

Defence 'review' could tie us to European Union for ever

Labour's economic incompetence and military ignorance have so damaged our capacity that the prospect of the UK as part of pan-European armed forces now looks inevitable

Last autumn, the European Union Institute for Security Studies pointed its finger at the United Kingdom as the main reason for a lack of progress on the European Security and Defence Policy.

In its book *What ambitions for European defence 2020?* one of the Institute's expert authors opined: "Britain today is a bigger obstacle to the advancement of ESDP than the United States. British Prime Minister Gordon Brown is much less of a Europhile than his predecessor Tony Blair. Moreover, his political position is very weak. Faced with strong opposition at home and within his own party, the last thing he wants is a new push for European defence."

Sadly, that view appears to be rather out of date – sadly for the UK, that is.

This month's defence Green Paper, *Adaptability and Partnership*, is nothing if not an admission that Britain no longer has the will or the resources to manage its own security and that henceforth we shall have to rely on our European partners to keep us safe.

Our gloomy and unimpressive Secretary of State for Defence notes in his Foreword: "As we approach the next Defence Review, we must also confront the fact that despite our continued investment in Defence, we face challenging financial pressures: rising fuel and utility costs, increases in pay and pensions, and cost growth on major equipment projects. This is set against the backdrop of a global economic crisis which will constrain

Government resources... I also firmly believe that increasing globalisation ties our security to that of our allies – we cannot be unilaterally secure. Therefore we must increase cooperation with our international partners to deliver defence more efficiently and effectively."

What does this mean? The clue is in the title and the Green Paper spells it out: "Further integrating our capabilities with those of our key partners and allies, through role specialisation, joint capabilities or additional dependence, *would place limits on our ability to act nationally* [our italics]. But it could deliver a more effective contribution to international security."

They must be rubbing their hands in Brussels. For 50 years or more, the Eurocracy has dreamed of controlling pan-European armed forces and now, with the advent of the Lisbon Treaty and a NATO strategic review due this year, it has the opportunity to do so. Our Government is playing into the hands of the Brussels bureaucracy.

The history of Labour governments is one of economic mismanagement and a lack of interest in our armed forces possibly arising from the party's pacifist and internationalist roots (Mr Blair and his cronies were an aberration). Now, as it continues to fight two costly yet under-resourced wars and has spent its way to the largest public debt in our history, Labour is preparing to outsource the primary responsibility of government:

national security. Oh, it says, the world has changed, become more dangerous, and international threats require international action.

We have NATO for that, and pretty successful it has been, but today the talk is of sharing the NATO burden with the EU, "particularly with respect to operational deployments". There would be pooling of capabilities and a division of specialist roles, an "alignment" of European resources.

Anyone who doubts that our Government is conniving at the attempted creation of pan-European armed forces and defence policy should read the extracts from the EUISS book appearing on page 3 and take note of the recent comment from the German Foreign Minister, Guido Westerwelle:

"The long-term goal is the establishment of a European army under full parliamentary control. The European Union must live up to its political role as a global player. It must be able to manage crises independently."

We have ceded the bulk of our lawmaking powers and a large slice of our sovereignty to Brussels. We are in the process of handing much of our international diplomacy to the EU External Action Service. Now it seems that we are preparing to give up, at least in large measure, the last guarantee of our independence – the ability to defend ourselves properly. If that goes, we risk being permanently trapped in the United States of Europe.

INSIDE: *Structural flaws of the euro in spotlight p.2 - A European army in all but name? p.3 - Shaky start for the age of Lisbon p.4 - £14m a year for EU "waste police" p.4 - Mission creep towards a European state p.5 - Straws in the wind p.5 - Letters p.6*

Structural flaws of the euro in spotlight

Those of us who were sceptical from the beginning about the long-term viability of a European single currency – previous attempts having always failed – argued that there were huge risks attached to imposing one-size-fits-all monetary policy across widely divergent economic performers. It might just work in good times, we said, but the real test would come when the inevitable economic crisis struck. Well, that crisis has now come upon the euro.

The immediate problem is, of course, Greece, as some economists forecast would be the case when the country joined the euro during the heady days of 2001. It is no secret that years of economic mismanagement and a cavalier approach to accounting have combined with the worst recession in 70-odd years to leave the Greeks with a budget deficit running at some 12 per cent of GDP and public debt approaching 120 per cent of national income. There are real fears that Athens might default.

Greece, however, was not the only reason why bond markets got the jitters and stock markets slumped at the beginning of this month. The deeper concern was the possibility that the contagion would spread to Spain and Portugal, which are also running hefty deficits and debts and are struggling to emerge from recession. Then there is Ireland, still reeling from the effects of the downturn that shot the runaway Celtic Tiger. Add to this Italy, which is also struggling with debt.

It is bad news for the euro. As the German conservative leader Guenther Oettinger (the new EU Energy Commissioner) put it on 7th February: “The euro is in danger of becoming unstable...”

That might be putting it mildly. Leaders and central banks failure to recognise that the boom years of the early 21st century were based on an unsustainable boom in credit and asset values, and to realise that as well as the financial crisis there was a deeper economic one. That failure could have disastrous consequences for the EU and its hubristic single currency.

The problem for the European Central

Bank and the EU in general is that there is no way out of this debt and deficit crisis that will not damage the credibility of the euro. Leaving aside the prospect of actual Greek default, the damage caused to its credit rating cannot fail to dent the euro as a whole, particularly with the other dominoes teetering behind. Should Greece then withdraw, at least temporarily, from the eurozone, which is allowed for under the terms of the Lisbon Treaty, as we explained last month? If it did so, what would that do to the reputation of the single currency?

If, on the other hand, Greece remains in the euro and fails fully to take the measures needed to reduce its indebtedness to the satisfaction of the markets, not only will its borrowing costs rise, making its situation worse, but such costs are likely also to increase for Spain, Portugal, Italy and Ireland. If those countries are forced to borrow at a rate higher than the likes of Germany and France, then what is the point of their having the same currency as their European partners? If those higher rates are extended across the whole of the eurozone because of fears about the overall stability of the currency, then there is the risk of plunging Europe into the double-dip recession that some economists already fear.

One choice for the EU is to mount a bail-out for Greece. So far, Brussels has played down this possibility, but we have seen in the past the Eurocracy saying one thing and doing another. The excuse (as we have heard often from our own Prime Minister and Chancellor) would be that the crisis is an international one and not the fault of poor little Greece, and that stringent rules of future performance would be applied.

“We will defend the euro,” said Prime Minister Jose Luis Rodriguez Zapatero on behalf of the Spanish EU presidency. “All of the countries of the European Union support the euro and support all of the countries that belong to the euro.”

Yet what message would a bail-out of Greece send to the bond and currency markets? And if Greece were helped, what price Spain and the others? There would be other dangers in any bail-outs,

too. Suppose that Greece did not live up to the accompanying criteria...what would its punishment be?

As we go to press, the message coming from Brussels is that Greece will be permitted to pursue the austerity measures it has proposed to the Commission but will be carefully monitored to prevent any further cooking of the books and that the Commission will “help” by offering its own proposals for restructuring such things as public sector employment and pensions.

What this means, in effect, is that Greece will be handing over much of its management of economic policy to unelected bureaucrats, which, as we have seen already, does not appeal to an disaffected and volatile population.

In Spain, meanwhile, the powerful trades unions have set their face against wage reductions – indeed, they have called instead for pay rises – and in Portugal a proposed austerity programme has been rejected by Parliament. Any attempt by Brussels to impose its own rescue measures is unlikely to go down well.

Another option is the involvement of the International Monetary Fund in extracting the most urgent case of Greece from its dire straits, but that would amount to an admission that the Eurocracy cannot manage its own economic affairs.

To the rational mind, what this mess might suggest is that tying economies such as Germany into the same monetary system as those of Greece and Portugal was never going to work. The Eurocrats, though, do not think rationally. For them, the problems of the single currency play to their dreams of a single European state, as a German banker noted: “The ultimate problem is the non-existence of a political union”.

These are dangerous days in more ways than one. But we in the UK, with a budget deficit pretty well matching that of Greece, have at least retained control of interest rates and have derived benefit from the ability to allow devaluation of our currency. Such independence might prove to be our greatest protection, economically and politically.

A European army in all but name?

The book What ambitions for European defence 2020?, published by the European Union Institute for Security Studies in October 2009, is at pains to play down the idea of creating a European army, but the following extracts make it clear that the policies to be pursued in the wake of the Lisbon Treaty are founded upon increasing integration of national forces and defence ministries under EU management

THERE IS NO TIME to waste, and already from 2010, armed with a new treaty, we need a cohesive Union, true to its values and principles, speaking with a powerful single voice in the international arena. This is imperative if the European Union is to overcome the political deficit that hampered the effectiveness of what is to be known in the near future, as the Lisbon Treaty enters into force, as the EU Common Security and Defence Policy – CSDP instead of ESDP. The full ratification of the Lisbon Treaty will create favourable conditions for the full implementation of the ten-point “roadmap” for European defence in 2020... the European Union must find ways to be able to continue to integrate the sensibilities, activism and capacity of initiative of the various Member States, as hitherto demonstrated in the various rotating presidencies, not only in the field of foreign policy but also in that of defence policy.

- The European Union will remain a civilian power, but hopefully one with a commensurate military capability... The revision of NATO’s strategic concept in 2010 will be an opportunity to define NATO’s role and to take stock of the specific civilian/military role of ESDP... the EU will need to establish a fully-fledged European command to plan and conduct military operations.

- Twenty years after its inception, the ESDP must have a foundation of permanent structures: a formal Council of Defence Ministers, chaired by the High Representative; a European Defence College, with its own premises and budget, to train all personnel in a common strategic culture of the Union, a European Command to plan and conduct the Union’s military operations, alongside a civilian command and an integrated civil/military command capability; joint manoeuvres on the ground for

European forces. A number of permanent units should be set up, a sort of European armed rapid-reaction mini-force: one or more battlegroups, the European corps, a civilian intervention force for natural crises and disasters, a European humanitarian intervention corps, a pool of civilian ESDP officers, European logistical stocks, particularly medical equipment. Lastly, the speed of Union action will also depend on having a substantial European budget for ESDP operations, for use by the High Representative.

- ... the EU lacks a clear political and military chain of command, sufficient autonomous planning and control capacities, a coherent strategic concept and possibly also enough strength and clarity of purpose to deter escalation in a volatile situation... it should be made clear that the EU is capable and ready to use its “hard power”, commencing with the military, when needed. And, in order to do so, ESDP should dispose of all the necessary ways and means, from the command and control structures, to the requisite military forces. No useful European military capacity can be developed or employed without an effective command and control system, a proper Headquarters, fully interfaced and in continuous communication with the projected headquarters of the various missions.

- In order to improve our ability to react, should we think about a European army in the medium term? This would only make sense once the European Union had decided that it wanted a single defence structure, which would also mean a single political authority.

- The European Defence Agency is well-aware that defence budgets of its Member States will most likely remain constrained, in particular under the impact of the financial-economic crisis. At the same time the costs of equipment rise annually between five

and ten per cent. Logically, the Ministries’ of Defence room for investment will decrease. Therefore, the European countries will have no other choice but to invest more together and to seek civil-military synergies. Working together in Europe will reduce costs and that is of paramount importance. The EDA is well-placed in the family of European institutions to coordinate and stimulate this development.

- A complete reassessment of all the existing command structures in Europe could easily identify a number of national and allied structures that could be modified, completed and Europeanised. It is important that the European command structure becomes permanently operational...

- A fully-fledged European defence necessitates not only relevant legal and institutional adaptation, but first and foremost a political one. European defence will never be worthy of the name as long as the Union will not become an alliance. And to be an alliance, the EU needs far more than ESDP – its institutions and capabilities. It needs political solidarity and a Common Foreign Policy that speaks with one voice with regard to problems of strategic importance.

- All that falls well short of the establishment of a single European Army, or of the closing down of the various national defence authorities. Yet it is also incompatible with the present complete exercise of national sovereignty over defence matters. A process of progressive shifting of sovereignty from the national to the European level should be endorsed, applying the principles of subsidiarity to the defence and security field. We can imagine the possibility of a partial or total reversibility of the committed assets to national control, should any imperative need arise.

Copyright © EU Institute for Security Studies 2009

Shaky start for the age of Lisbon

We can say one thing for those Europhiles who kept telling us that the Lisbon Treaty did not merit national referenda because it would make no significant difference to the fundamentals of the EU: they were right. Unfortunately for them, their very rightness has demolished their other argument, that a post-Lisbon Union would be more cohesive, more effective and have greater standing in the world.

It is now obvious that not only has Lisbon left the EU as faction-ridden, inefficient, divisive and institution-obsessed as it has ever been, but it has also managed to diminish its international reputation, which was not exactly high to start with.

“The least that you can say is that the Union is a bad way,” wrote the leader of the liberal group in the European Parliament, Guy Verhofstadt, in an open letter to the new President of the Council, Herman Van Rompuy.

“The number of failures and setbacks is rising ... We know that these setbacks are no coincidence,” Mr Verhofstadt added.

What the former Prime Minister of Belgium, was referring to was the series of international humiliations the EU has suffered since the advent of its much vaunted modernisation.

As soon as the ink was dry on the document, Brussels found itself the subject of international derision over the appointment of the unknown Mr Van Rompuy as “President of Europe” and the serial time-server Baroness

Ashton as High Representative for foreign policy. Almost immediately afterwards, the status of the EU was placed in perspective when it was left out of the only talks that bore any fruit at the Copenhagen climate summit.

In the wake of the Haiti earthquake, the EU completely failed to make an impression in international rescue efforts, a fact that has provoked criticism even from some member states themselves, which pitched in on their own account.

Then came the greatest humiliation so far: the decision of President Obama that it was not worth attending the Madrid summit meeting that had been trumpeted by the Spanish rotating presidency in an attempt to upstage the *ingenu* Mr Van Rompuy.

The US State Department explained that under the new arrangements of Lisbon they were not sure to whom they were supposed to be talking.

“Now you have a new structure regarding not only the rotating EU presidency, you’ve got an EU Council president, you’ve got a European Commission president,” said a spokesman. “When you have a future EU-US summit meeting, who will host it and where will it be held?”

Other commentators pointed out that the EU’s habit of holding bilateral summits with someone or other every six months was a waste of time, since nothing of substance ever emerged.

“Optimists hoped that the Lisbon Treaty would put an end to such embarrassments and help the EU craft

a credible common foreign policy,” noted Hugo Brady, of the Centre for European Reform. “But instead, Europe’s decline seems to be accelerating as it is sidelined in Copenhagen, dismissed by the Chinese and despaired of by the Americans.

“The reality is that the Lisbon Treaty is just a piece of paper. It cannot by itself cure the Europeans of their weakness for circuitous arguments and tendency to offer up process as product.”

Mr Verhofstadt’s solution to post-Lisbon decline is “more unity and, above all, more integration”. He warned Mr Van Rompuy: “Otherwise, tomorrow, [the EU] will no longer play a meaningful role.”

Well, he would say that, wouldn’t he? It is a refrain we hear constantly from the Eurocracy to cover up its failures and shortcomings.

The fact is that the EU is making itself internationally irrelevant by refusing to play to its strengths and falling prey to overweening ambition.

As a trade organisation, which is what the UK was persuaded it was joining, it worked. As the politically unified “state” strutting the world stage that so many Eurocrats dream of, it is set fair to be a disaster.

Still, there is one positive result of Lisbon. It has permitted MEPs to award themselves an extra £16,000 a year in expenses to cope with the additional workload they say has been imposed on them by the treaty.

Plus ça change...

£14m a year for EU ‘waste police’

The European Commission is preparing to raise its spending by a further £14 million of taxpayers’ money a year with the creation of new agency dedicated to policing its directives on waste disposal – in a tacit admission that they are not working.

The EU already has a network of inspectors across member states, but it has been found that illegal waste dumping is widespread and in almost a fifth of the cases of waste

transportation examined the shipments also broke EU rules.

“Illegal dumping of waste continues on a significant scale, many landfill sites are sub-standard and in some member states basic waste infrastructure is still missing,” says the Commission.

Its solution is to throw more cash at the scheme by establishing an official EU inspection force with the power to take control of waste disposal sites in

serious cases of non-compliance. Two conclusions may be drawn. One is that when bureaucracies are given control they will inevitably spawn costly new bureaucracies in order to consolidate that control.

The second conclusion, which has implications for any future expansion of the EU, is that economic, political and social criteria are far from the only considerations to be taken into account in judging membership applications.

Mission creep towards a European state

If there were ever any real doubts that the Lisbon Treaty was another step towards the creation of a single European state, they will surely have been dispelled by the behaviour of the Eurocracy since the eventual adoption of the treaty.

Within weeks of the treaty's entering into force, Brussels had converted 54 of its 136 overseas delegations into fully functioning EU embassies, with their ambassadors empowered to speak for Europe as if it were a "government". Backed up by the new Brussels diplomatic corps, known as the European External Action Service, these new embassies are also scheduled to take over responsibilities previously held by national embassies and consular services.

"EU delegations could gradually assume responsibility, where necessary, for tasks related to diplomatic and consular protection of Union citizens in third countries, in crisis situations," says a declaration signed by European leaders last autumn.

In London, the Foreign Office (which will presumably become known as the Foreign Branch Office) has already produced a memorandum suggesting a reduction in overseas establishments and staff cuts. "The EU's foreign policy will become more consistent

and effective, without costing the British taxpayer any more, because this is about redeploying existing resources," it says. Which means that the EU's gain in power and budgets is our loss.

Quite how a "consistent and effective" EU foreign policy is to be arrived at is not clear. Presumably the sometimes competing and legitimate national interests that usually underpin international relations are simply to be swept aside for an EU fudge.

"Common EU embassies means that Britain can be overruled on crucial diplomatic matters, such as on how to respond to human rights abuses in a conflict-ridden country," says Open Europe. "In order for common embassies to work, EU member states must have shared national interests. This simply isn't the case."

Nor are EU embassies the limit of the international ambitions in Brussels. Serious lobbying is going on for the EU to assume its own seat on the United Nations Security Council, to whose detriment is not evident, though EU membership would no doubt compromise the position of the UK and France as permanent members.

More advanced is the EU campaign for the eurozone to be given a seat on the G20 group comprising the world's

leading industrialised and developing economies. The Lisbon Treaty gave formal recognition to the euro zone as an economic grouping and that "implies external representation", according to Jean-Claude Juncker, Prime Minister and Treasury Minister of Luxembourg and president of the European single currency group.

"The role of the president of the eurogroup on the international stage will need to be determined," says Mr Juncker. "I would envisage a clear mandate to represent the eurozone's interests, as well as further discussion on the full range of issues of external representation."

"It is essential at this juncture to ensure that the euro area's interests are fully reflected in international discussions."

Naturally, Mr Juncker is seeking the creation of a whole new bureaucracy to support him in his international pretensions.

The Eurocracy knows that it will never achieve the "United States of Europe" by public acclamation so it is using purely institutional methods to realise its aim. Once all the trappings of a state are in place, the recalcitrant citizens of Europe will find they have no choice but to accept it.

Straws in the wind

'It would make sense to rethink the financing of the EU budget through a European tax imposed on certain services or products that would go directly into the European budget. Because of the cross border nature of certain activities, a European environmental tax or a tax on certain financial transactions would be particularly suitable.'

Luc Frieden, Finance Minister, Luxembourg. (Source, *Le Figaro*)

'Turkey is a part of the European family of peoples. It is better to have Turkey inside the EU than to leave it standing outside. It would bring Europe more advantages than drawbacks.'

Miguel Angel Moratinos, Foreign Minister, Spain. (Source, Reuters)

'My greatest desire, as long as I am a protagonist in politics, is to bring Israel into membership of the European Union.'

Silvio Berlusconi, Prime Minister, Italy (Source: *Washington Post*)

LETTERS

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

How independent?

Dear Sir,

The analysis by Anthony Scholefield, "Voters the big parties are ignoring" (*eurofacts*, January) reveals that sceptics have a very significant potential – from 11 per cent to 18 per cent, or about 2.6 million voters. This should induce consideration of what sceptics have to offer: not complaint from the wilderness but sound policies from a position that is bound to strengthen.

What should an independent Britain actually do in practice?

In 1972 a weak government took the UK into the Common Market. Since then the world has much changed, possibly most significantly in the development of globalisation. Would sceptics be content to have British energy operations owned in France? Or British jobs exported in hundreds of thousands to Asia, leaving many British workers in state dependency?

Withdrawal from the EU might save the UK around £7 billion a year, but what about the £860 billion in the asset value of British companies that have been sold to foreign buyers since Labour came to power in 1997? Ownership implies control.

British business organisations have been keen to extol the benefits of globalisation – more especially before the current economic crisis. Does this estimate now need revision?

Sceptics seek political independence for the UK. Should economic independence also be sought in order to secure the self-government of our country?

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Our only hope

Dear Sir,

As a consequence of Gordon Brown's signing of the Lisbon Treaty, government of England will increasingly move from London to Brussels. Whoever wins the next election will have no power because

Gordon Brown has signed power away and Cameron and the Lib/Dems agree.

The French/German political elite which controls the EU has all but taken over England by "peaceful means". On the EU maps of Europe, England has disappeared.

The French/German plan for Europe is a federation controlled from Brussels where France and Germany set the agenda and preserve their autonomy. The autonomy of all other member states will be abolished.

In England's case power will go to Prescott's Regional Assemblies, which take instructions from Brussels. The only hope for Britain is a hung parliament and enough UKIP MPs to force a vote on exit from the EU.

They will be friendly and co-operate with the rest of Europe, not as an EU member but as an independent sovereign nation.

EDWIN BATEMAN
Cumbria

Jury service

Dear Sir,

I recommend that L.G.Holt (*Letters*, January) watches as many performances of *Trial by Jury* as possible. Then he (or she) will be able to tell posterity what a jury was.

PETER HOWELL
Wiltshire

The man for the job

Dear Sir,

The post of "President" of the European Central Bank will soon be open and nominations invited.

The candidate most suitable is obvious. He abolished boom and bust. He went on to save the banks. Then he solved the problems of the world's financial institutions.

I give you, Gordon Brown!
PAUL METSON
Yorkshire

UKIP is serious...

Dear Sir,

Ralph Maddern asks if UKIP is a broader political party (*Letters*,

January). The answer is YES, for the following reasons:

1) UKIP has fought every European and General Election since it was founded in 1993, as well as Welsh Assembly elections.

2) It expects to field over 500 candidates in this year's General Election.

3) It has prepared a full manifesto. No party which supports British membership of the EU can have more than a quarter of a manifesto, since three-quarters of our laws are made in Brussels.

Anybody who believes in a self-governing Britain should support UKIP. We may have our weaknesses, but these are mainly due to a lack of money and manpower.

DAVID ROWLANDS
Wales

...or is it?

Dear Sir,

Gerard Batten MEP asserts that UKIP will make no deals (*eurofacts*, January) with the Tory party at the election to be held in a few weeks' time. He goes on to claim that UKIP will achieve its best results ever.

Bearing in mind that UKIP did not win a single seat at the 1997, 2001 and 2005 elections, perhaps he hopes that UKIP's Member for Castle Point, a defector from the Conservative Party, will succeed in holding on to that ill-gotten gain? I doubt that very much.

DAVID OWEN
Devon

Erratum

In the January issue of *eurofacts* our front-page article, "New year, new games in the Brussels playground", suggested "that budget deficits across the eurozone could hit 84 per cent of GDP in 2010 – while in shaky Greece it is expected to reach 120 per cent." The figures quoted refer, of course, to the average *national debt* of eurozone countries and not to budget deficits. We apologise for this editing error.

MEETINGS

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **23rd February**, 6.00 pm
"The New Consensus of the Governed -
Re-imagining Corporate Governance"
Kenneth Costa, *Mercers' School
Memorial Professor of Commerce at
Gresham College*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London
Admission Free

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **11th March**, 6.00 pm
"Town and Crown: Why London never
became an imperial capital"
Simon Thurley, *Visiting Gresham
Professor of the Built Environment*

PUBLIC MEETING
Museum of London, London
Admission Free

UK Independence Party
0124 3532 509

Wednesday **24th March**, 7.00 pm
Andrew Moncrief, *PPC for the
Chichester Constituency*
The Rev'd Dr Peter Mullen, *Chaplin
to the Stock Exchange*
Lord Pearson of Rannoch, *Leader of
UKIP*
Question & Answers Session

PUBLIC MEETING
The Assembly Rooms, The Council
House, North Street, Chichester, West
Sussex PO19 1LQ
Admission Free (Free tea and coffee)

UK Independence Party
(South Dorset
Constituency Association)
01929 439099

Friday **9th April**, 7.00 pm
William Earl of Dartmouth MEP
Nigel Farage MEP
Mike Hobson, *PPC for South Dorset*

PUBLIC MEETING
The Pavilion, Esplanade, Weymouth,
Dorset
Admission Free

**Social Democratic
Party**
0121 7474 546

Sunday **16th May**
Starts 10.00 am

Speakers to be announced

SPRING CONFERENCE
Bridlington, Yorkshire
Admission Free
(Further details to be announced)

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Monday **22nd February**, 4.05 pm
Evidence will be heard on the *EU 2020
Strategy* from Ian Pearson MP, Economic
Secretary, HM Treasury.

Thursday **25th February**, 10.35 am
Evidence will be heard on the *Somalia
Piracy - Operation ATLANTA Inquiry*
from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2010

EU Economic Summit **26th February**

Commonwealth Day **8th March**

Last date for UK
General Election **4th June**

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

2011

Hungary takes over
EU Council Presidency **1st January**

Poland takes over
EU Council Presidency **1st July**

2012

Denmark takes over
EU Council Presidency **1st January**

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.eurosceptic.org.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

I Want a Referendum

www.iwantareferendum.com

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

Team

www.teameurope.info

The TaxPayers Alliance

www.taxpayersalliance.com

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

How the EU treated its chief accountant when she refused to go along with its fraud and waste. That's the strap line.

How much does the European Union cost Britain?

by *Gerard Batten MEP*. **£3.00**

This shows amongst other costs that the accumulated trade deficit since joining the EU in 1973 is £383.7 billion.

The Real Global Warming Disaster

by *Christopher Booker*. *Hdbk*. **£16.99**

Is the obsession with 'climate change' turning out to be the most costly scientific blunder in history? That is the question Booker deals with and concludes that the answer is 'Yes'.

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.

Bloodless Revolution

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£4.99**

Are political parties the cause of our problems? Why we would be better off without them and how to do it one day.

Reflections on the Revolution in Europe:

by *Christopher Caldwell*. **£14.99**

How mass immigration affects Europe and what the culture-shaping potential of religion can have on democracy Can Europe be the same with different in it?

The City of London Under Threat:

The EU and its attack on Britains most successful industry

by *Professor Tim Congdon CBE*. **£4.00**

How the EU wants to ruin the UK.

The Great European Rip-Off

by *David Craig &*

Matthew Elliott. **£8.99**

How the corrupt wasteful EU is taking control of our lives.

While the Earth Endures

Creation, Cosmology

and Climate Change

by *Philip Foster*. **£10.00**

A theological look at the earth, and myths associated with global warming with a foreword by David Bellamy.

Babylon In Europe

What Bible Prophecy Reveals

About The European Union

by *David Hathaway*. **£6.00**

Is there a hidden purpose in the creation of the European Union?

Why Did Britain

Take The Wrong Path?

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£9.99**

How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government, resulting in democracy being exchanged for the EU dream of a superstate.

Ten Years On: Britain Without The European Union

by *Dr Lee Rotherham*. **£5.99**

The title explains the idea of this book, with a foreword by Trevor Kavanagh and an epilogue by Frederick Forsyth.

An Environmental Audit

How membership of the EU has

changed the face of Britain

by *Tom Wise MEP*. **£2.00**

From the view of the landscape through fishing and ending with immigration.

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

euofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK **£30**
 Europe (Airmail) **£42**
 Rest of World **£55/\$95**
 Reduced rate (UK only) **£20**

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

Please send me the monthly *euofacts* and the occasional briefing papers.

I enclose my annual 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 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 7385 9757
 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
 Lord Pearson of Rannoch

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006