



The Problems  
of  
Separation

essays  
& diatribes

mitchell john warren

## The Debating Club Defined (2)

(A continuation of A Poorly Defined Debating Club)

As it appears to me, while this game of points works very well for the Debating Club membership, especially as there are so many privileges assumed by the members though they are not expressly given by the mass subjected to this Club of NeoLiberal defined debate; that should the code of Democratic Secrecy be broken, and knowledge of these redefinitions get out to the public .. and if this public, us mass, have not accepted completely the necessity of the process and all the redefinitions associated with it, then we are in a mass of trouble. A mass of discontent. Because no matter how the conclusion of the debates are come by they are never completely accepted by the dissenters no matter who they are - we only have to open our windows to see and hear the truth in this - so perhaps by making the process better, and less secretive, then the dissenters will be just that little bit more satisfied with the end result.

This really is the problem of Democracy; how to ensure that the dissenters remain only dissenters and are not forced into a position of revolution. Secrecy make no one happy unless of course that it becomes endless secrecy. Secrecy is always tainted with deceit and dishonesty and deceit and dishonesty are like spider webs of razor wire - they do a wonderful job of holding things in and keeping things out but are hell when one finds them behind you in retreat. So there, there should be no retreat. And from my way of thinking and with the old saying that 'retreat may be the better part of valour' - which I may say, I do not believe - retreat should not be a part of the process of a properly designed Debating Club. If the design is right and it operates on good moral principles (integrity, honour and sincerity)) then it should not be impossible to substitute conciliation and cooperation for dishonourable retreat. And as we still have phrases like, 'for the greater good', 'in our best interests' .. and, as the current King of Australia likes so much to shout out, 'a fair go for all', we won't have to change any of the placards that our progressive, inclusive humanity like to nail up on such expensive and beautiful buildings like those that usually house these

Debating Clubs. As you can see things begins to cost less once we decide to revert to older definitions.

If we begin to redefine the principles behind the purpose of the Debating Club .. and this is not difficult to do as they are the definitions used for good principles for many many centuries through Man's progression through a continuously acquired line of knowledge, in fact we will only have to wipe out the redefinition of these ideals corrupted by Liberalism and Neo-liberalism over the past 250 years. And once we can get back to the age old accepted definitions we too, can get back on the road of progress- we can rejoin the line of Time. Of course, we will also have to accept that the secrecy of the debates and the seclusion of the Club for our own good, is in fact anything but for our own good.

And then as I believe - if we are going to use the Ideal of Democracy - that the very first thing that we, us the people, the mass must do is to choose our representatives from within the community that they are going to represent\*. This simple expedient will solve almost all the problems that have been associated with Liberal and now, NeoLiberal Democracy.

Ah, you say, but what if we don't have anyone who belongs to our community whom the rest of the community feels is up to the job of a representative to a Parliament? (A Parliament, because we can soon begin to see that once the membership of the Club begins to divest itself of exclusiveness and presumed privilege it stops becoming a mere Club).

What I say? You have no one who knows the interests of the community of which they belong? Then your community requires an adjustment, but still it will be someone from within your community who will always be best suited to the protection of the special values and needs of your community - and not a representative who is appointed from outside. In fact, in the Constitution of the Collective of Communities it should be stipulated that your representative must be one of you ... It should be one of a very few rules of the collective. Only one of you can represent you. You will choose them by whatever method your community decides and of course, the community should be able to replace its representative at any time it feels is necessary, and the representative, if at any time they feel that they are not up to a

particular debate, then they too should be able to go back to the community and be replaced (in fact they should have no other choice) - no community, or the individuals that make that community, should be disadvantaged for any reason in the process of debate - the collective will wait. We must trust and have complete confidence in both the process and the representative we send to participate in the process. The Parliament is open to view at all times. The process is transparent .. there is no secrecy ... And there is never a rush.

Secrecy, and all the excuses put forward for it, including rush, create fertile ground for the usurping of power and privilege by a Parliament and they turn a Parliament back into a Club. Secrecy enshrines the belief in representatives that, for some reason, they are the only qualified people to debate issues on behalf of the mass of men that are communities.

And another thing for consideration; that a Parliament should only be convened when there is actually something to debate. What is the reason to have a bunch of people sitting around pretending to be working for the greater collective good when there is nothing that is required by this greater collective to make living better? When something comes up, then we can convene a Parliament to hash it out. A Parliament should disband once a debate has had resolution. There is no cost in this ... Once again the cost comes only in the assumption that one set of men are the best men to resolve all the conflicts that must arise within a collective of communities. Laziness which devolves into complacency on behalf of a community it is the job of each individual community to solve .. and to prevent. But I say, that when the Parliament is open to the view of all of those for whom the issue at hand is under discussion, when the people can observe their interests being taken care of and when the members of each community desire to live in peace with each other and desire that same peace amongst the collective .. then there will be peace. And the dissenters within each community, though they may not be completely happy or content with the resolution, will not feel unfairly treated.

And this, after all, is the job of a Parliament - To ensure that no one feels unfairly treated. That they have had representation on an equal and

equitable basis, and that though they may not be entirely happy with the result they can be entirely sure that the collective of representatives has operated under the best and fairest process. They have watched with their own eyes, have heard with their own ears, have moderated with the collection of their own reasonings and have felt with their own hearts. They have observed. They have participated.

That is the key point; Democracy is about the people, and where there must be policing done it is the people who should do it and not the membership of a Debating Club and most definitely not the Debating Club in itself.

\* The two stipulations for membership of the club being; that the representative come from their community and that the debates are open and fully transparent to all members of the communities who have a representative to it. In fact the Club will be open to be viewed by all communities regardless of whether they choose to send a representative or not. Education and example will be the agents of change and this is easier now, at the present time in Man's history, than at anytime through our past.

*"We are all held in a single honour ... A man dies still if he has done nothing, as one who has done much." - Achilles, from Homer's Iliad.*

Mitchell John Warren. Mt Boyce, December 2018.