**The fatal conceits of euroscepticism, and how to solve them.**

In the last few years, the world public has been undermining the sense of the European Union. It has been mostly fuelled by the rising “far right” (Centrist authoritarians for people who know anything about politics) in the old continent, mainly showcasing in the so called Brexit. The rise in neo-Nazi/fascists in Europe was in turn created by no other, but by a few leading EU officials, one in specific- Angela Merkel. The centre left politician’s single decision created the mess which could end in a destabilised global economy, which would create yet another opportunity for Keynesians to mess up the future for everybody. If this isn’t a perfect example of the butterfly effect, I don’t know what is. But should the wrong (she admitted to it) decision of a single women be a legitimate reason to end the biggest economy in the world, with over 510 mln inhabitants?

Let’s start from the beginning. On the 31st of August 2014, Angela Merkel announced an open door policy, to accept all the refugees that come into Europe, infringing the unwritten rule of the EU, to consult other leaders before implying anything that could affect their countries. She promised to give the refugees all they need, with a promised warm welcome. Now, as some readers might have noticed, this is taking the worst out of both: people and socialism. Because they got a promise of prosperity, hard working Middle-Easterners were over run by lazy ones, but as we all know, only the worst people are showcased by the media. What kind of cover story would “A family of refugees ate supper with their new neighbours” be? This talk itself sparked the historical tremendous rise in refugee numbers, from around 280 000 (prospectively speaking, the EU’s population is 510 mln, whilst the 280k refugees were accounted for the whole continent of 740 mln people, making the migrants less than **0.04%** of the whole population) in 2014 (before the refugees from the catastrophic speech came) to over 1.2 mln in 2015. This number is now dropping by the minute, since the refugees don’t get what they bargained for by coming to Europe. One was quoted saying to Merkel “Why couldn’t you say no from the beginning?”, as he noticed that they weren’t actually wanted. As with most international problems, welfare and socialism were a main reason, **not the EU** itself. I often give Poland, my home country, as an example. Getting welfare in Poland is extraordinarily hard, and when you get it, it’s a bare minimum needed for existence. Because of this, although our borders are opened to the rest of the EU, no refugees stay. At best, they live in Poland for a month, and flee back to Syria (yes, it happened!) Or run away to Germany. If the UK managed to cut welfare too, they could open borders, and no lazy immigrants would enter. Only some of the refugees, who are actually desperate for help would come, and they’d leave when they’d could- everybody prefers home over foreign land. And all of the problems could be avoided, by sheer policy change, not destroying the Union.

# Now that we covered why the cons are unreasonable- you can always change policies, let’s cover the pros. Firstly, a single economy on single terms eases trade, which is crucial to ensuring peace between European nations- as Frédéric Bastiat famously said: “When goods don’t cross borders, soldiers will”. This perfectly sums up the situation in Europe, which has a history of territorial disputes. This can be further proven by the fact that since WW2, the united places in the world are the most peaceful. From North America, to the united nations of today’s Europe, there haven’t been any international aggressions, as countries now need each other for importing and exporting goods. “But wait!” you might say “This isn’t what the EU has become any more!” Well then, then the USA shouldn’t exist, because now most of you are ok with paying enormous taxes, whilst the birth of your nation came from rebelling against a ***3% tax on tea!*** The fact that something isn’t like it was, doesn’t mean that it can’t be restored to it’s former glory. Now you might try the “But the USA is a country!” argument. Well, to that I respond: the fact that you are a big nation, doesn’t immediately grant you any freedoms/prosperity. Neither does your size. Being united, but autonomous in some way, is what gives you prosperity. And this, in one form or another, is what I want for the EU. United in interests, the economy, a viewpoint of freedom-are my arguments for a United (but independent) Europe.