



The Graphs that Demolish Remain



Notice how Remain never use graphs? Well here are some of our favorites!


This is a graph of Britain's GDP from 1957 to 2015 which shows that Britain's GDP constantly increased before we joined the EU and consistently declined afterwards. In the 40 years since we joined the EU, GDP more than halved.



Here is a graph showing how Britain had relatively balanced trade (equal imports and exports) for 40 years from 1946 onwards. But then in 1986 Margret Thatcher signed the Single European Act and our exports collapsed. As we became increasingly integrated within the EU our exports declined more and more. Coincidence or correlation?



Next, Remain predicted a vote to leave would cause a Brex-pocalypse, but this is what actually *happened*. Here is the FTSE 250. We can see the blip on June 23rd 2016 but look what happens next! Brex-geddon is always just around the corner for the Remainiacs...



The next two graphs show how leaving the Single Market will make us richer. The first one shows the long term decline of global tariffs...and the second one shows our EU membership contributions going up and up.

There is no such thing as free trade with the EU, we either:
A, pay a membership fee and no tariffs, or...
B, pay tariffs and no membership fee.

Why would we want to pay membership fees that are going up and up, when we could pay tariffs that are going down and down? Clearly paying tariffs will make us richer.

And finally, before the referendum Remain said a vote to leave would cause half a million job losses (who does their forecasting? Nostradamus?) Well this graph shows the reality. Unemployment is plummeting back to the 3.7% it was at when we joined the EU.

The 3 Empirical Examples - The Classic Brexit Argument.

1, Look at India, the USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, Norway, Iceland, Greenland and Switzerland. The success stories are independent democracies, because where they have problems they can vote for new laws to fix them. It's a good system, indeed across the world and throughout history no political system works better and fails less than self-rule.

2, Now compare those nations with the Eurozone. Eurozone member states have no control over the neoliberal free movement of capital, labor, goods and services so they can't design their own futures. Consequently they tend to have double the unemployment and half the GDP of the countries in Example 1. They are in demographic, economic and cultural decline and appear to be fighting theocratic insurrections. They have great pasts but bleak futures because they adopted a political system that insulates power from democracy.

3, Let's contrast Britain in the 40 years before and after joining the EU. In the 40 years *before* we joined, Britain confronted fascism, set up the NHS and Welfare State, rebuilt our cities with social housing, set up the Green Belt, passed the Clean Air Act, the Race Relations Act and the Equal Pay Act, decriminalised homosexuality and abolished the death penalty. *That's* reform. But in the 40 years *after* we joined GDP halved, pollution, debt, unemployment, terrorism and inequality all increased. Our NHS, manufacturing sector, countryside, high streets, coastal towns, fishing industry and armed forces all declined. Wages stagnated. Workers rights were dismantled. Education was monetised. Free speech became reclassified as hate speech. Banks were deregulated and bailed out when they failed. We went from being a liberal society to being a *neoliberal* society. That's not all the fault of the EU but it *is* the fault of us failing to democratically govern ourselves.

Surely we can all agree that a good system of government is one where the most people have the most scrutiny over the most power? Well clearly Britain's pre '73 system did that better than our post '73 system. And Example 1 countries do it better than Example 2 countries. These 3 examples represent a pattern not a coincidence: When the people tell the government what to do there is progress. When the government tell the people what to do there is decline.

EU Supporters Always Argue Using Unfalsifiable Pseudoscience.

No facts substantiate the opinion that Britain would be worse off as an independent democracy, because no external body could give us better laws than we could write for ourselves. That's why, instead of making a positive case for EU membership Remain relied entirely on character assassinations and predictions, which are unfalsifiable.

Firstly go onto YouTube and watch '*Science as Falsification by Karl Popper*'. It's a terrific 17 minute essay that explains this issue, but in a nutshell, an argument is unfalsifiable if any fact can be used to support it but no fact can disprove it. For example, if I say the economy is going to crash but it gets stronger, I can claim that it's a bubble and that I am therefore vindicated. But if the economy declines I can say that the crash has already begun so I am *still* vindicated. It's win/win! Similarly accusations of thought crimes are impossible to falsify as any odd behavior can be assumed to indicate depravity, whilst good behavior can be dismissed as a charade.

Naturally it's tempting to make unfalsifiable arguments because they can't be disproved, but ultimately unfalsifiability is pseudoscience - a theory that can't be tested is just conjecture. Worse still, unfalsifiable arguments allow people to project all sorts of hysterical nightmares on what is unknown and unknowable. Here are the main Remain arguments:
-Vote Remain or there will be a war.
-Vote Remain or there will be a recession.
-Vote Remain or you will lose your job.
-Vote Remain or Boris will be PM.
-Vote Remain or you are racist.
-Vote Remain or we will lose influence.
-Vote Remain because it's the enlightened thing to do.
All these Remain arguments were either guesses about the future, or opinions about people's character. No observable test could prove any of them to be false. They were *all* unfalsifiable. Similarly '*We are worse off than if we had stayed*' is a fallacy as it attempts to compare what can be observed with what can only be speculated about.

Brexit propaganda may have been amateurish and badly spelt but generally it was observational, any lay person could check it for themselves on Wikipedia, Remain's was deliberately uncheckable. They asked us to take their forecasting models on trust, we didn't, and sure enough none of their lurid predictions came to pass. They had been making it up all along. Generally, Leave said '*look*' - Remain said '*listen*'.