

RT

QUESTION MORE

⚡ Zelensky doubles down on ultimatum to Russian ally | Russia-Ukraine conflict

LIVE



Russia & Former Soviet Union

World News

Business

India

Africa

RT Features

Analysis

Opinion

Entertainment

Shows

Projects

[/ Home](#) / [World News](#)

Keir Starmer's resignation is an illusion of democracy

His exit satisfies public anger, but the system stays intact: new faces, same donors, same policies, same insulation from voters

Published 22 Jun, 2026 15:56 | Updated 22 Jun, 2026 17:00



By **Constantin von Hoffmeister**, a political and cultural commentator from Germany, author of the book *The Fate of White America* and director of *Multipolar Press*

eurosiberia.net



UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer announces his resignation © Dan Kitwood / Getty Images

British Prime Minister Keir Starmer's resignation on Monday exemplifies the cynical sham of 'democratic renewal' in a system dominated by globalist plutocratic interests.

Starmer stood outside 10 Downing Street and announced that he was stepping down as leader of the Labour Party and head of government. He cynically masked his political execution as a voluntary departure made 'with good grace' for the sake of the party's chances at the next

Top stories



Britain's 'first gay father' and his husband charged with child sex offenses

Starmer turned UK into 'authoritarian hellhole' – George Galloway **EXCLUSIVE**

DEA 'sat back and watched' as fentanyl flooded New Mexico – AP

Lebanon should be Israel's 'playground' – minister

\$140,000 raised for Texas woman who called Islam 'terrorist organization'

election. The grim reality is that his hand was forced by an imploding cabinet and years of plummeting approval ratings fueled by economic paralysis, disastrous U-turns, and outright voter disgust.

Media outlets immediately framed the moment as *“historic,”* a signal that the system had listened, that accountability had prevailed, and that Britain might now chart a different course. Yet this narrative rings hollow. Starmer’s departure is not a rupture but another installment in a long-running political theater designed to sustain the illusion of choice while preserving the underlying structures of power. In contemporary Western ‘democracy’, genuine transformation remains elusive because the system functions less as rule by the people and more as management by a self-appointed new ‘aristocracy’, whose priorities consistently diverge from those of native populations.

Starmer’s Labour government, like the Conservative administrations that preceded it, continued or accelerated policies that many voters perceive as detrimental to national interests. Record levels of legal and illegal immigration, the continued aggressive pursuit of net-zero carbon targets – which have driven up household energy bills through massive grid upgrades needed to integrate intermittent wind and solar power, along with the phasing out of cheaper fossil fuels – and a foreign policy closely aligned with supranational institutions rather than distinct British priorities all persisted under Starmer’s watch. His resignation changes none of these trajectories at the structural level. A new leader will inherit the same institutional constraints, the same donor networks, the same media ecosystem, and the same ‘international commitments’.

The term ‘plutocracy’ describes a system in which wealth and concentrated economic power determine political outcomes far more effectively than ballots. In Britain and across the West, this plutocracy operates through interlocking networks of finance, multinational corporations, media conglomerates, and supranational bodies such as the World Economic Forum, the European Union (even post-Brexit, its influence lingers), and global financial institutions. These actors prioritize borderless capital flows, cheap labor, regulatory harmonization, and cultural liberalization because such arrangements maximize returns and minimize resistance from rooted national communities.

Friedrich Engels, who lived for decades in Manchester and closely studied Britain’s political order, diagnosed the same structural reality more than a century earlier. In his 1891 introduction to Karl Marx’s ‘The Civil War in France’, Engels declared that *“the state is nothing but a machine for the oppression of one class by another, and indeed in the democratic republic no less than in the monarchy.”* He elaborated in ‘The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State’ (1884) that universal



Subscribe to RT newsletter to get news highlights of the day right in your mailbox

E-mail

☐ We offer you the possibility to receive RT's news highlights every Monday, Wednesday and Friday by email.

Subscribe

RT Features



The ‘Tiffany’s father’ gambit: Inside the secret US deal to carve up Libya FEATURE

suffrage functions only as *“the gauge of the maturity of the working class”* and *“cannot and never will be anything more in the modern state.”* For Engels, the British

parliamentary system, even after successive Reform Acts extending the franchise, was not a genuine arena of popular sovereignty but a refined instrument of class rule. Alternating parties (then the Liberals and Conservatives) served as competing administrative teams for bourgeois interests, preserving capitalist dominance behind the formal rituals of debate, elections, and leadership changes. Starmer’s resignation and the expected elevation of a successor fit this pattern precisely: another rotation of personnel within an unchanged framework, where the plutocratic imperatives of global capital, immigration policy, and economic orthodoxy continue uninterrupted.

Sustained high immigration depresses wages in lower-skilled sectors, strains public services, and alters the demographic balance in ways that native citizens did not vote for. Energy policies framed as ‘climate necessity’ impose costs that fall disproportionately on working and middle-class households while benefiting green-tech investors and international energy traders. Cultural shifts promoted through education, media, and corporate diversity mandates harm the shared identity and social trust that have historically underpinned stable democracies. When voters express discontent – through protests, low voter turnout, or support for outsider candidates – the response is rarely substantive policy reversal. Instead, the system offers spectacle.

Resignations function as particularly effective herd control mechanisms. The dramatic exit of a prime minister generates wall-to-wall media coverage, parliamentary farce, and public catharsis. Citizens are encouraged to believe that the system works because a failing leader has been removed. Historical examples abound. Boris Johnson’s 2022 downfall involved dozens of ministerial resignations in days, portrayed as a spontaneous revolt of principle. Liz Truss’s brief tenure ended in market chaos and swift replacement. Theresa May and even Margaret Thatcher’s departures carried similar dramatic weight. Each episode produced intense coverage, temporary polling shifts, and the sense that accountability mechanisms were functioning. Yet, as the spectacle dissipates, the new occupant settles into the same institutional furniture, and public attention moves to the next distraction: sports, entertainment, or the next celebrity scandal.

This cycle keeps populations docile. The modern equivalents of Roman bread and circuses include expansive welfare systems that foster dependency, ubiquitous digital entertainment that dull the people’s reasoning faculties, and a news cycle engineered for outrage rather than analysis. The mainstream media acts as a ruthless guardian of the status quo by relentlessly pushing identity-based conflicts that fragment public attention and block unified opposition to the ruling economic order. This calculated distraction deliberately shields the predatory architecture of financialization, offshoring, and elite regulatory capture, all while advancing policies hostile to the ethnocultural interests of white British

Read more: UK’s Starmer resigns as prime minister



The worst day in Russian history: How the USSR met Hitler unprepared – and still crushed him

FEATURE



Sixty years of Black Power: Why America still can’t survive its own race debate

FEATURE

Podcasts

[All podcasts](#)



'Karma's a b***h: Starmer betrayed and was betrayed. He was the most hated PM' - George Galloway

0:00 55:10



Trump's life is in danger from Israel after deal with Iran - ex-Israeli intel officer Ari Ben-Menashe

people, the destruction of the traditional British heritage, and institutional favoritism towards non-native groups at the expense of the historic majority. When frustration builds to the point of threatening stability, a high-profile resignation or leadership contest is staged. The message is clear: your voices have been heard; change is coming. In practice, the new leader often accelerates elements of the previous agenda or introduces cosmetic reforms that leave core power relations intact.



Read more: Trump piles misery on outgoing Starmer

The illusion of choice is reinforced by the party system itself. Britain's first-past-the-post electoral framework – the winner-takes-all system in which the candidate with the most votes in each constituency wins the seat, even without an overall majority – and the dominance of two major parties (with occasional third-party perturbations) create the appearance of alternation while enforcing convergence on fundamentals. Outsider challenges, whether from Reform UK or left-wing insurgents, are contained through negative media framing, institutional barriers, or co-option. The result is a managed pluralism in which voters select from pre-approved options whose differences are largely stylistic or tactical rather than

structural.

Andy Burnham's emergence as a potential successor illustrates the point. His by-election triumph was hailed by some as a rebuke to Starmerism, yet Burnham's record as Greater Manchester mayor and his positioning within Labour's broad church suggest continuity rather than change. Whether the next occupant hails from the party's right, center, or soft left, the institutional incentives push towards accommodation with the plutocratic consensus.

True democratic renewal would require mechanisms that genuinely empower citizens to alter foundational policies: stricter controls on elite influence through campaign finance reform, actual referendums on immigration and constitutional questions with binding force, and devolution of power that reduces the distance between rulers and ruled. Instead, the current arrangement offers periodic leadership musical chairs while the music, global capital's preferences, continues uninterrupted. Starmer's resignation will be remembered as another well-choreographed scene in a production whose directors remain firmly in their chairs.

The British public, like most citizens across the West, grows increasingly aware of this dynamic. Polling has shown deep distrust in institutions and a sense that the political class operates in its own interest. Yet awareness alone does not alter structures. Until mechanisms exist for ordinary people to impose

real costs on elites who disregard national interests, the cycle of spectacle and continuity will persist. Resignations will come and go. New puppets will be installed. And the plutocracy, globalist by nature and insulated from the consequences of its preferences, will continue to rule in democracy's name. The question is no longer whether the next leader will be different in any fundamental way – he will not – but whether citizens will continue to accept the performance as the substance of self-government.

The statements, views and opinions expressed in this column are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of RT.



OPINION

You can share this story on social media:



Follow RT on



Telegram

Please check our [commenting policy](#). If you have questions or suggestions feel free to send them to feedback@rttv.ru.

AA B i “ > ☰ ☷

Your comment here

Sign In ▾

Sort by Recently updated ▾

M Max Holbrook 6/23/2026 at 12:09 PM

0

It's the replacement that is the illusion of a Democracy.
But actually the rise of Political Teams, and basically ending up with just two Political Teams, is ANTI-Democracy.
It represents everything that is NOT a Democracy, but is sold as a Democracy.
All the people in a Party are TOLD how to vote on a particular matter by the Parties Power Brokers, which is literally a handful of people. That is not a Democracy.

[Reply](#)

E Eli Brookstein 6/23/2026 at 11:31 AM

0

If you actually read this ARTICLE, it is a very large HAMMER; hitting a very big NAIL!!!!

[Reply](#)

M Mattewis Kat 6/23/2026 at 6:32 AM

0

Unqualified democracy in itself is an illusion of democracy. It's a fundamentally flawed ruling structure crafted by the financial elite to benefit themselves at the cost of the perpetually disillusioned voting fodder, the latter fed the lie that it's the only viable system of governance to prevent the minority elite ruling over the mass majority. What's absolutely mind boggling in the modern western democratic structures is the level of intellect of those chosen by the elite to represent them, of which Starmer is a stellar example.

[Reply](#)

R Roderick Black 6/23/2026 at 1:47 AM

0

I think he had things in his psyche that were hidden – and he couldn't really lead Britain with all that stuff

percolating

[Reply](#)

 **Pravda** 6/23/2026 at 1:46 AM

0

Different boss, same script and puppet strings

[Reply](#)

 **Steven Hughes** 6/23/2026 at 1:24 AM

1

Good Riddance

[Reply](#)

 **Lee Driver** 6/23/2026 at 1:06 AM

3

The Zionist will replace him with another stooge.

[Reply](#)

 **Alan Mukando** 6/23/2026 at 12:04 AM

2

Many leaders are in the same group, never have a long term vision, and nothing really for the people.

[Reply](#)

 **Thomas Coote** 6/22/2026 at 11:59 PM

2

That is a brilliant, well written article!!

[Reply](#)

 **brahim bel** 6/22/2026 at 7:29 PM

8

WOW!!! British Prime Ministers don't seem to last as long as vegetables in your refrigerator...🤔

[Reply](#)

 **Paul J** 6/22/2026 at 7:46 PM ↗

6

But they resemble them.

[Reply](#)

 **Misha** 6/22/2026 at 11:40 PM ↗

0

That is because you have a Lucas Refrigerator.

[Reply](#)

 **XFretensis** 6/22/2026 at 11:25 PM

4

Well done Keir, you served your masters well. Now FOff and write a book about how well you've done. I'm sure the sales of such a page-turner will correspond to your actual achievements. Don't forget your pager on the way out.

[Reply](#)

 **Aca Pupu** 6/22/2026 at 11:15 PM

1

The Kosher Nostra's revolving door...

[Reply](#)

 **C B** 6/22/2026 at 8:06 PM

1

Why does he always look like his explosive collar is on a countdown

[Reply](#)

 **Jim Beauchamp** 6/22/2026 at 10:49 PM ↕

2

He looks like he knows what a scumbag he is but they have him by the balls and he's given up.

[Reply](#)

 **Ralph Griebenow** 6/22/2026 at 8:49 PM

0

Wait what!? 'Cultural liberalization?' What the hell can that possibly even mean? Maybe the man is referring to social dogmatism, or to a social or cultish zeitgeist, or groupthink, or subculture, but how that relates to 'libralization,' only heaven knows, and liberalization of what exactly? Again only God knows. Or is this another cheap shot at libertarianism to foster dark enlightenment on behalf of a illiberal cult-ural elitist agenda?

[Reply](#)

 **Jim Beauchamp** 6/22/2026 at 10:46 PM ↕

0

He means not keeping foids, nons and homos in their place. Plus normalizing degeneracy.

[Reply](#)

 **Christian Fourie** 6/22/2026 at 7:48 PM

4

It is already a 3rd world country that will be Islamic state in one generation.
No wonder the Brits are fleeing.

[Reply](#)