

THE UNITED KINGDOM'S DEPARTURE FROM THE EU: THE LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

17 OCTOBER 2016

This regular paper produced by SPICe sets out developments in the UK's negotiations to leave the European Union which are expected to formally begin early in 2017.

Ahead of the UK Government's triggering of Article 50, the updates will provide information on the UK Government's approach to leaving the EU, along with details of the Scottish Government and the other Devolved Administrations positions. The updates will also provide information on developments within the EU with regard to the UK's departure. Finally the update will provide information on the key issues likely to be at play during the negotiations and in developing the UK's future relationship with the European Union.

As was clear during the referendum campaign and since the decision to leave the EU was taken, there is an abundance of information and analysis available, and this SPICe paper will try to cover the key issues by drawing on that information and analysis. This week's update includes details of the creation of a UK Government Cabinet sub-committee on Brexit and a speech by the President of the European Council.

UK Government European Union Exit and Trade Cabinet Committee

A [report in Politico](#) on 14 October gave details of the UK Government's European Union Exit and Trade Cabinet Committee assembled by Prime Minister Theresa May. Although composition of the group has not been publicly confirmed by the UK Government, Politico states that half the positions in the Brexit Committee have gone to "hard-line Euroskeptics" which Politico suggests is "further evidence that the UK is heading toward a hard exit from the European Union". The group is also made up of the Prime Minister and five of her colleagues who campaigned for the UK to remain in the EU.

According to Politico, the composition of the group is as follows:

- Theresa May (Prime Minister)
- Boris Johnson (Foreign Secretary),
- Philip Hammond (Chancellor),
- Amber Rudd (Home Secretary),
- Liam Fox (International Trade Secretary)
- David Davis (Brexit Secretary)

- Damian Green (Work and Pensions Secretary),
- Greg Clark (Business Secretary)
- Priti Patel (International Development Secretary),
- Chris Grayling (Transport Secretary)
- Andrea Leadsom (Environment Secretary).
- Patrick McLoughlin (Conservative Party chairman)

According to the [Independent's report](#) on the Committee, "the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish secretaries will attend meetings "as required" but not as a matter of routine, according to the Government document."

Hard Brexit or No Brexit

The President of the European Council has suggested that the UK's only real alternative to hard Brexit is no Brexit. [Speaking at the European Policy Centre's 20th anniversary conference](#), Donald Tusk addressed a number of issues including Brexit. On the Brexit negotiations he said:

"As for the negotiations, the situation is pretty clear. Its framework will be set out by the European Council - that is by the guidelines foreseen in the Treaty. Our task will be to protect the interests of the EU as a whole and the interests of each of the 27 member states. And also to stick unconditionally to the Treaty rules and fundamental values. By this I mean, inter alia, the conditions for access to the single market with all four freedoms. There will be no compromises in this regard.

When it comes to the essence of Brexit, it was largely defined in the UK during the referendum campaign. We all remember the promises, which cumulated in the demand to "take back control". Namely the "liberation" from European jurisdiction, a "no" to the freedom of movement or further contributions to the EU budget. This approach has definitive consequences, both for the position of the UK government and for the whole process of negotiations. Regardless of magic spells, this means a de facto will to radically loosen relations with the EU, something that goes by the name of "hard Brexit".

This scenario will in the first instance be painful for Britons. In fact, the words uttered by one of the leading campaigners for Brexit and proponents of the "cake philosophy" was pure illusion: that one can have the EU cake and eat it too. To all who believe in it, I propose a simple experiment. Buy a cake, eat it, and see if it is still there on the plate.

The brutal truth is that Brexit will be a loss for all of us. There will be no cakes on the table. For anyone. There will be only salt and vinegar. If you ask me if there is any alternative to this bad scenario, I would like to tell you that yes, there is. And I think it is useless to speculate about "soft Brexit" because of all the reasons I've mentioned. These would be purely theoretical speculations. In my opinion, the only real alternative to a "hard Brexit" is "no Brexit". Even if today hardly anyone believes in such a possibility. We will conduct the negotiations in good faith, defend the interests of the EU 27, minimise the costs and seek the best possible deal for all. But as I have said before, I am afraid that no such outcome exists that will benefit either side. Of course it is and can only be for the UK to assess the outcome of the negotiations and determine if Brexit is really in their interest. Paraphrasing Hannah Arendt's words: "a

full understanding of all the consequences of the political process is the only way to reverse the irreversible flow of history".

Article 50 legal challenge

One of the legal challenges to triggering Article 50 without the consent of Parliament began last Thursday in London. The Courts and Tribunals Judiciary have published the [transcript](#) from the first day of the hearing.

The UK Constitutional Law Association have published a [blog summarising the proceedings](#) on 13 October. The petitioners' case was introduced by Lord Pannick who made a number of arguments about the procedure for triggering Article 50, the status of the European Union referendum, the status of the European Communities Act 1972 and the use of the Royal Prerogative. During the case four advocates will focus on different issues in presenting the petitioners case:

- Dominic Chambers QC – parliamentary sovereignty and whether a 'decision' has been made to withdraw from the EU.
- Helen Mountfield QC – devolution points, Acts of Union and Bill of Rights 1689
- Patrick Green QC – rights of citizens abroad
- Manjit Gill QC – impact on children and carers.

The case continues on Monday 17 and Tuesday 18 October.

Ahead of the hearing starting, the [BBC reported](#) that a senior lawyer has been instructed by the Scottish government to attend the High Court challenge to the Brexit process in London. According to the BBC article, whilst the Scottish Government are not involved in the case it is "sending legal counsel to observe in case they decide to become active".

In connection with the on-going Article 50 cases, the London School of Economics blog has published two articles by Alison Young examining the case and the Government's arguments. The articles are: [Understanding the 'People's Challenge': does Theresa May need Parliament's approval to trigger Brexit?](#) and [Understanding the 'People's Challenge', part 2: the how and why of prerogative power](#).

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATE – Parliamentary Scrutiny of the UK leaving the EU

Last week's Leaving the EU update reported on the Secretary of State for Exiting the EU David Davis' [statement to the House of Commons](#) outlining the next steps in leaving the EU. Two days after the statement, on 12 October the House of Commons debated [parliamentary scrutiny of the UK leaving the EU](#).

The debate was moved by Shadow Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, Keir Starmer. Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, David Davis, responded on behalf of the Government.

The motion as amended which was passed without division stated:

"That this House recognises that leaving the EU is the defining issue facing the UK; believes that there should be a full and transparent debate on the Government's plan for leaving the EU; and calls on the Prime Minister to ensure that this House is able properly to scrutinise that plan for leaving the EU before Article 50 is invoked; and believes that the process should be undertaken in such a way that respects the decision of the people of the UK when they voted to leave the EU on 23 June and does not undermine the negotiating position of

the Government as negotiations are entered into which will take place after Article 50 has been triggered.” A full record of the debate is available in [Hansard](#).

Ahead of the debate, the Opposition published a letter to the Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union asking 170 questions on Brexit. The [letter including the questions](#) was reproduced on politics.co.uk

A role for parliament in triggering Article 50

As the Article 50 court cases continue and the House of Commons debates what role the UK Parliament should have in triggering Article 50, the London School of Economics blog page has published an article by Valentino Larcinese which argues that [There is no such thing as the ‘will of the people’ – Brexit needs the involvement of parliament](#).

Central to Valentino Larcinese’s argument is that Parliamentary scrutiny will not thwart the will of the people as indicated by the outcome of the referendum as there are different options for the future relationship between the UK and the EU and as a result Parliament should have a role in determining the UK’s future relationship. Larcinese concludes that:

“It should be clear at this point that allowing parliament to vote on Brexit plans will not thwart the will of the British people. Yes, a referendum has taken place and, whatever its interpretation, there is no doubt that its outcome must be respected. At the same time, however, taxpayers’ money, people’s jobs and more generally the prosperity of this country also deserve respect.

This does not mean that the outcome of the referendum should be ignored – I would never claim this – but simply that the people of this country deserve adequate deliberation and decision-making procedures to determine what has to be done now. It would be paradoxical if the parliament was not part of this process since one of the most important arguments in favour of Brexit concerned precisely the sovereignty of Westminster against the technocracy of Brussels. Even more paradoxical is the fact that the government intends to interpret the outcome of the referendum as a mandate to do pretty much what they like.”

Scottish Government Cabinet Secretary at the Friends of Europe conference

On 13 October, the Scottish Government’s Cabinet Secretary for Culture, Tourism and External Affairs spoke at the Friends of Europe annual conference. According to the [Scottish Government](#), Fiona Hyslop was expected to tell the conference that the Scottish Government is considering all possible steps to protect Scotland’s relationship with and place in the EU, and that the contribution EU nationals make in Scotland will continue to be strongly valued.

Ahead of the conference the Cabinet Secretary said:

“Scotland has delivered a strong, unequivocal vote to remain in the EU and the Scottish Government welcomes that outcome. The UK vote means that Scotland risks being taken out of Europe against its will and that is democratically unacceptable. Our priority is to protect all of Scotland’s interests.

“The Scottish Government strongly values the contribution that EU citizens make in Scotland, just as we hope Scottish citizens in Europe are equally valued, and we will continue to press the UK Government for the protection of their right to live and work here. We have been clear about the benefits of being a member of the EU – the prosperity and economic opportunities which membership of the single market brings

to our nation; the social protections it gives to our workers; the human rights it affords our people; and the important standards which protect our environment.

“Scotland has always been an outward looking nation and to this day we actively and enthusiastically collaborate with our European friends. We are also a nation that believes strongly in European solidarity so that we can tackle today’s global challenges such as climate change, terrorism and the refugee crisis together.

“We are now in uncharted territory. Brexit has not yet happened – Article 50 will not be invoked until next year. We are at the start of a process and we are ready to work creatively and positively with the UK Government and with all of our friends across Europe to shape a future that respects the interests of Scotland and the UK and benefits all of our citizens.”

The Great Repeal Bill – Briefing for the Scottish Parliament’s Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Relations Committee

The Leaving the EU [update](#) published on 3 October provided details of the [speech](#) by the Prime Minister in which she gave details of a Great Repeal Bill which will remove from the statute book the European Communities Act 1972.

Sionaidh Douglas-Scott, the adviser to the Culture, Tourism, Europe and External Relations Committee has prepared a [briefing for the Committee](#) on the plans for a Great Repeal Bill. The briefing includes a section examining specific relevance of the Bill for Scotland and the question of whether the Bill may require legislative consent from the Scottish Parliament. Introducing the section, Professor Douglas-Scott states:

“One of the most immediate issues that the ‘Great Repeal Bill’ is likely to face arises with respect to devolved matters. The aim of the Bill is to convert EU law into national law. However, a good part of EU law relates to competences that have been devolved – for example, in the case of Scotland, devolved competences include: agriculture, fishing within Scottish waters, public procurement, environmental law, as well as others. If the ‘Great Repeal Bill’ translates EU law on matters that have been devolved into UK law this could amount to legislation on devolved areas.”

Scottish Parliament’s Economy, Jobs and Fair Work Committee call for evidence on Brexit

The Scottish Parliament’s Economy, Jobs and Fair Work Committee has issued a [call for evidence](#) on the economic impact for Scotland of leaving the EU. The evidence will support the Committee’s inquiry into the [Economic Impact of Leaving the European Union](#).

During November the Committee will be scrutinising the economic impact of leaving the European Union with visits to relevant businesses. They will also hear views and opinions from a range of organisations and individuals at formal committee meetings.

Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe) Brexit Briefings published

On 12 October, SPICe published a briefing analysing the [Options for the United Kingdom’s future trading relationship with the European Union](#). The Briefing sets out what different trading options mean, from European Economic Area membership through to relying only on World Trade Organisation rules without any specific bilateral or regional agreement in place.

On 13 October, SPICe published a further Brexit related briefing, this time examining what leaving the EU means for [Higher Education in Scotland](#).

The UK Parliament's response to the decision to leave the European Union

The UK Parliament [has confirmed the establishment](#) of two scrutiny committees to examine the work of the Department for Exiting the EU led by David Davis and the Department for International Trade led by Liam Fox. The Exiting the EU Committee will be chaired by a Labour member whilst the International Trade Committee will be chaired by an SNP member. Nominations for the Chair roles close on Tuesday 18 October at 12 noon. Elections take place on Wednesday 19 October, with the ballot open between 10am and 1.30pm. The Speaker will announce the results of the elections that afternoon.

The Institute for Government has published two blogs by Hannah White examining [Parliament's role in the Brexit negotiations](#) and why [A 'supersize committee' could hamper Parliament's scrutiny of Brexit](#).

A number of Committees in both the House of Commons and House of Lords have established inquiries linked to the UK's decision to leave the European Union. Upcoming Brexit related work includes:

The Scottish Affairs Committee will continue its [inquiry into Scotland's place in Europe](#) on 24 October with a meeting in Glasgow where the Committee will take evidence from representatives of key sectors, including the Scottish Fishermen's Federation, National Farmers' Union Scotland, Scottish Trades Union Congress, Royal College of Nursing and the Scottish Food and Drink Federation. The meeting will be held in The Buchanan Suite, Glasgow Royal Concert Hall.

On 19 October, the House of Lords EU Home Affairs Sub-committee will [take evidence](#) from Government Ministers Rt Hon Brandon Lewis MP (Home Office) and Rt Hon David Jones MP (Department for Exiting the EU) on the Government's approach to police and security co-operation with the EU after Brexit.

From 17-18 October, the House of Lords European Committee will visit [Belfast and Dublin](#) for its inquiry into UK-Irish relations. In Belfast the Committee will hear from academics and representatives of cross-border groups. The following day in Dublin, the Committee will hear from witnesses including academics and Irish business representatives.

On 18 October, the House of Lords EU Justice Sub-committee will [take evidence](#) from His Excellency Dan Mihalache, the Ambassador of Romania and His Excellency Arkady Rzegocki, the Ambassador of the Republic of Poland. Both Ambassadors will be able to raise the concerns of their citizens in the UK following the EU referendum. Coverage of the meeting is available on [Parliament TV](#).

On 13 October, The EU External Affairs and EU Internal Market Sub-Committees held a [joint evidence session](#) on their inquiry "Brexit: future trade between the UK and the EU". The Committees took evidence from Lord Bridges of Headley MBE, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Department for Exiting the EU and Lord Price CVO, Minister of State for Trade Policy, Department for International Trade. Coverage of the meeting is available on [Parliament TV](#).

On-going Brexit related work in the UK Parliament includes:

[House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee Post Referendum Consultation](#)

[House of Commons Scotland Affairs Committee Scotland's Place in Europe](#)

[House of Commons Welsh Affairs Committee Implications for Wales of the EU Referendum Result](#)

[House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee Lessons Learned from the EU Referendum](#)

[House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee The Future of the Natural Environment after the EU Referendum](#)

[House of Commons Energy and Climate Change Committee Leaving the EU: Implications for UK Energy Policy](#)

[House of Commons Brexit and health and social care inquiry](#)

[House of Lords European Union Committee Brexit: UK-Irish Relations](#)

[House of Lords European Union Committee Brexit: Parliamentary Scrutiny Inquiry](#)

[House of Lords EU External Affairs and EU Internal Market Sub-Committees Brexit: future trade between the UK and the EU inquiry](#)

[House of Lords EU Internal Market Sub-Committee Brexit: future trade between the UK and EU in services inquiry](#)

The [sub-committees](#) of the House of Lords European Union Committee are also conducting a number of evidence sessions following the UK's decision to leave the EU including:

[Fisheries Policy after Brexit](#)

[Brexit implications for environment policy examined by committee](#)

[Brexit implications for energy and climate change policy](#)

[Brexit and Financial Services](#)

The [schedule of meetings](#) for the House of Lords European Union Committee and its subcommittees from 10-21 October includes seven meetings where evidence will be taken contributing to the Committees Brexit work.

The UK Parliament has also produced [impartial analysis](#) of the UK's referendum for remaining in or leaving the European Union. This page sets out useful research on the impact of Brexit on key policy areas. It also explains the process for leaving the EU.

How to deal with Brexit

John Bruton, the former Prime Minister of Ireland writing on the Friends of Europe website has suggested [how British and European leaders can deal with the disruption](#) caused by Brexit. According to John Bruton a key factor in the UK Government achieving a successfully negotiated outcome will hinge on recognising what is also good for Europe.

“if the UK wants talks on its withdrawal from the EU to work well, it needs to ensure that it asks itself what is good for Europe as well as what is good for Britain.

A good negotiation starts with an intelligent appreciation of the interests of the people on the other side of the table. If Britain is concerned only with its own interests, the talks will fail. The UK government needs to think: what are our economic and social priorities? And how can these be made compatible with those of the rest of the EU?” On the process following the triggering of Article 50, Bruton wrote:

“When the moment comes to trigger Article 50, I believe that there will be two negotiations: one on withdrawal, and one on the framework of a future UK-EU relationship. The two must run in parallel.

The other 27 EU leaders rightly insist that the EU’s four freedoms of movement – of people, goods, capital and services – go together. Nobody has any idea yet how the UK will propose to get around that.”

John Bruton also suggests a number of ways in which the European Union will need to reform to ensure the organisation is strengthened. His proposed changes include direct election of the European Commission President and more powers for national parliaments to propose Europe-wide legislation.

The cost to leave the EU

An [article in the Financial Times](#) published on 12 October suggested that the UK may face a bill for as much as €20 billion when it leaves the EU. According to the Financial Times: “More than €300bn of shared payment liabilities will need to be settled in the divorce reckoning, according to EU accounts. It is a legacy of joint financial obligations stretching back decades — from pension pledges and multi-annual contracts to commitments to fund infrastructure projects — that Brussels will insist the UK must honour.”

The Financial Times states that €20 billion is an upper estimate and would cover the UK’s on-going multiyear budgetary commitments along with liabilities such as pension liabilities and future spending commitments.

Can Scotland stay in the UK and the Single Market?

Writing for the [EU Law Analysis Blog](#), Professor Steve Peers discusses whether Scotland can remain in the UK and the Single Market when Brexit occurs. He suggests whilst it would be feasibly possible for Scotland as part of the UK remaining in the Single Market, the challenge would be addressing issues of free movement of goods and people. On this issues Peers suggests:

“The most difficult issues relate to movement of goods and people. Would different rules on Scottish/EU relations compared to the relations between the EU and rest of the UK mean that there would need to be border controls between Scotland and the rest of the UK? On this point, the Westminster government has promised there will be no border controls between Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland, even though that border will become an EU/non-EU border. Surely whatever deal is reached to this end could be adapted for use at the Scotland/England land border too.”

Professor Michael Keating writing on the [Centre on Constitutional Change blog](#) also questioned whether Scotland and Northern Ireland could remain in the Single Market including the Customs Union when the UK leaves the EU.

Professor Keating concluded that if Scotland and Northern Ireland were to remain within the single market and customs union, they could not simultaneously be within the UK economic union. According to Professor Keating:

“There would be a hard economic border between them and England and Wales; to do otherwise would create a gap in both economic unions through which goods, services and people could flow uncontrolled. Such tariffs as would apply to trade between the UK and Europe would apply to trade between the rest of the UK and the two devolved territories. If Scottish and Northern Irish firms could export services freely around Europe, they could not do so with the rest of the UK as long as it was

outside the single market. If Scotland and Northern Ireland were within the customs union, then trade with England and Wales would be subject to rules of origin and customs checks to ensure that the appropriate duties had been paid. The only precedent I can find in Western Europe is the Basque system before 1820, allowing the Basque provinces free trade with the world but imposing tariffs on trade with the rest of Spain.

Even were it economically viable, such a system would not be acceptable either to the UK or to the European Union. For Scotland, it would almost amount to independence, raising the question of why it did not just go the whole way. In Northern Ireland, barriers with the rest of the UK would be unacceptable to the unionist community and undermine agreement about consensus being needed for a change in the status of the province.”

Scotland and Brexit

On the theme of Scotland’s options for its relationship with the EU after Brexit, Kirsty Hughes writing on [European Futures](#) asks what Scotland’s options are with hard Brexit looking more likely. Hughes writes:

“Scotland’s government is looking at options for Scotland to stay in the EU or at least in the EU’s single market, including having the advice of First Minister Nicola Sturgeon’s Standing Council on Europe. But the main potential options for Scotland – staying in the EU and the UK, or staying in the single market while the rest of the UK does not – are starting to look impossible or politically infeasible.

The so-called ‘Reverse Greenland’ idea of Scotland (perhaps with Northern Ireland) staying in the EU as the member state, while England and Wales opt-out, is highly problematic. Under a ‘Reverse Greenland’ scenario, Scotland would be agreeing common foreign and trade policies with other EU member states while, in total contradiction to this, Westminster would also be responsible still for overall UK foreign and trade policy. Other challenges abound in this scenario – and it is hard to see the UK government ever agreeing to such an outcome.

Even Scotland staying in the EU single market while the rest of the UK did not would create major issues around further devolution. It would require a raft of new policies to be devolved from migration policy – to ensure free movement between Scotland and the rest of the EU – to product standards, health and safety and more. It would raise questions over how free movement of people between Scotland and the EU would operate while England and Wales were not part of this. And it would require the rest of the UK’s future trade deal with the EU to be consistent with Scotland being in the single market without requiring new customs or other checks at the England/Scotland border.

Politically, it seems highly unlikely the UK government would go along with this – it would split the UK’s own internal market and would mean Scotland would have a much greater pull for foreign direct investment than England and Wales. And if Scotland was, despite this, somehow able to go for such a differentiated approach, then independence in the EU would give it much more say in the rules of the single market, so debate would focus on whether such a half-way house – of being in the UK and in the single market – was desirable.”

Brexit and the Glasgow Economy

Research published by Glasgow City Council on 10 October outlines the “great challenges” Glasgow will face when the UK leaves the EU. [Brexit and the Glasgow Economy: Impacts](#).

[Actions and Asks](#) “calls for the Scottish and UK governments to implement bold policies to empower and grow the Glasgow economy to allow Brexit's economic challenges to be met.”

The report lists six main asks of the Scottish and UK Governments:

1. To match fund to the same level crucial EU structural and investment funds vital to economic growth. This is currently worth £780 million to Scotland between 2014 and 2020.
2. Scottish and UK governments to accelerate City Deal capital infrastructure works, principally in relation to the approvals required for enhanced surface access to Glasgow Airport, with other projects accelerated in conjunction with the Scottish Government.
3. Both governments should transfer surplus land holdings in Glasgow to Glasgow City Council to allow the acceleration of major housing building programmes that will provide a major jobs stimulus and help meet the city's housing needs.
4. More effective collaborations on economic development and skills between the Glasgow City Council, the Scottish Government, its agencies and business to support higher levels of competitiveness, innovation and economic growth.
5. A commitment to fund beyond 2019/20 the major EU research programme (Horizon 2020) and to clarify the immigration status of EU students for 2017/18. In this regard the Scottish Government's commitment to continue to fund EU students studying in Glasgow and those about to enrol is welcomed.
6. The Scottish Government should introduce a two-year moratorium on non-domestic rates for new build Grade A properties that are not fully let. This would stimulate speculative development at a time when it is most required post-Brexit.

The report has been submitted to the First Minister's Standing Committee on Europe, led by Professor Anton Muscatelli of the University of Glasgow.

Scotch Whisky Association response to Brexit

On 13 October, the Scotch Whisky Association (SWA) published its latest [response to Brexit](#). The SWA urged the UK Government “to help boost Scotch Whisky exports after Brexit by giving a high priority to negotiating new trade deals in key markets”.

The SWA analysis highlights future markets which will be of value to whisky exports which are currently worth nearly £4 billion in customs value. The SWA highlights the following priorities for future trade:

“Markets with long-term potential for whisky exports and where an ambitious free trade agreement (FTA) with the UK could eventually deliver significant benefits through the elimination of tariffs and trade barriers. Priorities could include:

- Major markets with long-term potential: above all India, but also China, and Brazil (and the wider Mercosur region of Argentina, Paraguay, Uruguay and Venezuela).
- Fast-growing emerging markets with potential: for example Angola, Kenya, Nigeria, Burma, or Vietnam.
- Established markets where further growth is possible with the boost of an FTA: Australia and Thailand.

Resolution Foundation analysis of the Brexit vote

Following up [analysis conducted following the referendum](#), the Resolution Foundation has now conducted more detailed research into the factors which influenced people's EU referendum vote. [According to Stephen Clarke](#) from the Resolution Foundation, the original analysis showed:

“across 378 of Britain's 380 local authorities we found that the share of Leave votes in an area was connected to measures of living standards (areas with lower employment rates were more likely to vote Leave), demographics (high Leave-vote areas had fewer students and bigger increases in non-UK born populations over the last decade) and culture (those places with lower recorded levels of 'cohesion' and localities with higher levels of homeownership recorded higher Leave votes). Cutting across all three of these themes, we found a particularly strong connection between the Leave vote and areas with fewer graduates.”

Further research using the British Election Study data has now shown that:

“Specifically, the vote is driven by a mix of living standard, demographic and cultural factors (this time covering variables such as employment, household income, education, views on immigration and their position on the 'liberal-authoritarian' scale).”

On regional variations, and specifically Scotland, the further research shows that:

“not controlling for anything – Scots were 10 per cent less likely to vote to Leave. However, when we control for the various other factors this falls to 6 per cent suggesting that Scotland is less unusual than our previous work suggested.”

Iain McIver SPICe Research