

# The Democracy Vacuum

## Introduction

This simple essay basically demonstrates that Great Britain has ceased to be a truly democratic nation, home to the 'mother of all parliaments'. We are currently living in disgraceful political times of the sort that historically led to the Civil War of 1642-49.

This is not a groundbreaking observation; it is common sense to all sane analysts. But since a general election is now almost certain to occur within weeks or months, it behoves me to remind voters of the background. Christians should not vote for candidates that have ridden roughshod over truth, justice and democracy.

For full disclosure I can state that I follow no political party; indeed I am opposed to such. I hold some policies that would be construed as Left Wing and some that are Right Wing, but I am not a centrist either. Some might consider me an old fashioned Liberal (not a modern Neo-Liberal) while others may see me as a Libertarian. I am neither a Progressive nor a Reactionary. I entirely support God's absolute truths and would temporarily support (in conversation and vote; not in activism) any party that fostered such divine laws.

## The Brexit Catalyst

Brexit has been the canary in the coalmine that has exposed what we knew for a long time, that Britain has not enjoyed a true democracy for some time, if ever. As in America the two (occasionally three) party system is always 'more of the same' with just the appearance of change every few years.

For example, New Labour under Tony Blair gained power from the support of Socialists but largely followed the policies established by Margaret Thatcher including capitalism. In fact, the poor got poorer under Blair and the rich gained from tax-breaks while the poor saw many taxes rise, often by stealth. Though Blair railed against the 'establishment', to please Socialists listening to his speeches, he was a product of the establishment.<sup>1</sup> Though he castigated the previous Tory governments for unrighteous policies, he presided over a government that raised lying to its highest level and instigated illegal wars that caused devastation.

So the nation follows the strategy devised by higher elite powers and pretends to have a democratic parliament based on parties elected by popular vote. In fact, the civil service, dominated by the elite establishment, drives the engine of government whomever is in power. Belgium continued to operate without a government for nearly two years. In Northern Ireland Stormont has been inactive for years but the country continues to function. The civil service is opposed to democracy.

What happened with Brexit took the establishment by surprise. It fully expected a Remain win. Despite the millions spent by Cameron's government on Remain propaganda and the

---

<sup>1</sup> His father was a lecturer in law. Blair was educated in posh schools and colleges (Chorister School, Fettes College, St John's College, Oxford). He gained a second-class honours degree in jurisprudence. He became a member of Lincoln's Inn and enrolled as a barrister. Blair's brother is a High Court judge.

massive influence of most of the media, the people did not obey their masters and voted to leave the EU. Cameron, the government and the civil service were shaken.

The establishment then went into overdrive considering various plans to thwart a clean Brexit (an independent Britain) and these were worked out by various individuals, NGOs, civil servants, politicians, political parties, the BBC and others. From the beginning there has been a concerted plan by the establishment to overturn Brexit.

It soon became apparent that there was a massive dichotomy in the democratic structures of the nation. The majority of the people (not an insignificant majority by the way) voted to leave the EU but the majority of Parliamentary MPs were Remainers. The BBC was a Remain institution. Most of the media were Remainers. The civil service was a Remain institution.

In short, the people in power were actively working against the democratic wishes of the people. Parliament ceased to be a representative body. In fact, some of the most dominant anti-Brexit MPs represent Leave constituencies (like Dominic Grieve<sup>2</sup>, Yvette Cooper, Tom Watson, Lisa Nandy, Margaret Beckett, Jess Phillips, John McDonnell, Rory Stewart, Sam Gyimah, Sarah Wollaston, Angela Eagle, Barry Sheerman, Oliver Letwin, Liz Kendall or Anna Soubry<sup>3</sup>). More than 400 MPs are at odds with their constituencies regarding Brexit.

Gradually multiple tropes were designed to emasculate the democratic process.

## **The fact of the democratic decision**

The 2016 referendum was a true democratic process.

The government provided a simple in/out binary decision on leaving or staying in the EU. Despite later claims, this was clearly understood by all. In fact, in the run up both sides made it absolutely clear that leaving the EU would mean leaving the Single Market and leaving the Customs Union. This is unequivocal. Look at videos of promotions and speeches at the time, both sides openly stated this fact. Indeed, the Remain side tried to scare the public by overstating the dangers of leaving the Single Market and the Customs Union.

It is a barefaced lie to say, as often said today, that the referendum did not make clear that it meant leaving these two institutions or that no one understood what was involved. Though there were many issues in the debate, the most prominent were regaining national sovereignty and setting our own laws and trade policies, plus dealing properly with immigration based on our own quota system. Even if there would be a temporary economic hit (there needn't be) people were willing to accept that hit to achieve their main aims based on independence.

The referendum delivered a true democratic decision. 51.9% of the votes were for Brexit. That is 17,410,742 votes for Leave against 16,141,241 votes to Remain. The total votes of 33,577,342 represented the biggest democratic process in British history (there were 46,500,001 registered voters at the time). Many general elections had far fewer voters

---

<sup>2</sup> His local Conservative party wants to de-select him but has no legal power to do so until the next general election.

<sup>3</sup> Her local party expressed their anger against her leaving the Tories for a Remain party on the radio in no uncertain terms. The Sun, 21 February 2019.

come out and many governments gained power with less than a third of the national vote - but no one complained then.

The actual question was literally: *‘Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?’*.

Now no one has previously seriously contested the democratic process, which is based on a numerical majority, if necessary of only one vote. Many MP seats have been won, even after recounts, by less than ten votes. No one has ever denied that this is democracy.

So under the democratic system in Britain, the referendum delivered a very good result – a clear majority of 1,269,501. Democracy only required a majority of one; instead it delivered a majority of over 1.2 million. The trope that it was an even split is wrong. The idea that it is not democracy is wrong. The claim that over a million majority votes are insufficient is wrong.

The Prime Minister, David Cameron, plainly stated that the government would enact the decision of the plebiscite. This was unequivocally declared by the people in power.

In due course there was a vote in Parliament to trigger Article 50 to leave the EU under the Lisbon Treaty. This won by a sizeable majority of 384 votes. This was also democratic, even though it was unnecessary, as the PM had already said that he would deliver the vote of the referendum.<sup>4</sup> Thus there was a double democratic process. Theresa May invoked Article 50 on 29 March 2017.

There was another democratic process that undergirded the Leave decision. This was the general election called by Theresa May PM for 8 June 2017, which was a failed attempt to strengthen her position. Both the Conservatives and Labour, plus some smaller parties, published a manifesto promising to fulfil the mandate of the people and leave the EU. Nearly 85% of the population voted for a party with such a manifesto promise. This meant that the majority of the public in favour of leaving had increased to 85%.

The trope that Brexit was not a genuine democratic decision is utterly false. The claim that the decision was too tight to call is also false. In fact most of the country has voted for Brexit through the general election of 2017.

## The state of the main parties

### The Conservatives under Theresa May

When David Cameron resigned from party leadership, afraid to deal with the mess he created, Theresa May became Tory leader and PM. The prime focus of her leadership was to effect the referendum decision and get Britain out of the EU. The problem was that she was a Remain voter and her heart was not in it when the country needed a strong negotiator to face Brussels. Furthermore she was a very poor, isolated leader who could not even discipline her own party effectively. She also denied the importance of her cabinet and acted more in line with her advisors who were all ardent Remainers seeking to keep us in the EU.

---

<sup>4</sup> It was necessitated because Gina Miller went to the Supreme Court to make the triggering of Article 50 a Parliamentary issue, even though Parliament had already voted for the referendum Act and promised to effect it. This was just one of the many wrecking tactics to stop or delay Brexit.

These advisors, like Olly Robbins,<sup>5</sup> proved to give May bad advice on many issues. The worst was advising her to go for a general election because the polls suggested that she would do well (when the polls had got the referendum completely wrong). In the event, May cut her majority of 17 by losing 13 seats, which set the playing field for the next few years of parliamentary indecision and necessitated an alliance with the DUP. It also weakened her negotiating hand with the EU. This required asking the EU for an extension to the Article 50 process from 29 March to 31 October 2019.

The dissatisfaction with May's handling of Brexit was reflected in the 2019 MEP elections where the Conservatives suffered their most humiliating defeat, coming fifth behind the Greens and the LibDems. There was talk about the Conservatives being obliterated if Brexit failed to materialise.

May managed to negotiate a very bad deal with the EU (in fact a treaty) which no one could accept. Its 'Back-Stop' meant that N Ireland was effectively an EU vassal state and Britain had no unilateral get-out clause. This deal was so bad that it was rejected three times in humiliating defeats in the Commons. May finally realised that she had to step down, and resigned.

In short, Theresa May's leadership was disastrous. She was the most ineffective leader in a hundred years.

### **The Conservatives under Boris Johnson**

Johnson entered into leadership of the party and the government with one hand tied behind his back and a host of detractors. Never was a leader more hamstrung. With various defections and dismissals of Remainers he had a negative majority and so government could no longer govern at all.

Despite every negative criticism, in fact constant negative criticism from everyone, Johnson managed to secure changes to the Withdrawal Agreement that made it just about palatable to Tories (though it is not a proper Brexit).<sup>6</sup>

After several humiliating Commons defeats, the Withdrawal Agreement passed to the Second Reading (a major victory) but the fast timetable motion was rejected by the House, making it impossible to leave by the 31 October deadline. Johnson was forced by the Hilary Benn 'Surrender' Act to ask the EU for another extension.

Johnson then called for a general election in December, but the iniquitous Fixed-Term Parliament Act of Nick Clegg means that he requires two-thirds majority vote to get this.

Despite the country crying out for a change, for a new Parliament; despite Corbyn repeatedly asking for a general election; despite the fact that the government cannot govern, the opposition parties have so far refused to vote for a general election and continue to dither. This situation changes by the minute. [See 'stop press' later.]

However, despite all the criticism, Johnson managed to do in less than three months what Theresa May could not do in three years – get a deal past the EU and the Commons. If Johnson had been PM instead of Theresa May (which nearly occurred but for the errors of Michael Gove) we might have sorted this out by now. Johnson is also surging in the polls.

---

<sup>5</sup> Sir Oliver Robbins, PM's Europe Advisor and Chief Negotiator from 2017 to 2019.

<sup>6</sup> It puts a border in the Irish Sea, contemptible to the DUP, and does not deal with the Common Fisheries Policy for many years. Plus we continue to pay to the EU for many years and the EU can keep extending the transition period. It is largely being in the EU with no representation or veto.

## Labour

For most of his political career Jeremy Corbyn, leader of the Opposition, has been a Eurosceptic like his meteorologist brother Piers. Indeed historically, the Labour Party was opposed to Europe but a portion was tricked into supporting Edward Heath by Roy Jenkins (former deputy leader). In fact Jenkins possibly acted criminally as all sorts of methods were used to stop Labour MPs voting against Europe in the 1972 decision. One trick was to send certain MPs long distances from London on urgent party business to stop them voting. Jenkins led 69 Labour MPs through the division lobby in support of Heath's motion to take Britain into the EEC. So traditionally, the Labour Party was opposed to the EU. Some of the strongest anti-EU (then EEC) speakers were Labour MPs like Tony Benn who would be ashamed of the antics of his son Hilary today. Jenkins was rewarded by becoming president of the European Commission and a Lord.

Despite the manifesto promise and Corbyn's history, the leadership of the party was gradually taken over, regarding Brexit, by Keir Starmer, a globalist and Remainer. Slowly after 2017 the Labour Party became a Remain Party and is now openly so. This is odd since Corbyn's facial expression betrays that, despite his statements, his heart isn't in it.

For three years we had a Prime Minister trying to get Brexit done but she was really a Remainer, and the Labour Party claiming to be for Remain with a leader who had always been a Eurosceptic. What nonsense.

Thus it is no surprise that in recent months Labour has been stricken by a dichotomy of policy. There are the hard Left Momentum people versus the centrist Blairites. There are the Remain MPs versus Brexit MPs like Kate Hoey. There are centrists like Liz Kendall opposed to the extremes of the Left and the Right. But worst of all there is the fact that the Remainer Labour Party is now openly opposed to the 60% of Labour voters who voted for Brexit. This includes the Labour heartland of the North that feels betrayed.

This was expressed in the 2019 European MEP elections where very many traditional Labour voters voted for Nigel Farage's Brexit Party and Labour came third.<sup>7</sup> It is also reflected in the polling figures showing that Corbyn is now the most unpopular party leader in British history, even worse than Michael Foot.

Others are equally lacking in wisdom. Emily Thornberry (Shadow Foreign Secretary) was widely ridiculed when she publicly stated that she would make the '*best Brexit deal for Britain*' with the EU (if Labour won an election) but then campaign against her own deal. This shows the level of incompetent confusion in MPs and only a real fool would state such a thing on national television.<sup>8</sup> The thought of someone like her as a real Foreign Secretary is scary, but not quite as frightening as Diane Abbot as Home Secretary.

## The Liberal Democrats

The LibDems are now neither Liberal nor Democratic.

The travesty of British politics today is that the party leader, Jo Swinson, is so undemocratic and so hubristic that she has publicly stated that if there were a second referendum (that the party strives for) that voted again for Brexit, she would ignore it and if she were in power she would revoke Article 50. This astonishing lack of self-awareness is too shameful to believe. This is despotic behaviour from a Liberal Democrat.

---

<sup>7</sup> Brexit Party 29 seats, LibDems 16 seats, Labour 10 seats, Greens 7 seats, Tories 4 seats, SNP 3 seats, Alliance 1 seat, Plaid 1 seat, DUP 1 seat,

<sup>8</sup> BBC 1, Question Time, 5 September 2019.

In the past the LibDems have clamoured for a referendum on Europe, even staging a walkout of Parliament. Yet when they got this vote, they have done everything in their power to try to scupper it. They have cynically chosen to go for the disgruntled Remain voters and shun any idea of democracy.

Ironically several of its current spokesmen are actually twice or three times un-democratic, such as Chuka Umunna. As a Labour MP he denied the validity of the referendum and sought to revoke Article 50. He then resigned from the Labour Party to help form the ChangeUK failed group before he joined the LibDems. He refused to be democratic and fight a by-election, denying his constituents their right to confirm what party they supported. As a LibDem he now campaigns to revoke Article 50. This is a cynical and disgraceful politician; but there are several like him.

### **The SNP**

The SNP are cynically using the current situation to make a nationalist bid for yet another referendum on Scottish Nationalism. Thus they oppose the various plans for Brexit and disparage Johnson at every opportunity. In fact the record of the SNP devolved government in Scotland is very poor (e.g in schools or the NHS) because they are focusing on nationalism instead of governance.

They deny UK democracy because Scotland narrowly voted for Remain. While claiming to be Scottish democrats, they actually deny the democratic process of the UK that they are members of. They also seem oblivious to the fact that if Scotland seceded from Britain and joined the EU they would be much worse off. They would have to join the Euro and adopt the Schengen area open border policy. The membership fee would take a large proportion of their tax returns. This at a time when the economy of the EU is facing recession and serious problems and open border immigration is destroying multiple nations. Only a complete fool would secede from the 5<sup>th</sup> richest nation in the world to join a collapsing federal league over the sea.

### **The Brexit Party**

Infuriated by what he saw as a betrayal by the political class of the referendum result, Nigel Farage, with help from businessmen like Richard Tice, formed the Brexit Party after UKIP became embroiled in internecine strife.

Within a matter of weeks it did really well in the MEP elections, coming first, and gained huge national support. It was bolstered by well-known figures like Anne Widdecombe who has given some barnstorming speeches.

This party is demanding a clean-break Brexit, by which it means a no-deal Brexit and leaving on WTO terms. Sadly almost no politician (apart from the Tory ERG group) countenance this.

The strength of the Brexit Party, though it is a natural ally to Johnson's Tory Party, would actually split the Leave vote in a general election and help Labour to gain seats. This is unless Boris Johnson agreed a pact with Farage, which he has currently refused to do.

## **The striving to change the narrative**

Over and over the Remain establishment sought to change the referendum narrative to reverse its impact. This includes statements such as:

**Even a vote for Brexit (let alone actually leaving) will cause terrible economic damage and require an emergency budget response.**

Sheer scaremongering by the treasury, the Bank of England chairman and George Osborne at the time. None of this occurred; in fact the economy grew, unemployment fell and inward investment increased.

The same scaremongering was associated with Britain leaving the European Exchange Rate Mechanism. In fact Britain went from recession to economic strength.

**No one knew what they voted for.**

I have already shown that this is false. The vote was to leave the EU, which meant leaving the Single Market, the Customs Union and getting out of regulatory alignment under the European Court of Justice. This enables national sovereignty, independence, setting out our own immigration policies and establishing international free-trade deals.

**No one voted for ‘No-Deal’.**

In fact they never voted for any deal; they voted to leave the EU, which does not require a deal. A free-trade agreement can be negotiated after we have left under our terms.<sup>9</sup> Even the current deal does not result in a free-trade agreement; it must be negotiated separately (as demanded by the EU when it dominated the negotiations with May) and may take years. Michelle Barnier has stated that it will take at least three years. This will prevent us from setting up foreign trade deals independently and will cost £65 billion.

**The referendum majority was too small for it to be enacted.**

This is anti-democratic. Many general elections were decided on a much smaller majority – but no one made a fuss.

**The country needs a second referendum to ratify the current deal or revoke Article 50.**

This is anti-democratic. The government stated that it would enact the first referendum. You cannot establish democracy by thwarting previous democratic processes.

**Those who voted for Brexit were old people who wrecked the country for young people.**

Astonishing nonsense. The older generation built the country and defended Britain in a war. In any case many young people voted Brexit.

**Those who voted for Brexit were stupid and know no better.**

In many cases Brexiteers are highly intelligent people like Christopher Booker<sup>10</sup>, Anne Widdicombe or Jacob Rees-Mogg on the Right and Rod Liddle or Kate Hoey on the Left, or traditional Liberals like Melanie Philips. They include successful businesspeople like Michelle Dewberry and Tim Martin, journalists like Isabel Oakeshott, radio presenters like Iain Dale and so on. On the other hand Remainers know nothing about the corruption, lack of democracy, fiscal incompetence, federal objectives and the iniquitous history of the EU,<sup>11</sup> or they would not support Remain.

---

<sup>9</sup> In fact, Donald Tusk offered us a free trade deal twice, rejected by May, before they realised that they had the upper hand in negotiations.

<sup>10</sup> Who co-authored a detailed history of the EU.

<sup>11</sup> I have explained all these things in other papers.

**A no-deal Brexit will cause massive chaos to the country and ruin the economy. Thousands of jobs will be lost and businesses will be bankrupted.**

This is sheer alarmism. I have showed in other papers that it is also false. Customs and Excise and the port chiefs in France and England have plainly stated that there need be no queues at ports. A minority of businesses will have to complete extra forms, that is all. We are already in regulatory alignment with Europe.

**People will die because they won't be able to get their medicine and shelves will be empty in the supermarkets.**

More scaremongering that is completely wrong. Why would European businesses act against their financial interest?

**Prices will rise.**

No, prices will fall, especially in food, and children's clothes. The more we get better foreign trade deals the more prices will fall after leaving the protectionism of the EU.

**What is needed is a 'soft-Brexit'.**

This is particularly the position of Keir Starmer and Labour; but it is nonsense. One has to wonder how highly qualified people like Starmer (a lawyer) can make statements that are so irrational. You cannot be partly in an exclusive club and partly out of it at the same time. Brexit means leaving the EU; how then can you have a Brexit that is in the Single Market and the Customs Union submitting to the regulations of the European Court of Justice?

**Workers rights will be hampered if we leave the EU.**

I have explained in other papers how Britain has superseded the EU in workers' and customer's rights many times. In fact, the EU has been behind other countries in affirming people's rights. For example it took years to change the EU mobile roaming charges situation after other countries changed the rules in favour of customers. Britain led the way in establishing a living wage.

**We need to be in the EU to establish vital climate protections.**

Firstly, climate change alarmism is a complete fraud; CO<sub>2</sub> is beneficial to all life on earth and we need more of it not less. See my papers on this. Despite this fact, Britain has reduced its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and is committed to zero emissions by 2050. Germany has largely abandoned solar and wind generation because it doesn't work and is expensive; it is building coal-fired power stations to meet its needs. Britain isn't the problem in CO<sub>2</sub> generation, that would be China and India.

**The EU is necessary to keep the peace of Europe.**

This is utter nonsense. If this supposedly democratic institution has preserved peace since WWII, why is it building a European Army? Why has it provoked Russia by allowing the US to build military bases all along its Eastern borders? What about European wars, such as the Bosnian War, the Kosovo War and associated genocide? What about NATO bombing Yugoslavia?

These false messages were repeatedly played out in the media and politics. The establishment sought to brainwash the public by a constant barrage of conditioning to get it to accept these false messages.

The level of bias was astronomical. This was especially evident in the BBC (it should be called the Biased Broadcasting Corporation). One example is that the popular Question Time programme repeatedly had a panel of four Remainers to one Brexiteer or even none. This is shocking bias. To reflect the country it ought to have had three Brexiteers to two

Remainers. In programme after programme, from comedy to political commentary, the BBC (and other channels) disparaged Brexiteers and applauded Remainers. The barrage from the media has been intense and constant. And yet the polls continue to show surging support for Boris Johnson and continuing commitment to Brexit.

## The undemocratic Parliament

It would be tedious to analyse the long and labyrinthine machinations of the Commons over the last three years. Over and over wrecking motions, amendments and bills have been put forward to frustrate the democratic vote to leave. Individuals like Gina Miller, Dominic Grieve, Hilary Benn, Yvette Cooper and Oliver Letwin have tried to frustrate the Brexit process or try to stop it entirely. A no-deal Brexit (the best and simplest solution) has been removed by wrecking bills; it could now only occur by default if the EU did not extend Article 50.

The basic problem is that the majority of MPs are Remainers representing a country where the majority of voters demanded to leave the EU. These Remainers have put their own aspirations first and ignored the national constituency. In many cases, such as Jo Swinson, they are also receiving large amounts of money from globalist corporations (e.g those run by George Soros) that want to stop Brexit. Some of these Remainers are in bed with the global elite to thwart the national vote. This ought to be made public. People like Jo Swinson and Ben Bradshaw should declare the vested interests that they are involved with.

This is exacerbated by the fact the whole establishment (civil service, media, judiciary etc.) is also Remain.

So we have the people against those in power. This is a dangerous situation. **Brexit has revealed that the democratic institutions are not subject to the people at all; there is no real democracy.**

A general election may not resolve this situation if it results in a hung parliament, but to refuse it (as the opposition parties currently are) makes the matter worse. The nation is crying out to end this frustrating nonsense that is hindering business and stopping the government fixing the infrastructure problems (which are many). The reason the opposition parties won't vote for an election is because the polls show that Labour and others would suffer very badly. As I write this situation is in flux.

Stop Press (29 October 2019): As I was about to publish this paper the Commons decided to approve a bill for an early general election on 12 December. This in itself was odd as the day before Johnson could not get a two-thirds majority for an election under the fixed term Parliament Act, but just now got over two-thirds support for a one-line general election bill. Clearly pressure was brought upon Labour (especially after a terrible Newsnight performance) in the last 24 hours because the party was looking ridiculous in opposing an election.

The effects on the street are getting serious.

Brexiteers are being attacked and labelled as Nazis and racists. Some have been openly assaulted. People on both sides have received death threats. Tory MPs are facing massive abuse on exiting the Commons, requiring police escort. Communities are being ravaged by partisan spirit.

Scotland is threatening to leave the union if we leave the EU. On the current treaty, N Ireland is close to being a vassal state of the EU issuing customs declarations to pass goods

on to England and Wales and many voices in Ireland are trying to strive for reunion of N Ireland and the Republic. This situation is very serious. It is not inconceivable that Scotland and N Ireland could end up as part of the EU and the union wrecked.

Brexit needs to be accomplished quickly. It could have been effected three years ago if the political will had been present.

## **The undemocratic courts**

It is incredible that, in the name of democracy, certain wealthy establishment individuals (often financed by globalists) have acted undemocratically to frustrate Brexit. Our democratic system should be able to avoid such things – unfortunately not.

The prime example of this is Gina Miller, a businesswoman and former law student, originally from Guyana. I suspect that Miller acted from good intentions but her anti-Brexit bias caused her to act contrary to her democratic principles in other areas. A classic case of tunnel vision.

In June 2016 she engaged a top class law firm to challenge the British government from invoking Article 50 via prerogative powers. She argued that only Parliament must do this as a whole. What she ignored was the fact that Parliament had already given this assent when it voted for the Referendum Act and the government publicly stated that Parliament would fully enact the people's decision. It was she that acted against democracy.

On 3 November 2016 the High Court of Justice ruled that Parliament had to legislate before the government could invoke Article 50. The government appealed to the Supreme Court, which dismissed the government's case in January 2017.

The whole affair proved to be a waste of time and money since on 16 March 2017 Parliament voted to invoke Article 50<sup>12</sup> anyway, by a large margin and without any amendments.

Miller then raised £300,000 campaign funds to back anti-Brexit candidates in the 2017 election. Then she launched a campaign to challenge the Conservative-DUP agreement.

On 28 August 2019 Miller, with others, started legal proceedings against the Johnson government's intention to prorogue (suspend) Parliament, claiming that it was unconstitutional. In fact there is no law regarding this and Parliament is prorogued every year for the party conference season. Johnson sought to prorogue Parliament for an extra four days. Several Prime Ministers have prorogued Parliament for far longer for more dubious reasons (notably John Major who also hypocritically challenged Johnson).<sup>13</sup>

On 6 September 2019 the High Court dismissed her case. Miller appealed to the Supreme Court, which, on 24 September, ruled that the prorogation was unlawful.

Firstly, the fact that the High Court and the Supreme Court were at odds shows that this is not a clear case of legal exactitude. But the whole affair is anti-constitutional in that British courts are not supposed to act politically or decide on political matters. It is beyond their remit. This is a usurpation of power by the judiciary over the executive and trashed the Bill

---

<sup>12</sup> The European Union (Notification of Withdrawal) Act 2017.

<sup>13</sup> Major prorogued Parliament for six weeks to take the heat off his party embroiled in the MPs expenses scandal.

of Rights as it makes unelected officials the determiner of executive actions. It resembles the evils of the Star Chamber and sets a dangerous precedent. Charles 1's use of this against political opponents was one of the causes of Civil War.

Parliamentary sovereignty does not permit the courts to exercise power over the executive branch of the state in its dealings with Parliament. The Supreme Court cited no authority to support its decision.

The Supreme Court was created by Tony Blair to replace the Law Lords and is currently filled with Remainer Progressives who acted selfishly and not judiciously. How could the Supreme Court say that the prorogation was unlawful when Parliament has never created a law that limits the use of the prerogative to prorogue Parliament? Parliament makes laws but the government governs even when Parliament is not sitting. If Parliament does not like the way the executive governs it can vote it down, but it cannot usurp the powers of the executive.

The judgment did not understand how Parliament works, which is a team of the executive, the Commons, the Lords and the Queen. It set the Lords against the Commons in the way it worded its judgment, saying that prorogation (which is heard in the Lords with both Houses present) is '*imposed from outside*'.

The Supreme Court has taken upon itself the power to make Constitutional law. This is shocking and serious. Political decisions must now be justified by unelected judges.

The prevention of the suspension achieved absolutely nothing, except severe inconvenience for the Tory Party conference. Labour and the LibDems had concluded their conferences but Parliament was reopened during the week of the Tory conference. The Leader of the House (Rees-Mogg) had to arrange Commons business so as to allow as many Tory MPs as possible to travel north, at least for some of the conference. This hindrance was shameful. Nothing of importance was done on the days the Commons met in the four days that would have been prorogued.

Remember that all of this is hostile to the fact that 17.4 million people secured a majority to leave the EU in 2016.

## **The undemocratic Speaker of the Commons**

John Bercow is the most biased Speaker that the House has ever had. He is an ardent Remainer that has even been in direct talks with Brussels to sound out strategies. This is treasonous under the Constitution.

He has constantly favoured Remainer strategies by preferring them in the order of business of the debates, such as Brexit-wrecking amendments and bills. He has abused his position by certifying a bill opposed to the government that did not require Queen's Consent or a money resolution.

The Supreme Court, however, has not been called upon to judge the actions of the Speaker in denying the democratic conventions of Parliament. Yet Bercow has done far more to damage the democratic process than Johnson ever did.

## The current situation

We are now in the position where Boris Johnson's revamped May Withdrawal Agreement may get final acceptance in the Commons and ratified by the Lords. But it may not and stalemate resumes.

Even if it gets passed, we are then committed to three or four years negotiating a free-trade deal at a cost of £65 billion in additional membership funds.

The current deal does not sort out Britain's fisheries problems and keeps us under the ECJ. It also keeps us in the development of the European Army ('Defence Force') whereby Britain's security becomes subsumed under the EU federal government. When Britons understand that Brussels will be commander-in-chief of British armed forces there will be havoc. The media is keeping this quiet.

The current deal is not Brexit at all.

Johnson has managed to get a general election despite the opposition parties hindering him (Labour feared they would be thrashed). If he changes his tune and commits himself to a clean-break Brexit (no deal), he would wipe out the Brexit Party and get a huge majority. In fact, furious northern Labour Brexit voters could well vote Tory for the first time in history. If he makes a pact with the Brexit Party, together they may secure a Brexit majority coalition but who knows what would happen after that in governing Britain? If he refuses a pact, then the Brexit vote will be split and opposition parties could gain seats, especially the LibDems and Greens. This could result in a hung Parliament and we would be back to square one.

A great deal depends upon what Johnson does next.

## Conclusion

Never in 400 years has there been a situation where democracy was in so much peril in this country. Never has the will of the people been so thwarted by individuals with vested interests.

When Parliament previously became so corrupt that it ceased to function, Oliver Cromwell shut it down and expelled the MPs at sword point by soldiers. Assuming despotic power reluctantly, Cromwell sorted the mess out and Britain became the world's superpower with the best army and navy, feared on the high seas. The economy grew after the reckless Stuarts had been exiled or executed.

Some called for the Queen to dissolve Parliament and make it restart by a general election. Though she has the power to do this within the law in theory, it will never happen. At the last minute it wasn't necessary.

This is the level to which we have sunk because we have many politicians who are simply appalling, corrupt and incompetent. We need to get rid of the dead wood and start again.

It will be interesting to see how this resolves.

Christians can thank God that they are citizens of a better country, a heavenly city that has foundations. Our British Parliament no longer has any foundations and needs reformation.

However, Christians also have responsibilities as citizens in this material world to do good to all and honour legal governance. Thus it behoves us to carefully analyse what is going on and come to sound conclusions. This is so that we can fulfil our responsibilities properly, especially when we vote and how we pray for leaders. What we do today affects the world that our children and grandchildren inherit. We must respect and propagate divine attributes in society: such as justice, honour, goodness, truth and righteousness and oppose (at least in principle) injustice, lies, evil, dishonour and unrighteousness.

Christians must be very careful not to support or vote for MPs that have proven themselves to be undemocratic, liars, charlatans, wicked, dishonourable and treacherous.

In the long view of things this charade is a blip that is not worth Christians getting excited about. It is part of the degeneration of society characteristic of the end times. On the other hand, Christian responsibility demands that we act righteously, especially in voting and in teaching our children how to behave in society. This necessitates analysis of political actions.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version

© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2019**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>