

To – Commissioner Mansfield

Political Donations Enquiry

GPO Box 4396,

Darwin NT 0801

Dear Justice Mansfield,

Political Donations Enquiry 2017

Free Speech has been the cornerstone of Western Civilization since the dawning of the philosophical age over 3000 years ago. But inherently free speech, has never been free. It is with great pleasure, I wish to submit my concerns to your enquiry on political donations.

My recent experience in our electoral system has found it to be not only expensive, but also the lack of clear information, and dispersion of this information to be anything but freely available. But, most disturbing was the blatant and clear use of the current electoral rules to promote the dissemination of a Marxist agenda and a very clear attack on free Speech.

I believe that it is important to remove the ability for “Parties” and or “Organised Political Groups” to attain financial Political donations. I do not believe such financial political donations should be declined by “Declared Independents”, however. I believe that to promote the intellectual and psychological requirements of a representative, for the people, and by the people, that there is a clear and accurate formula for attracting persons of good character and conduct. I shall endeavour to make a case for these reasons in the following document.

Overview – Why would someone choose to be a candidate?

Having approached several Council members and Politicians over the years either personally or through intermediaries, to provide positive and constructive criticism based on sound economic data, I was constantly frustrated by the lack of positive response or action. Many Idea’s expressed were either manipulated and contorted in such a way as to make them unworkable or became political footballs for either party.

I have however, been able to, through both social pressure, and financial lobbying through third parties, directly and indirectly, precipitate and create amendments to acts that have both benefited and in some ways softened the blow of economically aggressive policies from both sides of politics.

It is both in regards as a lobbyist and as a political candidate, that I give my idea’s and opinion. Election campaigns have been and will continue to be historically expensive. Either a candidate requires a public identity, or a political party will align and create one to suit its needs. The type of Candidate normally identified by parties or as representatives of the people require a certain level of narcissism that seldom occurs in those with positive mental health.

From an intellectual stand point the public scrutiny placed on the candidate will require a tremendous amount of both political and personal will, amid many distractions. One of the major distractions will and always has been finance.

For this purpose as described above, for there to remain an objective, rather than subjective view on the matter, it is brought to my attention the question of morality versus due diligence, “Do we search for the best person for the job or the one that can do the Job?”

Morally as a society we wish to be represented by the very best candidate, yet in my own experience, I can attest I would not consider myself the best candidate, like all people I am flawed, but the people I personally wanted to run, were either, not willing to, could not or would not place themselves in the both financial and emotionally challenging environment of politics.

We, as a society seldom see the political leadership or hear the aspirational quotes of visionaries today, but this is as much, due to the costs involved in politics as it is the very fundamental social shifts in our political environment. It was very clear during a recent election that those fundamental shifts have and had included the very nasty intentions of the “post-modernist” political ideology, based on the failed socialist and communist parties of the past.

We currently have a political system where the person with the most money or in better terms “Political finance” will almost certainly win, where “personal identity” or “Celebrity” does not exist. The “organised political parties” recognise this and have countered this activity with the use of party volunteers, whom they use in an organised way to conceal the campaign material of other candidates and use intimidation through numbers and uniform to promote a united front.

Neither side of politics really wants this to change due to ideology and the political ability. However, the integrity of our political system and the ability to ensure freedom of speech and expression are being not only attacked, but diluted.

How political donations affect the left –

The ideology of the “Left” seeks a Marxist, socialist (elected communism) or realistically, totalitarian and authoritarian regime, most notably in modern times under the heading “post-modernist” agenda. It seeks through its rebranded views, to create divisiveness in the community based on gender, colour, culture and economics rather than the truly infinite numbers of uniqueness we all experience. They use these groups as subjective partners to push identity (ego) issues on an apathetic public and seek power through fear and resentment.

Although ignorant to the true realisation of an educated mind that we are all individuals, the “left” uses unions, special interest groups and social agenda activists to finance and “man” the polling booths. On a psychological level they use a victim (slave mentality) based on cowardice to escalate the most abusive or psychopathic of the tribe to rule (bully and intimidate) them.

Watching the actions of the “Left” or as some more blatantly aligned themselves during the campaign as “Labor or greens candidates” was quite eye-opening.

Like something out of communist China, where it is legal for any person who has attained the age of 18 to run as an independent, but, the ruling communist party will encroach on any attempt to promote the freedom of speech or political equity. (Citing- BBC stopped from visiting China independent candidate - BBC News - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c1HdCIW2Xtk>)

It was just as surreal to experience an event quite similar, with several Labour Party candidates and their affiliates pushing, shoving, goading the volunteers of other candidates. Whether they (the aggressors) were emblazoned with bright coloured shirts with pictures of their candidate head on them or making continuous attempts to conceal the campaign material of other candidates, what I witnessed was a very real and blatant attack on free speech.

When I attempted to discuss the matter in a civil way, I was given party rhetoric and one liners, “It’s about organizing”, “It’s about having the greatest Coverage”.

What it was clearly about was using the failings of the electoral process to push a very real and dangerous

agenda.

Electoral changes giving them (the "left") more time to "man" the polling booths is not as financially distracting as they have the "manpower" during bad economic times. Due to the weak willed in society being drawn to "special interest groups" through both failures in personal development and tribe mentality, extended pre-voting times creates a distinct advantage for "organised political parties".

From an observational perspective it is entertaining to watch the subjective seek equality and revenge (based on resentment) in their struggle ultimately for power, in a world made up entirely of objective realities. It is akin to watching "Luke Skywalker" using his mind to lift a rock. The exception being that these groups have created a "credo" that subjugates them under totalitarianism, in the hopes of maintaining the freedom to be offended without accepting responsibility.

In political financing they have the advantage generally of numbers, because fearfulness is easily disseminated, or their followers are imported, and they have the "man hours". Due to the educational and intellectual constraints, and the objective reality that people don't wish to be angry and afraid all the time, they can be easily derailed through positive action and representation, but this takes public presentation and debate, otherwise they generally float towards the more uniform "party" like sheep to the slaughter.

Their (The left aligned) political power relies on economic mismanagement or ignorance, and they grow in number in bad economic times or during great times of change, attempting to slow it down, or stop it all together. They align economics to the socialist relativity of a "Family Unit", however, this to any economist is both dangerous and ignorant. Ignorance is their greatest weapon.

Locally parties like the Labour Party and the Greens have fulfilled this role adequately, and their numbers and ability to raise finance swelled due to poor management from their previous political counterparts. As stated, their communist economics using austerity, is based on fundamentally ignorant ideology that an economy is like a household budget.

A cap on political donations to an independent representative will help this type of "political party candidate" as public funding or smaller contributions from larger numbers will swell their financial capability in times of crisis, a time when both economically and politically we can ill afford, their lack of courage, progress or decisiveness.

How political donations affect the Right –

Historically we have seldom had a far-right party, due to our economic stability and low unemployment level, our society is mostly conservative or progressive. However, mentally the far-right party mirrors the left, in authoritarian ideology, tyranny and abuse.

The local parties that meet this need are the "One Nation" party. Some smaller local parties have political candidates that also share many values of the "Far-Right" including the Australia first party (AFP).

Allowing these "organised Political parties" the ability to attain political donations is both dangerous and damaging to our political landscape. Just as the "left" through ignorance and fear using promotes a totalitarian regime, so does the "Right" promote divisiveness in the community through gender, colour, culture and economics. The difference between the right and the left is quite small, and why both sides use similar engagement and recruitment techniques.

It is personally vexing that as a western society, with western values, we have been so adequately educated on the horrors and destruction by Nazi's and Hitler's socialist party that killed an estimated 12 Million people, during conflict, yet so thoroughly un-educated by the far-left communist movements of Lenin, Stalin and Mao that last century wiped out over 300 Million people during conflict, and an estimated additional 200 Million due to economic rationing and starvation.

The right ideology that only the strong survive, and that life is hard, is based on objectivity without compassion. It has historically left its dictators headless as it promotes rapid wealth distribution to the top. However, just as the left increases its following during bad economic times, so does the Right. Its financial capability is almost entirely aligned to smaller donation from large numbers, but has also historically been endowed by the older wealthier and angrier contributor. I fear their numbers will swell in the future.

Just like the Left, the right, promotes based on Fear and Power, although the rhetoric is more colourful, and generally more aggressive, they both share the psychopathic tendencies of Narcissism.

The removal of political donations to these "parties" will hinder their growth and allow time for independent and intellectual idealism to have a greater impact.

Conservatives/Progressives Parties

Although they have different brands, they both share almost all the same ideological views. Although, the greatest number when polled, like all human beings they are pragmatic and easily distracted by "celebrity", "identity" and or the influence of last minute distraction of fear.

The easiest way to attain their loyalty is to use logic and site examples, this seems totally alien to the subjectiveness of the left.

Historically, they were elected due to their merit and capabilities, usually attained by honest appraisal. The creation of Facebook and other fake and false news platforms have lead to a diminishing view of public life and display by the most progressive and conservative in our society.

As their ideology is based on time, effort, and historical merit, it requires, time, skill and influence. The most intelligent conservative realises upon entry to or on reflection of our current political and electoral system that to promote intelligent positive idea's you require finances for influence.

Smart business men will give money to the left and the right, but historically have given it at about 20% to the left, 10% to the right and 30% to conservatives, why?

Intelligence, progress and positivity relies upon the objectivity of change. Whilst a progressive can have the subjective aspirational ability to promote the pleasures of abundance, people will still do more to avoid fear and pain, than go forward to attain pleasure.

It could be argued that to attract the type of conservatives and progressives we require to adequately lead they need to be able to attain finance. However, most would also understand the reasons why the removal of "political party donations" would play a major party in ensuring that their opposition did not attain too much power,

My personal experience –

Whether I like it or not, through personal experience, I originally chose not to accept \$30,000 in donations from corporate and business sources, instead raising, over \$3000 from smaller donations from the public. However, this was based on ignorance and naivety. I thought our political system was fair, I was warned by labour affiliates that they would run at least three candidates in my electorate and were willing to spend over \$60,000 dollars. They did, plus they had amassed a political party following based on nepotism and false promises.

I was approached very early on due to my political opinion and ability to create articulate content and professional website designs by a representative of the "Left". This ex-communist party member with a past political history, came to me with the vision of creating a team of candidates, to promote himself.

He was quite visibly unimpressed when I compared his idea to revert the "Darwin Mall" back to a street, to a massive waste of rate payer's money like that used by the previous council on a roundabout conversion and bike lanes on the esplanade. He promoted his government affiliation and past actions albeit some questionable as the merit for him to own the position he sought. The current sitting Mayor, although personable, and in my opinion, sharing a similar ideology, lacked ambition and ability (and in my opinion, Narcissism). I made it clear that we agreed to disagree on many idea's, but that the council was a democratic body that required 7 clear and concise progressive votes.

During the election at a time of perceptual need, this candidate innocently proposed financial assistance. I chose to decline the offer as I had the previous financial incentives. During the election campaign I had 3300 flyers or around 40% of my political campaign material purposely not delivered by a third party. I had 57 signs removed, destroyed or stolen out of 120 signs. The financial cost was more than \$1500 for the sabotage.

I do not point the finger at either political party for these offences. Whilst, I believe quite clearly this was the work of persons, whom I would concur, based on historical political actions and ideology followed "Organised Political Party" dogma, it was done out of ignorance.

The greatest cost I incurred during this election was due to a change in the electoral process. This change was quite obviously inserted to incur greater financial cost on candidates and to dissuade a visibly agitated public from providing multiple candidates. It didn't dissuade the number of candidates, but it clearly tested the resources and resourcefulness of all concerned.

Many candidates spent substantially over \$20,000 for a position that provided \$22,000 in remuneration. This quite obviously exposed the power required and narcissism of those that endeavoured to spend such large amounts of money.

Personally, as a father of four with both family, social and financial commitments, the added requirement of 2 weeks of "Manned" attendance at the voting booths was not only financially exhaustive, but due to the restrictions on public digital demonstration, it removed several weeks of door knocking and personal interaction with the most important people, the voters.

I ran an extremely effective online campaign and I expect that if my political campaign material was not sabotaged, I may have attained the additional 2% of votes required to win a seat? I may not have?

But, what I did attain was knowledge and experience. Our electoral system is already flawed, the preferential system is already an affront to democracy. It blatantly promotes a two-party preferred system. New early voting systems were brought in to provide greater financial burden to stop independents. This will greatly empower both the far left and right. This, in my opinion, is attack on free speech.

Changes to our democracy do need to be made, if somebody blatantly is involved in a "pay to play" situation or overtly corrupt nepotism is linked to financial or political corruption, we require immediate and very public punishment and incarceration. Corruption not only destroys the fabric of our society, it also encourages the ideology of anarchy, communism and terrorism.

I believe all donations need to be declared be they small or large. I believe any caps on donations should only be aimed and directed towards parties or political groups or organisations.

I thoroughly hope that if there are to be any financial caps made to political donations that it be made on political parties only, and that "declared" and "proven" independents are not tarred with the same brush.

In summary

Free speech requires open, transparent debate, in our recent council elections, it was easy for me to see which candidates did not believe in free speech, quite obviously the ones who were not willing to have open public debate for instance, at a publicly advertised debate at the Parap Railway Club. In this most recent election it was representatives of Labour, Liberals and the Greens, that failed to attend.

Unfortunately, to defeat those empowered by political parties, independents will require financial investment, it is more egalitarian that it be from the public and corporate identities alike.

The election of individuals willing to fight for all Australians, not just those who follow Party Dogma, is extremely important as we enter a world full of uncertainty. The fight for freedom, has never been free, even when attained, it requires constant vigilance as the toxicity of ignorance in our society, even in the age of information can be from the corruption of those we seek to represent us.

Kindly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Sam Wilks', written in a cursive style.

Sam Wilks