

The UN prepares for its newest member state: the EU

With a new foreign policy and diplomatic service and now the promise of a seat at the top table, the United States of Europe comes two steps closer

Anyone naive enough ever to have doubted that the ambition of the EU was to become the United States of Europe, its member governments reduced to something akin to local authorities, can now firmly consign their illusions to the waste bin and abandon any lingering belief that the institution is a benign co-operative effort for the good of the continent and its diverse peoples.

It is not simply that Brussels and member states have signed off on the creation of the European External Action Service, which is to run EU foreign policy round the world and ultimately make European national embassies redundant. The latest news is that the EU is to be granted most of the rights and powers of a nation state at the General Assembly of the United Nations.

The EU currently sits alongside Nato and similar regional organisations on the periphery of the UN chamber, but in future the European “High Representative” (read it “Foreign Minister”), Baroness Ashton, will take her place near the centre of the chamber beside a new European ambassador to the UN and will have “the right to speak in a timely manner, the right of reply, the right to circulate documents, the right to make proposals and submit amendments (and) the right to raise points of order”.

“This is without doubt the biggest EU power grab since the introduction of the Lisbon Treaty, and combined with the formation of the EU diplomatic

corps, represents a further giant step towards the building of a European superstate at the expense of the nation state,” noted the Washington-based political commentator and foreign policy analyst Niles Gardiner. “These developments should be of immense concern to anyone who cares about the erosion of British sovereignty within Europe and maintaining an independent foreign policy.”

He added: “The march towards an EU seat at the United Nations as well as an EU United Nations Ambassador may ultimately spell the end of Britain’s seat on the UN Security Council. By agreeing to these proposals, London is playing with fire, with declining British influence and power the inevitable end result.”

And agree London did, though the spin coming out of the Foreign Office is that the deed was only done with great reluctance.

Yet was it not David Cameron who promised during the recent election campaign that Brussels would not be allowed to assume any further sovereignty from Britain without a referendum?

And was it not our own Foreign Secretary who, when in opposition, raised the spectre of Britain’s fall from the Security Council as a consequence of handing the primary foreign policy role to Brussels?

Yet this is what Parliament has done.

As the Eurorealist MP Douglas Carswell put it:

“Not merely have senior Conserv-

atives dropped their opposition to it, but coalition ministers apparently played a ‘decisive’ role in making sure that the new EU foreign office got off the ground.

“How can it possibly be right for us to go along with the formal establishment European diplomatic corps? If one is a rebel for opposing this sort of nonsense, then we make rebels of our party, our country and our consciences.”

The best William Hague and the Foreign Office could claim from this betrayal of sovereignty and democracy was that they had managed to scotch a plan put forward by Germany and Ireland, for their own obvious reasons, to endow the EU with the right to call a vote at the UN. We might wonder how long that barrier will remain.

“The UK’s support does not imply agreement to seek additional rights in any other forums and does not prejudge whether the EU should actually exercise those rights on any particular issue,” our Europe Minister, David Lidington (who he?), said in a Commons statement.

On the evidence so far, when the EU goes for those additional rights – and you may be sure it will – it is more than likely that the British Government will do no more than make a half-hearted attempt to snap at its ankles then roll on its back with its paws in the air, whimpering for approval.

Once George Bush’s poodle – now the EU’s? This is becoming really serious. Is it too late to stop it?

INSIDE: What does European “solidarity” mean? p.2 - Millions queue for EU passports p.3 - How Israel has become the EU’s hidden “member” p.3 - Globalisation? Let’s just pay to give up p.4 - When in doubt, set up a new committee p.4 - The big boys play the hand-out game p.5 - Letters p.6 - Brussels waves the big stick on top jobs for women p.6

What does European ‘solidarity’ mean?

In the Eurocracy’s panic to push through the Lisbon Treaty, one aspect of the drive towards greater ‘integration’ has been largely ignored – and no one seems clear on its significance

In the EU’s rush to implement the Lisbon Treaty, little attention has been paid to the “Solidarity Clause”, now enshrined as Article 222 in the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

This one-page provision creates one of the most explicit demands upon EU members to act jointly and to assist one another in the face of disasters, emergencies and crises on the European continent. Yet the precise meaning of this demand, and its implications for EU institutions and member states, has yet to be fully assessed.

In some respects, the lack of attention to the Solidarity Clause is easy to understand. The Lisbon Treaty was full of headline-grabbing and complicated changes requiring the full attention of busy governments. The Solidarity Clause has not grabbed similar headlines, perhaps because other treaty changes appear more pressing, because its brevity belies its content, or because it tends to be confused with the more narrowly focused “mutual defence clause” (Article 42.7) on co-operation in the event of armed aggression.

In other respects, neglect of the Solidarity Clause is surprising. The word “solidarity” hangs heavily in the air as Europe struggles with a debt crisis. The continent has been hit by a spate of disasters and crises in recent months – including ash clouds, pandemics, explosions, and cross-border infrastructure failures – which can outstrip national coping capacities.

In the aftermath of disasters and terror attacks, national governments tend to loudly proclaim the importance of enhancing co-operation to protect the safety and security of citizens. The Solidarity Clause, conceived as a treaty-based method for improving EU co-operation on a range of complex threats, acknowledges the need to mobilise a host of instruments to deal with new security concerns. It thus

provides a potential answer to increasingly vocal concerns. Solidarity, however, means different things to different people (and governments).

For some, solidarity is measured by how much support flows to a country in need. For others, solidarity means everyone doing their own “homework” to avoid the need for assistance in the first place. Still others believe that solidarity against today’s risks and threats is best pursued outside of EU frameworks.

As long as solidarity remained a rhetorical device in the EU context, such differences could be tolerated. Now that solidarity has been established as a legal concept in the case of the Solidarity Clause, such differences need to be reconciled.

This paper spurs attention to the Solidarity Clause at a timely moment in its development. Not only are the complexities of modern crises becoming increasingly apparent, but the political/administrative machinery to support the Solidarity Clause is now being put in place. A proposal is due from the European Commission in the upcoming months, and an opportunity will emerge to “frame” the clause in a way that is consistent with its original intent.

The Solidarity Clause

Article 222, Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

1. The Union and its Member States shall act jointly in a spirit of solidarity if a Member State is the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster. The Union shall mobilise all the instruments at its disposal, including the military resources made available by the Member States, to:

(a) prevent the terrorist threat in the territory of the Member States;

● *Extracted from the report The European Union’s Solidarity Clause: Empty Letter or Effective Tool? By Sara Myrdal and Mark Rhinard published by The Swedish Institute of International Affairs*

protect democratic institutions and the civilian population from any terrorist attack;

assist a Member State in its territory, at the request of its political authorities, in the event of a terrorist attack;

(b) assist a Member State in its territory, at the request of its political authorities, in the event of a natural or man-made disaster.

2. Should a Member State be the object of a terrorist attack or the victim of a natural or man-made disaster, the other Member States shall assist it at the request of its political authorities. To that end, the Member States shall co-ordinate between themselves in the Council.

3. The arrangements for the implementation by the Union of the solidarity clause shall be defined by a decision adopted by the Council acting on a joint proposal by the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. The Council shall act in accordance with Article 31(1) of the Treaty on European Union where this decision has defence implications. The European Parliament shall be informed.

For the purposes of this paragraph and without prejudice to Article 240, the Council shall be assisted by the Political and Security Committee with the support of the structures developed in the context of the common security and defence policy and by the Committee referred to in Article 71; the two committees shall, if necessary, submit joint opinions.

4. The European Council shall regularly assess the threats facing the Union in order to enable the Union and its Member States to take effective action.

Millions queue for EU passports

As worries about immigration into the European Union are moving inexorably up the political agenda across the continent – most recently in France – the EU may be about to see its population rise by a potential five million as some member states encourage more people to jump on to the work and benefits gravy train. They are achieving this by handing out passports to outsiders with often tenuous links to the EU countries.

A report from the Associated Press reveals that countries such as Romania and Bulgaria are already giving passports to ethnically related groups and the descendants of existing immigrants who live in regions beyond the EU borders.

This will, of course, give such people the right to live and work anywhere in the Union. The two countries will soon be joined by Hungary, which apparently plans to issue its own invitations from next January.

In Moldova, for example, some two-thirds of the population speaks Romanian and 120,000 of them have been issued with Romanian passports. A further 800,000 have recently taken advantage of a new law that can grant Romanian citizenship to Moldovans who speak Romanian.

Others who could benefit, according to AP, are people who fled Romania and other countries during the Second World War and now live in places such

as Macedonia, Serbia, Ukraine and Turkey. Given that the standards of living in these countries are very far below those in the EU, it might be assumed that millions of people living in them will be only too keen to take up their new privileges.

But these are not the only outsiders poised to benefit from passport giveaways. Last year, Spain gave the grandchildren of refugees from the Civil War the right to Spanish passports. So far, 161,463 people, mainly living in Latin America, have applied, nearly 82,000 applications have been approved – and the offer of citizenship has been extended until the end of 2011 to meet the demand.

Thus the EU is likely to have to find room for hundreds of thousands of perfectly legal “citizens” from Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela and other Latin American countries.

Similarly, there are some two million people in Latin America who have Italian passports that would enable them to settle in the EU without question, while Portugal confers citizenship to the descendants of emigrants who settled in Brazil.

The EU has made it clear that it believes immigrants are necessary to replace in the future an ageing workforce and has instituted a visa programme to bring in skilled workers. The European passport time-bomb, however, seems more likely to attract

people less skilled and less interested in work than the currently undreamed of social benefits that go with EU citizenship.

So is anything being done about this prospective influx? Apparently not.

“No reliable and comprehensive global tally exists of just how many people living elsewhere are eligible for EU passports,” AP reported. “But the figures available suggest such passport policies could put a strain on the EU at a time when most of the bloc’s nations favour putting enlargement on hold as they try to put their economic houses in order.”

Romanians and Bulgarians are still required to get work permits in ten West European EU nations, while Austria and Germany place the same restriction on Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Hungarians and Poles. Those limits, however, are due to expire by 2013 at the latest.

Prior to AP’s revelations, the matter has received no publicity and no EU authority or national government has either criticised the mass issuing of passports or flagged up the dangers.

It is “a matter for member states,” the news agency quotes our own dear Foreign Office as saying. Yet it is not the member states as such but the existing citizens of Europe who will have to live with the economic and social consequences.

How Israel has become the EU’s hidden ‘member’

WHAT ON EARTH is the EU doing when it cosies up to the Israelis? In a remarkable, detailed – if slightly over-inflated – book to be published in November, the indefatigable David Cronin is going to present a microscopic analysis of “our” relations with Israel. I have just finished reading the manuscript. It leaves me breathless. As he says in his preface, “Israel has developed such strong political and economic ties to the EU over the past decade that it has become a member state of the union in all but name.” Indeed, it was Javier Solana, the grubby top dog of the EU’s foreign policy (formerly Nato secretary general), who actually said last year that “Israel, allow me to say, is a member of the European Union without being a member of the institution”.

Israel, by the way, has been praised for its “logistics” help to Nato in Afghanistan – where we are annually killing even

more Afghans than the Israelis usually kill Palestinians – which is not surprising since Israel military boss Gabi Ashkenazi has visited Nato headquarters in Brussels to argue for closer ties with Nato. And Cronin convincingly argues an extraordinary – almost obscenely beautiful – financial arrangement in “Palestine”. The EU funds millions of pounds’ worth of projects in Gaza. These are regularly destroyed by Israel’s American-made weaponry. So it goes like this. European taxpayers fork out for the projects. US taxpayers fork out for the weapons which Israel uses to destroy them. Then EU taxpayers fork out for the whole lot to be rebuilt. And then US taxpayers... Well, you’ve got the point. Israel, by the way, already has an “individual co-operation programme” with Nato, locking Israel into Nato’s computer networks.

Robert Fisk, *The Independent*, 31 July 2010

Globalisation? Let's just pay to give up

Few if any Western governments have managed to come to terms with the economic changes they face as a result of the accelerating globalisation of capital, labour and markets. Indeed, it might be said that none has really recognised the full implications of the dynamism so evident in emerging economies, thus it is hardly surprising that responses have ranged from hand-wringing and wishing the problem would go away to continuing attempts at old-fashioned protectionism.

The EU, of course, is no stranger to protectionist tendencies. It has a history of manipulating tariffs in order to defend industries whose complacency and laziness have rendered them uncompetitive in global terms – and it is not above slapping import bans on goods from countries it accuses of “dumping”.

That, however, is not the end of the story. European taxpayers are largely unaware of the fact that since the end of 2006, Brussels has set aside almost €400 million of their money in what it calls the EU Globalisation Adjustment Fund. In plain terms, what this means is featherbedding the inflexible

European labour markets that have failed to compete in the global arena and have shed workers as a result.

The EGF, according to the European Parliament, was created to provide “a visible, specific, targeted and temporary financial support for personalised programmes for the re-skilling and re-integration into employment of workers affected by collective redundancies in sectors or regions undergoing severe economic and social disruption.”

The money is spent on training, job coaching and supporting workers in setting up their own businesses.

Great strategy! Instead of investing money to make European industries lean and fit enough to compete with the likes of China, India and Brazil, the EU pays governments to make an orderly retreat from the global market.

Now there might be a case for offering some measure of protection to workers in EU member states where economies are less developed and wages are already relatively low – though not low enough to stop jobs being exported. It comes as a shock, therefore, to discover that countries such as Lithuania, the Czech Republic,

Poland and Malta account for a mere 2 per cent of applications for cash from the EGF.

Some 70 per cent of requests for handouts comes from the EU's largest economies: France, Italy, Spain, Ireland and Germany (**see the chart on the facing page**).

France, Italy and Germany, of course, are members of the G20; Ireland was not long ago hailed as the great economic success story of the EU; Spain is hardly impoverished. Austria, Belgium, Denmark and the Netherlands are also holding out the begging-bowl.

The UK may take some pride in the fact that it is, for the moment at least, among the 17 member states that have declined to take advantage of this shameful slush-fund.

This month, the European Parliament debated the EGF and, far from expressing disappointment at this defeatist strategy and seeking its abolition, has asked the Commission to consider making it permanent and establishing a dedicated budget for it from next year. MEPs also want the payouts to go through more rapidly.

Well, if that is not a case of abandoning all hope...

When in doubt, set up a new committee

Well, isn't that just what the European Parliament needs – another committee? It already has, among so many others, a Budgets Committee, but as of this month it has acquired a new special committee on policy challenges, which is tasked with preparing the parliament's work on... yes, you've guessed it, the EU's next long-term budget.

The Policy Challenges Committee, complete with chair, rapporteur and five vice-chairs, starts work in September on parliamentary input into the EU's next long-term budget framework (known in the jargon as the “financial perspective” or multi-annual financial framework, MFF), which starts in 2014 to replace the current long-term budget framework covering

2007-2013. What this means in practice is that the new committee is to:

- define the parliament's priorities for the EU's next long-term budget framework, in both political and budgetary terms,
- estimate how much money the EU will need to achieve its objectives, define the duration of the next long-term budget framework (this has traditionally been seven years but MEPs want to adjust it to match the mandates of the parliament and the Commission),
- propose a structure for future long-term budget frameworks,
- draw up guidelines on how resources should be distributed within and between different parts (“headings”) of the EU budget, and

specify the link between a reform of the EU's financing system and a review of expenditure, so as to provide the Budgets Committee with a basis for the forthcoming MFF negotiations.

Its chair is German MEP Jutta Haug, a veteran of the Budgets Committee and of which its first vice-chair since last year's European elections. She says: “As members of this committee, we are going to have a lot of work.” Possibly, but one might be tempted to think it was work that could have been done by the Budgets Committee.

We'll find out what value the Policy Challenges Committee adds to the deliberations, if any, when it presents the results of its work in a report to the parliament early next summer.

The big boys play the hand-out game

How some of the major economies in the EU – including Germany, the world's second largest exporter after China – are going cap-in-hand to Brussels to seek European taxpayers' bail-outs as parts of their inflexible labour markets suffer from their failure to become more competitive in the face of advancing globalisation

No.	MS	Case	Content	Date	MS amount € millions	EGF € millions
EGF/2007/001	FR	Peugeot	Motor industry	09/03/2007	2.6	2.6
EGF/2007/002	FR	Renault	Motor industry	23/03/2007	withdrawn	withdrawn
EGF/2007/003	DE	BenQ	Mobile phones	27/06/2007	12.8	12.8
EGF/2007/005	IT	Sardegna	Textile sector	09/08/2007	11.0	11.0
EGF/2007/006	IT	Piemonte	Textile sector	10/08/2007	7.8	7.8
EGF/2007/007	IT	Lombardia	Textile sector	17/08/2007	0.7	0.7
EGF/2007/009	ES	Delphi	Motor industry	08/10/2007	withdrawn	withdrawn
EGF/2008/001	IT	Toscana	Textile sector	12/02/2008	3.9	3.9
EGF/2008/002	ES	Delphi	Motor industry	06/02/2008	10.5	10.5
EGF/2008/004	ES	Castilla Leon	Automotive	29/12/2008	2.7	2.7
EGF/2008/005	ES	Catalonia	Textile sector	29/12/2008	3.3	3.3
EGF/2009/004	BE	Vladeren	Textile sector	05/05/2009	4.0	7.5
EGF/2009/005	BE	Limburg	Textile sector	05/05/2009	0.9	1.7
EGF/2009/006	IT	Gruppo Merloni	Dom. appliances	28/05/2009	5.7	10.6
EGF/2009/008	IE	Dell	Computer	29/06/2009	8.0	14.8
EGF/2009/0012	IE	Waterford Crystal	Crystal glass	07/08/2009	1.4	2.6
EGF/2009/0014	ES	Valencia	Ceramics	02/09/2009	3.6	6.6
EGF/2009/0019	FR	Renault	Automotive	09/10/2009	30.4	56.4
EGF/2009/0020	ES	Castilla La Mancha	Wooden doors	09/10/2009	1.1	2.0
EGF/2009/0021	IE	SR Technics	Aircraft	09/10/2009	4.0	7.4
EGF/2010/002	ES	Catalonia	Automotive	29/01/2010	1.5	2.8
EGF/2010/003	ES	Galicia	Textile sector	05/02/2010	1.0	1.8
EGF/2010/005	ES	Valencia	Stone marble	09/03/2010	0.8	1.4
EGF/2010/009	ES	Valencia	Textile sector	22/03/2010	1.1	2.1
EGF/2010/009	FR	Peugeot	Automotive	05/05/2010	20.5	38.1
EGF/2010/0016	ES	Aragon	Retail sector	06/05/2010	0.8	1.6
EGF/2010/0018	DE	Heidelberger	Print industry	27/05/2010	4.5	8.3
EGF/2010/0019	IE	Construction 41	Construction	09/06/2010	22.1	41.0
EGF/2010/0022	DK	LM Glasfiber	Wind turbines	07/07/2010	4.1	7.6
Total applications since 2007 65					Total of funds sought from EGF since 2007 €372.9 million	

Source: EU Globalisation Adjustment Fund

LETTERS

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

Doctors' hours and the EU

Dear Sir,

It is very amusing to read in *The Daily Telegraph* that Mr Lansley is going to have to "urge" Mr Cable to "take a robust approach" to sorting out this self-imposed mess.

As this is presumably coalition Government policy, why does any Minister have to be "urged" to carry out official policy, even ("spare the Lib-Dems") a Lib-Dem Minister whose instinct is to grovel to Brussels? Could there be the seed of a referendum here? Breath-holding not recommended.

L.G. HOLT
Kent

Targeting the young

Dear Sir,

In 2001 the EU organised a UK-Danish Conference with an accompanying booklet entitled *EU 2001: An Optimistic Vision of the Future*. It stated categorically: "Every school and university in New Europe will be teaching entrepreneurship and all children will have explained to them how the EU works by 2010."

In July 2010 a rather surprised BBC

Today programme interviewer was told that there is to be a Scouts badge for entrepreneurship. A coincidence in terminology and timing, or an example of that continuous propagandising process whereby the EU surreptitiously operates through "the shell of our national structures", as a Europhile smugly expressed it? Your report last month on *How they'll try to make us love the EU* indicated the latest policies to infiltrate every aspect of our life – again especially targeting the young.

C. FRANCIS WARREN
Lancashire

England is dead

Dear Sir,

Much is made of the European (and British) legislation on equality and human rights, and it is noted that equality is extended to all, except those who are nationalist and in opposition to things such as immigration and our subjugation to Europe.

People of all kinds may have access to the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) process, except those who are pilloried and hated for their political views.

Views expressed by nationalists are

regarded by European and national authorities as being unworthy of consideration and moves have been made to exclude those who hold such views from the political process by the establishment of a campaign of hatred that flies directly in the face of the infamous "equality" legislation.

For example, the BNP has been harassed by the EHRC for attempting to participate in the democratic process, yet it has never been given the opportunity to take its grievances to the European Court of Human Rights, a body where individuals have a right to express their views in public and to be free from harassment by the authorities.

For most of my life all English people were encouraged to be proud of their country and it was regarded as self-evident that England was the land of the English. Now it is not our country and to claim to be English is considered racist.

I have come to regard all mainstream politicians as traitors, and no longer hold any hope for the future. England is dead, murdered by its own treacherous leaders.

AN OLD ENGLISHMAN

Brussels waves the big stick on top jobs for women

When Labour's Harriet Harman floated the idea of forcing private companies to appoint more women to top jobs by imposing gender quotas, the howls of outrage and ridicule were sufficient to see her off and there was no whisper of any such thing in the Labour manifesto.

However, that does not mean British companies are off the hook. Float a daft idea that sounds fair and plausible and, especially if it involves telling people how to run their lives or businesses, and you can be pretty sure the EU will take it up – and so it has in this case.

The Brussels "fundamental rights" commissioner, Viviane Reding, has warned companies across the EU that if they don't significantly increase the numbers of women in their boardrooms

by the end of 2011, she will wheel out new Lisbon Treaty powers to impose gender quotas on them.

On average, women are under-represented on EU company boards, with an average if only about 11 per cent – with Britain slightly below that at one in ten.

In Germany, there is already a target of filling 20 per cent of senior management jobs with women by 2015, but Brussels is looking at a quota that is described as "more ambitious". It is studying a Spanish law requiring firms with more than 250 employees to apply 40 per cent female representation in the boardrooms.

While many businessmen and politicians admit that increasing the number of women in senior private

sector positions is an important aim, there are plenty of opponents to any quota system. They argue that quotas encourage tokenism and are insulting to women. But if they think pious promises to promote more women will do, they might be disappointed.

Reding, of course, is the European commissioner who in a previous life was in charge of telecommunications – the woman who offered mobile phone companies the opportunity to cut their excessive roaming charges by themselves, then whacked them with legislation when they failed to follow the voluntary route.

So, British businesses could soon find themselves scrambling around to find women willing and able to fill up to a fifth of their board seats.

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party
01626 831290

Friday **3rd September**, 10.00-5.30pm
Saturday **4th September**, 9.30-5.00pm

Speakers to include:

UKIP speakers plus

Tom Hind, *NFU Chief Executive*

Peter Mach, *Czech Eurosceptic Party*

Lord Stoddart of Swindon, *Former Labour MP*

Steven Woolfe, *Outspoken City advocate*

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Riviera Centre, Torquay, Devon

Admission details

Friday £20 - Saturday £15

Both days inclusive £28

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Monday **20th September**, 7.00 pm

John Redwood MP

Gabriel Stein, *Director of Lombard Street Research, economic commentator*

PUBLIC MEETING

Princess Alexandra Hall, Over-Seas House, 6 Park Place, St James's Street, London SW1A 1LR

Admission £10

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting on the EU we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

FRINGE MEETINGS

CONSERVATIVE CONFERENCE

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Monday **4th October**

Tuesday **5th October**

Speaker to be announced

THE FREEDOM ZONE

Austin Court, 80 Cambridge Street, Birmingham, Warwickshire B1 2NP

Admission Free

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Monday **4th October**, 2.30 pm

Roger Helmer MEP

Melanie Phillips, *Columnist with the Daily Mail*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Birmingham & Midland Institute, Margaret Street, Birmingham B3 3BS

Admission Free

Conservative Way Forward

0207 403 3990

Monday **4th October**, 8.00 pm

Guest Speaker: Rt Hon Michael Gove

MP, *Secretary of State for Education*

CONFERENCE DINER

ICC, Birmingham

Admission

(Members £50 Non-Members £60)

Details: events@conwayfor.org

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Saturday **6th November**, 10.30 am

Speakers to be announced

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College, London

Admission (details to follow)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2010

UKIP Party **3-4th September**

Party Conference

Torquay

UK Parliament **6th September**

Commons Return

(for 2 weeks)

Lib-Dems **18-22nd September**

Party Conference

Liverpool

Labour Party **26-30th September**

Conference

Manchester

Conservative Party **3-6th October**

Conference

Birmingham

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Gazette

www.britishgazette.co.uk

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.eurosceptic.org.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.ccc.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

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

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

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? Booker 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

Britain Abolished

by James Carver, George Curtis & Torquil Dick-Erikson. £5.00
 The detail is in the sub-title; Democracy Dead, The Rule of Law Exterminated and Your Federal Future.

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.

Fleeced

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.

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.

Climategate - The Crucial Letters

by Steven Mosher and Thomas W. Fuller. £10.00
 Here is the story of what the missing emails on climate change said, resulting in democracy being exchanged for the EU dream of a superstate.

A Lesson in Democracy
 Comparing the EU and the US response to climate alarmism
by Jeremy Niebor. £4.00
 How the EU uses threats to the environment to gain more power over people.

Ten Years On: Britain Without

The European Union
by Dr Lee Rotherham. £5.99
 The real future for the UK is outside the control of the EU, with a foreword by Trevor Kavanagh and an epilogue by Frederick Forsyth.

A Crisis of Trust

by Stuart Wheeler. £7.50
 Wheeler examines, the political culture that has grown up in Britain since EU accession and how it should be put right.

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/€50
 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 Harriet Harman MP

Liberal 01562 68361
 Mr Rob Wheway

Liberal Democrats 020 7222 7999
 Rt Hon Nick Clegg MP

New Britain 020 7247 2524
 Mr Dennis Delderfield

UK Independence Party 01626 831290
 Lord Pearson of Rannoch

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006