

ENCOURAGING AUTHORITARIANS

Introduction

Can authoritarians live in a democracy? Of course, they can!

In a democracy that values freedoms, an authoritarian can live happily, but within bounds. He can come up with a brilliant idea, pay for it and implement it himself. If it is such a good idea, then others will recognise it as such and follow his example. If it is a perfectly good idea everyone will **freely** follow his example.

If it is a lousy idea, then no one will follow his lead – that might hurt his ego. However, he will have to accept that. If an authoritarian took it upon himself to force everyone to adopt his lousy idea, most would not like that, and would say “No”.

What is not tolerated is when any authoritarian crosses this boundary and forces others to live by their rules. This is not tolerated because he is removing freedoms from those citizens.

How Can Authoritarians Live in a Democracy?

Any member of a democracy is **free** to give up any of his freedoms if he wants to do that. Think of all the organisations in our society that you can join with an agreement that you abide by their rules. In agreeing to that, you are accepting the loss of some of your freedoms. You accept this because the net effects – loss of freedoms and benefits of association – in your eyes are acceptable.

For example, we see citizens living in gated communities, joining sporting and other clubs, gyms, any religious organisations, or living in communes. Any of these organisations would cross the line of acceptable behaviour if they forced anyone to stay when they want to leave that organisation. For example, some extreme interpretations of Islam require anyone trying to leave that religion to be killed. Once again in a democracy the authoritarians have just crossed the line.

In today's Western societies we see increasing numbers of examples of authoritarians telling people, how to think, what to say and what to do. They have crossed the line. In a democracy that was built to defend our freedoms, some foolishly believe if they have a majority (51%), they have a right to force their views on the minority, claiming “That is the way democracies work”.

Wrong!. Democracies are there to defend the freedoms of **all** citizens and protect those freedoms by stopping any elite, of any size, from removing freedoms.

Whatever our likes and dislikes are, we should be left to live the way we want free from any interference from anyone else. In return, we need to be tolerant of others living in a way that we might find unacceptable. Freedom is a two-way street.

Abusing the 51% Concept.

President Erdogan of Turkey was recently asked what he thought about democracies. He replied that a democracy should be used like a train. You get to where you want to go with it, and then abandoned it. So here we have an authoritarian who is going to use democracy to overturn a secular democratic government system and install a theocracy.

What many don't realise changing a 'regime' in a democracy happens without violence. In contrast, authoritarian governments are generally formed using violence, violence is then used to maintain power and the government can only be changed with even more violence. President Erdogan has avoided the initial violence by abusing the 51% concept of a democracy.

President Erdogan is not the only person or organisation "hellbent" on getting rid of democracy as well as our freedoms. There are a variety of organisations within the UN who continue to try and convince countries that democracies should be replaced with a one-party state like the "Chinese model" [1]. We should remember as we throw democracy in the bin, all our freedoms will follow it.

The influential World Economic Forum which attracts leaders from all around the World to its annual meetings at Davos is using the COVID pandemic to advocate abandoning democracies and their economic models and replacing them with a one party state model – under the banner of "The Great Reset". Video clips on their site talk about how great life is when you have no privacy, no property, and very few freedoms with the State giving you everything you need. Demand it and you will get it for free.

It becomes easy for authoritarians to convince 51% of the population to believe in this Nirvana dream and agree to give up their freedoms and the democracy that was meant to protect them. What about the 49% who don't agree – do they get a say?

If you abuse the 51% concept, are the 49% meant to meekly give up their freedoms and democracy. If they refuse to give up their freedoms, the only option left is to start a civil war or be subjugated as second-class citizens. So here we are back several hundred years fighting authoritarians for our freedoms again. How did we arrive back here?

Democracy was not created to get rid of itself.

Defending the 51% Concept

The first rebuttal of the words above is generally; "But that is what a democracy is all about – if more than fifty percent want it then that is the path we should take". So, let us look at some extreme examples and ask; "Is this what democracy was created for?"

So, we all should go with the 51% flow if,

- The 51% want to kill all the 49%,
- The 51% want to take all the property of the 49%,
- The 51% want to enslave all the 49%,
- The 51% want to remove all the freedoms of the 49%,
- The 51% destroys the economy and the welfare of all citizens, or
- The 51% want to get rid of our democracy.

Most people react to this extreme scale by saying that won't happen. So how do you stop this happening at this or at any other scale. Is it acceptable if it is on a smaller scale? The Third Reich killed six million people and took their property. Stalin enslaved millions in the labour camps and removed most freedoms from all citizens. The 51% caused the PIGS nations (Portugal, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Greece, and Spain) to go broke.

What most don't realise, by strongly embracing the 51% concept, we are empowering authoritarians who couldn't care less about 49% of the citizens and might even call them "deplorables". Those within the 51% might be happy to give up their freedoms, but they are now forcing the 49% of the population to join them who are very unhappy with the new life. Democracy was not created to be used this way, where half the citizens are ignored.

We might choose the political leadership using the 51% concept but there must be a way to prevent this leadership becoming an authoritarian elite who remove our freedoms. If we cannot stop that, we are heading back to serfdom.

Dealing with Authoritarians

We have forgotten the dangers posed by authoritarians, and how to deal with them. We have forgotten how to defend our freedoms. We have forgotten the primary purpose of our democracy, and how to defend our democracy to stop people turning it into a tool to set up an authoritarian state.

Our educational institutions no longer teach students about such topics and all the benefits the World has seen with the advent of Western Civilisation and its democratic countries. Instead, they encourage students to study communism or the many different hybrid versions of communism. Within such courses the student is not told of the hundred years of horrific consequences caused by the failure of such social engineering.

Because both our freedoms and democracies have been presented to us on a platter, we don't appreciate the gift and show no interest in it. We have gone to sleep on the job. Is it any wonder that we are losing more of our freedoms and there

are an increasing number of people demanding that we replace our democracies with some form of authoritarian rule?

Conclusion

Both citizens and the politicians need to realise that the government is there to defend the freedoms of all citizens. As such, they also need to remember to limit the amount of 'authoritative interference' from any government.

This requires both citizens and politicians to control their desire to become authoritarians. If they cannot do that, it will divide the nation and ultimately lead to conflict.

Consequently, authoritarians should not be encouraged within our society.

Note.

1. Executive Secretary of the [United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change](#), Christiana Figueres has visited Sydney several times telling the Media that we can no longer afford democracies and we should adopt a form of government based on the Chinese model.