

# The Future of the EU

29 June 2016

The 92 comments made (*so far; there could be more; the webhost allows comments for 30 days*) to the entry "Europe - A Reader Question" (18 June) were the most ever for single post, I believe; this "energising" subject naturally leads to reaction inside & out of Great Britain, across Europe and also the rest of the world. More importantly, it leads to questions about the future of the European Union.

*Q: Esteemed Committee, why is public policy in Great Britain in a state of "meltdown" as one British reader suggests?*

C: As we have said, few leaders wanted or expected this and have now been thrust into a position of carrying it out.

*Q: The value of the British currency has fallen, many stock and bond indices have dropped and the impression is loss of wealth.*

C: These are paper losses as humans are given to say, although all loss of money is a paper loss, despite human perception otherwise.

*Q: There will be a recovery in value of the investments which fell immediately after the vote?*

C: Yes, however this is not to say there will not be a variation of value, as there always is. What we say is, the decision to leave the regional conference will soon stop being a factor in the decisions of buyers and sellers of paper investments.

*Q: What about other investments, for example in projects or expansion of business?*

C: Currency flow is not restricted and will not be.

*Q: You understand the concern for loss of wealth?*

C: Yes. We wish to say, this decision need only cause wealth to drop if it is collectively chosen. The decision to see economic activity lessen, because of this decision, remains under the control of European Union members, Great Britain and other trade partners.

*Q: What will be the effect on the remaining twenty some odd nations, once Great Britain has departed?*

C: This effect has already begun and is financial; there is great effort coming to estimate the drop in costs and tax revenue, because the centralized authority will have to shrink. The departure of sixty million people, places obvious pressure to shrink on this regional conference.

*Q: Will the EU central government reduce its size proportionally?*

C: This is unlikely, and we will say no, not voluntarily. This authority has steadily expanded in size, both absolute and in proportion or relation to the several measures of the member nations' total size; economic output and population are the two most obvious measures.

*Q: Will the European Union continue to exist?*

C: It will eventually break up, or be dissolved.

*Q: Do you have a list of departing members and possible their order?*

C: Not specific in order, however yes; the smaller economic members are at the moment more interested in separation yet keep their ideas quiet; they are patiently waiting to see what is done by the central authority. There is little mystery regarding what the British will do; this nation is a known and somewhat stubborn entity. This is not to say they are resistive; for the national culture is not. They are determined to move in a preferred direction as they always have, and their neighbors understand them very well. The smaller European Union members are interested in what shall come, to judge the likely effect upon themselves, if they seek to leave the union.

*Q: Let's assume everything goes well, and no material flaws flare up; the EU goes on minus Great Britain, and Britain herself gets along just as well. Then what?*

C: This will not come to be; the catalyst will be economic and will affect the eurozone. As teetering economies

continue to balance the edge of debt collapse, the departure of Great Britain removes it from play as a possible destination for migration within the zone, placing potential additional pressure on remaining large nations to absorb migration from the smaller.

*Q: Would this be Greece, Portugal and maybe Italy, which is not so small, whose populations might attempt to migrate to Germany and France? Maybe the Netherlands?*

C: As you see, it is not so simple, yet the economic difficulties soon to arise, caused by factors not directly related to the existence of the European Union, will bring about its dissolution.

*Q: Who will bail out first?*

C: There are several candidates; the decision will likely be one of default, where the departing nation simply ceases to remit tax monies to the central authority. The established leadership of such countries can do so, and will, justified by economic pressures. Simultaneously these non-remitters will establish a national currency, and the break-up will ensue.

*Q: This sounds like a bigger nation; my guess would be Germany.*

C: Your guess is accurate.

*Q: What's going on inside the United Kingdom, with the political landscape in meltdown?*

C: The departing prime minister is already under pressure to begin planning the departure, a task he does not want because he did not want the United Kingdom to leave. There is always the component of political ambition, which will bring forward a number of replacements, the expected political struggle. Mixed in with this is the minority, representing the losing option, who will pressure any and all of the emerging hopefuls to the position of prime minister for the outcome most suited to their preferences. This group has already called for nullification of the vote. Such a move by the legislative body would effectively dissolve credibility; they would be seen as supporting a return to a true monarchy where elected representation is optional before royal authority. England, its former colonies, conquests and neighbors who formed Great Britain, all toiled long and tough to establish a representative government. To nullify a popular referendum, one which re-establishes a claim to national sovereignty, would be seen as a sell out, an abdication of responsibility. This is well understood by all British government officials yet their positions as politicians rest upon popularity. Unpopularity among the majority of voters is the position to remain, which conflicts with citizens.

*Q: What does the Queen of England think of this?*

C: She is not the Queen of Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland; her position is unique before these countries, yet she is pleased. She is happy to see her subjects express their will, she is proud of her nation, England, as the keystone of the greater Britain built upon its history, and she keenly remembers former foes on the European continent who once sought to invade and dominate England. She is supportive of the decision to depart.

*Q: She doesn't seem to have made a public statement like this.*

C: She will not until pressured to do so; this is unlikely. If foot dragging begins to slow the process of unhooking Great Britain beyond a reasonable time, you can expect to hear from her publicly on this point. This is unlikely.

*Q: What about the resistance to the departure? For example, the recently elected mayor of London suggesting the city should declare its independence from England and join the European Union separately.*

C: Humans call this political grandstanding.

*Q: What about the idea Scotland would do what in Texas we'd call a two-step; vote again to leave Great Britain then join the European Union? Is that a realistic possibility?*

C: There are several factors in play; we shall explain each.

If Scotland proposes leaving Great Britain, the question essentially asks: Scotland's decision to remain a part of Great Britain was not tied to Britain's continued membership in the EU. This was not considered and would become a key part of a new Scottish referendum. Few Scots believe their decision to remain in Britain was based on the EU.

The second factor involves joining the European Union separately; what challenges would Scotland face? One strong factor pushing for independence from Great Britain was to gain control over revenue from crude oil production; many Scots believed too much of this was used to benefit other parts of Great Britain, and that Scotland did not benefit

proportionally or fairly. Since then prices have fallen and much less than Scotland might expect to realize would remain with them; the European Union membership costs would involve a larger portion of the oil revenue than Scotland would prefer.

The third factor to be considered is the effect this might have with the now smaller Great Britain; trade, investment and good relations are unlikely to continue to common benefit as they have been in effect.

Lastly, Scotland would be required to create a sovereign currency or adopt the existing regional system. The latter would immediately involve assumption of a share of debt, implicitly or directly. The cost of creating a sovereign central bank and monetary authority, while not impossible, would be seen as oppressive if not dangerous to Scottish interests, much as assumption of a share of existing eurozone obligations would also be perceived.

These factors will work strongly against a Scottish vote for independence from Great Britain.

*Q: What about Northern Ireland or even Wales?*

*C: No desire to separate would gain traction, for similar reasons and even more acute effects as might apply to a Scotland separation.*

*Q: How is the European Union leadership and Parliament viewing this decision?*

*C: With displeasure. Efforts to reorganize, reform and remake the EU are being discussed.*

*Q: Efforts within Great Britain to resist the separation are going to have an effect?*

*C: No. This would be political suicide, far more costly than political disgust.*

*Q: What about other EU nations?*

*C: Many are watching with keen interest; movements to consider a similar departure are gaining favor. No material actions will be forthcoming until the dissolution is observed; such nations are watching both what and how Great Britain acts and as important, how the European Government proceeds.*

*Q: What about the rest of the world?*

*C: There are political considerations now being made, especially in the United States although little effect will there be upon upcoming elections, in this nation. What was going to be decided, will be, independent of the EU separation vote.*

Overall there is seen an opportunity both with the remaining EU nations and Great Britain itself. Many nations are looking to establish new agreements to their respective benefit, where and as these become possible.

*Q: Esteemed Committee, thank you.*

*C: Our pleasure; do return one and all.*

## **Comments**

**Paul 30 June 2016 00:55:31**

Who will bail out first?  
-Germany !

If I understand this to be right, what year does this country start to unfold?  
Time schedule .....

**Patrick 30 June 2016 11:30:27**

Even if I had that schedule, who would believe it? Only after the fact and at that point, what value could the knowledge hold? All besides the point, since set schedules strongly imply free will has been removed from the process.

The Committee says "Germany, by virtue of its dominant economic position, is most exposed to financial turbulence. The poor do not lose money when the markets gyrate. Germany will abruptly act when it appears inevitable that continued membership in the eurozone and European Union will operate to their detriment."

**Mike 30 June 2016 07:20:13**

Patrick, Thank you for allowing the TC to clarify on many points raised. We have had shock news this morning that the front runner for the new PM job (Boris Johnson) has dropped out of the race.

Germany, would be a surprise if it dropped out first as it is basically the bank of the EU. If they do that would mean the EU would very quickly dissolve. - Mike

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:33:51**

The Committee says Germany will hold on for a time, then choose to depart abruptly, when no positive result is seen to come from continued membership in the European Union. It will already be coming apart when this occurs.

**Elsie 30 June 2016 11:01:37**

I have been reading for a long time now and I have to say the EU bit was the first time I have entertained serious doubts about this site. Specifically because it is a global event and the only thing the committee talks about, and Patrick, is the EU and the US. One would think the other several billion people on the planet don't matter. It raises questions.

**Patrick 30 June 2016 11:21:07**

You would enlighten readers with your explanation of how Britain's leaving the EU affects trade between China and North Korea, for example. I'd enjoy that, if nobody else.

Most of the world's billions do not know English; who will ask their questions and how will the answers be translated back into the necessary language?

What questions do you have?

I have lived in 5 countries, know 3 languages fluently and I can get through 2 more. I have visited nearly 30 nations, many repeatedly. What I have learned most of all, Earth society is VERY diverse, divergent and complicated at times. Attempting to paint the entire house with one can of paint....well. Res ipsa loquitur.

I am a "lone wolf" and I charge zero for what appears here. To expect a BBC world correspondent's approach is not possible.

**Elsie 1 July 2016 04:29:52**

North Korea and China? Touche. I was thinking of a fabulous landmass somewhat further south of the equator to be honest. Eh, we all have our geo-tribalistic limitations.

And yes, you are not a BBC- thank goodness. Fine as they are, consulting them on metaphysical issues would be mental. I guess I just fell into the trap of forgetting you are a man doing the best you can and decided to have rather irrational expectations of you. Forgive.

"Most of the world do not know English: who will ask their questions and how will answers be translated back into the necessary language"- I don't know but I am passionate about cross-cultural communications. Technology: there's a youtube video out there of a fantastic simultaneous translation app that works on smartphones: you point it at a sign and it translates the writing back to your language of choice. At present it is very limited, but maybe in 10 years or so language barriers will be surmountable through the use of tech. I'm hopeful.

Anyways, to conclude this windy essay: If the committee could offer some insight on the throw-away comment by Mr. Farage about Britain looking to strengthen it's ties with the Commonwealth, it would be appreciated. As a citizen of a former colony, this news is in no way welcome. If Britain is considering some imperialism again I would like to know about it.

PS: Maybe if Kim Jong Un stopped playing with his nuclear weapons in public China wouldn't be exasperated with NK. I don't know what it does for trade but it is something NK might want to keep in mind.

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:25:22**

If you are thinking imperialism along the lines of colonization, no. The United Kingdom cannot afford it, even if there were plans to do so. There are none.

I am also passionate about cross cultural communication, and have lived it since I can remember. My father emigrated to the USA after his native country was invaded in World War II.

Interesting you say "throw away comment" as if it were not intended to be serious or that it was, but should not be taken seriously even if Mr Farage indeed meant it.

What is he is getting at is improved trade, to benefit the UK in ways EU membership restricted it.

North Korea plays with its weapons for internal effect & benefits; they are not taken very seriously.

Language barriers surmounted & dismantled will reveal attitudes far more challenging to understand. Translation is the easy part.

**Steve 1 July 2016 03:15:44**

Hhmmm, I'll bite, what questions arise?

**Elsie 1 July 2016 06:00:49**

Thanks, Steve.

1. What does Britain intend for its role in the Commonwealth post-Brexit?
2. How do they intend to explicate the overt racism that was a Brexit pillar to said Commonwealth, all things considered?
3. What does this mean for the AU dream in general and the EAC project in particular?

Thanks in advance.

**Patrick 1 June 2016 17:31:30**

3. AU dream = Australian hopes? American Union?

EAC project = ?

Says The Committee:

1. To re-establish trade & commerce they have not been permitted pursued under the yoke of the EU. as Great Britain sees it.
2. Racism was not a pillar of the decision to leave; the desire of Britons to control immigration into Great Britain was the factor. Overt racism across-the-board would have come to a head and ruptured long ago, had it been a material issue.

**Elsie Eyakuze 3 June 2016 08:01:19**

Thank you Patrick. Thank you Committee. Much to think on to consider my perspective on this issue. But primarily, gratitude for being so willing to dialogue.

**Maltese 30 June 2016 11:33:44**

Malta is the smallest country in the EU and a former British colony with strong ties to the UK...

- 1) How is Brexit going to effect Malta?
- 2) Will Malta be one of the first or last nations to leave the EU?
- 3) Malta imports most of its needs from the UK and the EU - will the EU dissolution effect Malta very drastically? For example, regarding essential imports like food. Would this tiny nation be able to cope in the upcoming world economic crisis?

**Patrick 30 June 2016 15:55:12**

1. Beyond being the first step leading to the end of the EU, it won't.
2. Malta will no longer be a member as the EU comes apart on its own.
3. No, not dramatically and at most, mildly. Malta's size makes it but a small component in the greater scheme. It is not influential and conversely, is easy to accommodate in greater patterns of trade & commerce, to satisfy Malta's requirements.

**Paul 30 June 2016 12:45:41**

Thank you Patrick and TC.

Since EU will eventually dissolve, would be interesting to know if it will be as soon as 2017 or later?

**Patrick 30 June 2016 15:50:25**

The Committee says both, in steps.

**alex campbell 30 June 2016 16:55:14**

Will Jeremy Corbyn win the British general election in 2020?

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:35:21**

The Committee says, "We shall all see. Many decisions lie along the path from now until the election you question."

**Paul 1 July 2016 08:21:05**

Following question, which of the following people will be the next PM in UK?

Michael Gove  
Theresa May  
Liam fox  
Stephen Grabb  
Andrea Leadsom

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:37:24**

The Committee is saying Theresa May at the moment, but the decision is not final. The probabilities allow for several winners, as of this time.

**Derek 1 July 2016 08:53:57**

The reason I keep coming back to this site is it always "feels" true and authentic. Even when, at times, it takes my logical

brain by surprise. Thank you, Patrick and TC, for your tireless and generous contributions.

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:38:23**

Thank you for saying this Derek, it's good to know.

**Mike 1 July 2016 09:22:26**

Patrick, In previous communications talks of further more severe and systemic financial issues loom large on the human races horizon.

I'm guessing whilst BREXIT was a shock to the worlds economy, then Germany's GEEXIT will be fiscal devastation will it not? Thanks

**Patrick 1 July 2016 17:42:08**

The Committee says "The British exit from the European Union was but a series of ripples, economically. It has not been a shock and the effects will not reverberate as such. There will be the usual ups & downs of economic movements, easy to see as caused by the decision, but largely, are not.

Germany will not cause economic devastation as much as Germany will seek refuge from economic downturn it sees as damaging its interests permanently."

**Veronica 3 July 2016 07:58:23**

Hi Patrick, Many thanks, as always. While I have read the Committee discussions over the years about how monetary money and markets around world are changing (and has obviously begun), I have not been able to figure out how to prepare on a personal level. For example what should I do now to preserve the small savings I have in a 401K plan for retirement. If in the future actual money is rarely or not used as often or inflation makes paper money useless, what good will any monetary savings be anyway? Being a human on earth with "money" ingrained in my brain I find that I seek a direction, even though on a deeper level I am sure I will be safe and I will not starve. Is there is a way to preserve monetary savings for this tremulous time to come? All I can think of doing is moving it to a CD or IRA. Which brings me to the thought, what good is a IRA or CD if the banks close or the government is not able to back them either? After my brain spins around for awhile on the issue of savings and cash, it then jumps to home mortgages, etc. What happens to them? How are they paid, will they even be around? Makes me wonder how property will change hands, etc. Can the Committee comment?

**Patrick 5 July 2016 14:28:25**

C: "Frame your question not about money but floods; after the water recedes, will you be unaffected? Even if you escape the direct flood waters yourself, everything else around you will have been, and therefore the effects of the flood, if not the water, indeed reach you.

Money is a human social agreement; your question is really about purchasing ability. Even if you keep the units of money you have, and maybe also the growth you hope for and expect, what will the value of it become when everything else around you changes?

Everything else will change. Money will not go away anytime soon; however humans will pursue the same behaviors with and concerning it, that will bring about the changes humans will dislike."

**Maltese 5 July 2016 15:33:41**

Can the committee please elaborate on this?

"Money will not go away anytime soon; however humans will pursue the same behaviors with and concerning it, that will bring about the changes humans will dislike."

**Patrick 8 July 2016 15:02:01**

Says The Committee: "Economic cycles and disturbance are the result of human behaviors about borrowing, lending and consuming. When faced with economic pressures, the human reaction, collectively, is to believe pulling back and in, will worsen the situation. The lowering of confidence will provoke more of the same; the answer is often to borrow and within the process, create more money. The idea this will loosen investment and bolster confidence, thus economic activity, will function to a degree, yet little or no examination of the degree is undertaken.

As the borrow & create behavior continues, the degree beyond which the practice will no longer function and turn sharply negative, will be too rapidly approached to stop in time."