



The Problems
of
Separation

essays
& diatribes

mitchell john warren

Of Professional Representatives.

I cannot, for the life of me, see why any community would accept a representative being imposed upon them ... Imposed on them from outside the community they are supposedly going to represent. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

This of course, is just another one of my harpings on about democratic process. Democracy can't possibly work if communities are either just so lazy that they can't find a representative from amongst their ranks, or, somehow believe that a professional representative will look after their interests .. with more knowledge and with more integrity than a member of the community. Professional representation is the road to Corruption.

In reality, our Parliament should be full of independents, the representatives should have all the diversity of the communities that make up this great land of Australia. That is Democracy. Democracy is not this game of two intransigent sides - two teams. Two teams who under no circumstances are prepared to look at, to debate truly the issues of interest to ALL the individual communities that make up the country. This doesn't mean that the Parliament is to be a room full of corner dwellers, thats not what a parliament should be. Corners are hard to get out of and easy to be backed into. A Parliament should be a place where all the communities - via their representatives - come together to debate, discuss and work out problems that collectively will be of interest to, and in the interest of the Collective of Communities.

There is no need for this parliament to sit permanently, that is, for a period of years .. or even a year. This parliament should only be convened for the debate and discussion of particular points that would, or will, effect the Collective of Communities. Once the issue has been dealt with, the parliament should dissolve and the representatives of the communities, appointed to debate and discuss the particular issue, should go back home to live their lives. When the next issue comes up the communities should appoint - by whatever means they deem appropriate or necessary - a Representative to deal with that particular issue. Like we appoint juries to deal with particular cases of importance.

Now of course, if we mire ourselves in the thought that we must have, at all times, a Representative to WATCH OVER THE OTHER REPRESENTATIVES then we are barking up the wrong tree - continually. Its a matter of Trust, Integrity and Democracy.

What says we must have a permanent debating club if there is no issue to debate? This idea is divisive in itself and has been set up and perpetuated by that class of person who believes that their wisdom - and their desires - override those of a community. It is a fallacy of *self-interest* on the part of those who have nothing better to do than to be *Professional Representatives*. Nothing better to do than create a job, a job to rake in the cash, that to them, appears to need guarding and managing on behalf of the collective communities. This form of representation is nothing more than a form of policing. A policing of greed and of intolerant morality. It's self perpetuating .. and is not in the best interests of communities. There is no need to make jobs where there is no need for those jobs and there is no need to make laws where there is no need for laws. And there is no need for a community to be compelled to share the views, the laws of another community. Where communities must get on, then they will find their common ground. Conformity does not prevent wars; Wars are an excuse to compel conformity.

This is church thinking; thinking that says my way is the right way, my god is the true god and that your god is not allowed to exist because my god says so. This is the corruption of, as example, Jesus of Nazareth by Jesus the Christ .. the corruption of the teachings of John the Baptist and James the Just by Paul. There is no need. Its the *enshrinement of power and greed*. Both power and greed require subjects or they cease to be what they want to be. Now I use this example because here in Australia at this present time - December 2018 - we have a body, a Parliament that has fallen into the trap that says that all men are ignorant of their needs, that all men are, in their base, criminals. Criminals who require a strong and injurious hand to guide them .. to lead them in the true way. That all men must be made catholic in their conformity to the way that a certain small group of men say is the true way.

For what reason do we require this compelled conformity? WE do not

require it at all. IT is required to perpetuate a corrupt system - a System of Corruption. A system that is nothing more than a protection of base self-interest. A system imposed upon man by men who would be kings, by men whose own criminality can only be fed by the criminalisation of the rest of man.

If we disband parliament once the job of the Parliament is done, and only the job that the Parliament was convened to do, then much of this greed and this belief in *divine right* will disappear from the common lives of men who share their communities. It doesn't of course mean that greed and criminal self-interest will disappear - because there will always be men who envy what other men have - but these Representatives of a Parliament will not have anything of significance (self-interested presumption of privilege) with which to build a base upon. Once the job is done, the job of reaching a consensus both in the best interest of their community and of the collective community, they will go home to live their lives amongst the community that they have just represented ... Should another issue arise that requires a representative to be appointed to a collective of representatives, who is to say that the representative - who was considered to be the best for the debate and discussion of the previous issue - will be the same as that judged to be the best for this new issue? Privilege will then become privilege and will not become a right in itself.

There is no cost in this. Cost is an attribute of greed and individual self-interest, its an excuse for things not to get done, an excuse for not dealing with issues.

It only takes one look at Australia's Parliament of the past few years to see that nothing worthwhile gets done in there, no true debates and discussions happen, that the interest of the common Australian are subsumed to the interest of Professional Representatives. Professional Representatives whose whole idea of democracy is that we, the common man, the peacefully living common man of conscience, is ignorant of our true needs and desires. It assumes that even though we may have children .. nothing we will do will be for their interest; for the interest of a common collective and inclusive future. This Parliament of Professionals says that we will all be at war with each other, that we will

all destroy what others - in the same position as we are - have, it says that without professional representation we are lost to our own criminality. That we do not know the meaning of Consensus, Compassion and Security.

Why do we believe, or how is it that we can be led to believe that these professional Representatives somehow have more wisdom and a better understanding of our affairs than we do? What makes us think this can be the truth? What makes us, despite all the evidence to the contrary, allow representatives appointed on our behalf from outside our community, who have an allegiance to a body other than our community .. make decisions for us and our children and for our futures? It's laziness. Allowing Representatives appointed by a party with professed ideologies - and I say 'professed' here because, despite the secrecy that they work in - the current Australian Parliament is run by self-interest and individual greed that pays no real attention to ideologies if those ideologies somehow don't support a representatives view point, or rather at a particular time don't support the Representatives own interests, and because of the secrecy that our so called democracy says that it requires to further our interests, allows for the Fluidity of Principle, even when the community whose representative appointee has professed a particular set of principles, who has said to his or her community that these are the principles that will be their guide finds that *their own* self interest can be better served by eschewing those principles. This system that allows this Professional Representative to operate in secrecy. This is corruption. If our Representative finds that his principles cannot be constrained to those of the community that has placed him in this position of privileged trust - then our Representative must return to his community and the community will find a Representative that they can trust. Our Representative must not be allowed to operate in a system that can abrogate our trust to the Principle of Secrecy. This Parliament must be open. Our Representatives have no reason to hide debate, discussion and their consequences from us - they have no right to; because they operate on our behalf in our best interests and we who have privileged them with their appointment, know what our interests are. How can our Representative tell us that our interests are other than what we believe

they are? If our Representative finds that for whatever reason they cannot fulfill their brief, then they must return to us and we will find a replacement who we believe can. For this reason our Parliament needs to be open, for although we may not have the time, nor the inclination, nor should we find it necessary, we just may at times desire to see what it is that our Representative and those of other communities are doing. See how they are getting on. We may decide that WE have sent the wrong Representative to this collective debate and that we wish to appoint one who is better able to participate on a particular point in this particular debate, and who has better skills to reach the consensus that is required in a Democracy and which we desire.

This should not be a point of embarrassment, or shame, to our representative but, as he or she is part of our community, our Representative should readily see that it is appropriate that a replacement is found. Men are men and we do not always get on together and its a farce to assume that because one man has been appointed our representative then that man, and only that man, can complete this debate and discussion that is, after all, of interest to the community as a whole. This parliament is joined to reach consensus and not to impose intransigence on the communities of our collective community.

At this present time here in Australia we have a case of two Professional Representatives, two senators, who give neither the right to speak their minds though they both profess the right to speak theirs exclusively. These are representatives of communities, who as individuals have no interest in the process of parliament, other than to collect the paycheck their communities have privileged them with, to reach consensus in the interest of their communities collectively. They assume rights that neither of them are prepared to give the other. Their communities should have the right, and the ability, to remove them from the debating and discussion group because whatever it is they are doing .. it is not in the interests of the collection of communities. And no community should be penalised by the antics of their Representatives just because they are Professional Representatives. Their communities effectively have no representation in the collective. And while, in this case, a judge has told them to sort their differences out, the judge cannot under the

System of Australia's Parliament remove them from the parliament. The people of their communities should, and in fact, have a duty to the other communities to remove them from what is supposed to be a COLLECTIVE COMING TO CONSENSUS on specific issues. These two senators are not worthy of inclusion in the collective of communities and their behaviour and petty self interest penalises the communities they are supposed to represent. At this present time their communities have no voice in the debates. These two representatives are a good example of just why a Parliament should be convened only for the matter, the issue at hand, and not be allowed to debate and discuss issues outside of their ability to work to consensus - both in the interest of their individual communities and for the interest of the collective community. This is corrupt. These two Professional Representatives corrupt the process. Their intransigence on issues of their *own self serving moralities* have no place in the lives of the people of other communities joining in a collective solving of issues on behalf of all the communities that make up Australia, and I doubt very much that their communities look upon them with any great pride. They most certainly don't reflect any pride back on to the communities they supposedly represent.

This is the System of Professional Representation enshrined by an unrepresentative and democratically corrupt parliament. We have built some nice buildings in which to hold debates and discussions .. when is it that we are going to ensure that that is what they are used for?

" ... the nature of politics, which is as natural dimension of human life as eating, drinking, sex or commerce; a universal process by which human beings adjust to reality - especially the reality of other people - and adjust reality to themselves. It is messy, never wholly successful, and necessarily incomplete. It is the opposite of Utopia, and it may be observed that if it is the difficulty of Utopianism which has made so many Utopians into totalitarians, its impossibility has made many others democrats." - Hugh Brogan.

Mitchell Warren - Mt York December 2018.

