

French and German economies are on collision course

The European political project is threatened by the growing divergence of the French and German economies and more generally between those of southern and northern Europe

High on Nicolas Sarkozy's list of priorities is the re-assertion of French leadership of the European Union. To this end he can already be observed attempting to breathe new life into the Franco-German relationship which has traditionally provided the engine of European political development and the most effective means by which the French national interest might be pursued.

Given Sarkozy's obvious intelligence and dynamism and the strong German inclination to accommodate their principal ally wherever possible, his prospects of success would normally be rated good to excellent. But there is one development which not merely makes his task infinitely more difficult, but which also threatens the future of the European project as a whole: the growing divergence between the French and German economies and more generally between the economies of northern and southern Europe.

The problems arising from the very different performances of the eurozone countries became more acute earlier this month when the European Central Bank, which unlike our own central bank continues to take money supply figures seriously, raised interest rates a quarter of a per cent to 4 per cent. The Bank has doubled interest rates since December 2005 - hence the relative strength of the single currency.

Prior to his election Sarkozy's criticisms of the European Central Bank (ECB) were taken in some quarters as mere electioneering, the kind of thing that would be toned down

after polling day. But Sarkozy has repeated similar remarks and has reportedly asked his staff to draw up plans to revise the EU's monetary architecture in order to prevent what he refers to as "currency manipulation" by Asian powers.

"How can you continue to export if the euro is the only currency in the world that is overvalued compared to the dollar, the yen and the yuan. How can a sector make ends meet if its productivity gains are eaten up by the artificial depreciation against the euro," he told farmers, according to Ambrose Evans-Pritchard in the *Daily Telegraph* on 8th June.

Strategic Initiative

France's new Europe minister Pierre Jouyet is reported as saying that the French government was working on a strategic initiative over "interest rates and exchange rates".

While German exports boom the French share of world trade continues to shrink - France is estimated to have lost 20 per cent of its foreign markets in six years.

Although popular with the voters Sarkozy's income tax cuts are regarded in Germany, as in Britain, as short-term measures that will add significantly to the French budget deficit and assuredly breach the EU's limit of three per cent of GDP.

Meanwhile, in Germany the government coffers are filling more quickly than during any other economic recovery in postwar German history with the result that the budget

deficit which once broke through the EU limit has been slashed to 0.6 per cent.

The hiring wave has made a clear dent in labour market statistics. From March 2006 to March 2007, the number of people seeking employment declined by close to 900,000, the strongest drop in postwar German history. And it's expected to continue.

In their spring report Germany's five leading economic research institutes predicted that this year will bring 450,000 new jobs. Each day, 1,200 people find new jobs. And the German job machine is expected to continue running at similarly high levels in 2008.

The economic researchers also predict that the economy will grow by 2.4 per cent annually both this year and in 2008. Almost no one expected a German recovery on the present scale to follow in the wake of Chancellor Merkel's modest economic reforms.

For all these reasons and because of deep historic apprehensions about the political havoc to which inflation can lead, Germany is likely to resist French attempts to force the ECB to follow a laxer monetary policy. It is the one area where Germany is likely to strongly resist the overtures of its EU-partner and where no obvious compromise is possible.

Whatever political agreements and deals can be finessed or cobbled together, France and Germany remain on collision course, and although both would prefer to avoid a collision it is difficult to see how this can be avoided.

New European military operations centre plans first exercise

The latest development in the creation of an autonomous European defence capability demonstrates that defence remains a growth area in terms of EU integration

Europe's defence arrangements are in danger of becoming so complicated that the next time the EU decides that military intervention is required it seems doubtful whether anyone will know which military lever to pull.

Until this month the EU had two options for commanding from Brussels military missions and operations.

One option is to make use of facilities provided by the five Operation Headquarters currently available in member states. These are the French OHQ at Mont Valérien near Paris, the British OHQ at Northwood, the German OHQ in Potsdam, the Italian OHQ in Rome, the Greek OHQ in Larissa. In 2003 the EU operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo was planned in the French headquarters while the current EU operation in that country uses the German OHQ.

Second Option

The second option is by means of the so-called "Berlin plus" arrangements whereby NATO capabilities and assets such as the SHAPE headquarters at Mons are used, but only in circumstances in which NATO has declined to get involved. This was the option used in the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

There is now a third option: from 7th June the EU's own OpsCenter became officially operational.

Based inside the EU Military Staff

(EUMS) headquarters in Brussels, the OpsCenter officially opened its doors in January, but until this month, to the reported irritation of the French, it has consisted of a room full of equipment without any people in it.

However, from the middle of this month it has been staffed by 76 military and 13 civilian personnel, and is intended to enable the EU to plan and run autonomous military and joint-military operations without the bothersome involvement of national headquarters.

If things go as planned the first command post exercise will have been completed by the time this issue of *euromagazine* appears. It will have involved no actual troops and will have been based on events in a fictional country in which there are clashes between the transitional government and a rebel group. Just to set an additional challenge to the planners there are assumed to be difficulties getting humanitarian aid to refugee camps for an under-equipped UN mission. The scenario assumes the deployment of a 2,000 strong force of soldiers and policemen.

Significant Step

The operational opening of the Center undoubtedly marks a significant step in the creation of the Euro-army. Characteristically, the UK government has sought to give the impression that its purpose was to supplement existing defence arrangements rather than to

replace them and really doesn't amount to very much at all. In this respect the Ninth Report of the House of Commons EU Scrutiny Committee, which commented on an EU Presidency Report setting out the case for the OpsCenter was of considerable help.

"This new capacity would not be a standing HQ, as the paper makes clear," it states. "The UK view is that any such operations would most likely be limited and small-scale, involving the civilian-military interface where the EU can add most value."

Growth Area

If the new Centre is not meant to be a standing HQ it is curious that Javier Solana, the EU's defence and foreign policy supremo should have been asked to produce a report on its 'shortcomings' even before it had been tried out; his report is widely expected to recommend the expansion of the EUMS' staff. And if the operations that it is expected to plan really are going to be on a small scale at the 'civilian-military interface' why does the present OpsCenter staff include five times more soldiers than policemen?

The reality is that, as these developments demonstrate, defence and security is a growth area in terms of EU integration, but for its own reasons the British government pretends otherwise and sometimes succeeds in convincing even itself.

Brussels: good croissants and rotten ideas

"Nobody seems able to change the default formula for Brussels policy seminars: good coffee and croissants, dull speeches and a brief exchange of conventional wisdom. The painful

comparison is with Washington, DC, where the best think-tanks refuse public money, compete to set the agenda with provocative ideas, and enjoy extraordinary access to

administration and Congress alike. It suggests that the consensus culture and corporate funding may be the reason." Charlemagne column, *The Economist*, 8th June.

Could Tony Blair face trial as the result of the Iraq War?

It would be a matter of supreme historical irony if as a consequence of European political integration Britain's euophile Prime Minister ends up in a European jail

It would be a matter of supreme historical irony if it turned out that the first big name on a European Arrest Warrant should be that of Tony Blair, the most Europhile Prime Minister of modern times and that he should subsequently spend time languishing in a European jail. This scenario might seem fanciful in the extreme but it is one that apparently haunts the imagination of the Prime Minister's wife who, as an experienced QC, is better placed than most to form a judgement about her husband's prospect of facing trial. According to the *Sunday Telegraph* on 10th June Mrs Blair has confided in friends about her anxieties: "Cherie is worried about a prosecution - she still thinks it is a real possibility".

If there is a prosecution of Mr Blair after he leaves office it is likely to arise due to the decision to invade Iraq possibly as the consequence of the alleged torture of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay or of "extraordinary rendition". Such charges could be brought in some other European jurisdiction under the laws of that state.

We are indebted to William Rees-Mogg the veteran political commentator and former editor of *The Times* for drawing attention to Mr Blair's possible problems and for pointing out the relevance of the recent House of Lords judgement on Moutas Almallah Dabas (*Times* 11th June).

On 17th March, 2005 a European arrest warrant was issued by a court in Madrid for extradition from Britain of Mr Dabas who is alleged to have assisted the terrorists responsible for the Madrid bombing of March 11th 2004. The decision on which the warrant was based was an order by a

Spanish judge that Dabas should be subject to unconditional temporary imprisonment to await trial for collaborating with the terrorists responsible for the bombing.

In dealing with Mr Dabas's appeal the Lords defined the position in British law of the European "system of surrender between judicial authorities". This came into being as the result of a European Framework Decision of 13th June 2003 which subsequently spawned the 2003 Extradition Act. This abolished the requirement that there should be a prima facie case made for extradition to the US and some other countries.

All five Lords joined in dismissing Mr Dabas's appeal.

Specific Offences

As Lord Rees-Mogg pointed out some safeguards are provided by the principle of double criminality which ensures that a person cannot be tried for an offence which is regarded as a crime in the requesting state but not in the requested state. However, this safeguard does not apply in the case of specific offences punishable under the law of the requesting state by more than three years imprisonment.

Moreover, as we pointed out throughout the issues of *eurofacts* during 2003, British citizens can find themselves extradited to countries where there is no presumption of innocence, no tradition of habeus corpus or trial by jury. The Extradition Act assumes a compatibility of systems of law which does not exist: there are wide differences of legal philosophy and procedure.

The consequence of all this as Lord

Rees-Mogg shows is that if a Ruritanian judge, anxious to make himself famous, issues a European arrest warrant for a British ex-minister and brings the warrant under the appropriate Ruritanian laws, British courts will be bound to oblige; they simply have no choice in the matter.

He wisely concluded: "*I have sympathy with the old doctrine of sovereign immunity. I do not think the Labour Government should have accepted the European Framework or passed the Extradition Act in 2003. But it did, and that presents serious problems. We have made British extradition law respond to every judge in Europe and to the varying laws of every European country. That was a crazy thing to do.*"

There are no doubt literally dozens of left wing political parties in Europe who would like to put George Bush in the dock over the Iraq war. He is not vulnerable, but his closest friend and ally has become highly vulnerable

There may well be eurosceptics who draw some satisfaction from the prospect of Mr Blair sitting in stir as the result of ill-conceived support for the onward process of European political integration. But the result of an attempt to bring Tony Blair to trial would have far reaching consequences.

Mr Blair has gone to war five times during his 10-year premiership. His successors are also very likely to face decisions about whether to employ military force. The knowledge that they may face prosecution and even a jail sentence as the result of doing so is unlikely to help them decide the matter in the national interest.

Eighty per cent of French laws made in Brussels

"...eighty per cent of French legislation comes from Brussels. French law, formerly supreme, is now the result of 'compromises' between

*[France] and the Commission and France's twenty-six [EU] partners". Eric Zemmour, Senior Political Reporter of *Le Figaro*, in an op-ed*

article, Deux énarques seulement sur quinze ministres: extinction ou mutation de l'élite républicaine? 4th June.

So farewell then, Tony Blair

Helen Szamuely assesses the Blair legacy and concludes that he missed an opportunity of huge historic significance

Historically Tony Blair will be judged for his domestic record, just as all his predecessors have been and, no doubt, all his successors will be. The one exception to this rule is Churchill, who was a complete failure as a politician while being superbly successful as a war leader. Almost certainly Blair will be seen as a failure domestically, having achieved none of his loudly proclaimed aims of reforming the public sector, sorting out Northern Ireland to ensure it has a real political future or, even, of continuing with the economic success he had inherited from the equally unadmirable Major government.

That leaves foreign affairs, at present more discussed than the domestic agenda, largely because the American alliance and the war in Iraq are unpopular with the media and many of the talking heads that pontificate on the subject. The subject of British anti-Americanism is a complex and rather sad tale that requires a separate article (ahem, editor?). Let us look at Blair's efforts in that respect and, of course, with regards to the European project, still regarded as a matter of foreign policy by our political elites and, sadly the main-stream media (MSM).

The real problem with Blair as far as foreign policy is concerned is his obsession with transnational governance. As a result he can be charged with missing out on a wonderful opportunity to press forward with the creation of the Anglosphere for which he was in an excellent position. As it is, the idea will be carried on by the United States, Australia and India with support from Canada and one or two external allies like Japan. Will Britain, the progenitor of the Anglospheric ideas, be part of it? If not, Tony Blair is more to blame than any other politician. (Well, for the moment, anyway. We have not seen either Gordon Brown or David

Cameron in action.)

It is quite clear from all American accounts that Blair, far from being Bush's or, for that matter, Clinton's poodle, has had enormous influence in Washington, particularly with the present Administration. The problem is that he tried to use that influence to drag the United States into the world of transnational governance and, inevitably, failed. The United States is not going to sign up to Kyoto - an idea that has been acknowledged to be a failure in the last G8 summit - or the International Criminal Court. It is pointless even to ask for that. It was Blair's influence that caused that agonizing path through the UN before the Iraqi war, his bouncing desire to be approved of at the bar of public opinion comprehensively scuppered by the French, who, as ever, played their own game.

Impossible Ambition

That leaves the European Union, the one transnational organization that has serious ambitions to become a state. Blair, like Major and, it seems, Brown has spent a good deal of time telling the world that Britain's role was to be a bridge or a link or whatever other simile may have occurred to him and his speechwriters between America and Europe. This is an impossible ambition. Either there is a western alliance in which America and Europe pull together, in which case Britain's role is to be a significant part of that alliance; or the two paths are diverging and the European Union is harbouring ambitions to set itself up as a rival superpower. Setting aside the likelihood of this ambition being realized, let us just look at what it entails: constant trade wars in which Britain's interests are necessarily submerged; a desperate creation of a common foreign policy, whose only aim is to oppose the United States and

its allies; an integration of the defence structure that would finally destroy NATO. It is not possible to support all that and be America's staunchest ally at the same time.

One of the things Blair tried to extract from Bush was a whole-hearted support for further European integration, in particular, the Constitution, hoping to be able to take that back to the "colleagues" in order to overcome the distrust most of them have felt for him for some years. Support there was some but whole-hearted never. In particular, Bush and the Defence Department made it quite clear that they were not happy with the attempts to create a separate European Defence and Security Identity, while being quite happy to negotiate various deals with the pro-American new members in Eastern Europe. In the wake of the French and Dutch referendums there were, quite properly, no American calls for a renewed effort to ensure that the European Constitution was implemented. Blair loses again.

Of course, Tony Blair's biggest "achievement" as far as his European colleagues are concerned was the St Malo agreement in 1999. Unable to take Britain into the euro, he offered what was even more desirable - the country's armed forces. The notion that this was somehow a new development, proudly negotiated by Blair and Chirac is erroneous, to put it mildly. An integrated defence force and, above all, an integrated procurement programme had been planned and discussed for some years. At present, because of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq total integration is not possible but future procurement is being planned and announced with that in mind. This will take Britain further away from her natural allies in the Anglosphere as procurement decides a good deal of the strategy. This time not just Blair but the whole country loses.

Lord Stoddart pins down Government on cost of the EU

In a written question in the House of Lords, Lord Stoddart of Swindon has pinned the Government down on the estimated cost of British membership of the EU between 2007 and 2013. The reply from the Government on 4th June confirms fears that Britain's net contributions will climb to over £10 billion this

year.

Lord Stoddart points out: "*The figures the Government quotes are based on 2004 prices and anything up to 20 per cent should probably be added to these already extortionate costs.*" Lord Stoddart also highlights the fact that our contributions would dramatically

increase if the British rebate (abatement) were to be lost. "*Given the intense pressure the British Government has been under in recent years to give up the rebate, this is a very real concern.*"

The figures extracted from the Government by Lord Stoddart are set out in the table below.

£ billion 2004 prices (payments)		
Year	Gross contribution before abatement	Abatement
2007	14.2	3.9
2008	14.6	4.6 to 4.7
2009	13.7	4.8 to 4.9
2010	14.4	3.8 to 3.9
2011-13	14.1 to 14.5	3.5 to 4.1

EU Constitution: the way ahead

As we go to press the much awaited AEU summit is still several days away and the fate of the EU constitution consequently remains unclear. Any judgement on the subject in these pages therefore risks giving a hostage to fortune. However, there are two aspects of the recent rounds of negotiations that strike us as noteworthy and upon which comment perhaps may be made without running the risk of being made to look foolish by events.

The first is that the British government has been successful in playing down the significance of what has been taking place. Unlike the Poles who have supported the behind the scenes talks with the German presidency with a vigorous campaign of public diplomacy to achieve their objectives in relation to the voting procedure and which has coined a phrase - "The square root or death!" - worthy of a place in any compilation of political slogans, the British government has said nothing at all. The Foreign Secretary, Mrs Beckett has

even denied that meaningful negotiations are taking place. Too bad that the Opposition parties have been either unable or unwilling to force a greater degree of candour.

The second striking aspect of the German presidency's attempt to get agreement on a deal is the unwillingness of the major players to make any concession to Britain. There has been no talk this time by British ministers of inviolable "red lines" - such talk is evidently far too specific - but despite its silence on the subject the government is known to have at least six main 'concerns'.

If Britain's membership was considered vital to our partners we might have expected them to make concessions in at least one of these areas. There have been concessions to the French and Dutch voters who turned down the Constitution at referendums. There have been attempts to cajole and bribe the Central Europeans. But as far as it is possible to say there have been no attempts whatever to make concessions to the

UK.

Why should this be?

It is possible that thinking among political elites in continental Europe runs as follows:

In the past British governments have finally gone with the integrationist flow - while deceiving British voters about what was actually taking place. The same may happen again - so why make concessions? If on the other hand, the state of British opinion has reached a stage that makes it impossible for a new Prime Minister to conceal any further transfer of powers then again there is no point in making concessions to the British. If that is the case it suggests that the obtuse British public has finally rumbled us, and the European project will have to proceed without Britain. Better to acknowledge that fact now than to offer concessions that will not ultimately satisfy UK opinion.

There is nothing illogical about this approach. If only straight thinking on the subject was equally evident in Whitehall and Westminster!

LETTERS

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

Smoking Ban

Dear Sir,

It seems ironic that the Country is instigating a smoking ban next month, whilst still supporting Tobacco Farmers in Europe! Last year the UK contributed £3,909 million nett to the EU, which in turn paid £466 million in subsidies to the Tobacco Farmers.

Your readers may be interested to know that in 1998 we contributed £3.5 billion to the EU, which gave tobacco subsidies worth £586 million that year and it is forecasted that in 2007, £4,699 million will be paid by the UK to the EU.

Is this what every tax-paying adult expects?

GRAHAM ALLT
East Sussex

Why the Government Won't Tell

Dear Sir,

Recently the House of Lords debated a Bill which would force ministers to conduct an official cost-benefit analysis of our EU membership - the third attempt in four years to get them

to do this, rather than airily claiming that the benefits are "self-evident".

Introducing the Bill, Lord Pearson of Rannoch pointed out that four private studies in the past five years have put the annual net cost at between 4 per cent and 10 per cent of GDP, or between £40 billion and £100 billion a year.

But, he added, figures in a Treasury report suggested it could be £160 billion a year.

Far from being an economic benefit, it is now proved beyond all reasonable doubt that being in the EU is costing us a fortune, even though nobody knows exactly how much.

And the government does not want to know, because then it might have to tell us.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

The Blair Legacy

Dear Sir,

I thought that Tony Blair's retirement should not pass without a proper tribute to his legacy. I have therefore composed the following lines which I

have entitled *Tough on Crime?*

*New Labour's boast of tough on crime
Is but a hollow pantomime
And as politicians are reviled
Criminals are running wild*

*The law breaker has human rights
The law of compensation cites
In city streets that teem with thugs
There's crack cocaine and other drugs*

*The turf disputes are lost and won
With recourse to the blade and gun
The drunken hooligans do dispense
Their brand of brainless violence*

*The police must jump through sundry
hoops
To avoid upsetting ethnic groups
So out of touch the judges stance
Of leniency and arrogance*

*The citizens left to their fate
While ministers do procrastinate
And as politicians spew more lies
All faith in law and order dies*
DARRYL ASHTON
Blackpool

EU gets access to our data base

The creation of a European Big Brother state came one step nearer on 12th June when the EU home affairs ministers gave their backing to the Prüm Treaty which allows EU states to give one another automatic access to genetic records, fingerprints and details of traffic offences.

Under the deal, which will result in the world's biggest bio-data base, member states will be entitled to access "reference data" in the DNA files of non-EU citizens who want to enter the Schengen zone.

The push for the deal came from Germany the current EU president and one of the original signatories to the Treaty, along with Austria, Belgium, France, Luxembourg and Spain.

Opposition to the scheme came from MEPs as well as civil rights groups,

mostly on the grounds that the scheme fails to provide adequate data protection.

In a statement, Statewatch, the civil rights watchdog said that there had been no indication at all that the Council had addressed the fundamental criticism of the European Parliament, the European Data Protection Supervisor or the European Data Protection Authorities.

The organization also criticized the secretive and illiberal nature of the process by which the deal was reached, pointing out that numerous working parties set up by the Council had referred to the Prüm Treaty as if it were already law while important documents were withheld from public scrutiny.

As Tom Bunyan, the Statewatch

editor argued, the idea that measures should be scrutinized *after* they had been adopted cannot be squared with meaningful democratic accountability. By that stage they are set in stone.

In a letter to the *Daily Telegraph* on 12th the Conservative MEP Syed Kamell said that the UK had the largest DNA data base in the world, but that the UK government did not know how much the scheme would cost. "*We are sleepwalking towards a Big Brother Europe while our government stands idly by,*" he added Baroness Ludford, a British Liberal Democrat MEP declared: "*The entire process is a scandal...the deal has been cooked up by national officials outside the EU...and laundered by the Brussels machinery on the basis of take it or leave it*".

MEETINGS

The Freedom Association 01242 574043

Saturday **7th July**, 6.00 pm

Roger Helmer MEP, TFA, *Hon. Chairman*

Revd. Peter Mullen, TFA, *Chaplin*

12th ANNUAL SUMMER PARTY
Stanway House, Stanway,
Gloucestershire

Admission £21 (non members £23)

Includes a buffet super

Tickets from: Paul Simons, 32 Berkeley Court, Cheltenham, Gloucestershire GL52 6DA

Marlborough Group 01672 515275

Sunday **8th July**, 2.00 pm

Ashley Mote MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

Assembly Room, Marlborough Town Hall, Marlborough

Admission Free

The Freedom Association (Sussex Branch) 01424 736880

Saturday **15th September**, 6.30 pm

“Battle for Britain”

John Gouriet, *Founding Campaign Director, TFA*

Simon Richards, *Campaign Director, TFA*

PUBLIC MEETING

(The Inaugural Event of Sussex Branch)
The Mistral Bar/Restaurant, The Sackville, De Lar Warr Parade, Bexhill-on-Sea, East Sussex TN40 1LS

Admission £14 (TFA Members £12)

(Includes a buffet super)

FREE - Advertising Space

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations

eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65

Email: eurofacts@junepress.com

USEFUL WEB SITES

Better off Out Campaign

www.betteroffout.co.uk

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.cibhq.co.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruith.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020 7219 3000

Tuesday **26th June**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Inquiry into Air Travel and Health* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Wednesday **27th June**, 10.30 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Future of the Common Agricultural Policy* from Defra.

Tuesday **10th July**, 11.10 am

Evidence will be heard on the *The Inquiry into Air Travel and Health* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Note:

Committee Meetings can change from Public to Private without warning

DIARY OF EVENTS

2007

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

Lib-Dem Party Conference Brighton **15-20th September**

Labour Party Conference Bournemouth **23rd-27th September**

Conservative Party Conference Blackpool **30th Sept-3rd Oct**

UK Independence Party Conference Excel Centre, Docklands London **5-6th October**

2008

France takes over EU presidency **1st January**

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

2009

European Parliamentary Elections **June**

The European Question and the National Interest

by *Jeremy Black*. **£16.99**

A leading historian's interpretation of Britain's relations with EU/EC/EEC.

A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU

by *Richard Body*. **£10.00**

Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

The Great Deception: Can the European Union survive

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North*. **£10.99**

This book is the most comprehensive history of the EU.

Living in a Fascist Country

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£15.99**

The disappearing freedom and privacy.

Hard Pounding: The Story Of The UK Independence Party

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**

An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

The Bumper Book of Government Waste

by *Matthew Elliott and Lee Rotherham*. **£9.99**

An exposure of the huge levels of waste in Britain and the EU.

The Future is a Foreign Country

by *Matthew Illsley*. **£10.00**

Full of useful detail and quotes on how and why we got into the EU mess. It leads to the conclusion that withdrawal from the EU is the only way forward.

Disappearing Britain

The EU and the death of Local Government by *Lindsay Jenkins*. **£14.99**

The detailed Brussels agenda for the break-up of the United Kingdom.

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? A European businessman's view of the impact of divergent national cultures.

Iran The Clash of Ambitions

by *Houchang Nahavandi*. **£16.95**

A history of the people and influences that have formed the Iran of today. It has a history of integrating invaders.

Corruption -

The World's Big C

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures by *Ian Senior*. **£12.50**

Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

EU: Papacy Reincarnated?

by *Mark Stout*. **£9.99**

This book explores the origins and functioning of both the EU and the Medieval Papacy from a legal/political/historical perspective and unearths a startling number of parallels

Video

Britain On The Brink

by *Sanity*. DVD or VHS Video **£5.00**

Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

Better Off Out! Okay What Next?

by *Bruges Group* DVD

Morning/Afternoon Session **£20.00**

Evening Session **£10.00**

The 2006 Conference, held in the Great Hall of King's College, London.

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

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£28
Europe (Airmail)	£38
Rest of World	£50/\$84
Reduced rate (UK only)	£16
Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.	
Special rates for multiple copies	

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

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

Name

Address

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

Britain Out	01403 741736
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
CIB	020 8340 0314
Democracy Movement	020 8570 5681
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7386 1837
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email: globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org	
Global Vision	www.global-vision.net
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender	
Labour	020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Tony Blair MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Rt Hon Sir Menzies Campbell MP	
New Britain Party	020 7247 2524
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
UK Independence Party	01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134

