reiterating that the constitution makes

the union more democratic, efficient and transparent.

For now, the CDU-SPD government will support the continuing ratification of the treaty by member states, and will strengthen the process more directly when it takes over the helm of the EU in January 2007, the parties proclaimed.

Wisdom from Giscard

"Now that French sovereignty has been partially transferred to 'Europe', you have hardly any real power left, apart from nominating prefects [of French départements]" Valéry Giscard d'Estaing to President Chirac, 25th March 1997, reported in *Exil à l'Elysée* by Christine Clerc, quoted in *L'Indépendance* Sept-Oct 2005.

Wisdom from le grand Charles

"The most costly, most ruinous policy is to think small..." Charles de Gaulle, 20th March 1965. ("La politique la plus coûteuse, la plus ruineuse, c'est d'être petit").

After the bra war ... the shoe war

Whatever the brand name on your trainers, gentle reader, the chances are that they have been made in China or Vietnam. These two countries have become so dominant in the production of high-tech sports wear that there is almost no production of such items in EU countries. Which makes it all the more remarkable that sports shoes are to be included in an anti-dumping inquiry currently being carried out by the EU.

'Dumping' is the name given to the device by which producers artificially lower prices in order to destroy competitors; once this has been accomplished prices can then be raised. But in the case of sports shoes there is no European competition for Chinese and Vietnamese companies to destroy. So the claim that Far Eastern producers are guilty of 'dumping' trainers and other sports footwear onto the European market is inherently absurd.

Nevertheless, according to Reuters on 17th November, Commission spokesmen have confirmed that trainers and other sporting footwear are included in the current investigation into alleged dumping of footwear by China and Vietnam. As a result of domination of the European market by Far Eastern producers there have been

no quotas in this sector of the footwear market since 1994.

Spokesmen for European sporting goods retailers and importers have warned that the investigation could lead to a 'shoe war' of greater intensity than that which occurred between European textile producers and retailers during the 'bra-war', suggesting that around 640,000 high-value jobs in design, marketing, sales and logistics are at stake.

"China and Vietnam are world leaders in the manufacture of high-technology sporting footwear and cutting off these sources of supply would put a whole European industry at risk", the chairman of the trade committee of the Federation of Sporting Goods Industry Karl Sedlymeyer said.

"We must learn the lessons following the EU/China textile negotiations over the summer. This investigation has the potential to be far more damaging."

As well as sports shoes, the investigation is looking into other types of leather upper shoes, raising concerns among well known companies such as Clarks and Timberland.

The inquiry has been launched following complaints of 'dumping' by Italian and Spanish shoe

manufacturers.

Even in this area of fashion-wear there are reasons for thinking that the claims are groundless. As millions of British shoppers have recently discovered, Italian and Spanish shoes are no longer the bargain they used to be. If the companies that produce them want to survive in the global marketplace they will have to compete harder in terms of quality and design - or shift production to countries where labour costs are lower.

The fact that sports shoes have been included in the investigation strengthens the suspicion that instead they are seeking trade protection. An apparent 'concession' in this sector during talks between the EU and China would provide a bargaining chip which the trade commissioner Peter Mandelson could use to restrict quotas for other kinds of footwear. If Mandelson descends to such methods the result will be market distortions that damage the interests of British consumers, British retailers, and many other British companies.

The Commission has promised to announce the result of the inquiry in April. We will know then whether Mr Mandelson is brave enough to spot the difference between a dumping strategy and an export drive.

The reason for the EU's dodgy book-keeping

The rejection of the EU Commission's accounts by the European Court of Auditors has become a recognised feature of the calendar, not as much fun as Guy Fawkes day but equally predictable. Reactions to this event - this is the 11th year in which the Court has refused to sign off on the accounts - are also predictable.

The Commission's spokesmen point to "improvements" although on inspection these turn out to be trivial or non-existent. They scornfully dismiss suggestions that the fact that no less than 90 per cent of the EU's £68 billion budget cannot be properly accounted should be treated as a reason for opposing further budget increases. For

their part, British newspapers run earnest and well-meaning editorials suggesting a variety of changes that would improve matters, but display little grasp of why it is that genuine remedies are unlikely to be implemented.

Speaking on the *Today* programme, Marta Andreasen, the former EU chief accountant who was sacked because she really did want to change things displayed a better grasp of reality:

"When I tried to change or suggest ways in which we could improve I wasn't heard, I was pushed out", she said. "There seems to be a culture that is not very inclined to improve things."

The reason why such a culture exists is that the EU executive is

unaccountable. The people who work in Brussels are not necessarily more wicked than their counterparts elsewhere but they cannot be held properly responsible for mistakes and wrong-doing, a defect which goes to the heart of the European project.

When the EU finally implodes, perhaps its passing should be commemorated by an annual ceremony at which men in pinstripe suits laden with pages of financial data solemnly announce that they have no idea what has happened to millions of pounds of taxpayers' money. It should serve as a reminder of what happens when there is no link between public expenditure and democratic representation.

LETTERS

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

Time to Combine Forces

Dear Sir,
After decades of Government subterfuge, recently there have appeared at least five cost-benefit studies of the UK's membership of the EU, showing that for this country the cost is great and the benefit small. And more and more people are at last saying that the UK's best course is to leave the EU, a view I advanced in my book "*The Ratchet*" published by the June Press.

As to our trading basis on leaving, as the world's fourth largest trading nation, we should not stumble over the mechanics involved. I tend to agree with Sir George Earle (letters 4th November) that we might be better off without Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Of the two hundred or more countries in the world, many trade under FTAs, a much smaller number in customs unions such as the EU, and many more under the World Trade Organisation rules alone. With tariffs now reduced to very low levels, presumably the UK with its global reach could decide to trade without the involvements of FTAs. As Ian Milne points out in "*A Cost too Far?*", once freed from the EU restraints, one of the numerous advantages for the UK would be to resume its own seat and voice at the WTO.

In the *European Journal* this March and April (Vol. 12, Nos 3&4) were

tables showing some 38 different anti-EU groups. Those groups should be urged to set aside Party and other differences and join together to form a single Alliance with much more authority and concentrated power to be directed towards our leaving the EU. The longstanding charade about our need to be in the EU and the myths created to sustain it are belatedly being faced and revealed in all their hollowness. Hesitancy must now give way to resolve energising the new groundswell to build up into a force for regaining our national independence.

JOHN RENNIE STEWARDSON
Surrey

Cameron's Way

Dear Sir,
Would a "tougher EU line pay off"? Pay to whom, in what respect. Your analysis that most Tory members want a tough line on the EU is correct, some even want out yesterday. But that is not the point. The point is can the new leader and the Conservatives persuade the great mass of voters who did not vote Conservative last time to do so next time. Cameron is absolutely right to take this issue gently; out of the EPP, pull back on all regulations affecting business, employment, social chapter; but hold back on further promises on the EU until later.

Whether we like it or not millions of voters are more interested in tax,

pensions, schools, NHS, than they are in Europe. You may think them silly, but without their vote we can do nothing.

STUART SEXTON
Surrey

No Withdrawal

Dear Sir,
Christina Speight's enthusiasm for David Davis' proposed 'double referendum', which she believes would ultimately lead to withdrawal from the EU, is rather scuppered by David Davis's recent pronouncement, in an interview with Jeremy Paxman, that there are no circumstances in which he could envisage withdrawal from the EU.

HUGO MILLER
Sussex

Cut off the Cash!

Dear Sir,
Reading the various correspondents in your pages, it occurs to me that there is no need to have a referendum or to re-negotiate any treaties.

All we need do is cut off the money supply to Brussels on the grounds that they are not capable of keeping proper accounts. The whole, rotten structure would then disintegrate.

PETER HOWELL
Wiltshire.

Klaus refuses to fly the flag

"Plan D" - the new communications strategy devised by European Union Commissioner Margot Wallstrom with the aim of winning public support for the EU - could not have got off to a worse start. Mrs Wallstrom arrived in the Czech Republic to launch the project in the company of EU President Jose Manuel Barroso and Czech Commissioner for social policy, Vladimir Spidla on 18th November

during the week in which the European Union celebrated the 50th anniversary of its flag. But instead of finding the Czech newspapers full of pictures of happy Czech citizens waving the blue and gold emblem the main item concerned the refusal of the Czech President Vaclav Klaus to fly the flag at Prague Castle, his official residence.

Two artists were actually barred by

the president's guard from hoisting the flag above the Castle walls. Former President Vaclav Havel added to the controversy by suggesting that the behaviour of his successor was "scandalous". But President Klaus retorted that he had not received "*a mandate, order or request*" concerning the flag when he took his post and did not intend to entertain one now.

*The next Double issue of eurofacts - Christmas double issue
Vol 11 No 5/6 - will appear on 16th December 2005*

MEETINGS

The Anti-Common Market League

020 8675 4854

Friday **2nd December 2005**, 6.30 pm

Annual Party
Special Guest

Gerard Batten MEP, UKIP

ANNUAL PARTY

The Hoop and Toy Public House
(Upstairs), 34 Thurloe Place, London
SW7 (nearest tube - South Kensington)

Admission - Advance £6 (double £10)

On the Door - **£7 (£11)**

Tickets: Anti-Common Market League,
28 Highdown, Worcester Park, Surrey
KT4 7HZ

Public Meeting

01672 515 275

Sunday **4th December 2005**

10.30 am - 5.00 pm

Speakers include;

Nicholas Hagger, Author

Brian Gerrish

PUBLIC MEETING

Church Hall, Silverless Street,
Marlborough, Wiltshire

Admission Free

Tough Talking From The Right

020 8691 7495

Thursday **12th January 2006**, 7.00 pm

“Reclaiming Our Country”

Nigel Farage MEP, UKIP

Questions and Answers session

PUBLIC MEETING

AND BUFFET

Function Room, Counting House, 50
Cornhill, London EC3

Admission £17.50

(Includes a glass of wine)

Tickets: Tough Talking From The Right,
PO Box 29208, London SE8 3ZU

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Democracy Campaign

www.britishdemocracycampaign.co.uk

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Congress for Democracy

congressfordemocracy.org

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

Democratic Nations in Danger

freenations.freeuk.com

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Referendum

http://eureferendum.blogspot.com

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Facts, Figures & Phantasies

www.eufactsfigures.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Freedom UK

www.taylor.co.uk/eu/

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Save Britain's Fish

www.savebritfish.org.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

Trade Unionists against the EU

Constitution

www.tuaeuc.org.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Tuesday **24th January 2006**, 6.00 pm

“The referendum: direct democracy and
the Constitution”

**Professor Vernon Bogdanor CBE
FBA, Gresham Professor of Law**

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

DIARY OF EVENTS

2005

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

UK Parliamentary **21st December**
Recess Starts

2006

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

UK Parliament
Lords Restarts **4th January**
Commons Restarts **9th January**

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **6th December 2005**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard by the Economic
Affairs Committee from; Professor John
Broome, Oxford University; and Mr John
Kay.

Wednesday **7th December 2005**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Constitutional
implications of all public bills* from;
(a) Professor Peter Rowe; Professor Ian
Loveland; Mr Sebastian Payne;
(b) Professor John Bell; Dr Katja Ziegler
and Mrs Elizabeth Wilmshurst.

Tuesday **13th December 2005**, 10.35 am

Evidence will be heard on *A European
Strategy for Jobs and Growth - The Lisbon
Agenda* from;

(a) Lord George; and
(b) Mr Martin Wolf, *Financial Times*.

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

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".

The Syndicate

by Nicholas Hagger. **£11.99**

Why a European state is unworkable and how in the end it will destroy parliamentary democracy.

The Case for EFTA

by Daniel Hannan MEP. **£3.00**

Alternatives to the EU.

Britain and the EU:

Time to Move On

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

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? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

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 EU/UK 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.

The Wrong Side of the Hill

The Secret Realignment of UK Defence Policy with the EU

by Richard North. **£10.00**

The author argues that Britain has embarked on a course that will divide it from its traditional American ally.

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.

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

CIB **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

Open Europe **0207-197 2333**

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