**PRESS RELEASE**

**IMMEDIATE 2.5.2018**

**BREXIT WAS, AND BREXIT IS, MULTI-OPTIONAL**

The UK’s 2016 referendum on its relationship with Europe could have offered:

(a) in the EU;

(b) in the EEA;

(d) under the WTO. (See my press release of 5.2.2016; herewith attached.)

And today, a ‘meaningful’ vote in parliament or a referendum could suggest:

(a) in the EU;

(b) in a Theresa May-style “customs partnership”

(c) as per the ‘max-fac’ (maximum facilitation) formula;

(d) under the WTO.

And to be “meaningful” for (almost) everyone, a vote must be multi-optional.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

For many people in or children of mixed relationships, the 1991 referendum in Croatia – “Are you Serb or Croat?” – was a dangerous nonsense.

For many supporters of PR, the UK’s 2011 referendum on the electoral system was also nonsensical, like asking a vegetarian “beef or lamb?”

The 2014 Scottish referendum – “Independence or status quo?” – was a third nonsense: the winning option was ‘devo-max’, but nobody voted for it; they couldn’t; it wasn’t on the ballot paper.

While the 2017 referendum in Iraqi Kurdistan was just silly… and again dangerous: a border ‘here’ means Kirkuk is in a majority-Kurdish area; ‘there’ suggests it’s in a predominantly Shi’a region; and ‘over yonder’ implies it’s mainly Sunni.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In summary, if the subject is complex and/or controversial, the vote in parliament and/or any referendum can only be *meaningful*, for everyone, if it is multi-optional and, ideally, preferential.

Peter Emerson, (currently in China which, if it adopted our western binary form of democracy, could suffer horribly from binary referendums – as, for example, in Xīnjiāng – as did the Caucasus and the Balkans).
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