

## Defence is the next area for European integration

*The auguries suggest that Britain will meekly acquiesce in French plans for a 60,000-strong common intervention force*

It is becoming increasingly clear that the next push for European political integration will take place in the area of defence and that once the Lisbon Treaty is out of the way the British Government will meekly acquiesce in the creation of what can be legitimately described as a European army.

In defending the Lisbon Treaty ministers have maintained that while the national veto would be lost in a limited number of foreign policy matters defence would remain firmly under the control of national governments. Evidently ministers have not quite found a way to justify putting the lives of young men and women at risk as a result of Qualified Majority Voting. So, for the time being, the initial decision to dispatch British troops to far-away places to make or keep the peace will be taken at the Inter-governmental level.

### Growing like Topsy

But it is not true, as ministers frequently suggest, that all of the important decisions on defence will continue to be taken at Westminster. The truth is more “nuanced” than that, as is so often the case with the present Government. A close reading of the text also demonstrates that the range and scope of the military tasks which the EU wishes to undertake are growing like Topsy.

The Treaty introduces twelve new areas within the CFSP where majority voting is to be introduced. These

include setting up an “inner core” in defence, terrorism, mutual defence, and the role of the European Defence Agency.

As recently as the Inter-governmental Conference the position of the British Government was that QMV on foreign and security matters was simply unthinkable. “QMV is a no-go area in CFSP”, Peter Hain, Britain’s leading representative at the IGC declared. The Government has since eaten its words and looks set to eat more of them.

Perhaps the most significant innovation contained in the Treaty is the plan to allow “permanent structured cooperation” within the EU framework. This would permit the creation of an inner core of EU members interested in taking forward military integration in order to perform what are described as “the most demanding missions”.

### Elite Group

Within days of the French ratification of the Treaty on 10th February, President Sarkozy’s spokesman on defence matters, Pierre Lellouche announced that under the provisions for permanent structured cooperation the French EU presidency would bring forward specific proposals to create a G-6 comprising France, UK, Germany, Spain, Italy and Poland. Each would contribute 10,000 troops to a common intervention force and commit to spending two per cent of GDP annually on defence (at present among the EU-27 only Britain and France do this).

This elite group would also create a European defence market, carry out joint anti-terrorist initiatives and participate in infrastructure programmes such as missile defence. Lellouche also called for the “Europeanisation” of external military bases.

Given that Britain’s armed forces are over-stretched and under-strength this commitment would place obvious constraints on Britain’s ability to carry out its mission in Helmand Province of Afghanistan. It would also represent a quite flagrant breach of repeated British assurances to the US that the creation of an autonomous European defence force would not seek to duplicate NATO capabilities.

### NATO Viability

More than anything that has been done in the area of defence cooperation it would raise questions about the viability of NATO - to which, Britain apart, EU countries are increasingly unwilling to commit combat forces. US spokesmen have repeatedly warned that NATO could not survive if some members left the fighting to others.

Reports in the *European Voice* suggest that Britain has already signalled its approval of the French plan, but will not say so prior to the ratification of the Treaty.

In the past those in authoritative positions within the EU have avoided the suggestion that a European defence force could ever be used for the

**Continued on p.2**

## Defence is the next area for EU-integration

territorial defence of Europe. But the inclusion in the Lisbon Treaty of a mutual defence clause - very similar in kind to that contained in the Washington Treaty of 1949 which created NATO - raises doubts whether this still remains the intention.

It is also clear that the range of military missions that the EU intends to undertake - the so-called "Petersberg tasks" - is growing.

"Petersberg" is the name of the hotel where European defence ministers met in 1992 under the auspices of the WEU. On that occasion they agreed to contribute national contingents to a European defence force which would carry out "...humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks and tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking".

Seven years later the scope of the European security policy was enlarged and fleshed out at the June 2004 European Council when for the first time the tasks included anti-terrorist measures. The Headline Goal 2010

defined the role of the ESDP as follows:

*"...humanitarian and rescue tasks, peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peacemaking. As indicated by the European Security Strategy this might also include joint disarmament operations, the support for third countries in combating terrorism and security sector reform".*

Now, according to article 28 B of the Lisbon Treaty the "Petersberg tasks" are defined as:

*"...joint disarmament operations, humanitarian and rescue tasks, military advice and assistance tasks, conflict prevention and peace-keeping tasks, tasks of combat forces in crisis management, including peace-making and post-conflict stabilisation. All these tasks may contribute to the fight against terrorism, including by supporting third countries in combating terrorism in their territories".*

In expanding the list of military tasks

which the EU wishes to undertake and in establishing new rules under which these will be conducted the Lisbon Treaty marks an important milestone in the creation of a permanent and autonomous European defence force. It also lays the foundation of further measures of military integration which are capable of fatally fracturing the Atlantic Alliance, but which are not now being resisted in Whitehall or Westminster.

The European Army may not exist - yet. But the drive to create it is moving into higher gear and the response of the British government is following a familiar pattern: initial resistance followed by meek acquiescence, coupled with an attempt to conceal from the public what is going on and just how high the stakes have become. It is a depressing story, and unless there is a major change of direction by this government or its immediate successor, it is one which could have a disastrous conclusion.

## Kissinger on the European Union

**SPIEGEL:** *What does Europe not understand? Paris, London and Berlin do not see the "war on terror" as a common challenge for the West?*

**Kissinger:** *I don't like the term "war on terror" because terror is a method, not a political movement. We are in a war against radical Islam that is trying to overthrow the moderate elements in the Islamic world and which is fundamentally challenging the secular structures of Western societies. All this is happening at a difficult period in European history.*

**SPIEGEL:** *Difficult why?*

**Kissinger:** *The major events in*

*European history were conducted by nation-states which developed over several hundred years. There was never a question in the mind of European populations that the state was authorised to ask for sacrifices and that the citizens had a duty to carry them out. Now the structure of the nation-state has been given up to some considerable extent in Europe. And the capacity of governments to ask for sacrifices has diminished correspondingly.*

**SPIEGEL:** *Thirty years ago, you asked for one phone number that could*

*be used to call Europe.*

**Kissinger:** *... and it happened. The problem now is: Nation-states have not just given up part of their sovereignty to the European Union but also part of their vision for their own future. Their future is now tied to the European Union, and the EU has not yet achieved a vision and loyalty comparable to the nation-state. So, there is a vacuum between Europe's past and Europe's future.*

Der Spiegel, 18th January, 2008

## The rising cost of translation

The cost of translating each of the 23 EU-recognised languages into every other EU-recognised language now amounts to 1.1 billion - equivalent to one per cent of the EU budget or 2.50 per person. This pays

for the 2,500 staff employed at the Commission's translation department - the world's biggest public language service - who constitute one tenth of the Commission's work force (*EU observer* 25th February 2008).

According to the Commission there are now 506 possible language combinations although this will inevitably increase with each round of EU enlargement. Translation costs are currently rising at five per cent a year.

# Constitution: Can the Lords come to the rescue?

*The Parliamentary arithmetic is daunting but the goal of winning a referendum may not be beyond reach*

**By David Willoughby de Broke**

The Government is taking no chances with the Constitutional Treaty- sorry, Reform Treaty - in the House of Commons. The Speaker, 'Air-miles' Martin, has bizarrely ruled 'out-of order' an amendment which could have led to the requirement for a referendum to be held before the Treaty could be ratified. The promised twenty-five full days of debate have been cut to twelve, organised into so-called themes to avoid the embarrassing line-by-line scrutiny of a treaty that will fundamentally and finally tilt the balance of power away from the nation states to the unelected Eurocracy in Brussels. It could have been "embarrassing" because some MPs might have felt obliged to ask themselves whether they can realistically justify their £200,000 remuneration and pension package once the dirty deed is done. With immigration, trade, foreign policy, economic policy, agriculture and fisheries no longer being decided in Westminster but in Brussels our Parliament will now enjoy a purely consultative role; MPs and peers will earn their salaries and expenses being compliant rubber stamps for EU legislation, whether or not they agree with it - it won't really matter; they won't really matter.

So we can assume that the Reform Treaty Bill will clear the Commons with shameful ease. The battle then moves to the Lords, possibly as early as mid/late March where the prospects for a referendum amendment may seem brighter - but are they?

For the avoidance of doubt it should be made clear that neither the Commons nor the Lords has the power to change a single word in the Treaty itself - so much for the Government's empty claim that the Treaty will be subject to Parliamentary "scrutiny". In this context "scrutiny" means "debate it if you must but forget changing it". Parliament may only amend the implementing Bill, the European Union (Amendment) Bill. In theory Parliament could vote the whole Bill

down; end of story, but in practice that is not going to happen.

So the hopes of those who oppose the Treaty rest on a suitable amendment being tabled in the Lords and then won in the voting lobbies. Everyone's favourite here is a "referendum amendment" which would stipulate that the Treaty would not come into force unless it has been put to the people of Britain in a referendum. It is certain that such an amendment will be tabled by the Conservatives or by an alliance of like-minded peers.

It is less certain that such an amendment would be carried. Let's look at the maths. There are 217 Labour peers, 202 Conservative peers, 201 Crossbenchers, 78 LibDems, plus 26 Bishops and 14 "others" (convicts past and present Lord Archer and Lord Black, a Green, two UKIP peers and assorted disaffects who do not wish to join the crossbenches).

## **Serious Slippage**

The LibDems, true to form, have reneged on their own manifesto pledge to hold a referendum on Not the Constitutional Treaty. Indeed, Lord McNally, their leader in the Lords, has formally notified the House that the LibDems will be voting with the Government benches against any such amendment.

That gives the Government a notional total of 295 votes. Allowing for slippage of peers who are sickened enough by the breach of promise to abstain or stay away and even a very few who may support a referendum amendment we are likely to be left with say 275 solid Government votes.

Turning to the Conservatives, their 202 votes will also be subject to serious slippage; think the three H's (Hurd, Howe, Heseltine), the ex-MEPs, the Commissioners - who could be liable to lose their fur-lined pensions if they act against the interests of the EU - members of the various EU quangocracies like the Committee of the Regions and

Regional Assemblies as well as the "let's not frighten the horses" school. Let's say the Conservatives could count on 175 votes. We can expect most of "the Others" to vote with the Conservatives. The position of the Bishops is unclear; that leaves the Conservatives 90 votes behind the Government at the start line.

So to the Crossbenchers, two hundred of them. O-level maths shows that the pro-referendum group will need to get the votes of one hundred and fifty of those two hundred crossbenchers to carry the day. That is what Ministers like to call a "challenging" target, bearing in mind that the cross-benches are the retirement home for a number of ex-heads of QUANGO's or public bodies who owe their position to the Government. If a referendum amendment is to be carried in the Lords it will need to be led by respected members of each party, plus a similarly respected crossbencher. They will have to be organised, hold regular meetings to decide what amendments to table and at what stage; who is to table them and speak to them; to get and keep the press informed and onside. It will still be a bit of a long-shot, but not out of reach.

What is deeply depressing is that even if the referendum vote is carried, assuming the Commons does not overturn it, and the Treaty is rejected by the electorate, we will still be where we are now, with the EU making the majority of our law, pressing ahead with all the elements contained in the Constitution - as they have done in spite of the French and Dutch votes. We will still be inexorably sucked deeper into the EU quicksand. Perhaps that is too pessimistic; perhaps a "NO" vote in the referendum will spur our two main political parties to re-think our relationship with the EU.

And perhaps Mohammed Fayed is telling the truth...

*The author sits in the Lords as a member of UKIP*

# Expulsion from the EPP is mark of honour

*The excruciatingly slow progress in reversing Britain's attachment to the EU reflects a curious intellectual phenomenon*

Opinion about the European Union is becoming gradually firmer. Newspapers and commentators which once supported British membership of the EU now find it difficult to find a good thing to say about it. The *Financial Times*, which has probably done more to assist the cause of British membership than any other major newspaper, now regularly refers to the EU's lack of democratic accountability and routinely complains about the impact of EU regulation on the economy. And yet this heightened mood of dissatisfaction with the EU does not lead former enthusiasts for European political integration like the FT to call for renegotiation or withdrawal. It does not feed into public protest and, far from stimulating interest in the European Union (Amendment) Bill as it makes its profoundly depressing way through Parliament, it appears to be having the opposite effect.

Writing in the *Financial Times* on 16th February, Matthew Engel reached an opinion that some might conclude had come to him rather late in the day: *"Europe as a whole cannot be a democracy because it is too large and too diffuse to constitute a polity with a cohesive popular will"*.

You might think that that in itself is reason enough for rethinking our relationship with the European Union. But having pointed out this central fatal flaw in the European project Engels continued: *"Unfortunately those who grasp this tend to be marginalised zealots: with a sinking feeling I heard the Tory Europhobe Daniel Hannan invoking Germany in the 1930s at the mildest provocation the other week. That makes it all too easy for the political elite to continue*

*to keep defending the indefensible, and the rest of us to decide that the European Union is as it is, and turn away"*.

So it's all Dan's fault. His alleged intemperance is not only responsible for the actions of an elite that does not want to own up to its mistakes but also for the apathy of those who have finally and reluctantly grasped that British democracy is being destroyed - even if they cannot stir themselves to do anything about it.

Engel's comments and those of Caroline Jackson, a Conservative MEP who has called on David Cameron to "dump" Hannan over the same remarks, point to an interesting phenomenon, one which helps explain why the task of reversing the direction of British policy on the EU is so excruciatingly and painfully slow.

## Glaring Defects

In Britain today hardly anyone makes an overt case for closer European political integration, but there are many, including a considerable number who recognise that the EU suffers from some glaring defects, who are enraged by the expression of robust eurosceptic sentiment. Similarly, during the Cold War, there was a strand of opinion which was not wholly Marxist in orientation but which reflected a hatred for those who, like Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan, believed that Soviet communism was an unmitigated evil and were prepared to say so. Today's anti-eurosceptics have much in common with the anti-anti-communists of the 1980s, not least an inability to think straight. If in the past they have got the EU project wrong, the folly is theirs, not Hannan's

Unlike many politicians Hannan

eschews personal abuse, speaks several European languages and has a considerable knowledge of and passion for Spain and its culture. He is therefore not a Europhobe in any meaningful sense, far from it; what he detests is a brand of European politics that is anti-democratic in spirit, which cannot tolerate dissent and has much in common with the corporatist views of the 1930s. In the post-democratic political world of Brussels this is sufficient for him to be categorised as a marginalised "zealot".

Hannan stands out because he combines intellectual rigour, passion and clarity of expression. The *"mildest provocation"* which produced the remarks leading to his expulsion from the EPP was Hans-Gert Pottering's decision to ignore procedural rules in order to stifle dissent over the little matter of the EU constitution and the betrayal of the promise to give millions of ordinary people a say in the matter. We hope that Hannan wears his expulsion as a badge of honour; it is something to be proud of; few MEPs achieve as much.

However, he, and a handful of others like him, will have to reconcile themselves to the fact that they will continue to arouse hatred, not least among those who, like Engel, reluctantly admit that he is right. This is because he reminds them of the enormity of the political legacy they have allowed to be frittered away.

So while opinion in Britain about the EU may be firmer than formerly, true enlightenment remains a distant prospect. Britain's political elite would prefer to think about almost any other subject; forcing them to think about it only enrages them. It is to Hannan's credit that he does this so well.

## Euro quote of the month

*"The document is not secret. It is confidential"*, unnamed spokesman for the European Parliament commenting on a report which uncovered *"extensive, widespread and criminal*

*abuse"* by MEPs of staff allowances worth almost £100,000 a year, but which could only be seen by members of the EP budget control committee in a designated room protected by

biometric locks and security and then only on condition that they signed a confidentiality agreement and didn't take notes.

# Life after the EU: why Britain would not be isolated

*The UK is the EU's single biggest market worldwide and is in substantial - not to say alarming - structural deficit on its trade with the EU*

There is considerable ignorance about the likely nature of Britain's trading and economic relations in the event of a decision to leave the European Union. This enables supporters of EU membership to allege that such a decision would leave Britain isolated and marginalised. In fact Britain would remain a member of the **European Economic Area**; if it chose to do so it could also rejoin the **European Free Trade Association (EFTA)**. It is important to understand the scope and role of both of these.

The **European Economic Area (EEA)** brings together the twenty-seven EU member states and three of the four European Free Trade Association (EFTA) member states (Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein, but not Switzerland) in a 30-member Internal Market governed by the rules set out in the EEA Agreement. This is a conventional international treaty whose signatories are on the one hand the European Community (EC) and its member states, and on the other hand Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein. The EEA Agreement explicitly obliges its signatories to comply with the rules of the **World Trade Organisation (WTO)**.

Excluded from the EEA Agreement are the following EU policy areas, sovereignty over which (in contrast to the position of the EU-27 member states, including the UK) remains with each of the three EEA-EFTA states:-

- Common Agricultural Policy
- Common Fisheries Policy
- Customs Union
- Commercial Policy
- Common Foreign and Security
- Justice and Home Affairs
- Economic and Monetary Union
- Tax Harmonisation
- Economic and Social Cohesion

The EEA Agreement provides for the free movement within the 30-member EEA of goods, services, capital and people (the "four freedoms"). In addition, the Agreement incorporates

so-called "horizontal provisions" deemed to promote and safeguard the four freedoms, such as health and safety at work, labour law, equal treatment of men and women, consumer protection and the environment. These horizontal measures incorporate the EU *acquis communautaire* and are legally-binding.

In the early 1990s, EFTA and the then EC negotiated a **Free Trade Agreement (FTA)** called the **European Economic Area**. Switzerland, constitutionally obliged to seek electoral approval for EEA membership, held a referendum on 6th December 1992: a majority voted no. EFTA itself, to which Switzerland continues to belong, was thus unable to be a "Contracting Party" in the EEA. The three other EFTA countries entered the EEA individually in 1994. Switzerland subsequently negotiated a series of sectoral bi-lateral FTAs with the EC/EU covering much the same ground as the EEA

## Legal Framework

EFTA is an inter-governmental organisation established in 1960 by the UK and six other European countries. The UK and Denmark left EFTA to join the EC in 1973; so, subsequently, did Austria, Portugal and Sweden. Currently, EFTA's member states are Switzerland, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein.

EFTA provides the legal framework for intra-EFTA free trade between its member states. It also, on behalf of its four member states, negotiates FTAs with other states and regional groupings worldwide. Currently, EFTA has FTAs with Canada, Mexico, Chile, Singapore, South Korea, Turkey and seven other countries or regional groupings. In addition, EFTA has "Joint Declarations of Cooperation" - partial FTAs - with another eleven countries or regional groupings.

EFTA is NOT a customs union: each

of its members retains control of its own trade policy worldwide. The EC, unlike EFTA, is a customs union, which sits and votes in its own right at the WTO, in place of its member states, setting tariffs, quotas and negotiating trading arrangements worldwide for the customs union as a whole. British trade policy, since accession to the EC in 1973, is explicitly, *de jure* and *de facto*, not to have a British trade policy.

The 1994 Agreement on the European Economic Area (as subsequently amended to admit the ten states which joined the EU in 2004 and Bulgaria and Romania in 2007) is an international treaty. It contains no article or clause providing for the expulsion of any contracting party from the EEA. Neither does it contain any language which specifies that a non-EU or a non-EFTA state CANNOT be a member of the EEA. Thus, if the UK withdrew from the EU by repealing the 1972 Act, she would, as an existing EEA member, be automatically and legally entitled to stay in the EEA, preserving free movement of goods, services, capital and people with both the three non-EU and the remaining twenty-six EU member states of the EEA.

The UK would have to decide for herself whether, outside the EU, the balance of the costs and benefits of EEA membership was optimal for her trade worldwide. The UK would also wish to consider whether re-joining EFTA, with the latter's expanding worldwide network of FTAs, was desirable. Alternatively, the UK might conclude that a Swiss-style relationship with the EU (combined perhaps with EFTA membership) was preferable. While these decisions were being taken, UK trade and investment worldwide, including with the EU, would continue under the rules - legally-binding on the UK and her trading partners inside and outside the EU alike - of both the EEA and the

**Continued on p.6**

# LETTERS

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

## Redressing the Balance

Dear Sir,

Due to copious output of that terrible trio of UKIP bashers, Frederick Forsyth, Christina Speight and Denis Cooper, UKIP is always shown in an unfavourable light in your publication. It would be nice if the balance was redressed.

It is quite obvious that the Tories, left to their own devices, will never, ever lead Britain out of the EU. David Cameron has said quite clearly, "*There is no place for Eurosceptics in my team*". But with UKIP being a pain the Tory neck (hopefully an ever-growing pain), there is some hope of blunting their Euro-enthusiasm. If they are really interested in winning the next election, their course is clear - adopt a policy of withdrawal from the EU and demonstrate they mean what they say. This they would never do if UKIP did not exist.

Without such an undertaking there is no point in voting for them. There is no evidence to show that they would be any more competent than the present bunch. It's up to the Tories to come to their senses. The ball is in their court.

JOHN CULVERWELL

Essex

*[Letters are chosen on their merit. But we regularly publish letters - and articles - from UKIP members - Ed.]*

## Lessons from the Turf

Dear Sir,

Recent Letter's columns have been stating the obvious, that voting UKIP would cause the Conservatives to lose

seats and maybe the election.

Christina Speight, in urging a vote for the Conservatives, is realistic enough to acknowledge that this course, even if it returned a Conservative government, offers but 'faint hope' (of halting the integration process), let alone recovering lost sovereignty and democracy.

I have letters from several MPs, including David Cameron and William Hague on the subject of a retrospective referendum on the Lisbon Treaty should their party gain power. Although words of comfort are offered, there's no guarantee that such a referendum would be held - this is consistent with their public statements. I don't believe for a moment this position will change.

The blindingly obvious has to be recognised, that Conservatives have whipped all treaties and acts through parliament when in government, as have Labour - there is but a cigarette paper's difference between the two on Europe. Successful betting at the races is all about studying form. On this score, the Conservatives are no hoppers. So what's to be done?

There is a third option not involving the hope of a UKIP government, and that is to initiate a Conservative split. A fourth election defeat would surely lead to that. We could then expect to see a true and strong Conservative party emerge, probably through merger with UKIP. It would be dedicated to negotiating an arrangement that people

thought they had voted for in 1975.

That should be the strategy.

DAVID BARNBY

Oxfordshire

## Northern Rock

Dear Sir

Alistair Darling has been pushed into nationalising Northern Rock because he must get "state aid" approval from the European Commission by the March 17th deadline.

It may be argued that six months was long enough to sort out the bank's future, but on the other hand with more time it might have been possible to find a better solution.

Northern Rock will not be exempt from the EU's "state aid" rules once it is in public ownership. We know that, because the same rules apply to the Royal Mail. It is one of the reasons why the government prefers to shut post offices, rather than subsidise them.

However closely Alistair Darling and his staff pore over the details of the rules, it will still be in the lap of the gods whether any step he takes will be deemed permissible.

Not the gods on Olympus, of course, but the judges at the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg. They can impose severe penalties if they decide that "state aid" rules have been broken, and there is no appeal.

Considering that this is our money, it might be supposed that the government would be answerable only to us for how it is used. Unfortunately, that is no longer the case.

MURIEL PARSONS

Berkshire

Continued from p.5

## Why Britain would not be isolated

World Trade Organisation.

To conclude:

■ If the UK left the EU and joined EFTA, she would preserve free trade in goods and services, and freedom of movement of persons and capital with the EU and with Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein.

■ If the UK left the EU and chose a Swiss-style relationship with the EU

(bilateral sectoral agreements) in preference to a Norwegian-style relationship she would not need to be in the EEA.

■ If the UK left the EU, chose a Swiss-style relationship with the EU, and did NOT give 12 months' notice of its intention to withdraw from the EEA, the default position would be that her membership of the EEA (and free trade with the rest of the EU and

with Norway, Iceland and Lichtenstein) continued until such time as UK-EU bilateral agreements were in place. After all, the EU needs the UK market much more than the UK needs the EU market. The UK is the EU's single biggest market worldwide (the USA is the second biggest) and is in substantial - not to say alarming - structural deficit on her trade with the EU).

# MEETINGS

**UK Independence Party**  
01626 831340

Saturday **8th March**, 10.00 am

“Let the People Speak”

**Speakers will include;**

**Nigel Farage MEP**

**Christopher Gill RD**, former Conservative MP

**Marc Glendening**, Democracy Movement

**Lord Pearson of Rannoch**

**SOUTHWEST RALLY**

The Great Hall, Exeter University, Exeter, Devon

**Admission Free**

---

**Hurlingham Club**  
0207 736 8411

Tuesday **11th March**, 7.30 pm

“Is it in Britain’s best interest to be a member of the European Union?”

For the motion;

**Peter Luff**, Chairman of the European Movement

**Denis MacShane MP**, Former Minister for Europe

Against the motion;

**Christopher Booker**, Journalist and author

**Daniel Hannan MEP**, Columnist, Daily Telegraph

**PUBLIC DEBATE**

The Hurlingham Club, Putney, London (100yds from Putney Bridge)

**Admission £30 (Includes Supper)**

{**Tickets from the Hurlingham Club**}

---

**FREE**

**Advertising Space**

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of UK-EU relations we may be able to advertise the event without charge.

**Contact Details**

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 12 12 65**

**or Email: eurofacts@junepress.com**

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **16th April**, 6.00 pm

“The British and American Constitutions”

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

**Professor Cristina Rodriques**, New York University

**PUBLIC MEETING**

Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London

**Admission Free**

**Followed by a Seminar on;**

Thursday **17th April** 1.00 pm  
Ends approx. 3.00 pm

**SEMINAR**

Barnard’s Hall Inn Hall, London

Reservations required

(Those attending this seminar are expected to have attended the lecture on 16th April - See above)

[Refreshments available afterwards]

---

## SELECT COMMITTEES

---

**House of Lords**  
020-7219 3000

Thursday **13th March**, 10.10 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from Peter Lemmey, Director of Policy, Human Tissues Authority, Dr Wisely, Director, NHS National Patient Safety Agency, National Research Ethics Services; and Professor Margot Brazier, Centre for Ethics and Social Policy, University of Manchester.

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

---

## DIARY OF EVENTS

---

**2008**

UK Government Budget **12th March**

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

---

## USEFUL WEB SITES

---

**Better off Out Campaign**

[www.betteroffout.co.uk](http://www.betteroffout.co.uk)

**British Declaration of Independence**

[www.bdicampaign.org](http://www.bdicampaign.org)

**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**

[www.bwmaOnline.com](http://www.bwmaOnline.com)

**Bruges Group**

[www.brugesgroup.com](http://www.brugesgroup.com)

**Campaign Against Euro-Federalism**

[www.caef.org.uk](http://www.caef.org.uk)

**Campaign for an Independent Britain**

[www.cibhq.co.uk](http://www.cibhq.co.uk)

**Democracy Movement**

[www.democracymovement.org.uk](http://www.democracymovement.org.uk)

**EU Observer**

[www.euobserver.com](http://www.euobserver.com)

**EU Truth**

[www.eutruth.org.uk](http://www.eutruth.org.uk)

**European Commission (London)**

[www.cec.org.uk](http://www.cec.org.uk)

**European Foundation**

[www.europeanfoundation.org](http://www.europeanfoundation.org)

**European No Campaign**

[www.europeannocampaign.com](http://www.europeannocampaign.com)

**Foreign Affairs**

[www.foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

**Freedom Association**

[www.tfa.net](http://www.tfa.net)

**Global Britain**

[www.globalbritain.org](http://www.globalbritain.org)

**Global Vision**

[www.global-vision.net](http://www.global-vision.net)

**I Want a Referendum**

[www.iwantareferendum.com](http://www.iwantareferendum.com)

**June Press (Publications)**

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

**Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign**

[www.lesc.org.uk](http://www.lesc.org.uk)

**New Alliance**

[www.newalliance.org.uk](http://www.newalliance.org.uk)

**Open Europe**

[www.openeurope.org.uk](http://www.openeurope.org.uk)

**Regional Assemblies**

[www.regionalassemblies.co.uk](http://www.regionalassemblies.co.uk)

**Speak Out Campaign**

[www.speakout.co.uk](http://www.speakout.co.uk)

**Sovereignty**

[www.sovereignty.org.uk](http://www.sovereignty.org.uk)

**Statewatch**

[www.statewatch.org](http://www.statewatch.org)

**The People’s “No” Campaign**

[www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk](http://www.thepeoplesnocampaign.co.uk)

**United Kingdom Independence Party**

[www.ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org)

**Thinker Tailor Soldier Spy**

by *Harry Beckhough*. **£18.99**  
A remarkable book about a soldier, code-breaker, intelligence officer, teacher and political activist.

**A Democratic Europe: An Alternative to the EU**

by *Richard Body*. **£10.00**  
Sir Richard lays out the case for a truly democratic European Union as opposed to an undemocratic super power.

**Scared To Death**

by *Christopher Booker & Richard North*. **Hdbk £16.95**  
This latest book by the famous duo explores the tricks used to extend EU power and control.

**Gordon Is A Moron**

by *Vernon Coleman*. **£9.99**  
Analysis of Brown's Chancellorship.

**The Problems for Post-Communist Countries in the Context of the EU**

by *CRCE*. **£11.95**  
Papers from the 2006 colloquium in Bled.

**The Bumper Book of Government Waste**

by *Matthew Elliott and Lee Rotherham*. **£9.99**  
An exposé of the huge levels of waste in Britain and the EU.

**Hard Pounding:**

**The Story Of The UK Independence Party**

by *Peter Gardner*. **£9.99**  
An inside story of the rise of UKIP.

**A Life of Mayhem, Money and Unintentional Treason**

by *J Brian Heywood*. **£9.99**  
This novel clearly shows how easy it is for good intentions to be used by anyone with ambitions for a world government.

**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.

**Corruption - The World's Big C**

Cases, Causes, Consequences, Cures  
by *Ian Senior*. **£12.50**  
Senior shows how corruption in the EU is becoming worse and why the UK should not sign up to the proposed European Constitution.

**Allegations**

Selected works by Alexander Litvinenko  
Edited by *Pavel Stroilov*. **£12.95**  
Translated from Russian with an introduction by Vladimir Bukovsky.

**The Principles of British Foreign Policy**

by *Philip Vander Elst*. **£4.00**  
Should British Foreign Policy reflect any political principles or should it merely be shaped by current conceptions of national self-interest, which may change?

**Video**

**Britain On The Brink**

by *Sanity*. **DVD or VHS Video £5.00**  
Latest film starring Christopher Booker, Christopher Gill, John Bingley, Lindsay Jenkins, Ian Milne & Vladimir Bukovsky.

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

Tel: 08456 120 175  
Email: [info@junepress.com](mailto:info@junepress.com)

**WEB SALES [www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com)**

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

## eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

**RATES**

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

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

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

Name .....

Address .....

.....

Postcode .....

Date .....

*Please print clearly in capital letters*

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

<b>Britain Out</b>	<b>01403 741736</b>
British Weights & Measures Assoc.	020 8922 0089
<b>CIB</b>	<b>020 8340 0314</b>
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
<b>Freedom Association</b>	<b>0845 833 9626</b>
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
<b>New Alliance</b>	<b>020 7386 1837</b>
Save Britain's Fish	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

<b>Congress for Democracy</b>	<b>01372 453678</b>
-------------------------------	---------------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

<b>Bruges Group</b>	<b>020 7287 4414</b>
Global Britain	
Email: <a href="mailto:globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org">globalbritain-1@globalbritain.org</a>	
<b>Global Vision</b>	<b><a href="http://www.global-vision.net">www.global-vision.net</a></b>
Open Europe	0207 197 2333

POLITICAL PARTIES

<b>Conservative</b>	<b>020 7222 9000</b>
Rt Hon David Cameron MP	
<b>English Democrats</b>	<b>01277 896000</b>
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
<b>Green Party</b>	<b>020 7272 4474</b>
Richard Mallender	
<b>Labour</b>	<b>020 7783 1000</b>
Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP	
<b>Liberal</b>	<b>01562 68361</b>
Mr Michael Meadowcroft	
<b>Liberal Democrats</b>	<b>020 7222 7999</b>
Nick Clegg MP	
<b>New Britain Party</b>	<b>020 7247 2524</b>
Mr Dennis Delderfield	
<b>UK Independence Party</b>	<b>01626 830630</b>
Nigel Farage MEP	

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006