

## More destructive of British values than terrorism

*The project to create a European state is doing far more damage to British identity than Islamic fundamentalism*

In the wake of the London bombings of 7th July many commentators suggested that the underlying aim of the bombers was to destroy our way of life and even our sense of national identity. In this vein, a leader in the *Daily Telegraph* reflected on the essential components of our identity. Statutory patriotism, it rightly averred, was un-British, but it was possible to identify the non-negotiable components of British-ness and it went on to list ten of them.

### Public Reaction

Although we do not know what the public reaction will be to further terrorist attacks on London or other British cities, thus far there appears little reason to suppose that Islamic terrorists will succeed in destroying the essential characteristics of being British. But when reflecting on the *Telegraph* list it is impossible not to observe that where the terrorist has so far failed others have met with an astonishing measure of success. *eurofacts* readers will have no difficulty in guessing the primary source from which the threat comes. Of the ten "essential components" of national identity at least six have been seriously eroded through Britain's membership of the EU.

Stressing the fundamental importance of one such component - **the sovereignty of the Crown in Parliament** - the *Telegraph* declared:

*"The Lords, the Commons and the monarch constitute the supreme authority in the land. There is no appeal to any higher jurisdiction, spiritual or temporal."* The reality is that sixty per cent of our laws originate in Brussels, that British law is subordinate to European law, and where disputes occur there is most certainly the right of appeal to higher authority - to the European Court of Justice. Already marginalised, the monarchy is on its way to obsolescence. Like Ken Clarke, the *Daily Telegraph* leader writer does not appear to have read the Maastricht Treaty.

Acknowledging the centrality of **the rule of law** to the British way of life the *Telegraph* asserts: *"No one is above the law - not even in Government."* Well, actually an increasing number of senior EU officials enjoy a remarkable array of legal immunities - not to mention a formidable list of privileges. To such an extent that even one europhile Lib Dem peer - Lord Wallace of Saltaire - has warned of a future public backlash.

### State Coercion

When it comes to **individual liberty** the *Telegraph* is surely right to say that there should be a presumption always and everywhere against state coercion and that eccentricity should be tolerated to the point of lunacy. There *should* be such a presumption but as a

consequence of EU membership this can no longer be taken for granted: the major threats to individual liberty in the form of state coercion including the European Arrest Warrant, identity cards, and mandatory data retention requirement on service providers have originated in Brussels where enthusiasm for harmonisation greatly exceeds a liking for eccentricity.

Respect for **British institutions** in which British freedom and the British character are immanent is a core value, the *Telegraph* suggests. Whether one is talking of the great institutions of state or those of civil society it is difficult to think of a single one whose activities are not curtailed or diminished as the result of EU regulations or deals struck by the Council of Ministers.

### Common Values

**Membership of the English speaking world** - the anglosphere in modern parlance - is undeniably central to our idea of the British place in the world, as the *Telegraph* maintains. But, as the result of EU membership, step by step Britain has been forced to distance itself from the countries to which it has been linked through common political values, shared historical experience and language.

At the heart of British identity is **the British character**, which, says the *Telegraph*, shapes British institutions

**Continued on P.2**

**INSIDE:** Tell us where the CAP money goes p.2 - **Today Europe, tomorrow the world: EU Security and Defence Policy** p.3 - **Is Britain heading for the exit door?** p.4 - **Straws in the wind - 1** p.4 - CAP boomerangs on Chirac p.5 - **Straws in the wind - 2** p.5 - Straws in the wind - 3 p.5 - **Straws in the wind - 4** p.5 - Straws in the wind - 5 p.6 - **A Citizens Guide to Statistics** p.6

# Tell us where the CAP money goes

*The demand for full details about who benefits from the Common Agricultural Policy is gathering strength and may have unexpected consequences*

The campaign to force European governments to divulge how they divide the millions of euros they receive in farm subsidies is gathering strength - and may have some wide-reaching consequences.

In June the campaigners succeeded in pressing the British government to produce that data which confirmed what most people suspected - that the bulk of the money goes to agribusinesses and large landowners while small farmers receive very little. But the specificity of the report's findings - not least the revelation that the beneficiaries of a system that impoverishes the world's poorest farmers include the Queen and Prince Charles - brought home the immorality and absurdity of the CAP in a way that statistics alone would not have done.

Pressed to produce similar information the Dutch government has revealed that major beneficiaries in the Netherlands include Cees Veeman, the Minister of Agriculture who received 190,000 from the CAP during 2003. In June Mr Veeman angrily threatened to resign when the Dutch Prime Minister Jan Peter Balkenende offered cautious support for Tony Blair's demand for

a reduction in CAP subsidies.

In Denmark, Mariann Fishcher Boel, the Danish Minister for Agriculture held out for 18 months against demands for information about how the subsidies are used. But when the figures were finally released these revealed that Mrs Boel, with her husband the owner of three farms, was herself a significant beneficiary, receiving no less than DKK389,000 ( 52,200) during 2003. Other major beneficiaries included three further government ministers, former ministers, MPs and members of the Danish royal family.

## Full Disclosure

The campaigners, who have enjoyed some success in extracting information from the Irish and Spanish governments, believe that they are on the verge of getting the Swedish government to make full disclosure about where the money goes.

No one it seems has yet had the temerity to press France, the largest national beneficiary under the CAP to say what it does with the money (France receives £117 per capita and the UK a mere £45.). It seems most

unlikely, however, that it is likely to be forthcoming.

French officials have not only failed to cooperate with attempts by the Court of Auditors to ensure that the cash is spent according to the rules, but have actually obstructed it in its duties (see *eurofacts* for 8th July). In the circumstances it seems reasonable to assume either that the list of French beneficiaries includes some very big political names indeed - or that the consistent lack of transparency conceals significant wrong-doing.

For decades the French have taken it for granted that the CAP preserves a unique culture which would not survive if exposed to the full blast of global competition. Recent studies have thrown doubt about this cherished assumption, even in France. If the reputation of the CAP is further tarnished by revelations about where the money goes - or even by a French government refusal to match the candour of other EU governments in saying what happens to it - then finally, and thankfully, the days of the CAP may be numbered. On the other hand, given its remarkable powers of survival, we wouldn't bet on it even now.

Continued from P.1

## More destructive of values than terrorism

and in turn is shaped by them. But these days the most powerful institutions are European ones. These are opaque, undemocratic, often corrupt and usually inefficient. We can hardly expect them to have a beneficial impact on the evolution of the British character. Indeed, their baleful influence can already be perceived in the refusal of ministers and officials to take responsibility for their actions

and, whenever convenient, to take refuge behind evasions and falsehoods. Membership of the EU alone cannot be held responsible for this fall in standards, but it has most certainly produced a rhetoric of deception that exceeds by far the normal prevarications of political life.

The conclusion can only be that 'Europe' has damaged British identity far more effectively and

comprehensively than the deluded young men who have strapped parcels of explosive to their bodies in pursuit of a perverse and impossible dream. The task of any truly patriotic political party must not be simply to defend national identity against further erosions, but to revive and restore what has been lost. The restoration of nationhood should be starting point for any party seeking to renew itself.

# Today Europe, tomorrow the world: EU Security and Defence Policy

*Technological change is being used as a pretext for harmonising European defence policy - and for distancing Britain from its traditional ally*

**By Gerard Batten**

The defeat of the European Constitution in the French and Dutch referenda caused many to breathe a sigh of relief in the belief that it had been dealt two mortal blows. But the European Union, after an initial moment of panic, has decided that a "period of reflection" is in order. What this means is that the constitution will be re-engineered in order to be foisted on the peoples of Europe in a modified form at some point in the not too distant future. Meanwhile, large sections of the draft constitution are being implemented anyway. One such area is the Common Security and Defence Policy, and this will have major consequences for Britain's foreign policy and defence capabilities.

The Common Security and Defence Policy, the EU maintains, requires a military capability - in effect a European Army, although it is never referred to as such. The practical needs of this new army will be served by a European Defence Agency. This was proposed in the draft constitution, and like the CSDP itself, might reasonably be supposed to be dead in the water. In practice, it has survived the collapse of the treaty and its legitimacy is now defended on the basis of existing treaties.

The purpose of the EDA is to promote the Security and Defence Policy and a "European Defence Identity". It is intended to 'coordinate and promote the development of European military capabilities, research and technology, military equipment, and foster the establishment of a European defence market'. This is being done at the same time as a revolution occurs in military technology and the way in which military forces are equipped and deployed.

This development will have major implications for the Army's armoured fighting vehicles, and the way in which

computer technology is used to coordinate their operations on the battlefield. In the electronic age the ability of our forces to fight alongside other units will be determined by decisions about which systems we purchase.

Key to UK defence planning is the Future Rapid Reaction Effects System (FRES) which will create weapons and vehicles systems co-ordinated through satellite positioning systems. In conjunction with the Chinese the EU is about to develop its own satellite system, Galileo, and there are profound but unanswered questions about the compatibility of Britain's new fighting systems with the USA's Global Positioning System (GPS) which is currently used by NATO.

## **No Discussion**

Britain's armed forces, like so much else, will be harmonised with those of other EU member states. This will be achieved by the piecemeal implementation of a succession of technical measures, largely through the acquisition of common European hardware and systems. There has been little parliamentary or public discussion of any of this, but one day Britain will wake up to find its armed forces are inextricably bound to the new European 'military capability' and are consequently incapable of fighting on the same battlefield as US units. And that is the intention.

Under agreements reached in 1999, a European Rapid Reaction Force was to be created consisting of military, maritime and combat aircraft contributed from member states and capable of deploying 60,000 personnel within 60 days. The European Commission and member states were called upon to "do preliminary work" for the building of the ERRF. The start date was not the coming into force of

the draft constitution but its signing. The pre-structuring of the ERRF therefore formally began on 29th October 2004.

The British government claims that NATO will remain the cornerstone of British defence policy and that the ERRF will only be assembled in response to a 'crisis' and only for the duration of that crisis. Does the ERRF constitute an army? The EU denies this on the basis that it is not a 'standing army'. But neither were the forces that liberated the continent in 1944; they were made up of British, US, Commonwealth and other forces, but no one doubted that they constituted an 'allied army'. EU President Romano Prodi admitted to the *Independent* newspaper in 2000 that it is intended to be an army, whatever it was called.

Under the draft constitution it was intended that defence matters could only be decided by a unanimous decision of the Council but when we look at the small and dwindling number of areas still decided by unanimity it is a safe bet that before long defence policy too will be subject to qualified majority voting.

The European military capability (army to me and you) is, as we are told in Security and Defence Committee meetings, to be primarily used for humanitarian and peace-keeping functions, and these are to be outside EU borders. It is openly stated that an EU military capability will be used pre-emptively for such purposes, possible theatres of activity being the Balkans and Africa. The scenarios where pre-emptive action taken by the EU could escalate are all too easy to imagine. Almost inevitably the continued implementation of the Security and Defence Policy by the EU will see the EU aggrandizing power and military capability at the expense of NATO. In the long run, the

**Continued on P.4**

# Is Britain heading for the exit door?

*The referendums in France and Holland have changed the political climate in a way that makes withdrawal respectable to talk about*

The French and Dutch rejection of the EU Constitution may not have slowed the pace of European political integration but in Britain at least it has had one desirable consequence: those advocating withdrawal are no longer assumed to be deranged.

To put the matter slightly more rigorously, the argument that we should give notice of leaving the formal political structures of the European Union in favour of a new relationship with the EU is no longer regarded as being beyond the limits of respectable political debate. The political weather has changed and among the first to acknowledge this fact has been Dan Hannan, the MEP and journalist who declared in the *Sunday Telegraph* on

28th August: “We can call it *renegotiation, or associate membership, or leaving the EU and striking a different kind of deal with it. What we call it matters less than the content. It is perfectly possible to enjoy full access to EU markets while freeing ourselves of the accompanying costs of membership.*”

If the courageous Mr Hannan had been an infantry officer in Flanders he would have been among the first to go over the top. As it is, he is the first elected Conservative politician since the No votes in France and Holland to call for British withdrawal.

How many more will follow, if only out of fear that their position on Europe will soon seem as dated as yesterday’s

latest fashion? In the 1980s the Conservative politician Keith Joseph was dismissed as ‘mad’ when he began to urge his party to abandon the Middle Way preoccupations with neo-Keynsian demand management, exchange controls, prices and incomes policies and cosy deals with trade unions. But within a very short space of time he found that most of his party colleagues agreed with him publicly and a growing number of those in the Labour Party were prepared to do so privately.

Are we approaching a similar tipping point? We cannot be sure but we print below a number of further indicators that suggest the political mood in Britain (and elsewhere) is changing.

## Straws in the wind - 1

The Tory Party at Westminster tends to talk in code when it comes to European issues, not least during a leadership contest - even Lord Tebbit. Thus, while he did not actually use the word ‘withdrawal’, writing in *The Daily Telegraph* on 13th August, he set out a course that would surely lead to Britain’s departure from the formal structures of the EU and a new relationship with it. He wrote: “It [a Tory government] *should regain the power to make our own laws and to control who should be admitted here. That would mean a fundamental renegotiation with the EU of our relationship with it. ‘Ever closer union’ should be repudiated, along with the supremacy of the European Court, and we should look to normal government-to-government treaties to conduct activities such as cross-*

*border trade, pollution control and extradition.*”

“An early exit from the European agricultural and fisheries policies, renewed sovereignty over our coastal waters and an end to the European Court’s extra-territorial jurisdiction would be embraced...”

Tory ‘modernisers’ were quick to criticise Lord Tebbit’s proposals, arguing that not having recently fought an election he was quite clearly ‘out of touch’.

It is therefore reassuring to note that *Direct Democracy: An Agenda for a New Model Party\**, a pamphlet written by 23 of the Conservative Party’s youngest and brightest talents, most of whom fought the 2005 election, has come to rather similar conclusions to Lord Tebbit:

“If Britain is to be a democratic

country, it cannot accept the supremacy of regulations passed by unaccountable functionaries. Just as we should apply that precept at home, so we should extend it to Brussels. The Reserve Powers Act discussed earlier should specify that policies stemming from foreign treaty obligations would come into force only following their specific implementation by Parliament; and Sections Two and Three of the European Communities Act should be repealed to the same end...”

“The EU...is constantly centralising powers, and heaping ever higher the *acquis communautaire*, the accumulated pile of Brussels legislation. It is this, ultimately, that militates against our participation.”

\*Published by [direct-democracy.co.uk](http://direct-democracy.co.uk)

Continued from P.3

## Today Europe, tomorrow the world

European Union does not seek to complement US military power, but to rival it. That aim is expressed in many quarters of the European Parliament. The mystery is why Tony

Blair, given his pro-American rhetoric, should prefer to entrust Britain’s defences to the European Union - ‘a military pygmy’ in George Robertson’s words - rather than to an

alliance with a tried and tested ally, the USA.

*Gerard Batten is UKIP MEP for London*

# CAP boomerangs on Chirac

Jacques Chirac is turning out to be the most incompetent French president since.....well, Mitterrand, his immediate predecessor.

In making his frontal and heavily-mediated attack on the British rebate Chirac seems not to have realised that the reason it's there is to mitigate - a bit - the grotesque unfairness of the CAP to the UK. The British responded to Chirac's attack by publicly and explicitly linking any change in the rebate to CAP reform. (A prime example by the way of British negotiating incompetence, but that's

another matter.)

Now, in France, the Chirac-initiated spat over the EU Budget has boomeranged in spectacular fashion. In July and August (admittedly months when the French focus on holidays) a previously-unthinkable debate has got under way on whether the CAP is good for French farmers in particular and for France in general. Articles have appeared in the serious French press saying that the Blair position (that it's economic folly to spend 40 per cent of the EU Budget on 2 per cent of the EU economy) deserves attention. Worse, from Chirac's point of view, many of

these articles are going much further, suggesting that French and European farming should look to the Australian and New Zealand examples, of more or less unsubsidised agriculture, for inspiration.

This doesn't mean that the CAP's going to disappear overnight. But it does mean that even the French are beginning to realise that the CAP's doomed. Once that realisation becomes widespread, the main emotional and psychological prop to the French belief that there's no alternative to the EU will have disappeared.

## Straws in the wind - 2

*Which way to go has to depend on what the British people decide is in their best interests and what they vote to see implemented. The new mood in Europe reflects the fact that radical alternatives are no longer the preoccupation of a relatively small dissident minority. As the failings of the existing EU model become increasingly apparent and evidently less and less acceptable, the options for major change become more realistic. In no country are these likely*

*to be more apparent than in the UK both because our traditions are more different from those of other Member States than the average and because we have had - and will continue to have as long as we are members - such a remarkably poor economic deal from the EU. Over any time span, the single biggest determinant of any country's self esteem, its position in the world and its ability to be at ease with itself stems from its economic performance. Ours has been pulled down by EU*

*membership and would almost certainly be better in the short and the long term if we were no longer members. ...We need to look outward to the wider world, and not to feel permanently obliged to tie our future to institutions and policies which are manifestly failing both in themselves and in their ability to bring the people with them.*

July issue of *Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign Bulletin*

## Straws in the wind - 3

Maurice Druon, Member of the Académie Française, KBE, is a distinguished Frenchman who as a young second lieutenant joined de Gaulle in London in 1940. His anglophilia dates from those dark days; he has been a constant, sincere and genuine friend of the United Kingdom ever since. In an article in *Figaro* on 12th August 2005 entitled "Chère Angleterre" he discusses the UK's position in the EU, and concludes:

"Isn't it time to look reality in the face? Wouldn't it be better for the

UK, and for us, if the UK withdrew from the political institutions of the EU, and became instead a 'privileged partner' of the latter? One can't remain indefinitely 'in or out'."

He cites a number of reasons why the UK should leave the EU. The UK won't join the euro. She continues to look beyond Europe to the "wide open seas", just as Churchill did. She won't cut the umbilical cord with the USA, and allows herself to be dominated by the latter. To please the USA, she supports Turkish entry

to the EU, oblivious of the question of the geographical limits of the EU and of the enormous demographic and financial implications of Turkish entry. In contrast, she has a profound distrust of Russia, whose energy reserves will become more and more indispensable to Europeans

Druon is absolutely right. His view is undoubtedly shared by a growing and influential number of people in France and the rest of the EU - and of course in the UK. How long will it take for that view to be adopted by Britain's political elites?

## Straws in the wind - 4

A YouGov poll commissioned by UKIP shows that fifty per cent would vote to leave the UK in a referendum, while 62 per cent think that such a referendum should be held. The poll which involved more

than 2000 people was carried out between 22-25th July. The question asked was: *If a referendum was held and these were the available options which would you choose?*

Britain remaining in the EU - 34

per cent.

Britain leaving the EU and replacing our membership with a free trade agreement - 50 per cent.

Don't know - 17 per cent.

# LETTERS

Tel: 08456 12 12 65 Fax: 08456 12 12 75 email: [eurofacts@junepress.com](mailto:eurofacts@junepress.com)

## Impossible to Integrate

Dear Sir,  
*eurofacts* (29th July 2005) suggests that “radical Imams funded from outside the UK are discouraging the process of assimilation”. Islam cannot be assimilated into UK society. Our liberal, secular, hedonistic society is anathema to Islam. Those with an interest in the subject should read the Koran and understand the Tawhid and Sharia. Much of what takes place in the UK today is anathema also to all decent indigenous people! Our levels of crime are the highest in Europe, we have the highest number of single parents, highest incidence of STD’s, highest dependency levels on drugs and alcohol. The list is long. Muslims cannot marry outside of the Faith and so for this and many other reasons it is wrong to suggest that radical Imams are preventing integration.

PAUL RHODES  
London

## Can we wait until 2041?

Dear Sir,  
Adding the words “*to appease the Tory party*” in apparent confirmation that some would rather hunt Tories than foxes or Eurocrats, Ian Smith challenges me (letters 18th July) to explain why UKIP should vote

tactically rather than contest seats indiscriminately.

If my letter of 10th June was not clear enough, he can find the answer in his own figures which show UKIP to have reached its best-ever support of 1227 votes per Parliamentary candidate in the 2005 election; up from 899 in 2001. An average of 19,000 votes seems to have been necessary to win a seat in 2005; so if UKIP can sustain this percentage rate of increase, it will start winning in the 2041 Parliamentary election - assuming that we are still having them then.

Unfortunately, on present trends, power will probably all have been concentrated in Brussels and the Regions by then, and our Parliament (if it still exists in other than a ceremonial role) may already have surrendered its power to take Britain out of the European Union.

But I don’t wish to discourage anyone from campaigning - only from being prepared to wait until 2041 before having any influence. As I pointed out, by voting tactically instead of contesting every seat regardless, UKIP could gain real influence straight away, without giving up any chance to bid for independent office if the polls should show that to have come within realistic reach.

ANTHONY HOYLE  
Buckinghamshire

## The Maddest Mullah?

Dear Sir,  
What can be done about Muktar Ibrahim Clarke, sometimes known to his followers simply as “Ken”?

This fanatical europhile was born in this country into a respectable middle-class English home, attended a grammar school, enjoyed the benefits of a Cambridge education and rose in his chosen profession as a member of the English bar before becoming a member of the Mother of Parliaments.

And yet he has declared a jihad against that Parliament, the pound sterling and the supremacy of British law, placing a monstrous ambition at the service of these evil goals. He may recently have issued a partial ‘recantation’ but it is clear that his ultimate aims remain unchanged and that he will stop at nothing.

It is hard to comprehend the workings of so closed a mind, impossible to reason with it.

In the interests of the nation, Chairman Maude must issue a fatwah instructing ordinary decent Conservatives to ban this man from their supper meetings, tombolas and summer fetes. Only in this way can young and impressionable minds be protected from so perverse an influence.

HECTOR BOFFEY  
London

## Straws in the wind - 5

“...important voices question the legitimacy of the EU. Again, I think I am lucky in my timing. Once it seemed as if deep suspicion of the EU was confined to Britain and, with no

rejectionist party in parliament, that side of the argument tended to get ignored, or covered as part of a Conservative feud. Now the question ‘What is the EU for?’ is fundamental to

the story I am telling.”

Mark Mardell, writing in the *Guardian* on 30th August on his appointment as BBC Europe Editor.

## A Citizen’s Guide to Statistics

Ian Milne’s new publication is a reference-book listing 58 separate sources of economic statistics at the global, regional and country level (the latter covering the UK, the USA, Germany and France). The main

categories are Population and Demography; GDP; Trade and Balance of Payments; Foreign Direct Investment; and the European Union Budgets. The aim is to give non-specialists the capacity to question the pronouncements of experts and the

politicians and others who employ them. Read Milne and prevent them pulling the wool over your eyes!

“*A Citizen’s Guide to Economic Statistics*” is available free in PDF format at [www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

# MEETINGS

**London Swinton Circle**  
0208 691 7495

Tuesday **13th Sept. 2005**, 7.00 pm

**Simon Heffer**, *Journalist and author*

SUMMER MEETING & BUFFET  
The Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53  
Whitehall, London SW1  
**Admission £15.00**  
(Tickets from The Swinton Circle, PO  
Box 29208, London SE8 3ZU)

**Gresham College**  
020-7831 0575

Tuesday **20th Sept. 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Alternative Electoral Systems”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA**  
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

**Gresham College**  
020-7831 0575

Wednesday **28th Sept. 2005**, 6.00 pm

“Leadership and Change:  
Prime Ministers in the Post-War World”  
**Professor Vernon Bogdanor FBA**  
CBE, *Gresham Professor of Law*  
**Response**, *Philip Ziegler*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Staple Inn Hall, High Holburn, London  
**Admission Free**

## FRINGE MEETINGS

**Labour Conference. Brighton**

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**  
01692 402339

Monday **26th Sept. 2005**, 5.30 pm

“Britain, the EU and Democracy”  
**Tony Benn**  
**Kelvin Hopkins MP**  
**John Mills**  
Chairman, **Austin Mitchell MP**

Creations, 78 West Street, Brighton  
**Admission Free (Free refreshments)**

**Conservative Conference. Blackpool**

**The Bruges Group**  
020 7287 4414

Tuesday **4th October 2005**, 12.45 pm

“DEBATE: The Conservative Party,  
where next?”  
**John Redwood MP**  
vs  
**Steve Richards**, *Chief Political*  
*Commentator*, *The Independent*

The Adam Room, The Claremont Hotel,  
North Promenade  
**Admission Free**

**The Freedom Association**  
01746 861267

Tuesday **4th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“The welfare state we’re in”  
**James Bartholomew**, *Author and*  
*journalist*

The Regency Suite, The Ruskin Hotel,  
Albert Road  
**Admission Free**

**The Freedom Association**  
01746 861267

Wednesday **5th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“Why we should leave the European  
Union”  
**Philip Davies MP**, *Shipley*  
**Christopher Gill**, *Hon Chairman, TFA*

The Regency Suite, The Ruskin Hotel,  
Albert Road  
**Admission Free**

**Independence/Democracy**  
**Group Rally**  
0121 333 1536

Friday **7th October 2005**  
10.00 am to 5.00 pm

**Speakers include**  
**Jens-Peter Bonde MEP**, **Nigel Farage**  
**MEP**, **Sir Teddy Taylor**, **Philippe de**  
**Villiers MEP**, **Vladimir Zelezny MEP**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Central Hall, Storey’s Gate, London  
**Admission Free**

**The Freedom Association**  
(City of London Branch)  
0207 488 4533

Tuesday **11th October 2005**, 12.30 pm

**Ruth Lea**, *An Economist*

PUBLIC MEETING  
The Counting House pub, 50 Cornhill,  
London EC3V 3PD  
**Admission Free**

**Tough Talking From The Right**  
0208 691 7495

Saturday **15th October 2005**, 1.00 pm

“EU fraud and corruption”  
**Ashley Mote MP**, *Journalist and*  
*author*

MEETING & BUFFET  
The Parliament Room, The Clarence, 53  
Whitehall, London SW1  
**Admission £15.00**  
(Tickets from Allan Robertson TTFTR,  
PO Box 29208, London SE8 3ZU)

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2005

German **18th September**  
Parliamentary Elections  
(to be confirmed)

Liberal Democrats **17-22nd September**  
Party Conference

Labour Party **25-29th September**  
Conference

Conservative Party **3-6th October**  
Conference

United Kingdom **7-8th October**  
Independence Party  
Conference

UK Parliamentary **10th October**  
Recess Ends

ECOFIN meeting **11th October**

GAERC meeting **14-15th October**

ECOFIN meeting **8th November**

GAERC meeting **12-13th December**

**Britain and the European Union:  
Alternative Futures**

by Mark Baimbridge, Brian Burkitt and Philip Whyman. **£7.50**

A critical analysis of UK membership, with credible alternative options.

**A Throne in Brussels**

by Paul Belien. *Hdbk* **£25.00**

A penetrating historical analysis which warns that the EU is heading the way of Belgium.

**The Case for Commonwealth Free Trade**

by Brent Cameron. **£11.26**

The Canadian author explores at length the pros, cons and practicalities of a Commonwealth Free Trade Area.

**The Great Abdication**

by Alexander Deane. **£8.95**

The strap line explains all. "Why Britain's decline is the fault of the middle class".

**Britain and the EU: Time to Move On**

by Christopher Hoskin. **£3.95**

The EU malaise and the cure.

**The ECB and the Euro:**

**The First Five Years**

by Otmar Issing. **£10.00**

An upbeat assessment of the euro by a member of the European Central Bank.

**The Missing Heart of Europe**

Does Britain hold the key to the future of the Continent?  
by Thomas Kremer. **£11.99**

Can nation states flourish in an integrated Greater Europe? A European businessman's view of the likely impact of divergent national cultures.

**The New Case for Europe:**

The crisis in British pro-Europeanism and how to overcome it

by Roger Liddle. **£6.95**

Roger Liddle was the Prime Minister's policy adviser on Europe 1997-2004.

**Who's Afraid of a European Constitution?**

by Neil MacCormick. **£8.95**

This book by a member of the European Convention on the Future of Europe and former MEP describes the nature and purpose of the European Convention.

**Should Britain Leave The EU?**

by Patrick Minford, Vidya Mahabare and Eric Nowell **£15.95**

An economic analysis of the relationship.

**Alarming Drum**

**Britain's European Dilemma**

by Peter Morgan. *Hdbk* **£19.95**

An analysis of Britain's relationship with the EU, Director-General of the IoD (1989-1994) proposes alternatives to current failing EU.

**Plan B For Europe - Lost Opportunities in the EU Constitution**

Edited by Lee Rotherham **£7.00**

A collection of key Eurocritical papers and speeches, which mark the path to an alternative Treaty for Europe.

**A Guide to the Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe**

by Stuart Sexton. **£5.00**

A layman's guide explains in simple language the essentials of the Treaty.

**CD**

**EEC Entry Campaign 1970-72**

by Independent compiler **£2.00**

Uses startling new source material showing how Parliament and the people were deceived into supporting entry. You will need a pdf reader such as adobe acrobat. Free Educational CD (charge is for handling).

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

**PLEASE ADD 10% P&P (UK ONLY)  
20% for Europe 30% Rest of World**

## eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£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"

<b>European Commission</b>	<b>020-7973 1992</b>
European Movement	020-7940 5252
<b>Federal Trust</b>	<b>020-7735 4000</b>

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403-741736</b>
British Housewives League	020-8445 4848
<b>British Weights &amp; Measures Assoc.</b>	
	<b>020-8922 0089</b>

Campaign against the Single Currency  
07071-663876

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**  
**020-8340 0314**

Democracy Movement	020-7491 3072
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>01746-861267</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	
	020-7691 3800

<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020-7386 1837</b>
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

## 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