

Europe's confusing signals could start a war

The EU is incapable of following the one course of action that makes sense in the wake of the Russian invasion of Georgia

One of the most common causes of war is the failure of states to communicate their strategic intentions clearly. Argentina invaded the Falklands because it believed that Britain had given it the green light to do so. Saddam Hussein tried to swallow up Kuwait after a conversation with the US Ambassador to Iraq convinced him that there would be no US military response to such action.

This point is worth making because we do not know what the EU's strategic intentions are in relation to the Russian drive to create a sphere of influence in the former Soviet space and the signals it sends are contradictory. Specifically, we do not know what its attitude is likely to be towards further Russian attempts to destabilise the Georgian government or to Russian attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of the Ukraine.

The absence of clear thought on these matters was already apparent before Russian forces invaded South Ossetia and Abkhazia, but this is even more obvious now. So are the dangers which loom large as a result of this situation.

Having denounced the invasion in uncompromising terms and having called an emergency EU summit to discuss the crisis the French President proceeded to negotiate a peace agreement which largely suited the Russian interest and then opposed firm action to punish Russia for its aggression. The EU, under French leadership, refrained even from calling for the return of Russian forces to their

pre-6th August positions. The only price that Russia is to pay for its invasion of a sovereign country is the postponement of talks with the the EU about a future "strategic partnership". Prime Minister Putin, whose acute grasp of power relations derives from his formative years in the KGB, will not be quaking in his shoes, and is very likely to conclude that he has nothing to fear from the EU by further flexing of Russian muscles.

Authoritarian Bullies

This does not mean that those who sought immediate confrontation with Putin were wise to do so. Standing up to authoritarian bullies makes sense if the will and the practical means of doing so are at hand but neither of these conditions are presently met. We should be thankful that France and Germany blocked the US attempt to get Georgia into NATO, even if their reasons for doing so were far from laudable. Had NATO forces been mobilised to protect an immature democracy from the consequences of its leader's rash behaviour, the one certain consequence would have been the destruction of NATO credibility.

It is now argued that since Georgia's entry to NATO can no longer be regarded as a practical short-term goal Georgia's application to join the EU should be speeded up. This eurosceptic publication would not wish the dubious benefits of membership on anyone but it should be pointed out that there is another reason for

doubting whether this is a very good idea: the Lisbon Treaty contains a mutual defence clause very similar to that contained in the Washington Treaty of 1948. Does the British government, which has ratified the Treaty, really want decisions about whether we go to war to be taken in Tbilisi or Kiev? It is true that nothing would destroy EU foreign policy aspirations more quickly than a mutual defence pact that was shown to be worthless even before the ink was dry, but it would be a high price to pay to demonstrate what in any case should be obvious.

What prevented the EU from matching action to rhetoric was fear of the implied Russian threat to turn off energy supplies. The Russian threat to use the energy weapon is not one that in present circumstances can be ignored; it has recently been used to punish the Czech republic for signing up to the US programme to build a missile shield; it is very likely that it will be used again.

The rational reaction to the invasion of South Ossetia and Abkhazia would have been a concerted trans-Atlantic programme to reduce Europe's dependency on Russian oil and gas and to stabilise international energy markets. That this was not even mooted reflects the fact that some European countries, notably Germany, have cut deals with Russia that are at variance with the common interest and that for many EU members, most notably France, the idea of increased

Continued on p.2

UK government backs plan that would change British system of justice fundamentally

Plans that would allow British citizens to be convicted in their absence by foreign courts for traffic, credit card and a range of other criminal offences have been widely criticised. Sadly, the critics do not include the British government which has given the proposals its full support and which gives the impression that it is no longer interested in preserving the distinctive character of the British system of justice in this case the right of the defendant to be present at his own trial.

The document containing the proposals has been approved in principle by the European parliament; this would also allow citizens to be extradited automatically under fast-track procedures at the request of another EU country on the basis of a decision by a foreign court.

There is no doubt about the philosophy underlying the document. A statement from the European Parliament, which approved the proposals by 609 votes to 60, states: *"The EU wants to create a common area for justice which requires the mutual recognition of criminal law judgements by member states"*.

The seven countries behind the plans

are Slovenia, France, the Czech republic, Sweden, Slovakia, Germany and Britain.

Countries can opt out from the proposals, but since Britain is backing the scheme this is unlikely to occur under the present government.

The critics include not only the British Conservative Party and UKIP but even the European Criminal Bar Association which says that the proposed measures are *"by their very nature a violation of the fundamental procedural rights of the accused"*.

A letter from the Association states: *"The rights of European citizens will be further undermined because in absentia judgements will result in the surrender of European citizens on the basis of a judgement given at a trial in which they never had the chance to participate"*.

"One member state could issue a European arrest warrant on the basis of an in absentia judgement, although the accused never had the chance to be heard - for example after a traffic accident or the use of a credit card in that country."

Baroness Scotland of Athol, the British Attorney General defended the proposals in a letter to the *Times* on 4th

September on the grounds that they would enable EU member states to help each other ensure that *"people who deliberately evade their trial do not escape justice because they have gone to another EU state"*.

She also stressed that defendants tried in this way would have an automatic right to a retrial. The Attorney General's assurances have cut no ice with the critics. A spokesman for the campaigning group *Fair Trials International* said that the safeguard of a guaranteed retrial was *"meaningless or worthless"* since there was the possibility of disappearing evidence, difficulty in locating witnesses and the failure of witnesses to remember accurately what had occurred.

The proposals will be presented to the Council of Ministers during the next three months - after which they will be translated into national law.

A spokesman for the Conservative group in the EPP accused the Government of *"throwing habeus corpus out of the window"*.

"We have no idea why the UK government has chosen to sponsor these proposals - it is still a mystery", he said.

Continued from p.1

Europe's confusing signals could start a war

dependency on the US is an anathema.

The crisis also suggests that plans to create a new institution of international cooperation whose membership would be confined to the world's democratic states along the lines favoured by John McCain, the US Republican candidate, make more sense than making empty threats about throwing Russia out of existing ones. Energy security would inevitably be at the top of the agenda of any such organisation whose entry criteria would ensure that it would reflect the interests and political philosophy of the Anglosphere, rather than the trans-national progressivism reflected in the priorities and actions of the UN and the EU.

None of this should be taken to imply that Russia constitutes a similar kind of

threat as that posed by the old Soviet Union or that a similar response is required. What is now termed the New Cold War differs in important respects from the old Cold War. Russia is now a capitalist country, although rather a peculiar one. There are now almost as many billionaires in Moscow as in Manhattan; Russia also possesses an expanding middle class. Its leaders may display little regard for property rights or the rule of law - witness the treatment of Western companies and investors - and will seek to avoid honouring international obligations whenever it suits its purpose. But Russia is not engaged in a systemic life and death struggle with an ideological foe and despite increased military spending Russia's armed forces are

vastly inferior to those of the US. The Russian population is shrinking rapidly, and its economy is acutely vulnerable to external shock. Energy is one of the few strong cards in its hand - the time to call its bluff will come when it can no longer play that card with confidence.

In the meantime Britain should back the attempts to build a new institution of international cooperation which actually reflects national interests while desisting from adding to the confused signals which the EU typically sends in time of crisis. In regions such as the Caucasus where democratic institutions are weak and ethnic and national sentiments easily inflamed, such signals can be lethal.

Spaniards see no way out of the deepening economic gloom

Alastair Darling may think that economic conditions in Britain are worse than at any time since the days of ration books and post-war austerity. The OECD may believe Britain is in worse shape than any other major economy. But there is good reason for thinking that several eurozone countries are in worse shape while enjoying less control over their economic futures. In the first of a brief series of articles on the economic situations in other EU countries we focus on Spain.

More than in any other eurozone country the sense of economic downturn in Spain is palpable. The cranes which still dominate the skyline in many Spanish towns are motionless. The boom in the construction industry which lasted more than a decade is finally over and the tens of thousands of immigrants from South America who have filled building jobs that young Spaniards were unwilling to take now sit around in the public squares talking about going home.

The thousands of British retirees who have made their homes on the Costas in recent years are as glum as the plumbers and carpenters from Argentina and Paraguay. Inflation, at 5 per cent the highest in the eurozone, as well as a strong euro, have severely reduced the value of their UK pensions. Many would sell up and return home - if only they could find buyers.

Those who have made down-payments on properties that they have not yet taken possession of could find themselves losing everything. This became apparent in July as Spain's largest property developer Martinsa-Fadesa filed for bankruptcy after failing to secure a loan as part of a 4 billion euros refinancing package. Other bankruptcies are expected to follow.

In a further sign of the slumping property market the latest figures from the Spanish housing ministry show that house prices fell in real terms year-on-

year for the second consecutive quarter.

Recently-published figures also reflect the depth of the crisis: in the first quarter of 2008, 28 per cent fewer homes were sold compared to the same period the previous year. According to a study by Deutsche Bank, prices will drop by 20 per cent by 2011.

For several years it was possible for young Spaniards to obtain 100 per cent or even 110 per cent mortgages without security and at the negative real rates of interest set by the ECB which resulted in annual house price increases of 15 per cent or more. The housing crash was consequently a crisis waiting to happen. In several parts of Spain there have been reports of home owners depositing their keys at the bank from which they obtained their loan, renouncing ownership of their homes and storming out in the belief that this had somehow wiped out their debt.

Crisis Meeting

After years of strong growth (3.8 per cent last year), the Madrid government has been forced to cut its economic growth forecast by 0.7 per cent to 1.6 per cent for this year, falling a further 1.3 per cent to 1 per cent next year. Independent forecasters are more pessimistic. Until very recently the Spanish prime minister, following the example of Gordon Brown, refused to use the word "crisis", but in August was forced to summon cabinet members back from their summer holidays for a "crisis meeting" on the economy - the first time that this had happened since Franco's days.

Continuing a long-term downward trend unemployment fell below 10 per cent last year but is now increasing rapidly. Economy minister, Pedro Solbes, has indicated that the unemployment rate will rise to 12.5 per cent next year (1.5 per cent higher than previously forecast), and may climb

still further.

Industries feeling the pain include tourism and car manufacture as well as construction. In previous decades a measure of economic relief might have been obtained by a devaluation of the peseta or by allowing the currency to float downwards against other currencies thereby helping exporters and restraining imports (which is pretty much what has recently been happening in the UK). No such relief is possible in Spain, which is also unable to choose its own interest rate.

With the exception of a tiny number working in the research departments of investment banks in Madrid few, if any, contemplate leaving the eurozone; membership is thought of as part of being a modern European country. There is, however, a curious sense of nostalgia for the old national currency and many Spaniards, the middle aged as well as the elderly, still think in pesetas before making back-of-the-envelope conversions to the euro. Attitudes could, of course, change if the economic down-turn becomes a protracted recession.

Spaniards in their twenties and thirties have known only economic growth and are deeply anxious about where present trends will lead. Since most Spaniards recognise that moderation is not one of their country's most notable characteristics there are concerns about the political implications of a protracted period of economic decline and about how Spain's still immature political institutions will cope.

Modern Spain is immeasurably better off in material terms than it was even 20 years ago, but there is little desire to play down or shrug off the present difficulties as a temporary blip. In the little Catalan town of St Feliu de Codines where the author of this article occasionally resides he was told by a neighbour: "*Senor, it is terrible. Things are so bad that even the Uruguayans are going home!*"

BOOK REVIEW

The return of superstition

By Ian Milne

Scared to Death From BSE to Global Warming: Why Scares are costing us the Earth

By Christopher Booker and
Richard North

Continuum Hdbk 494 pp

Available from *The June Press*
Price £16.95 + p&p
(see back cover)

ISBN 978 0 82648614 1

The modern “scare phenomenon”, say the authors, really began in the USA in the 1970s, but attained its “full virulence” in Mrs Thatcher’s Britain. The first scare they analyse in depth happened 20 years ago: “Killer Eggs”, in which Edwina Currie first distinguished herself. The authors dissect another half dozen food scares, including BSE/CJD, before turning to “general scares” such as the Millennium Bug and Passive Smoking, culminating in by far the greatest scare - and scam - of modern times, Global Warming, in which the delusions, fantasies, blindness, duplicity and skulduggery which characterise all scares manifest themselves in extreme form and on a literally global scale.

The authors identify seven basic attributes of a scare. First, a real problem becomes exaggerated, often by extrapolating from it to include something else. Second, the threat must be universal, to which anyone might be exposed (beef or the mass-malfunctioning of computers for example). Third, it must contain a strong element of uncertainty. Fourth, the threat must seem scientifically plausible - this is where the scientists are wheeled in. Fifth, the scare must be promoted by the media.

None of this, according to the authors, is enough to bring the scare to the tipping point. This (the sixth attribute) arrives once the government acknowledges the threat, and this is where the real damage begins “because invariably the government over-react. Their regulatory response creates social and economic havoc, at enormous cost”. Finally, the truth - that the scare has been wildly exaggerated - emerges, though by then the regulatory response “has become so enshrined in the system that it usually proves very difficult to remove”.

Global Warming is now in the sixth phase, in which dozens of national governments plus the EU and the UN are determined to “save the planet”. Nevertheless, in no small part due to the efforts of the authors, and, more recently, of former Chancellor Nigel

Lawson, the seventh phase - the emergence of sanity - is well under way.

No less absorbing is the authors' “Epilogue”, sub-titled “A new age of superstition”, in which they say that one of the keys to understanding contemporary scares is to compare them with those of pre-industrial times, such as the witch craze of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. They note that modern scares really “took off” in the late 80s and early 90s, just when the rivalry between the West and Communism, and with it the threat of nuclear Armageddon, was collapsing. That rivalry had given birth in the West to powerful lobby groups, such as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, campaigning in favour of nuclear disarmament and against civil nuclear power stations and the waste they produce. “Now that nuclear war was no longer top of the global threat list, for many idealistic campaigners the threat of climate change appeared with remarkably apt timing to take its place. The causes might be very different, but their prize was the same: the saving of the planet from the deadly follies of mankind. Look at the early years of Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace and their obsession was all with the nuclear threat. Thirty years later their websites were entirely dominated by global warning.”

The authors also point to the emergence in the West of “a new, informal but extremely powerful kind of ‘progressive’ consensus”, exemplified in the UK by the *Guardian*, the *Independent* and - *eurofacts*’ readers will not be surprised - the *BBC*. The “progressives” provided an intellectual and spiritual home for former adherents of fading ideologies such as Communism and - in Europe anyway - Christianity. The phenomenon was - still is - compounded by generally flabby uncritical journalism (especially, in the reviewer’s experience, in the so-called “quality” press) and of course by modern systems of trans-national and national governance. The authors do not however launch a polemic against journalists or scientists or politicians or officials - regrettable though their behaviour often is. Individually, they tend to be the prisoners of an impersonal thought-system and merely playing the roles allotted to them.

This is a significant and important book. No-one else has demonstrated the linkages between the disparate scares described here; no-one else has attempted so comprehensively to bring together the social, societal, psychological, political and religious factors which lie behind the phenomenon. The book ends on a sombre note, foreseeing real crises ahead, such as “the stupendous power of nuclear weapons beginning to escape out of the political control that since 1945 has held it in check.....When those real crises come upon us, people will look back on the closing decades of the twentieth century, and the early years of the twenty-first, as a time of unnatural peace, prosperity, security and ease.....When the real crises come, there will be little time for imaginary scares. We shall be back living, very uncomfortably, in the real world.”

The remarkable views of Declan Ganley

The multi-millionaire founder of Libertas may have successfully led Irish opposition to the Lisbon Treaty but his bizarre views do not mark him out as a eurosceptic

By Gerard Batten

On 2nd September I attended a bizarre meeting in the European Parliament in Brussels. Nothing unusual in that, but this was a meeting to listen to and question Declan Ganley, the multi-millionaire who helped to fund and organise the recent No vote in the Irish referendum on the Lisbon Treaty. What was bizarre was the message that Mr Ganley unfolded. We might have assumed that he is a 'eurosceptic', but it seems this is not so. Here is the gist of what he said.

Mr Ganley believes that the European Union has delivered peace, prosperity and plenty. It is because of the EU that Europe's young men are no longer slaughtered on the battlefield. Countries like Ireland have greatly benefited from membership of the EU, so why did they reject the Lisbon Treaty? It was because the political elites are out of touch with the people and not listening to them. The Lisbon Treaty should indeed be well and truly dead under the EU's own rules, but the political classes are not listening.

This is where Mr Ganley's argument

grew truly bizarre. In his view, one of the most dangerous things about the Lisbon Treaty was the Article that allows for a member state to leave the EU. He felt that in the future this might lead to a political party campaigning for withdrawal, winning an election, and then taking their country out of the EU. This he thought could bring about the beginning of the end of the European Union itself, and must be avoided at all costs.

He believes in a European Constitution, but not the one on offer in the Lisbon Treaty. He thinks that there should be a shorter, simpler Constitution, perhaps just twenty-five pages that would make provision for an elected President and an elected Foreign Minister. What he described was something similar to the Constitution of the USA - exactly the kind of United States of Europe that we all thought a No vote to the Lisbon Treaty was meant to reject.

Mr Ganley was reported in the *Telegraph* recently as saying that he may run candidates across Europe in

the 2009 European Parliamentary elections. When questioned he said that he had not yet made a decision and would not for some time. What we can now be sure of is that if such candidates are fielded they will not be 'eurosceptics', and not even reformers, but true political integrationists.

However if he stands candidates in 2009 on the basis of opposition to the Lisbon Treaty it is possible that some of those who vote for them will be opposed to the EU rather than in favour of it. Will Mr Ganley's manifesto explain that his real purpose will be for a truly federal European state? He wants a Europe-wide referendum on a new Constitution that would usher in an even more federalist Europe than Lisbon. All very bizarre and many of us came out of the meeting wondering what his real motives actually are.

Gerard Batten has represented UKIP in the European Parliament since June 2004.

Zero response to EU transparency scheme

The EU's voluntary registry of lobbyists was the Commission's big idea to promote transparency, limit the opportunities for corruption and cleanse Brussels' tarnished image. In all there are an estimated 15,000-20,000 lobbyists in the city. Commission staff have been working on the project for several years.

So how many major lobbyists - the ones who earn the big fees for twisting the arms of MEPs and officials in order to influence EU legislation in the interests of their clients (or to damage those of their clients' rivals) - actually signed up? The answer is none.

As of 4th September 303 names had been placed on the registry. Of these 126 were those of trade associations, 56 were those of non-governmental organisations and two were those of law firms. Not a single commercial

lobbying firm had signed up.

Mrs Valerie Kampi, a Commission spokesman admitted that the response was "low" and "not satisfactory" and speculated that "the summer period may have played a role".

She also cautioned against measuring the number of those who have signed up against the total number of lobbyists and pressure groups which is usually put at 15,000 to 20,000 by the media. This was not a figure endorsed by the Commission, she said. But as the *EUobserver* pointed out on 5th September, Siim Kallas, the EU commissioner for administration, audit and anti-fraud has quoted the figure of 15,000 on several occasions when seeking support for the scheme.

There are no reliable figures for the total amount spent by lobbyists in Brussels but Alter-EU, a coalition of

NGOs, green groups and others has recently published details of the 2007 lobbying costs of a number of major companies. Telefonica, the Spanish telecoms company, for example, spent €950,000, Renault spent €200,000-€250,000 and Air-France-KLM between €50,000 and €100,000.

The Commission has said that it intends to give lobbyists a year to demonstrate transparency in the conduct of their affairs while the EU executive "tests the technicalities of the system".

One doesn't have to be the world's biggest cynic to conclude that it's not the technicalities that are the problem but the reluctance of the lobbyists to explain how they spend their money combined with the reluctance of many of those in the EU Parliament and Commission to make them do so.

LETTERS

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

Who Speaks for England?

Dear Sir,

Many correspondents to letters columns frequently claim "Only UKIP can save us" but others claim that if the UK came out of the EU it would be "in the teeth of opposition from Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland".

Devolved governments get huge Objective One EU funds to 2013 (England's money recycled) so will not want to get "out" - again we have the tail wagging the dog and so it goes on.

However the "EU" is a Westminster Non-Devolved matter so, due to the excesses of the annual "devolution settlements", the devolved countries have nothing left in the kitty to contribute to such expenditure although they receive substantial indirect benefits from there.

It is constantly stated that the UK, after Germany, is the 2nd highest EU contributor. In reality it is England's taxpayers who shoulder the UK burden but despite this England seems anonymous within the EU and treated as a nonentity, a mere appendage of the UK.

The EU now proposes to stitch up England by splitting it into three parts to fit a new EU model and the UK government is reported to be fully behind such a cunning "divide and conquer" plan which would allow both unions to further subjugate England's

inhabitants.

Such divisive control of England's 52 million people (95 million by 2080) will result in future generations of this country becoming just tax fodder for the benefit of both unions.

No other country on earth would put up with it and France, four times the size of England, remains intact under these proposals since their patriotic MPs and MEPs fight tooth and nail for their own whilst England's inhabitants have few political champions.

In the event of Scotland's independence all UK countries would need to re-apply for EU membership since the UK would no longer exist. However, as a leading gross contributor, England could probably rejoin (if the people so decided) on extremely advantageous conditions because the EU is desperate for our cash. England would then be "at the top table" with substantial influence, perhaps even the ability to "change" the EU.

UKIP is unlikely to get the full UK out of EU but if the party became an EIP (England Independence party) - and this country so desperately needs pro-England political parties - then things could happen to benefit the party and England's tax oppressed inhabitants.

Presently England is being stitched up by the EU with the willing help of a duplicit UK government and it is high time for the inhabitants of this country to stop being the mugs of both these

unions.

R.A.HOPKINS
Gloucestershire

A Tory Conundrum?

Dear Sir,

Perhaps I can enlighten David Owen (*eurofacts* letters 5th September) "Hurrah for Libertas". I listened very carefully to Declan Ganley's view when he spoke in Brussels (see page 5).

I also carefully explained the position of the UK of which he is less well informed than Ireland, UKIP want out. No ifs and buts.

Mr Ganley wants in with some relatively modest reform. The conundrum that Mr Owen mentions is not for the UKIP but for the Conservatives, whose position he reflects almost exactly.

GODFREY W BLOOM TD MEP
Yorkshire

Slow Learners

Dear Sir,

A survey of Conservative Parliamentary Candidates has shown that the majority believe that Britain has gained from EU membership, especially in the areas of the environment, health and free trade (*Guardian* 9th September). Will they never learn?

RICHARD SWIFT
Leicestershire

Giscard proposes special status for UK in EU

As we reported on 27th July 2007 ("The British have undergone a profound change of attitude, says Giscard"), the former French president Valéry Giscard d'Estaing has been proposing to French audiences that, in order to reduce or remove the antagonisms resulting from differing conceptions about the future of the EU, the UK should be accorded a "special status" within the Union. In practice, this appears to mean that British opt-outs, existing and future ones, should

be formalised.

The think-tank *Global Vision* invited Giscard to set out his ideas for a British audience at a conference which took place in the House of Commons on 8th September 2008. *eurofacts* will be publishing an account of those proceedings shortly. In the course of his speech, and in discussions afterwards, Giscard (who chaired the Convention which came up with the Constitution) confirmed that "...the *Lisbon Treaty* is simply a legal re-

packaging (as it happens incomprehensible) of the draft *Constitution*.....*Lisbon* scrupulously reproduces the innovations set out in the *Constitution*". He also confirmed that the legal re-packaging was carried out exclusively by the EU's in-house legal experts, without input from the member-states, and that even the 27 EU foreign ministers were only allowed a brief peek at the final version of the Lisbon Treaty before Angela Merkel released it publicly.

MEETINGS

United Kingdom Independence Party
02380 705 193

Monday **22nd September**, 7.30 pm

“Your questions answered”

Speakers include:
Nigel Farage MEP, *UKIP, Leader*
Chairman - **David Samuel**

PUBLIC MEETING
Millenium Suite, The Legacy Botley
Grange Hotel, George Road, Hedge
End, Nr Southampton
(2 miles NE of Hedge End junction of
M27, on A334)
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **23rd September**, 6.00 pm

“Asia’s rivals: The implications for the
world economy of developments in
China, India and Japan.”

Bill Emmott, *author, consultant and
former editor of The Economist*
Chairman - **Professor Michael
Mainelli**

PUBLIC MEETING
East Wintergarden, 43 Bank Street,
Canary Wharf, Docklands E14 5AB
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **30th September**, 6.00 pm

“The American Presidency - Richard
Nixon.”

Vernon Bogdanor CBE, FBA,
Emeritus Gresham Professor of Law

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Hall Inn, Holborn, London
Admission Free

FREE Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting
and/or conference dealing with the sub-
ject 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

Conservative Conference Fringe Meetings

The Freedom Association
0845 833 9626

Monday and Tuesday
29 and 30th Sept, 8.00 am to 9.00 pm

“The Freedom Zone”

Speakers include;
Iain Dale
Rt. Hon David Davis MP
Matthew Elliott, *Chief Executive of the
TaxPayers’ Alliance*
Simon Heffer
Roger Helmer MEP
Rt. Hon John Redwood MP

PUBLIC MEETING
Kingston Theatre and Free Trade Coffee
Lounge, Austin Court, 80 Cambridge
Street, Birmingham B1 2NP
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **29th September**,
2.30 - 4.00 pm

“Will a Conservative Government
Deliver on Europe?”

Nigel Farage MEP
Daniel Hannan MEP
Simon Heffer
Roger Helmer MEP

PUBLIC MEETING
The Birmingham and Midland Institute,
Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Monday **20th October**, 7.00 pm

“The Creation of Anglo-American
Grand Strategy 1941-45: Anglosphere
Planning for the Liberation of Europe”

Andrew Roberts, *Author and historian*

PUBLIC MEETING
Foreign Press Association, 11 Carlton
Terrace, London SW1Y 5AT
Admission £10

United Kingdom Independence Party
East Devon Branch
01395 276130

Friday **24th October**, 7.30 pm

Earl of Dartmouth
Nigel Farage MEP, *UKIP, Leader*
Laura Moralee, *UKIP Youth*

EUP Launch and
PUBLIC MEETING
West Hill Village Hall, near Ottery St
Mary, Devon
Admission Free

Marlborough Group
01672 515275

Sunday **9th November**, 2.00 pm

Michael Ancram MP

PUBLIC MEETING
Court Room of the Marlborough Town
Hall, Marlborough, Wiltshire
Admission Free

Bruges Group
020 7287 4414

Annual Conference

Saturday **22nd November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

Speakers to be announced

PUBLIC MEETING
The Great Hall, King’s College, London
Admission (details to follow)

DIARY OF EVENTS

Labour **20-24th Sept**
Party Conference
Manchester Central

Conservative **28th Sept - 1st Oct**
Party Conference
Birmingham

UK Parliamentary **6th October**
Recess Ends

EU Summit **15-16th October**

EU Summit **11-12th December**

European Reform **December**
Treaty to be Ratified?

Germany's Fourth Reich

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£5.00**

Beckhough a former code-breaker and intelligence officer, shows how the EU is being formed by the needs of Germany.

The Treaty of Lisbon in Perspective

by *BMDF*. **£27.50**

Detailed analysis and review together with the full text of the Treaty as signed in Lisbon in December 2007.

Scared To Death

by *Christopher Booker*

& *Richard North*. **Hdbk £16.95**

This latest book by the famous duo explores the tricks used to extend EU power and control.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by *David Brown*. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy. Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

The O.F.P.I.S. File

The Organisation for the Preservation of Individuality and Sovereignty

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£15.95**

Why citizens all across Europe are fed up with the EU.

A Tribute to Ralph Harris

1924-2006

by *CRCE*. **£9.95**

Lord Harris of High Cross was one of the leading figures in the fight against the EU and injustice everywhere.

Squandered

How Gordon Brown is wasting over one trillion pounds of our money

by *David Craig*. **£8.99**

An exposé of the huge levels of financial waste by government on Quangos and Advisers, which are self serving at the tax-payers expense.

The Costs Of Regulation And How the EU Makes them worse

by *William Mason*. **£4.00**

How by imposing EU regulations power is taken from national Governments.

A Life of Mayhem, Money and Unintentional Treason

by *J Brian Heywood*. **£9.99**

This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

Lost Illusions:

British Foreign Policy

by *Ian Milne*. **£4.00**

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

Are the British a Servile People?

Idealism and the EU

by *Kenneth Minogue*. **£4.00**

Professor Minogue argues that successive British Governments have surrendered our democracy to layers of international bureaucracy which have acquired completely unaccountable powers.

Warning: Immigration Can Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

The Principles of British Foreign Policy

by *Philip Vander Elst*. **£4.00**

Should BFP reflect political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest?

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

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£17
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 Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	0116 2874 622
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
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	
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Nick Clegg MP	
New Britain	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006