

## **BREXIT**

**Tassos Symeonides**  
**(RIEAS Academic Advisor)**

Copyright: Research Institute for European and American Studies ([www.rieas.gr](http://www.rieas.gr))  
Publication date: 19/05/2016

Boris Johnson, the former two-term Tory mayor of London, is a man with strong convictions, his admirers insist. Johnson is also fond of *not* pulling his punches, especially now that he has put himself at the head of the Brexit campaign. Witness his recent comparison between the European dis-Union's endeavors to force more integration upon its members with what Adolf Hitler attempted to do in shaping his Nazi empire through war, conquest, and the extermination of "inferior peoples."

Predictably, Boris's firecracker triggered a storm of protest from EdU mandarins and all ardent "Europeanists." Donald Tusk, the Polish European Council president, went as far as [warning](#) that if Britain leaves the "union" European "egoisms" would resurface, and a "dangerous blackout" will ensue, eventually leading to armed conflict.

Tusk was only the latest top figure in the 28-nation bloc to add his two cents worth to a billowing storm of fearmongering unleashed upon the British voter so that he casts his vote for Remain.

Leading the attack against Brexit is the block of international financial interests: banks, financial conglomerates, giant transnational companies, and influential "investors" (read: global financial raiders) have united in warning, via a blistering deluge of reports and analyses, that Brexit could, and would, lead to untold calamities, from economic collapse and penury for the British people to international destabilization, breakdown of global trade, and every other Biblical pestilence and consumption, all triggered by the departure of *one country* from the increasingly gargantuan, bureaucratic, regulation-mad, undemocratic Brussels-based "union."

The Brexit fear offensive hinges on a legion of unpredictabilities. Since Britain will be the first ever member country to attempt the “unthinkable,” i.e. shedding the EdU regulatory and increasingly intrusive membership straightjacket and reverting to fully independent national status, there is no “comparison matrix” in place to assess the impact of such defection.

The Remain campaign is quick to suggest that it is simply too risky to experiment when the UK is already “having it so good,” especially after the latest round of striking UK-specific exception rules [negotiated](#) by PM David Cameron with the Brussels mandarin. The Remain campaigners have pulled all stops in predicting the impending Armageddon; one most potent claim is that the pride of Britain, London’s financial sector, the world’s largest, will be [destroyed](#) if voters decide to pull the country out of the EdU.

For each Remain claim, of course, there is a counterargument for Brexit. Among the most prominent is restoring the Parliament’s ability to legislate without interference from Brussels (and, indirectly, that of Berlin’s). Various estimates suggest that Britain “alone” will save significant amounts of cash by shedding the shackles of the common budget increasingly being used to expand the EdU bureaucracy and to constantly add layers of unnecessary “common -projects” spending upon member nations. As for trade, which the Remain campaign claims will suffer dearly because of Britain losing the “open borders” access to continental markets, Brexit-ers underline that bilateral treaties will work far better than the present arrangements and allow flexibility that does not exist under EdU rules.

Brexit, however, already looms so large over Brussels and Berlin because *it could set in motion a chain reaction of demands by individual members for “special arrangements” excluding them from common policies that they find intrusive, dangerous, and politically distasteful.*

The strongest current incentive to demand exceptions is the illegal Moslem immigration crisis that promises steadily expanding woes for all in Europe unless radical and immediate measures are taken. With Berlin having lost the initiative thanks to Mrs. Merkel’s folly during last year’s Moslem “refugee” invasion, the danger of EdU-wide political destabilization is very real. Brexit, the Brussels mandarins justifiably fear, will fire the opening salvo in the war *to abandon all “progressive” and “human rights” initiatives that have been the pet projects of Europe’s liberal elites for decades and are being used as muzzles to quash “nationalist” feelings.*

Whether the Brexit campaign wins the day or not, its mere presence has already led to much hand wringing and turmoil in European capitals and it is viewed as a “threat” by all devoted “Europeanists.” Former Eastern Bloc countries, for example, which Brussels hastened to include in EdU enlargement with little thought of the consequences, are increasingly recoiling at EdU demands, especially pertaining to “human rights” (see, for example, the swelling rejection of ‘hate crime’ legislation and Brussels demands for open-border policies in eastern capitals). Complaints by the EdU mandarinates, like [this latest](#) from the European Commission, further exacerbate resentment by the “subject” governments and widen the potential fissures attributed by arrogant “Europeanists” to “democratic deficit” in the member countries in question.

While the Brexit initiative’s core purpose was never to declare the revolution of the oppressed against Brussels and Berlin, its launching has set in motion political and social reactions that could be quite detrimental to the longevity of the European “experiment.”

With the EdU too unwieldy and too closely identified with built-in practices and core rulebook targets, most of which *are unacceptable to growing popular majorities across Europe suffering the perennial European crisis*, Brexit’s fuse is now burning irrespective of what will be the outcome of the June referendum. *Alea iacta est.*