

Why There Will Probably Be a Second Referendum on Brexit

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, July 01, 2016

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [Law and Justice](#)

Preliminary

Brexit (British exit from the European Union) would be a ferocious kidney-blow to the international aristocracy, [the people](#) (and [their agents](#)) who own controlling blocs of stock in international corporations, and who control politicians in every country (except Russia and perhaps China), and who especially control international organizations such as the [executive body of the EU](#), which is the [European Commission \(or “EC”\)](#). The EC, the executive power within the EU, is [an appointed not elected body; each of its members can be fired, at will, by the President of the EC](#), who is the real President of the EU, who is himself appointed as a result of deal-making amongst appointees who were selected by deal-making amongst elected politicians from each one of the nations that’s a member-state of the EU. The whole process of control at the EU is incredibly convoluted (for example, it includes, by reference, [this monstrosity](#)) and prevents real political accountability to the public, so that a career in “public service” at the EU is, essentially, service to the European aristocracy, *not* to the public.

The EU is set up as a unification of the various national aristocracies, or ‘member states’, that the EU represents; the EU does not represent the public — not even the *voting* public — anywhere. The President of the EC has enormous power over Europe: he drafts, and the entire EC rubber-stamps, all laws within the EU [dictatorship](#), which is one of the reasons why there is such strong sentiment amongst the publics within the EU, to replace the EU dictatorship and to put in its stead some democratic system of government, one that’s responsive to the will of the majority of the public, and not *only* to the will of the major stockholders in international corporations.

British exit from the European Union would therefore constitute a public rejection of this entire system, and a public preference for restoring the given nation’s democracy — it would constitute a public *rejection of rule by Europe’s aristocracy*.

There is no actual European democracy; there is, instead, a European dictatorship, or else (via *exit* from the EU), independent national governments, some of which governments might be democracies, and some of which might be dictatorships. The choice is either continued dictatorship, or else, the possibility of establishing (or *re-establishing*) national democracy. The EU is an international dictatorship, not really a democratic federation (such as it pretends).

The British Situation

UK has no written constitution, and so the UK government “wings it” on matters such as

determining when a public vote in a referendum (such as Brexit) is actually final.

[The petition to Parliament for there to be a revote](#) about British exit from the EU has already received over four million signatures, and it notes that “Parliament considers all petitions that get more than 100,000 signatures for a debate,” which means that even if only one-in-forty of those signatures are valid, and there are no additional signers, Parliament will take up the debate.

At that time, the fact that the referendum on Brexit was only “advisory” and not at all obligatory-to-be-adhered-to by the government, will be put forth in Parliament, again and again, as reason why the 52%-to-48% Brexit vote shouldn’t necessarily be considered to be final. That 52% might have been an accurate snapshot of voters’ opinion on June 23rd, but public opinion constantly changes, and a repeat-vote could easily produce a majority decision to “advise” Parliament *against* leaving the EU.

Furthermore, the petition’s point might also find majority support amongst Parliamentarians, that “We the undersigned call upon HM Government to implement a rule that if the remain or leave vote is less than 60% based a turnout less than 75% there should be another referendum.

“ There is no fixed rule on these matters in UK, because there is no written constitution; so, a mere majority-vote on such a matter might even be argued not to make good democratic sense. For example, the U.S. Constitution (widely considered to be “democratic”) requires that at least two-thirds of U.S. Senators must vote to pass a proposed treaty in order for it to become law in that country — America’s Founders recognized that adopting any treaty is vastly more binding a national commitment than is merely adopting a new law, which can easily be abandoned or changed by merely another majority-vote to do so. Since treaty-matters are (by their international nature) inherently more binding than any mere law is, a requirement for some type of “supermajority” or above-50%-standard, does actually make sense, in order to enter into a treaty. (And America’s Constitutional requirement for at least two thirds of the Senate to vote for a proposed treaty in order for the treaty to become law is actually a vital protection of U.S. national sovereignty, and thus of U.S. democracy.)

As to whether a supermajority-requirement in order to *exit* a treaty makes democratic sense, it doesn’t in this case, because no supermajority was required (as it *should* have been required) in order to “vote” to *join* the EU. That supermajority would then be applying ONLY in order to EXIT the EU, not in order to JOIN the EU (which was done without any such supermajority-standard). Consequently, by rights, there should be no *re-vote* at all: if 50% was required in order to join the EU, then 50% should be required in order to leave it, and that standard was met; it was the 52% vote, and that should be final.

But rights and wrongs do not make policies and laws; power does, and the international corporations possess it, the public unfortunately do not. Consequently, there will probably be a revote, because the owners of international corporations want there to be a revote.

This revote will probably likewise be only “advisory,” and it will probably be required to meet a stiffer standard than a mere majority of the voting electorate to “advise” Parliament to exit the EU, in order for the vote to be “advising” exit.

By that time (the time of the re-vote), the millions of citizens who are eligible to vote and who opposed Brexit but didn’t care as passionately about the matter as did the Brexit

people and so didn't come to the polls on June 23rd, will far more likely be coming to the polls on the re-vote; and the result of that will be a far-shortfall of the 60% or whatever standard Parliament will have set in order for Parliament to be "advised" to exit the EU, and probably there won't even be as much as a bare majority (50%) of voters favoring Brexit. Those results (probably sub-50% but in any case below the super-majority standard set) would likely end the "Exit the EU" movement, first in UK, and then (by its example, which can conveniently be copied elsewhere) in other EU countries.

And, so, UK will very likely remain in EU; democracy will probably be irrevocably dead in UK, from that time forward; the major stockholders in international corporations will then rigidly control the country. UK's unwritten constitution will then, without any practical challenge, be whatever the major stockholders in international corporations want it to be. And, as far as other countries in EU are concerned, all of which do have written Constitutions, those Constitutions will become less and less effective over time, as the EU's international-corporate dictatorship will increasingly take precedence, in the emerging United States of Europe. It will be [the Bilderbergers' dream, the Trilateralists' dream, the Davos dream: international dictatorship, by the international aristocracy](#). The words might [superficially sound pleasant, but the outcome will be hell](#). And [here](#) that hell is described regarding U.S. President Barack Obama's proposed TPP treaty for Pacific nations, which is similar to his proposed TTIP and TISA treaties for Atlantic nations (including Europe): [regulations regarding the environment, workers' rights, and product-safety, will be whatever international corporations want them to be; democracy, the sovereignty of the public, will end](#).

Even Obama's statements advocating action against climate-change are sheer [fakery](#). Scientists can publish to each other [the reality](#) regarding climate-change, but the mass-media project a different 'reality' (more favorable to the international-corporate aristocracy), to serve an audience not of consumers but of the international corporations (such as oil companies) that advertise to consumers and that provide the advertising income to the 'news' media. The attitude of the people in power (the people who control those corporations) is: the world can simply go to hell; I need my profits. Profits used to be a *privilege* that was *earned* by an investor's taking risks; now profits have become an investor's *right* that the public *guarantees* to them, and that takes precedence over the public's sovereignty — investors are now the *new* sovereign, replacing the public in that capacity. Governments exist to serve investors, not citizens. Citizens have instead become mere subjects, of the aristocracy. It's a return to feudalism, but in the era of corporations, a body-politic that Benito Mussolini called — and championed as — ["corporationism"](#) (or, alternatively, as "fascism").

Conclusion

The significance of the first Brexit vote is: it was the first instance in modern times when UK citizens formally expressed their opposition to what the UK's aristocracy desire. However, the outcome of that vote is likely to be the same (though by different means) as was the outcome of [the Greek referendum](#) regarding the international aristocracy's 2015 'bailout' (their euphemism for purchase) of the Greek government. In that case, the 5 July 2015 Greek referendum vote was, by a 61% majority, to reject the sale of the nation's government. The [wikipedia article on that matter](#) closes by noting: "On Monday, 13 July, the Syriza-led government of Greece accepted a bailout package that contains larger pension cuts and tax increases than the one rejected by Greek voters in the referendum." And that was the end of that.

The Greek leader, Syriza Prime Minister Alexis Tsipras, even stayed in power. By contrast, Britain's Tory Prime Minister, David Cameron, promptly resigned when the first Brexit vote turned out to reject his position that the UK should stay in the EU. The process of defeating the people's rebellion is more drawn-out in Britain than it was in Greece; that's all. Otherwise, it'll probably be basically the same end-result in UK as it was in Greece. People must accept their fate, as subjects. Western history is going full-circle back to feudalism, but in its modern form: 'peaceful' fascism.

The message of that, if all of this comes to pass, will be, from the masters: *Welcome to the future; it belongs to me and my children, not to you and your children. We own it, you don't. Just get out of our way, because we'll get there, by hook or by crook, no matter what you do.*

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2016

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They're Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST'S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca