

Brown doesn't *do* foreign policy and he doesn't *do* Europe, either

The Prime Minister's lack of interest in external affairs, including those of the EU, mean that we get the worst of all possible worlds

Europe has become a post-military as well as a post-democratic society. It behaves as if war and even the possibility of war had been conveniently abolished. As the distinguished military analyst Colin S. Gray has written:

For the peoples of EU-Europe in particular, war is not merely old-fashioned, indeed obsolete, it is wholly uninteresting, except as a non-participatory recreational diversion. The societies of peninsular Europe today face no security problems of a kind that demand a military response, at least not as they choose to define their problems. When a US administration seeks to persuade its European allies to cooperate actively in the latest scheme for ballistic missile defence (BMD), for example, it fails to recognise the degree to which its friends have become thoroughly debellified. The European solution is not simply an opinion of the moment, but is now sufficiently deeply rooted as to warrant description as cultural: it is an attitude.

Harm's Way

It is this attitude which explains why European states spend so little on defence, and why their armed forces take care to keep out of harm's way.

It is one which has taken hold to a lesser extent in Britain than in continental Europe but it has a growing number of adherents even in this country. Whatever his defects this

was not an attitude displayed by Tony Blair who, like Margaret Thatcher, recognised that the world was an inherently dangerous place, that the peace had to be kept by someone and that there were few suitable candidates for the job.

Mr Brown appears to be an agnostic about such matters. It is this absence of belief in the importance of military power that has not conveyed itself to Britain's senior service chiefs who find him deeply unsympathetic. This does not necessarily put the Prime Minister in the camp of those who believe that the age of military power has been surpassed by the age of soft power. He simply has no views on the subject and given the primacy of economic factors in determining the way people vote he sees no profit in acquiring any.

Risk-Taking

Such attitudes, or the absence of them, inevitably colour his view of America. He is not anti-American in the normal sense of the term. He apparently admires US risk-taking and the American can-do philosophy. But if Mr Brown admires US foreign policy and the military strength on which it depends, he has evidently kept his enthusiasm to himself.

The truth is that Mr Brown does not *do* foreign policy. As Irwin Stelzer has written recently he has effectively outsourced foreign policy to international institutions, especially the EU, as was apparent from his speech at the Lord

Mayor's banquet. The road from Westminster to Washington now runs via Brussels. As Stelzer pointed out, the consequence is a weakening of the alliance that preserved Western values from assaults from fascism and communism and has been waging a new battle against international terrorism.

But Mr Brown's shortcomings as Prime Minister go still further. It is increasingly evident that Mr Brown does not *do* Europe, either, a state of affairs which was symbolised by his late arrival for the signing of the Lisbon treaty. He does not like Brussels (which fully returns the sentiment) but has no strategy for achieving the kind of Europe he says he wants to build. According to George Parker in a recent article in the *Financial Times* there is muttering that he has left the field at the very moment when Nicolas Sarkozy has started to make the running in the EU.

"We try to give the impression that something is going on between Paris and London but the reality is that there is very little", Parker quotes one French EU official as saying.

Non-stop Smoozing

In seeking to win friends and influence people Sarkozy engages in energetic non-stop Europe-wide smoozing. Brown stays at home devoting his energies to patching up the welfare state and to little local

Continued on p.2

INSIDE: Tory words fail to reassure eurosceptic opinion p.2 - Sarkozy tells it like it is p.2 - Who gains most from mass immigration? p.3 - Harmonisation 'to a degree never before imagined' p.4 - Expansion of Schengen are 'an invitation to criminals', say German police p.5 - Brussels names EU first Ambassador p.5 - Commission issues threat over plan to save fish stocks p5

Tory words fail to reassure eurosceptic opinion

The Conservative leader's promises in regard to the Constitution are far vaguer than his commitments on membership of the EPP

Media reports on New Year's Eve suggested that the Conservative leader had provided the strongest indication so far that he would tear up the EU Constitution if returned to power even if it had been ratified by Parliament.

Mr Cameron's carefully-crafted comments, which appeared in the *Telegraph* and *Mail* on 31st December were represented as an apparent firming up of his position on the issue.

What Cameron actually said was:

"If we reach circumstances where the whole treaty has been not only ratified but implemented that is not a situation we would be content with.

"We wouldn't let matters rest there.

"We think the treaty is wrong because it passes too much power from Westminster to Brussels.

"We would address that issue at the time".

In fact these words are almost identical to words used by William Hague, the shadow foreign secretary during a debate on foreign affairs in the House of Commons on 12th November 2007 and consequently do not represent even a shift of emphasis in the party's position.

Their clear purpose was to assuage the anxieties of Tory eurosceptics and to limit support for UKIP. But the

history of the last decade suggests that painful experience has made selling eurosceptics down the river rather more difficult than it used to be. Certainly, the reaction of Tory bloggers of eurosceptic stripe suggests that the Conservative leader has not been successful.

ConservativeHome's *Tory Diary*, for example, declared "*Eurosceptics who saw much firmer promises made about EPP withdrawal in 2005 are unlikely to be reassured by what looks like tactical wording*".

Election Prospects

It continued: "*CCHQ is convinced that enough voters who don't want ratification now won't want the issue re-opened if, as expected, the Treaty is ratified. What they believe is that there's a preference for the status quo and that status quo may well favour Brown by the time of the next General Election*".

The blog's description of the Tory attitude towards the EU generally is surely correct: "*The Tory leadership want to manage Britain's relationship with Europe, they don't want it transformed. Although all of the most senior members of the shadow cabinet are sceptical about the EU there is no*

stomach for a big fight with Brussels. One member of Team Cameron told ConservativeHome that they would not allow a Cameron government to be engulfed by the same "Euro-strife" that shipwrecked John Major. David Cameron was one of Michael Howard's inner circle who fiercely opposed a much-discussed suggestion in 2004 that the Tories propose a referendum on whether Britain should stay in or leave the EU. If he was cautious then he'll be even more cautious now that the Conservatives, ahead in the polls, have more to lose".

Nevertheless Cameron's decision to try to assuage eurosceptics rather than insult them represents an advance of a kind. It is a reflection of the strength of eurosceptic opinion and the Tory leadership's recognition of the need to take account of it. The lesson for eurosceptics generally, and for eurosceptic columnists, bloggers, and party activists in particular, is that they must not allow it to get away with bland and vacuous assurances. The next time Cameron or Hague repeats the "we won't let matters rest there" formulae he, and every member of his Parliamentary party must be bombarded with questions about where precisely a Tory Government will let matters rest.

Sarkozy tells it like it is

"The minute France organises a referendum on the simplified treaty, Britain will too. And what are the chances of a yes in Britain?"

Nicolas Sarkozy quoted in *Coulisses de Bruxelles* on 17th December, 2007.

Continued from p.1

Brown doesn't do Europe

political difficulties.

"The French are pulling on one end of the rope, but there's no one pulling on the other", one EU official told Parker.

In one sense eurosceptics should be relieved by the fact that Mr Brown's

heart is not in the cause of European political integration. But his lack of interest means that we have ceased to try to make the best of a very bad job and simply go with the flow. In the case of foreign and defence policy this means we have ceded authority to

those who doubt whether warfare is a serious possibility and who consequently doubt the value of military power - except as a means to build the European political project. It is an error for which we may pay very dearly indeed.

Who gains most from mass immigration?

In seeking to prove its compassion Britain's political elite has actually failed those it says that it wants to help

By Anthony Scholefield

The enthusiasm of politicians for mass immigration is not only a UK or even EU phenomenon. While all three British political parties in their 2005 election manifestos insisted that mass immigration was beneficial to native Britons, exactly the same message was given by President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers in their report of 20th June 2007.

Its chairman, Edward P. Lazear, stated: "*Our view of economic research finds immigrants not only help to fund the nation's economic growth but also have an average positive effect on the income of native-born workers*".

It is doubtful, however, whether either President Bush or the current Labour government sincerely believes this. President Bush's failed Immigration Reform Bill attempted to skew immigration towards those with higher skills but controversially proposed an amnesty for many current illegal immigrants.

Step towards Sanity

On 4th December Jacqui Smith, the British Home Secretary, announced that unskilled immigrants from outside the EU would now be banned from entering the UK. Yet, previously the government had argued strenuously that unskilled immigrants were advantageous to British citizens. In its evidence to the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee the Home Office stated that "*migrant workers complement the existing workers*".

The move to argue that only higher skilled migrants benefit natives is at least a step towards sanity - but EU membership has frustrated the proper application of this principle. The British government's position can now be summarised in the following way: unskilled immigrants from Eastern Europe - good, unskilled immigrants from outside the EU - bad.

While this may represent an advance on the previous position it should also

be noted that there will still be substantial lower-skilled migration via family reunion, asylum-seeking and student entry.

Although the UK is not legally bound by the common immigration and asylum policy of the EU (except where it has opted in) this move is in tandem with Franco Frattini's proposed Directive on the admission of highly skilled workers to the EU, announced on 23rd October 2007. This is an interesting conjunction.

Intellectual Foundations

Previously the stance of the major British political parties together with that of their counterparts in the USA and the EU appeared to reflect a desire to win the approval of the liberal elite in academia and the media. In seeking to demonstrate its compassion to this group it missed the opportunity to lay the intellectual foundation of policies based on a real understanding of the likely impact of mass unskilled immigration on the workforce at large and those at the bottom of the economic ladder in particular. It is this latter group - i.e. those with the lowest incomes and least capital - which are likely to experience the greatest impact; ironically, its members are largely those who formed part of previous waves of immigration. In short, we appeared to have arrived at a situation where the Western political establishment has convinced itself of its own compassion while in practice impoverishing those it professes to be compassionate towards.

It now looks as though immigration in general, and particularly mass illegal immigration, is on its way to be the defining issue of the 2008 US presidential election. This follows Hillary Clinton's blunder in announcing support for granting driving licences to illegal immigrants and then 'clarifying' matters by saying that she was against the idea. She would have found this was unpopular

even with blacks if she had checked: the George Mason Poll of Black Virginia in June 2007 showed 81 per cent of black Virginians wanted local police to check the immigration status of all traffic offenders, for example; it also demonstrated the existence of a whole range of 'incorrect' attitudes among the black population.

The recent debate in Florida between the five leading Republican contenders revolved around immigration with both Giuliani and Romney back-peddalling on their previous support for illegal immigrants. To the irritation of the elite the issues it would most liked to have talked about - Kyoto, other 'green' issues and the Iraq war - figured less prominently.

Voters' Concerns

In this way, American democracy is now responding to voters concerned about the massive downward pressure on the wages of poor Americans and the deteriorating infrastructure and social life in blue-collar areas. The September 2006 issue of the National Bureau of Economic Research found that over the last 25 years wages for the lowest paid US workers were down 20 per cent. An Internal Revenue report in October 2007 showed that the US's top one per cent increased their share of total income to 21 per cent while the bottom 50 per cent earned just 12.8 per cent of total income. While there is no doubt that globalization is part of the explanation, mass immigration - which our Home Office rightly tells us is similar in economic effect to globalization - is a major factor.

However, one should not exaggerate the responsiveness of American politicians to public concerns over immigration, since the political class remains largely in thrall to the Washington/New York liberal elite, a group whose incomes insulate its members from the pressures facing ordinary Americans. Moreover, this

Continued on p.4

Who gains most from mass immigration?

group of course benefits from cheaper servants, waiters, plumbers, etc. (50 per cent of US senators are reputed to be millionaires). Hence the position on immigration of Romney/Giuliani during the last few years.

The situation is complicated by the fact of Trojan horses within the communities worse affected by mass immigration. Typical examples are Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton who publicly argue for unrestricted immigration. In the past more thoughtful black American leaders such as Frederick Douglass, Philip Randolph and Booker T. Washington, regarded mass immigration as a threat to black prosperity and wrote extensively on the subject. While many civil rights leaders support illegal aliens and amnesty, many African-Americans believe they do so as "partisan Democrats" (and think that mass illegal immigration has been a major impediment to black advancement over the past quarter of a century).

Similar Pattern

A similar pattern can be discerned in the UK. The ruling Westminster elite looks to representatives of the black elite such as Trevor Philips or Darcus Howe, and assumes they accurately represent black opinion. Writing in the *New Statesman* on 3rd December 2007 Darcus Howe supported recent mass immigration from Eastern Europe on the bizarre grounds that "*Many of the young workers are domestic workers ... who lessen the burden of middle class working women*" and "*the cost of refurbishing houses and building new ones has fallen spectacularly*". It is

easy to see why a middle-class homeowner or a landlord in need of cheap domestic servants might benefit from mass immigration; there is plenty of reason to doubt whether the average West Indian or Bangladeshi sees the matter in quite the same light.

The distinguished Harvard economist George Borjas has explained why blacks and previous immigrants suffer most from the new wave of mass immigration: "*It turns out that African-Americans are likely to lose from immigration for two different reasons. First, it is employers who receive the bulk of the benefits from immigration (Blacks own about three per cent of the capital stock of the US while proportionately they constitute rather over ten per cent of the US population). Because blacks and immigrants are relatively more similar than whites and immigrants (in economic characteristics) any adverse impact of immigration on competing workers will fall hardest on the population of native-born African-Americans*".

Cheap Labour

Exactly the same is true of the UK. Take the Bangladeshi community. National average wages for Bangladeshis were £15,000 according to a recent IPPR report (£18,000 in London). This is about 60 per cent of average UK earnings. Plainly Bangladeshis are most in competition with cheap Eastern European labour. Similarly Bangladeshis own a disproportionately small share of capital so they do not benefit from the gains to capital arising from

immigration.

Yet in recent evidence given to the House of Lords Economic Affairs Committee by the TUC and the Committee for Racial Equality, these central facts are completely ignored. Catholic and Anglican bishops and even the new leader of the Liberal Democrats Nick Clegg, pose as compassionate liberals by favouring an amnesty for illegal immigrants - despite the obvious harmful effects on existing ethnic communities.

Financial Betterment

The increasing self-absorption and financial betterment of the British political class, its propensity to receive information only from black elites, and the fear of being thought racist has led all three political parties to ignore the effects of mass immigration on Britain's ethnic minorities. In the USA voters are beginning to put their concerns about these matters to the politicians and the politicians are being forced to react. But at present there is no sign of the cocoon of hypocrisy surrounding British politicians being disturbed. At the EU level, which enjoys an even greater degree of insulation from the views of the voters, grandstanding in the European Parliament on 'racism' and 'xenophobia' is a substitute for real concern about the effort of 'liberal' policies on existing minority communities.

Anthony Scholefield has recently published a pamphlet called "Warning Immigration Can Damage Your Wealth" price £6.00 available from the June Press see rear page.

Harmonisation 'to a degree never before imagined'

"I started off thinking it was necessary but not very significant. But there are one or two things in the Treaty that are very significant, most of all the move on the whole justice

and home affairs area, including the fight against terrorism and international crime, where our partners are going to harmonise their policy to a degree never before

imagined."

Sir Stephen Wall, Tony Blair's former Europe advisor in an interview with the *House Magazine*, December 2007.

Expansion of Schengen area ‘an invitation to criminals’, say German police

Even some EU officials admit that lifting national borders means subordinating security interests to the requirements of the European idea

Manuel Barroso, the EU Commission President described the 21st December - the day on which the EU's borderless Schengen zone was extended to cover nine new members - as "the best day of my life". Without detailed knowledge of the President's personal history it is difficult to quarrel with this judgment - who knows how many days of dark despair the EU President has had to endure? Regrettably, it seems very likely that a significant number of traffickers, drug barons and fraudsters feel the same way.

The head of Germany's police union GdP Josef Scheuring described the lifting of border controls on Germany's borders with Poland and the Czech Republic in particular as "*an invitation to criminals*". He added that Europe's citizens will "*suffer a considerable loss in terms of security*".

Konrad Freiberg, another spokesman for the German police has said the problem of people trafficking will become acute.

German politicians and police chiefs are also worried that the overloaded Schengen Information System which keeps a record of all wanted people,

passports, stolen cars and firearms will become overloaded and collapse, although recent improvements to the system have been made.

Even within EU institutions there are concerns about the security implications of the removal of borders.

Executive director of Frontex, Ilkka Laitinen, said that the extension of the passport-free zone would greatly hamper attempts to frustrate asylum seekers.

"We are going to lose a very effective instrument to fight illegal immigration", he said.

As soon as people had entered the Schengen zone legally or illegally, he pointed out, they would be free to move across an area with a population of 400 million stretching from Greece to Finland and from Poland to Portugal.

Mr Laitinen said European countries were well aware of the potential problem but it had been "*a deliberate choice of the European Union to focus more on the free movement of persons than on security aspects*".

Britain and Ireland remain outside the Schengen area while Cyprus, Bulgaria

and Romania are expected to join as soon as they can meet the entry criteria.

The nine new members are Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and the Czech Republic. EU neighbours such as the Ukraine, Moldova, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Montenegro, Macedonia and Albania have negotiated visa facilitation agreements with the EU.

In most of the new Schengen member states the lifting of borders was widely celebrated. In Slovakia, for example the occasion was celebrated at street parties that were reported to continue late into the night. In neighbouring Austria, however, there were no signs of rejoicing, only misgivings about the implications of extending the Schengen borders.

"Schengen is not about criminality, it's not about insecurity or fear", the Austrian chancellor Alfred Gusenbauer declared. "*It is a bigger zone of peace, security and stability.*" Opinion surveys show that most Austrians don't agree with him: 75 per cent of those polled expressed opposition to the lifting of borders.

Brussels names first EU Ambassador

The EU has appointed its first ambassador - more than a year before the Lisbon treaty is scheduled to come into force and even before all but one of the EU members has ratified the treaty.*

The position has gone to Keon Vervaeke, presently an adviser to Javier Solana the High Representative to the Common Foreign and Security Policy, who will represent both the EU

and member states to Africa.

Mr Solana, the ultimate Brussels insider, is almost universally assumed to be the future High Representative to the EU i.e. foreign minister in all but name and will have the task of creating a European diplomatic corps.

Mr Vervaeke, 47, a former Belgian diplomat, who will be based in Addis Ababa will in effect become regional foreign minister.

The appointment was announced in a

joint press statement from the EU Commission and the African Union. This did not explain why it had been made before treaty ratification had taken place, but on 16th December the *Sunday Telegraph* reported that Brussels was justifying the appointment as "*an exception*".

*The Hungarian Parliament ratified the treaty on 17th December 2007.

Commission issues threat over plan to save fish stocks

The European Commission has indicated that Croatian plans to create a protected fishing zone in the Adriatic to stop over-fishing by Italian

trawlers could affect Croatia's plans to join the EU. "*It is essential that a solution is found... in order to avoid negative consequences for the*

country's EU accession process", said Enlargement Commissioner Olli Rehn. Source: BBC, 2nd January 2008.

LETTERS

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

Perverse Priorities

Dear Sir,
Why are the Liberal Democrats planning to break their word over the EU Reform Treaty?

In 2003 Sir Menzies Campbell explained their position:

"If any Government propose to agree to a major shift in control or any transfer of significant powers from member states to European institutions, or to agree to any alteration in the existing balance between member states and those institutions, there should be a referendum of the British people".

The proposals in the EU Reform Treaty fulfil those criteria. The Liberal Democrats said as much, when essentially the same proposals - with essentially the same British opt-outs - were embodied in the previous Constitutional Treaty, and they pledged support for a referendum in their 2005 manifesto.

However it is one thing to pose as democrats and score political points by demanding a referendum when there is little prospect of getting one, but a very different thing to vote for a Commons amendment calling for a referendum when there would be a good chance of forcing the government to hold one - which might then produce the "wrong" result.

Unfortunately it appears that the Liberal Democrats have their priorities in the wrong order, putting devotion to democracy far below their commitment to the EU project.

MURIEL PARSONS
Berkshire

The UKIP Effect

Dear Sir,
In response to two points in Letters in the November 30th issue of *eurofacts*.

Firstly, according to Stuart Gulleford *"it makes not a jot of difference whether a Tory, Labour or Liberal Democrat candidate is elected"*.

He may notice a difference quite soon, when (almost all) the Tory MPs vote in favour of a referendum on the EU Reform Treaty, while (almost all) the Labour and Liberal Democrat MPs vote to stop us having a referendum.

It is precisely this black and white

view, with an obstinate refusal to recognise any shades of grey, which leads UKIP to such foolish conclusions.

For example, that it could do no harm to help an extreme europhile to defeat a moderate eurosceptic, and enter the Commons as the MP for Eastleigh.

Similarly, as far as UKIP is concerned there is nothing to separate Bill Cash from Kenneth Clarke - both stand condemned as traitors, the one as bad as the other.

Which leads on to the question raised by Anne Glyn-Jones in her letter: is it really true that the presence of a UKIP candidate tends to disadvantage the Tory candidate?

Clearly the UKIP leadership thinks it is true, or how else did they hope to unseat Bill Cash by putting up a UKIP candidate against him?

Indeed in a speech last February, the UKIP Deputy Leader uncritically repeated the usual analysis that "UKIP cost the Tories 27 seats at the last election".

Because of the public perception of UKIP as a "right wing" party, it is natural that it will compete for votes with the Tories, far more than with the "left wing" parties.

And any "left wing" party MP desperately trying to fight off the Tories in a marginal seat will know this, and will see the inclusion of a UKIP candidate on the ballot paper as a godsend, not a threat.

UKIP should state, now, that any MP who votes against us having a referendum will be a marked man, and UKIP will do everything it can to ensure that he is unseated at the next election - which could very well include NOT putting up a UKIP candidate.

Dr D R COOPER
Berkshire

What the Tories Must Do

Dear Sir,
Both Dr Cooper and Christina Speight are attempting to prohibit electors from voting for a Party which wants Britain to leave the EU. Their unwritten undemocratic message is that the Conservative Party has a divine right to govern. It is my experience that the electorate doesn't vote to put a Party

into power. It votes to get the governing Party out. The Conservative Party was dishonest about the EU's intentions even before we joined, and remains so. This can be proven by the activities of Edward Heath, John Major and David Cameron who became leader on the promise of withdrawing his MEPs from the EPP, and the Party continues to support the EU's federalist intentions. The day Gordon Brown signed the Lisbon Treaty William Hague refused to say whether the Conservatives would renounce it if they came to power. The Conservatives are just as dishonest as the Labour Party. Conservative members are divided between those who want to leave the EU and those who wish to remain. It will never govern with authority whilst it remains divided. The answer for the Conservatives is to confirm that they will leave the EU and establish a trading agreement. The Party may lose some members but it will gain far more because it will then reflect the views of a large majority of voters. If it does this there will be no doubt that it will win the next general election. The alternative remedy is for someone to start the Real Conservative Party.

BRYAN SMALLEY
Hertfordshire

The Importance of Farage

Dear Sir,
I see that you have published two letters from anti-UKIP readers (*eurofacts* 14th December), both criticising UKIP (the only major party determined to leave the EU).

Neither make any positive suggestions on how we can withdraw from this monstrous effigy, merely putting forward vague ideas, with no definite or practical solutions!

Christina Speight appears to have left UKIP to return to the Conservative fold, and Dr Cooper appears to be commenting from an ivory tower.

At least Nigel Farage tells the truth, whenever he is allowed a public platform!

TOM COLLINS
Essex

MEETINGS

UK Independence Party

Worcester Branch
01684 541533

Saturday **12th January**, 7.30 pm

Michael Shrimpton, *Barrister, specialist in national security, constitutional law and strategic intelligence*

SOCIAL EVENING

Powick Parish Hall, Powick,
Worcestershire

Admission £12.50 on the door

(Includes buffet, wine and soft drinks)

Campaign for an Independent Britain

0116 2874 622

Wednesday **30th January**, 6.00 pm

Dr Bob Spink MP, *Chairman of CIB*

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London

Admission £10 payable in advance

(CIB, c/o 38 Market Place, Folkington, Lincs NG34 0SF)

The Democracy Movement

(Surrey North and Spelthorne Branch)
01372 465379

Thursday **7th February**, 8.00 pm

“EU - Give us a Referendum”

Marc Glendening, *Campaign Director, Democracy Movement*

Daniel Hannan MEP, *Columnist, Daily Telegraph*

PUBLIC MEETING

Claygate Village Hall, Claygate, Surrey
Admission Free

The Freedom Association

0845 833 9626

Tuesday **12th February**, 1.00 pm

“Freedom in the City”

Jeffrey Titford MEP

PUBLIC MEETING

The Function Suite, The Counting House, 50 Cornhill, London EC3V

Admission Free

UK Independence Party

01626 831340

Saturday **8th March**, 10.00 am

Further details including Speakers to be announced shortly

SOUTHWEST CONFERENCE

The Great Hall, Exeter University,
Exeter, Devon

Admission Free

Hurlingham Club

0207 736 8411

Tuesday **11th March**, 7.30 pm

PUBLIC DEBATE

“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, available 6weeks prior to event**}

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 Rodrigues, *New York University*

PUBLIC MEETING

Royal College of Surgeons of England, 35-43 Lincoln’s Inn Fields, London WC2

Admission Free

SELECT COMMITTEES

House of Lords

020-7219 3000

Tuesday **15th January**, 10.40 am

Evidence will be heard on *The Future of European Structural Funds* from witnesses to be confirmed.

Tuesday **15th January**, 3.35 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Economic Impact of Immigration* from (a) Rt Hon Liam Byrne MP, Minister of State for Borders and Immigration; Mr John Elliot, Chief Economist, Home Office; and DWP Ministers/Officials to be confirmed; and from (b) Sir Andrew Green, MigrationWatch UK.

Tuesday **15th January**, 4.15 pm

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the Impact of the EU Reform Treaty on the EU Institutions* from Jim Murphy MP, Minister for Europe on the December 2007 European Council Meeting.

Wednesday **16th January**, 10.15 am

Evidence will be heard on *Media Ownership and the News* from (a) Ms Rebekah Wade, Editor of *The Sun*; and from (b) The Press Association, (witnesses to be confirmed); Mr David Schlesinger, Editor-in-Chief, Reuters; and Mr Pierre Lesourd, London Bureau-Chief, Agence France Presse.

Thursday **24th January**, 10.10 am

Evidence will be heard on the *Inquiry into the EU Commission’s Communication on organ donation and transplantation* from the Kidney Wales Foundation; and the Patient Liaison Group of the Royal College of Surgeons of England.

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

DIARY OF EVENTS

2008

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

European Reform Treaty to be Ratified **December**

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.

The General Rule

A Guide to Customary Weights and Measures
by Vivian Linacre. **£12.99**
The author reflects the needs for imperial units in every day usage.

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.

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

WEB SALES www.junepress.com

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

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

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

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

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

Name

Address

.....

.....

Postcode

Date

Please print clearly in capital letters

FOR "EU"

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

AGAINST "EU"

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

CROSS PARTY PRESSURE GROUPS

Congress for Democracy	01372 453678
-------------------------------	---------------------

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

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

POLITICAL PARTIES

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

ISSN 1361-4134



9 771361 413006