



# Socialism Lacerates Australia: Wealth Creation Without Liberty Is Extralegal Servitude In All But Name

Democracy

21 September 2020

Stirling Larkin, CIO



Dedicated to **Innes**, our role model, who shows us daily how to strive, to seek, to find and not to yield.

In whatever line of work, study or aspiration an Australian today pursues, it is almost impossible to avoid government.

Throughout such pursuits and the unexceptional every day affairs of all whom recognise themselves as Australian, it has also become a challenge to delineate where public ends and private begins.

In unambiguous terms, Australian Democracy was founded on the promise that government was the servant of its people, irrespective of incertitude, evildoers or the spectre of crises.

But that is not where many Australians find themselves today – they live all or part of their waking moments in servitude to government herself, addled by a climate of fear.

Such serfdom is then entrenched and reinforced by means of perennial hyperbureacracy, regulations, accreditation bodies, certifying agencies, compliance protocols and to boot, tax-payer funded Federal, State and Municipal government television, street-post and YouTube advertisements; telling (not asking) us how to think, behave and in essence, where and when to kowtow.

According to Credit Suisse's respected, Global Wealth Report 2019, Australia's wealth per adult in US Dollar terms ranks as the fourth highest in the world and in terms of median wealth, ranks second only to Switzerland, the "playground of the rich and famous".

However, wealth without liberty is extralegal servitude in all but name; mechanisms for allocating resources increasingly now sit in the purview of Canberra, the value of our wealth diluted by means of 'Financial Repression' pronounced by technocrats sitting in the boardroom of 65 Martin Place and even how we give our own, 'private' monies away controlled by self-anointed "peak bodies" and de facto state-regulated commissions.

Cite:- Bad New Days Of Big Government, 16 May 2015

Cite:- Seismic Shifts In 2019, 16 January 2019

Cite:- Cheating, On Cheating, On Cheating; Maintaining Portfolio Quality In The Era Of Cheating, 13 March 2020

The qualifications in response to the **Great Corona Crisis (GCC)** of the Australian Federal Government's Emergency Restrictions [Biosecurity Act 2015 (Cth)]

or those of Victorian Premier Daniel Andrews, do not only wonder into legal jeopardy, they accentuate that there is a complete incongruity between the economic infrastructure, political superstructure, democratic conventions and recourse in Australian law.

Beyond simply a lack of clear accountability, it is increasingly becoming patent that governments are no longer able to protect anyone apart from their own state sector personnel and even that protection will prove transitory, since it is being paid for by issuing debt and not by taxation or genuine prosperity.

With the lowest per capita novel coronavirus and COVID-10 infection and fatality statistics in the **G-20**, under the State of Victoria's Public Health and Wellbeing Act 2008 (Vic) and Emergency Powers Acts, "**Authorised Officers**" of the government can today: (I.) detain any person or group for as long as reasonably necessary, (II.) without a warrant, enter any premises and search for and seize anything and (III.) require the destruction or disposal of anything and continue to do so well into 2021 without elective consultation nor bicameral Parliamentary legislation (neither Federally or in the case of Victoria and provides the ability to make procedural changes by government regulation rather than legislation).

This is not Democracy nor what Australian Diggers fought and died defending for over one hundred and twenty-one years, not that this should come as a surprise to any Australian who has paid attention to the fact that our Constitution does not contain a national bill of rights.

Australia is among a tiny minority of democratic nations to not have a formal bill of rights in any form; constitutional or statutory.

According to French political philosopher **Yves René Simon**, elective Democracy is persuasion and not coercion.

The common confusion of authority and coercion is easily accounted for by the consideration that authority is more strongly felt and, in all respects, more noticeable when it proceeds by way of coercion, notwithstanding, frequent use of coercion evidences weakness and speaks to a broader dysfunction.

Of all conceivable forms of coercion, the only one which certainly conflicts with the essence of democracy is precisely the one which bears the greatest resemblance to the democratic process of persuasion.

Thanks to such resemblance, it is sometimes possible to put an end to democratic control through operations which seem to be regular procedures of democratic control. Between

moderate propaganda, which is a process of persuasion, and intensive propaganda, which is a process of parapsychological coercion, nobody can trace a clear line. The result is that psychical coercion, exercised by way of intensive propaganda, generally does not admit of legal identification, or in simple terms, it becomes **extralegal**.

Propaganda built into a process of psychical coercion is an indispensable instrument of the **totalitarian state**.

It replaces, in sufficiently disintegrated societies, the spirit of communal action, which holds the principles of social life above deliberation and criticism. Sound familiar fellow Victorians?

A democratic society that loses its spirit is readily delivered to disintegration, for it no longer has any means of asserting its principles and yet for those who were looking, this trend revealed itself already several years ago.

Democracy does not imply liberalism, but it does demand a discussion of means freely conducted in all parts of society.

Consider the case of a law submitted to referendum; it is passed or rejected according as its promoters have or have not succeeded in persuading the voters, and the vote, in democratic law, is held null and void if any of the contending parties was refused a chance to advertise its stand and to try its rhetoric.

One thing is at once certain: democracy uncompromisingly demands whatever amount of free expression is needed for the process of electoral persuasion to be genuine.

Thus the relation of democracy to persuasion can be described in three steps: (I.) as a lawful and political regime, democracy systematically prefers persuasion to coercion and endlessly struggles to extend the domain of government by persuasion; (II.) as an elective regime, democracy rules that persuasion shall play a decisive role in the designation of the governing personnel; and (III.) as democracy, it rules that attempts at persuading the voter shall take place in open and public discussion.

At every particular moment there is, for a government, an upper limit to the effects that can be obtained through persuasion; beyond that limit coercion ups the ante and is not in any way animated by virtue.

In whatever line of work, study or aspiration you pursue as an Australian today, remember the words of Tennyson, "*Guard your roving thoughts with a jealous care, for speech is but the dealer of thoughts, and every fool can plainly read in your words what is the hour of your thoughts.*" ■

➔ [australianstandfirst.com](http://australianstandfirst.com)

This information contained herein has been prepared and issued Australian Standfirst Asset Management Pty Ltd ACN 612 265 219 as an AFS Representative 1276948 of Australian Standfirst Funds Management Ltd ACN 618 093 079 AFSL 510915 and is provided for educational purposes only and should not be taken as advice. This is not an offer to buy/sell financial products. We do not provide personal advice nor do we consider the needs, objectives or circumstances of any individual. Financial products are complex and entail risk of loss. The price and value of investments referred to in this research and the income from them may fluctuate. Past performance is not indicative of future performance, future returns are not guaranteed and a loss of original capital may occur. Fluctuations in exchange rates could have adverse effects on the value or price of, or income derived from, certain investments. Certain transactions, including those involving futures, options, and over-the-counter derivatives, give rise to substantial risk as they are highly leveraged, and are not suitable for all investors. Please ensure you obtain professional advice (including tax advice) to ensure trading or investing in any financial products is suitable for your circumstances, and ensure you obtain, read and understand any applicable offer document.

All intellectual property relating to the information provided vests with Australian Standfirst unless otherwise noted and the research is provided on an as is basis, without warranty (express or implied). All views shared are Australian Standfirst views and do not represent any other organisation or individual (unless cited accordingly). The information, opinions, estimates and forecasts contained herein are as of the date hereof and are subject to change without prior notification. We seek to update our research as appropriate and where possible. Whilst the research has been prepared with all reasonable care from sources, we believe to be reliable, no responsibility or liability shall be accepted by Australian Standfirst for any errors or omissions or misstatements howsoever caused. No guarantees or warranties regarding accuracy, completeness or fitness for purpose are provided by Australian Standfirst, and under no circumstances will any of Australian Standfirst, its officers, representatives, associates or agents be liable for any loss or damage, whether direct, incidental or consequential, caused by reliance on or use of the research.