

Leaving the EU is safe; remaining in isn't!

'I really want to leave the EU, but with so many warnings about the dangers, I'm really scared'

Apart from Boris's boisterous optimism, little is being reported in the media to refute Mr Cameron's Project Fear and the subliminal message that we are all useless. Also, when European Union (EU)-fanatics sing the praises of perhaps the biggest scam on earth, little is said to show that we can do much better without even trying. Again, we hear a few meek statements along the lines of "we used to manage our affairs before the control-freaks from Brussels arrived" or "we've got ingenuity" but that is all. Sadly Leave Campaign leaders appear unaware of any systematic way of proving what we all intuitively realise, that (1) there are no significant risks in leaving the failing EU and (2) if the EU appears to do anything 'good', we can do much better.

This country is the world leader in risk management – ahead of America and light years ahead of the vacuous, clueless leaders and bureaucrats of the EU. If they knew the basics, they wouldn't be repeatedly making disastrous mistakes like, the Euro, debt mountains, stalling competitiveness, and runaway migration which impacts on the most vulnerable in society. Risk, including the likelihood of occurrence and severity of undesirable consequences, can be managed very successfully. Otherwise electricity would be too dangerous to use, air travel wouldn't get off the ground, money couldn't be invested and major projects, such as Crossrail's tunnelling under London, would peter out unfinished.

The inherent problems which the EU suffers trying to get its policies right and fine-tuned cannot be cured. One size does not fit all (28 divergent states or former countries), and the

considerable hierarchical and physical distance between them and us means they can only guess what might work, drawing on their Dreamworld ideology of an EU Superstate. By comparison, the SAS (living in the real and dangerous world with serious jobs to do) delegates authority down to the lowest level, nearest the action. And we often know from our personal experiences what havoc distant, out of touch management can create, whereas being close to the action delivers faster moving, better decisions and ultimately, results.

Moving major decisions outside the nation state, with its homogeneity, transparency and democratic accountability, is intrinsically risky. The worst effects of the EU's many mistakes fall especially hard on ordinary hard working people and the most vulnerable. Yet Mr Cameron and EU-fanatics appear not to understand this. Or they are cavalier in ignoring the obvious? Restoring national policymaking or even localising it further will deliver better results. Not surprisingly the trade deals negotiated by small, independent countries, such as Switzerland, are more numerous and better than the EU's efforts. There is also a theory, based on the study of many successful innovations from the dawn of civilisation which can predict this, and can be used to repeatedly improve results. There is no 'leap into the dark' by leaving the centralised bureaucratic corporatist EU, just a leap into a far less risky, better performing and democratic situation.

We can do better still, taking any risk out of the transition period in leaving the EU. This comes about by managing the processes involved using best practice, arising from current knowledge and invention. Process management for low risk is something the EU is, again, very poor at and Mr Cameron does not appear to know much, if anything, about either. The starting place is to use normal risk management tools, which these days are well refined. We can go further still and build in ways of adapting and self-learning to ensure that anything that hasn't been thought of in the beginning can be suitably

dealt with. This gives the lie to the claim that the EU will not co-operate; it can be made very much in their interests to negotiate a WIN-WIN divorce.

This brief overview cannot go into the details of risk management, process management, collaboration management and low risk innovation. However, the more you drill down into the detail, the more obvious it becomes that we are being deceived. The high risk option is to stay bogged down in the EU-quagmire. The low risk alternative is to leave and thus create a sound basis for our future progress as a nation.

Every example of Project Fear only reinforces the impression that our EU-loving ruling establishment cannot manage risk effectively in its various forms. We, as an independent country, can do much better and achieve vastly improved overall results. Messrs Cameron and Corbyn and your distant EU-overlords, Mr Juncker and (and his boss) Mrs Merkel, please explain honestly to us why we can't?