

## Europe and United Kingdom:-Two Worlds ?

What is that on the screen ?

It is a flag of Newfoundland. All crosses and saltires in disintegration. Should it be the flag of another country at this moment?

The people of the United Kingdom voted on the 23rd June last to leave the European Union, by a margin of 1.9%, over the 50% mark, in a referendum result in which two of the four constituent nations – Scotland and Northern Ireland, voted to remain in the European Union, and in which 26.8% did not vote.

The ambivalence of the result is underscored by the low turnout of the young, who had the most to lose by a Leave vote, but also by the lower working class turnout, which neither the Labour Party nor Middle England Brexiteers were able to mobilise.

The purpose of this paper is to help situate New Zealand within the Brexit process and the EU as it currently constituted and as it is challenged by electoral revolt. My role is that of a staff-officer, analysing a dynamic theatre of operations, not to do history, or be prescriptive. The lesson of our times is the necessity for government to anticipate and inbuild resilience, so as to shift seamlessly from essentialist, nationalist and nativist paradigms towards multiculturalism. The UK failed to do that.

The subtitle is taken from the poem "La Grande Chartreuse" by Matthew Arnold of 1851:-

Wandering between two worlds, one dead  
The other powerless to be born

Is it the UK and England that are dead, or else powerless to be born, or is it the EU ? Is Brexit even do-able?

Right now the European Union seems virulently alive, setting the terms, insisting on the Rule of Law, while something seems dead in the British Isles. What, precisely? Who can say. It's too soon for an inquest. Whether the United Kingdom stays together or falls apart, the Union Jack is looking rather like the flag of Newfoundland at this moment.

I bring Brexit home to our own flag referendum this year.

I suggest that the Union Jack retained in the canton of the New Zealand flag could well be the ensign of a nation that might cease to exist by 2025. Why then would we want the flag of a dead nation on our flag?

Russia and Albania remember the second Rome on their flags, by means of the double-headed eagle, while the old Union flag of South Africa consisted of the flags of the Cape Colony and the Afrikaner republics. Quebec cherishes the fleur de lis. Do we really want to be left with a vestige flapping in the wind?

England has been dead the last 309 years, but now an English national consciousness has finally found political expression and power. Unfortunately it recovered that identity through an anti-Immigration campaign contaminated by nativism and xenophobia and hysteria.

Britain is a civilised country. It does pogroms by ballot box. Such is the message sent out to the world. Lord Ashcroft's polls reveal that the voters for the Leave position identified with a tight, mutually reinforcing bloc of three positions, that can be characterised as Sovereignty, or "taking back control", controlling immigration, and concerns at the accession process.

Critical political evaluation of the debate and of the Brexiteer Conservatives are now beside the point. The Brexiteers are an established fact and we must now deal with them. Their reputation for honesty and probity and the international standing of their government are another matter, which we must factor in, as events unfold. It is looking like victory is harder for them than they thought. A more interesting second generation of Brexit leaders should be noted, and watched out for intellectually, and as governance exponents.

Remainers however remain, and that remaining is an established fact. Leave is going to need Remain expertise and Remain sanction, and it is going to need Remain votes to grow the margin into a majoritarian movement.

Conversely Remain might remain in such a way that Leave is undo-able. Le Monde headlined Arnaud Leparmentier's article of 25 June as "Le Brexit n'aura pas lieu". Brexit just won't happen.

We must professionally and dispassionately appraise the situation in the New Zealand interest despite any surprise and chagrin we may personally feel at the decision and despite our concern at the low standard of the debate and the abuse and violence to which it descended. The United Kingdom has disabled itself for the moment by the manner of this result. I would argue that if a giant hurricane had struck the country, affecting turnout, so that the result was 49.0% or 49.9% Leave, such a result would not have put the question to bed.

The internecine and disabling politics would have persisted. I refused to be drawn publicly before the result was announced as to who would win, because I did not think that was the point. What is the point is that regardless of the outcome, the UK is hung together by sellotape and rubber bands. It must reinvent itself.

The EU by the same token must reinvent itself. The current asymmetry is that it is indeed reinventing itself and that it has an integration programme to pursue while the UK Govt is struggling to contain the Brexiteer coup, and while the Labour Party is in the throes of sloughing off an anti-politics moment.

History for Europe and the UK has largely run out of road and offers us precious little to go by. "Hitler" so often invoked by the Brexiteers like an H-bomb word, has nothing to do with it. Irrational romantic nationalism and the archaic narratives of historians and of the nationalist culture industry have prevailed over rational economic argument. Grub Street and Grub Street politicians from "Spectator-land", with the prose skills of another era, have worsted the experts and the technocrats, and rendered nugatory the best quantitative techniques.

The consequence of not obtaining political consensus behind the true destination of the EU project, was that the UK failed to reconfigure domestic institutions of health, welfare, Police and local government to cope with EU membership and with the freedom of movement guaranteed by the EU. Other member nations of the same class were better able to firewall their internal institutions and access to their labour markets. The UK has relied on the EU to serve as its exoskeleton, when it hasn't relied upon the sea.

If the Union itself should unravel, counterclaims will be made against the Westminster government, by the governments of Scotland, of Northern Ireland and of the Republic of Ireland. This exorbitant regulatory and diplomatic investment of government time will consume the attention of the UK Govt and its partners, when there are so many other challenges for governments, such as improving social mobility and life outcomes after the Credit Crisis of 2008, and maintaining the geopolitical balance and a credible deterrence with respect to the Eurasian powers and the jihadist threat.

Immigration did indeed fuel the Brexit vote but the big surprise was the emergence of an English nationalism. A chick has been hatched unrecognized in International Relations, and it is chirping for food. Is it a changeling or is it for real? The Italian political philosopher Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) used to deny that there was an apostolic succession of nations, that the people of a nation now were the same people of a nation then. All that is going on is a process of identification and appropriation, of the impersonation of legal personality in a later age.

As recently as the Scottish referendum in 2014, commentators were wondering where was an English national consciousness? A range of people as wide and varied as John Prescott and the 7<sup>th</sup> Marquess of Bath have proposed regional English devolutions, comparable to those of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, but there has been no interest in a new heptarchy of New Zealand-sized Englands.

The founder and ideologue of the Brexit project was Enoch Powell (1912-1998). The media has failed us in refusing to report the true ideological origins of the Brexiteer movement. A Powellian policy has prevailed in the Conservative Party, seeking to "emancipate" the UK from the EU, but perhaps also from the Union. Whether it succeeds even now is another matter. Enoch Powell was the Voldemort genius of British conservatism and it was at Peterhouse, Cambridge, 31 years ago that I was first introduced to his school of political thought.

Powellian policy is a triangulation of right-wing nationalist historians with the Conservative Associations and the working classes, combining a nativist reaction to immigration and yet an adherence to early monetarist policy. Powell was ahead of the monetarist game in the mid 20th century - and yet the romantic apologia for English history and the defence of the Westminster power state over a millennium prevented a Hayekian critique of that state and constitution. In Powell's mind, the power project was based on poetics, and the poetry of "this England", turned into propaganda.

The EU and the Euro may well survive by means of more radical reform and integration. Certainly the Brexit vote may well energize them. The dissolution of the EU would result in the Ruritanianization of Europe and the failure of the Euro would involve Germany in a wipe-out of 40 % of GDP or US \$ 1.3 trillion. France and Germany have definitive electoral cycles next year. Their leaderships, are trying to get ahead of a profound political crisis in "le monde anglo-saxonne", in the Brexit-voting UK and in the Trump candidature US.

The legitimacy of the vote is arguably affected by the extreme polarisation it both reflected and caused in the British electorate, by class, income, age cohort, education and nationality within the United Kingdom. There seem to be precious few cross-overs. The nature of this vote is that it failed as a majoritarian exercise.

That does not mean that the result is illegitimate. It means rather that other domestic stakeholders and interests and constituents are required to sanction and support the result, and contribute their terms to a settlement.

Some basic questions to ponder on at this moment, are:-

Would a Brexiteer government have the strength and public support and capability to carry out its programme or would its political capital fast dissipate ? What are the Remainers' terms going to be?

Will the current Parliament survive to term, in 2020?

Will the Union survive the 2020s? Is the end-reign of Elizabeth II an end-time for the Union, and for the other constitutional monarchies of the Commonwealth?

The uniqueness of the current situation is that a de facto primary within the Conservative Party was imposed upon the EU referendum. A government- in-waiting with a revolutionary policy might be established without resort as yet to a General Election - the election of 2015 and the referendum result constituting a presumptive mandate. Or the Brexiteers and Remainers may come to a compromise and effect a political settlement.

The Labour Party is unusually compromised by its countercultural leadership and the sooner it returns to normal Opposition politics, and forms a government in waiting, the better, because such a Labour might have to form an effective post-Brexit government.

My advice to the UK Labour Party is that they should have made alliance with the Centre-Left Partito Democratico government of Matteo Renzi and Pier Carlo Padoan, over Immigration, and that they should have rejuvenated Social Democracy through the economic thought of Mikhail Kalecki (1899-1970) who taught at the LSE, Oxford and Cambridge.

A coup has taken place on a 1689 scale, like the Glorious Revolution. Just as the coup leaders then wrenched England from the continental system of Louis XIV and the absolutist bureaucracy of the TV ( and soft porn) series "Versailles", so have the Brexiteers achieved something. Whether it is an Inglorious or a Glorious Revolution is yet to be seen. The coup by the Whig conspirators and William of Orange took months to pull off. It took a few years to sort out Ireland. James II abandoned his throne. Replacing him with William III and Mary II as joint sovereigns required a lot of work, and a war in Ireland.

The race is now on to develop legitimacy for a Brexit Britain, or legitimacy for whatever successor state emerges in the old footprint of the Roman Britannia.

The race is also on to grow the margin of support for Brexit. We may not exclude the prospect that those who identify with Europe might seek to grow the support for their cause. The reason why that is not improbable is that the wisest and most strategic Brexiteers insist on a positive and not a denigratory relationship with Europe and insist on a full commitment to NATO. This is a rare cross-over.

The German expert Brendan Simms of Peterhouse, Cambridge, is a conspicuous instance, and I agree with him. It is not improbable then that Europhiles and less nativist Brexiteers might compromise and develop a modus vivendi with one another that generates a modus operandi with Europe. Yet we heard none of that in the debate. There were few signals transmitted back to Europe beyond the sentimental, that Europe consisted of a polity or polities worth respecting.

From my experience of the United Kingdom, I propose that the UK is a great country with an innovative and powerful economy that nonetheless has government at national and local government levels that is not a good fit with the societies and economies it regulates. Therefore dissatisfaction with the manner in which Britons are governed can reach generational flashpoints such as the Poll Tax Riots of 1990, the race riots of 2011, which I witnessed in Birmingham, and now the EU referendum.

Nor is the Business Model. I refer to Baron Liddle. Roger Liddle has the following to say on the deficiencies of the British Business model.

- 1/ limited finances for promising products
- 2/ persistent lack of intermediate skills
- 3/ inability to transfer products into commercial viability
- 4/ infrastructure and services failures

These were the same problems that the UK experienced during its long decline between the 1870s-1910s. If the EU and its regulations are such an inhibitor, why do the French, Germans and Swedes have greater success in penetrating foreign markets, asks Liddle? Liddle interestingly proposes that the UK might have to join a Euro Mark II in the 2020s. A European future just won't go away.

It is far from surprising that frustration with an elusive and complicated system of governments in the UK might be projected onto the EU nationalistically. The Scots did this in 2014. The English have done so now. One of the many ironies of the situation is that Mr Cameron was prompt after the Scottish vote, to end the West Lothian problem that had bedevilled Anglo- Scottish relations in the House of Commons, by proposing "English votes for English laws", a manoeuvre which had been arranged by late 2015.

The genii of Scotland, England and the EU were all let out of the bottle by Mr Cameron, who thought in reasonable good faith, that he could obtain political consensus on each of these issues. David Cameron has been an exemplary democrat for a fatalistic and jaded British polity, because he believed that it was not only possible to BUILD support for a positive Union and EU project but ethically required. He succeeded in Scotland. England might well have a useful existence as a subsidiary polity or polities, and so there is no trail that may reasonably traced

between his moderate English patriotism and the fell beast of English nativism that has since crawled like Grendel from the mud. We do not really yet know whether he really did fail with Europe. He lost a battle. The war is still ongoing- though it will go on without him as Prime Minister.

The English, reviving as a polity, have projected their dissatisfaction against the EU. It is wrong to say however that this is simply unfair reaction against Brussels, and that the animus should be projected against Westminster, as in the historic Poll Tax Riots of 1983 and 1990. A constitution, a constitutional institution such as the referendum process are an information system. And the EU referendum process promised Eurosceptics and Europhobes the capture of Westminster. Therefore we have no grounds for proposing that pro-Brexit voters voted like the Gadarene swine and rushed over a cliff. They were not goaded into insensibility. They thought they were sorting out both Westminster and Brussels in one go.

The manner of the debate was never worthy of either the European or Brexit position, which was largely the fault of the Brexiteers, who relentlessly demotivated and polemicised the debate, and war-headed their arguments into instruments of unreason. Nationalist narrative, nostalgia and xenophobia combined in the topic of Immigration to replace the wide fronts of problems and alternatives that either option presented the public. Typical of the debate was Nigel Farage's parting comment, that "England has attained its independence without a shot".

He is too intelligent a man not to have known that this comment was an offensive erasure of the assassination of Jo Cox MP. What welcome to the world such a country as England would receive, that has revived out of such an ugly mood is yet to be seen. We reprove such obduracy in the Balkans.

However I would warn against characterising the debate as anti-rational. The English themselves have long identified themselves by a limited scepticism as to the powers of reason, and by the self-attributions of obduracy and doggedness as national characteristics. From my experience of the UK and of Europe, I readily admit that the more totalising forms of reason known to the Continent hold no traction in England and Wales. Nor alas the sceptical reasonableness and prudentialism of David Hume and of the Scots. This cultural trait to some extent, explains why the proofs from the analytical disciplines of Political Economy failed to prevail over a movement led by romantic nationalists and historians.

Once the weather vanes swung towards Immigration on that recent dull end-of-May Bank Holiday, the Prime Minister did front up conscientiously to the public. It was never a matter that he could persuade people given over to a nativist mood. He made the strenuous moral effort to counter a modern "Gordon Riot" of xenophobia.

We have heard a lot about the square tomatoes which the EU has allegedly imposed, and about lightbulbs. I agree about the lightbulbs. It is ridiculous to impose standards on a region ranging in latitudes from the Canary Islands to the Arctic Circle, where the winter darkness and need for safe clear lighting for reading and working in, increase as one moves north.

But it was in the United Kingdom of 31 years ago that I bought a jug for my rooms at college in Cambridge, and opened the box to find there was no plug. That was the result of the UK's

regulatory compromises. The new wave of EU regulatory standardisation removed such strange pitfalls for the consumer. I could go on and on with a list of UK regulations that make the silliest EU counterparts look like "sourires de raison".

If the Brexiteers intended to assert British identity, they have sadly only subverted it. The British have been assuring other nations for a long time now, that they are a :-

- 1/ fair-minded people
- 2/ polite people
- 3/ good-humoured people, who can take a joke at their expense
- 4/ a pragmatic people
- 5/ a nation built on compromise and reasoned discussion
- 6/ an exemplar of liberal values

They had better recover themselves now. "Compose yourself!" as Victorian Britons exhorted one another.

All of that is smouldering and burning political ecosystem right now, and toasted. Michael Gove has stated that government will nonetheless proceed along "the lines of tradition" while Boris Johnson has made emollient comments about the Union. It is as if they regard the campaign violence, the personal abuse and damage done to public reason as just street theatre. But Mr Cameron is still calling for people to calm down and cease xenophobic abuse and violence. The Brexiteer realpolitik has only added to the current market uncertainty. Not many foreigners understand the English cultural practices of a "Skimmington Ride" or "Rough Music".

The shame is that the campaign was not more legitimising of a new British order. The campaign was a failure of civility in a polity, that is discerned by its leading political scientists to have a low degree of civicism. I have the authority of David Miller of Nuffield College for this observation, among others. New Zealand is a polity of high civicism as is Canada.

The media was largely a pro-Brexit shredding machine. Grub Street went to war with the technocrats, experts and political elites. I was experiencing Wellington gale of propaganda up until moments before the assassination. It simply impossible for the seagulls and albatrosses of Reason to take flight, let alone Hegel's Owls of Minerva. An outdated and struggling media model killed the best analysis from the best analytical tools. This was a CP Snow "Two Cultures" War, an Isaiah Berlin battle between the Counterenlightenment and the Enlightenment. Unfortunately darkness won and the fog has rolled back in.

Let us try however and enter the Brexit-voting population's more reasonable mindset however. The English feel great loss, in moving on from the Westphalian nation state, into the EU. The British state did not catastrophically fail, as Spain did over 1936-39, as France fell in 1940, and with Vichy, as Germany did with Hitler and Italy did with Fascism, as Austria did, as Salazarist Portugal did, as Greece of the Colonels had, as the Irish did with a clerical state. The nativist thinking is that, although these states failed down the line, and perhaps required post-sovereignty solutions, why should the UK be consigned to permanent intergovernment with the sinbin or Purgatory of history?

Yet it would be wrong to attribute the successful Leave vote to any British exceptionalism. The entire continent is convulsed. The British are no more unreasonable than any other people. French, German and Italian anti-immigration ferment is at a peak as well. Marine Le Pen, the Alternative fuer Deutschland, Pegida and the Five Star Movement are challenging the late 20th century consensus in France, Germany and Italy. In none of these countries however, is an ancient nation hatching, such as England has.

A good many successful intelligent qualified asset-owning people in Britain have been denied a particular relationship with Europe, as a second homeland, and as their domestic market, so that others might have "this, England" which has to be entirely reinvented.

England has been unknown to the International Relations system since 1707. It is a country known to poetry, historical dramas, and known to FIFA. Football is admittedly a form of poetics.

This is curious. We know it is wished for. We understand why it is yearned after. But why was Europe not yearned after as well, and why has the association with Europe been simply utilitarian and not affective? Why did nothing come of Krzysztof Kieslowski's "Three Colours" trilogy?

Europe was an answer to the H-bomb word - "Hitler". "England" is the answer to "Hitler". It was England, and England alone that fought the forces of darkness, - forgetting Scotland Wales and the old Dominions and India and volunteers from the Empire elsewhere.

But Europe was also an answer to the USSR. NATO is not enough. How are England and Wales, this flightless blind unfeathered chick of a Britannia, an answer to Russia, as the EU reasonably was, - and what now is the Trans-Atlantic relationship, which President Obama affirmed, after the vote, when since Dean Acheson and George W. Ball in April 1961, American policy has desired the UK to be in Europe?

Europe is a high culture concept. It is arguably the only major civilization that is just a high culture "Lothlorien" project. The folkways and cultures of being Chinese are in a continuum with the classical civilization and thought of China. Islam is an integralist religion, connecting society, culture and reason, as is Judaism. Latin America – "the Civilization of Joy", is a street culture and culture of the household and friends that has creative high culture dimensions. Russia has the Orthodox Church and folkways of being Russian that are connected with what the intelligentsia has produced. India has vernacular and sublime ways of enacting South Asian identities. India is the Music of the Night, as Tagore remarked and everyone there inhabits the Indian night.

But Europe is Mozart, Europe is Dante, Europe is Descartes, it is the summary achievement of a "Europe des patries", in which there are only nation state ways of attaining collective identity. There is no European Demos, such as EU reformers propose to encourage, because there are no cultural practices -apart from the Eurovision Song Contest, that bring people together without the contestation and police deployment that Football brings about. Resorts and Costas are perhaps the only places where Europeans may share space and even then language and culture segregates them. Since Roman times, Europe has been a project of contestation. Our Pakeha experiences of imperium have been very different from those of Han China, Mauryan and Gupta India, and the Ummayad and Abbasid Caliphates.

Brendan Simms has done the most to intellectually and ethically expose what separation from the EU would require of the UK ( or its majority successor state). Daniel Hannan the MEP for the South East was brought up in Peru by Ulster Catholic and Protestant parents. His Brexit book was the very best and most candid of the Brexiteer publications. He is fluent in French and Spanish. He might provide a sensitive pair of hands in Ireland. Because he preserved his honour and integrity scrupulously during the campaign, he is now able to tell the truth that others would not avow.

Britain's previous superpolity experience is based on subsidiarity and correspondence and review towards its subordinates – whether the American colonies of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, or “us” the responsible government colonies and dominions of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. None of that has been the case with polities from Eastern Europe which present marked asymmetries in economics, GDP and in quality of institutions. The EU is a “ Europe des patries” with a supra-government alongside an intergovernment. And that intergovernment is of, and by, and with, all 28. The late Empire however was a solar system. The White dominions and their indigenous moons were in the habitable zone while the gas giants of Asia and Africa were farther away.

Brexit did not begin on 23 June. The latest sequence began in February. Nigel Lawson developed it in the 1990s. The Archimagus was Enoch Powell. It is a movement as old as the UK's entry process into the EU.

The Cold War settlement altered what the British public had voted for in the referendum of 1975 by the margin of 63%. The Rome Club of developed European nations included only Ireland and the south of Italy, as markedly underdeveloped regions. The 2004 accessions included Eastern European nations, recently members of Comecon.

These nations have been unable to generate the economic settlements that Spain and Portugal and Greece did before the Crash. The immediate aftermath of Dr Salazar, Franco and of the Colonels was a generous social settlement. No such settlement has been possible in these polities haunted by an extreme conservatism and nationalism, and by declining demography.

The Deputy Council Leader of Boston, Lincolnshire, complained that the EU should've helped with the immigration flows into East Anglia. He was thereby referring to the budget constraints after 2008 and to the added migratory pressure. But Wales and Cornwall received huge amounts of Brussels funding and voted for Brexit at same rates that England did.

The electorate shot down Laputa, then. In Jonathan Swift's " Gulliver's Travels", the subjects of the Laputan flying island of philosopher kings try to draw down the island and make it crash by means of magnets. That is what Brexit has done. The electorate wanted to show their power, and their grievance was immigration.

The Brexiteers are sons and daughters of the Counter-Enlightenment that Isaiah Berlin exposed, and which Enoch Powell represented. Reason, like government, in this view, is limited, and cannot do as much it pretends to. The EU officials and EU-committed European leaders, are sons and daughters of 1789, of the totalising Reason promulgated by the French

Revolution. It is not that these current more intellectual Brexiteers are anti-rational. Their reason and conversely their unreason are limited. In that lies hope.

Humpty Dumpty has fallen off the wall. The Queen's horses and Queen's men might not be able to put it together again. On the other hand they might cobble something together, but this time, the British will face costs and penalties and risks from the process. The nation that lectured the developing nations on transparency and democracy, has become opaque. A curate's egg of possibilities and impossibilities.

The future of the British Isles, if ever, or whatever successor states form from it, is WITH Europe and proactively IN NATO, regardless of whether the UK is IN Europe.

An Immigration deal of some kind has to be struck, despite the deplorable nativism shown in the campaign by UKIPers and Tory Brexiteers alike. English is the second language of most people in developing countries inside and out of Europe. Many immigrants are therefore not going to resort to France, Germany and Italy as they would the UK.

The UK has taken on a disproportionate burden of the problems of Poland. Polish immigrants are industrious and hardworking and I am astounded at the conspiracy of silence in relation to them. There is a prejudice only whispered, by people wittering away. But it is obviously difficult living in a "Christ Nation", that still has two million people engaged in farming -when there were only seven million farmers in all the rest of the EU in 2004. Despite the considerable benefits they bring to the UK and global economy, their inadvertent effect is to break up native white communities that feel in danger of dissolution. Often the more native British communities regardless of ethnicity, come under such pressure, the more they reinforce their own group identifiers. Rejected and disrespected in a class-riven society, one has to be superior to someone, and the nativist does this by legitimising their time out of mind identity.

The Prussia that Brendan Simms uses as a metaphor, comes to mind as I read that British authorities are investigating options to federate the United Kingdom, while allowing the constituent nations of Scotland and Northern Ireland to remain in the UK. I stress that this is only being investigated. Legal scholars are examining the precedents for Greenland and the former DDR, to see whether sovereign states may attain that plasticity. The Germans are displeased, even though they were allowed leverage in 1990, to include the DDR in Europe, yet it is admittedly the reverse situation, of withdrawal and partial retention that is being investigated with respect to the four nations.

Prussia is a most illuminating metaphor. Simms regards Britain as the Prussia of Europe. He was disappointed that Tony Blair was not the Bismarck of that Europe. He sees a new opportunity now. Prussia is interesting because:-

1/ Prussia is dead. It was killed off in 1947 for obvious reasons. England is dead too. It has been unknown in the International Relations system since 1707.

2/ Prussia was a composite territory, like the United Kingdom. It consisted of several states and territories, of several ethnicities and languages and religions with different legal systems.

3/ Prussia was both in and out of that vast European project known as the Holy Roman Empire. The Emperor in Vienna permitted the Elector of Brandenburg to assume the title King IN Prussia. Friedrich I however made sure he was crowned outside of the Empire's sovereign borders, in Koenigsberg, the modern Kaliningrad, in what was then East Prussia, is now the Kaliningrad pocket. The French Minister of the Economy, Emmanuel Macron warned of the Guernseyfication of the UK. He was referring to the status of the Isle of Man and of the Channel Island outside of the EU, under their own governments. What is being explored right now are ways to be both this and that, is discrete territories, like the Prussia of yore.

4/ Prussia regarded its people to be commandeered and deployed as resources for the State and Economy, and when one reads of Lord Freud referring to the British public as "stock", and read UK labour market reform policy documents, one wonders.....

5/ Prussia has had a bad press but historians like Christopher Clark have rightly rehabilitated it as a polity of reasoning liberal conscientious elites. It was one of the classic Enlightenment polities. It was therefore a rational state, regarded as an exemplar by the philosopher Hegel, - if by fits and starts.

This resembles the UK- where the long tradition of Conservatism renounces and condemns totalitarian reason, suspects anyone who or anything that know too much, and yet the British ruling elites to this day think nothing of biting off huge issues and executing massive paradigm shifts – at the rate of one every political generation since WWI. They went off Gold in 1916, went back on it, led by Churchill in a "Boris" moment in 1925, went off it again in 1931, they went off Free Trade, locked in Protectionism, and then blew out the Boy Scout Camp Fire of the Commonwealth in the 1960s, and stamped on the embers, with consequences that stupidly affect residency rights for the OECD "War" Commonwealth to this day.

Prussia and the UK have been progressive and reactionary by fits and starts, - that is their cyclicity of governance reason if you like.

6/ the Staatsraison of Prussia was, and British policy remains, governed by prudence and interest. Political Economy drove that prudence. Prussia had the most advanced monetary system in Germany from the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The UK currently has the following tasks:-

1/ to activate a Lisbon Treaty Article 50 notice. The timing of that is up to them. If the children of the night do howl, out in the Euro darkness, I think they are mistaken. A creative solution, which could benefit everyone, might come of this if the British are not rushed. If it's not activated, no one will act on it and informal negotiations are ruled out. Yet once the UK activates it, it is at a disadvantage.

2/ to negotiate terms of reengagement with Europe.

3/ to fill the legislative void. That legislative void comes into effect two years after activating notice. Festina lente, hasten slowly, might be the best way.

4/ to negotiate FTAs with extra-European partners.

5/ to sort out relations with two constituent nations that voted to remain, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

6/ to perhaps reconfigure and redispense a federal UK, or Home Rule Union UK, in such a way, that it might be both in and out the EU, and create the internal governance systems to afford efficiency consistency, transferability along an internal border with a supranational government. That is, if the EU will allow this, and it might take the intervention of proactive and imaginative US leadership, after the presidential elections, to bring that understanding about “on the Matter of Britain”.

All of this will demand an elite project. The vote was impelled by anti-elite rage. All of this will demand the assistance and wisdom of the Gove-derived experts and technocrats. Leave will require the help of Remain. Leave will only be operationalised on terms that Remain allows.

All of this might require a dedicated government like a wartime government, a “National Government” as they used to be termed. That would limit the Brexiteer seats at Cabinet. It might though secure a settlement that most could live with. There is also the precedent of the Imperial War Cabinet system. A parallel cabinet might be an entity that could be coordinated through Cabinet Office. They would need the best of the “experts” and much despised elites.

In quick time, it will be revealed how right Mr Cameron has been, and how wrong Brexiteers and Bruxellois/Brusseleers alike have been. The current row in the Conservative Party is perhaps an attempt to contain the Brexiteers. Already the wheels are falling off the Brexit campaign bus, as leading Brexiteers variously backtrack, and their positions on NHS financing, Immigration and on Turkey are exposed as impositions on public credulity. The admissions are coming thick and fast and so are the bare-faced denials.

I predict a stitch-up. There are Britons for whom Winston Churchill is the teddy bear in the night. There are those politicians who are “Kagemusha” politicians, impersonating the teddy bear. But Teddy will leak or else it will be stitched up. That is probably what the current Conservative row is about. Second rank Brexiteers are of more interest- people of great ability and promise like Penny Mordaunt and Daniel Hannan.

Europe then will not dissolve into Ruritania. The Eurasian powers want a Europe of Neuschwanstein, of the ineffectual Glassbead Game, and of Venice as the tourist terminus for OBOR. People bring their own demons and their own angels to the European project. It is wrong to attribute unique blame.

As an aside- if the UK did inventively apportion itself like Prussia, across the marcherlands of Europe, what is there to stop all of Ruritania or Syldavia from pouring into a UK federated Scotland, and then flowing into England? Suppose Scotland retains the current arrangement and doesn't go into Schengen? If it is lucky it might retain successor state rights. If it is less lucky, then it will have to join just as other countries must and accept Schengen. It would be a nuisance for Scots and Englanders to live with a land border that hasn't been seen since Rome.

Here is my Irish passport. It expired. The Irish just can't process it in time for me to commute between the UK and NZ. Heathrow Customs will simply have to let me in as they did a few weeks ago on this passport, back into a country where I have indefinite leave to remain, pay taxes, and have a British family. It is expected that the Republic of Ireland passport services will

now be inundated by Britons descended from any resident of the Irish Free State as of September 1922.

No better illustration can I offer of how young people in particular have been deprived of a second European homeland and of an extended domestic market of 500 million? So that a bare majority of others might have “this England”, of Shakespeare’s “Richard II” Act II, this Narnia, and nothing else. This passport is all that stands at the moment between my children being stranded on “Airstrip One”, and having all the liberty of Europe.

The answer to this internal UK “domino” problem might be the development of internal firewalls. The Isle of Man makes residency difficult in all sorts of local authority ways. Certain prohibitions would be legal in a Brexited England whether or not the UK exists. Canada has migrant quotas for provinces. Such a subsidiary England government might have the powers to apportion migrants among regions. This will do little to solve tensions because migrants have done a good job of discovering regions where they might compete with the locals for cheaper housing stock.

And then there is the obvious difficulty of whether Europe and all 27 other states will allow the major portion of a power to exclude itself from the EU while dipping its toes otherwise. It would just take a single veto, to spite Scotland and both Irelands, to ruin it all.

So what should New Zealand do?

1/ New Zealand should recover its affection for the UK in its present trouble. We would be helpful to friends and support responsible British leaders, in international arenas, as they try to figure out the riddle of the public’s instruction to them. We are best served at Westminster and Whitehall by our compassion and concern, rather than by reproving them. We joined them in war when they were previously imperilled, as they upheld the International Order.

We are a bigger-hearted people, we New Zealanders, than what was done to us in the 1960s and 70s, when old allies, that had fully mobilised and assumed public debts for war, were just dumped. Let us recover our love for them again at this hard time;[- on this occasion as a mature and independent nation, not a daughter or a colony. Our Prime Minister, Bill Massey, remarked at Versailles in 1919, that New Zealand made the contribution it did to WWI, for the sake of “Civilisation”. We are back in that kind of situation again. Let’s draw on most generous emotions and see what happens. We have always been Androcles to the Lion, one of the mice that nibbled at the bonds of Aslan.

2/ Let us rebrand ourselves in the post-Brexit vote UK. Much of what works for us in PR doesn’t work for them. We should work with London-based PR companies and work to a new script.

3/ Let us regain our residency rights by war and by descent to the UK. The New Zealanders who fought, and nursed and practiced war medicine, for the British Empire had Schengen rights in the UK. We are not asking for those back now- but for an improvement. The Brexiteer Minister of Immigration Rt Hon James Brokenshire is perhaps the current greatest impediment to the revival of an inner track OECD, despite the Brexiteer professions of affection to reconnect with Canada, Australia and New Zealand. It was under him that the income floor was imposed on New Zealand residents. A Commonwealth grouping of the kind proposed could be considered so long as it was not univocal and recolonising.

4/ we should offer ourselves as efficient tidy FTA partners if they do give an Article 50 notice under the Lisbon Treaty. We are adepts at the WTO. An FTA with New Zealand would be exemplary of its kind. We have great legitimacy. We would help ratify a state of affairs. We need to do our homework now and build up our contacts in the whispering gallery. Would our FTA follow on from the UK's adoption as a post-EU successor state to the current NZ-EU Free Trade negotiations, or would it be snakes and ladders? Would we be relegated? Those who say we would be at the bottom of the pile, are those who have little faith in what the UK and NZ might do, and could lack the skills for such engagements.

5/ let us also support the EU at this time, and keep investing in our FTA with them, which will continue regardless. Our trade with Europe and from European bases can only grow, and the security of Europe is our security too. Europe should be able to sort itself out. Let's keep our two scripts- the EU and UK well coordinated, so we don't get caught between the powers.

President Woodrow Wilson's Buckingham Palace after dinner speech comments have been the ultimate cold shower of pragmatism in the International arena. No- we are not your Anglo-Saxon cousins - he told British statesmen. We are rather two nations connected by common interests.

We New Zealanders are arch-pragmatists at this but we also have strong affective bonds towards the UK, despite the rebuffs. It is my hope that these are deployed at this time.