

Detering catastrophe

Robert Tombs

In trying to understand the present crisis in the Ukraine, and suggesting how further disasters can be avoided, history has some lessons. But they are not very reassuring.

Catastrophe can come out of the blue. Shortly before Britain was dragged into the devastating French revolutionary wars, the Prime Minister William Pitt reassured the Commons that 'there never was a time in the history of this country when ... we might more reasonably expect fifteen years of peace.' In 1938, Neville Chamberlain won global plaudits for securing 'peace for our time'. In 1914, just before the German army marched in, the French public was wholly absorbed by the trial of a politician's wife who had killed an indiscreet journalist. (She got off.) Might future generations wonder how we in our turn could be so focused on Omicron and illegal Christmas parties while Russian armies mustered, the Chinese airforce menaced Taiwan, and Iran stood on the brink of making the nuclear weapons that Israel had sworn it would never permit?

There are lessons from these past disasters, not all of them encouraging. First is that a potential disturber of the peace must think it can win - but so must those resisting it. No one, however unbalanced, embarks on a conflict they expect to lose. The weaker side backs down. As long as the United States was clearly predominant - which it generally has been since 1945 - there would be no direct Great Power clash. It is when the balance of power becomes uncertain that danger arises, because both sides can anticipate victory. Nuclear

weapons for a time seemed to have changed the rules, but only if it is credible that they would be used. Now it is not.

Second, aggressors must think they can win quickly and at acceptable cost - 'over by Christmas' is the fatal illusion, often coloured by ideology. In 1792, both the French revolutionaries and their monarchical enemies were confident of a rapid walk-over. The former trusted in revolutionary fervour; the latter in professional discipline. In 1914, both sides had planned a quick and decisive campaign. In 1940, Hitler expected the decadent British to make peace, the materialistic Americans to stay neutral, and the inferior Russians to collapse. In both cases Germany's rulers knew they would lose a long war.

Third, and perhaps most dangerous, is when a potential aggressor thinks that time is running out. Since 1870, Germany had been a rising force, economically, culturally, and militarily, and so its rulers saw no reason to seek trouble. But by the 1900s, the rise had stalled, and Germany's chances of becoming one of the leading world powers was slipping away. Its rivals seemed to be 'encircling' it, and preparing for war. The German army and its Austrian allies believed in 1914 that they could still win, and quickly; but only for another couple of years. The Nazis similarly believed that their time was running out, and only bold and decisive action could save them. If you think conflict is inevitable, logic means you act fast, whatever the risk. As the Austrian chief-of-staff put it chillingly in 1914, 'now we play *va banque*'. Hitler used the same

gambling metaphor in 1939.

None of this is reassuring. Today, Russia is still powerful, but in decline. China until recently appeared to be in unstoppable ascent. But now its economy is stalling, its population ageing, and (like Germany before 1914) it has alarmed its rivals. Its rulers may be starting to feel 'encircled' as America, Japan, India and now Britain start to react. Russia may not have had much time left to grab Ukraine. And if China wants Taiwan, both for prestige and for its semiconductor industry, its chances may not be improving. As for Iran, is it already too late for it to develop usable nuclear weapons, or will it rush to do so while its enemies hesitate? Who might play *va banque*? Is Putin only the first?

Could past generations have staved off the disasters of 1792, 1914 and 1939? Even with hindsight, there seem no simple solutions, no moment at which any politically feasible action could have saved the world. Take the most notorious case, the Munich Conference of 1938, when Chamberlain made a last attempt to 'appease' Germany. We now know that had France and Britain gone to war, Germany would have been fighting a losing battle and its generals would probably have overthrown Hitler. Disaster averted? But the peoples of Britain, France, the Empire and the United States were not then reconciled to fighting for Czechoslovakia, 'a faraway country of which we know nothing'. Chamberlain's concession was almost universally, even hysterically, praised.

If we venture into political science

Continued on page 2

Detering catastrophe

Continued from page 1

fiction, we have a little more scope. The best chance of preventing these three global wars would have been a broad alliance - strictly defensive, but clearly willing and able to resist aggression. To deter the French revolutionaries, an alliance based on Britain, Prussia and Austria. To deter the Kaiser and Hitler, an alliance of France, Britain, and Russia, and with the United States, already the potential superpower, prepared to intervene. These alliances, which eventually came into being as a result of those wars, would have been the best chance of preventing them if they had existed before conflict broke out. That was impossible then, because of deep mistrust between the Powers, and because of America's determined isolationism - always tempting for a country which can be self-sufficient if it has to be. But what was impossible in 1791, 1913 and 1938 may not be

impossible today. Indeed, NATO is precisely this kind of defensive alliance. Involving America in the relations between the major states has been the core of Britain's international strategy since 1940, indeed perhaps since 1916; and in the end it worked. At least until now. President Macron has declared that NATO is brain dead. Will he now be proved right?

The first aim of the democracies must be to prevent fatal miscalculation by potential aggressors: to convince them that they cannot win quickly and at low cost. Conflict delayed may be conflict averted, if potential aggressors come to accept that their 'window of opportunity' has closed. This of course is basic deterrence. Until recently, many hoped that the rulers of Russia and China were less ideologically driven and hence more rational than the revolutionaries of 1792, the racists of 1939 or even the social darwinists of

1914. But the attempt to deter or persuade Putin proved vain.

Must there be carrots as well as sticks in preventing conflict? The danger is that conciliation is hard to distinguish from 'appeasement', and may encourage aggression. One advantage we have over earlier generations is that we can communicate more effectively with the peoples of hostile states, in a way the aristocratic diplomats of 1914 would scarcely have contemplated. The democracies must show the peoples of Russia, China and Iran that we are not their enemies. We have to trust that our highest values are of universal appeal, and not just a 'Western' peculiarity. For that, we need to regain the confidence to speak not just for ourselves, but for people everywhere. But Putin has shown that words are not enough, unless they are backed by firm intentions and hard power.

Source: www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk

Free Trade and Brexit

In a report published by Civitas, Patrick Minford (Professor of Applied Economics, Cardiff University) analyses the ways in which official trade modelling and policy assumptions have underestimated the gains from free trade with non-EU countries.

The UK government has rolled over almost all Free Trade Agreements between the EU and non-EU countries, negotiated new deals with Australia and New Zealand and formally applied to join the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP), the Asia-wide trade pact. Minford asks why official calculations underestimate the gains from these deals.

In the report "Free Trade under Brexit: Why its benefits to the UK have been widely underestimated" Minford applies his own Cardiff world trade model to the recent trade deal struck with Australia. This new analysis finds that this deal is likely to boost UK GDP by 3 per cent, a more positive

outlook than the 0.08% predicted by government economists.

Furthermore, he challenges official assumptions around 'gravity' in economic modelling and questions why they predict 'trivial' economic gains from new Free Trade Agreements. This popular theory has a bias towards trade with geographically nearby countries at the expense of doing business with more distant markets, proximity is substituted for competitive advantage.

Fashionable economic opinion uses gravity theory to predict that the UK will be poorer after leaving the EU but Minford shows that this model fails to fit the facts of UK trade and uses his own model which succeeds in doing so to predict 'big gains from free trade with the rest of the world and no loss from moving from the EU status quo to a Free Trade Agreement with the EU'. Professor Minford is forensic in his analysis and debunks 'false policy assumptions' which together with the poor 'gravity' modelling bias

calculations towards negativity.

His conclusions - Economists in the UK and in international organisations, as well as in the British Treasury and civil service, have widely claimed that Brexit FTAs with the non-EU world would give only trivial gains, while moving to an EU FTA would cause losses, compared with the status quo. To support these claims, they have used trade models in which 'gravity' dominates. According to this gravity theory, trade is caused mainly by size and proximity, not by comparative advantage; productivity is driven by trade, and there is little substitutability between the products of different countries. However, the model does not fit the UK trade facts. The classical model based on comparative advantage does fit them. According to this model, there are big gains from free trade with the rest of the world and no loss from moving from the EU status quo to an EFTA with the EU.

Source: Full report available from www.civitas.org.uk

EU pressure for UK/EU defence policy

Having failed over its Russia-Ukraine foreign policy the EU tries to suck Brexit Britain back into common defence

Some European Union leaders are making it known through briefings to the British media that they wish the UK to chair a new EU-led security council in the belief that this will lower tensions between the EU and its former member. Called a “European Security Council”, the plans are reportedly being pulled together by Germany, the Netherlands, and Poland with the temptation of the UK being given a prime role.

Meanwhile the ‘EU Army’ grows ever closer, in Brussels recently the talk was all about common defence. In a 22-page document the Commission unveiled significant actions to contribute to EU defence, boost innovation and address strategic dependencies.

This new document comes just weeks before an EU defence summit which will be hosted in Paris by President Macron. The summit is expected to agree the EU Commission’s “Strategic Compass” on defence – a set of proposed policies published last year.

Regular readers will know that Facts4EU.Org has researched and published more reports on the EU’s military ambitions than any other pro-Brexit organisation, and so the latest EU moves will come as no surprise.

Some EU leaders now want to cosy up to Boris. - The sweet mood music being played by the EU is that years of bitterness following Brexit can be put behind “us” so that security and global co-operation can ensure that “Europe is better positioned” to handle world crises like the pandemic and the threats posed to Ukraine. This is accompanied by flattery about how well the UK has handled the Ukraine crisis and has sought to work flexibly with European allies.

Macron is not one of them. - It is also being briefed that French President Emmanuel Macron is opposed to the plan to have such a security council and that not all EU members will be invited to attend, with

only those meeting “strict criteria” such as having a high level of defence spending being considered suitable. Norway and western Balkan states are said to be amongst those non-EU countries that will be included in the plans.

No doubt these factors are meant to reassure and impress UK politicians, not least because the siren approaches are being made through the media for all to see.

It is also reported that Boris Johnson is “generally very keen” on more bilateral relationships with European countries outside the EU’s institutions and that this security council provides a stage on which to take part. On closer inspection the offer is only to chair the first meeting of the ‘security council’ as it will be a rotating Presidency.

If the report about Macron’s opposition to the security council is accurate and not a bluff (would it not be seen as an insult that he would not be chairing the Council?) then it only serves to illustrate the division within the EU on its security and foreign policy – and the Ukraine issue has shown the division is deep and rankerous.

Observations - Yet again when confronted with an international conflict the EU’s foreign policy capabilities are found wanting. The clunky and conflicted decision making of 27 states makes it almost impossible to reach a consensus on how to proceed. When it does, the one-size-fits-all response is often a meek compromise and slow to materialise.

Having failed to attract the UK into its security and mutual defence programmes – the euphemisms for the EU foreign policy having a military capability most people would recognise as an army – the ‘European Security Council’ now being suggested in the media would usefully serve the purpose of pulling UK foreign policy into the EU’s embrace and compromise the ability to act in the UK’s national interests.

The UK must give the idea short shrift. How can the EU have the nerve to want the UK’s help to solve continental European issues when it

has conspired to split our country in two with a border down the middle of the Irish Sea?

Meanwhile in Washington the mood is shifting – even Democrat and State Department critics of Brexit are voicing their pleasure that the UK is leading the line in resisting Russian intimidation and saying they may well have overestimated the impact of the UK leaving the EU. In particular it is being noted how quickly the UK is able to act and take decisions rather than be held back by the slowest ship in the EU convoy.

The Russian-Ukrainian impasse about Ukraine’s eventual EU and NATO memberships – the former planned in the next few years and the latter a prospect that ignites Putin’s fury – may yet lead to nothing. However it has been a timely reminder (as if it were needed) that NATO should be the UK’s sole military alliance – not some EU army in disguise. Nor should any dalliance with EU meet and greet sessions that can put pressure on the UK to conform to the Brussels foreign policy view be countenanced.

The truth is that the EU’s plan for a ‘European Security Council’ goes back a long way. This is a long-standing EU initiative and just the latest in many attempts by Brussels and Foreign Office/MOD officials – acting in concert with UK Rejoiners – to bounce us back into EU defence structures that we have only just left.

There can be no such thing as UK leadership of a ‘European Security Council’ as everything in EU Common Security and Defence is done on the EU’s terms with EU interests paramount. It would be a binary relationship with which to point the UK towards EU participation but with no reciprocal obligation for EU to take heed of the UK’s views. The UK needs to be saying very firmly that any such format duplicates NATO and is unwelcome.

Source: *Facts4EU.org*

The EU is digging its own grave

Jayne Adye

Ever since the European Union's first inception – the European Coal & Steel Community, as it was in 1951 – the goal has been its continuous expansion with more and more Member States, and economic power – in order to bind countries together to try and help maintain peace. Ironically it is this same unity and lack of individual freedom for Member States, which now leaves the EU unable to react to the clearly hostile actions of Russia, as well as not being able to respond to the growing mistrust of the Federal EU project within its own Member States.

The key to achieving the EU's goal of expansion into a Federal Superstate has clearly been achieving good public perceptions, with the citizens and Governments of countries around Europe believing joining the EU will do them more good than harm. This façade has clearly started to crumble over the last five years since the United Kingdom voted to Leave the EU.

The UK has been able to succeed outside the EU so far – despite the Covid-19 Global Pandemic. The repeated failures of top EU leaders to properly stand up to the hostile actions of Russian President Vladimir Putin in the last few weeks has, however, also shown the limited capacity of the EU to defend the principles it supposedly espouses. In addition, this has proved to demonstrate just how divided the EU is, with attempts at sabre-rattling undermined by different messages from individual Member States' Leaders putting their own priorities first.

At present what are any of the EU's Member States gaining from their EU Membership – beyond being virtually ignored by the leaders of France and Germany, with both President Emmanuel Macron and Chancellor Olaf Scholtz seemingly intent on continuing to appease Russia in its quest for further control of Ukraine. The German economy is now almost completely reliant on Russian natural

gas and Macron is trying to boost his reputation as a power player on the world stage, while trying to win a new Presidency in his own country in April this year, it appears the rest of the EU is being abandoned.

Even the President of the European Commission, Ursula von der Leyen seems almost invisible during this crisis – apart from continuing to preach about the values of democracy; rule of law and equality. However – talk is cheap! The EU's inactions so far to even state the same level of support for Ukraine as the United Kingdom, demonstrates the reality of traditional alliances – such as NATO – being discarded in favour of distancing the EU from countries (such as the UK and the US), which have been willing to push back more strongly against Russia.

The EU will never survive if this mentality continues – especially at a time when the non-elected bureaucrats in Brussels are seeking more and more control over Member States – regardless of the opinions of the electorate in each country.

What's more, it seems the European Union has been unable to learn *any* lessons from *Brexit* – with no change in its internal policy development. If anything, it seems Brexit has resulted in the EU being intent on attempting to further reduce the powers of individual Member States, while ignoring the best interests of each country in favour of a continuing single-minded Federalist approach.

What is the EU afraid of? If its leaders believe the EU is the best option for European Member States, they should be shouting it from the rooftops. Yet they can't – as their project seems to be falling apart by its own intransigence.

For example, instead of decreasing the EU's 'Annual Budget' as a result of the loss of contributions from the UK after we left the EU, they now force Member States to pay more to make up

the difference – with countries like Ireland facing a huge jump in payments.

We should remember – according to the EU Commission – the amount a country is forced to contribute to the EU Budget is based on the size of a country's economy. This means if a country enjoys economic success and its economy grows, its payments to the EU increase – effectively this means the EU 'punishes success' by depriving the people who work hard to achieve success of the benefits of their labour.

If the EU wants to survive, then success **MUST** mean a reward for the people – and not simply increase the pay packets of the unelected bureaucrats in Brussels.

EU membership costs are soaring – Irish contributions are expected to double in the next four years – while EU bureaucracy is growing beyond any reasonably expected level. It is clear the Eastern European countries' vulnerabilities are being manipulated by Russia – and will continue to be until those in Brussels grow a backbone.

How much longer can the European Union really survive in its current form?

It is clear that without severe changes within the European Union and the European Commission, the United Kingdom will not be the last country to escape out of the EU's door. At present the same discontent which led to the movement to 'Get Britain Out' of the EU is only becoming stronger inside many EU countries. The EU can only survive with the support of its people – and if the EU's incompetence and hypocrisy continues, then you can be sure the gravy train within Brussels will come to a screeching halt.

Source: Get Britain Out, of which Jayne Adye is the Director of this leading grassroots, cross-Party, Eurosceptic campaign, this article was written in February 2022.

Rocketing fuel costs forcing tie-ups

The EU and Norwegian fishermen's organisations are warning that fuel prices are forcing vessels to tie up because fishing is becoming uneconomic.

European fishing organisations *Europêche* and *EAPO* have written jointly to the European Commission warning that spiralling fuel costs and the overall difficult economic situation and costs of seafood production are forcing boats to tie up.

They write: "The impact on commodity prices triggered by the Russian-Ukrainian conflict on top of a post-pandemic market recovery is a substantial problem for the production of seafood by the industry.

"Fishing vessels in all the member states represented by our organisations are tying up as a consequence of this. Specifically, the fuel price has just reached a new all-time high, exceeding €1/litre in many EU countries. This has led to a situation in which for many vessels it is impossible to go to sea and achieve a revenue that is higher than the costs of the fishery operations.

"First-sale fish prices are not covering the increased production costs, and most market processes in our sector do not enable a quick adaptation of the revenue."

Norwegian fishing industry organisation *Fiskebåt* has warned the Norwegian fisheries minister that the rocketing cost of fuel may force some owners to tie up their vessels because it will not be economic to catch their quotas.

Deputy director Jan Ivar Marák warns that despite efforts to move in new directions, the fishing fleet has no real alternative to fossil fuels and is at the mercy of international fuel prices, reports *Fiskerforum*.

The fleet was paying around NoK5 per litre at the end of last year, which rose to NoK6.20 a few weeks ago, and this has since jumped to more than NoK10 per litre.

He points out that in addition to these rocketing prices, fishing companies are also subject to a CO2 tax and VAT on fuel, and that

companies face 'a very substantial' liquidity burden when paying for fuel.

He tells the minister that a series of measures is needed, including 'strengthening the compensation scheme for the fishing fleet, making it possible for the fleet to bunker without a basic tax on mineral oil, assessing subsidisation of fuel on similar lines to the scheme for electric power, and assessing measures that could increase the energy efficiency of the fishing fleet, as well as changing the definition of distant-waters fishing'.

Meanwhile the EU MEPs call on the EU to protect fishing Post-Brexit

The fisheries MEPs have urged the European Commission to safeguard the EU fleet's fishing rights in the North Eastern Atlantic following the UK's withdrawal from the EU.

With the Trade and Co-operation Agreement (TCA) now having been in place for a year, MEPs on the Fisheries Committee were reviewing the hurdles that have impeded its implementation, and emerging issues in the fisheries field. They put on record that they 'deplored' the fact that the TCA gradually reduces the share of the European fleet's fishing opportunities in UK waters by 25% over a five-and-a-half-year period.

A draft resolution on the future of fisheries in the English Channel, North Sea, Irish Sea and the Atlantic Ocean following Brexit was adopted unanimously by the committee on the 3rd March.

It expresses the fisheries MEPs' concerns about the UK's 'protectionist' measures, which limit fishing licences for EU vessels in the Crown Dependencies, and urges the UK 'to refrain from controversial actions'.

The fisheries MEPs ask the Commission to 'consider all options to ensure that the rights of EU vessels are respected, including limiting the UK's access to EU ports or restricting the import of fisheries products'.

The resolution states: "The EU-UK

relationship must be anchored in a spirit of good faith and neighbourliness that would lead to stable and predictable conditions for fishers now and after the transition period ending in June 2026."

The draft resolution says that Brexit has destabilised relations between North Atlantic coastal states, resulting in Norway, Iceland and Faroe taking unilateral decisions that negatively affect stocks and the EU fleet – such as its loss of Svalbard cod quota.

The MEPs on the Fisheries Committee are calling on the Commission to work on appropriate solutions with other coastal states on better control and management measures in line with the CFP and the Green Deal.

They stress that the EU-UK Specialised Committee on Fisheries must be transparent, urging that Fisheries Committee representatives be invited as observers when the committee meets.

Fisheries Committee rapporteur Manuel Pizarro said: "The European Union and the UK need to continue to work together to deliver sound international ocean governance by promoting the sustainable use and exploitation of ocean resources. Marine areas must be protected and restored on the basis of the best and most up-to-date scientific knowledge. We must work together in a spirit of good neighbourliness and peaceful co-operation.

"Unfortunately, the UK has already shown that it intends to implement some protectionist measures like the so-called 'economic link' that go beyond the spirit of the Trade and Co-operation Agreement. It is of utmost importance that the European Commission pays particular attention to this type of action and responds accordingly."

The draft resolution now needs to be voted on by the full house of the EU parliament, possibly during the April session.

Source: www.fishingnews.co.uk

LETTERS

Tel: 08456 120 175 email: info@junepress.com

Ukraine safety

Dear Sir,

The damage caused by Russia's attack on the Ukraine will take years to put right, but will the people ever feel safe again?

Whatever agreement is made with Russia to cease the war they created in Ukraine, can it be trusted?

Russia under Putin has proved to be untrustworthy as a neighbour to a democratic sovereign nation, as long as Putin remains in charge in Russia none of its neighbours will be safe.

Should Crimea and or other parts of Ukraine be controlled by Russia, that will allow Russian forces to steadily build up in these areas. Therefore, security in Ukraine can never be guaranteed.

Clearly the country will most likely never be in a position to join Nato, and it would be better for them to remain as a Sovereign neutral country.

Regarding its attempt to join the EU that would only raise a red flag to Russia and not help anyone in the short term.

DEBRA DAVIES

Kent

Brexit

Dear Sir,

I was glad to read in *eurofacts* 4th March that Jacob Rees-Mogg has now taken on the task of implementing the opportunity that leaving the EU has created for the UK.

One of the first steps he should make is to insure that the UK insurance market should be controlled and run by the UK government only. This would bring down insurance costs by reducing the financial burden set by the EU and still in force in the UK.

The whole range of EU dictates that the UK is still following need to be examined thoroughly and removed or replaced by UK legislation only.

Leaving the EU was to set us free

from EU interference in controls and rules for UK companies to follow to the benefit of allowing cleverly worded rules to assist the export of EU goods and services to the UK.

The Northern Ireland Protocol is a fine example of this EU thinking.

UK government officials have for a long time just turned a blind eye, or even worse added to this type of behaviour. The time has come for UK civil servants and politicians to operate for the benefit of the UK economy first and foremost.

RICHARD SIMONS

Manchester

Merkel's legacy

Dear Sir,

History will record the former German Chancellor Angel Merkel as the leader that created the worst energy crisis in the EU.

Her blinkered policy of putting Germany and the EU's energy supply in the hands of Russia has finally proved to be a disaster.

While many warned her she ignored them and now the result is clear.

MARION TILER

Cornwall

Defence spending

Dear Sir,

The EU has finally waken up to the issue of defence, but they appear be shunning Nato and just considering having a separate EU force.

Over the last 40 years the EU has expected the UK and the US to provide the funding for Nato and their defence.

Now instead of paying up for the years of neglect of Nato costs they now wish to have an independent force. The selfish nature of the EU continues, luckily we are outside their control and most remain so.

Should the EU go ahead with an independent a EU military force, this will inevitably mainly be controlled by

German. News has already come out that Germany is to spend large sums on its defence budget, such that it will become the 3rd largest spender in 5 years time and that will give it the inevitable leverage to be in charge. History has already shown us what can then happen!

DIANA SULLIVAN

Lancashire

EU propaganda

Dear Sir,

For the last 40 odd years we have constantly heard from the EU that it has kept the peace in Europe. That has now been shown to be completely untrue.

Many believe that the EU's constant push for Eastern Europe countries to join the EU has in fact contributed to the present climate and the Ukraine crisis. Should this continue then Russia and China are likely to feel under greater threat.

RUSSELL CARTER

Wiltshire

China's Covid problems

Dear Sir,

Recently it was announced that it is possible that 51 million people in China have Covid and 5,000 a day are turning up at hospital. Reasons given vary but questions are being asked about the efficiency of the Chinese vaccines that had been used.

Considering the first recorded outbreaks were said to come from China and the fact that we still do not have confirmation as to the true source of the outbreak, the current position is truly worrying. Many consider it came from a Chinese laboratory while China appears to put the source on bats being sold in market places, maybe in twenty years time we will no the truth but I seriously doubt it.

THOMAS EVANS

Derbyshire

MEETINGS

This year due to the ongoing Covid crisis some of the meetings are being held both in person (where the wearing of face masks may be recommended) and virtual on line, please check before attending.

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Monday **11th April** 6.00 pm

“Social Media and COVID: Fighting Disinformation”

Philip Howard, *Oxford Internet Institute*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free - Tickets required

Online version:
@gres.hm/covid-disinformation
Registration required at
ww.gresham.ac.uk

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **13th April** 1.00 pm

“Preventing the Extinction of Tropical Species”

Cristina Banks-Leite, *Imperial College London*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free - Tickets required

Online @gres.hm/tropical-extinction
Registration required at
ww.gresham.ac.uk

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.

eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175
or Email: info@junepress.com

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **26th April**, 6.00 pm

“Supply Chains in the Wellbeing Economy”

Jacqueline McGlade, *Frank Jackson Professor of the Environment*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free - Tickets required

Online version:
@gres.hm/supply-wellbeing
Registration required at
ww.gresham.ac.uk

Gresham College
020 7831 0575

Thursday **5th May**, 6.00 pm

“Breaking Democracy: Lies, Deception and Disinformation”

Andrew Chadwick, *Loughborough University*

PUBLIC MEETING
Barnard’s Inn Hall, Holborn, London EC1N 2HH
Admission Free - Tickets required

Online version
@gres.hm/breaking-democracy
Registration required at
ww.gresham.ac.uk

DIARY OF EVENTS

French presidential elections April 10-24th

UK Council Elections 5th May

Northern Ireland Elections 5th May

Czech Republic takes over EU Council Presidency 1st July

2023

Sweden takes over EU Council Presidency 1st January

USEFUL WEB SITES

Brexit Watch
www.brexit-watch.org
Briefings For Britain
www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk

USEFUL WEB SITES

Briefings For Freedom
www.briefingsforfreedom.co.uk
Britain First
www.britainfirst.org
Bitish Future
www.britishfuture.org
British Weights & Measures Assoc.
www.bwmaonline.com
Bruges Group
www.brugesgroup.com
Campaign Against Euro-Federalism
www.caef.org.uk
Campaign for an Independent Britain
www.cibuk.org
Civitas
www.civitas.org.uk
Democracy Movement
www.democracymovement.org.uk
EU Observer
www.euobserver.com
EU Truth
www.eut ruth.org.uk
European Commission (London)
www.ccc.org.uk
European Foundation
www.europeanfoundation.org
Fishing News
www.fishingnews.co.uk
Freedom Association
www.tfa.net
Freenations
www.freenations.net
Futurus
www.futurus-thinktank.com
Get Britain Out
www.getbritainout.org
Global Britain
www.globalbritain.co.uk
June Press (Publications)
www.junepress.com
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign
www.eurosafeguards.com
Leave means leave
www.leavemeansleave.eu
New Alliance
www.newalliance.org.uk
Policy Exchange
www.policyexchange.org.uk
The Reform Party
www.reformparty.uk
The Red Cell (Think tank)
www.theredcell.co.uk
Statawatch
www.statawatch.org
The Taxpayers’ Alliance
www.taxpayersalliance.com
United Kingdom Independence Party
www.ukip.org
Veterans For Britain
http://www.veteransforbritain.uk

Handshakes not Handcuffs

Edited by Lionel Bell

£6.99 - Pamphlet 2002 - 96 pp
[Special Offer £5.00]

An easy-to-read collection of proposals for co-operation alternatives, show a full depth of reasoned opposition to the EU.

The End Of The English

The European Superstate

by David Brown

£6.99 - Pbk 2008 - 111 pp

Written as an apology to all grandchildren, it analyses how the EU planned for control of UK democracy.

Living In A Fascist Country

by Vernon Coleman

£15.99 - Pbk 2006 - 346 pp

An account of the conspiracies, greedy politicians, endless religious wars and disappearing freedom and privacy.

'Europe Doesn't Work

by Tim Congdon

£5.00 - Pamphlet 2013 - 32 pp

Congdon exposes the three-million-jobs at risk and related misconceptions of the dangers for the UK of leaving the EU.

All Books plus 10% P&P (UK Only)

Cheques to June Press Ltd

PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

A Challenge to the Pseudo-Liberals

Time For A Change

Before It's Too Late

by Christopher Hoskin

£4.00 - Pamphlet - 2020 - 33 pp

How Political Correctness and Multiculturalism in all its manifestations has come to dominate society and the world of politics. Without consultation with the people and the dangers it exposes for the future.

Worlds Apart

by Mica Jay

£7.99 - Pbk -2017 - 111 pp

An intriguing novel about how a cosmic explorer who crashes to earth in the Amazon jungle becomes a cosmic celebrity and his effect on a remote tribal community.

There's A Place For Us 1991-2021

Thirty Years History of the Wokingham

Mental Health Crisis House

by Pam Jenkinson

£11.99 - Pbk 2021 - 289 pp

The author who runs this successful house argues that reliance on health professionals to enable mental health recovery, is to embrace a sad myth. Self help is always the answer supported by voluntary workers in a crisis house, to get people back into society with real successful examples.

Time to Say No

Alternatives to EU Membership

by Ian Milne

£8.00 - Pbk - 2011 - 78 pp

Milne examines the cost of EU membership, possibly in excess of 10% of GDP, over £140 billion a year at 2009 prices, and the three main alternatives to membership.

[Special Offer £5.00]

Climate

All Is Well, All Will Be Well

by Jeremy Niebor

£14.99 - Pbk - 2021 - 71 pp

How the dogma of global warming was first conceived and why. He argues how and why CO2 is not the real source.

Corbyn's Britain

Land of the Superwoke:

A Travel Guide to Corbyn's Britain

by Lee Rotherham

£13.99 - Pbk - 2019 - 265 pp

With a foreword by Jacob Rees-Mogg MP, a look into the past and possible future of a Hard Left Government.

Untouchable

by Pierre De Villemarest

£15.95 - Pbk -2005 - 506 pp

A former intelligence officer, examines who protected Bormann and Gestapo Muller after 1945.

Online from ww.junepress.com or Tel: 08456 120175 email info@junepress.com

eurofacts

SUBSCRIBE TODAY

RATES

UK	£30
Europe (Airmail)	£42/€50
Rest of World	£55/\$95
Reduced rate (UK only)	£25

Reduced rate for senior citizens, students & unemployed only.

Subscriptions alone do not cover costs so we are also seeking donations.

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

I enclose my annual payment of £.....
 to **The June Press Ltd, 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.	01738 783936
Business for Britain	0207 3406070
CIB	0116 2874 622
Conservativesforbritain	www.conservativesforbritain.org
Democracy Movement	020 7603 7796
Freedom Association	0845 833 9626
Labour Euro-Safeguards Campaign	020 7691 3800
New Alliance	020 7385 9757
Fishing Association	01224 313473

CROSS PARTY THINK TANKS

British Future	www.britishfuture.org
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Futurus	www.futurus-thinktank.com
Global Britain	www.globalbritain.org
The Red Cell	www.theredcell.co.uk

POLITICAL PARTIES

Brexit (Reform) Party	0800 414 8525
Richard Tice	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Boris Johnson MP	
English Democrats	01277 896000
Robin Tilbrook (Chairman)	
Green Party	020 7272 4474
Co-leaders: Carla Denya and Adrian Ramsey	
Labour Party	020 7783 1000
Sir Keir Starmer MP	
Liberal	01562 68361
Mr Rob Wheway	
Liberal Democrats	020 7222 7999
Sir Ed Davey	
UK Independence Party	020 3476 9564
Neil Hamilton	

ISSN 1361-4134

