

# Clarity on the current Brexit situation

## Introduction

In the light of the current political chaos, the 'project fear' scaremongering, the media bias and a potential impending second referendum, I ought to explain some simple facts laid out concisely.

## The European Union

We voted democratically to leave the EU. We have had over 40 years to assess this experiment and so are not without solid reasons for leaving. The main reason to leave was to reclaim national sovereignty and escape an undemocratic oligarchy. There were other reasons, such as fears about mass immigration, but the chief cause was to regain national sovereignty after being unconstitutionally dominated by Brussels for decades.<sup>1</sup>

### The undemocratic EU structure of government

- The Commission: an unelected body with a monopoly on initiating laws and policies meeting in secret. This is then passed on to:
- The Committee of Permanent Representative's: again, meeting in secret. This is then passed on to:
- The Council of Ministers, which rubber-stamps what has been agreed.

20,000 laws have been imposed upon Britain by this undemocratic process. The House of Commons and the House of Lords can do nothing about these laws.

Thus laws impacting on you are set by unelected, unaccountable figures in Brussels and your Parliament has no say whatsoever on these laws.

### The EU is fascist

'Fascism' means an intolerant, authoritarian, totalitarian style of government. In the past it was used to refer to right-wing political groups, such as that led by Mussolini, but it can now be applied to any group, left or right.

By definition, the EU is fascist. It is not democratic in any sense and was never designed to be so. It is run by unelected bureaucrats, in the Commission, who act despotically. The EU Parliament is merely window dressing, a talking shop with no authority to initiate laws, and has no governing power. It is part of an act to deceive nations as to what it is really all about.

I have explained before<sup>2</sup> that the EU project was initially developed by Nazis towards the end of WWII as an instrument to deceive nations and gather federal power in Europe.

---

<sup>1</sup> Joining the EEC was based on political lies and was always about surrendering sovereignty. This was illegal and treacherous. The Constitution [Magna Carta, Common Law, Bill of Rights, Coronation Oath etc.] demands that no parliament constrain any future parliament. It also forbids any foreign rule taking precedence over British law. Thus our membership of the EEC/EU has been treason.

<sup>2</sup> See particularly 'Exiting the European Union'.

Idealistic fascists from Europe, such as Count Coudenove-Kalergi took this development further. To mongrelise the populations of Europe, racist Kalergi had previously proposed to *'turn the European into a mixed race of Asians and Negroes ruled over by the Jews... Europe will against its own will ... turn Europe into a mixed race of Asians and Negroes ... through this artificial selection process'*.<sup>3</sup> Please read previous papers for the history.

The point is that the EU was begun by fascists to produce a totalitarian federal state of Europe. Kalergi was intent on destroying the individual nations and cultures of Europe to produce a mongrelised single superstate of homogenised citizens just like Big Brother in the book '1984' (this explains the mass immigration policies of today). From the beginning the plan was to start as an economic partnership, develop into a political unit, then initiate a single currency, followed by a single fiscal system then by a single defence policy with a European army. From the beginning it was called a United States of Europe by Jean Monnet and the rest.<sup>4</sup> The EEC goal was a *'common foundation for economic development as a first step in the federation of Europe'*.<sup>5</sup> *'Europe's nations should be guided towards a superstate without their people understanding what is happening. This can be accomplished by successive steps, each disguised as having an economic purpose but which will irreversibly lead to federation'*.<sup>6</sup>

Since I have explained all this before I need not comment further. The point is that the EU is a fascist government intent on producing a despotic United States of Europe. Britain did well to state that we wanted out.

### **The EU is a failed project that is collapsing**

Because it was founded on false political and economic principles, the EU is doomed to collapse and the rot is well underway. Eventually nation states will rise up against fascism and either rebel or start a civil war. That has happened throughout history. The expanding revolt of the gilets jaunes (yellow vests) may be the beginning of this; who knows.

#### *A failed political system*

I have already explained that the EU is not a democratic government; it is totalitarian in its leadership. The power lies with unelected officials in the Commission (often failed politicians) who initiate laws and policies.<sup>7</sup> The basis of the founding of the EU was that populations are too stupid to know what is good for them and must be ruled by oligarchs in a privileged class.

This class is tied to corporate business interests, which is why businesses influence 75% of EU laws. This system leads to the growth of the wealth of the rich top 1%, pressure and restrictions on the middle class and stagnation for working class people. This is exactly what the current French riots are all about – yet France is supposed to be one of the prosperous northern EU nations and not one of the depressed southern states.

As well as being undemocratic by design, the EU is politically corrupt in root and branch. There have been multiple scandals and corruption charges of its officials and its accounts

---

<sup>3</sup> Kalergi, 'Practical Idealism' (1925).

<sup>4</sup> See: Arthur Salter (friend of Monnet), 'The United States of Europe' (1931). Giovanni Agnelli, 'European Federation or League of Nations' (1918). Count Richard Coudenhove Kalergi, 'Pan Europa' (1922).

<sup>5</sup> Robert Schuman, French Foreign Minister, 9 May 1950.

<sup>6</sup> Jean Monnet, 'Communiqué', 30 April 1952. See Christopher Booker's book, 'Deception', for a thorough analysis of the history and development of the EU as a federal superstate. He gives multiple quotes showing how all the founding fathers sought a 'United States of Europe', developed by deceit.

<sup>7</sup> In fact, the Commission is under the control of the global elite cabal. The EU is a stepping stone towards a single totalitarian world government.

have not been able to be audited for decades. The amount of money alleged to go missing each year is vast. If it were a business corporation, it would have gone bankrupt years ago and its leaders put on trial.

If you have a system of governance that is led by unelected officials that cannot be voted out periodically, you create not only an undemocratic system but one easily prone to corruption.

### *A failed economic system*

It is a failed economic model based on protectionism.

The idea of a 'one size fits all' monetary policy was always doomed to failure and the result is being worked out before our eyes. It is impossible to have a common economic policy to suit large developed nations in the north of Europe that also suits smaller, less productive nations in the south. Thus the massive unemployment and budgetary problems in Italy; the collapse of the economy of Greece with falling living standards, plus the terrible growth rates of Spain and Portugal. Italy has seen no economic growth for twenty years; wages have stagnated. In 2016 a study established that the Euro produced no trade gains whatsoever (which was supposed to be the original stated purpose).

The open border policy of the EU does generate some trade benefits, but these are overstated, while it does carry risks, such as adverse distribution consequences. Harvard economist Dani Rodrik stated that '*economic welfare changes only modestly when countries with extensive trade relationships increase or decrease the extent of their international trade*'.<sup>8</sup> Such trade agreements only help the rich, not the poor. '*Trade agreements are driven overwhelmingly by a business-led agenda ... the interests of labour – good pay, high labour standards, employment security, voice to the workplace, bargaining rights – get little lip service*'.<sup>9</sup> The EU shows evidence of these ills. Corporate lobbyists influence nearly 75% of EU laws. In other words, staying in the EU is not conducive to workers or long-term economic gains.

The GDP of Europe is collapsing. The booming nations are outside Europe, such as China, India, Russia, Singapore and Malaysia. European banks (and especially Deutsche Bank) are collapsing under billions, or even trillions of debt. Deutsche Bank is exposed to more debt than the GDP of Germany.

If Britain does actually escape from the EU, the lack of the UK budget contribution to the EU may be the straw that breaks the camel's back. This is why the EU is desperate to stop Britain actually leaving. The EU is facing multiple crises: the Greece problem, the Italy problem, the economic woes of Spain and Portugal, the revolt of Poland and Hungary, the riots in France, the collapse of law and order due to the migrant explosion in France, Germany, Belgium, Sicily and Sweden, the rise of nationalism and so on. MEPs have stated that Brexit is about number ten on the list of EU problems at the moment. The EU could actually crumble within a few years.

### *It is a failed social system*

The policy of mass immigration is also causing deadlock in the EU. In reaction to the terrible social problems and crimes caused in Sweden, France and Germany,<sup>10</sup> to say nothing of terrorism, nationalistic parties have risen to the fore all over Europe in a wave

---

<sup>8</sup> Ashoka Mody, (Professor of international economic policy at Princeton University), The Independent, 'Ignore the Brexit scare stories', 6 December 2018.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Such as rape, burglary and murder rising dramatically plus riots and increased terror attacks.

of nationalistic populism.<sup>11</sup> Hungary and Poland are already under suspension by the EU bureaucrats while Italy has had its budget denied. France has been on fire for several weeks now with Macron's popularity being at an unprecedented 18% and the far right rising. While Macron is having eggs thrown at him and being called a traitor to his face, yellow vest protestors are now occurring in other nations as well.

Failed social policies, added to a failed economy, corrupt politics and no representation, have led to a crusade of nationalism, populism and anti-globalism of the sort that dominated Germany in the 1930s.

### **Yet its federalism is increasing**

Despite the walls crumbling around them, EU politicians blithely continue their federalised experiment with the utmost callousness. Macron is the classic example of a globalist crony that completely ignored the middle class, the working class and the poor, to rub their noses in further federalist strategies. His time is up. Merkel, considered a traitor by many Germans, has now come to the end of her leadership with Germany seeing a rise of far-right political groups.

Notwithstanding current events, the EU ploughs on in federal schemes. The latest and most important is the federalised European Defence and Security strategies.<sup>12</sup> Despite no debate in Parliament, nor any consultation of MPs, Britain is fully signed up for this, putting our defence and foreign policy in the EU's hand.

The culmination is an EU army planned to be activated in 2025 with all the preparations (budget, infrastructure, procurement, strategy, officer staff) already in place. Recent war games in Europe saw British army personnel wearing EU shoulder flashes. Unless we actually leave the EU soon with a no deal arrangement, Britain's foreign and defence policy will be run by France and Germany – yet no one in the media is talking about this.

### **Why people love the EU**

When you weigh up all the characteristics of the EU, it soon becomes clear that it is pointless. It does nothing good. There is nothing the EU does that can not be done simply between consenting nations independently.

If you add to this the colossal cost of it, the despotism of it, the corruption of it, the bureaucratic red tape, and so on, it is clearly a useless organisation.

To this the usual reply is that it has secured peace in Europe. This is also a lie. It is NATO that has been the bulwark of security in Europe backed by the power of American military might. Nevertheless, the EU or NATO did not prevent several wars in Europe: the bombing of Yugoslavia, the Serbian conflict, The Bosnian War, or the Kosovo War. So even the notion of the EU providing security is a fallacy. Furthermore, by breaking the promise to Gorbachev not to encroach eastwards, the EU has provoked war with Russia. It is complicit in trying to annex the Ukraine and fully involved in a ring of military and missile bases newly built in Eastern Europe on the border with Russia.

The reason that people support the EU with passion, chiefly younger people, is social conditioning. Children from a young age are bombarded with expensive propaganda<sup>13</sup> from the EU PA machine. Throughout their education they are bombarded with conditioning to love the EU. This is further backed by Common Purpose teachers who strengthen this

---

<sup>11</sup> This is not necessarily the rise of the far right, but a swell of nationalism.

<sup>12</sup> See my paper, 'Surrendering foreign policy'.

<sup>13</sup> Billions per year.

resolve. This is further compounded by propaganda from socialists<sup>14</sup> that have completely hijacked the further education system.

The net result of this social conditioning is a passionate love of the EU and a fear of leaving it. Far from the repeated accusation that stupid old people voted for Brexit, in fact it was old people that have experienced decades of the EU that have the best means of assessing what it truly is. Throughout history all societies have respected the wisdom of older people gained from experience. Today, young impressionable people yet to fully understand the ways of the world<sup>15</sup> ridicule and castigate older people; it is a sign of social problems to come.

## **Why Britain must get out fast**

In the light of the above, Britain should run away from the EU as fast as it can. The ship is sinking and Britain needs to re-establish its sovereignty and economy based on international trade.

But the real reason is that Britain has proved to have a system that works while the EU system does not work. This is for four or five main reasons.<sup>16</sup>

### **Democracy**

Britain's parliamentary system has been the envy of the world and copied by many other western nations. Britain has proved that a democratic system produces prosperity better than any other system. Just look at what totalitarian socialism did for China, Venezuela and the USSR, to say nothing of around twenty other failed states.

Democracy gives the people a say, at least in a limited fashion, over how they are governed and this leads to trust in the markets and prosperity. Government only has a five-year term and can then be thrown out if they fail. Parliament is subject to British law.

The EU is undemocratic. Its executives are unelected and cannot be thrown out. The people have no say in the matter because that was how the system was deliberately designed by the founding fathers, such as Monnet and Kalergi. They did not trust the people and designed a system where leaders decide what is good for all, no matter what the people want. Citizens are treated as if they are too stupid to be involved in government.

Yet the appointed leaders behave more stupidly than the plebeians.<sup>17</sup> Do you want to be ruled by people like Jean Claude-Juncker (EU Commission President), who stumbles out of international summits drunk as a lord wearing odd shoes? After one meeting he was so drunk that he had to be propped up and escorted out by two agents. This happened again only yesterday after a meal celebrating his rise in pay.<sup>18</sup> Britain objected to him being appointed as president but we had no power to stop him.

---

<sup>14</sup> In fact cultural Marxists.

<sup>15</sup> Note how many, like Peter Hitchens, were idealistic socialists in their teenage years but became Conservatives in later life as they became wiser. [I am not a Conservative but I observe the changes that age brings.]

<sup>16</sup> I'm grateful for comments by Jacob Rees Mogg to suggest this section.

<sup>17</sup> Common people, the working-class, peasants.

<sup>18</sup> His salary was 324,377 Euros (£275,275) in 2016 with a Christmas bonus of 5,181 Euros. In 2018 his salary rose to 369,670 Euros. Theresa May earns £152,532.

## Free speech

Democracy is underscored by freedom of speech. In a libertarian society people are allowed to think and say whatever they want as long as the law is not broken (e.g. libel laws or defamation laws). Offence and criticism is not to be outlawed; hurt feelings are not a reason for litigation. Comedians should be able to ridicule anyone within the law.

All these things are being overturned by the EU.

Under the EU jurisdiction, Britain has already succumbed to severe curtailing of free speech in multiple areas. Police are now so preoccupied with policing hate crimes on social media that they can't get normal policing done and the chief commissioner of the Met has complained about it. The comic blogger Count Dankula (Mark Meechan) made a Nazi send-up video with his girlfriend's dog (viewed 3 million times) and was convicted of a hate crime<sup>19</sup> and fined £800. But it will get worse.

The European Court of Justice has already stated that criticism of the EU is to be considered as illegal. One EU bureaucrat has already proposed to stop criticism of the EU by establishing new blasphemy laws. Evangelical Christian churches are already formally defined as a cult. Criticising EU sanctioned immoral ethics (such as homosexual marriages and recognising transgender choices) are already hate crimes.<sup>20</sup>

## Ownership of property

The collectivism of socialist / Communist projects around the world have not only produced brutal despots but have also ended in economic failure. One of the prime features of Socialism / Communism is getting rid of private property.

Freedom to buy and own property (property rights) enables people to be prosperous. They also then have collateral which can be leveraged for other purposes, such as starting a business.

## The rule of law

The rule of law ensures a stable social order, which is conducive to a stable economy. When democracy is eroded people eventually revolt and rule of law breaks down (as in France at this time). Unstable social circumstances cause drops in stock markets and weakened confidence in government leads to the pound falling. Thus rule of law is vital to stable politics and economics, as well as the social order.

## Free trade and low prices

All the successful economies have found that they work best with a free trade system; keeping the cost of transactions cheap. This encourages businesses to thrive. In addition, focusing on low prices for the consumer means that more money gets either saved (which can be lent to businesses) or spent in a prosperous economy. Money saved on one thing gets spent on another, which encourages business.

The EU regulates to keep external countries out in order to protect inefficient businesses within (protectionism). The excessive regulations are meant to make it difficult for lower cost producers unable to sell into European markets. It is a protectionist racket. It makes

---

<sup>19</sup> Under the Communications Act.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. a man (who happened to be Black) in Luton saw a man coming towards him that he had seen many times and said, 'Alright geezer'. The man had changed his gender identity and no longer considered himself a man and reported the Black man to the police. The Black man was arrested, prosecuted and convicted of a hate crime and suffered huge economic losses. Thankfully, he took it to appeal and the conviction was quashed, but his life was ruined.

all people within the EU less rich. It also gives a false sense of security to failing business models that are protected from the real world of economics. Excessive regulations even make British services (e.g. financial services) less competitive with the world.

Removing tariffs and tariff barriers would make Britain more prosperous. For example, outside the EU poor people in Britain would be able to have cheaper food and clothing.

### **Success needs all these**

All of these things need to be working in order for success. If you take any one away the whole system crumbles.

This is why the EU can never succeed. Since it is an undemocratic system, it has taken away at least one of the fundamental columns on which stable prosperity is based. Constituents in Britain cannot change EU rules or be represented by an MP that can speak for you in parliament to change rules; neither can you remove the Commissioners after five years.

But the EU fails not only in the area of democracy, but also on free trade and free speech as well. It is a doomed project.

## **The big issue**

What's at stake at the current time is democracy.

The people were given a legal referendum. Parliament passed an act to allow this referendum and set the terms. The government promised, in a leaflet sent to every household, that the result of this referendum would be implemented. Parliament confirmed that it would enact the result. The referendum was not advice to Parliament; it was a legal transaction to be enacted by Parliament. Parliament then separately voted to leave the EU in March 2019; this is law.

The establishment did not expect such a result, even with millions spent on promoting the remain option, even with massive media bias, even with massive pre-referendum scaremongering by the Treasury and the Bank of England and even with alleged vote fraud (especially in N Ireland) in favour of Remain.

The problem was that the people had spoken for Brexit by a huge plebiscite that had far more weight than any previous general election. It also had 85% of the vote of the subsequent general election where the two main parties both committed to Brexit in their manifestos. Thus the proportion is really not 52% to 48% but 85% of the national vote. There is no need for a second referendum; the general election vote was a confirmation of Brexit.

Despite the people overwhelmingly voting for Brexit, the whole establishment is EU subscribers committed to Remain. The majority of the Press is Remain. The vast majority of the rest of the media is Remain. The BBC bias is Remain. The civil service is overwhelmingly Remain. The majority of the House of Commons and the House of Lords is Remain. The Prime Minister is Remain, The Chancellor is Remain. The Cabinet majority is Remain. The mainstream media political commentators are all Remain, with a very few exceptions (like Julia Hartley-Brewer on TalkRADIO).

Thus a war ensued between the establishment and the people with every dirty trick pulled out of the arsenal. Note that the recent comment by the Chancellor, calling Brexiteers

'*extremists*' is totally undemocratic. Firstly, the majority of the country are Brexiteers according to a legal referendum. Secondly, the manifesto policy of his own party is Brexiteer. Thirdly, his own leader officially committed herself to '*Brexit means Brexit*' in a number of speeches, such as the Lancaster House speech. He should resign because he is voicing disloyal globalist policy against the wishes of the people, his party and formal statements of his leader.

Make no mistake, this is a war of the globalist centred establishment acting against the voice of the people.

Underlying that [the current crisis] is a certain amount of treachery within the bureaucracy and some of the politicians; they actually want to reverse the will of the people.<sup>21</sup>

## Structure of negotiations<sup>22</sup>

Under Article 50 Britain is supposed to negotiate with the Council of Ministers but this body handed over negotiations to the Commission (under clause 2), whose sole purpose is to secure and advance EU integration. This is why EU negotiations have been so hard-nosed, implacable and ruthless.

Since this has failed, Britain should now refuse to negotiate further with the Commission and initiate talks (not negotiations) with the Council of Ministers, telling them that we walk away (under clause 1)<sup>23</sup> and pay no money (there is no legally binding reason to). The resultant panic will ensure a much more amenable EU to arrange necessary agreements.

We can then offer the Council of Ministers mutual residence rights (EU citizens in the UK can be offered security). We can offer free trade with the EU (thus no Irish border problem). When this is agreed, we can then offer budgetary funds for the next two years (£10bn pa) to pay for necessary salaries and commitments. If these things are not agreed, we pay them nothing and go to WTO rules and tariffs. The EU will pay more than us in tariffs.

Simple, effective and decisive. The reason Theresa May did not do this is because she is a Remainer and her close advisors are committed Europhiles.

## Facts about a no-deal exit; confronting the scaremongering

### Comparison: project-fear lies before the Referendum

- If we voted leave, unemployment would rise by 500,000 within two years. Actually, it fell by that amount.
- A new emergency budget would be required. In fact, no budget was necessary.
- The Stock Exchange would collapse, wrecking pensions. In fact, the Stock market rose to record levels.

---

<sup>21</sup> Lord Pearson, interview with Carl Benjamin, YouTube, 'The gravity of the situation', 13 December 2018.

<sup>22</sup> I acknowledge a debt to Lord Pearson in these suggestions.

<sup>23</sup> Britain can walk away under its own constitutional requirements (which is a referendum followed by a vote in both houses of Parliament).



- France would end the bilateral deal and the Calais migrant camp would move to Kent. The camp has been dismantled.
- GDP would collapse. Growth has continued.
- Inward investment would stop; it has continued.
- The financial centre in London would relocate to Paris; it stayed.

The establishment always pushes out rafts of lies in propaganda to try to sway people to do what it wants. The Brexit vote was significant in that the people ignored all the hysterical fibs. Far from Brexiteers being stupid, as so often claimed, they proved more intelligent than the mainstream media, most politicians, the Bank of England and the Treasury.

### **Dover will collapse and the M20 will be a car park of lorries due to extra checks**

The argument is that it will take so long to process customs checks that lorries will back up at Dover. Why would the UK hold up lorries unnecessarily and create chaos?

This problem has been denied by the British Major Ports chief, Tim Morris.<sup>24</sup> First, the major ports are privately owned and they will suffer if they do not plan effectively. They will not let this happen. Second, Dover only handles 6% of British port volumes and these risk factors do not exist at other British ports, which have the capacity and infrastructure to handle large volumes of traffic without logjams due to millions of pounds of private investment.

In fact, Morris states that British ports will all see additional volumes once the UK regains control over international trade policy and strikes new agreements, ensuring greater prosperity and creating thousands of new jobs.

Jon Thompson, CEO of Customs and Revenue, in evidence to the Select Committee, explained that there need be no extra customs checks because checks are related to risk and imports from the EU will be no riskier than before Brexit. John Bourne, policy director of Animal and Plant Health for DEFRA, confirmed that this also applies to food and animal imports. Note that fresh fruit from Israel is imported with negligible delays at airport customs.

Regarding the claim that customs paperwork will have to be filled in by lorry drivers at the border, which are then checked against their loads, causing delays and chaos, is rubbish. Virtually all customs declarations are made electronically ahead of arrival at a port and most loads are cleared within seconds of arrival. A few loads are checked by officials usually due to intelligence reports or risk assessments and can be carried out away from the border.

[Cf. 'Trucks from non-EU countries ... have to park and fill in a form at the freight clearance office.' *The Economist*, 6 April 2017. 'The risk of a no deal Brexit – delays to lorries at Dover.' Hilary Benn MP.]

### ***There are no checks on imports from the EU currently***

The idea that there are no current checks on goods from the EU is also false. There are several checks on trade crossing the EU/UK border. Companies have to pay duty and report their transactions in their VAT returns. Statistical returns are required of intra-EU trade. Excise taxes are applied on imports of tobacco and alcohol. E.g. cigarettes are much more expensive in the UK than in Europe because of duty. Lorries may also be searched for illegal drugs or immigrants. Larger companies have to report details of their intra-EU trade to Intrastat. Most of this will continue after Brexit.

---

<sup>24</sup> Letter to 'The Telegraph', 8 December 2018.

[Cf. 'Currently, goods moving between the EU and UK don't need to be checked at borders.' Ian Stone, *The Independent*, 23 July 2018.]

### *WTO rules means border checks*

Claims that WTO rules mean that border checks will have to be made are also false. Checks of customs declarations are mostly made electronically and physical checks are often made at importer's or exporter's premises. Even the checks on agri-food can be legally made as far as 40 miles from the border.

[Cf. 'The legal requirement we will have ... to operate the WTO-compliant border, which does require checks at the border. That's what the WTO rules require.' Philip Hammond.]<sup>25</sup>

### *Just-in-time issues*

The 'just-in-time' supply problems, that have been exaggerated out of all proportion, do not just apply to trade from the EU. Example cars: 21% of components of UK motor manufacturing come from outside the EU and their timely arrival is just as important. These are already subject to customs procedures that do not cause problems. 36% comes from the EU and 43% from within the UK. The car trade already has to deal with significant delays to parts being held up in Calais and weather conditions in Europe (see later).

Ford and General Motors in America depend on supply lines across the Canadian and Mexico borders where there is no customs union; but it operates well. Time sensitive flowers travel from the Netherlands to Switzerland across a customs border with no difficulty.

HMRC do not expect more checks on imports from the EU after Brexit and will prioritise flow over compliance.

[Cf. 'I don't think it's feasible for the carmakers to carry on running the JIT supply chains if ... UK leaves the EU customs union.' Tim Lawrence, *Financial Times*, June 2018.]

To keep trade flowing we must advance our customs capability. Money has been set aside for this but the government has not yet done anything.

### *Customs declarations will cost up to £20 billion*

If applicable, half would be borne by EU business and consumers for a start. However, measures of actual border costs are a fraction of these theoretical estimates. Switzerland computed that the cost of border compliance is less than 0.1% of the value of trade. NEXT plc, estimated that the additional costs of customs compliance on their imports from the EU will be less than 0.1%. Tate & Lyle stated that costs are 0.06%.

The HMRC has ignored the fact that repeat transactions are a fraction of the cost of the first one and are often a digital scan.

[Cf. '(Customs declarations) indicates a burden on UK-EU trade in goods of around £17-20bn a year.' Letter from Jon Thompson, CEO of HMRC to the Treasury Select Committee.]

### *Deliberate delays*

Deliberate delays on the EU side would be a breach of WTO treaty commitments, the Trade Facilitation Agreement (2017), and the Lisbon Treaty. If Calais would cause problems (as has been suggested), ports in Belgium and Holland are anxious to take trade away from Calais. Do the French really want to lose thousands of jobs?

---

<sup>25</sup> The ERG asked Hammond to supply the text of these rules; the Treasury failed to do so.

In fact, Xavier Bertrand (head of the region covering Calais) denies that France would deliberately slow UK trade; it does not want to lose this trade to other ports. He said that less than 1% of lorries would face checks.

Apart from this, queues caused by problems in Calais already exist while we are in the EU. Operation Stack has operated on 211 days since 1998. Delays of up to 35 hours were experienced in 2015.

[Cf. *'We also need to prepare for the worst-case scenario where the authorities at Calais are deliberately directing a go-slow approach.'* Dominic Raab, October 2018.]

### *A customs union is better for trade*

This is simply a lie.

It is not true that free trade arrangements impose more burdens on trade than customs unions. Studies show that free trade areas (like NAFTA) are more trade creating than the EU customs union. Countries like Switzerland and Norway (EEA nations) do not complain about completing customs declarations and do not call for a customs union.

Turkey has a customs union with the EU but massive delays at the border are infamous. In the TTIP negotiations, Turkey came close to ending its customs union with the EU. If Britain had a customs union with the EU after Brexit we could face similar problems.

The real problem is that being in a customs union with the EU rules out making trade deals with the rest of the world.

[Cf. *'(A Canada-style free trade agreement) would be a bad Brexit outcome for the UK ... a customs union should serve as a practical, real-world answer.'* Carolyn Fairbairn, Director General of the CBI.]

### *Common Transit Convention*

The UK has negotiated an agreement to stay in the Common Transit Convention even if there is no Brexit deal. This means that goods can continue to be transported freely between the EEA and Britain with customs declarations and import duties being paid when the goods arrive at their final destinations.

This is especially important for the Republic of Ireland, which transports its exports mostly across the UK 'land bridge'.

All the ingredients to ensure a smooth exit process of the UK from the EU and which allow almost frictionless trade after the exit, are already available [in the Union Customs Code].<sup>26</sup>

[Note: for very detailed explanation of the niceties of trade and customs issues, see the ERG document, 'Fact Or Friction' which I have extensively consulted in parts of this section.]

### **GDP will collapse**

Economist differ so much in their predictions of the future and have been proved wrong so many times that it is pointless to use their predictions as any basis for anything.

However, one should be aware that, despite many economists being quoted affirming doom and gloom for a no-deal Brexit, there are many other economists that rarely get

---

<sup>26</sup> Chair of the European logistics and customs association. 'Fact Not Friction', European Research Group & Global Britain, p5.

coverage who predict a glowing future. In fact several have stated that a WTO terms exit will produce a 9+% increase of GDP.

The Bank of England has been acting as a political tool of the establishment while the Treasury is simply peddling lies because the Chancellor is a Remainer. Both predicted that the economy would collapse immediately after a Brexit vote (not actually leaving, but after the referendum). The treasury even said that there would have to be an emergency budget. None of this occurred, the economy has grown and inward investment continued.

The same thing happened when the ERM was voted on. Doom and gloom were predicted by globalist economists, which never occurred when we decided to not join it.

The current Bank of England doom-laden forecasts have been badly received. Nobel laureate economist Paul Krugman immediately questioned it, accusing it of making big assumptions (i.e. making it up). A large number of esteemed academic and media economists wrote a letter asking governor of the B of E, Mark Carney, to explain the economic model that had been used because they did not trust it. Mervyn King, former Bank of England chairman (2003-2013) agreed with Krugman.

If the EU puts up trade barriers (a stupid thing to do), Britain will sell less to the EU and more within the country and to the rest of the world. *'No trade economist believes that the long-term cost of this shift in sales patterns is any more than 0.5% of GDP.'*<sup>27</sup> Scholars at the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis affirmed that Britain would prosper outside the EU.

Since individual economic predictions are pretty pointless, one must ask: 'What is the best model for prosperity?'. The answer is severing formal ties with the failing EU (which is failing economically, monetarily and politically) and establish free trade deals with growing economies worldwide. This would immediately lead to cheaper food and clothes but would also boost GDP.

If the pound were to fall, as Mark Carney claims, then British goods would be cheaper and more attractive to export.

Do not fear biased forecasts of a GDP collapse after a no-deal Brexit.

I absolutely disagree that a no deal is bad for the UK. For me, it's the greatest economic opportunity this country has had in 100 years.<sup>28</sup>

### **There will be a famine of medicines**

There is no reason why this should happen. Statements by Remainer Jeremy Hunt are sheer scare stories. Pharmaceutical companies will not want to see their profits collapse because one of their biggest markets is unavailable. It simply won't happen, unless some party deliberately engineers it.

Medical companies have already geared up for an extra six-week supply of medicines ready for some emergency created by delays at borders. The Health Secretary, Matthew Hancock has already stated that there is no need for clinics to hoard medicines.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ashoka Mody, The Independent, 'Ignore the Brexit scare stories', 6 December 2018.

<sup>28</sup> Chris Clarke (economist), The Express, Aurora Boscotti, 'Sick to death of Brexit scaremongering. Economy expert dismantles disaster claims', 7 December 2018.

The key (as stated by the Brexit department) is to allow EU products to enter our markets by unilaterally recognising EU regulations of medicine and processes. Medicines will then enter Britain easily if we upgrade our customs processes.

If the EU levies tariffs on medicines imported from Britain, it is their shelves that will not be stocked.

### **Supermarket shelves will be empty within days**

Do you really think that supermarkets will allow their profits to collapse? Contingency plans will be initiated if there are shortages. But there is no need for shortages. Only Dover may be affected (it need not be if planned properly) and this accounts for only 6% of imports (see earlier). Only 30% of our import trade is with the EU, so any shortfall could be fixed by increasing trade elsewhere. But the EU nations will not want to kill their own profits; why would they.

### **Petrol will run out**

Why? See above.

### **No international trade deals or difficulty in getting these**

Firstly, trade accounts for a smaller percentage of our economy than for many countries because we have a large home market. Trade with the EU accounts to about 14% of our GDP.

Nations are queuing up to cement trade deals already. Britain has huge, and I mean huge, opportunities for prosperity with free trade deals that we cannot currently initiate due to EU protectionism. In fact, Switzerland has already given the British government a formal guarantee of a free trade deal in the event of a no-deal Brexit. Canada has already stated that it aims to replicate its existing Canada-EU deal with Britain when we leave the EU and then enhance it. America is deeply determined to establish a bilateral trade deal. Others will follow.

If Germany were to make buying Mercedes and BMW cars more difficult, then all we have to do is buy good cars from the Far East and Germany would lose £48 billion. Do you think Germany will allow this to happen?

### **WTO rules means that we would have to impose tariffs on imports into the UK**

Wrong!

Britain is a member of the WTO as an independent nation already. This means that we have promised not to charge higher than the allowable ceiling in tariffs on imports from other WTO members. Furthermore, we can charge 0% if we so wish.

Being outside the EU means that we do not have to charge the EU external tariff rates on anything and can insist that we pay ourselves nothing on all sources of food from everywhere. This will lead to cheaper food prices in Britain.<sup>29</sup>

The idea of some in the mainstream media that businesses would place tariffs on goods imported from the EU is nonsense. Businesses don't apply tariffs, that is the job of the government.

---

<sup>29</sup> Sic, Tim Worstall, Continental Telegraph, 'The Brexit no deal scare stories descend into drivels', 24 September 2018.

### **The army will be called in to deliver food, medicine and fuel**

Shamefully, this was claimed by Labour MP David Lammy. Others added to this that the country would run out of sandwiches and an epidemic of super-gonorrhoea would ravage the nation.

Fortunately, Dominic Raab, then Brexit Secretary, assured us that these were lies.<sup>30</sup>

The facts are that British farmers produce 50% of our food; 20% comes from the world outside Europe and 30% from the EU. EU farmers and business will not commit suicide and stop exporting to us. But even if they did, we could manage a loss of a third of our food supply by quickly increasing supply from elsewhere. In fact, a free trade deal with former Commonwealth major food producers like Australia and New Zealand, could lead to greater food supplies and cheaper prices. Before we joined the EU it was common to see New Zealand lamb and Argentinian beef in butchers.

### **Food prices will go up**

No they won't they will go down. If we stop import quotas to allow non-EU countries access to the UK, prices will fall.

People forget that when we joined the EEC in 1973 the average weekly household shopping cost went up by £18. Being in the 'common market' did not mean that costs went down.

Currently, inefficient food producers have the UK as a captive market and hide behind a high tariff wall, such as Irish beef (supplies 70% of UK beef), French farmers and Bavarian dairy producers. Opening up our markets to international producers will give fierce competition to these and bring prices down.

### **Planes will not be able to fly to and via Europe**

Why would the EU turn down the world's third largest aviation area? Thousands of jobs would be lost in Europe. Apart from that, many aircraft leaving Europe need our airspace to get to their destinations.

The Transport Secretary has affirmed that Britain has concluded all of the third-party aviation agreements needed with non-EU countries, bar four yet to be concluded soon.

The EU Commission has made clear that in all circumstances, including a no-deal Brexit, routine aviation will continue. The individual nations in the EU have also expressed readiness to arrange any necessary landing agreement to continue flights.

Furthermore, our European Aviation Safety Agency membership will allow us to agree air safety certificates and air traffic rights.

Airlines are already selling tickets for after 29 March 2019.

### **Visas will be required for travel to Europe**

There were no Visas required before we joined the EU and there is no reason to impose these once we leave. EU nations do not want to make it harder for British tourists to spend money in their countries.

Remember that very many Europeans want to visit or study in the UK. If the EU cause problems it will impact on its own citizens.

---

<sup>30</sup> On 23 August 2018.

### **We won't be able to drive in Europe**

There is no reason to reject UK driving licence holders. However, if the EU did do this, you can get an international driving permit for £10 from a Post Office.

### **The hard border with Eire or in the Irish Sea**

This has been blown out of all proportion for political reasons with collusion between Eire and the EU to facilitate a united Ireland separated from mainland Britain further down the road.<sup>31</sup> The beginning would be severing ties with mainland Britain due to customs and single market issues.

Multiple experts and politicians<sup>32</sup> have stated that with good will there is no reason for any problem whatsoever. A soft border, assisted by technology, can ensure no change to the current situation. There is already a border that works effectively and this need not change. A similar situation exists between Spain and Gibraltar whereby people from both sides cross the border every day to work.

The technology to facilitate this already exists and is currently used in major ports such as Eindhoven. This smart technology can check the contents of freight, origin, bill of lading allowing it to move on without the need for handling or physical checks. This solves the 'Backstop' problem at little cost and no new large infrastructure; needing about six months to implement.

However, attempts by the tech firm GSM to put this proposal before the government and MPs have been hindered. GSM contacted the Commons Brexit Committee and Downing Street explaining it in November but has received no reply. Apparently the government wants to block and hinder anything which contradicts the Treasury position that trade won't work outside the EU; Philip Hammond has stated that it would take years to get a technological solution for the border – clearly a lie.

### **Women will suffer**

Why?

With enhanced global free trade deals there will be more prosperity, lower prices and many more jobs. Working women will have more opportunities; homemakers will have more money to spend. It is a win-win situation.

Female politicians (such as Labour's Angela Rayner)<sup>33</sup> that spread this lie, giving no evidence for it, should be ashamed of themselves.

### **Killer squirrels will ravage the countryside**

Does this stupidity need comment?

### **Business opportunism**

Now facts overturning the scare stories are one thing, but businesses may take the opportunity of Brexit to raise prices. This is common in major national changes (it happened after decimalisation) but completely unnecessary; it is just corporate greed.

---

<sup>31</sup> Speech by Kate Hoey affirmed this and she should know as a Northern Irish Labour MP. 'Sophie Ridge on Sunday', 16 December 2018.

<sup>32</sup> The CEO of GSM, Kate Hoey, Jacob Rees Mogg, Anne Widdecombe etc.

<sup>33</sup> 'Peston', ITV programme, 19 December 2018. In fact, in her interview she spouted lie upon lie. Almost all her points were false. Typical mainstream media bias.

For example, guitars made in America have already seen price hikes of £100 each, blamed on Brexit. Yet Brexit hasn't even occurred yet. This is just immoral greed.

### **Positive reasons why Britain should be a prosperous world power alone**

- Britain is a G7 country.
- Britain is a nuclear power.
- Britain is a permanent member of the UN Security Council.
- Britain has the best universities in Europe. People come from all nations to study here.
- Britain has the most innovative technical companies.
- Britain has the world's best audio-visual sector.
- London is considered to be one of the best cities in the world; if not the best.
- The City Of London is the centre of global finance.
- English is the world's common language.
- The Royal Family is respected worldwide.
- Britain has a reputation for stability.
- Britain is renowned for democracy and rule of law. Its parliamentary system has been copied by all major advanced nations.
- Britain has some of the best facilities and technicians for movie-making in the world.
- Britain has a history of the best acting tradition and the best music innovation in the world.
- Britain has the most respected elite armed forces in the world.
- Britain gave the world its literary tradition.

### **A no-deal scenario impacts the EU much more**

- EU agricultural exporters could lose access to British markets overnight.
- German car manufacturers could lose access to £48bn worth of markets.
- French, Spanish, German, Portuguese and Italian wine merchants could lose access to British markets.
- French cheese manufactures could lose British markets.
- France and Spain could lose access to British fishing grounds.
- There would be damage to the EU's access to the City of London financial sector.
- The EU's capital costs would increase; fragile economies could be severely damaged.
- The EU would lose the current offer of £39 billion.

The net result of this is that the EU simply cannot afford to lose the British market. This gives British negotiators a massive hand to play in the negotiations, something Theresa May has simply failed abysmally to utilise.

## **Conclusion**

This paper is written to help you have information that may count; my job is to give you the best information in the face of propaganda lies. My first reason is to give you peace regarding the scaremongering tactics that could cause distress. I myself have a number of medicines that I require to survive but I am not the least afraid of a no-deal Brexit.



Secondly, while we do not get actively involved in politics by protesting, activism, and so on, we should act as sensible citizens and stand for law, peace, democracy, and Biblical ethics.

If there is a second referendum (which is unlikely in the near term<sup>34</sup> but may happen in the longer term) the current scaremongering lies will go into overdrive. A massive propaganda campaign will be unleashed and people will be too scared to vote for Brexit. What you need in that situation is fact-based data and not propaganda lies.

The truth is that even if we were to 'crash-out' of the EU, Britain would be much better off in the long term. In the short term there will be some confusion, though the government has taken steps already to avoid this, according to David Davis. There is no reason for Britain to be less prosperous acting under its own sovereignty.

This issue for Christians is that God established the nations with their own individual cultures and placed borders between them (Acts 17:26). The globalist satanic plan is to destroy nations and cultures (especially Christian culture) and create a homogenous, federalised superstate, of which the EU is the first.<sup>35</sup> In any second referendum, even if you never vote in general elections, one should stand up and vote for divine principles.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version  
© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2018**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

---

<sup>34</sup> The Electoral Commission has stated that it could not organise a referendum before 29 March (it takes at least six months). A second referendum would first require new legislation to extend the Article 50 period and stop Brexit.

<sup>35</sup> The prototype was the Soviet Union.