

## Brexit weakens the drive to war

Next to Shakespeare, our great national poet is John Milton. Writing at the beginning of the British Revolution, with the first civil war in prospect, he wrote this about London; ' London is the mansion house of liberty, citizens sitting by their studious lamps, musing, searching, revolving new notions and ideas.'

Well, here we are, in London, sitting by, or under, our studious lamps. So now we should muse, search, to come up with new notions and ideas.

People of a certain age, mainly Americans, used to say they knew precisely where they were when President Kennedy was murdered. Murdered almost certainly because he was beginning to dare to think that war should *not* be launched against the people of Vietnam. Murdered because he may have been beginning to think that, after the defeat of his attempt to invade Cuba at what we call the Bay of Pigs, the place Cubans call Playa Giron, which was the first ever defeat of America in its own hemisphere, maybe he was beginning to think that war should *not* be launched against the people of Cuba. Maybe even that the illegal blockade of Cuba should be lifted.

Whatever he was beginning to think, he didn't think it any more. His life was cut short by forces in American society who believed he was going soft on Communism.

I think that everybody in this room and everyone *you* know, will remember for the rest of *your* lives where you were when you heard that Britain had voted to leave the European Union. Many people stayed up all night until they heard the results. A very dear friend of mine, a leader of the leave campaign in Newcastle, was so knackered after all his hard work that he didn't manage to stay awake beyond 4 am, so *he* fell asleep thinking that Britain had voted to remain, only to get a pleasant surprise several hours later.

For my part, I went to bed relatively early, after only the first few declarations. So I got up on the morning of the 24th June not knowing the fateful outcome. Being a low tech sort of person, I didn't look on the tinterweb, I turned the radio on. The message seemed indistinct, and my first impression was that Britain had voted to remain. I went to put on a pair of trainers I'd left by the back door, still listening intently to the radio. When I put them on I felt something unpleasantly cold and wet up against my toes in my left shoe (I didn't have socks on). I was still listening hard to the radio but the unpleasant sensation in my left shoe was making concentration really difficult. In the end I realised I had to take my shoe off and noticed that in it, right down inside, was a slug.

Now I don't know whether you've ever tried to get a slug out of a pair of trainers (or any other type of shoe for that matter) but it is not as easy as you might think. Unlacing them and poking about with your fingers turns out to be both ineffectual and unpleasant. If you want my evidence-based tip (and frankly why wouldn't you?) you'll need a pencil. Not a stubby one. And a good deal of concentration.

Preferably not when the most important political event of your lifetime is unfolding on the radio a few feet away.

Perhaps I could have got the slug out more quickly if I'd turned the radio off.

I could certainly have found out the referendum result more quickly had I stopped scraping about inside my shoes with a variety of household objects.

Anyway, success was achieved - I had no slugs in my shoes! *And* Britain had voted to leave the EU!!

So I will certainly remember where I was when I heard!

I referred to the leaving of the EU as the most significant political event of my lifetime. It is undoubtedly that. It has been likened to 1945, or even, wrongly in my opinion, February 1917 in Russia. Another analogy proffered has been 1640, the cusp of the British Revolution. Well, we have to be in the business of looking *forward*, and we look over our shoulders only to check what's behind us.

Herbert Morrison, Peter Mandelson's grandfather, who was acting Labour Prime Minister at the time he said this, explained the reason that Britain couldn't join the EU when discussions about it first began in 1950. He said, 'It's no good, we can't do it, the Durham miners won't wear it!'

Well, there may be no miners left in Durham, but enough of their descendents, along with 16 plus millions of others, said on 23rd June that they wouldn't wear it either.

The signal political import of the vote to leave is various and profound. Principally it gives us the possibility to secure independence, which possibility did exist in 1945, which the British people spurned at the time.

It enables us to begin to rebuild Britain and to use funds freed from what we might describe as the *tithe* we submit, akin to a feudal tribute to Brussels.

Much was made in the referendum campaign of the amounts of money we did or didn't spend on EU membership. The latest official figures are that Britain's *net* contribution to the EU is running at £11.1 billion a year. That's almost exactly £40 million per day. So since 23 June I make that £5,880 million, nearly £6 billion. I suggest that every meeting, whatever it's about, no matter what's on the agenda, should include a discussion about what that growing windfall might be spent on.

It would be a wonderful, positive debate to have with our friends and colleagues - you've got £40 million/day to spend on rebuilding Britain, what would you spend it on? A revolutionary new game show is born! Maybe we

**should open a competition for its title. Pounds mean prizes! Who wants to be a Billionaire? Opportunity knocks? Eurotrash?**

**Britain's financial contribution to the EU is more than 12% of EU income; imagine the damage it will cause when we withdraw it.**

**One of the most profound implications of the vote to leave hasn't really been much commented on, and that is the blow that Brexit struck against the plans being made for war, in particular a war against Russia. As a Party we recently released a document summing up our view of the international situation, entitled Britain in the World. It included the following words,**

**“We are constantly told that the existence of the EU has prevented war in Europe. This myth was destroyed by the fact that war broke out in Europe the minute the Soviet Union collapsed and continues to this day. It was the Soviet Union that kept the peace in Europe after World War 2, not the EU.**

**Today, the EU is inseparable from NATO as all applicants (perhaps supplicants is a better term) to the former must first join the latter. Together with the USA they are a force for war; the Soviet Union was a force for peace. Had the Soviet Union continued to exist, there would have been no invasion of Iraq or Afghanistan, no bombing of Libya and the chaos that followed, no ISIS and no war against Syria’.**

**The BBC website says that the EU was created because countries that trade with each other are less likely to go to war with each another. This sounds plausible, but history is full of examples of countries going to war with one another precisely *because* they traded with each other.**

Those BBC words describe the beginnings of a military bloc. When countries band together and agree not to fight one another, they constitute the beginnings of a military alliance against other countries which are not in that bloc. And a military alliance among capitalist countries is an *aggressive* alliance.

That was the significance of the EU's so-called trade treaties, TTIP, CETA and so forth; they were, and remain in truth embryonic military pacts, and were part of the EU & NATO's encirclement of Russia; the thinking behind these treaties was, if you don't join you're on the outside, our guns are aimed at you. And modern wars can only happen if these kind of alliances, or blocs exist.

The First World War stemmed from the world being divided into the Triple Alliance and the Entente Cordiale (and *they* all traded with each other). The Second World War was, until the Nazi attack on the Soviet Union, fought between the anti-Comintern Axis and countries who were members of the League of Nations, both examples of blocs.

The first organisation of European countries to be established after the war was not an economic one, but a military, set up between west European countries and the USA in 1949. It was the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation or NATO.

The first Europe-only organisation was the European Payments Union, proposed in December 1949 & launched the following year. This body was set up to administer the European Recovery Programme, or ERP. The ERP has gone down in history as the Marshall Plan, the economic & fiscal means by which the USA bound war-ravaged western Europe into a capitalist future, excluding the far more war-ravaged countries of eastern Europe.

**In fact, the Americans (not the Europeans) had proposed an ‘Organisation for European Economic Co-operation’ as early as 1948, and Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Secretary, proposed the establishment of the Western European Union, a sort of NATO-without-the-Americans, also in 1948.**

**So clandestine was American involvement in Europe after the war that it has only recently become clear that the first west German currency, the Deutschmark was not even printed in Germany at all, but in the USA. It was shipped secretly and under guard to Frankfurt in 1948, before the creation of the state of West Germany had even been agreed.**

**West Germany was in origin an artificial creation of the USA, and that artificial state played the leading role in establishing the equally artificial putative state of the EU. So the argument, often run out, that the EU is a counterweight to the USA, is not based on any facts. The facts show that the allegedly economic community of european states began as an offshoot of, and remains today central to an american-led *military* organisation.**

**The European Coal and Steel Community, which is said to be the embryo of the EU, was not established until 1951. The head of the ECSC was a man called Jean Monnet, who is often described as the father of the EU. Monnet is usually described as pro-British, pro-planning, almost social democratic in politics, passionately enthusiastic about bringing the peoples of Europe closer together and so on. What isn’t often mentioned is that Monnet had been investigated in 1941 in America because of his pre-war business dealings with the Nazi’s.**

**Monnet it was who went on to write the 1957 Treaty of Rome which effectively established the EU's forerunner organisation the European Community.**

**The idea of a 'united Europe' however didn't originate with Monnet. That other great European Adolf Hitler dreamt of a New Order straddling Europe with its' own currency (the Reichmark), its' own army (the Wehrmacht) and its' own police force (the Gestapo). Before Hitler, Napoleon sought the same kind of thing, as did, if you want to go right back, Julius Caesar.**

**The US has always been in favour of dealing with the countries of Europe as a single entity, as a bloc, not as individual nations. America's leading foreign policy advisor said at the end of the war, 'the only thing wrong with Hitler's New Order in Europe is that it was Hitler's'. In other words, if Hitler's agenda could be brought about without Hitler – let's do it! And so the EU was born.**

**There is much talk, quite frankly extremely naive, describing the EU as a bringing together of people, of uniting Europe. It has always only been about uniting the oppressors, bringing together the ruling class in each country, not the oppressed, and it has always been a military project first and foremost.**

**Oppressors are always secretive bullies who seek to intimidate those who they see as uncontrollable. Like all bullies they are essentially cowards, and melt away when faced down.**



At the core of the EU is its Janus-face, NATO, at the core of NATO is the government and the armed forces of the United States of America. At the heart of the integration of Europe's capitalist governments has always been North America.

The North Atlantic Treaty of course states that any attack upon any NATO member is considered an attack on all NATO members.

The EU has, it goes without saying, supported every war that NATO has launched, whether it was against Iraq in 1991, Yugoslavia in 1992, Iraq again in 2003, Afghanistan, Libya in 2011, and Syria.

Of course NATO, particularly the Americans, don't want any of these wars to be *called* wars, and they don't want NATO aggression to be called NATO aggression. So the slavish media refer to them as 'military engagements', undertaken by the 'international community', or sometimes, 'coalition forces'. Or even, when they're testing how stupid we really are, they describe them as 'humanitarian missions', just to see if we'll swallow that.

However they're described these wars have been fought in what we are told is our 'national interest'. It's worth pausing to ask ourselves, had any of those countries attacked by NATO ever actually attacked Britain? Or attacked any other NATO member country? No, of course they hadn't. Were any of those countries about to attack us? Or any other NATO member country? No of course they weren't. In fact not even NATO suggested that they were.

The closest NATO came to suggesting such a thing was the gossamer thin fabrication of Saddam's phantom weapons of mass destruction, which in reality NATO has a near-monopoly on.

The rulers of these countries that were attacked by NATO/EU were demonised systematically and deliberately by the media. But we should ask, do we really think that Saddam was worse than the Saudi royal family, that firm ally of NATO? The Saudi Arabia that is now proven beyond reasonable doubt to have funded the fascists who killed nearly 3,000 people in the World Trade Centre?

In Syria millions of women go to school, work in the professions and are able to vote; is it a worse country than Saudi Arabia, where it is illegal for women to drive, and stoning for adultery is commonplace; stoning of women for adultery of course?

And as if to prove the insanity and cowardice abroad in the world, three weeks ago Russia was voted off the UN Human Rights Committee, and Saudi Arabia elected, unanimously, for a second term.

The reason these leaders were demonised, and had to be overthrown, was because they were independent of the USA, of NATO, of the EU. Their relations with other countries were decided by *them*, not by foreigners.

That kind of independence was not acceptable to the old colonial empires of Britain, France & Belgium 150 years ago, and it's not acceptable today to the new colonial empires of the USA, NATO & the EU. So they had to go.

Just as Afghan emirs & Pashtun pasha's were hoicked out in the glory days of gunboat diplomacy, so the Arab Socialists had to be harried into a painful & above all undignified grave. All deeply barbaric, deeply unfair and as racist as has been the attitude of colonialists to those fighting for national liberation throughout history.

Kenya's first post-colonial leader Jomo Kenyatta memorably said of his country's experience at the hands of Europeans (it could be said of the whole of sub-saharan Africa,

"When the Missionaries arrived, the Africans had the land and the Missionaries had the Bible. They taught us how to pray with our eyes closed. When we opened them, they had the land and we had the Bible."

The bible is now owned by the World Bank and leased back to the Africans on very reasonable terms of interest.

But is it any of our business who runs other countries? Haven't countries got the right to decide for themselves how and by whom they are governed? We think we have, so why doesn't that apply to everyone? International law says *everyone* has that right.

And frankly the spectacle of the uncouth unlettered George Bush passing judgement on the eloquent sophisticated Bashar al-Assad would be laughable if it weren't so serious for us all. In a region now swarming with pre-medieval bestiality we don't hear much in our so-called free press about the multi-lingual London-educated ophthalmologist and his British wife do we? That's the Dr Assad who didn't even want to be President of Syria.

**It's the 'butcher' Assad we get offered up in the media, so that we'll be more prone to support his overthrow, torture and murder.**

**All of which begs the question, what *is* our national interest? Have these wars been in our interests? The cost of the war against Afghanistan alone was a massive £37 billion. That's £2,000 for every British family. Plus nearly £2 billion for the illegal war against Libya. Not to mention the irreplaceable human cost of over 600 British lives. If that is in the British national interest then there is no better argument for changing that national interest.**

**All of those wars were illegal. The United Nations is only empowered to intervene in wars *between* member states, not intervene in conflict *within* member states. All these countries attacked by NATO since the collapse of the Soviet Union, including Yugoslavia, were equally sovereign members of the UN; no more nor less than are Britain or the US, and all wars against them were equally illegal.**

**Independence is now a central political issue. It's what the referendum was all about. According to our ruling class & its' media, independence is good if it's Lithuania breaking away from the old Soviet Union, or Croatia breaking away from Yugoslavia, or even for some, Scotland breaking away from the rest of Britain. But it's not good when it's Britain breaking away from the EU. And nor will it be considered good for Britain to break away from NATO.**

**Independence of mind is where it all begins; it is the beginning of the end of oppression. Question what you're told, come to your own conclusions, don't allow yourself to be force-fed propaganda, gossip or distorted views.**

**It's true that first of all we must keep the pressure on to make sure we leave the EU, or to use a Geordie phrase, to keep the cat's arse to the fire. But the road we've opened up leads to Britain leaving NATO. Just as our inclusion in its military ranks pre-dated our inclusion in the EU, so our independence of the latter must lead to our independence of the former.**

**We must decide what our national interests are by applying the test of independence. How can we assert it, and what will we do with it when we achieve it? Our national interests are the interests of the British people, not of the international banking system.**

**Mark Carney has been in the news recently, having his contract extended by a year as Governor of the Bank of England. Usually the only job mentioned in Carney's CV before he came here as the first foreigner to head the Bank was his position as Governor of the Bank of Canada. But more relevantly he had headed an organisation called the Bank for International Settlements, or more precisely its Financial Stability Board. B.I.S. was established by the self-same Bank of England in 1930 to act as a 'central bank of central banks'. It therefore pre-dates all the Bretton Woods and UN institutions established in 1945, the World Bank, the IMF and so on, and long before the EU in all its forms.**

**The BIS's guiding light at the beginning was the man who was *then* Governor of the Bank of England, Montagu Norman. Now for some people it might come as a surprise to discover that there was ever a Governor of the Bank of England who was a Nazi sympathiser, never mind its longest-serving Governor, which Norman was, from 1920-44.**

Well, think again. Monty Norman was a real cheerleader for Hitler. The head of the huge American bank J.P.Morgan said of Norman, 'Monty says that Hitler & Schacht are the bulwarks of civilisation in Germany. They are fighting the war of our system against Communism.' He said this not in the early 1930's when all sorts of fashionable members of the ruling class and one of their newspapers the Daily Mail supported Hitler & Mussolini, but in 1938, by which time it was not quite so chic.

And who is this 'Schacht' he referred to? Well he was the Nazi Finance Minister! He was tried at Nuremburg as a war criminal. Naturally, as a banker, he wasn't found guilty! Norman was so enamoured of Schacht's financial policies as Nazi Minister of Finance that he put him on the Board of the Bank of International Settlements! This makes Schacht a direct predecessor of Mark Carney. Had Hitler won the war Carney would *not* have been the first foreigner to run the Bank of England, Schacht would.

Norman was so enamoured of Schacht the man that he went to Berlin just months before Britain & Germany were at war to stand god grandfather to Schacht's godson, who was, unbelievably, christened Norman. So there was a man on trial at Nuremburg whose godson was called Norman. After the Governor of the Bank of England. If you made it up no-one would believe it.

**The Bank of International Settlement is a private bank wholly owned by the Central Banks of which it is composed. It is therefore one of the principal means by which finance capital imposes its' policies and interests upon sovereign governments, from whom it is entirely independent – independent even before Blair & Brown privatised the Bank of England in 1997, which move incidentally might be said to mark the official takeover of the that Labour government by the City of London.**

**The BIS today implements a policy which Gladstone described before he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1852 in these words, 'The hinge of the whole situation is this: the government itself was not to be a substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power (what we would know as Finance Capital) supreme and unquestioned.' Or to put the same thing in Marx's famous phrase, 'The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie'.**

**We might now say that the modern state is the *drudge* of the banks.**

**B.I.S. and its' Financial Stability Board it is who have overseen the internationally-applied economic measures after the 2008 banking collapses. So Carney, now Bank of England Governor, is applying BIS policies to our economy. And even more instructive is who Carney worked for before he worked for BIS - Goldman Sachs, the world's leading bank. As did his fellow B.I.S. board member, and now head of the European Central Bank, Mario Draghi. It is precisely Goldman Sachs & their ilk who determine the policies of the B.I.S., which in turn seeks to impose them on sovereign states.**

International finance capital's policies have led to what has become known as 'austerity'. Austerity is in fact nothing more complicated than a transfer of wealth from us to them, from workers to capitalists. Austerity for us, £325 billion for them, in what's called quantitative easing.

It's called Quantative Easing for the highly technical reason that it sounds better than theft, which is what it is. In case QE isn't enough for the delicate flowers there are little things like this; in 2012 Barclays paid £82 million in tax, which might sound a lot. But that's on a profit on £7 billion, so that's a tax rate of 1%. That's perfectly legal, and that's austerity.

So, the military alliance of European countries within NATO came first; but the EU *has* got its' own separate military organisation as well. We should ask those, especially those within the British Trade Union movement so fond of extolling the nice sweet face of the EU, what they make of the European Defence Agency for example, established in 2004 to co-ordinate military capabilities and create a european military equipment market?

Or we could ask them what they think of the EU's own army, the Eurocorps & the European Rapid Reaction Force, set up even earlier, in 1999. That's 60,000 soldiers which can be deployed within 60 days. I don't recall Frances O'Grady advocating a vote to remain in order that we can protect and expand the EU's war-fighting capacity.

And we should ask those still in favour of remaining in the EU whether they also support the expansion & beefing up of NATO, because you can't have one without the other.



And if you think you *can* have the EU without NATO, or vice versa, listen to the US war criminal Zbigniew Brzezinski, who said, “NATO and EU expansion go hand-in-hand, which means there is a partnership between the military push and the economic push.”

We’ve heard a lot about neo-conservatism, neo-liberalism, neo-federalism and a host of other neologisms in recent years. But at the heart of the EU is the remarkable & rather strange concept of neo-feudalism! Listen to Giuliano Amato, twice prime Minister of Italy and a leading figure in an organisation called the Convention on the Future of Europe, the outfit which does some of the EU's long-term thinking. He described his objective like this,

‘I prefer to go slowly, to crumble little by little pieces of sovereignty, avoiding sudden shifts from national to federal powers.....And why not go back to the period before Hobbes? (If anyone here hasn’t come across Thomas Hobbes, this is your cue to look him up [not now, on your phones!]) The Middle Ages had a much richer humanity, and a diversity of identity which can today be a model. The Middle Ages were beautiful; it had its policy-making centres, without relying entirely on anyone. *It was beyond the bounds of the nation-state.* Today, as then, nomads are reappearing in our societies. Today also, we have powers without territories. *Without sovereignties we will not have totalitarianism’.* In other words, without national sovereignty we will not have socialism. The EU's objective could not be more clearly spelled out than that. The EU is trying to prevent Socialism by eradicating national sovereignty.

**The Middle Ages of which Amato is so enamoured are of course the Middle Ages of heretic-burning, plagues and poverty on such a scale that most people were dead by the age of 30, if you hadn't already been burned alive that is.**

**We must consider the alternative; what if we'd voted to remain? That would have been interpreted as a green light. A green light for more reactionary policies to be imposed. A green light for even more money to be extracted from us. And a green light for war.**

**Sometimes, when warmongering doesn't lead directly to war, we might overlook the danger inherent. One of the most dangerous of recently-averted wars was in the Ukraine. Ukraine, which throughout history has never constituted an independent nation, was cajoled into an agreement of association with the EU. When the Ukraine's President realised that it was less beneficial, and at the same time excluded his country from its already-existing agreement with post-Soviet Russia, he chose to reconsider this EU agreement, and from that point all hell broke loose.**

**It was said that Ukraine was being oppressed by the evil empire to its east, who of course should be attacked & put down. In fact, Russia had done nothing, it was the EU's attempt to force agreement on the Ukraine that had provoked the trouble, not the Ukraine's already-existing agreement with Russia. Somehow the argument then became about Crimea, which, completely coincidentally of**

course, is the home of the Russian Black Sea fleet. Russia and in particular Putin were demonised in the media. (It may even be that one of the reasons that Putin is so hated is because of his grandfather, Spiridon, who worked with Lenin, in fact he was Lenin's cook.)

Anti-Russian rhetoric preceded the Crimean War of 1853. The rhetoric now used against Russia is, if anything, even more strident, and a new Crimean War was narrowly averted, by the action of the Crimean people voting to detach themselves from the putative Ukraine & to reattach themselves to Russia, of which they were an integral part throughout their history until 1954.

And the margin by which they voted to return to Russia was by almost 97% on an 83% turnout, so bear that in mind the next time you hear the BBC call it an annexation of Crimea by Russia.

But make no mistake, the EU has not forgotten the Ukraine. A more convenient jumping off point for aggression against Russia does not exist for NATO. Not just geographically and militarily, but politically, with the most militant Ukrainian separatists being simultaneously the most pro-EU people in Europe. They're also the most neo-fascist of all. Many of the steps taken by the so-called Ukrainian government were also taken by Hitler's forces when they occupied that part of what was then the Soviet Union between 1941-44; the Communist Party is

**illegal, and reference to Soviet achievements – like defeating the EU’s principal country, Germany – is also illegal.**

**A so-called ‘country’ as reactionary as the Ukraine finds its’ natural home in the EU. And of course in NATO. And thereby hangs another tale. As we’ve said, the usual pattern is that a country has to join NATO before being admitted to the EU. Ukraine is a classic example of this. It applied to join NATO in 2008, but when President Yanukovyck was elected, he halted the application.**

**Yanukovych by the way, much-reviled and now driven out of the Ukraine, was democratically elected by a massive 49% of the popular vote, in a 68% turnout, thereby giving him a solid mandate for what he was doing, which was questioning the Ukraine’s relationship to the EU & NATO.**

**But it’s better for the EU to portray this as being about the nasty Russians stopping the nice Ukrainians joining us smiling Europeans than it is to tell the truth, which is that the grubby little anti-semites and communist-haters who describe Hitler as a dog-loving vegetarian were prevented from giving his adherents in Washington bases on the Russian border by the overwhelming democratic vote of the people of Crimea.**

**The EU didn't get its war, and NATO didn’t get its Black Sea naval base.**

**Sanctions, economic and political, are weapons of war. All the EU/NATO wars I mentioned earlier, against Iraq, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Libya, Syria, they all involved the use of sanctions against those sovereign countries.**

**So we should be very wary whenever NATO and the EU decide to impose sanctions against a country, it means they are preparing for war against them. And which country is subject to the most extreme sanctions of all? Russia. Nuclear-armed Russia.**

**So Britain leaving the EU must mean a weakening, hopefully fatally, of those bullying sanctions. This would start the process of pulling the rug out from under the Americans' attempts to get Europeans to fight Russia for them. It would be even better if we then did the obvious thing and begin trading properly with Russia, rather than applying sanctions which are harmful to us as well as to Russia.**

**What we're witnessing is a change in the composition of the establishment. It's no longer merely public school, white, Oxbridge, Church of England. Now it's also anti-anti-zionist, pro-religion, 38 degree Corbynites who are seemingly ready to leave the country rather than embrace Brexit and build a future here. But where can they go? They can't go to America now that the nasty man in a wig is president-elect. Maybe the Ukraine would suit them.**

**So let's be circumspect about Trump's election. Clinton's defeat is a blow against war. Let's see if Trump is as pro-Brexit and anti-NATO in practice as he says he is. If he is, then he is an ally, and we should not be afraid of saying so.**

**Just as Assad has been clever enough to describe him as an ally in the struggle against terrorism.**

**And now Bulgaria & Moldova have elected social democrats who are pro-Russia, and further isolating the EU. So the EU is weakened and isolated by the events of the last few months.**

**The new establishment are if anything more in favour of war than the old because it won't take the steps to stop it**

**A very good erstwhile friend and Comrade of mine is dying of cancer. Or to be more precise, he's fighting the fight of his life against cancer. Some of you in this room will know him, Steve Hewlett. He's a journalist by trade and has been publically explaining his predicament. One of the things he says is that he is not brave, as people have averred. He is realistic, and is trying to do what is necessary. That is what is demanded of us. We haven't got to be brave, although bravery wouldn't come amiss, but we have to be realistic, and we have to do what is necessary.**

**To conclude, we can say this; In their arrogance the remainers don't know how to deal with defeat. In our timidity we don't yet know how to deal with our victory.**

**I started with Milton, and will end with him. I first mentioned a wonderful description of the people of London. Here is his description of the people of an independent Britain, which he wrote when we were in the thick of our Revolution.**

**"What Nation it is whereof ye are, a nation not slow and dull, but of a quick, ingenious and piercing spirit, acute to invent, subtle and sinewy to discourse, not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to"**

**We have struck out for peace in our rejection of the EU.**

**Now let us assert what we have yet to gain, our independence.**