

Blair's European obsession puts all our lives at risk

Step by step the foundations of British defence policy are being dismantled in favour of untested and grandiose EU plans that will leave us vulnerable to attack

The most urgent security threat to Britain is that posed by transnational Islamic terrorism. This has been clear since the events of 11th of September, if not before, but intelligence reports have recently brought home the scale of the problem. The most recent of these, the *Military Balance 2004-5*, published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies, suggests that al-Qaeda is present in more than 60 countries and that at least 20,000 jihadists have been trained in its camps since 1996. Half of its leaders and 2,000 rank and file members may have been killed, but a rump leadership is still intact and 18,000 of its members are at large. Recruitment is now thought to be on the increase.

More Menacing

The new terror threat is significantly more menacing than the old. Whereas terrorists formerly sought to kill and injure a limited number of people in order to frighten a much larger number, the contemporary terrorist aims at killing as large a number as possible in order to demoralise nations and to deflect them from protecting their interests. According to the IISS: "*The principal threat to Europe is now transnational terrorism, which potentially entails mass-casualty attacks that the old groups eschewed.*" Such attacks could involve chemical or biological weapons and even missiles. Moreover, the threat to Europe is

thought to be growing for several reasons. The first is that the grievances of European Muslims - from whom the terrorists recruit - appear to be multiplying. These are mainly to do with feelings of economic, social and political marginalisation in the host nations. In the words of the IISS: "*The 'universalisation' of Muslim complaints dovetails with al-Qaeda's anti-Western and pan-Islamic agenda.*"

A further reason for believing that the threat may be escalating is that new-style terror is judged to be inexpensive in relation to its benefits. The Bali bombings are estimated to have cost under \$35,000, the USS Cole Operation about \$50,000 and 11th September less than \$500,000. Given recent successes in freezing the accounts of terrorist groups and in hindering cross-border transfers of their funds, such massacres are reckoned to represent a veritable bargain.

Attractive Target

Further, effective counter-terrorist measures in America may have had the effect of making Western Europe relatively more desirable as a target. According to the IISS: "*Whereas Europe was most valuable to al-Qaeda and its followers as a platform for attacking America before the 11th September, improved homeland security and the involvement of some European countries in the Iraq*

intervention alongside the US have since made it more attractive as a direct target."

If Islamic terrorists armed with modern weaponry constitute the greatest threat to British interests it follows that British defence policy must reflect that fact. It must also take account of a related threat, that posed by the proliferation of missiles armed with weapons of mass destruction, whether in the possession of sub-national groups such as those to be found in the al-Qaeda network or of 'rogue' states such as Iran, Syria and North Korea. The fact that Iraq was found not to be in possession of WMD at the time of the Iraq war does not in any way diminish that threat. For obvious reasons of geography Europe is coming into range of ICBMs based in the Middle East at an earlier date than the US.

Unconditional Determination

All changes to UK defence policy must be judged on the basis of an objective assessment of whether or not they help counter these threats, whether by pre-emption or by frustrating the terrorists in the execution of their plans. For the non-expert such assessments are difficult because of the arcane language in which much of the debate about defence issues is carried out and because of the high-tech aspects of modern weaponry. But the

Continued on P.2

INSIDE: Relative superiority p.2 - Will the French say 'No'? p.3 - Britain 'has set a date for referendum' p.3 - Forty-two years on the arguments are the same p.4 - From the horse's mouth... p.4 - Britain to come under new pressure to harmonise business taxes p.5 - UK's gross contribution to the EU hits £252 million a week! p.5

Blair's EU obsession endangers all our lives

fundamental requirements of anti-terrorist policy are not difficult to understand. To deal effectively with terrorism agents are needed to penetrate Islamic networks and 'turn' their members, linguists who can analyse the propaganda, and high quality surveillance - both human and technical. Above all, we need, an unconditional determination never to yield or to seek an accommodation with terrorists since such accommodation only demonstrates the effectiveness of their action and invites more of the same. In the case of missile proliferation the choice lies between peremption and the development of systems capable of preventing missiles reaching their target.

Political symbolism is therefore important, ambivalence dangerous. When Mrs Thatcher said that she would not deal with terrorists her enemies had greater reason to believe her than Britain's enemies today.

The change is not merely due to a matter of personalities. Despite the Prime Minister's reassurance that the final decision on defence issues will always be taken by the UK government there is a growing EU dimension to UK defence policy which is not only shaping decisions on procurement matters but which conveys important messages to our enemies.

The draft EU Constitution states: "...the union shall define and implement a common foreign and security policy covering all areas of foreign and security policy."

"The Member States shall support the common foreign and security policy actively and unreservedly in a spirit of loyalty and mutual solidarity".

If Britain was a member of a political union whose members' opposition to terrorism was unequivocal and whose readiness to defend themselves robustly was beyond question we would have less reason to fear the security implications of EU

membership. But that is not the case. Some EU members have struck deals with terrorists, others have declined to track down the terrorists in their own midst for cynical political reasons, others have put obstacles in the way of the US in pursuing the perpetrators of September 11th. The fact that one of the biggest recipients of EU aid continues to be the Palestinian Authority which is widely believed to have passed on large sums to terrorist gangs itself speaks volumes about the EU's inability to express itself unambiguously on the subject of terror.

The practical consequences of Britain's gradual absorption into the structures of European defence and the steps being taken to create a 'European defence market' are equally alarming since they threaten to diminish our independence of action while limiting our future ability to take part in joint military operations with the US, the ally upon whom we remain crucially dependent for intelligence.

Complex System

In December 2003, the UK's Defence White Paper stressed the need for interoperability with US forces in an areas in which the emphasis would be on integrated sensors, weapons and decision makers in accordance with the concept of Network Enabled Capabilities (NEC).

But in early October this year the MoD awarded a truck contract to the EU consortium MAN Nutzfahrzeuge AG rather than to an American consortium, Stewart and Stevenson which included British companies. Since the trucks are part of a complex logistical system which is gradually being digitised the decision has been taken as a signal of its intentions in relation to future high-tech purchases. The controversy over this decision has been aptly likened to the Westland-

Sikorski controversy of 1985 - only in this case it has been the European rather than the US option that has been favoured.

The decision to purchase the trucks was made one month after Geoff Hoon threatened that if the US Congress did not pass a waiver permitting classified military technology to be passed to Britain the UK government would spend its defence cash on European items. Initially, Congress refused to issue such a waiver fearing, perfectly reasonably in the light of recent experience, that its military secrets would gradually leak to less trustworthy EU members. It has now passed a partial waiver with which the MoD is said not be entirely happy.

Still more extraordinary is Britain's involvement in the £2.5 billion Galileo project (see *eurofacts* for 12th March and 30th July 2004), the EU's rival to America's Global Positioning System (GPS) which will have a military as well as a civilian capability and in which China has recently invested. According to *The Business* on 24-25th October, at a conference organized by the Royal United Services Institute earlier this year, an EU spokesman confirmed that in the case of an international crisis it would not switch off the system. This means that the US could find itself at war with enemies using Galileo. In reply US officials made it plain that in that case it would take whatever action was necessary in US interests including the destruction of the system, paid for in part by the British taxpayer.

The pattern is clear. Step by step, the tested foundations on which our national defences have been established are being undone and replaced by grandiose, untested and even absurd schemes that answer to political rather than security needs. We will all be at greater risk as a consequence.

Relative superiority

Question to President Chirac at a press conference in Hong Kong on 12th October: "When you return to France, are you going to advise French students to learn Chinese as the first foreign language and English as the second?"

President Chirac: "Alas, in France we're not very good at languages, scarcely better than our British friends!"

Will the French say 'Non'?

The combination of dire economic news and fears of mass Turkish immigration could bring about an eruption of national protest

Could the French say "non" in a referendum on the Constitution and cause the entire European project to collapse? The British eurosceptic MEP Dan Hannan has argued that only a French rejection of the Constitution could halt the process of European integration while a British no vote would be insufficient to achieve this outcome.

Speaking on French television on 24th October Luxembourg's Prime Minister Jean-Claude Juncker seemed to agree with at least part of Hannan's proposition: "A French 'non' would lead Europe into an absolute crisis where there could be no more European dream, no more European ideal to nurture; it would be total paralysis."

Opinion polls suggest that a majority of the French are in favour of the Constitution, but France is an unpredictable and often impatient country in which opposition to the Constitution is growing.

Widespread Fears

Widespread fears about the implications of Turkish entry appear to be colouring attitudes towards the EU - despite President Chirac's assurance that future enlargements would be subject to a plebiscite. Referendum prospects are also likely to be influenced by economic factors. Earlier this year some analysts believed that the economic storm clouds were lifting, but recent economic data suggest the apparent recovery was due to a short-lived spending splurge by consumers who had been saving record amounts of money. The one-off readjustment in the French savings rate

- back in line with its long run average of about 15.3 per cent, down from a recent peak of 16.8 per cent - has now largely come to an end, and with it France's modest economic improvement (*Sunday Business* 24th October, 2004).

Unemployment is again edging up, rising to 9.9 per cent in August compared to 9.8 per cent a year ago. A mere 35 per cent of Frenchmen and women over 55 have jobs, while the remainder have been put off work by high taxes or drawn into retirement by lavish pre-retirement schemes, or by a combination of the two.

Meanwhile, a bevy of reports highlight the dire state of the French economy. The most important of these has been a major study by Michel Camdessus, the former head of the IMF who warned that the French social model was "*being borne on the backs of our children.*"

Absolute Decline

Camdessus blamed the French "work deficit" for the country's problems - a judgement which has not been received with rapture by French trade unions or by the French socialist party, which is currently in the ascendant. Camdessus warned that unless reforms are pushed through soon relative economic decline could turn to absolute decline.

According to his report, potential output growth could collapse from between 2-2.25 per cent a year to 1.75 per cent by 2015 in the absence of radical action to restore incentives, encourage innovation, reduce public debt and cut the size of the public

sector.

M. Camdessus recommended more than 100 reforms in order to reverse decline. The handful of French economists with free-market convictions are highly dubious whether these are sufficiently radical. But it is doubtful whether even a watered down version of them will be adopted. Although warmly welcomed by Nicolas Sarkozy who is shortly stepping down as the French finance minister in order to become leader of the Union for a Popular Movement (UMP) and to prepare for an expected presidential bid, few believe that this chameleon-like figure possesses the iron resolve to do what is required.

Threats and Protests

That the reform process is now in retreat and disarray became clear in early October when the half-hearted plans of the French Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin to liberalise the labour market were emasculated as the result of trade union threats and protests. Given the fact that rocketing oil prices are judged likely to impact more severely on the French economy than that of Britain or the US, it is plain that the French economy is likely to deteriorate still further before there is even a prospect of an improvement. British eurosceptics would be most unwise to bank on it, but it is at least possible that growing unrest about the economy will result in one of those eruptions of protest that characterise French national life and that this will take the form of saying no to the Constitution.

Britain 'has set date for referendum'

A UK referendum on the EU Constitution is to be held in March 2006 - shortly after the UK ends its turn for the Presidency of the European Union in December 2005, according to the *Sunday Telegraph* (24th October). The paper quotes Jack Straw, the Foreign Secretary, as saying: "*We can't do it while we are holding the presidency. But we need to strike while the iron is hot.*"

Forty-two years on the arguments are the same

A reader has sent us the election address of Sir Piers Debenham in 1962, thirteen years before the UK joined the then "Common Market". A shortened version appears below.

Dear Elector,

I ask you to vote for me whatever party you ordinarily belong to.

I stand at this election as an Anti Common Market Candidate believing that a clear expression of the peoples' will is needed to stop the Government signing the Treaty of Rome without consulting the Electorate. I oppose signing that Treaty for these four reasons:-

1. Our System of Government

The Treaty of Rome has already set up what is virtually a Federal Government of the European Community having overriding powers in economic matters.

By this Treaty we should promise for all time that our Law Courts would be bound by decisions of the Community's Law Court and that Parliament would not pass laws that conflicted with the Community's regulations, and would amend existing laws to bring them into line with those regulations. ...

On matters that are very important to us all, our Government would no longer be able to do what we need and wish without the consent of remote civil servants, coming from countries having different political traditions, and not controlled by an elected body.

To sign the Treaty of Rome would upset our Parliamentary system, which for the last hundred years has brought us so many great reforms.

2. Peace and War

Political union is to follow. We should not then be free to choose

between peace and war on our own. We are already linked to the members of the European community by the North Atlantic Treaty. Our forces are under the same Command and there is no opportunity or ground for war between us. In that quarter political union brings no new safeguards.

The division of Germany between East and West is only accepted by Germans because they are too weak to end it. By entering the European Community with the Germans we are making a war with Russia about this more likely. The Americans wish so to strengthen Europe so that it could be left to fight any war it gets into on its own. Now, while Europe is weak, America might have to join in even though she thought Europe in the wrong. This is what happened when both the World Wars broke out.

3. The Commonwealth

Linking ourselves with Europe would separate us from the great Dominions, where our true friends and blood relations live, who have done so much for us in peace and war. This would be ungrateful and unwise. Canada, Australia and New Zealand are fast growing countries. Their trade with us has not lately grown as fast, because our demand for their foodstuffs and raw materials has slowed down. They have been forced to sell their exports cheaply in poorer markets. We shall later regret it, if we sacrifice their goodwill and preferences...

4. Economic Advantage

Economists argue about whether it would make us richer if we entered

Europe; but they agree that the difference one way or the other, is small. In a larger market there can be more specialisation, which would improve productivity; but to cut ourselves off from the free entry of Empire foodstuffs and raw materials, and of cheap eastern textiles, immediately affects our standard of life and our power to compete in world markets. For instance, if our food prices rise till they are as high as on the Continent, more British people will go abroad for their holidays and fewer Europeans will come here. Even if food prices rise, farmers are likely to be worse off; for the European public is unlikely to help farmers as much as we can afford to help the few farmers we have. If we join we shall eventually have to let European workers into this country. They will want to come here because wages are higher, our houses better, and because of our health service. We shall not get on so fast, because we shall have to pull Europe after us.

Economic progress depends on making use of modern science, and on having managers and Trade Unions who do not quarrel. Governments can help a great deal, especially by encouraging scientific training and research. Sweden and Switzerland have shown how much faster small countries move when compared with big ones...

Piers Debenham

From the horse's mouth...

"The Union is not just a club of rich countries; it is not just an economic project. The Union is first and foremost a great political pact between States and peoples who have decided to share their destiny. That "destiny henceforward shared" is referred to in the preamble of the 1951 Treaty establishing the European Coal and

Steel Community. That shared destiny Europe's parliaments and peoples will be asked to give their assent to by ratifying the new Constitutional Treaty... The Constitution consolidates European integration... Only a truly integrated Europe, only the committed support of the Member States for the European political project can help us

build a genuine "special" relationship - on equal terms and based on mutual respect - with our American partners."

Romano Prodi, outgoing President of the EU Commission quoted in the *Wall Street Journal Europe*, 20th October 2004.

Britain to come under new pressure to harmonise business taxes

The economic illiteracy of the German Chancellor has some perverse consequences

When it comes to economic 'reform' EU leaders have a unique talent for getting matters the wrong way around. Gerhard Schröder, the German Chancellor possesses a special flair in this respect. Presenting a seven-point reform package ahead of a 'mini-summit' with President Chirac earlier this week he declared that the aim "must be to boost growth in order to preserve the social model."

Were Ludwig Erhard, the architect of Germany's post-war economic miracle able to speak from the grave there is no doubt about the likely drift of his rebuke:

*"No, Gerhard, you have got matters back to front again: the aim must be to **dismantle** the social model in order to create growth. The once great German economy cannot sustain the costs that have been imposed upon it. It would help if you could understand that when I developed the notion of the 'social market economy' in the 1950s I put the emphasis on the second term in this phrase. By using it I sought to draw attention to fact that the market is not an arid theoretical construct invented by economists but a matter of social relationships that arise in answer to human needs and preferences. When*

you use the phrase, as you often do, you put the emphasis on 'social' and you seem to equate the term with government action. This is economic illiteracy of a high order. You really must try harder to grasp economic fundamentals if Germany is not to sink further into the economic mire. My policies produced a miracle, yours have helped produced ten million unemployed."

Striking Fact

Not many will take heed of Chancellor Schröder's seven point plan which was described in an article by him in the *Wall Street Journal Europe* on the 26th October. But we should take note of one of his demands - the demand for corporate tax harmonisation since it is also made in Wim Kok's only slightly more plausible paper on how to achieve the Lisbon goals on growth and competition (see *eurofacts* for 22nd October).

No reason was adduced in either paper for supposing that tax harmonisation contributes to economic growth - but that maybe because no such evidence exists. Tax competition

encourages efficient use of resources and punishes those who tax relatively heavily as businesses relocate. It is a striking fact that many of those governments which talk loudest about competition go to almost any length to prevent it from occurring in their own sphere.

When tax rates were reduced in Britain in the 1980s business creation and the income from taxation rose. The private sector in Britain grew from 17.3 million employees in 1981 to 21.5 million employees in 1997 - an increase greater than in any other country in Europe. The public sector shrank from 7.2 million employees in 1981 to 5 million employees in 1997.

Along with Reagan's tax cuts the Thatcher policy forced a wave of similar cuts world-wide.

Although rising, business taxes in the UK remain significantly lower than in the eurozone. The strengthening of the European consensus in favour of harmonising corporation tax strongly suggests that Britain is likely to come under still fiercer pressure to bring its rates into line with its EU partners.

UK's gross contribution to the EU hits £252 million a week!

The UK's gross contribution to Brussels hit £252.33 million per week in calendar year 2003, according to the *United Kingdom Balance of Payments: The Pink Book 2004*, ISSN 0950-7558, Table 9.2. That's equivalent to £36.0 million per day, or £1.50 million per hour. This was 11 per cent up on 2002 - roughly five times the UK rate of inflation. And that was for EU-15, before the ten new

countries joined the EU.

The UK's gross receipts from Brussels increased by 9 per cent in 2003, so the balance, the UK net contribution, increased by 15 per cent in 2003, to hit £4.811 billion in total, equivalent to £92.52 million per week.

The overall UK deficit with the EU (trade plus net contribution to Brussels) almost doubled in 2003, from £12.9 billion (in the red) to £22.7

billion (in the red). With Germany alone, the UK trade deficit more than doubled, from £5.2 billion to £10.9 billion.

And guess what? On our trade with the rest of the world outside the EU, the UK was in surplus (in the black) to the tune of £2.2 billion. Must be one of the "benefits" of belonging to the EU!

LETTERS

Tel: 01548 821402 Fax: 01548 821574 email: eurofacts@junepress.com

An Appeal to UKIP voters

Dear Sir,
Roger Knapman's honeyed words in your edition of 22nd October may daydream but they do not clarify. Many of your readers complain (with some justification) that the Conservative Party's official position is not robust enough. Neither they nor Mr Knapman seem to be aware of the hidden truth. The Conservative Party is undergoing a quiet revolution after years of effort. All UKIP can do is ruin it. Let me explain.

At the next election about 30 sitting Tory MPs are standing down. In that group are about 50 per cent of those I would call WOE - weak on Europe. But 100 per cent of those replacing them are ROE - robust on Europe. It gets better.

There are 170 marginal seats usurped eight years ago, now held by Labour or Lib-Dems, which are targeted as 're-winnables'. Over 90 per cent of the young men and women aiming to snatch seats are ROE e.g., down in Gravesham (basically Gravesend) is 39-year-old, fiercely pro-British ex-SAS officer Adam Holloway.

It is utter madness for Roger Knapman to follow the advice of Kilroy-Silk and set a UKIP candidate against this young man, take, say, 2000 Tory votes and let the useless Labour man back in by 1000.

When the new and younger Tories convene on May 3rd (Euro-centrism was a 1970s enthusiasm shared by yesterday's people) it will be a radically euro-sceptic party. So I beseech UKIP voters to take pen in hand and urge Mr Knapman to leave winnable Tory seats alone or allow Blair another term to destroy our country.

FREDERICK FORSYTH
Hertfordshire

Following Instinct

Dear Sir,
I was deeply interested in your correspondence on the subject of UKIP

(22nd October).

In the 1974 Referendum in spite of every reassurance from politicians, press, family and friends that this was a purely economic union, I had a gut feeling that I didn't like it and voted 'no'.

Now, in spite of reassurance from the Conservatives that they will renegotiate our position on Europe, my gut feeling is that I don't trust them and that our only hope is to get out. So, hopeless or not, disloyal to my life-long Party or not, I shall follow my gut feeling and vote for the only party that unequivocally offers escape - UKIP.

MRS JANET WISE
Sussex

A Cannon called Kilroy

Dear Sir,

In a sea battle a "loose cannon" was either tied down or pushed over the side. In a political battle you do the same or the ship sinks!

KEN HUTCHINGS
Wiltshire

Time for Unity

Dear Sir,

Now is the time for unity of purpose, not division. Kilroy-Silk has clearly demonstrated his ability to press the UKIP case for withdrawal from the EU.

Would it not be better for those talents to be focussed upon UKIP's prime objective rather than play for personal party political gain? He is undermining the considerable achievements that both he and other UKIP members made in the June European Elections. The media will play up any divisions in the party to the detriment of all who share the view that the UK should leave the EU. With the correct focus perhaps such financially valuable supporters as Paul Sykes would reconsider the direction to which their generous funds are targeted.

R.S.GALLIANO
Buckinghamshire

Influence without Representation

Dear Sir,

Some popular movements achieve their aims without a single Member of Parliament.

The suffragettes for example, achieved the first steps for the female vote which lead inexorably to a universal female vote in this country; the Referendum Party achieved a commitment to a referendum by all parties on the euro - which looks to have preserved the pound.

Many UKIP supporters still do not appreciate the scale of their victory! UKIP have actually achieved a Conservative Party volte-face on the EU. Think about it! Their policies inexorably will lead us in the UK to a 'Norway/Switzerland' EU relationship - provided the Tories win the next election.

As a former Referendum candidate, I was a fervent 'UKIP' supporter. Now, I feel it's time to stop protesting and start winning at Westminster. So I'm voting Conservative. Judging from the recent Euro-elections, our combined vote can deliver what we voted for in 1973.

ROBYN GRANT
Surrey

Aren't we Lucky!

Dear Sir,

What marvellous value for money is our contribution to the EU! (*Please see bottom of P.5 - Ed.*) We get benefits such as these:

- 96,000 pages of regulation
- No fishing problems (no fish, no licences)
- Peter Mandelson away from Parliament
- Eurosceptic MEPs paid as much as Europhiles
- No need to legislate (all the thinking already done in Brussels).

So, for a measly £4 a week, 60 million Britons can rest secure in the knowledge that Her Majesty's elected government is carrying out the will of the people, with 24 per cent of voters' support.

ALAN ORME
Hampshire

MEETINGS

The Bruges Group
020-7287 4414

International Conference

“The European Union: In or Out?”

Saturday 6th November

10.30 am - 6.15 pm

(2.00 pm Bruges Group vs The Federal Trust)

Speakers to be announced

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College, London

Admission £20 Members

(£25 for non-Members)

Includes lunch and refreshments.

Sanity

01962-711112

Thursday **18th Nov. 2004** 7.30 pm

“The Destruction of England”

Lindsay Jenkins, *author of Britain Held Hostage and The Last Days of Britain.*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Guildhall, Winchester, Hampshire

Admission £3

Gresham College

020-7831 0575

Tuesday **30th Nov. 2004**, 6.00 pm

“Europe and the old Constitution”

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holburn, London

Admission Free

Campaign for an Independent Britain

01224-313473

Saturday **16th April 2005** 2.30 pm

“Defeating the EU Constitution”

Speakers to be announced

The Emmanuel Centre, 9-13 Marsham Street, London SW1P 3DW
Admission Free

MEDIA COMPLAINTS

The Advertising Standards Authority

2 Torrington Place, London WC1E

7HW. Tel: 020-7580 5555

Fax: 020-7631 3051

complaints page: www.asa.org.uk

BBC

www.bbc.co.uk

[/info/bbc/complaints.shtml](http://info/bbc/complaints.shtml)

Broadcasting Standards Commission

7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS

Tel: 020-7233-0544 Fax: 020-7233

0397 E-mail: bsc@bsc.org.uk

www.bsc.org.uk

Independent Television Commission

33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB

Tel: 020-7255 3000

E-mail: programme@itc.org.uk or

advertising@itc.org.uk

www.itc.org.uk

Press Complaints Commission

1 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JB

Tel: 020-7353 1248

Fax: 020-7353 8355

How to complain page:

www.pcc.org.uk

Radio Authority

Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen

Street, London WC2B 5DG

Tel: 020-7430 2724

Fax: 020-7405 7064

www.radioauthority.org.uk

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004

EU Summit

17th December

2005

Luxembourg takes over

EU presidency

1st January

UK takes over

EU presidency

1st July

2006

Austria takes over

EU presidency

1st January

Finland takes over

EU presidency

1st July

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Monday **8th November 2004**, 4.30 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Union Rail Policy: Liberalisation of International Rail Freight in Europe* from Mr Heinz Hilbrecht, Director DG-TREN, European Commission; and (b) Mr Tony McNulty MP, Minister of State, Department of Transport.

Tuesday **9th November 2004**, 10.35 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Future Financing of the European Union* from Terry Wynn MEP.

Tuesday **9th November 2004**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Scientific Aspects of Ageing* from Professor Sally Davies, Ms Susan Lonsdale, and Mr Craig Muir, Department of Health; Mr Paul Williams, Office of Science and Technology; and Ms Ann Frye, Department for Transport.

Wednesday **10th Nov. 2004**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on *EU Counter-Terrorism Activities* from Richard Thomas, Information Commissioner, and David Smith, Assistant Information Commissioner.

Wednesday **10th Nov. 2004**, 3.40 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Energy Efficiency* from the Carbon Trust.

Wednesday **10th Nov. 2004**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on *Procedural Rights in Criminal Proceedings* from Criminal Law Practitioners.

Thursday **11th Nov. 2004**, 10.45 am

Evidence will be heard on *Current Developments in European Foreign Policy* from Dr Denis MacShane MP, Minister for Europe, FCO.

Monday **15th November 2004**, 4.30 pm

Evidence will be heard on *European Union Rail Policy: Liberalisation of International Rail Freight in Europe* from Network Rail.

Tuesday **16th November 2004**, 10.35 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Future Financing of the European Union* from witnesses to be confirmed.

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

Germany's Four Reichs
by Harry Beckhough. **£5.00**

Idiosyncratic history of Germany by Englishman, El Alamein, Burma, Bletchley (codebreaker), who knew Adenauer well.

What if we say No to the EU Constitution?
by Lord Blackwell. **£5.00**

Britain can and should settle an arrangement with the EU that preserves its political, economic and constitutional independence.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union
by Christopher Booker & Richard North. **£20.00**

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

Saving England

The Case for Independence: Why England Should Declare UDI
by Vernon Coleman. **£8.99**
Coleman, inimitably and deadly accurately spells it out in 85 short chapters.

Will the EU's Constitution Rescue its Currency?

by Professor Tim Congdon, CBE. **£2.00**
Could this constitution be easily adapted for taxation at an EU level?

Britain and the European Project
by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

Reflections on sovereignty, history, politics, psychology and economics. How they point to the UK regaining her independence.

The Essential Guide to the European Union
by Ruth Lea. **£12.50**

A detailed yet accessible picture, right up to date, of how the European Union works now and in the future.

EUROPE

A Concise Encyclopedia of the European Union
by Rodney Leach. **£14.99**

The fourth update of this highly informative and necessary encyclopedia.

A Cost Too Far?

by Ian Milne. **£8.50**
A fully worked out cost/benefit analysis of Britain's EU membership.

The Fate of Britain's National Interest

by Professor Kenneth Minogue. **£4.00**
The author argues that the national interest is being undermined by legal activists and international bureaucrats.

Galileo - The Military and Political Dimensions

by Dr Richard North. **£4.00**
A European satellite positioning technology that has hidden implications for the whole world.

The Need for Nations
by Roger Scruton. **£8.50**

Why the nation states of Europe need to regain their sovereignty, to keep peace, prosperity and defend human rights.

V I D E O

Shockwaves

by Sanity - Video **£5.00**
A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the UK.

Send Payment to

THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA
Tel: 01548-821402
Fax: 01548-821574
Email: info@junepress.com
www.junepress.com

PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY) Ring for foreign rates

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£14
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

Please send me *eurofacts* fortnightly and the occasional briefing papers for the next year.

I enclose my payment of £.....
to *eurofacts*: PO Box 119
Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

European Commission	020-7973 1992
European Movement	020-7940 5252
Federal Trust	020-7735 4000

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403-741736
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020-8922 0089
Campaign against the Single Currency	07071-663876
Campaign for an Independent Britain	020-8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
Freedom Association	01746-861267
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020-7691 3800
New Alliance	020-7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224-313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372-453678
------------------------	--------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	
New Frontiers	020-7808 7772

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020-7222 9000
Rt Hon Michael Howard MP	
Democratic Party	01684-891700
Mr Geoff Southall	
Labour	020-7802 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562-68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020-7222 7999
Rt Hon Charles Kennedy MP	
New Britain Party	020-7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	0121 333 7737
Roger Knapman MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006