

## Hard Brexit

- I. Protocols of communication in the UK and the rest of the EU.
- II. The consequences of Hard Brexit.

### I

The UK has currently been in the EU for 45 years. A reason negotiations will crash is the UK elite does not understand how protocols of communication operate in the EU. Surprisingly, the EU negotiator, Michel Barnier, does not understand this difference either. We will compare protocols of communication in the UK regime with the Republic of Ireland.

A social protocol is an agreement, often taught from birth, or otherwise acquired through cultural absorption, of the way communication happens in a society. It is culturally imposed, and reflects the way a society operates. It is the inner state of individuals, used by them to navigate the power structures operating in a society.

Consider a society as a pyramid with horizontal layers extending from the apex to the base. Each layer is an administrative structure consisting of more and more people. The scope of responsibility from the apex to the base is like a pyramid upside down. It is greatest at the top.

In the UK power is highly vertical. The powers of the executive, legislature and judiciary are integrated. Rules apply to the layer below but do not operate as a power structure in the reverse direction. This asymmetry has detailed procedures by which reverse rules do not apply. The most common is obstruction by technicality. Should it be necessary to invoke the operations of a rule based system, there is an extensive knowledge base on procedures for whitewash and the appointment of people to direct it. The law may be applied as if it operated everywhere due to political in-fighting or because violation of the law is so blatant, incompetent and publicly visible that to do otherwise would cast doubt on the judicial façade.

At the apex, Brenda Windsor is a powerful world figure and the richest person in the world. Military investments are the largest, and the revelation of their extent was one of the prime reasons Philip Windsor ordered the assassination of his daughter-in-law. It is well known that the British and Dutch Royal families own the Shell oil company. In terms of ownership the Windsors own one sixth of the worlds land surface. This land is worth £17,600 trillion, where a trillion is a million million.

It follows from the structure of the UK regime there are no power relations between people, A and B, at the base. It is a no-power relationship. This means that no enforcement of compliance occurs between A and B in a communication except by reference to the power structure above. The way out of this impasse is that extensive negotiations are applied to obtain cognitive agreement between both parties as to the way they should proceed. It is perfectly acceptable for either party to disagree. If both parties agree on an ethical way of proceeding this may apply even if it has no legal basis. In some situations one party may have more access to the legal power structure than another, and this may be applied as a threat. It is normal for A and B to try to obtain cognitive agreement at all costs, otherwise no action can be performed. It is often assumed by people in the UK that this process is so natural it universally applies, even though it does not.

In the Republic of Ireland, the power and no-power relations are inverted. Let us take an example of A and B at the base. A and B both have power, and there are protocols on the way it is applied. If A asks B the question 'what do you think of the weather today?' this is not a request for information as it is in the UK, it is an order. B has to comply with this order, otherwise A will physically eject B from the space which A occupies. There are various protocols by which this negotiation takes place. Say B does not know what the weather is like today. If B wishes to assist A, say because B realises that it is right that A should have the information, then B must say without preliminary politeness 'I do not know', and must follow this with the reason 'I have not looked out of the window today'. It is perfectly acceptable for B to respond in a beguilingly charming way 'Well it is so nice that we have such marvellous weather today, and we have had such a long spell of it' even though it is raining torrentially outside. This is the reason UK people are so often misdirected to their destination in Ireland, and do not understand why this has happened.

It is interesting that the no-power relationship operates between layers in the Irish Republic. This is the best feature of the Irish system. Negotiations between layers happen in an analogous way that the no-power relationship between A and B at the base operates in the UK. Press barons in the UK regime may try to impose a UK interpretation in Irish governance, but this always fails in a way that it would not in the UK.

It is a regular feature of UK referendums and elections that they are unfair. Fraudulent miscounting of ballots is becoming increasingly endemic. In the Scottish Referendum ballots were removed and fraudulently substituted. Although the British government chose Russian observers to report fraud who would be discredited, two French observers agreed with them. No observers accepted the validity of the referendum count. Open diplomatic opinion in Ireland was that clandestine operations took place by MI5. Specifically, a Kilmarnock counting officer gave a detailed account of multiple security violations including non-closure, illegal transportation and the prevention of her inspecting the boxes. She was informed of bribery of caretakers and security personnel at polling stations. Sample polling of this result gave a 50% Yes vote and a 37% No vote, but the returns gave 45% and 55% respectively. At one count over 100% of the computed available voters voted. The government in London indicated definitively it knew the result before it took place. We will be lax in presenting extensive details of other incidents which include use of computer databases which contravene ostensible rules, say by Cambridge Analytica, by the gerrymandering of electoral boundaries, by intervention of establishment press barons who know how to, and often apply, manipulation of public opinion to their own ends and by massive and intended secret contraventions of rules on electoral funding. David Cameron has said that 'the Conservative Party will be in power for ever'. The negotiations between the UK regime and the EU were initiated by a referendum in the UK that was fraudulently conducted.

If I make a background comment on how the deduction of the fraudulence of the Scottish Referendum was obtained, I note that there were widespread reports that occurred from many independent sources that indicated that something was going wrong. We would note that when this happens it is appropriate to ask why reports of irregularities are appearing all over the place when there is no organisation there that would initiate these complaints. They seem to be a response to events, not the consequence of any organisational attempt to discredit the Referendum. They are background and not source. Secondly, when we look at official accounts which refer to this unquiet, although they may look at each individual case, whereas they say

very often that these irregularities could have taken place, they are often constrained in deducing anything from each of these many individual complaints, since in the majority of cases there could be alternative explanations. It is remarkable that there are so many of these complaints that no probabilistic computation of the likelihood of these separate incidents may lead to the deduction that something other than random irregularities is going on. However there are a number of reports that are very specific and direct, which indicate that procedures to avoid tampering with ballots were directly, deliberately and illegally imposed, and that electoral officers with the duty in law of inspecting the ballots later were illegally refused their right to do so. Moreover, in the incident reported, there was information received from those that had received bribes that they were induced to behave this way. We may feel that despite intuition, rules of logic strictly forbid us to make deductions on what happened here. I think it would be an extraordinary person, probably a mathematician like me, that from these collected events we had no proof that fraud took place in the instance given. When we look at official investigations of the legality of this Referendum, they either assert there is no way that an organised conspiracy can be deduced from these multiple random complaints, or otherwise that specific direct evidence of fraud occurred but it cannot be concluded from these isolated frauds taken together that the result was any different than it otherwise would be. This is not good enough.

I think there are sufficient reasons to continue investigations to determine whether this official minimal explanation has sufficient viability to be thought true. In order to do this, we need to locate other explanations. These are given the name Conspiracy Theories. My understanding is these are officially unapproved explanations of what went on. It may be remarked that journals that investigate Conspiracy Theories, like Private Eye, come up with explanations which are coherent, based on fact and logical deduction and we could not assume that they would be anything other than the truth, including from the case that in the vast majority of these cases the claims are libellous, provided we might add if they were untrue, and the English legal system is such that very large damages in compensation would result. Our intention, after much exhaustive effort, in finally locating Conspiracy Theories on this Referendum, was not to assume they were correct, but to investigate them. What this reveals is a vast coordinated, multiply sourced, direct, coherent explanation of what happened. It is entirely predictive and results in further interpretations with no other conclusion than that the Scottish Referendum was a fraud directed by the UK regime. We have given an account of some aspects of this above. This excessive explanation we believe indicates this fraudulent type of operation could be endemic. It is our conclusion that this is precisely the case. This astonishing conclusion reluctantly obtained requires decisive action in protecting the democratic basis of our society. It appears that despite a blanket of assumed legality and compliance albeit on occasion and inexplicably violated, our democracy is not only corrupt at its core and the subject of massive centrally directed fraud, our democracy is not there. Democracy is dead.

By and large, people in the UK are totally incompetent in navigating between social protocols. There is the question whether Theresa May, the UK Prime Minister, has intelligence greater or less than a brick. The Brexit negotiations between the UK and the EU will fail because Theresa May, despite repeated advice from her own experts and statements to the contrary by Michel Barnier, the EU negotiator, thinks as is natural in everyday communications in the UK that a no-power protocol applies in negotiations between the UK and the EU. The EU thinks a power relationship applies. It has stated the parameters under which compliance to these rules applies.

It has repeatedly stated that the UK is has not and is taking no reasonable steps towards conformity with this requirement. The result will be ejection of the UK from the EU space.

## II

The establishment in the UK consists of three main types. We say that conservatives accept the free market economy, there are social structures for capital and labour within it, and their objective is to direct and extend the power of capital within this. Fascists accept the objective world, but see their role is the imposition of their will, their representation within it. No rules apply in this aim, although it may be convenient to present the situation as if they do. Nazis are fascists who believe in racial superiority and possibly eugenics.

Theresa May is a conservative. The fascists in the Conservative Party, for instance Michael Gove and Boris Johnston, are increasingly aligned with the Russian kleptocracy, from whom they obtain payments (see *Russian political donations to the Conservative Party are illegal* on the website). There is no concern by these people for people of a wider mix, although it is always necessary to strictly apply in public the principle that democracy is working and they are at the forefront as its representative.

The Conservative Party, despite its name, has for centuries been the most revolutionary in Europe. In ejecting the peasantry from six and a half million acres of their land in the Enclosure Acts, it terminated their arduous but relatively egalitarian and democratic way of life and drove them into the towns, creating in the Industrial Revolution the world's first industrial society. In the genocide of the Irish potato famine, every effort to feed the starving was prevented by a British government intent on teaching the Catholic Irish a lesson and by imposing market forces. This depopulated its countryside and created a vast diaspora. A similar situation in Scotland was prevented jointly by the landowners and the government. In the Thatcher era, a trade union reform paper referred to the unions as a political mafia. "We must neglect no opportunity to erode trade union membership". The Whitehall committee Misc 57 did detailed work from 1982 preparing for the initiation of a miner's strike which began in 1984, prompted by pit closures. Thatcher presided over the dismantling of much of Britain's manufacturing industry which was a stronghold of the trade union movement, and used mass unemployment to keep wages low and weaken the unions. Within two years alone, her policies destroyed a fifth of Britain's industrial base. This programme against organised labour created the world's first postindustrial society. They are at it again.

It is difficult to see the full consequences at this stage. The objective of the fascists is to obtain a Protofascist state under a Prime Minister with Henry VIII powers.

Ireland, despite political division, has been an integrated economy. The EU and UK positions on the Irish border are incompatible. The border between the Irish Republic and the North will be 500 km of chain link fence 4-5 m high topped with razor wire, with many cameras and few open crossing points. This is like putting a border between Manchester and Birmingham with customs posts and taxation of goods between it. This would clearly cause severe economic disruption, and the failure of a large number of companies with knock-on effects to the wider economy. In Ireland Guinness is a major exporter. It is produced in Dublin and is bottled in the North. I cannot see other than that this company will fail.

This is not the only case and the effect will be devastating. We will call 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019, the date at which Hard Brexit is implemented as Titanic Iceberg Day. It is sometimes advised in crisis situations to be calm. I think it is preferable, and often necessary, to panic.

This problem can be readily addressed. It requires a cognitive shift in perceptions of the role of money. Many people equate money with an extended idea of the notes and coins in what I call 'Margaret Thatcher's handbag'. This money is never created or destroyed, and it is always used in exchange for services, either for their purchase of goods, or their sale.

That this is not so is well recognised. There is no good definition of money at the higher levels. The reason is that its various forms depend on protocols of transfer and conversion. The allocation of these at the lowest level results in the use of notes and coins with an ostensible value. These aggregate definitions of money are used in the preservation and acceptance of the financial system. Forms of it may be created or destroyed. There is the understanding that the acceptance of these fictitious forms are dependent on the cognitive acceptance of or confidence in the money system at the lowest level.

A further comment is, like in a communist system, at the level of the hyper-rich money does not operate in the system. Admittedly the odd £100 million may be held in readily convertible assets expressible in money for the odd purchase or two. Various features of this system at the higher levels operate in ways that people who are instructed in the good use of resources below it find strange. When money is no object, it is perfectly usual to rent property, say of a Rothschild, at exorbitant rent, in a show of wealth and power.

It is sometimes remarked that the absence of the use of money at these levels amounts to embezzlement of the system. Viewed one way, as its ethical end result, this is so. Viewed another, money is not the operative object in this system. It is power. This power may be expressed in the ownership of resources, say military investments only incidentally expressed in money via systems of accounting, the ownership of banks, held in promissory notes, and the ownership of land directly held. Transfer of ownership and power can proceed, say in the transfer of promissory notes, without any reference to systems of money whatsoever.

The effect of the financial system is often disruptive. Being almost without exception a hierarchy for the preservation of its own control, it misdistributes assets so that progressively those who have power have more, and those who do not have less. This system is the consequence of a vertical power structure which seeks to maintain power relationships in this way. Claimed democratic control of this system is inhibited by the fact that the system is not democratic at all, it merely claims to be. When the social structure disallows aspects of this hierarchy, then it may be the case that social objectives of society can be pursued, which has the effect of levelling the structure. Protocols of exchange are arbitrary. However, vertical power structures have access to resources, like those of the military, ownership of the media, and control of other aspects of the financial system which can be used to destabilise attempts to redistribute too much the allocation of resources in its favour.

What is likely to happen for the economy of the Republic of Ireland is that political structures will acknowledge the permanence of the protocols of value which the hyper-rich frequently ignore. With a hold on the banking system and its direction, these protocols can be changed. This is difficult, but an acknowledgement of the way the system operates can lead to the realisation that a rational reconfiguration of its transfers will not result in the collapse of the

Guinness company. All that need to be recognised is that the accumulation of funds derived from taxing the border need to be transferred in at least equal measure to maintain the stability of the company. Guinness is an important element of Irish culture, and the survival of the company is important for the maintenance of employment in the Republic, and substantially for Irish exports.

Once the need of a redirection is recognised, and the political will and power structure is present in which protocols can be changed, given enough time there is no reason in theory why apart from the inconvenience of queuing at the border, and the building of the administrative structure to reallocate resources is there, that the two halves of Ireland could not continue to operate in the same way as they did before.

It is a consequence of the technical incompetence of the British elite that all technical issues are ignored, and fascist principles on the pre-eminence of will over objective fact in the conduct of negotiations apply. This is not fascism. It is lunacy.

It is well known that the British regime, in an act of technical lunacy, decided to disconnect the UK air traffic control system from the rest of Europe, when no replacement system for the UK was technically possible, nor could it communicate with the European system. This means on Brexit there will be no air movements from the UK which transgress EU airspace.

A similar issue is the termination of electricity transmission on Titanic Iceberg Day. The UK outside of Northern Ireland has two interconnectors with France, one via the channel tunnel. These interconnectors transfer 4 GW of power between the EU and the UK. Norway is not part of the EU and so presumably the situation does not apply here. There is a connector planned between the UK and Norway which has extensive hydropower facilities, widely used throughout Europe, but this will not be available until 2021. For that date I asked a colleague, quite knowledgeable but not necessarily an in-depth expert on these issues, whether it would be possible to reconfigure electricity transmission throughout Europe so that the Norway connector could supply electricity to the UK. This is not feasible. Electricity generators are being purchased for use in the England, particularly the South East, which has greater priority to the regime than the rest of the UK, which apart from Scotland may vote Labour, and does not matter. Scotland generates more electricity than it uses, having both extensive oil and gas supplies, a very large wind generation capacity and hydropower. There is extensive transmission of electric power in the UK from north to south. Scotland, which will become independent soon after Titanic Iceberg Day, has extensively game planned its relations with the remainder of the UK for a long time. Scotland will maintain control of its electricity supplies after Titanic Iceberg Day, since it has negotiated the retention of powers it assumed under the EU. Power in Scotland will remain on.

Northern Ireland, after the dismantling of its coal power stations, obtains the majority of its electricity from the Republic, which has an extensive renewable energy infrastructure. A major result of this ideology is that electricity will cease to be transferred between the countries via the two interconnectors, and there will be brown-outs in the North. The electricity power supply in the Northern Ireland is important. This will have important knock-on effects on the economy of the Republic. It effects the population of at least a substantial proportion of the North with whom it closely associates.

It is not beyond the wit of man that the Republic could have sufficient control of electricity transmission through the interconnectors between it and the North so that any formal restriction of control, whilst legally in place, is effectively bypassed. These subversions are available in the financial system, in particular for substantial companies within it. They are known as accountancy. The analogy is valid.