

Look who's talking!

A worthwhile article on rare.us gives us some insight into Brexit by asking "How could so many be furious over a female Doctor Who?". The answer is, they're not. The author says "I decided to go in search of this misogynistic outrage mob, only to find that it existed mostly in the imaginations of the people mocking it". This largely confirms what we already know. No-one really cares. This is the fuel of today's culture wars. Pre-emptive reaction to and satisfaction in the other's side's anticipated reaction.

This is interesting because it extends right across the issue spectrum. I've seen this exact dynamic mocking a cardboard cut-out Brexiteer who, as far as the wider populace is concerned, doesn't exist save for a few high profile loonies they coalesce around and elevate to the status of typical.

The dynamic creates a hyper self-congratulatory, smug and sanctimonious bubble, personified by Nick Cohen and Matthew Parris, spawning their own little bands of acolytes and fan boys on Twitter. Since other hacks lower down in the pecking order like to be in with the gang so as to appear clever, you get a groupthink unable to see outside the walls of its self-satisfaction. And then they wonder why they lost the referendum.

To a point it's all fair game in that you have the Leave.EU idiots but they speak only to a sub-sect of what was the Ukip vote – which at last polling was far less than 52%. Closer to 6% one suspects. Still, there is enough low hanging fruit to go after.

As much as anything, though, it betrays the intellectual dishonesty of the remain crowd in that there are perfectly well reasoned arguments for Brexit, encompassing issues where even the FT hacks dare not tread. This all contributes to the

mythos of Brexit where the silent leavers are left unrepresented and left patiently to endure the ongoing insults. The stereotype of the stupid Brexiteer is well deserved if Brexit ministers are anything to go by but the people very often show more wisdom than those they elect. The on-going condescension is a stark reminder of why it is necessary to put these people in their place.

There are plenty of leavers who are well aware that Brexit comes with trade-offs, who aren't obsessed with immigration and recognise the need for a transition. Certainly everyone I campaigned with was aware Brexit would have economic consequences but made the decision on balance.

In this respect, remainers have a little cult of their own going on, mocking the straw man Brexiteer but dishonestly refusing to engage on a more sophisticated level. Certainly the globalisation of regulation is an issue they will go to any lengths to avoid – not least because it is complex, but also because it opens up a debate about the world beyond Brussels which they cannot admit exists or their entire worldview starts to fall apart. The most we get is a nod from the FT to the “Brussels Effect” which they have only half understood – and as to the ecosystem of private authorities they wouldn't know where to begin.

Over the next few months we can expect a torrent of gloating articles pointing out how many areas of governance will be locked into the existing régime. We are probably looking at being tied to EU tariff rates for a long time to come, and we will likely have to maintain the status quo in agriculture for ten years at least until we have taken full control of our customs régime. This is all besides the point. The fact is, the separation process will mean we have to keep a high level of conformity but this is about ending EU political integration and engineering the EU out of domestic decision making. Nobody was expecting anything to change overnight. They can gloat all they like, but outside the bubble, it is

they who look foolish.