

Soon we're all going to be Euro-suspects

'Big Brother' Brussels is pouring millions of euros into projects that aim to impose surveillance on virtually every aspect of our lives

We in Britain have become accustomed to living – with surprisingly little protest – in the most monitored environment in the world. We might not have secret police and networks of informers, but we do have more surveillance cameras than any other country. However, as Ronald Reagan would have put it, “You ain’t seen nothing yet.”

The European Commission is spending millions of euros of taxpayers’ money on projects designed to ensure that those very taxpayers will be subject to a continent-wide system of surveillance and information-sharing so that any deviation from what Brussels decides is acceptable behaviour can be quickly snuffed out.

There has been some wailing and gnashing of teeth in the libertarian blogosphere, but little comment in the mainstream media. So *eurofacts* has gone to the source to discover how the Eurocracy intends to control our lives.

One project, on which the EU is spending €2.5 million, will take the use of CCTV cameras to a new level, allowing “prevention and rapid-response to events as they unfold.” This is SAMURAI, *Suspicious and abnormal behaviour monitoring using a network of cameras & sensors for situation awareness enhancement*. The Commission says: “The aim of SAMURAI is to develop and integrate an innovative intelligence surveillance system for monitoring people and

vehicle activities at both inside and surrounding areas of a critical public infrastructure (e.g. an airport or train station concourse, a football stadium or a shopping mall).

“By concentrating technology developments on to multiple cameras and mobile cameras, many of the limitations of the existing state-of-the-art will be overcome... The project will also exploit methods for feeding back human operators’ evaluation on any abnormality detection output...”

That is a chilling phrase. It means that if some camera-watcher decides that what you are doing is “abnormal” or “suspicious”, you could be liable to “rapid-response and prevention”.

Even more chilling is the €3.2 million EU project to standardise concepts of abnormality. This is called *Automatic detection of abnormal behaviour and threats in crowded spaces*, or ADABTS, which “aims to develop models for abnormal and threat behaviours and algorithms for automatic detection of such behaviours as well as deviations from normal behaviour in surveillance data...”

It will monitor such things as voice pitches and body movements and interpret them according to a preset determination of what is considered normal and what is regarded as suspicious or threatening.

And what are our European masters going to do with the results of this constant monitoring? That is where

INDECT comes in, *Intelligent information system supporting observation, searching and detection for security of citizens in urban environment*. Funded by €10.9 million of Euro-cash, INDECT aims to develop “the registration and exchange of operational data, acquisition of multimedia content, intelligent processing of all information and automatic detection of threats and recognition of abnormal behaviour or violence... supporting the operational activities of police officers...”

INDECT will also construct “agents assigned to continuous and automatic monitoring of... web sites, discussion forums, UseNet groups, file servers, p2p networks, individual computer systems.”

In the tortured, authoritarian-inclined logic of the Brussels bureaucracy, our collective security can only be ensured by handing over our privacy and our personal security to camera-watchers and computer models.

If we are going to prevent this blatant attack on our individuality, on our human rights, we need to do it now. In a few years’ time, any attempt to do so may be regarded as abnormal and threatening. One can imagine new Soviet-style psychiatric hospitals for dissidents, or Maoist “re-education” centres for enemies of the state.

Source: *Security Research Projects* (European Commission)

New Parliament, same old politics?

There has been growing competition between the centre-left and centre-right in the last few European Parliaments. Will this continue in the new 2009-14 Parliament? The increase in the seat shares of the smaller political groups, at the expense of the three main groups – the centre-right European People's Party (EPP), the centre-left Socialists and Democrats (S&D), and the centrist Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE) – means that neither a centre-right bloc nor a centre-left bloc will be large enough to dominate the assembly.

As a result, in the first plenary session of the new Parliament in July, the EPP put together a "grand coalition" with the socialists and liberals to divvy up the key leadership positions and to build support for the re-election of Mr Barroso as Commission President.

However, in return, the EPP had to delay the vote on Barroso until September and give away several key committee chairs to the socialists. The EPP may seek to maintain this grand coalition. However, it is unlikely to hold together on all legislative issues on the agenda.

The socialists, despite their diminished power in the European Parliament, will come under pressure to resist the overwhelming forces of the centre-right in the Council and European Commission, and the liberals will continue to switch between a

centre-right coalition on economic reform issues and a centre-left coalition on environmental and justice and home affairs issues

The main political groups in the Parliament vote in a highly cohesive way. While voting in the chamber along party lines has increased, voting along national lines has decreased, so much so that in the 2004-09 Parliament, the main political groups were more cohesive than the Democrats and Republicans in the US Congress.

Put simply, if one knows which group an MEP belongs to, one can correctly predict how he or she votes about 85 per cent of the time, whereas if one knows the member state, one can correctly predict how the MEP votes only 50 per cent of the time.

Coalitions in the European Parliament mainly form along left-right lines, with the two largest groups – the EPP and the socialists – often voting against each other in key legislative votes. The "grand coalition" between these two groups has always been central to politics in the European Parliament.

However, since the peak of this alliance in the 1989-94 Parliament, there has been increasing conflict between a socialist-led centre-left bloc and an EPP-led centre right bloc, with the centrist ALDE often playing a pivotal role between these two

coalitions. If the centre-right clearly won the June 2009 elections and the centre-left clearly lost, then the centre-right should be given a chance to govern, within the checks and balances of the EU system, of course. This would allow voters to base their choices in the 2014 elections at least partially on the performance of those MEPs and parties who won the 2009 elections.

In contrast, if the socialists climb into bed with the EPP on most issues between now and 2014, it will be impossible for voters to see how their choices in 2009 had any effect on politics in the European Parliament, let alone the direction of EU policies more generally.

It would be much better for the legitimacy of the EU if the socialists accept their electoral defeat in 2009 and start promoting a clear alternative set of policies to those that we are likely to see from the dominant centre-right forces at the European level in the next five years.

Extracted from "What to Expect in the 2009-14 European Parliament: Return of the Grand Coalition?" by Simon Hix, professor of European and comparative politics at the London School of Economics (*European Policy Analysis*, Swedish Institute for European Policy Studies, August 2009)

- *In a recent survey, 83 per cent of UK respondents said they knew little or nothing about the EU, while just 4 per cent said information available on EU affairs was simple and clear*

Source: Flash Eurobarometer No. 274

Do ex-Soviet countries really want to join EU?

We are constantly being told that the EU is such a success that the countries of the former Soviet bloc just cannot wait to join. It is interesting, then, to consider the results of a recent poll carried out for *Eurasia Monitor*, which finds that EU membership might not be the prize that many people seek.

The poll asked whether the populations of a number of post-Soviet nations would prefer to throw in their lot with the EU, embrace integration with Russia, or maintain full independence without any form of integration. Here are the results:

Georgia: For EU, 36 per cent; pro-Russia, 3 per cent; retain independence, 48 per cent.

Moldova: For EU, 33 per cent; pro-Russia, 26 per cent; retain independence, 20 per cent.

Belarus: For EU, 20 per cent; pro-Russia, 23 per cent; retain independence, 28 per cent.

Ukraine: For EU, 20 per cent; pro-Russia, 34 per cent (12 per cent want return to USSR); independence, 23 per cent.

In **Russia** itself, more than a third of the population likes the country's independence, but a fifth would like the USSR to return. There is no apparent appetite for joining the EU.

Perhaps the most interesting result, however, concerns **Latvia**, where only 31 per cent of the people support EU membership – even though they are in already.

It's not just the economy, stupid

The European Commission remains cautiously optimistic as the struggle continues to emerge from an economic crisis which, according to some, might threaten the very existence of the EU. In the latest of its half-yearly interim economic forecasts, the Commission says that strong policy interventions have led to signs of recovery and receding fears of a double-dip recession.

As the table below shows, seasonally adjusted quarterly forecasts indicate that in the large economies of the EU, including the UK, GDP growth will have entered positive territory by the end of the year. For 2009 as a whole, however, the figures for September's unadjusted interim forecast remain broadly in line with the May assessment, since the estimates for 2008 and the first quarter of 2009 proved to be higher than actual performance.

On this measure, the UK is set to fare slightly worse than the EU as a whole, though its fourth quarter figure is forecast to show higher growth than

other countries. "The improved economic outlook reflects increasingly favourable external conditions," the Commission says. "Recent data for trade and industrial production, as well as business and consumer confidence, are generally encouraging. The resilient private and public consumption and advances in the inventory cycle will also support growth in Europe."

However, there are concerns that what will cause strains in the aftermath of the crisis are the responses to it.

Last month, former Commissioner Mario Monti told *The Daily Telegraph*. "The special role played by the Commission in EU integration is based on the market, and this crisis has brought the market economy itself into crisis. It has lost respectability. This threatens to tip the Community into disintegration."

He criticised the British Government for ditching the free-market principles that are central to the operation of EU trade, singling out Gordon Brown's ill-judged pledge of "British jobs for

British workers". Where did that leave the EU mantra of free movement of goods, capital, services and people?

Meanwhile, French Prime Minister, François Fillon believes the state intervention that characterised the responses of governments to the crisis is a clear vindication of French-style *dirigisme*. There has been an important ideological shift in the way Europe deals with its economy, he claims: the market will no longer be all-powerful.

Maybe so, but a former Italian prime minister, Massimo D'Alema, doesn't think it will do much good. He said: "It is an illusion to think that once crisis is over we will return to where we were. The US and China will emerge stronger: we will be left ever further behind. Within 15 years not a single country in the EU will qualify for the G7, except perhaps Germany."

The Commission might be right in suggesting that the recession is over, but the political fallout in the EU could well be prolonged and bloody.

	Quarterly GDP forecast (%, quarter-on-quarter) 2009				Annual GDP forecast (%, year-on-year) 2009	
	2009/1	2009/2	2009/3	2009/4	Spring forecast May 2009	Interim forecast September 2009
Germany	-3.5	0.3	0.7	0.1	-5.4	-5.1
Spain	-1.6	-1.1	-0.4	-0.2	-3.2	-3.7
France	-1.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	-3.0	-2.1
Italy	-2.7	-0.5	0.2	0.1	-4.4	-5.0
Netherlands	-2.7	-0.9	-0.4	0.0	-3.5	-4.5
Euro area	-2.5	-0.1	0.2	0.1	-4.0	-4.0
Poland	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.0	-1.4	1.0
United Kingdom	-2.4	-0.7	0.2	0.5	-3.8	-4.3
EU 27	-2.4	-0.2	0.2	0.1	-4.0	-4.0

Source: European Commission

Oligarchy versus democracy in the European project

"The European project was designed to take over the governance of the nation states and to create an unaccountable self-perpetuating oligarchy to rule without the inconvenience of

democracy. Those who have power had not been elected, and those who had been elected have no power. European elites are in danger of creating a profound moral and institutional crisis

in Europe – a crisis of democracy."

● From the Synopsis of *Our Fight for Democracy: The United Kingdom and the European Union*, by John Stafford (The Bruges Group).

Immigration: the canary in the European coalmine

Christopher Caldwell's new book has attracted much media interest. *The Economist*, a very pro-immigration journal, concluded that "this is an important book as well as a provocative one: the best statement to date of the pessimist's position on Islamic immigration in Europe".

That such a clear, candid book is written by an American mainstream journalist is important in itself. The book is subtitled quite clearly *Can Europe be the same with different people in it?* and Caldwell says equally clearly, "the answer is no".

His main title, of course, echoes Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* and, like Burke, Caldwell looks to the long-term consequence of the phenomenon he characterises as Western Europe becoming "a multi-ethnic society in a fit of absence of mind". He views immigration in the way Burke saw the French republican revolution, as aggressive, dangerous and, ultimately, leading to violence. Much of his book centres specifically on the importation of Muslims, since he regards Islam as an anti-European culture. Like Burke, he believes the current population of a nation and its rulers are trustees, with duties both to their past and to generations yet unborn.

Caldwell starts by facing up to the fact that importing mass Third World labour was a disaster. "Europeans... overestimated their need for immigrant labour. The economic benefits immigration brought were marginal and temporary. They now belong to the past. The social changes immigration brought, however, were massive and enduring."

He shoots down the constantly advanced argument that the arrival of low-skilled immigrants is of benefit to European countries. He recites again the obvious fact that welfare states transfer benefits to low earners and demolishes again the idea that

Reflections on the Revolution in Europe: Immigration, Islam and the West

By Christopher Caldwell

Allen Lane, Pbk 364pp 2009

Available from *The June Press*

Price £14.99 +p&p

(see back cover)

ISBN 0713999365

immigration can support the ageing of Europe, by quoting the well-known estimate of the United Nations that to maintain the ratio of labour to dependants, Europe will have to import 701 million people by 2050.

Caldwell is clear that the peoples of Europe never wanted mass immigration. Why should they? Immigrant labour without capital increases the supply of labour and reduces wages.

He excoriates the political class from the 1950s to the present. In the beginning, in the 1950s and 1960s, "Those elites, to the extent that they thought about the long-term consequences at all, made certain assumptions; immigrants would be few in number. Since they were coming to fill short-term gaps in the labour force, most would stay in Europe only temporarily. Some might stay longer. No one assumed they would be eligible for welfare. That they would retain the habits and culture of southern villages, clans, market places, and mosques, was a thought too bizarre to entertain."

It is worth noting, however, that at least one politician was fully aware of the long-term consequences. Ian Gilmour, then editor of *The Spectator*, recorded an interview with Winston Churchill in 1955 when Churchill told him: "I think it is the most important subject facing this country, but I cannot

get any of my ministers to take any notice."

When the elites realised how unpopular mass immigration was, this did not change what became a rigid, almost sacred view. All that happened was the arrival of a panoply of suppressive efforts, including diversity training, ethnic quotas and vilification and muzzling of opponents.

The reality was that "for all the lip service paid to diversity, people tend to flee it" and "in no country in Europe does the bulk of the population aspire to live in a bazaar of cultures". Despite inflicting these pressures on the poorest natives, the political class was conspicuous by its absence in "diverse" residential areas or sending its children to "enriched" schools.

Caldwell estimates that most European countries will have an immigrant (plus descendant) population of between 25 per cent and 33 per cent by 2050. He points out that only one group is more favourable to immigration than the national political elites and that is the EU institutions.

Immigration is the canary in the coalmine. Caldwell says: "If Europe is getting more immigrants than its voters want, this is a good indicator that its democracy is not functioning". Indeed, the whole EU process is designed to put some policies beyond democracy. "European leaders have chosen to believe...that its immigration and asylum policies involve the sort of non-negotiable moral qualities that you don't vote on."

While approved political debate remains in a narrow range of opinion, nothing will change the political class until it loses a lot of votes. This is slowly happening and Caldwell's book, as *The Economist* noted, is a sign that Enoch Powell's arguments are becoming dangerously mainstream.

Reviewed by Anthony Scholefield

EU ‘not a significant world player’

President Obama’s recent decision to abandon the “star wars” missile shield in Eastern Europe was, in part at least, an acknowledgement that American foreign policy is increasingly looking eastwards. It is in line with the President’s desire to “reset” US relations with Russia, as acknowledged by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, and Russian delight at the missile announcement suggests that Moscow, too, is keen to forge a new transatlantic balance of power.

If such a fundamental change in the balance of East-West relations really does come about – and straws in the wind indicate that it well might – where does that leave the European Union on the world stage?

The answer is “nowhere”, according to the prevailing view among an influential group of Russians.

“The European Union is growing weaker as an actor in foreign politics,” says a report published last month for the Russian-US section of the Valdai Club, a heavyweight gathering of Russian academics, intellectuals and politicians set up to consider the development of their country and society. The report points to a “rapid shift of the centre of global politics from the Euro-Atlantic region to the Asian-Pacific” and concludes that the EU is being left behind:

“The EU common foreign and security policy is still in its infancy because of the diverging interests of

the European Union member states, and their reluctance to increase defence spending and shoulder responsibility for keeping up international peace and security. For this reason, the EU cannot be viewed as a significant player in the world’s political and especially military-political arena.

“At the same time, China is developing at an unprecedentedly fast pace. Its foreign economic expansion is widening, its political influence is growing. The vector of the US main interests is also moving to the Asian-Pacific zone.”

This dismissive view of the EU, needs to be taken seriously. The executive editor of the Valdai report is Sergei Karganov, chairman of the Presidium of the Council on Foreign and Defence Policy, and one of the authors is his director of research. What these men think is listened to in the Kremlin. Their report – “Reconfiguration, not just a Reset: Russia’s interests in relations with the USA” – is a cogent and detailed blueprint for the creation of a wide community of domestic and international interests between Russia and the US.

Mr Obama has so far shown little interest in the EU’s international pretensions and it is evident that the Russians care even less. As Nico Popescu wrote recently in the *euobserver.com* blog, “Russia’s perception of an ‘EU in decline’...is

not just arrogance. The EU itself has the foreign policy psychology (and instincts) of a small power. And Russia has the psychology of a great, even rising power...the EU’s perceived irrelevance creates problems for the EU’s partnerships in the region – with Russia and the Eastern neighbourhood countries.”

Mr Popescu, research fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations in London, concludes: “In tough international environments, reputation is a foreign policy resource in itself. And EU’s external reputation as a meagre foreign policy actor is a serious problem. EU’s current mixture of self-congratulating views on the success of the ‘European model’ and half-hearted political investment in EU foreign policy is not enough to promote European interests and values.”

With the US turning towards Russia and China, and now, as the G20 summit demonstrated, increasingly towards emerging economic powers such as India and Brazil, it seems the EU will have to embark on radical reforms if anyone else in the world is going to listen to it. Either that, or the member states will have to return to full-blooded independence in foreign policy, without the constraints imposed by the Brussels idea of “consensus”.

One thing Cameron *can* do about Europe

Now that the implementation of the Lisbon Treaty is inevitable, the Conservatives’ policy of holding a referendum has a fatal hole in it. David Cameron’s always forlorn promise depended upon ratification being incomplete by the time of the expected Tory victory at the forthcoming General Election. That will evidently not be the case.

If he does become prime minister, Mr Cameron could, of course, go for what

some would see as the nuclear option of a full-blown referendum on British membership of the EU, but that is hardly a possibility – it would blow the government apart. There is, however, one thing a new Tory government could do about Europe, *writes Anthony Scholefield*.

As the three main parties vie with each other to promise the most swingeing public spending cuts, with the least possible pain, in order to cut a

government deficit of £100-175 billion a year, none of them has mentioned the £16.5 billion paid to the EU (less the Fontainebleau abatement of £4.8 billion – net £11.7 billion). Mr Cameron can remedy this.

There is, in fact, good reason why the complete axeing of the gross contribution to the EU should be at the top of the list of spending cuts.

There are three points to make about

continued on page 6

LETTERS

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

Sceptics must speak out

Dear Sir,

The re-launch of *eurofacts* provides sceptics with a welcome opportunity.

Just as the recession crept up unnoticed to deliver effects that will last for years, similarly party politics in Britain would seem to be generating a convulsion.

Voter disenchantment; Labour in complete exhaustion; Lib-Dem irrelevance; Conservatives in deep division between a confused front bench and a rank-and-file hoping for delivrance.

This is a moment for sceptics to say plainly and clearly what needs to be done in the interests of the country.

First, total extraction from the EU. There is no domestic issue that can be realistically tackled until Britain is released from the shackles of the EU. No political party will face up to this

either now or after the general election. Sceptics need to share views on this and possibly agree that a programme should be set out which could lead to the founding of a political movement able to tackle the complex tasks demanding attention.

This would be a movement that could welcome disenchanted members from existing parties as well as some of the many citizens who have given up on politics.

The re-launched *eurofacts* would seem to be a suitable forum in which to begin.

RALPH MADDERN
Warwickshire

Votes not required

Dear Sir,

The decision to ask the Irish to have a second referendum on the Lisbon Treaty because they voted NO first

time, shows how totally undemocratic the EU really is. Now they have voted YES, the EU accepts that vote as final: how very generous of them.

Next we see the prospect of Mr Blair becoming president of the EU.

A man who takes a country to war for his personal ideology is usually referred to as a "mad dictator", but in the eyes of the EU elite he is clearly seen as the kind of man the EU wishes to have as its leader.

Luckily for the EU, the democratic vote of its so-called "citizens" is not required. All that is expected of them is that they obey the rules of the EU elite.

History shows us that this form of "Communism" rarely lasts, but unfortunately it is the "citizens" who have to suffer until the democratic voice finally takes over, usually resulting in bloodshed.

RICHARD LONG
London

One thing Cameron *can* do about Europe

continued from page 5

British EU contributions. First, they have to be paid in euros. There is no question of Mervyn King printing some extra money and handing it out to the EU. It may be possible to pay British government liabilities in the UK in "funny money", but the EU demands hard cash.

Second, the headline gross contribution £16.5 billion consists of three parts. There is the abatement of £4.8 billion, which can be reasonably said to be a deduction from the gross. Then there is the part which is spent in the UK, about £5 billion. The rest, nearly £7 billion, is simply given to the EU and is a total loss to the British taxpayer.

Third, the £5 billion given back to the UK is spent on EU mandated activities. Some of these, such as EU promotion activities, are plainly wasteful, but

much goes to agricultural subsidy and various social programmes.

That some activities may be considered useful and others wasteful is irrelevant. The question from an accounting viewpoint is whether the gross (less abatement) or the net contribution is the correct figure to consider when assessing the taxpayers' EU burden and identifying the amount to be cut.

The answer is simple. In all aspects of government spending, cuts are considered in relation to what is spent. Secondary and tertiary effects are ignored.

After all, having found out that MPs' expenses include moat-cleaning and wisteria-cutting, the fact that cuts mean moat-cleaners and wisteria-cutters will see a fall in income, and even lose their jobs, is not a reason to continue paying MPs' outrageous expenses.

Quango employees or consultants

spend their incomes on all sorts of expenditure which forms the income of others. All parties are committed to cutting quangocrats and consultants but do not take account that those who receive their income from the expenditure of quangocrats or consultants will lose part of their income.

The same logic should apply to EU contributions. The yardstick on which cuts should be based is the gross contribution (less the abatement).

Certainly, some people in agriculture, some landowners, fake academics such as Jean Monnet professors, those engaged on EU-funded social programmes or promotions, will lose their income or their jobs.

It is impossible to take account of secondary or tertiary affects. The only figure that matters is what is actually spent by the government. Over to you, Mr Cameron.

MEETINGS

Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Saturday **17th October**, 7.00 pm

“The myth of man-made Global Warming”

Christopher Booker, *Journalist and author*

MEETING - Dress Lounge suits
Swan Hotel, Wells, Somerset BA5 2RX
Admission £35

(Cheques to Freedom Association,
Somerset - Cllr Ron Forrest, Pear Tree
Cottage, Lower Milton, Wells, Somerset
BA5 1DH)

Democracy Movement

(Southeast Sussex Branch)

01424 848964

Thursday **22nd October**, 7.30 pm

Bryan Smalley, *Retired submarine
Commander and freelance anti-EU
researcher.*

Steve Uncles, *National Membership
Secretary and South East England Area
Chairman of English Democrats.*

PUBLIC MEETING

Lansdowne Hotel, Kings Edward's
Parade, Eastbourne

Admission Free

Marlborough Group

01672 515275

Sunday **25th October**, 2.00 pm

Harry Beckhough,
Michael Shrimpton, *Constitutional
Lawyer*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Bear, Marlborough, Wiltshire

Admission Free

Gresham College

020 7831 0575

Wednesday **28th October**, 6.00 pm

“Are Bankers Good or Bad for
Society?”

Chris Skinner, *Chairman, The
Financial Services Club*

PUBLIC MEETING

Barnard's Inn Hall, Holborn, London
EC1N 2HH

Admission Free

New Britain, The London Swinton Circle

and

Flag Newspapers

020 7247 2524

Saturday **31st October**,
11.30 am - 4.00 pm

**Speakers include:
Numerous spokespersons for anti-EU
groups**

THE WAY OUT - CONFERENCE
Conway Hall, Red Lion Square,
Holborn, London EC1

Admission by ticket £5

Not available on the door

(Tickets from New Britain, 10 College
East, Gunthorpe Street, London E1
7RL)

Bruges Group

020 7287 4414

Saturday **21st November**,
10.30 am - 6.15 pm

“The Future of the EU - Can it survive?”

Gerard Batten MEP, *UKIP*

Christopher Booker, *Journalist*

Richard Conquest

Peter Davies

John Mills, *Labour Euro-Safeguards*

Ian Milne, *Financial expert*

Prof. Kenneth Minogue

Bruno Waterfield

ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, King's College London,
Strand, London WC2R 2LS

Admission £20

(Includes, tea, coffee, water, juice and
lunch)

DIARY OF EVENTS

2010

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

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

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

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Declaration of Independence

www.bdicampaign.org

British Weights & Measures Assoc.

www.bwmaOnline.com

Bruges Group

www.brugesgroup.com

Campaign Against Euro-Federalism

www.caef.org.uk

Campaign for an Independent Britain

www.eurosceptic.org.uk

Democracy Movement

www.democracymovement.org.uk

EU Observer

www.euobserver.com

EU Truth

www.eutruth.org.uk

European Commission (London)

www.cec.org.uk

European Foundation

www.europeanfoundation.org

European No Campaign

www.europeannocampaign.com

Foreign Affairs

www.foreignaffairs.org

Freedom Association

www.tfa.net

Global Britain

www.globalbritain.org

Global Vision

www.global-vision.net

I Want a Referendum

www.iwantareferendum.com

June Press (Publications)

www.junepress.com

Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign

www.lesc.org.uk

New Alliance

www.newalliance.org.uk

Open Europe

www.openeurope.org.uk

Regional Assemblies

www.regionalassemblies.co.uk

Speak Out Campaign

www.speakout.co.uk

Sovereignty

www.sovereignty.org.uk

Statewatch

www.statewatch.org

Team

www.teameurope.info

The People's "No" Campaign

www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk

United Kingdom Independence Party

www.ukip.org

Brussels Laid Bare

by *Marta Andreasen*. **£10.00**

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

How much does the European Union cost Britain?

by *Gerard Batten MEP*. **£3.00**

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

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by *David Brown*. **£6.99**

As an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU plans for control of the UK have destroyed democracy.

Required reading for all those worried in any way about the EU's power over us.

Reflections on the

Revolution in Europe

by *Christopher Caldwell*. **£14.99**

He makes it clear that the people never wanted mass immigration, which will result in the loss of democracy and the importation of an anti-EU culture Islam.

Central Banking in a Free Society

by *Tim Congdon*. **£12.50**

Congdon argues in this lucid and very readable book, that the Bank of England should act as the lender-of-last-resort.

The Great European Rip-Off

by *David Craig &*

Matthew Elliott. **£8.99**

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

While the Earth Endures

Creation, Cosmology

and Climate Change

by *Philip Foster*. **£10.00**

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

Cool Thinking on Climate Change

by *Roger Helmer MEP*. **£4.00**

Why the EU's climate alarmism is both mistaken and dangerous.

Why Did Britain

Take The Wrong Path?

by *Christopher Hoskin*. **£9.99**

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

The Return of History & the End of Dreams

by *Robert Kagan Hdbk*. **£12.99**

A new configuration of power is shaping the international order. Nationalism, and the nation itself, has now returned in Europe the EU model is now in decline.

Lost Illusions:

British Foreign Policy

by *Ian Milne*. **£4.00**

Is it time to make British self-reliance the guiding principle of foreign policy.

Warning:

Immigration Can

Seriously Damage Your Wealth

by *Anthony Scholefield*. **£6.00**

Scholefield argues that while immigration increases a nation's GDP it must inevitably reduce per capita income.

An Environmental Audit

How membership of the EU has

changed the face of Britain

by *Tom Wise MEP*. **£4.00**

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

Send payment to

**THE JUNE PRESS LTD
PO BOX 119
TOTNES, DEVON TQ9 7WA**

Tel: 08456 120 175

Email: info@junepress.com

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

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

FULL BOOKLIST AVAILABLE

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

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

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.
Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

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

I enclose my annual 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 0116 2874 622
Democracy Movement 020 7603 7796
Freedom Association 0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
020 7691 3800
New Alliance 020 7385 9757
Save Britain's Fish 01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy 01372 453678

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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

POLITICAL PARTIES

Conservative 020 7222 9000
Rt Hon David Cameron MP

English Democrats 01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)

Green Party 020 7272 4474
Richard Mallender

Labour 020 7783 1000
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP

Liberal 01562 68361
Mr Michael Meadowcroft

Liberal Democrats 020 7222 7999
Nick Clegg MP

UK Independence Party 01626 830630
Nigel Farage MEP

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006