**PRESS RELEASE**

**EMBARGOED: 0001 on 4th June, 30 years on from Tiān'ānmén Square.\***

\* Běijīng. Tiān'ānmén Square. June 4th 1989. The Chinese Communist Party Politburo Standing Committee’s decision to send in the tanks was also taken by a majority vote, (but Zhào Zǐyáng, the then General Secretary, disputes this), perhaps with a majority of just one.

**BREXIT – AN ANALYSIS**

**Voting: don’t divide on either side, try instead to compromise.**

|  |
| --- |
| There are two basic flaws in the UK’s democratic structure:(i) The FPTP electoral system. Hopelessly disproportional and  widely recognised as unfair. **(ii) Majority vote decision-making. Also inaccurate or even wrong** **–**  **but seldom questioned.** |

**If only…**

a) … the UK had PR, the Tories would not have won a majority in 2015.

b) … the 2016 referendum had offered three options – eg, “In the EU, EEA or WTO?” – ‘remain’ could have won.

c) … votes in parliament were preferential; but MPs use only majority voting, even in indicative (sic) votes. That’s “daft,” (Lord Desai, *Hansard*, 22.1.2003.)

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

**Compromise cannot best be achieved** with majority voting. Better a preferential system of decision-making so that MPs/voters may state their compromise option(s) in 2nd and subsequent preferences without detracting from their 1st preferences.

And rather than a concocted Tory/DUP ‘majority’, betteran all-party power-sharing coalition government. Brexit – let alone global heating – is a crisis: as in 1940, we need to work together.

So which voting procedures best facilitate a compromise? When “there are more than two” options – as in Brexit! – the Borda and/or Condorcet forms of decision-making by preferential voting are “the best interpretation of majority rule,” (*Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics*, p 139).
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