

London can expect major influx of EU immigrants

Britain's open-door policy will place a strain on the capital's jobs and housing markets

No one knows how many citizens from East and Central Europe will move to Britain when the Accession Countries are admitted to the EU on 1st May 2004, which is a cause for concern in itself. Citizens from Malta and Cyprus will also be eligible to work here after their countries become members. The total population of the new EU states is 73 million and includes 38 million Poles, 10 million Czechs, 10 million Hungarians, and five million Slovaks.

Even if the Government is reluctant to acknowledge as much it is clear that the number one destination will be Britain. For Britain is the only large member state to waive its right under the accession treaty to delay extending full working rights to citizens for up to seven years, as France, Germany, and Italy have all done. Among smaller states, Denmark has been the most recent to introduce measures aimed at preventing an influx of cheap labour. Unlike in Britain, there will be no automatic access to benefits from social security schemes, and permission to work and reside in Denmark will only be given to workers employed in jobs paid according to a tariff system that regulates minimum salaries for particular skills.

Apart from Britain's open-door policy, there are additional reasons for thinking that this country will attract far more citizens from the new EU states than any other. These include the popularity of the English language, Britain's relatively high levels of recent economic growth and relatively low levels of unemployment.

Among those settling in Britain are likely to be a significant number of

Romany gypsies. There are estimated to be 3-5 million Romanies in Central and Eastern Europe, although more than half of these are in Romania, which is expected to join the EU later as part of a second wave of entrants. The fact that many of them presently believe themselves to be subject to racial persecution is a reason for believing that a high proportion of those in Hungary, Poland and the Czech republic are likely to take full advantage of the right to move to other EU countries, especially Britain and Ireland (which also has an open-door policy).

So far the Government has appeared relaxed to the point of indifference about the likely consequences of EU enlargement. Jack Straw, the Foreign Secretary has said that numbers coming in would not be significant, adding "*The evidence is that emigrant workers return to their countries after joining the EU, thanks to the increased stability and prosperity that membership brings.*" (see *eurofacts* for 20th December 2002). The FO has pointed out that the entry of Spain and Portugal actually resulted in fewer immigrants from those countries than expected.

There are several reasons for thinking that the Government is dangerously misguided:

- The disparities of wealth and income between Britain and Central Europe are far greater than in the case of Spain and Portugal.
- The new member states will not receive the same level of support as earlier entrants such as Ireland and Greece, the countries which have most recently benefited from EU

largesse; the incentive to move will consequently be greater; the incentive to return less great.

- Unemployment rates in some new EU countries - particularly Poland and Slovakia - are far higher than in the UK.

Experience suggests that London is likely to bear the initial brunt of the social tensions and problems arising from a sudden wave of immigrants, and that these are likely to impact most keenly on the poorest areas of the capital - which currently has the highest rate of unemployment of any region in the country. Immigrants are likely to move to those boroughs where the unemployment rate is highest because housing costs tend to be lowest in such areas. These are likely to include Tower Hamlets which has an unemployment rate of 12.3 per cent, Hackney (12.2 per cent), Newham 11.7 per cent, and Southwark (10.3 per cent). Moreover, the arrival of large numbers of unskilled workers is bound to depress the wages of the low-paid, while the minimum wage will prevent both natives and immigrants pricing themselves into work.

Those sceptical about the value of Britain's membership of the EU are likely to conclude that this is yet another example of the UK's impotence to protect important national interests from developments that arise as a consequence of EU measures. The coming months will provide unambiguous evidence as to whether they are right in supposing that the Government's behaviour in this matter is irresponsible to the point of recklessness.

Will the Irish be party-poopers on the EU's big day?

Few people know how to party as well as the Irish - and according to Dick Roche, Eire's Minister for Europe, Ireland will use its presidency to stage 'simply huge celebrations' to mark the enlargement of the EU on 1st May. Obviously struggling to find words to convey the enormity of his plans, he told the Press Association on 1st December "We want to have the celebration out there on the streets, we want to have the people of Dublin, the people of Ireland share the sense of history we will be creating in Europe...Dublin will be reaching out to the eastern border of Poland and the dream will actually come true."

The question is: Will the Irish feel like celebrating? Inflation rates rocketed after the introduction of the euro, and although rates are now dipping, Ireland remains top of the inflation league with prices increasing at 3.3 per cent per annum in October compared to a eurozone average of 2.0 per cent, 1.4 per cent in Britain,

1.1 per cent in Germany and 2.3 per cent in France.

The consequence is that retail prices in Ireland remain spectacularly high with a basket of groceries costing more in Dublin than in St Tropez. According to the Dublin-based *Sunday Independent* on 30th November the city is ranked the 21st most expensive in the world - more expensive than Paris, LA, Miami or Vienna.

Fine Gael, the Irish opposition party, has been running a 'Rip-off Ireland' website. Among those who have posted their complaints on the website have been a housewife who paid 3,000 for a cooker which costs 1,700 in Britain; a van driver who was quoted 4,000 for foreign insurance cover that he was able to obtain in Austria for 40; a young man who was shocked to see that the make-up he bought for his girl friend last Christmas selling at a price 60 per cent higher this year; and a shopper who pointed out that a pair of jeans

on sale for 33 in the US costs 80 in Dublin.

"There is a palpable sense of frustration and anger out there," Phil Hogan, Enterprise Trade and Employment spokesman for Fine Gael told the Press Association.

There are, of course, other reasons why Ireland's European dream is turning sour and why a robust Irish euro-sceptic movement is growing. These include the discovery that like other small countries, Ireland will exert negligible-to-zero influence in the enlarged EU and the growing realisation that the country will take a disproportionately large number of immigrants from the Accession States (see p1).

Given that a pint of Guinness costs more in Grafton Street than in a London pub, it would seem that the only way of getting the people out into the streets to celebrate EU enlargement would be by promising that Romano Prodi will pick up the drinks bill.

Germany sells Taiwan down the river

A revealing insight into how much respect Germany, the European Union's biggest member, is likely to show to minorities and to the EU's smaller members can be found in the remarks of the German Chancellor, Gerhard Schröder during a visit to China. Citing his own country's history, the German Chancellor affirmed his support for the 'one-China' policy that insists that Taiwan is part of the Chinese mainland.

Schröder said that his government's position means that Germany would not send 'sensitive goods' such as weapons to Taiwan. "We have experiences with what it means when a country is divided. We have come to that position largely through our own history," he

said, according to an AP report on 1st December.

The German Chancellor also called for a lifting of the EU arms embargo on China which was imposed after the Tiananmen Square massacre of 14 years ago.

China has recently replaced Japan as Germany's most important trading partner in Asia and Germany is China's biggest trading partner in Europe.

While history may indeed explain the division of both countries, Schröder's cynical remarks overlook important differences between them. Germany remained divided following the second war because the eastern half of the country was occupied by the Soviet Union, while Taiwan remains free and independent following the civil war of 1949 because the Taiwanese

have said that they will fight to preserve their liberty. The import of 'sensitive goods' - mostly from the US - has helped keep it free. But although the island functions as a sovereign state, the communist leadership in Beijing has threatened to invade if Taiwan moves towards formal independence. It has also conducted military exercises close to the island with the aim of influencing elections there.

The German Chancellor's comments suggest that were China to impose its one-China policy by force there would not be much of a protest from Berlin. The Taiwanese now fear that the German Chancellor's remarks will be followed by an EU decision to endorse the 'one-China policy'.

Why Britain will lose control over policy on immigration and asylum seekers

By David Heathcoat-Amory

In his party conference speech this year, Tony Blair announced some bold changes to our asylum and immigration laws. He promised 'to cut back the ludicrously complicated appeal process, de-rail the gravy train of legal aid, fast track those from democratic countries and remove those who fail in their claims without further judicial interference'. An Immigration and Asylum bill was duly promised in the Queen's Speech.

How odd therefore, that Blair should be simultaneously agreeing to a European Constitution which will not only transfer these decisions to the EU, but will prevent member states legislating in this area at all.

Part three of the Constitution describes how the Union, 'shall develop a common immigration and asylum policy' (articles III-167 and 168). The instrument for this shall be European laws or framework laws, which in all cases means majority voting without any national vetoes.

These laws will determine visas, residence permits, the conditions of entry and residence, and the 'removal and repatriation of persons residing without authorisation'. The policy requires a 'uniform status of asylum for nationals of third countries, valid throughout the Union'. The Constitution provides elsewhere for social security benefits for all migrant workers to be decided by majority voting.

All this of course in the context of a Union which ensures, 'the absence of any control on persons, whatever their nationality, when crossing internal borders'.

The British government may claim that it has an opt-out from the requirement to abolish border controls. This was done at Amsterdam when the Schengen agreement was brought into the Treaty. But there has been no sign of the Protocol guaranteeing this opt-out. It is not included in the draft European Constitution, though the government say it will still be valid.

But even if the Protocol is somehow

carried forward, it has already lost part of its force because the government has chosen to opt in to certain EU-wide agreements on asylum and immigration, such as Eurodac and the second Dublin convention. So EU law is already having effect in this area. And this is where there is another important twist.

Under the Constitution, the whole area of 'freedom, security and justice' becomes a, 'shared competence'. This is defined to mean that when the Union legislates, member states cannot. So when the new Union gets busy with its new Constitutional powers, national governments will be frozen out and national parliaments paralysed.

Flatly Untrue

I recently challenged Blair at Prime Minister's Questions on why he was promising legal changes at home while simultaneously giving up the power to deliver them. He had clearly never thought about it. He made an irrelevant comment about the Charter of Fundamental Rights, and then said: 'As for the laws that we propose in this country, under the European Constitution we shall have every right to pass them, and we will do so'.

This is flatly untrue. There is a long list of 'shared competences' in the Constitution. As well as criminal justice and immigration, it includes transport, energy, social policy, the environment and public health. When the Union legislates in these areas, member states will not be allowed to.

It is extraordinary that we have a Prime Minister who has persuaded himself that the legal powers of the Union under the new Constitution will somehow never be used. Or has he just never read it?

He was at it again at a press briefing on 23 October. This time he expressed frustration about the 1951 Geneva Convention on Refugees, rightly pointing out that it is out of date and has contributed to the flood of asylum seekers. He suggested that 'national

measures' should be taken to escape its obligations.

Unfortunately this too will be impossible if we sign up to the European Constitution. The articles on asylum require compliance with the Geneva Convention. The same obligation appears in the Charter of Fundamental Rights, which will of course be an integral part of the Constitution. So again Blair is signalling a change of policy which will be illegal if he agrees to the European Constitution.

There is a bigger issue here, the issue of self-government. Every country has a right to decide who its citizens are, and who may be admitted and on what terms. Such controls must be democratically arrived at and capable of change. This is the best bulwark against extremist parties seeking to exploit the issue of immigration and race.

The European Constitution will transfer these decisions to the Union. It will stretch the democratic elastic to breaking point. Nor will it work. The same organisation which mis-manages every large policy under its control will hardly make a success of a Common Immigration Policy.

The same is true of all the other 'shared competences'. They form the bulk of present legislation in the House of Commons. They are the issues which are argued out in political debate, scrutinised by the press, and decided at general elections. Under the European Constitution, they will become only residual matters for the House of Commons, able to pass laws only if the new Union chooses not to.

All this is dangerous. But what is really frightening is that we have a Prime Minister who seems to think it is not happening.

David Heathcoat-Amory MP was the Conservative Parliamentary Representative on the Convention on the Future of Europe.

Lessons of the Stability Pact fiasco

*The euro was supposed to prevent exchange rate volatility
- now the debate is over whether it can survive*

By Ian Milne

The Stability Pact died two years ago. The fiasco of the last couple of weeks – another monumental row in Brussels, with France and Germany being let off the fines they should have paid for persistently breaching the rules – was merely the memorial service. The eurocrats will try to put Humpty-Dumpty together again. The old ineffective and inoperable “rules” will be amended, tweaked, added to, massaged, refined; much pseudo-technical jargon will be deployed, some borrowed from the New Labour lexicon. We can expect earnest debates about what exactly “over the cycle” means, whether the “structural” component of the deficit should be separated (for pact purposes) from the “cyclical” component, whether expenditure on the “security” of the Union (e.g. a new French aircraft carrier) should be excluded from the definition of the deficit (for pact purposes), whether the ECB’s inflation target should be symmetrical or not – you know the sort of thing. All terribly fascinating to the eurocrats and the few dozen people outside the magic inner circle who more or less understand what’s going on. And all utterly pointless.

The old rules (consisting of the Maastricht convergence criteria as

toughened up by Stability Pact Mark One) were meant to underpin a currency that was – in the words of the Maastricht Treaty – to be “irreversible” and “irrevocable”. In the event, those rules didn’t even last ten years. The geniuses who designed them got them wrong. Their powers of analysis, deduction and foresight failed to predict that the two mightiest economies of Continental Europe would be in structural crisis. Since the same bureaucracy, and in many cases the very same politicians, are now engaged in cobbling together Stability Pact Mark Two – in effect, fighting the war before the last one - it would take a heroic leap of faith to put money on Mark Two doing any better than Mark One. *eurofacts* can safely predict that Mark Two, like Mark One, will end in tears.

Dead as a Dodo

But here’s the curious thing. It won’t matter. Or rather, it won’t matter in the short term. Although it’s been clear to everyone except the *Financial Times* that Mark One has been dead as a dodo for the last two years, the euro has strengthened against the world’s benchmark currency, the US dollar. Even in the last few days, with the headlines screaming “EU in Crisis”

following the official demise of Mark One, euro/dollar fluctuation has been absolutely normal. The world financial markets saw the demise coming and in any case take the view that the main currency issue is to do with the trading relationship between the US and China, and that even if the euro does have problems they’re not as worrying as those of the dollar.

Eurocrats are now making a cruel and bitter discovery. They proclaimed – and perhaps even believed – that the euro would be stable, shielding the eurozone from outside turbulence. To their horror, they’ve ended up with a currency that’s even more volatile than the legacy currencies used to be. And with the demise of the Stability Pact – which has had no obvious effect on the euro’s value – has come the realisation that they’re powerless to “control” the euro, because if nothing adverse happens to the currency following a fiasco like the Stability Pact, logically, nothing favourable will happen to it even if they do the right things. For those control freaks, that’s hard to bear!

At a time when the euro’s off the British political agenda, perhaps for good, the question now being openly debated in the mainstream europhile Continental media is “can the euro survive?”

Poll shows declining support for the EU

Less than half of those interviewed in an EU-wide survey of opinion believe the European Union to be “a good thing” - down six per cent on March.

Other interesting findings from the Eurobarometer opinion poll involving more than 16,000 people and carried out between 1st October and 7th November:

- 15 per cent think the EU is bad thing - up four per cent.
- 67 per cent are in favour of the

single currency - down nine per cent; 28 per cent are against (in Germany opposition to the euro has grown by 11 per cent, by eight per cent in France, and by 13 per cent in Italy).

- Only 15 per cent say they trust political parties
 - Respondents were less optimistic about the economic and employment prospects for 2004 than six months ago.
- Apparently unwilling to

acknowledge the possible impact on public opinion of headlines about corruption within the EU commission and his own shortcomings, President of the Commission Romano Prodi said: “*These results highlight the growing pessimism felt by people right across the European Union.*” Signor Prodi also blamed the ‘bitter disputes’ over the Stability and Growth Pact and the ‘unseemly horse-trading between national governments’.

The mysterious case of the disappearing (and reappearing) report on anti-Semitism

Dr Helen Szamuely describes the curious behaviour of an EU agency which was set up to help combat racism

The European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia is a curious beast. For one thing, its Management Board, according to its Chair Bob Purkiss, consists of "independent experts in the fields of racism and xenophobia". The Centre was set up by the EU in 1997 in Vienna with a staff of 31, its primary objective "to provide the Community and its Member States with objective, reliable and comparable data at the European level on racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia in order to help them take measures and formulate courses of action". Until 2001 the EUMC, as it is known among friends, has led a quiet existence, periodically publishing reports on the growing racism and calling for the denial of the Holocaust to be made illegal.

The events of 9/11 and immediately afterwards ought to have galvanized EUMC, its Management Board of independent experts together with the Chair Bob Purkiss, into some kind of sensible activity. And so they did. They decided that the most dangerous outcome of the attacks on America and the subsequent war declared by America on terrorism will be Islamophobia. No fewer than three reports on Islamophobia were published and every isolated incident that could be interpreted as such lovingly examined. It was then pointed out that, as a matter of fact, what has grown since September 2001 in some West European countries has been anti-Semitism and attacks on synagogues, Jewish schools, businesses, and individuals. Simultaneously, there has been a growth in some of the EU Member States of what one might call politically correct anti-Israeli thinking that has, imperceptibly, become so

unreasonable as to be classed with the old-fashioned anti-Semitism. Even the French Government has acknowledged that the hundreds of attacks on synagogues, Jewish schools and individuals do, indeed, constitute anti-Semitism.

The EUMC woke up and commissioned a report on anti-Semitism in the EU and its member states. The report was finished in November of this year and was promptly suppressed. Or rather, according to the Chair of the Management Board, deemed to be inadequate. They hemmed and hawed and told us that the problems were a lack of agreement of what constitutes anti-Semitism and a tendency to blame whole groups. In other words, they did not like that the Report indicated many radical Islamic and pro-Palestinian groups to be behind the attacks. The Report did not blame Muslim communities in general but pointed to the obviously anti-Semitic nature of some of the political discourse (so-called) and vicious slogans. The other conclusion was that although some of the old-fashioned anti-Semitic groups were involved in some countries in the attacks, they were not, on the whole, as prominent as expected. Since the EUMC spends its time attacking old-fashioned right-wing groups of any kind and blaming all forms of racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism on the unimportant neo-Nazi organizations, this conclusion was something of a blow, as was the indication that the vicious anti-Israeli and linked anti-American propaganda in many mainstream and left-leaning political discourses and publications has contributed a great deal to the no-longer nebulous and growing feeling of anti-Semitism in parts of western

Europe. In a recent opinion poll 60 per cent of those asked pointed to Israel as the greatest threat to world peace. This was so embarrassing that even Romano Prodi has gone on record as denying that the poll was in any sense an official one. There is also the running saga of EU funds transferred to the Palestinian Authority that has still not been properly accounted for, while documents have turned up (their validity denied by the EU but acknowledged by various international experts) showing that a large proportion of those funds end up in the hands of terrorists. The remainder disappears into bank accounts controlled by Yassir Arafat's friends and relations.¹

When summaries of the report were leaked to the Financial Times, the EUMC showed itself to be both indignant and sorrowful. How could their good intentions be traduced in this way? But they still refused to publish the Report. It has now appeared on a number of websites, none of them the official ones. Even Daniel Cohn-Bendit has placed a copy on his personal website "in the name of transparency". For those of our readers who would like to read and make up their own minds, we publish a web address: <http://www.crif.org/index.php?menu=5&dossier=33&PHPSESSID=4933605e872a8132bc5020c11e306b9c>.

The EUMC intends to continue its research into anti-Semitism and publish another report early next year. Without, one presumes, any of the more controversial conclusions.

(1) Well documented in a recent book by Dr Rachel Ehrenfeld: *Funding Evil* (2003).

The Season's Greetings to our Readers

eurofacts wishes its readers the compliments of the season. Our next issue will be published on 16th January 2004

Gisela Stuart attends a master class in how to ignore the democratic will

The following description of how Giscard d'Estaing's Convention on the Future of Europe went about its task has been helpfully provided by one of its members, the Labour MP Gisela Stuart:

"Consensus was achieved among those deemed to matter, who made it plain that the rest would not be allowed to wreck the fragile agreement struck".

"Some members of the secretariat showed particular irritation with my insistence that documents be produced in English. On one occasion a redraft of articles dealing with defence mysteriously arrived just before midnight. They were written in French and the authorship was unclear. Verbal reassurances were given that this was little more than a 'linguistically better draft of the earlier English version'.

The draft was discarded when some of us spotted that references to Nato had mysteriously disappeared" (Sunday Times, 7th December).

And in a Fabian pamphlet, *The Making of Europe's Constitution* (see back page) on which her *Sunday Times* article was based she writes:

"Not once in the 16 months I spent on the Convention did representatives question whether deeper integration is what the people of Europe want, whether it serves their best interests or whether it provides the best basis for a sustainable structure for an expanding Union. The debates focused solely on where we could do more at European Union level. None of the existing policies were questioned".

Miss Stuart now says that there is no reason for Britain to accept a treaty

"riddled with imperfections". Her account brings home the autocratic nature of the processes by which Giscard has produced a constitution for Europe. If, as the only British member of the inner 13-member drafting "Praesidium" Ms Stuart feels her views were disregarded, how much influence, if any, could the 90 ordinary members of the Convention have had?

Question to Peter Hain, the British Government's representative on the Convention: Do you not feel just a little bit uncomfortable about the fact that your parliamentary colleague has undermined totally all your assurances that the constitution would strengthen the position of national parliaments and was generally a very good thing?

Constitution: the state of play

As *eurofacts* went to press an intense round of diplomatic activity was taking place to settle the final terms of the proposed European constitution - with some governments threatening to block a deal and Germany and France hinting that they would seek to lead a core of 'fast-track' nations if their objectives were not secured. Rather than analyse the current Italian

draft - which may quickly be superseded by another - we propose to deal in a future issue with the document which finally emerges from the on-going Inter-governmental discussions (assuming, of course, that there is one).

As of 10th December the state of play regarding the ratification plans of member states was as follows:

Holding a referendum: Czech

Republic, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Spain.

Not holding a referendum: Malta, Germany and Sweden.

No formal decision: Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia and the United Kingdom.

And who enforces the constitution?

Lord Stoddart of Swindon asked Her Majesty's Government: *What institutions will have responsibility for interpreting, implementing and enforcing any new constitution for the*

European Union.

Baroness Crawley: *The European Court of Justice will be responsible for ensuring respect for the law in the interpretation and application of the constitution. Implementation of the constitution will be carried out by the*

member states, the Council, the Commission and the Union Minister for Foreign Affairs.

HANSARD - House of Lords 20th November 2003

Parliamentary Copyright 2003

EU may have funded suicide killings

EU funds may have been channelled to Palestinian militant groups responsible for the deaths of scores of people in suicide bombings, according to *The*

Independent (3rd December 2003). Olaf, the EU's anti-fraud squad and the Belgian police are investigating claims that funds ear-marked for aid went to the Al-Aqsa Martyr's

Brigades through affiliated organisations in Belgium and Germany. Al-Aqsa is on the European Union's list of banned terrorist organisations.

Why Britain's security is put at risk by the euro army

*eurofacts poses - and answers
- some pertinent questions
about the European Rapid Reaction Force*

“Full and frank exchange” is the diplomat’s euphemism for a row. So presumably the words “severe, frank, intense” - the US Secretary of State Colin Powell’s description of the talks over the EU’s defence plans on 5th December - denotes a row of seismic proportions. It was also clear from Powell’s subsequent comments that the row remains unresolved.

At root, the disagreement reflects the US awareness that the EU’s defence plans would destroy NATO and that no matter how they are dressed-up, are part of Europe’s wider ambitions to provide a counterweight to the US “hegemon”.

For those who have difficulty understanding the ongoing rumpus we provide answers to some pertinent questions.

What is the military rationale for this new force? There isn’t one; it is impossible to think of a conflict or crisis which could not be better dealt with by other means.

Well, why is it being created? Because it is regarded as an essential building block in the creation of a unitary European state. Many in Brussels also believe that there will be no agreement on a common foreign policy unless there is a common defence.

So, this new force isn’t intended to provide protection against new threats? No, it will distract attention from the need to deal with the most urgent and compelling threats to our security, namely international terrorism and ‘rogue’ states with weapons of mass destruction. The RRF will not make any contribution to solving these problems.

What will Britain contribute? 12,500 troops, 18 ships and 72 combat planes. But we have also indicated that we will be prepared to put in additional men and materiel if, as expected, several of our partners fail to meet their

commitments.

What do the members of our armed forces think about this?

Members of our armed forces owe their loyalty to the Crown and also understand the importance of *esprit de corps*. They don’t like the idea of a multi-national force answerable to Brussels in which standards are likely to be set by the least efficient units. Experts refer to this tendency as the ‘multi-national troop degradation syndrome’.

In time, in our out of the EU, why couldn’t European states develop their own armed forces, instead of being reliant on the US? In theory they could, but the reality is that Europe free-loaded on the US during the Cold War, and has neglected its defences since. The one remaining military superpower - the US - spends 3.5 per cent of its GDP on defence compared to less than two per cent for EU states and it plans to raise defence spending by 30 per cent by 2009. In the words of the NATO Secretary General George Robertson, “*Europe is military pygmy*”. He was too polite to point out that, relative to the US, it is a shrinking pygmy with a broken spear. For Europe to bridge the gap would mean cancelling welfare entitlements, raising taxation, slashing other forms of public expenditure - all of which is politically impossible.

Couldn’t European defence cooperation be based on the British and French forces which are highly rated? Although over-stretched and under-manned, the British and French forces are good “niche armies” - but they do not begin to compare with the much larger and better equipped US forces, comprising twelve army divisions, the US navy with its 12 carriers, and an air force without equal.

Tony Blair says the creation of the RRF is just a way of rebalancing the Atlantic relationship and thanking the Americans for their help in two

world wars. Yes, but they don’t believe him any more. You could only rebalance the relationship if European states were prepared to spend more and do more, or if the Americans spend less and took on fewer responsibilities. Exactly the opposite has been happening.

Why are the Americans getting so hot under the collar about the proposed EU planning headquarters? The RRF already has a strategic planning capability, and now wants a permanent operational planning headquarters. For the Americans this constitutes the clearest possible evidence that the new force will duplicate NATO capabilities and will lead to the decoupling of European and American security.

Where does Mr Blair stand in all of this? The RRF couldn’t have happened with his backing for an autonomous defence capability at St Malo five years ago, and it can’t be taken even half seriously without Britain’s involvement. He has also said that he is “very ambitious” for a European defence. But he also maintains that he would never weaken NATO. In other words, true to form, he says things which are mutually contradictory. But actions speak louder than words - and he has given the goal of an autonomous defence capability his backing.

Does it matter? If we persist in this folly, we risk losing access to enormously valuable US intelligence which is crucial in dealing with international terrorism. More generally, we will undermine a relationship on which we have depended for our security for half a century.

Are there other dangers? Yes, there is the danger that the EU might take the RRF seriously and send it to war.

The proposed EU Constitution a view from the Peers

Lord Howell of Guildford: ...Above all, there is the dismal EU constitution project, which the Foreign Secretary now tells us is desirable but not necessary. If that is so, we have to ask why it is being pursued at such divisive cost....

A constitution for a nation or for nations is not just any old piece of paper, but a document in which every word has legal significance. I know that the Foreign Secretary is calling it no more than a "label" and that Mr Peter Hain says that it is just a tidying-up operation. Those statements are being rightly and almost universally ridiculed. Presumably, they are made only to defend the Government's crumbling case against a referendum on the issue....

Everyone in Europe recognises that the new constitution is much more than a treaty; that however many "red lines" there are - and some of those are looking very crumbly - it shifts power to the European institutions and significantly away from member states. It creates for the first time in our history a new and superior legal framework for our national affairs, which will affect every single one of us. So says the Belgian Prime Minister, Mr Verhofstadt, who states: "*The Convention's draft is quite rightly accorded the title of a Constitution: it is more than a treaty - it is the capstone of a federal state*". (italics added).

So, too, says our friend Romano Prodi, in stating:

"The Constitution is a big change from the basic concept of nation states. It's a change of centuries". (italics added).

So, too, says our own Chancellor, Gordon Brown, when he points to the constitution's fundamental importance and the threat it poses to our autonomy in tax and fiscal matters....

As great constitutions go, this EU effort is a very poor one. It is wordy, complex and lengthy, and fails to secure individual rights. We shall return to it again and again. However, for the moment I simply summarise by

saying that it is a constitution by bureaucrats, of bureaucrats, for bureaucrats. It is intolerable that the party-controlled majority in the other place should seek to force it through without proper reference to the British people....

Lord Skidelsky: ...We are debating British, not French, foreign policy. Much as I would like to see a more independent Europe, I cannot accept the proposition that we have to choose between the United States and Europe. There is no choice, actually, because there is no presently acceptable basis for a European alternative.

The Prime Minister can certainly be faulted for his judgment on the threat posed by Iraq. He can be criticised for an excessive public subservience to the Bush Administration. But on the central issue of who guarantees our safety, he is right. He understands with great clarity that no European alternative to America's defence guarantee is currently available, and it might not be desirable even if it were available.

For there is, of course, a potential alternative which has long been hinted at; that is, the political union of France and Germany. That would finesse the problem of a German finger on the nuclear trigger. That is the real alternative to reliance on America. The European superstate which the Eurosceptics fear will come about, if at all, not through the Brussels directives or the feeble federalist initiatives that the noble Lord, Lord Howell, so much feared in his speech, but through the political consolidation of the core of the European Union. It is not the European Union which will grow into a political giant, but a political giant might grow up within the European Union, to which we as well as our American ally will one day have to define our attitudes....

Baroness Park of Monmouth: Does anyone suppose that the special relationship would last five minutes without our military card? Yet we see our Government today choosing, quite

unnecessarily, to become the ally of the French and the Germans in their new venture when instead they should be acting as the leader of the newly freed world-the Poles, the Hungarians, the Czechs and such European countries as Denmark, Holland and Spain....

Russia has not gone away. It thinks long. NATO does not threaten the EU, but the reverse is true. The French and the Germans are prepared to use their relationship with Russia to drive the Americans out of Europe and to establish a hegemony of their own to dominate Europe, with Russia sharing the spoils. I am not talking in military terms, but simply in terms of weight and power. We are supporting them in a totally unnecessary, expensive and militarily inoperable new organisation with more institutions, more grand commitments - even a building - and more grand strategies by the high representative Mr Solana. But whose boots will be on the ground? Ours. Let us remember that once a common strategy has been agreed in any area of EU policy, implementation is by QMV, even for defence. The French and the Germans have committed a mean-spirited act of vanity, pique and ambition to control, which contributes nothing to EU capability....

Decisions in the EU on military matters are being made for purely political - and inept - political reasons. We cannot deliver on any existing ESDP or NATO requirement without spending on our over-stretched services; nor can we defend our country. While the Treasury is simply not prepared to fund the Government's own defence programme, that same Government have taken on a totally unnecessary and offensive new initiative which is guaranteed to be developed to threaten NATO and to drive our best friends out of Europe.

HANSARD - House of Lords
3rd December 2003
Parliamentary Copyright 2003

LETTERS

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

Time for all good men...

Dear Sir,

Permit me to add my fullest concurrence to the views of John Ashworth of York. Ever since, about seven years ago, I tired of the endless miasma of lies that surround the 'European project' and began to say so in voice and print, I have been deluged by embassies to join the UKIP. My answer does not vary.

Let me introduce a small friend. The APR is not big, but my own. The only Achievable Political Reality for us to take our country back is under a commanding government of the same hue.

It is an APR that this can only be a Conservative government. Provided that this can be won back from the palsied grip of the Heath/Howe/Heseltine/Hurde/Clarke nexus that owned it for too long. THIS HAS BEEN ACHIEVED.

It is not an APR that on the first-past-the-post system the UKIP will take a single constituency. It is an APR that the UKIP could and probably would 'shaft' between 24 and 40 Tory candidates, letting New Labour or Lib-Dem squeeze back in.

Surely it is madness, because of pique over past weaknesses, to put back in power all that we abominate. If we divide and let Blair rule, seven years from now we probably won't even have a country. So unite. We need every one of you under one flag.

FREDERICK FORSYTH

Herts

Dear Sir,

John Ashworth says, in response to Nigel Farage MEP, that there is a minority in the Conservative Party who really want a new nation called Europe and a few who are what could be called eurosceptic. Clearly this leaves a large lump in the middle who believe - what?

Ashworth himself talks bravely about amending the Fisheries Act but stops short of talk about leaving the EU, other than in a watered down way over a long period. Could this be because

Michael Howard said in response to a direct question the other day on the Today programme, "*We would never consider leaving the European Union. Believe me, we will never leave the EU*". Perhaps he was speaking for that large lump in the middle.

ROGER WILSON

Hants

Bleak Future

Dear Sir,

Your alarming page one article of 5th December ("Youth unemployment: one in six without work in euro-zone") brings home what a poor future our young people can look forward to as citizens of the EU.

In one field after another - from the arts to business - Europe has lost its pre-eminent position, mostly to America and is no longer a trend setter. In technology, Europe trails miserably behind, spending far less on R&D than the US or Japan. Economic growth rates are abysmally low, and, as you have pointed out in earlier issues, the demographic profile of the European '25' is sufficiently disturbing to keep you awake at night. Not surprisingly, the mood throughout Europe is one of deep pessimism about the future. Some of the problems faced by EU states may be unavoidable, but many are the consequence of a flawed political and economic model which offers little in the way of prosperity or democratic choice. The present generation of opinion formers and political leaders must have the courage to retrace its steps if it is not to leave future generations with a legacy of rapid economic and social decline and an all-pervading sense of failure.

ALAN HALL

Essex

Warnings from Big Brother

Dear Sir,

I have received three different (but apparently connected) warnings from Big Brother recently:

1) My stockbroker, whose firm has dealt and corresponded with me at my

present address for two generations, approached me for further proof of my identity and of my home address. He explained apologetically that this was going to be required from all their clients under a new EU directive against money laundering, and that if I wished to go on laundering my meagre savings through him the EU would not be satisfied with our long association but required my passport or driving licence and other specified documents to be entrusted to the post for his inspection. He didn't need to add that the directive has been implemented under the guise of the Financial Services Authority.

2) Then, with routine reports from my few unit trusts, an impressive leaflet arrived bearing the logos not only of the FSA but also of HM Treasury and the National Criminal Intelligence Service. It says, "*Fighting crime and terrorism (my italics): we need your help*". It says that by providing proof of my identity to my financial services provider I "*make it harder for criminals and terrorists to use false names including yours*". (That made me feel important, although I had not hitherto realised that my name is false).

3) Perhaps I'd have been less surprised if I'd already noticed my Sunday newspaper financial agony aunt's report of many complaints from readers whose bank or building society had demanded passports etc before allowing long-suffering customers to open a second account. (Her comment: "*It's for our own good!*").

I would be silly to ask how crime (let alone terrorism) would be prevented by me, old Aunt Fanny and all showing our passports to our building societies, and how they would know that these were not forged or stolen. For despite the leaflet's excuses it seems clear that the reason for all this unreasoning prying is the EU's regulation factory's usual urge to extend its control over us.

ANTHONY HOYLE

Buckinghamshire

LETTERS

Ratification Scenarios

Dear Sir,

Could there be a different reason for Tony Blair's refusal of a referendum on the EU Constitution than his often quoted claim that it does not represent a major constitutional change?

For the past thirty-three years, the average time for any government to remain in office is four years two months. This suggests that his preferred date for an election may be May 2005.

The IGC is meant to conclude its deliberations by the end of April 2004, but a more probable date for this stage is June/July 2004.

Assuming the IGC conclude their work in June 2004, the Bill could be presented to Parliament in November 2004 where it is likely to have a bumpy ride through the Commons. When the Bill moves to the House of Lords, it is sure to be rejected due to the public support for a referendum by Conservatives, Lib-Dems, Cross Benchers and some Labour Peers.

By the time the Bill is rejected by the Lords, it will be getting very close to Mr Blair's preferred election date. At this stage, he could either accede to a referendum to get the Bill through, or 'pack' the Lords with new Labour peers to get the Bill through without a referendum - a very high risk tactic for him, politically, with an election so close - or delay the election and use the Parliament Act to get the Bill through in the 2005/6 session. But this is, again, a high-risk option for him, since it limits his flexibility on the date of the

election.

Most legal opinions indicate all Member States are required to ratify the Constitution because it is a Treaty and Mr Blair probably suspects that at least one State will not ratify. As is common practice, that State will be given another opportunity to vote again to achieve the 'right' answer, but this will take a year to achieve.

Mr Blair is currently under pressure and we need to keep the pressure up with as many petitions as possible.

In the unlikely event that the Bill had been passed without a referendum before a general election and all other countries had by then ratified, an incoming Conservative Government could adduce the Denning Doctrine and overturn the actions of the previous Parliament. One would need to be a considerable pessimist to think that we will get to that point.

HARRY M RANDALL
Dorset

Forced dependency

Dear Sir,

On Sunday 26th October 2003, a radio farming programme reported on the plight of a farmer who, after generations of farming his land, had decided to call it day as he could no longer make a living due to the masses of red tape and restrictions imposed by the European Union's Common Agricultural Policy (CAP).

Later in the day, when reading the excellent Christopher Booker column in the *Sunday Telegraph*, we were told how British dairy farmers are struggling to make a living under the

EU quota system and a British farmer with a herd of 130 pedigree Holsteins, each producing 8,400 litres a year, found it increasingly difficult to make a living while in Ireland, under the same EU quota system, a farmer with just 30 cows could make a more than comfortable living.

In the situations vacant section of the same edition, *Advantage West Midlands*, an unelected and unwanted body, which has been set up as part of the EU initiative to break the UK into "regions" of the European Union, advertised a range of jobs with salaries ranging from £30,570 to £51,504, all with pay awards pending. The combined salaries for these five administrative vacancies add up to £206,918 of taxpayers' money per annum.

The EU has wrecked our fishing industry and forced our fishermen to scrap their boats under the rules of the Common Fisheries Policy, leaving our former territorial waters to the Spanish and other fishing fleets. Our farmers cannot survive under the rules of the CAP, and much of our essential industry is bogged down by masses of legislation. It would seem obvious to me that the EU intends to make us dependent on the rest of Europe as under its rules we will be unable to feed ourselves or provide many essential goods, while at the same time it is creating an army of well paid bureaucrats to enforce its law over us. Cannot our blinkered pro-EU politicians see what is coming?

DEREK BENNETT
West Midlands

Brussels gravy train rolls on

A compromise deal that would have ensured that members of the European Parliament only receive expenses backed by receipts has been defeated. The deal, which would also have ensured that MEPs receive 8,000 a month rather than the sum paid to national parliamentarians in their own country, was sabotaged through organised resistance by a group of MEPs. This consisted mainly

of German Christian Democrats and Social Democrats who argued that the Parliament was conceding too much to the European Council which has been seeking reforms in the arrangements for paying MEPs.

At present, Members of the European Parliament receive a lump sum every time they visit Brussels or Strasbourg - irrespective of the cost of the ticket, and irrespective what use, if any, they

make of their time on their arrival. This arrangement now looks set to continue. It is now up to the European Parliament as a whole to decide whether to reconsider the matter - but the euobserver (3rd December 2003) reported - not altogether surprisingly - that parliamentary sources had indicated that there would be 'no movement' on the issue.

MEETINGS

Democracy Movement
Southeast Sussex Branch
01424 848964

Friday **16th Jan. 2004**, 7.30 pm

“Regionalisation of Britain”

Mark Glendening
Bryn Smalley

PUBLIC MEETING
Village Hall, Hailsham Road,
Herstmonceux, Hailsham, East Sussex
Admission Free

New Britain
020-7247 2524

Sunday **1st February 2004** 6.00 pm

Australian/New Zealand Celebrations

(**Australia Day** 26th January - **New Zealand Day** 6th February)

St Paul's Cathedral, London
All Welcome

Cross-Party Organizations
01628-666456

Saturday **24th April 2004**

March & Rally calling for a
National Referendum on the
European Constitution

10.30 am, Victoria Embankment
12.00 am, March
3.00 pm, Rally, Hyde Park

Speakers to be announced

MARCH & RALLY
London
All Welcome

DIARY OF EVENTS

2004

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

UK Parliament Restart **5th January**

EU enlargement to 25 countries **1st May**

USEFUL WEB SITES

British Democracy Campaign
www.britishdemocracycampaign.com
British Weights & Measures Assoc.
www.bwmaOnline.com
Bruges Group
www.brugesgroup.com
Business for Sterling
www.bfors.com
Campaign Against Euro-Federalism
www.poptel.org.uk/against-eurofederalism
Campaign for an Independent Britain
www.cibhq.co.uk
Congress for Democracy
congressfordemocracy.org.uk
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
Democratic Nations in Danger
freenations.freeuk.com
European Commission (London)
www.cec.org.uk
European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org
Europe of Democracies & Diversities Group in EP
www.euobserver.com
Facts, Figures & Phantasies
www.eufactsfigures.com
Foreign Affairs
www.foreignaffairs.org
Freedom Association
www.tfa.net
Freedom UK
www.taylor.co.uk/eu/
Global Britain
www.globalbritain.org
June Press (Publications)
www.junepress.com
Keele Critical European Group
www.keele.ac.uk/socs/ks40/ceghome.html
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
www.lesc.org.uk
New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk
No Campaign
www.no-euro.com
Referendum04
www.referendum04.co.uk
Regional Assemblies
www.regionalassemblies.co.uk
Save Britain's Fish
www.savebritfish.org.uk
Sovereignty
www.sovereignty.org.uk
Statewatch
www.statewatch.org
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords
020-7219 3000

Tuesday **13th Jan. 2004**, 10.45 am
Evidence will be heard on *The World Trade Organisation. The role of the EU post-Cancùn*, from to be announced.

Wednesday **21st January 2004**, 3.45 pm
Evidence will be heard on *The Practicalities of Renewable Energy*, from DTI officials.

Wednesday **21st January 2004**, 4.15 pm
Evidence may be heard on *The Proposed Regulation on the Law applicable to non-contractual obligations ("Rome" II)*.

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

MEDIA COMPLAINTS

The Advertising Standards Authority
2 Torrington Place, London WC1E 7HW. Tel: 020-7580 5555
Fax: 020-7631 3051
complaints page: www.asa.org.uk

BBC
www.bbc.co.uk/info/bbc/complaints.shtml

Broadcasting Standards Commission
7 The Sanctuary, London SW1P 3JS
Tel: 020-7233-0544 Fax: 020-7233 0397 E-mail: bsc@bsc.org.uk
www.bsc.org.uk

Independent Television Commission
33 Foley Street, London W1P 7LB
Tel: 020-7255 3000
E-mail: programme@itc.org.uk or advertising@itc.org.uk
www.itc.org.uk

Press Complaints Commission
1 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8JB
Tel: 020-7353 1248
Fax: 020-7353 8355
How to complain page:
www.pcc.org.uk

Radio Authority
Holbrook House, 14 Great Queen Street, London WC2B 5DG
Tel: 020-7430 2724
Fax: 020-7405 7064
www.radioauthority.org.uk

Subsidiarity and the Illusion of Democratic Control

by *John Bercow MP. £2.00*

A critical examination of the concept of subsidiarity as employed in the draft EU Constitution.

The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North. £20.00*

A comprehensive history of the European Union project.

An Analysis of the Draft Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe

by *Anthony & Andrew Cowgill. £15.00*

The definitive guide to the draft of the proposed EU Constitutional Treaty.

Whip's Nightmare

Diary of a Maastricht Rebel

by *Christopher Gill. £17.50*

Former rebel MP gives an insight into the way politics works and why Britain's freedom is being surrendered.

The Trojan Hearse

by *J. Brian Heywood. £9.99*

This book although a work of fiction - or is it? raises a multitude of awkward questions and provides some uncomfortably plausible answers.

A Constitution For Europe

by *Martin Howe QC. £5.00*

A clear and easy to understand assessment of the EU Draft Treaty by a Constitutional Lawyer.

A Constitution to Destroy Europe

by *Bill Jamieson. £2.00*

A financial expert examines the proposed EU Constitution.

Criminal Justice and the draft Constitution

by *The Rt Hon Oliver Letwin MP. £2.00*

A review of the legal implications of the proposed EU Constitution.

A Critical History of Economics

by *John Mills. £19.99*

Mills's questions whether economists really do know the causes of economic growth. He sets out in simple language, the history of economic thought and its major influences.

OverCrowded Britain

by *Ashley Mote. £8.95*

This book looks at the facts and consequences of large-scale immigration.

The Making of Europe's Constitution

by *Gisela Stuart MP. £6.95*

An insight into the proposed EU Constitution and a call for greater democratic scrutiny.

Britain v Europe

by *David Winn. £11.99*

A factual account of Britain's fifty year dilemma over Europe and the development of the EU.

V I D E O

Shockwaves

by *Sanity*

Video £5.00

A clear thirty minute presentation of the EU threat to the United Kingdom.

Send Payment to

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

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

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

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

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

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

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

Britain in Europe	020-7233 0123
European Movement	020-7881 8989
Federal Trust	020-7799 2818

AGAINST "EU"

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

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372-453678
No Campaign	020-7378 0436

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

Bruges Group	020-7287 4414
Global Britain	
Email-globalbritain@ukonline.co.uk	

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	020-7434 4559
Mr Roger Knapman	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006