

Chirac's bold words are meant to protect only himself

The French President's threats to use nuclear weapons against terrorist attack is more likely to invite derision than to provide security

Speaking at a French submarine nuclear base near Brest in Brittany on 19th January President Chirac of France delivered a solemn warning to state-sponsored terrorists. His speech, which was widely interpreted as a reformulation of French strategic doctrine, made it clear - or seemed to make it clear - that if terrorists used weapons of mass destruction (i.e. nuclear, chemical or biological weapons) against France the response might take the form of a nuclear attack on the state which backed them.

For reasons explained below there are reasons for not taking the President's words at face value. But they are still highly revealing. Although he also called for a "common European defence" in the same speech it was evident that the French President was talking only about a WMD attack on France. The threat of nuclear retaliation would not apply to an attack on his country's EU partners.

as a way of trying to breathe new life into the European project!

As a result of French prompting the text of the Constitutional treaty contained a mutual defence clause which was intended to replicate and rival that contained in the Washington Treaty. Its ultimate purpose was to drive another nail into NATO's coffin. The President's latest words serve to confirm the suspicion that his pledge of all for one and one for all is purely bogus. When it comes to "vital interests" i.e. issues of war and peace it's every state for itself, and no one understands this better or is quicker to act on that assumption than the French. His pantomime bellicosity serves as a reminder that France has been offering a bogus defence pact in return for one that genuinely contributed to security.

However, there are aspects of the President's speech which should worry the French at least as much as their allies.

If threats of retaliation are to work they need to be credible. Even the most dangerous terror groups presently lack nuclear weapons and experts are divided over whether there is a danger that they will obtain them in the foreseeable future. Several terror groups, some with links to Iran, may well have access to chemical and biological weapons. But if, for example, such a group released a nerve agent on the Paris metro, or spread anthrax in Lyon, would the French President really be prepared to turn Tehran into the next Hiroshima by way of retaliation? Bearing in mind that the links between terror groups and their state sponsor are seldom obvious or transparent is such a threat (or half-threat) even remotely credible? Meaningless threats are more likely to invite the contempt and derision of France's enemies than to protect French citizens.

Target Selection

If taken seriously by the terrorists such warnings could plainly influence the selection of targets. One possible consequence would be a heightened risk of WMD attacks on other European states. So much for the idea of European solidarity and the idea of Defence Europe which has recently been aggressively promoted by France

Threats of Retaliation

It is a truism among analysts that strategic intentions need to be signalled unambiguously; uncertainty can heighten the risk of conflict rather than reduce it. But President Chirac says only that nuclear weapons might be used to retaliate against a state supporting terrorists armed with WMD.

Perceived Threats

It is true, of course, that deterrence is preferable to other possible responses to perceived threats - providing conditions are such that deterrence can work. But in order for deterrence to work it is necessary that adversaries understand one another and are able to communicate effectively. Such conditions existed during the Cold

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: What a difference a day makes? p.2 - UK top worldwide for inward investment p.3 - EU decisions still cloaked in secrecy p.3 - Out of the mouths of babes and copy writers p.3 - German unemployment tops five million p.3 - Review of The Great Deception p.4 - Britain 'has elements of fascist state' p.4 - No helping hand for Eurozone states that sink into debt p.5 - When silence spoke eloquently p.5 - What would really happen if the people spoke? p.6

What a difference a day makes!

A sudden change of heart over defence cooperation may mean that the French have got far more than access to the design of British aircraft carriers

Harold Wilson got it wrong: twenty four hours is a long time in politics.

On the 23rd January *Agence France Presse* in common with other French newspapers and news agencies reported that yet again France and Britain were on collision course, this time over plans on cooperation to build new aircraft carriers. The row had blown up following difficult and complex negotiations during which France had refused to pay the £100 million being demanded for access to the designs of the two Royal Navy carriers currently being built.

On the 24th January during talks in London between the Defence Secretary John Reid and the French Defence Minister Michelle Alliot-Marie the atmosphere suddenly changed. Not only did the French agree to hand over the money they also indicated that they might be prepared to put a further £40 million into the development plans. Mme Alliot-Marie described the agreement as an “*essential symbolic advance for Europe*”. Reid, who organized a military guard of honour for his French counterpart, described the breakthrough in the negotiations as “*hugely significant*”.

But what did it signify?

It is true that the French will benefit greatly from being able to base their

carrier - which is intended to supplement the nuclear-powered *Charles de Gaulle* - on the British ships. The *Charles De Gaulle* has suffered from an almost endless string of problems since it was conceived in 1986 and is slower than the *Foch* which it replaces. It has cost over four billion dollars and took more than eleven years to build. Before expensive improvements were made the electronics did not work. Its propeller was so badly designed that that of the *Foch* had to be installed in its place. And the nuclear reactor which powers the ship was fitted in such a way that the crew were exposed to high levels of radiation and are now suing the French government for compensation. Repairs and modifications continue to be made.

Change of Heart

So the French strategy has been to keep the *Charles de Gaulle* in port as much as possible and to adapt the design plans of the British, who have far more experience in building carriers, in order to acquire a smaller non-nuclear aircraft carrier that could actually put to sea.

But all of this was known prior to the talks on the 24th January and cannot explain the French change of heart. Part of the explanation may lie in the

increasing emphasis the French and particularly the French President and Mme Alliot-Marie place on defence cooperation as a means of promoting the EU project following the French and Dutch referendums (see Page 1)

Second, enhanced Anglo-French defence cooperation on which the British Prime Minister is also keen is bound to weaken Anglo-American security ties, a key French objective.

Third, it is possible that when tendering for the carriers takes place French companies will turn out to have done spectacularly well.

Fourth, as that assiduous and perceptive analyst Richard North has observed, it is possible that it may not be the US-made F-35 Joint Strike Fighter which flies from the decks of the two British carriers as currently planned. Indeed, there may be a tacit understanding that the British government will use current differences over a second engine for the Joint Strike Fighter as a reason for pulling out of the deal in order to purchase the French Dassault Aviation Rafale which will fly from the French carrier.

Judged from a French perspective £140 million consequently looks like money well spent. If judged from a British perspective it is possible to arrive at a very different conclusion.

Continued from P.1

Chirac's meaningless threats

War, although the two sides almost came to unleashing their nuclear arsenals on more than one occasion as a result of misunderstandings. Again, nuclear weapons may have contributed to the stabilisation of relations between India and Pakistan, a situation which is likely to continue for as long as the respective leaderships of those countries understand one another.

But no such conditions apply in the case of the West's relations with Iran. The latter poses a threat to Western interests not only because of its known

support for terror groups but also because of its development of nuclear weapons and the Shahab multi-stage missile which has a sufficient range to strike most European cities.

If there is a solution to the problems posed by this 'rogue' state it is one which must involve the US because of American military strength and political leverage. Now that the 'soft power' approach of the EU '3' has ended in humiliation President Chirac has sought to buttress his tattered reputation with words that sound tough

but do not correspond to reality. Security policy is supposed to be about protecting the lives of citizens. It is one of the many ironies of the present situation that Europe's political leaders treat security issues either as an occasion for protecting their backs or for serving the interests of a failing political project that is more likely to add to the security hazards faced by ordinary Europeans than to help them sleep safely in their beds.

UK top worldwide for inward investment

In 2005, according to preliminary figures just published by UNCTAD*, the UK accounted for just under a quarter of total world inward investment ("FDI" - foreign direct investment).

The UK received more FDI than the rest of EU-15 put together and almost as much as EU-15 plus EU-10 (the latter being the new EU members such as Poland and Hungary).

FDI into the UK was forty-five times that going into Germany; seventeen times that going into Italy and four-and-a-half times that going into France. FDI into the UK was even double that going in to the USA.

Mainland China plus Hong Kong together absorbed about half the

amount of FDI that the UK received.

As usual, most FDI worldwide, and especially in the UK, is in the form of acquisitions of existing businesses (as distinct from "greenfield" investments where a factory is built from scratch). In 2005 the UK's FDI figures were "artificially" swollen by the effect of the reorganisation of the formerly bi-national Shell group into a single Dutch company. But even without this, the UK would still have easily outscored its EU competitors such as France and Germany.

In 2005 many mega-acquisitions in the UK were by acquirers from France (Saint-Gobain buying BPB Industries for example), Spain (Telefonica buying O2 for example) and elsewhere in the

EU. (In 2006 the German company Linde may yet succeed in buying BOC - British Oxygen). Europhiles used to claim that the UK would "suffer a loss of FDI if the UK didn't join the single currency". The 2005 figures ought to put the nail in that particular coffin. Less-intelligent (or perhaps just more shameless) Europhiles may still claim that all the FDI into the UK happens "because the UK's part of the EU" - though even that ludicrous claim hasn't been much heard recently.

*The detailed figures can be found in the UNCTAD press release ("*UNCTAD/Press/PR/2006/002/23/01/06*") on the "Press" page of www.unctad.org

EU decisions still cloaked in secrecy

In a previous issue (*eurofacts* 23rd September 2005), we suggested that the drive to introduce transparency to the EU decision making process would either cause the EU to implode - or would get nowhere. The record to date suggests that the latter is the more likely outcome, as recent comments by Nikoforos Diamandouros, the EU Ombudsman amply demonstrate.

In an interview with the *EUobserver* on the 20th January Mr Diamandouros said that the EU Council still has a long way to go to open all of its meetings to the public with ministers still discussing "delicate" matters in secret.

On the 21st December ministers agreed to hold more discussions and

votes on EU legislation under the so-called decision procedure (which also co-involves the European Parliament) in public. But according to Mr Diamandouros the Council has only "partially responded" to the demand for full transparency.

"The decision is limited to the council's first deliberations after the European Commission has presented its proposal and the final vote. The debates in between are still closed to the public", he said.

"The intermediate steps of the debates are the more delicate ones, where decisions are hammered out and negotiations take place."

And, as the Ombudsman pointed out,

December's decision does not cover policy areas which fall outside the co-decision procedure.

"This means that substantive issues, including certain issues relating to justice and home affairs are not affected by the move", he explained.

It is true that as a result of the 21st December decision EU ambassadors may still decide, before each ministers' meeting, to make the intermediate stages public "where appropriate". But that has not been happening: and, as Mr Diamandouros indicated, it all depends how the Council chooses to interpret the word "appropriate".

Out of the mouths of babes and copy writers

Those who travel regularly to Brussels presumably know a little about the politics of the EU. Which may explain why the latest advertising slogan for *eurostar* reads as follows: *Change direction 20 times a day, just like your MEP. Now with 10 trains to Brussels you can back-track whenever it suits you!*

German unemployment tops five million

The number of German unemployed has risen by 408,000 to over 5 million in January, pushing up the unemployment rate by 1 point to 12.1 per cent. Source: *Die Welt*, 31st January, 2006.

A political construction that defies human needs

By Gerald Frost

A favourable review of the first edition of *The Great Deception* appeared in these columns in 2003, but this reviewer confesses to not having read it from cover to cover. I regarded it as a useful work of reference but frankly doubted whether it was possible to write about the ongoing political process of European political integration in a way that was authoritative, comprehensive and readable. The subject was surely too vast and Booker and North, who write regularly about EU matters for the *Sunday Telegraph*, were surely too close to their topic to find the appropriate perspective and detachment to produce an authoritative history of the EU and of Britain's troubled relations with it.

Having read this new, updated and expanded second edition, I am happy to acknowledge that my suspicions were entirely groundless. *The Great Deception* is a formidable intellectual achievement of which Booker and North can be rightly proud. They make no attempt to conceal their strong feelings about the enormity of the folly perpetrated by the architects of the European project or the scale of the deceit practised on the English public. The European project is described as "one of the weirdest, most grandiose, most self-deceiving political adventures the world has ever seen". But their strong feelings have not resulted in rabid prose or prevented them from displaying a meticulous regard for the facts; their achievement has been to combine passion with intellectual rigour. Thus far *The Great Deception* has not achieved the attention it deserves, but if one were

The Great Deception
Can the European Union
survive?

By Christopher Booker and
Richard North

Second Edition

Continuum 2005
Pbk 643 pp

Available from *The June Press*
Price £9.99 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 0-8264801-4-4

forced to confine one's reading about the EU to a single volume this should be it. As an account of the ideas and forces which have shaped the EU and of the various political and diplomatic staging-posts in its development, it cannot presently be bettered.

The new edition includes a masterly account of the collapse of the EU constitution, a highly revealing account of why the EU response to the tsunami of 2004 was vastly inferior to that launched by the United States, and a critical analysis of the plans for an autonomous European defence force whose creation will leave us less well-defended.

Given Booker's earlier fight to preserve Britain's architectural heritage, it is perhaps not surprising that he and his co-author should find parallels between the decline and impending fall of the European project

and the decline and actual fall of Le Corbusier's plan to replace ancient cities with soulless tower blocs:

"All that was wrong with Le Corbusier's tower blocs became obvious when real people had to live in them, to discover that they defied human realities and human needs. It was the same with the tower blocks created by Monnet's technocrats. The nation state and democracy were too fundamental to human needs and human nature simply to be eliminated by technocratic diktat. Just as when people woke up to the soulless inhumanity of Le Corbusier's Utopian dream they hankered for all the warmth and vitality of the old cities they had lost, so the same was becoming true of all that had been swept away by the Utopian dream of M. Monnet. Only when people began to discover that they had lost their democracy and the power of their countries to govern themselves did they begin to appreciate in a new way just how valuable was that which had been taken away from them without their knowing it."

How long it will take the victims of the European project to emerge from what Booker and North describe as the "terrible devastation" that the failed European project will leave in its wake remains to be seen. But it is evident that this process is now well under way. It is only a matter of time before this leads to the wider realisation that, like Le Corbusier's tower blocs, the edifice of European political integration cannot be improved and will have to be pulled down to its very foundations.

Britain 'has elements of fascist state'

I repeat that some of those measures have the elements of a fascist state. This country is preaching to many other countries about democracy. It wants democracy in Iraq; it wants democracy in Iran. It wants democracy everywhere except perhaps in this

country whereby the measures that it is introducing are undermining the democracy which has been built up over many hundreds of years. I do not deny that those are strong statements. But the fact of the matter is that there is a creeping competence for all kinds of

authorities in this country to have control over the individual.

Lord Stoddart of Swindon, the Independent Labour peer, speaking on the Government's ID Cards Bill, in the House of Lords on 23rd January 2006.

No helping hand for Eurozone states that sink into debt - merely a brisk goodbye

What would happen if a member of the eurozone got into a severe financial crisis (i.e. into a more serious mess than any of its members is currently in)? There has been a general assumption that it would be bailed out by other members. But a report from Standard and Poor* suggests that the scope for such help is strictly limited, and that the likely message to it from other states might be: *“If you think we’re footing the bill for your profligacy, you are seriously mistaken. Rather than suffer as a result of your mistakes we’re getting out of the Eurozone - and fast”*.

The report is based on the example of financial transfers by the German central government to heavily indebted regional (Länder) governments to assess whether similar (as yet unprecedented) arrangements on the EMU level would be possible.

“At present, the probability of any Eurozone country requiring such a bailout is still very remote, but over the coming decades, aging populations are set to create more substantial pressures on public finances.

“In Germany, heavily indebted state governments have met with considerable resistance from the Ministry of Finance and wealthier

regions when attempting to invoke constitutional obligations for financial support”, said Standard and Poor’s credit analyst Alois Strasser. “Furthermore, the assistance eventually accorded to the states of Saarland and Bremen for 10 years after 1994 has not had much of a sustained effect in terms of improving their budget operating balances and debt levels.”

The S&P report says that the first striking observation on the potential for similar financial rescue packages between Eurozone members is that this concept is explicitly forbidden under the “no bailout clause” of Article 104b of the Maastricht Treaty. In addition, the debt levels of the lowest-rated EMU sovereign states as a proportion of total Eurozone GDP are much higher than the debt of most German Länder as a proportion of total GDP for the Federal Republic. Indeed, a transfer package worth 75 per cent of Italy’s general government debt (the proportion equivalent to the assistance offered to Bremen and Saarland) would cost almost as much as the entire annual nominal GDP of Spain and Finland combined.

“The debt-to-GDP of a sovereign in a near-default situation would

presumably be significantly higher still, and this puts the potential cost of a sovereign bailout for the Union as a whole on an entirely different scale to the cost to the Federal Republic of financial assistance given to German states,” said Standard and Poor’s credit analyst Moritz Kraemer. *“Moreover, whereas German voters can deliver a backlash against the central government if it refuses to mitigate serious financial difficulties at the sub-national level, voters in a heavily indebted EMU country would have no political recourse if other members refused to offer assistance.”*

Indeed, both in terms of national finance and of domestic politics, more creditworthy EMU governments might view exiting the euro as preferable to footing the bill for another Eurozone member’s budgetary mistakes, the report states. This option is not available in the context of the German Länder, and therefore makes the prospects for financial assistance significantly less favourable in the case of the Eurozone.

**“No Friends In Need: Low Probability For Sovereign Bail-Outs Among Eurozone Members”.*

When silence spoke eloquently

A high level conference on the ‘European crisis’ in Salzburg ended on the 28th January without delegates being able to agree about whether a crisis existed. Dominique de Villepin, the French Prime Minister was in no doubt when he delivered the keynote address to the ‘Sound of Europe’ conference organised by the Austrian EU Presidency. In fact, he diagnosed three crises - “a deep crisis”, “a crisis of legitimacy” and “an identity crisis”. But the Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende disagreed: “Let’s not talk about a crisis - that is the last thing we need”. A

fourth crisis may therefore be added to the de Villepin list i.e. a crisis brought about by the inability to decide whether a crisis exists, and maybe even a fifth i.e. a crisis created by the failure to recognise the *kind* of crisis that exists.

Outside the conference hall protesters complained about the elitist nature of the event with Alfred Gusenbauer, leader of the Austrian Socialist Group protesting that the conference amounted to “absurd elitist theatre”.

Margot Wallstrom the EU Communications Commissioner tried to come to the rescue. She promised to

bridge the gap between Europe’s political elites and the voters and to “let the People speak”. In order to assist her goal ordinary unsuspecting citizens were interviewed about their views, but when their faces appeared on huge video screens outside the conference hall there were no words. The process was repeated but technical problems again prevented the People from speaking. A distraught Mrs Wallstrom was heard to declare: “Don’t do this to me, this is a nightmare”. - *Surely, she meant ‘crisis’ - Ed.*

LETTERS

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

Time to Choose

Dear Sir,
I could not agree more with the proposition that it is time for the Eurorealist movement to come out of the closet (*eurofacts* 27th January) and this is why the CIB has now decided to ask the British people to stand up and be counted, rather than seeking merely the incremental change in opinion which is taking too long. On St George's Day we, with the support of the Freedom Association, are launching a campaign to obtain signatures to a petition to Parliament, asking that legislation be enacted to withdraw this country from the European Union.

We are not asking for a referendum, nor are we setting a target or a time limit. What we seek to do is enable what we believe to be the vast majority of the British people to state their demand that the political class cease to put their personal self interest before the interests of the nation and end this farce which is draining the life from Britain.

It is time for the people to stand up for themselves and force their servants, the politicians, to follow the wishes of the electorate. If our fellow countrymen and women will not do this, because of apathy, fear or misguided support for the malign organisation centred in Brussels then they must accept the responsibility for the fate which will await us in a single European state.

Now is the time, so let's do it.

COLIN BULLEN

Kent

Return to Sender

Dear Sir,
As your readers may know the Royal

Mail recently lost its monopoly to deliver mail in the UK as a direct result of an EU ruling which was based on the premise of opening up all services to competition. However, the Royal Mail is the only postal service committed to providing a 100 per cent delivery to all addresses in the UK.

You may be interested to know that some time ago the German Post Office (the Bundespost) was given the all clear by Tony Blair's government to operate in the UK using the EU directive as an excuse. This allowed the Bundespost to come into the UK market and cream off millions of high revenue business post from the Royal Mail. If for any reason the Bundespost could not deliver its mail the Royal Mail had to deliver it at a cost to the Bundespost of 14p/letter.

At the same time, we the British public were paying 19p/letter for second class post. Hence we were subsidising foreign competition to the tune of 5p/letter. In addition the same Bundespost was protected by the German government which flatly refused to implement the EU directive allowing foreign competitors into Germany for at least another 5 years.

Recently a promotional letter from Sky TV was delivered to me. I was just about to open it when I noticed that it did not have a Royal Mail stamp. I therefore marked it:

"RETURN TO SENDER. ONLY ROYAL MAIL ACCEPTED HERE"

and posted it in the nearest Royal Mail post box. I hope your readers will all do the same particularly with promotional letters about credit cards etc. If there is something important in the envelope that you want to keep eg a cheque, I suggest you remove that

and re-post the envelope without a stamp if at all possible.

JERRY WRAITH

Surrey

Independence is All

Dear Sir,
eurofacts tends to dwell on the economic cost/benefit of being 'in Europe' and in doing so seems to distort the whole issue. It seems to be suggesting that if it was economically to our advantage there is nothing amiss with being a member. This ignores Jefferson's comment on America's situation over 200 years ago; "*A nation which trades its independence for economic advantage deserves to lose both*".

JOHN PAPWORTH

Wiltshire

If we sometimes appear to give precedence to economic factors in our pages it is perhaps because these are more easily quantifiable than non-economic factors and because we wish to provide our readers with a stream of facts and data that can be used in debate. We are primarily opposed to EU membership because of the loss of sovereignty that EU membership entails and the profoundly anti-democratic character of the European political project. This would be the case even if the economic costs of membership - which are huge - were zero- Ed.

What would really happen if the people spoke?

"If you had referendums in Poland, the UK or Denmark, I'm not sure what would happen", the Dutch prime minister Jan Peter Balkenende, referring to votes which were initially planned but called off after the French and Dutch referendums. *EUObserver* 27th January 2006.

MEETINGS

Hampstead Theatre
020 7722 9301

Until **February 25th 2006**

The Schuman Plan, by *Tim Luscombe*

PLAY

Hampstead Theatre, London

Admission by Ticket

(Various prices - for full details contact theatre as above)

Public Meeting
01672 515275

Sunday **12th Feb. 2006**, 2.00 pm

Lindsay Jenkins, *author of*
Disappearing Britain

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, High Street, Marlborough,
Wiltshire

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **21st February 2006**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and change: Prime
Ministers in the post-war world -
Wilson”

Professor Peter Hennessy
Philip Ziegler**Vernon Bogdanor CBE**
FBA, *Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING

Staple Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

**European Institute and
London School of Economics**
events@lse.ac.uk

Tuesday **28th Feb. 2006**, 6.30 pm

Valery Giscard d'Estaing
Chairman: **Howard Davies**

PUBLIC MEETING

Old Building, London School of
Economics, London

Admission by Free Ticket

(Tickets available from E-mail
event@lse.ac.uk)

The Anti-Common Market League
01787 376374

Monday **6th March 2006**, 7.00 pm

“The Case for EFTA”

Daniel Hannan MEP, *Conservative*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Clarence (upstairs), 53 Whitehall,
London SW1

Admission Free

Freedom Association
07979-695611

Tuesday **21st March 2006**, 12.30 pm

Howard Flight, *former Conservative
MP*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite of the The Counting
House Pub, 50 Cornhill, near Bank,
London EX3V 3PD

Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **21st March 2006**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and change: Prime
Ministers in the post-war world - Heath”

Professor John Ramsden, *Queen
Mary, University of London*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

UK Independence Party
01722 744814

ALL DAY CONFERENCE

Saturday **25th March 2006**

Commencing 11.00 am

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING

Great Hall, Exeter University, Devon

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **13th February 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Commission's
Seventh Framework Programme for
Research, Technological Development and
Demonstration Activities (2007-2013)*
from Lord Sainsbury of Turville,
Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State
for Science and Innovation.

Tuesday **14th February 2006**, 3.40 pm
Evidence will be heard by the Economic
Affairs Committee from witnesses to be
confirmed.

Wednesday **15th February 2006**, 3.30 pm
Evidence will be heard on *Government of
Wales Bill* from the Rt Hon Peter Hain MP,
Secretary of State for Northern Ireland and
Wales.

Wednesday **15th February 2006**, 4.15 pm
Evidence will be heard on *A European
Fundamental Rights Agency* from Mr
Francisco Fonseca Morillo, Director
JLS.C (Civil Justice, Rights and
Citizenship) and from Ms Lisa Pavan-
Woolfe, Director General for Employment
and Opportunities, European Commission.

Thursday **16th February 2006**, 10.00 am
Evidence will be heard on *EU Proposal on
Consumer Credit Harmonisation* from
witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2006

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

2008

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

A Throne in Brussels

by Paul Belien. *Hdbk.* £25.00

Historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

The Great Deception:

Can the European Union survive

by Christopher Booker. £9.99

This is the latest version (November 2005) of this comprehensive history of the European Union.

The Syndicate

by Nicholas Hagger. £11.99

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

Britain and the EU: Time to Move On

by Christopher Hoskin. £3.95

The EU malaise and the cure.

The Future is a Foreign Country

by Matthew Illsley. £10.00

Full of useful detail and quotes on how and why we got into the EU mess. It leads to the conclusion that withdrawal from the EU is the only way forward.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of

Local Government

by Lindsay Jenkins. £14.99

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

Resolving the European Crisis

Perspectives on the future of the European Union

Edited by Paul Jervis. £9.99

Opinion formers include; Daniel Hannan MEP, Ruth Lea, Lord Pearson, John Redwood MP and Gisela Stuart MP.

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 impact of divergent national cultures.

The 2006 Essential Guide to the EU

by Ruth Lea. £15.00

A detailed yet accessible analysis of how the EU works now and in the future.

Who's Afraid of a

European Constitution?

by Neil MacCormick. £8.95

A member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes its nature and purpose.

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.

The Benefits of Tax Competition

by Richard Teather £12.50

Teather argues that EU attempts to harmonise taxes will damage the world economy.

EU: Papacy Reincarnated?

by Mark Stout £9.99

This book exposes the origins and functioning of both the EU and the Medieval Papacy from a legal/political/historical perspective and unearths a startling number of parallels.

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**

euofacts

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 *euofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *euofacts*: 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
David Cameron 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

