

## If the French can grasp that the EU is doomed - why can't we?

*The attitudes of French intellectuals towards the European Union have changed profoundly - and are in marked contrast to the facile optimism of Tony Blair*

Whatever the ultimate fate of the European Union there is no doubting the scope of the ambition showed by its architects. Their plan was to build - by means of a geopolitical revolution of historic proportions - a unique political entity greater in size and wealth than the United States.

As readers of this publication will be all too aware the plan was fundamentally flawed. In Britain a few perceptive critics grasped this from the beginning; other members of a gradually expanding eurosceptic tribe doubted whether Britain was suited by history and character to be part of the grand political project underway in continental Europe.

Looking back one is struck by the degree of ignorance about the nature of the European project. Had the public been more fully informed it is inconceivable that they would have backed continuing membership of the European Communities in the referendum of 1975. But it believed what it was told: that it was a limited commercial undertaking. What is equally striking is the extent to which that ignorance persists. At the present time there is little knowledge or interest in the state of opinion in other European countries and curiously, that ignorance seems greatest among those who are most committed to British membership.

Remarkably, none of our newspapers and certainly not the BBC have reported the highly significant changes

in attitude towards the EU among members of intellectual elites in France, the country which more than any other has shaped Europe's institutions and determined its agenda. Here is a quotation from *L'Europe qui sombre* (see review on page 4), a book which forecasts a sudden and painful collapse for the EU and which comprehensively demolishes the myth that the EU is responsible for peace in Europe:

*"The EU should admit that it is nothing more than an illusion hiding the profound need to become more like the only model which counts: that of the USA.....Peace in Europe will be 'made in USA'.....European federation can only develop under cover of Pax Americana".*

### Perilous Condition

Earlier this year the *Conseil d'Analyse Economique*, a body comprising leading members of France's political establishment, produced a report that accepted not only that integration had not produced the expected economic benefits but also that "institutional shortcomings" were responsible for the EU's 'perilous' economic condition. In other words the main reason for the EU's dismal economic performance was the EU itself. (See *eurofacts* 6th October).

The growing mood of French pessimism also manifests itself in the reports of the various EU institutions, especially those where French

influence is strongest. In its *Long Term Vision Report*, the European Defence Agency, which is essentially a French creation, painted a deeply pessimistic picture of a Europe that will find it increasingly difficult to defend itself. (*eurofacts* 20th October). Gone without trace is the pretence that Europe might one day rival America as a military power. Its authors state: "*The global context is sobering, with the central predictions of demography and economics foreshadowing a Europe which two decades hence is older, relatively poorer and surrounded by regions (Africa, Middle East, Russia) which may struggle to cope with the consequences of globalisation*".

The new mood of political realism about the EU among French intellectuals follows a spate of books about the decline of France. French *déclinisme* is now part of French mainstream opinion. Similarly, views about the EU are likely to be shared by a growing proportion of the French public and to colour the atmosphere of debate about the EU's future direction.

Such views, which are based on a rigorous analysis of economic and military realities with which few *eurofacts* readers would dissent, stand in marked contrast to the vapid optimism of British europhiles such as the Minister for Europe, Geoffrey Hoon, and indeed our own Prime Minister when they can bring themselves to talk about the subject.

If the political class which invented

**Continued on P.2**

# Tory leaders fear grass roots explosion over EP candidate selection

The problem with trying to suppress debate on EU issues - as the Conservative Party leadership has consistently tried to do - is that this generates pressures that build up to the point where they become impossible to manage. There are small belated signs that the Party leadership is beginning to grasp this truth and has consequently begun to feel extremely nervous about the prospect of a grass roots explosion.

The signals include a letter from Party Chairman Francis Maude to Tim Montgomerie, the editor of the on-line discussion forum ConservativeHome.Com, which asks for ideas about how the Party can avoid the selection process for MEPs turning into open warfare.

This was in reply to an open letter written by Montgomerie reflecting the deep dissatisfaction of grassroots supporters with most of the Party's MEPS as well as present arrangements for their selection as candidates. Subsequent postings to the ConservativeHome.Com webpage - some of them extremely angry - demonstrate that it has grown as the result of a decision of some MEPs -

including the Tory leader Timothy Kirkhope - to defy the party whip in order to back a report demanding a "European dimension" to the teaching of history (the Tory whip instructed MEPs to abstain). The authors of the report included the Tory MEP Michael Beazley.

In his letter to Montgomerie Maude writes: *"How do we avoid these selection processes from becoming divisive and acrimonious?... there is a big prize for the Party in this process being conducted in a manner that is open and honest while remaining civilised and courteous...Views please"*.

Since Mr Maude asks for suggestions we make the following:

- Practise what you preach: if you want a civilised debate it is not very bright to describe members of UKIP (many of whom also happen to be members of the Conservative Party) as "nuts, cranks and racists". Similarly, best not to instruct those who believe passionately that 'Europe' is the central political issue of the present era to stop

"banging on" about it.

- Ensure that the selection process takes greater account of grass-roots opinion.
- Resist the current attempts by incumbent MEPs to give themselves additional advantages in the selection process.
- Do not make commitments - such as the pledge to order MEPs out of the EPP - which you subsequently do not keep.
- Make sure that the policy review process headed by Oliver Letwin acknowledges the central importance of the European issue and that it is not simply used to stifle debate and avoid policy commitments.

If Mr Maude follows these simple suggestions it may be possible to prevent open warfare over the issue of MEP selection and a wider row about Europe generally; if not, he should equip himself with the political equivalent of a hard-hat. Mere requests for party members to remember their manners simply aren't going to do the trick.

Continued from P.1

## The French grasp that the EU is failing

'Europe' now conclude that it cannot be made to work, our political leaders have a responsibility to take on board its reasoning and our media, and most particularly the BBC, have a responsibility to report the matter. Unfortunately this is not happening; our political parties continue to ignore the issue while BBC coverage of the EU is even more superficial and biased than formerly (see page 5).

None of this is to imply that France is on the verge of pulling out of the EU. The burden of Franco-German history, not to mention the self-interest of many of the major political players, make this virtually unthinkable. Indeed the degree of despair prevalent in France today is partly a reflection of an innate conviction that there is no alternative

to the failed project of European Union and that it must be persisted with come what may because the moral resources necessary for change do not exist. In the view of an increasing number, the very best that can be hoped for is a process of managed and orderly decline, although French history suggests that even that may be difficult to achieve.

The constraints on a major change of British policy on the EU are far less daunting than in France. The recognition of French writers and analysts that their federalist dreams have contributed to Europe's economic and political malaise ought to make such a change somewhat easier to initiate. It is seldom that a British publication argues that French

intellectuals should be taken seriously, but there is a case for doing so now.

Our problem is not merely that the leaders of Britain's main political parties expect this country to remain wedded to a political project that is failing. It is that they are asking it to remain wedded to a political project which is not only failing but which is incapable of real change and which is increasingly run by people who know this to be true. British ignorance about what is being said and done in Europe hampers intelligent policy formulation just as fatally today as it did when the European project was launched.

# How many eurocrats does it take to assess how well the other eurocrats are doing their jobs?

A revealing example of how attempts to cut-back on the Brussels bureaucracy inexorably lead to... more bureaucracy is contained in a press release from the EU Commission.

Bearing the title "*Working to ensure better quality of Commission impact assessments*" and dated the 14th November 2006 the press statement describes how, as a result of criticism of the rising tide of EU regulation, Commission officials are required to carry out an "integrated impact assessment" of new policy proposals.

The Commission has produced 160 such assessments involving hundreds of EU officials since the approach was adopted in 2003 and, according to the Commission, these now serve as a "model reference in many EU states". Whatever this means it is evident that the EU is very proud of what it is doing in this area. "*The progress made by the European Commission in applying integrated impact assessments is widely acknowledged by the other EU institutions, by academics and by*

*stakeholders at large*", it says.

So determined is the Commission to raise the quality of its regulation, or perhaps, more accurately, to improve the quality of its response to critics who complain about the costs of regulation, that it is not content to leave the matter there. For this reason it has launched a new initiative: "*Existing mechanisms for quality support and control of impact assessments are now to be substantially reinforced through the creation of an independent (sic) Impact Assessment Board*", it says. This will apparently consist of a group of high-level EU officials selected on the basis of their expertise who will be asked to evaluate the work of the assessors. They will also be asked to suggest other EU initiatives that might be made the subject of assessment.

However, it should not be overlooked that in August 2006 the Commission launched a *comprehensive evaluation* of the overall approach to assessment. So there will soon be a team of assessors assessing the work of another

group of assessors who will be examining the work of the original group of assessors.

But that's not all. In the same press release the Commission also boasts of establishing "*a highly developed and extensive practice of ex-post valuation of existing actions*" so that the impact of existing actions can be better evaluated from "*an ex-post perspective and the results of such evaluations are better taken into account in developing new or follow-up measures*"

So in all there will in future be four levels of evaluation as well as an on-going search for new things to evaluate. *euofacts* asks: is this enough? After all, who is to form a judgement about the quality of this fourth and final evaluation? Quite obviously a fifth evaluation and perhaps even a sixth team is needed. But please do not write to your MEP to suggest this: there is a sense of humour deficit as well as a democratic deficit in Brussels. There is every possibility that your suggestion will be taken up.

## EU membership causes massive labour shortage

Around 800,000 Poles are estimated to have left the country since it joined the European Union in May 2004. The exodus is believed to be one of the single biggest migrations by Europeans since the 1950s, when a wave of Irish crossed the Atlantic to escape poverty.

But in Poland, this incredible movement of people has created a labour shortage so severe that Warsaw may not be able to spend the money that is due to begin arriving from the European Union for projects like improving roads and the water supply.

"*The money is there but so is the problem*", said Bartlomiej Sosna, a construction analyst at the consultant group PMR in Krakow. "*Now that we are in the EU, we have a fantastic opportunity to improve our*

*infrastructure because we are due to receive billions of euros starting in 2007. But how?*"

The Polish Transport Ministry, for example, has already allocated 30 billion, or \$38 billion, to be spent from 2007 to 2013 on a road and motorway construction programme, some of it financed by EU funds, which will start flowing in January.

"*We do not have enough workers to build the roads*", Sosna said. "*If we don't take up the EU funds over a certain period of time, we will have to return them to Brussels. Do you know what this means? There will be a delay in the modernisation of our country. And that would have negative repercussions for investment.*"

Given the unemployment rate in Poland of 15.2 per cent, one of the highest in the EU, it is puzzling why

there is a labour shortage in the first place. But as hard as employers advertise, they cannot find enough workers in the construction, engineering and medical fields.

The Labour Ministry says, many of the construction workers have quit Poland to work abroad, lured by higher wages - yet they register as unemployed back home in order to remain in the state health insurance system and receive other benefits.

So critical is the shortage of welders and shipbuilders for Poland's shipping industry that Poland and Germany are close to an accord to allow skilled ship workers from northern German ports who are unemployed to go across to Poland to work.

*Source: International Herald Tribune 16th November 2006.*

# La grande désillusion: first France, now the EU

By Ian Milne

---

## L'Europe qui sombre

By Alain Bournazel and Jean  
Christophe Levêque

Arnaud Franel Editions  
Pbk, 300 pp; 15.

ISBN 2-896-030-64-6

---

In the spring of 2003, *eurofacts* was the first British publication to note the significance of the intense French internal debate about the decline of France. Since then, dozens of books and hundreds of articles have been published in France on this theme, some of them reviewed here. Now, having as it were flogged that particular horse to death, (and, in the process, made *déclinisme* mainstream opinion), French writers are moving on to the failure of the EU.

On page 5 of our 6th October issue we noted that the French equivalent of the Number 10 Policy Unit had published a devastating critique of the EU economic system. Another very recent example is *L'Europe qui sombre*, ("Sinking Europe") by Alain Bournazel and Jean-Christophe Levêque. Bournazel is an ENA-trained tax inspector, Levêque an academic specialising in the history of the EU, so they write with authority. Their last chapter is entitled *La chute finale* and foresees the collapse of the EU. Brussels hasn't yet woken up to what's happening, they say - rather like the court at Versailles in the years leading up to the French Revolution. The implication is that when the downfall finally comes it will be unexpected,

sudden, chaotic and painful.

The heart of the book is its early chapter on *La grande désillusion* (which needs no translation). The authors comprehensively demolish the claim that "the EU means peace in Europe" (about the only thing left for the europhiles now that everyone agrees the economy's a disaster). They argue that all nations - including those that are members of the EU - continue to behave like independent nation-states (France above all!). "*When the preservation of Sovereignty and the long-term survival of the Nation is at stake, no government hastens to join the EU...the first thing they do is to join NATO.*" Why NATO? To get the benefit of American military protection. That is why all present EU members, except a couple of neutral ones, joined NATO before they joined the EU. That is true also of future EU

members such as Romania, Bulgaria and (possibly) Turkey.

The authors also invoke Brussels' reaction to Chirac's speech on French nuclear dissuasion in January 2006 (see *eurofacts*, 10th February) as an example of the impossibility of there ever being an EU political structure capable of rivalling the twenty-first century's empires such as the USA, China, India, Brazil and Japan. (Thank heaven!)

They go further. "*The EU should admit that it is nothing more than an illusion hiding the profound need to become more like the only model which counts: that of the USA.....Peace in Europe will be 'made in USA'.....European federation can only develop under cover of Pax Americana.*"

We don't recommend you actually buy this book; for one thing, it's padded out with what appears to be the remnants of an academic thesis on the failure of the Lisbon Strategy, which was supposed to make the EU the most technologically-advanced region of the world by 2012. We bring it to readers' attention merely as an example of how the debate is moving inside France. As in the United Kingdom, mainstream opinion is now firmly eurosceptic.

## City is falling out of love with the EU

The City's rapidly waning enthusiasm for the EU continues apace - as Charlie McCreevy, the European Commissioner for the Internal Market discovered at a black-tie dinner for corporate treasurers at Grosvenor House on the 8th November. As Mr McCreevy launched into what the *Financial Times*

described as a "mind-numbing analysis" of the Financial Services Action Plan groans of discontent could be heard. These grew louder when Mr McCreevy was foolish enough to describe EU regulation as "tip top". The hubbub then grew louder with the Master of Ceremonies calling for quiet several times. When McCreevy

eventually sat down, he was greeted by mocking applause.

Comedienne Ruby Wax, who provided the post-dinner entertainment, thanked McCreevy "for warming up my audience" and said: "He spoke for 20 minutes; it seemed like 20 years." The quip was met with riotous clapping and cheering.

## MEPs demand permanent European navy

MEPs meeting in Strasbourg on the 16th November adopted by a large majority a report calling on the EU to strengthen its defence policy

with the creation of a permanent European naval force, including a coastguard service, in the Mediterranean Sea. They also called

for a European civil protection force and a "common defence market".

Source: AFP, November 17th 2006.

# BBC bias: it's now worse than ever

*Mark Thompson, the BBC's Director General, has failed utterly to live up to his promise to improve coverage of EU affairs*

Last year, following a lengthy campaign led by Lord Pearson of Rannoch the BBC admitted that its coverage of European politics had not been insufficiently impartial and promised to do better while also committing itself to cover the issue in greater depth. The admission came in January 2005 after an independent inquiry confirmed that BBC coverage of European issues had displayed a pro-EU bias.

In an article in the *Daily Mail* on the 29th October 2006 Mark Thompson, the BBC director general, acknowledged the flaws in the Corporation's coverage:

*"When I joined the BBC as DG [May 2004], I thought our coverage of Europe was deficient. There was too little and too much of what*

*there was tended to view Europe through the lens of Westminster politics. By the stopwatch, eurosceptics may have had their share of the debate but there was too little curiosity about the different shades of sceptical opinion, and too little seriousness given to those who thought the right thing to do was to leave the EU altogether. We've responded by appointing Mark Mardell in the new role of Europe editor, by delivering more consistent coverage of the work of EU institutions and by exploring the views of UKIP and other shades of eurosceptic opinion more regularly and thoroughly."*

Despite the inquiry findings and the admission of Mark Thompson it is clear that the pro-EU bias of the *Today*

programme has continued and is now worsening. It is also clear that there is even less coverage of EU issues on the programme than when Thompson was appointed.

This is apparent from the on-going survey of the *Today* programme conducted by Minotaur, the television monitoring organisation. As the table below demonstrates the coverage of EU issues on the programme accounts for only 3.2 per cent of total

obvious explanation lies in the fact that during this period the three biggest political parties displayed a strong desire not to address the issue.

When it comes to the views of those taking part in the *Today* programme the Minotaur monitoring project shows that the BBC bias is still there and may well be worsening. The data demonstrates that those with broadly sceptical attitudes have never reached parity with those with a broadly

positive attitude, and on occasions pro-EU speakers have outweighed sceptical speakers by more than 2:1. In the first seven weeks of the most recent survey the proportion of sceptical speakers reached a new low, with those opposed to the EU or its

Survey Date	Monitored Weeks	Proportion of EU coverage
Sept 02 - July 2003	47	5.6%
September - December 2003	12	5.7%
March - June 2004	12	9.5%
Mark Thompson Appointed Director General		
October - December 2004	10	5.5%
March - June 2005	15	10.8%
October - December 2005	9	8.2%
February - June 2006	16	4.1%
September 2006 onwards	7	3.2%

programme time compared to 9.5 per cent immediately prior to his appointment. The figures show that the *Today* programme did carry more coverage of the issues in the months following his appointment, but this has fallen appreciably since December 2005 and the situation is now worse than when Thompson took over.

The Minotaur survey shows that some progress may have been made in reducing the extent to which European affairs are viewed through the prism of Westminster politics. Since the beginning of September only 22 per cent of those commenting on EU matters were Westminster politicians and British MEPs compared to 46 per cent during the period September 2002 - July 2003. However, the most

legislation accounting for only 22 per cent of speakers.

Moreover, despite Thompson's commitment to explore the UKIP position more regularly and thoroughly the figures produced by Minotaur show that the number of UKIP speakers appearing on the *Today* programme has remained fairly constant during recent surveys.

It is disturbing that as EU powers continue to increase the BBC should, for whatever reason, choose to devote less coverage to EU affairs. The statistics released by Minotaur show that while the BBC is prepared to make minor tactical concessions to the eurosceptic camp when under pressure to do so, the old pro-EU bias returns as soon as the pressure is off.

## Tories for UKIP?

Dear Sir,

Your correspondents who write about the Conservative Party and UKIP are rehearsing old arguments. Circumstances have changed. When Mr Forsyth first outlined his argument for supporting the Conservatives I believed he was right and I supported him. But instead of Michael Howard we now see a Tory Party led by David Cameron. The Tory members were offered David Davis whose Double Referendum promise on repatriation of powers from Brussels I found compelling. Liam Fox advocated possible withdrawal. But, partly based on a promise that the Party's MEPs would leave the EPP Group 'within, not days nor months, but weeks' the membership voted for a leader who had little to offer except that promise and what was seen as an engaging personality.

His record since that election has been that of a "liberal Conservative" (his description) and his repudiation of central Tory beliefs has infuriated many core Conservative voters. On Europe he has committed the cardinal sin for any politician; he has broken the one specific promise he gave in the face of a europhile rebellion amongst the Party's own MEPs.

On the subject of Britain and Europe he has nothing else to say at all and has gagged his Members of Parliament from campaigning on the issue threatening them with no preferment if they step out of line. He calls such campaigning "Banging on about Europe". The party is firmly under the control of europhiles and to most readers of *eurofacts* is therefore anathema. But - and members of UKIP must recognise this - Britain will not leave the EU, nor significantly reform it, without the Conservative Party.

Therefore the battle must be for

control of that party. It is a truism that "Tory activists are far more eurosceptic than Tory MPs" and properly coordinated this should be possible. The ConservativeHome blog shows deep dissatisfaction with Cameron. Therefore Mr Cameron must be removed as a first step. But for this to produce effective change it must be clear that it is precisely because eurosceptic members have refused to vote Conservative in the election that the Tories did not regain power. Already the opinion polls show that voters' preferences are not sufficient now to produce a Conservative government.

For this to happen those Tories opposed to the EU must coordinate their opposition by voting coherently for either the BNP or UKIP. The former, whose resonance with the electorate is more dynamic, may be a step too far for some. Therefore I believe that such voters should coalesce behind a slogan such as "Tories for UKIP". They can, and should, remain Tory supporters and resume voting for a cleansed party at subsequent elections. I still remain of the opinion that UKIP's leadership is not to be trusted but on this occasion it can be used.

CHRISTINA SPEIGHT  
London

## Only Free Trade Will Do

Dear Sir,

The Swiss Government's Europe 2006 Report showed the current net budgetary costs of Switzerland's current bilateral agreement with the EU as 667 SFR million. The net budgetary cost deficit of Switzerland being an EU member was estimated as 3,400 million Swiss Francs. *eurofacts* (22nd September) correctly drew attention to this massive disincentive

for the Swiss to join the EU .

But what is also of note is that even the bilateral agreements are costly to the Swiss as the EU imposes budgetary costs on what are supposed to be trading agreements. After all, why should the Swiss bilateral agreements with the EU involve any net budgetary costs? Of course, the *Swiss Europe 2006 Report* did not estimate the economic costs of the bilateral agreements, only budgetary costs. As Switzerland has an entrenched trade deficit with the EU, just like the UK, those costs will be considerable.

The conclusion is that Free Trade Agreements with the EU are no panacea and may also involve budgetary costs. They are simply massively less costly than EU membership.

Those calling for Britain to also enter a FTA with the EU must bear in mind that there would be serious costs in such an arrangement; costs that could be avoided by Britain declaring universal free trade.

Those in favour of withdrawal should, therefore, consider what sort of trading regime should succeed membership of the EU. Are we seriously going to dismantle EU protectionism only to set up a similar protectionist regime in Whitehall? Presumably the UK would negotiate a Free Trade Agreement with the EU which would entrench the net permanent trade deficit in industrial goods with the EU and might involve budgetary costs as well and, therefore, provide a permanent transfer of wealth from the British economy to the EU - just like the Swiss.

Only universal free trade will mean a full stop to the leeching effects of the EU.

ANTHONY SCHOLEFIELD  
London

*The next Double issue of eurofacts - Christmas double issue  
Vol 12 No 5/6 - will appear on the 15th December 2006*

Gresham College  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **5th December**, 6.00 pm

“Humour and satire as the canary down the mine shaft of government”

**Rodney Barker**, *Gresham Professor of Rhetoric*

Tuesday **12th December**, 6.00 pm

“The new localism: Local government and the Constitution”

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

Thursday **14th December**, 6.00 pm

“The age of dictatorship: Europe 1918-1989 - Stalin and his imitators”

**Richard J. Evans FBA**, *Visiting Gresham Professor of History*

#### PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

**Brighton Philharmonic Orchestra**  
01273 709709

Sunday **25th February 2007**, 14.45 pm

A British Symphony, conducted by Barry Wordsworth.

*(Mr Rodney Atkinson, the well known political author commissioned Andrew Grant, the organist, Choirmaster and Composer at Her Majesty's Chapels Royal, to compose “A British Symphony” - The work is in the form of a unified symphony which links, inter-plays and unites the separate strands into a musical finale of one British identity - This work was commissioned to provide a counter-balance to those forces both within and without who wish to break-up the United Kingdom.)*

#### CONCERT

Concert Hall, Brighton

**Admission £6 to £23 by ticket**

(Mon-Sat at the Brighton Dome Ticket Office - Tel: 01273 709709 - 29 New Road, Brighton. or online at [www.brightondome.org](http://www.brightondome.org))

United Kingdom  
Independence Party  
01722 744814

Saturday **14th April 2007**, 11.00 am

#### Speakers to be announced

#### SPRING CONFERENCE

Exeter University, Great Hall, Exeter, Devon

**Admission Free**

#### FREE

#### Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**

**or Email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)**

#### SELECT COMMITTEES

##### House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Wednesday **6th December**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard on *Science and Technology* from Prof Peter Burney; Prof Aziz Sheikh; Dr Graham Devereux; and Prof John Warner.

Wednesday **6th December**, 11.15 am

Evidence will be heard *by the Constitution Committee* from Ms Clare Dyer, Legal Editor, The Guardian; Ms Frances Gibb, Legal Editor, The Times; and Mr Joshua Rozenberg, Legal Editor, The Daily Telegraph.

Wednesday **6th December**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *An EU Competition Court* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Thursday **7th December**, 10.00 am

Evidence will be heard on *European Commission Green Paper on EU Mental Health Strategy* from Dr Matt Muijen, Regional adviser for mental health, World Health Organisation Europe.

Wednesday **13th December**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *An EU Competition Court* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

#### USEFUL WEB SITES

##### British Declaration of Independence

[www.bdication.org](http://www.bdication.org)

##### British Weights & Measures Assoc.

[www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com)

##### Bruges Group

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

##### Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

##### Campaign for an Independent Britain

[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)

##### Democracy Movement

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

##### EU Observer

<http://euobserver.com>

##### European Commission (London)

[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

##### European Foundation

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

##### European No Campaign

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

##### Foreign Affairs

[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

##### Freedom Association

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

##### Global Britain

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

##### June Press (Publications)

[www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)

##### Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

##### New Alliance

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

##### Open Europe

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

##### Regional Assemblies

[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)

##### Speak Out Campaign

<http://speakout.co.uk>

##### Sovereignty

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

##### Statewatch

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

##### The People's "No" Campaign

[www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk](http://www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk)

##### United Kingdom Independence Party

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

#### DIARY OF EVENTS

##### 2007

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

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

Berlin Declaration on the Future of Europe **27th March**

French Presidential Election **22nd April**

French Parliamentary Election **June or July**

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

### The European Question and the National Interest

by *Jeremy Black*. £16.99

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

### A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU

by *Richard Body*. £10.00

Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

### The Great Deception: Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North*. £9.99

This book is the most comprehensive history of the EU.

### The Truth They Won't Tell You (And Don't Want You To Know) About the EU

by *Vernon Coleman*. £9.99

A further 269 useful facts you need to know about the development of the EU.

### Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. £9.99

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

### 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.

### 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 Referendum Roundabout

by *Kieron O'Hara*. £8.95

A lively and sharp critique of the role of referendums in modern British politics, includes the 1975 vote on Europe, devolution, and a possible Constitution.

### EU: Papacy Reincarnated?

by *Mark Stout*. £9.99

This book explores 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.

### Corruption - The World's Big C

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures by *Ian Senior*. £12.50

Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

### The Benefits of Tax Competition

by *Richard Teather*. £12.50

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

### Video

### Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. DVD or VHS Video £5.00

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

### 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)	£16
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 David Cameron MP	
Democratic Party	01684 891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	08705 900 200
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006