

Brexit

9 September 2019

Background (**corrections of inaccuracies, please**): In June, 2016 citizens of the United Kingdom (UK) voted to end membership in the European Union (EU), the effort led by the UK Independence Party (UKIP). Then Prime Minister (PM) David Cameron supported remaining, but resigned after the vote. The new PM Theresa May and Parliament set about the UK's withdrawal; newly appointed Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson was given the task of negotiating with the EU, which opposed the UK's decision. Proposals and variations have failed to achieve consensus; the Foreign Minister resigned in protest of the PM in 2018. The UKIP party, dissolved after the vote, was reborn as the Brexit Party. Former Foreign Secretary Johnson, consistently opposed to EU membership, became Prime Minister in July 2019 after Teresa May announced her resignation in the month of her surname, stepping down two months later. PM Johnson quickly announced the UK would depart on the last day of October 2019, agreement or not, and in late August 2019 he asked the British Monarch to suspend Parliament as related to the matter. The Queen did just this, scheduling a mid-October speech to the nation. Opposition interests inside the UK have turned to resistance by way of the courts.

A reader has asked The Committee if the withdrawal of the UK will in fact happen on October 31st.

Q: So, Esteemed Committee, will it?

C: This date is but one of many used by both sides of the matter, to achieve their objective.

Q: How does the "Remain" side (= the UK stays in the EU) use this date to their advantage?

C: They examine steps their opposition plans and in fact takes, and opposes them. The concepts of fairness, openness and transparency are used against the other side, which cannot conceal without accusations of underhanded, backroom and unfair dealings.

Q: Was there any material doubt among voters, for what they were voting? Whether it was to remain or leave the EU, did voters not understand?

C: No, the controversy was created around the effects, voters were attempted persuaded by emphasizing predictions of negative effects.

Q: I don't think any of the effects predicted have happened.

C: The exit has not happened, so of course not but allow us to clarify, we are not suggesting by this answer there will be negative effects, which would be easy to conclude. The outcomes will result from choices and decisions after Great Britain's departure.

Q: If there is no agreement by the end of next month and the United Kingdom abruptly stops everything as soon as it can, what are some possible bad things which would happen in the UK?

C: Officials doing such work will no longer.

Q: That's it? The sky will not fall?

C: There will be regular issuance of negative opinion about all changes, offered by the opposition. The practical effects will not match the descriptions, which will continue along similar and often the same lines as have commentary since the vote in 2016.

Q: What about the Leave side, who are soon going to get what they wanted? What will be said and done?

C: New challenges and tasks will arise, such as immigration. These will be straightforward to solve, despite complaints that the better course would have been not to need solve it.

Q: What was the main preference for the Leave side? What most appealed to them?

C: Border control. They wanted to see the ability restored to determine which people, how many of which goods and at what price and terms products and services would enter. A secondary issue was payment of taxes to receive in return rules and restrictions which were seen to largely benefit other nations of the EU more than they would benefit the UK.

Q: What did the Remain side want, which contradicted this?

C: Several aspects were appealing and threatening, and the successful development of fear of economic trouble was foremost. The notion of ease of movement figured prominently.

Q: Why is the European Union failing and is Brexit really the first step?

C: We answer the second question, first. If predictions of doom & gloom for the UK prove untrue, which will be the case, the appeal of departure will grow and spread. This leads to the first question, the EU commits the fatal flaw which doomed Communism; it attempts to force human nature.

Human group, club, tribe and clan affiliations are strong. They evolve naturally, only. They quickly turn into rebellion if attempted suppressed. One aspect your Alien ET cousins wish to explain - a subject almost no humans wish to hear from or about extraterrestrial visitors - is how planet-wide societies have developed on many planets in just our star cluster.

The steps and changes which are voluntarily chosen which lead to this development, will frame the current Earth desire of some interests to homogenize cultures, suppress others and centralize government functions.

Q: Why did the EU grow so unappealing for so many UK citizens and is there similar sentiment anywhere else within Europe?

C: In reverse again; yes, there exists significant frustration but not to the point of critical mass as was reached in the United Kingdom.

The faded appeal and even frustration, were growth thus intrusion into national, local and personal affairs of people who felt, often correctly, they held no individual or collective control over the rule makers and enforcers.

Q: Sounds like the Trump crowd.

C: Similar events, if different by circumstance.