

## Illegal Immigration

The following was produced before the governments 'Illegal Migration Bill' was announced.

In 2022, 45,756 persons crossed the Channel, entering the UK unlawfully on small boats. The previous year, 28,526 entered in this way, compared with 8,466 in 2020, 1,842 in 2019 and 299 in 2018. The direction of travel is clear. The Government is unable to secure the UK's borders and to stop the boats. Yes, the UK is working with France to disrupt people smuggling gangs and to intercept small boats before they depart, and yes, without this French cooperation the numbers would likely be much higher. But the problem is obviously bad and getting worse.

The Prime Minister has made tackling the problem one of the five priorities of the government he leads and is reportedly set to announce new legislative proposals to address the problem. New legislation is required, because the existing legal framework is not capable of providing the basis for adequate and effective action. More specifically, the Home Secretary's actions under the existing legal framework are at risk of being frustrated by litigation and by an apparent – and possibly related – reluctance by civil servants and Home Office contractors whole-heartedly to facilitate and implement an effective policy. Policy Exchange has been stressing these risks, and recommending Parliament act to address them, since at least November 2021. In February 2022, we were part of a Policy Exchange team that published a detailed analysis of options and a resulting plan of action, central to which was the enactment of

new legislation that would mandate removals to a British Overseas Territory and then, after processing, to safe third countries.

This short paper spells out what legislation is now required. In brief, the Government should propose, and Parliament should enact, legislation that will require the Home Secretary to remove from the UK persons who have entered it unlawfully on a small boat. The legislation should mandate removal to a country where the person is not at risk of persecution, within the meaning of the Refugee Convention 1951. The legislation should also provide that no person who enters the UK unlawfully on a small boat from a safe state will ever be permitted to settle in the UK and, save in the most exceptional of circumstances, will never be permitted leave to enter the UK. The legislation should rule out domestic legal challenge against removal. Speedy and predictable removal is essential if the policy aim is to be achieved – the aim of making clear that crossing the Channel on a small boat without entry clearance is not a viable route for entering the UK with any expectation of remaining here. So, the legislation should also address the serious risk that the European Court of Human Rights will intervene in order to frustrate removals.

The Prime Minister is reportedly open to withdrawal from the European Convention on Human Rights if new legislation "is found to be lawful by our courts, but is still being held up in Strasbourg", that is, if the Strasbourg Court were to "rule that the new plans are unlawful". The implication, if the reports are true, is that the Government

expects its new legislation may well never be implemented and is instead preparing the ground for the political implications of what they expect to be the failure of their legislation. This would be a failure of responsible politics.

It would be a bad mistake for the Government to propose, and for Parliament to enact, legislation that, while appearing to address the problem, would in the end fail to tackle adequately the shortcomings in the existing law, and would end up stymied by litigation. Unless the Government effectively addresses the crisis in the Channel, further loss of life is likely and public trust, which has been undermined by repeated failures to honour past commitments on this matter, will continue to decline. There are, of course, practical limits to what legislation can secure, and solving the Channel crisis will require careful diplomacy and intelligent, prompt deployment of sufficient resources, as well as legal change. But the crisis will not be solved without reform to the legal framework, reform which requires legislation. This paper makes clear what new legislation must accomplish – and suggests the form it needs to take – if it is to be part of a workable solution.

**Source:** [www.policyexchange.org.uk](http://www.policyexchange.org.uk)

[While the government tries to pass the Illegal Migration Bill in the Houses of Commons and Lords, we will have to wait and see if it gets stopped by the law courts using the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). If that happens what will the government actually do?]

# The ‘Stormont Brake’

Caroline Bell

**F**ar from restoring the democratic deficit in Northern Ireland, the Stormont Brake is designed as the accelerator pedal for new EU law to be imposed throughout the UK without consent.

It has taken me a few days to see the true anti-democratic scale of the Windsor Framework. The fact that new EU regulations rather than domestic legislation will implement it first set alarm bells ringing. Surely domestic legislation would follow to put the new Protocol rules into effect? How naïve of me to believe that democracy still functions in the UK.

Like everyone else, I focused on the “Stormont Brake” solely with regard to Northern Ireland, forgetting that there is already a (not very good) mechanism to question EU law in the Protocol. Why change it to something which ... is even worse? Why the big rush to vote on a Statutory Instrument to insert the Stormont Brake into UK law when all the new rules to govern trade between the mainland and Northern Ireland are being made (and voted on) in the EU? That’s correct: **the Windsor Framework hands legislative powers for the whole of the UK’s internal market to the EU**, because the three new EU regulations in the Windsor Framework apply to people and businesses in GB, not just in Northern Ireland.

The Stormont Brake Statutory Instrument is **the critical part** of the legal machinery which will allow a return to direct regulation from Brussels.

Here’s how it works.

1) Drop new UK legislation

governing the Protocol and GB to NI trade.

2) Amend the Protocol as “the Windsor Framework” and hope no one notices that all the new rules imposing strict conditions **on GB to NI trade are made by new EU regulations**.

3) The new regulations cannot be imposed through Annex 2 of the Protocol.

4) They govern the UK’s internal market, and *should* be made under UK legislation passed at Westminster.

5) Create a mechanism in the Northern Ireland Protocol called a “Stormont Brake” which allows 30 Northern Irish Assembly members to complain to the British government about new EU law being imposed under the Protocol.

6) Make sure it will have no material effect.

7) Pass new **EU laws** in Brussels, voted on by the European Parliament, **which apply solely to the internal affairs of the UK**.

8) Impose them in Northern Ireland via the Protocol/Windsor Framework.

9) Even if the Stormont Brake is triggered, it will make no difference. The EU laws have already been passed and the Sunak/Starmer British government will proceed to enforce them throughout the UK, claiming falsely that international law compels them to do so.

The Stormont Brake creates the mechanism to impose colonial rule from Brussels on the entire United Kingdom, just as May’s backstop was intended to do. That backstop **failed to pass three votes in Parliament**.

The EU and the Rejoiners won’t make

the mistake of asking Parliament to vote again. Instead, they will surrender control to the EU through political and legislative fraud.

If the Stormont Brake con succeeds, more and more EU laws will be imposed on the UK through the Protocol. Dynamic alignment will be baked in. Neither the British people nor Parliament will have any say in the matter.

The “Stormont Brake” Statutory Instrument flouts all legislative and parliamentary procedures for a reason. It will allow the Northern Ireland Protocol to be turned into May’s thrice rejected backstop. It is a con trick designed to deny the British people their democratic right to representative self-government.

**Source:**

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

[Not content with tricking the UK government it appears the EU is now trying to trick Switzerland like the UK into the Single Market.

“Fresh from his success in maintaining EU law in Northern Ireland, Commission Vice-President Maros Sefcovic is attempting the same trick for Switzerland. In a recent speech to Freiburg University, he appears to have attempted to revive the stalled 7-year negotiations which would bring the Swiss into the EU Single Market supervised by the European Court of Justice (ECJ). Although many Swiss firms agree, as it appears so do their government, while the majority of the population continue to resist.”

Who will win?]

## Scotland's new First Minister

**T**he announcement that Humza Yousaf has replaced Nicola Sturgeon as leader of the SNP and First Minister of Scotland has done little to change the SNP’s drive for Scottish Independence as its main goal.

Despite the new leadership of the SNP it remains fixated on the target for independence even though the SNP electorate has it listed as seventh on the reasons they voted for the SNP.

Meanwhile the SNP appear to be

neglecting the main problems in Scotland, like the Health Service and the drug and alcohol problems of its cities, to name but a few important issues that need immediate improvement.

# China and the Commonwealth

The following article by Robert Clark was written in February for *civitas*.

“China’s increasing influence in the Commonwealth of Nations: A triad of trade, diplomacy, and military relations.”

The UK has a unique post-Brexit opportunity to re-engage with its Commonwealth partners, forge new and exciting trading relationships – and where it has already done so, to build and capitalise on these with new security agreements which ensure not just the UK’s security but those of its partners, in a long-term, transparent

and non-authoritarian manner.

Ideologically, the deconstruction of the Commonwealth as an international body steeped in liberal values, by long-term and targeted malign Chinese influence from within, is of central importance to the Chinese Communist Party’s long-term strategic agenda of circumnavigating and ultimately replacing the liberal rules-based international order.

The Commonwealth must be shown an alternative vision to China’s debt diplomacy, export dumping, and revisionist security agenda to re-strengthen the bonds, values and goals,

which have underpinned the largest liberal international organisation in the world for more than half a century.

The UK must politically re-engage, invest its trading and diplomatic weight, and strengthen security bonds, to ensure that the Commonwealth will not only last at least another half a century but prosper well into the next one. On its current Sino-focused trajectory, it severely risks undermining the values held within its founding charter, and potentially no longer surviving at all.

Source: [www.civitas.org.uk](http://www.civitas.org.uk)

## The UK should consider e-fuel

While the UK government of all political alliances are hell bent on electric cars by 2030, it appears to be ignoring the possibility of e-fuels.

Meanwhile, the European Union environment ministers on the 28th March agreed on a 2035 phase-out of combustion engine cars, concluding a controversial leg of negotiations with Germany.

The agreement will ban the sale of carbon-emitting cars after 2035 and requires car producers to achieve 55 percent CO2 emission reduction from 2030 to 2034 compared to 2021.

The agreement will ban the sale of carbon-emitting cars after 2035. However, the EU Commission will present a proposal for e-fuels after pressure from German negotiators via a delegated act, which can still be rejected by the EU Parliament.

The use of e-fuel - which apparently does not pollute the atmosphere - could prevent the huge costs to hard working

tax payers’ getting into further financial difficulties to buy new electric cars and also save the environmental damage caused by the production of new vehicles when the older ones are still usable.

Furthermore, we must remember, the idea is to save the plant from further environmental damage, so why the talk is about freeing the UK from reliance on fossil fuels, we must remember that solar panels, wind turbines, electric vehicle batteries and other energy technologies require minerals including aluminium, cobalt and lithium. To meet the growing demand for clean energy technology, mining for green energy minerals will accelerate exponentially.

According to figures published in 2020 by the European Commission, the EU is 71 percent dependent on phosphorus extracted in Kazakhstan, 68 percent on cobalt in Guinea, and it

takes 68 percent of cobalt extracted in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The latter has suffered from decades of conflicts, including around extractive resources. An estimated 15-30 percent of the DRC’s cobalt is mined by artisanal and small-scale miners, but almost all the territory in the DRC with known cobalt reserves is concessioned for industrial mining.

A breeding ground for conflicts between small-scale and large-scale miners.

Mineral extraction is often associated with violence, poor working conditions, conflicts over water management, environmental harm, health hazards — the list is long.

Surely the production and use of e-fuels should be at least considered even though it is more expensive at present, if saving the planet is the real reason the UK is forcing electric cars with limited range to be the only allowed option for UK drivers.

## Biden’s ‘Democratic Summit’

Biden’s ‘Summit of Democracies’ that was held on the 28th to the 30th March has created an interesting debate regarding the identity of the European Union in terms of a true democracy.

The EU was the only international organisation invited to the talks, yet 26 of its member states were also invited

amongst the 100 other countries that also attended.

The identity of the EU appears to be undecided as it presents itself as an association of states, whilst also trying to pretend that it is a democracy. The reason appears to be the reluctance of its members to give up sovereignty completely to the EU institution. If that

happened, then no member state would have any veto on the actions or decisions of the EU.

According to the charter of the United Nations, which underlies the current system of global governance, distinguishes between states and organisations of states. The hallmark of states consists of absolute sovereignty.

# Proposed French law on the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games

A question is being raised about the the proposed French law regarding the Olympic and Paralympic games.

*Civil society public letter on the proposed French law on the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games condemns a legal proposal to deploy algorithmic surveillance cameras in public spaces. The law would make France the first EU country to explicitly legalise such practices, violate international human rights law by contravening the principles of necessity and proportionality, and pose unacceptable risks to fundamental rights, such as the right to privacy, the freedom of assembly and association, and the right to non-discrimination.*

*French below/français ci-dessous.  
Letter coordinated by the **European Center for Not-for-Profit Law**.*

## **Civil society public letter on the proposed French law on the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games**

Dear Members of Assemblée nationale,

We, the undersigned 38 civil society organisations, are writing to express our deep concern regarding Article 7 of the proposed law on the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games (*projet de loi relatif aux jeux Olympiques et Paralympiques de 2024*). This provision creates a legal basis for the use of algorithm-driven cameras to detect specific suspicious events in public spaces.

The proposal paves the way for the use of invasive algorithm-driven video surveillance under the pretext of securing big events. Under this law, France would become the first EU member state to explicitly legalise such practices. We believe that the proposed surveillance measures violate international human rights law as they contravene the principles of necessity and proportionality, and pose unacceptable risks to fundamental

rights, such as the right to privacy, the freedom of assembly and association, and the right to non-discrimination.

We call on you to consider rejecting Article 7 and to open-up the issue for further discussion with civil society. Otherwise, its adoption would establish a worrying precedent of unjustified and disproportionate surveillance in publicly accessible spaces to the detriment to fundamental rights and freedoms.

The proposal constitutes a serious threat to civic freedoms and democratic principles - The mere existence of untargeted (often called indiscriminate) algorithmic video surveillance in publicly accessible areas can have a chilling effect on fundamental civic freedoms, especially the right to freedom of assembly, association, and expression. As noted by the European Data Protection Board and the European Data Protection Supervisor, biometric surveillance stifles people's reasonable expectation of anonymity in public spaces and reduces their will and ability to exercise their civic freedoms, for fear of being identified, profiled, or even wrongly prosecuted. As such, this measure threatens the very essence of the right to privacy and data protection, which is incompatible with international and European human rights law.

In line with democratic values and principles, upholding the full protection of these fundamental rights and creating enabling conditions for public debate, including political expression in public spaces, is especially crucial during important events, such as the Olympics.

What is more, the proposed legislation significantly and dangerously expands the reasons justifying the surveillance of public spaces. The classification of situations such as begging or stationary assemblies as "atypical" creates the risk of stigmatisation and

discrimination of people who spend more time in public spaces, for example due to their homelessness, economic vulnerabilities or disability. Evidence has shown that the use of surveillance technologies creates a state of permanent monitoring, profiling, and tracking that disproportionately harms marginalised people. Using algorithmic systems to fight crime has resulted in over-policing, structural discrimination in the criminal justice system, and over-criminalisation of racial, ethnic and religious minorities, leading to the violation, among others, of the principle of non-discrimination enshrined in international and European human rights standards.

The proposal would lead to biometric mass surveillance - Article 7 - III of the proposed law wrongly asserts that algorithmic video surveillance systems will not process biometric data. The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) defines biometric data as "personal data resulting from specific technical processing relating to the physical, physiological or behavioural characteristics of a natural person, which allow or confirm the unique identification of that natural person" (Article 4(14) of the GDPR). If the purpose of algorithm-driven cameras is to detect specific suspicious events in public spaces, they will necessarily capture and analyse physiological features and behaviours of individuals present in these spaces, such as their body positions, gait, movements, gestures, or appearance. Isolating individuals from the background, without which it would be impossible to achieve the aim of the system, will amount to "unique identification". As established by EU data protection law, and as interpreted by the European Data Protection Board, the ability to single a person out from a crowd or their surroundings, regardless of whether the person's name or ID

# Proposed French law on the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games

number is known, constitutes “unique identification”.

It is important to remember that the use of AI-based systems to analyse and predict people’s behaviours, emotions or intentions can be equally as invasive and dangerous as those which are used to identify people. Classifying people as exhibiting “risky” behaviour based on their biometric data would amount to biometric categorisation, defined by the French *Défenseur des droits* and the proposed EU Artificial Intelligence Act as assigning natural persons to specific categories based on their biometric features. We bring to your attention that this measure risks colliding with the future EU AI Act. While legislative work is still ongoing, a number of parliamentary amendments propose to prohibit biometric categorisation entirely, given their severe risks to fundamental rights.

The serious interference with human rights does not meet the requirements of necessity and proportionality - Effective human rights protection begins with understanding the limits of technologies and presenting evidence that they are indeed fit for purpose. A corollary of that is the need to investigate how technologies introduced in the name of security respond to actual threats and how they will impact human rights and civic freedoms.

Despite this proposed law

presenting a grave risk to fundamental human rights and existing evidence of actual inefficiency of video surveillance to prevent crime or security threats, the government has not demonstrated how this proposal meets the principles of necessity and proportionality, nor meaningfully engaged with civil society about the measure. As such, we believe that the proposed restrictions to human rights do not meet the three-part test of legality, legitimate aim, and necessity and proportionality. This is a violation of the state’s human rights obligations, imposed by international treaties, such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights.

The proposal is a step towards the normalisation of exceptional surveillance powers

The proposed Article 7 is indicative of a worrying trend of governments expanding their surveillance powers as an emergency measure in the name of security. Yet rarely are these “exceptional” measures promptly revoked. Instead, surveillance and control become normalised, often lacking appropriate safeguards, transparency, stakeholder engagement and accountability mechanisms.

This has notably been the case for surveillance measures introduced over the last 20 years in the name of counterterrorism and more recently – with digital solutions adopted during

the Covid-19 pandemic. But we have also seen that previous Olympic games similarly served as a terrain for experimentation with increased state powers later repurposed for non-emergency situations.

These experiences provide valid justification for our concern that algorithmic video surveillance will not be abandoned after 2025. If adopted, this law will also set a dangerous precedent for other European countries which have - so far unsuccessfully - attempted to legalise a range of risky biometric surveillance practices, including Portugal and Serbia. France would then become an infamous “leader” in surveillance policies within the European Union.

We sincerely hope that you will take urgent steps in consultation with civil society to address the concerns outlined in this letter. We remain available to further elaborate on the issues raised.

Yours sincerely,

Signed by a list of 38 organisations from all around Europe; Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland for example. The list also includes; Amnesty International (Global) and Big Brother Watch (UK).

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

## Will the EU let us get back control of our UK waters?

The new Trade Deal with the EU gives away a 5-and-a-half-year Transition Period on fisheries. At the end of this Transition Period, we will have annual negotiations. However, the EU has the power to implement large tariffs if they feel we are not generous enough in allowing them access.

This type of agreement is unprecedented, and while recent announcements of £100 million in funds for the UK fishing industry to help it grow in the next 5 years are a start, we must prepare further.

In the negotiations since 2016, the UK was not prepared for the EU’s hard-line on fisheries, this mistake

must not be repeated. In the 5 years, we have until a new renegotiation is needed the UK Government must come up with a strategy for countering any EU demands.

We simply must not accept selling off our waters once again 5 years down the line. But can we trust those negotiators?

# LETTERS

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

## House of Lords reform

Dear Sir,

Don Briggs (Letters, 3rd March) has a point! In point of fact I suspect that the Reform Party, which I have just joined, are rethinking their position on the House of Lords, and rightly so with respect.

The answer to the problem of cronyism is to abolish Life Peerages, save for Law Lords. Although a Prime Minister could recommend a crony for a peerage he or she could not guarantee what their heirs and successors might do.

The hereditary peers should be brought back, including the Irish Peers, who were shamefully treated after the Irish Civil War, a point made forcefully to me many years ago by that nice man Lord Dunboyne. By and large the hereditary peers are loyal to the Crown and pro-Brexit. Remainder peers are almost exclusively superannuated party hacks, no offence intended, made Life Peers.

There is no reason why the Prime Minister could not be a peer, provided that he or she can command a majority in the Commons. Indeed, it is not impossible, given Labour's failure to enthuse the electorate, that our next PM could be one Lord Farage, were the ERG to defect *en masse* to Reform, say, or enter into a coalition agreement, on a manifesto promising to fully implement Brexit, end Net Zero, denounce the Refugee Convention and ECHR and hold a referendum on capital punishment.

As that nice man Lord Home confirmed to me not long before he died, he was under no pressure at all from the Palace to renounce his peerage. The pressure came from those pro-EEC idiots, no offence intended, Quintin Hogg and Reggie Maudling. Lord Home could quite properly have fought the 1964 General Election as the Earl of Home. As he conceded to me, somewhat ruefully, he would probably have won! As a commoner he

was a phony - there was nothing common about him, indeed he played first-class cricket and was a President of MCC.

The Commons has also lost its claim to be the chamber most interested in people's problems. No MP has been willing to assist me in my battle for a Royal Pardon for example, despite a ruling from the Speaker that any MP could help me after my own MP, Claire Perry, a notorious Remainder, refused to do so for political reasons. (We now know, from intercepted communications, that the learned trial judge was being blackmailed by the Ministry of Justice over an adulterous relationship and that the jury were nobbled.)

MICHAEL SHRIMPTON  
Wiltshire

## Identity Cards

Dear Editor,

Yet again we hear the calls for Identity Cards (ID). This time requiring them to be of the digital type, this will allow the state to add all kinds of information to them. The former Labour prime minister Tony Blair and a former Conservative prime minister now Lord Hague have combined forces on this issue.

Firstly, we have now to produce ID to vote at UK elections, that alone will deter many from voting, causing the result to be questionable if not seriously flawed. I like many, will more likely not vote as a result.

The idea of a Digital ID can only mean that the state and its officials will be allowed access to information that they have no right to acquire or see. This will quickly be added to the information from the now prolific use of cameras monitoring our activity throughout the country.

Secondly, the communist countries will be delighted to see that we will be the most monitored citizens of any democratic country. Yet again not good news for people who have been

persecuted in the past and could well find themselves in the same position again.

Thirdly, should Digital ID cards be introduced, they will quickly be insisted upon for all kinds of activity therefore, effectively making them mandatory.

Those spying on the UK, including fraudsters, will quite quickly gain access to this data, and it will be acquired by police, councils, uncle tom cobley and all. Then what!

GEORGE ANDREWS  
London

## Asylum hotels

Dear Sirs,

The recent public demonstration against the UK government spending millions of pounds of UK tax payers' per day putting up asylum seekers in UK hotels is likely to get worse.

The financial burden that people in the UK are currently facing has turned attention to this huge financial cost that has resulted by allowing people to cross the English channel in all sorts of boats. The people traffickers must be laughing all the way to the bank at the stupidity of the UK government in providing free accommodation for all those crossing. What more incentive can there be to know that once you have crossed the channel, you will be housed and fed for free.

The police are put into an unenviable position of having to provide protection for these asylum seekers, adding more costs to the hard-working UK taxpayers.

Should the government fail to prevent these crossings, then as sure as night follows day the public will quite rightly protest in the strongest way about this situation. These protests could well turn very violent if all-across the country UK residents are forced to pay and put up with these unwanted and illegal migrants.

CAROL MATHEWS  
West Midlands

# MEETINGS

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **18th April**, 6.00 pm

*“The Trillion Tonne of Carbon and Why it Matters for Climate Change”*

**Myles Allen, Frank Jackson**  
*Foundation Professor of the Environment*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Venue - not confirmed

**Admission Free - Tickets required**

Online version:  
@gres.hm/trillion-tonne  
Registration required at  
www.gresham.ac.uk

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Wednesday **19th April**, 6.00 pm

*“What is the Role of Nuclear Power in a Net Zero System?”*

**Sue Ion, UK National Skills Academy for Nuclear**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Venue - not confirmed

**Admission Free - Tickets required**

Online version:  
@gres.hm/nuclear-zero  
Registration required at  
www.gresham.ac.uk

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Thursday **20th April**, 6.00 pm

*“Do We Need Criminal law?”*

**Leslie Thomas, Gresham Professor of Law**

PUBLIC MEETING  
Venue - not confirmed

**Admission Free - Tickets required**

Online version:  
@gres.hm/criminal-law  
Registration required at  
www.gresham.ac.uk

**FREE**  
**Advertising Space**

Should you be planning a meeting and/or conference dealing with the subject of the UK-EU relationship or know of one upcoming.

**Contact:**

**eurofacts Phone: 08456 120 175**

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

**Gresham College**  
020 7831 0575

Tuesday **9th May**, 6.00 pm

*“Cybersecurity for Humans”*

**Victoria Baines, IT Livery Company**  
*Professor of Information Technology*

PUBLIC MEETING  
Venue - not confirmed

**Admission Free - Tickets required**

Online version:  
@gres.hm/cybersecurity humans  
Registration required at  
www.gresham.ac.uk

## DIARY OF EVENTS

### 2023

UK Parliament 17th April  
Easter recess ends

UK Royal Coronation of King Charles III 6th May  
London

Spain takes over EU Council Presidency 1st July

### 2024

Belgium takes over EU Council Presidency 1st January

Hungary takes over EU Council Presidency 1st July

## USEFUL WEB SITES

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

## USEFUL WEB SITES

**Britain First**  
www.britainfirst.org  
**British Future**  
www.britishfuture.org  
**British Weights & Measures Assoc.**  
www.bwma.org.uk  
**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.eutruth.org.uk  
**European Commission (London)**  
www.cec.org.uk  
**European Foundation**  
www.europeanfoundation.org  
**Facts4EU**  
www.facts4eu.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  
**Migration Watch**  
www.migrationwatch.org.uk  
**New Alliance**  
www.newalliance.org.uk  
**Policy Exchange**  
www.policyexchange.org.uk  
**The Reform Party**  
https://www.reformparty.uk  
**The Red Cell (Think tank)**  
www.theredcell.co.uk  
**Statewatch**  
www.statewatch.org  
**The Taxpayers' Alliance**  
www.taxpayersalliance.com  
**United Kingdom Independence Party**  
www.ukip.org  
**Veterans For Britain**  
http://www.veteransforbritain.uk



**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.

**Reflections on the Revolution in Europe**

by Christopher Caldwell

£14.99 - Pbk 2009 - 363 pp

How mass immigration affects European and UK culture and religious values extending to democracy itself.

[Special Offer £10.00]

**Elephant in the Room**

by David Challice

£6.50 - Pbk 2015 - 300 pp

Bite-size nuggets of information regarding the UK/EU situation over a number of years.

[Special Offer £4.00]

**Why Vote Leave**

by Daniel Hannan

£9.99 - Paperback 2004 - 217 pp

The implications of a British 'No' vote

[Special Offer £6.00]

All Books plus 10% P&P (UK Only)  
Cheques to June Press Ltd  
PO Box 119, Totnes, Devon TQ9 7WA

**Why Did Britain**

**Take The Wrong Path?**

by Christopher Hoskin

£9.99 - Pbk - 2009 - 270 pp

How and why the UK lost its way and ended up with a fear of self-government resulting in democracy being traded for life inside the EU without any understanding of what it would really be like.

[Special Offer £5.00]

**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.

**The UK's liabilities to the financial mechanism of the EU**

by Bob Lyddon

£8.00 - Pbk -2016 - 88 pp

UK's current exposure to the EU is over £80 billion and could easily be more.

[Special Offer £6.00]

**Climate Eco-Socialism**

by Jeremy Nieboer

£14.99 - Pamphlet -2023 - 107 pp

How the dogma of eco-socialism global warming over science has created a drive to reduce CO2 at any cost,

**Climate - CO<sub>2</sub> natures gift**

by Jeremy Nieboer

£15.00 - Pamphlet -2022 - 77 pp

Why CO<sub>2</sub> is not a pollutant and does not form a blanket to trap heat radiated by Earth's surface. It is not causing global warming as the doom merchants say.

**Counter Attack**

Montgomery and the Battle of the Bulge

by Robert Oulds

£8.00 - Pbk - 2022 - 65 pp

A previously untold and hidden story of Monty and his British led victory of Hitler's ruthless counteroffensive. Known today as the Battle of the Bulge.

**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.

**Global Conspiracy**

Evidence, Examples and Explanations

by Hugh Williams

£15.00 - Pbk- 2022 - 207 pp

Covid, Climate change and more, the author questions them all, and explains how the politicians and the media silence all those who dare speak out.

Online from [www.junepress.com](http://www.junepress.com) or Tel: 08456 120175 email [info@junepress.com](mailto: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 any 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	
<a href="http://www.conservativesforbritain.org">www.conservativesforbritain.org</a>	
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	<a href="http://www.britishfuture.org">www.britishfuture.org</a>
Bruges Group	020 7287 4414
Futurus	<a href="http://www.futurus-thinktank.com">www.futurus-thinktank.com</a>
Global Britain	<a href="http://www.globalbritain.org">www.globalbritain.org</a>
The Red Cell	<a href="http://www.theredcell.co.uk">www.theredcell.co.uk</a>

POLITICAL PARTIES

Brexit (Reform) Party	0800 414 8525
Richard Tice	
Conservative	020 7222 9000
Rishi Sunak 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 MP	
UK Independence Party	020 3476 9564
Neil Hamilton	

ISSN 1361-4134

