

<https://englandcalling.wordpress.com/2018/07/21/call-those-who-would-overthrow-brexit-by-their-true-name-traitor/>

## **Call those who would overthrow Brexit by their true name: traitor**

Posted on [July 21, 2018](#) by [Robert Henderson](#)

Robert Henderson

**Traitor**: *noun. One who is false to his allegiances or acts disloyally to country, king, cause, religion or principles (Oxford Concise Dictionary)*

The attempted sell-out of Brexit by Theresa May as laid down in [the white paper](#) entitled *The United Kingdom's exit from and new partnership with the European Union* should surprise no one. We have a remainder PM, a remainder dominated Cabinet; a remainder dominated government; a remainder dominated Tory Parliamentary Party and a remainder dominated Parliament. These politicians are widely supported by Europhile in the senior ranks of the civil service, academics and mainstream media folk.

### **Theresa May: an incompetent or a saboteur?**

Many commentators are ascribing to incompetence the seeming shambles May is presiding over. This is much less plausible than the alternative explanation, namely, that May is a steadfast remainder and is deliberately trying to sabotage Brexit from within.

This latter interpretation was plausible even before the Chequers proposals were made public. Since May came to office she has ensured that her Cabinet has been very heavily dominated by remainers in a ratio of around two thirds remainder to one third Brexiteer. – There is little difference between her [original Cabinet](#) and the [present one](#). If May had been really intent on delivering Brexit the balance would have been at least reversed.

To her Cabinet favouritism can be added the fact that May has capitulated at every point over both the shape of the negotiation with the EU and specific issues, most notably her proposal that the EU be paid [£39 billion](#) (and probably more because the EU has not agreed to anything) by the UK for the privilege of leaving the EU and her proposal that [3 million or more citizens of remaining EU states](#) should be given full residency rights if the EU reciprocates for the one million UK citizens living in other EU states. (This would make UK the big loser in the transaction, both from the difference in numbers, but also because the level of government provision in areas such as welfare, health and education varies considerably within the remaining 27 EU members, most of whom have government provision which is much inferior to that available in the UK (EU states are only obligated to treat incomers from other EU states as they do their own people and the EU will almost certainly insist this rule remains for those qualifying for residency in either the UK and the EU after Brexit).

Further evidence of May's treachery comes from [ministers](#) involved with the Brexit negotiations who have resigned. [David Davis](#) (who resigned as Brexit Secretary) has accused May of making *'concessions to the EU that were so fundamental they risked undermining the whole Brexit process*. [Steve Baker](#) (who resigned as a Brexit Minister) went so far as to

accuse the PM of having conducted a campaign to thwart Brexit with the aid of other remainder politicians and civil servants.

Boris Johnson in his [resignation letter](#) to Mrs May wrote:

*“It is more than two years since the British people voted to leave the European Union on an unambiguous and categorical promise that if they did so they would be taking back control of their democracy.*

*They were told that they would be able to manage their own immigration policy, repatriate the sums of UK cash currently spent by the EU, and, above all, that they would be able to pass laws independently and in the interests of the people of this country.*

*Brexit should be about opportunity and hope. It should be a chance to do things differently, to be more nimble and dynamic, and to maximise the particular advantages of the UK as an open, outward-looking global economy.*

*That dream is dying, suffocated by needless self-doubt.”*

In his [resignation speech](#) in the House of Commons Johnson reinforced his opposition to May’s proposals, by succinctly detailing some of the major restrictions on sovereignty which those proposals entail, viz:

*“We are volunteering for economic vassalage, not just in goods and agri-foods but we will be forced to match EU arrangements on the environment and social affairs and much else besides. Of course we all want high standards but it is hard to see how the Conservative government of the 1980s could have done its vital supply side reforms with those freedoms taken away. And the result of accepting the EU’s rulebooks and of our proposals for a fantastical Heath Robinson customs arrangement is that we have much less scope to do free trade deals as the Chequers paper actually acknowledges and which we should all frankly acknowledge. Because otherwise, if we pretend otherwise, we continue to make the fatal mistake of underestimating the intelligence of the public, saying one thing to the EU about what we are doing, and then saying another thing to the electorate. And given that in important ways, this is Bino or Brino – or Brexit in name only – I am, of course, unable to accept it or support it, as I said in the Cabinet session at Chequers, and I am happy now to speak out against it and be able to do so. Mr Speaker, it is not too late to save Brexit, we have time in these negotiations.”*

To all this can be added the widespread condemnation of her White Paper proposals from Brexiteers from backbenchers across the party divide in Parliament, for example, [Gisela Stuart](#) (Labour) who described what May is offering as a “*phantom Brexit*”, and [Jacob Rees-Mogg](#) (Tory) who ventured that it represented a “*very unfortunate U-Turn*”.

There is one further reason to believe that May is deliberately sabotaging Brexit. That is her demeanour. Despite enduring what on the face of it an intensely stressful extended period of political activity May gives no sign of being stressed. Indeed, in her photographs and on video either in the Commons or outside she gives the impression of being not merely relaxed but positively buoyed by the way things are going. That is exactly the behaviour that would be expected of someone achieving their ends by deceit. May’s frequent smiles have the coy triumphal quality of someone who is executing a Machiavellian plan successfully. Nor is

there any sign of her wavering for this very day (20 July) the Tory supporting Daily [Telegraph reports](#) that May is preparing to “go down fighting” in her attempt to stand by her Chequers proposals.

### **Treason and the irreconcilable remainers**

In a democracy the greatest treason is to betray the democratic Will when that Will has been shown in its most direct and unambiguous way through a referendum open to the entire electorate. That is no more than the statement of an objective truth, for the closer the electorate are to decision making the more elemental the democratic action. An intense desire for such a betrayal has been shown by many remainers following the EU referendum.

The liberal internationalists have been very successful over the past few decades in marginalising the crime of treason. Such people adhere to the idea that nations are at best outmoded forms of human social organisation and at worst positively dangerous as repositories of atavistic violence. In the mind of liberal the internationalist treason does not exist, at least in the form in which has been known throughout history. (What would constitute treason for the liberal internationalist – although they would not give it that name – would be to fail to subscribe to and support uncritically liberal internationalist values and policies, in short, any refusal to accept political correctness.)

But however successful the liberal internationalists have been in devaluing the idea of treason the crime still exists regardless of whether there is a formal law to punish it.

The reason is simple; treason is an eternal crime because it goes to the heart of human nature. It is betrayal and every normal human being can recognise it for what it is and understand instinctively that it is the most dangerous of behaviours because it threatens not just the individual but the entirety of a society.

### **What constitutes treason in a Remainer?**

**The attempt to overturn Brexit entirely or the attempt to engineer a faux Brexit, which is Brexit in name only.**

It is legitimate for a remainer to be disappointed after losing the referendum and to say so publicly. It is legitimate for the remainer to publicly lament the result. It is legitimate for the remainer to point out what they see as the ill consequences of Brexit. But it is not legitimate for remainers to attempt to overthrow the referendum result. That is precisely what many remainers with power and influence are trying to do, either directly or by subterfuge.

### **The remainer BIG LIES**

In the course of their betrayal remainers have developed a number of big, shameless and very obvious lies which they repeat incessantly in the hope that their repetition will give them a trashy sheen of meaning in the way that tinsel masquerades as silver at Christmas.

#### **1. 1. “We are giving power back to Parliament “**

Parliament gave up their right to decide what Brexit would be when both Lords and Commons passed the [EU Referendum Bill](#) into law. (The Commons voted for the Bill [544-53](#) at the Second Reading).

2. *Those who voted leave did not understand what was involved*

The [referendum question](#) was unambiguous and simple to understand: ***“Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?”***

Leaving any sort of organised group means precisely that, leaving. If you resign from a political party or a private group such as a golf club you cease to have any obligations towards or receive any benefits attached to membership of the group from which you are resigning. Leave does indeed mean leave.

3. *“The referendum was only advisory”*

Remainers claim that the EU referendum was only advisory because there was no specific clause in the Act stipulating that it was either advisory or binding. This is irrelevant because it could equally be argued that the absence of such a clause meant that it was not merely advisory because the UK does not have any general law determining the status of referenda.

More directly damning for the “advisory” claim are the various unambiguous statements made by politicians prior to the referendum.

The Conservative [General Election Manifesto](#) of 2015 Page 72 said this about the referendum: ***“We believe in letting the people decide: so we will hold an in-out referendum on our membership of the EU before the end of 2017.....David Cameron has committed that he will only lead a government that offers an in-out referendum. We will hold that in-out referendum before the end of 2017 and respect the outcome.***

And

In opening the second reading debate on the European Union Referendum Bill on 9 June 2015, the [Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond](#) said ***“This is a simple, but vital, piece of legislation. It has one clear purpose: to deliver on our promise to give the British people the final say on our EU membership in an in/out referendum by the end of 2017.”***

And

***“Few subjects ignite as much passion in the House or indeed in the country as our membership of the European Union. The debate in the run-up to the referendum will be hard fought on both sides of the argument. But whether we favour Britain being in or out, we surely should all be able to agree on the simple principle that the decision about our membership should be taken by the British people, not by Whitehall bureaucrats, certainly not by Brussels Eurocrats; not even by Government Ministers or parliamentarians in this Chamber. The decision must be for the common sense of the British people. That is what we pledged, and that is what we have a mandate to deliver. For too long, the people of Britain have been denied their say. For too long, powers have been handed to Brussels over their heads. For too long, their voice on Europe has not been heard. This Bill puts that right. It delivers the simple in/out referendum that we promised, and I commend it to the House.”***

David Cameron when PM also made the position clear. Asked if holding a referendum was a cast-iron pledge, [Cameron said](#): ***“Absolutely. We will hold that referendum by the end of 2017; it will be a referendum on an in-out basis – do we stay in a reformed European Union or do we leave? And I’ve said very clearly that whatever the outcome of the next***

*general election – and of course I want an overall majority and I’m hoping and believing I can win an overall majority – but people should be in no doubt that I will not become prime minister unless I can guarantee that we can hold that referendum.”*

In their [2010 election manifesto](#), the Lib Dems called for a national vote on Britain’s EU membership if and when there is a fundamental change in our relationship with the EU. Here is the LibDem pledge in full:

*“The European Union has evolved significantly since the last public vote on membership over thirty years ago. Liberal Democrats therefore remain committed to an in / out referendum the next time a British government signs up for fundamental change in the relationship between the UK and the EU.”*

This promise went far beyond the [European Union Act 2011](#) which only made provision for a referendum to be held on specific proposed changes to the EU. The LibDem manifesto offered an in/out referendum rather than just a referendum on whatever would be the fundamental change.

### **The moral corruption of the Big Lies**

Anyone who is not a remainer, whether or not they are fervent Brexiteers can see that the remainers are engaged in barefaced lying. Worse, even the most fanatical remainers will understand in some part of their mind that they are telling lies.

Barring perhaps thorough going psychopaths, everyone will know the pain and discomfort which telling lies brings. Repeating a lie often and being psychologically bolstered by others telling the same lie may lessen the discomfort and even create a shadowy feeling that in some sense the lie is true. But the pain and discomfort is never lost because the liar, however self-deluding, knows somewhere in their mind that what they are saying is false and that others will know it is false.

The consequence of telling lies about an issue as great as Brexit is to poison political discourse generally because the two sides of the argument become unreservedly polarised.

Human nature being what it is, it is simply impossible for those who are not telling the lies to view those who are with anything other than anger and contempt, while those who are telling the lies are driven ever more from a position of argument to one of simple denial in which the absence of argument is defended more and more with abuse.

That is a toxic situation which could do lasting harm to the UK’s political culture as it will destroy trust in our whole system of government and in the general exercise of political power.

### **The dangerous strength of the remainers position**

The remainers who continue to refuse to accept the verdict of the referendum are in a much stronger position than most leavers imagine. This is partly because both Houses of Parliament are remainer dominated and partly because Theresa May’s remainer dominated Cabinet is allowing her to systematically sabotage Brexit by her incontinent delaying tactics and her acceptance of what is as yet an indeterminate transition period.

The brutal truth is that if Parliament wishes to reject Brexit or to force through a Brexit in name only (Brino) it would have the power to do so because Parliament has a substantial majority of remainers.

The most potentially destructive of May's concessions to remainers is her promise that Parliament will have a "meaningful say" over the deal which May presents to Parliament. After much to-ing and fro-ing between Lords and Commons an agreement has been reached that the Speaker will rule at the time of the debate on whether any government motion relating to issue of Brexit can or cannot be amended. This might, for example, lead to amendments rejecting the deal, amendments sending the Government back to the EU with instructions to negotiate further or amendments forbidding the no-deal-trade-on-WTO-rules option.

It is true that the wording of Article 50 would suggest that the logical end of the two-year process without a deal with the EU would be for the UK simply to fall out of the EU. But there is also provision for the EU member states to agree (unanimously) that the negotiating period be extended indefinitely.

This would appeal to the irreconcilable remainers because apart from delay making the leaving process more and more etiolated, it would also give the remainers ample opportunity to keep pushing for either remaining in the EU or for a second referendum. Time is truly the remainers friend and the Brexiteers enemy

But there is a much simpler and comprehensive option for unscrupulous remainers to engineer. That is for May to produce a deal with the EU which is Brexit in name only. Because both Houses of Parliament are dominated by remainers Parliament could accept such a deal and legally speaking there would be no way of stopping its implementation.

Consequently, it is imperative that Leavers do not to imagine that the UK will inevitably leave the EU. Constant vigilance must be the leaver watchwords.

### **Treason and the irreconcilable remainers**

At the beginning of the post-referendum debate many leavers might have been willing to allow that remainers generally were honest in their beliefs which they held because of what they perceived to be in the national interest. No longer is such a view tenable when it comes to the irreconcilable remainers because of their naked attempts to overthrow Brexit.

If treason has any meaning today then those who are trying to overthrow Brexit are committing treason for they are effectively treating with the enemy in their attempt to thwart the referendum verdict. So let Brexiteers give such people their true name: traitor.

Thanks and Copyright to Robert Henderson