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Dear [Recipient’s name],

I write to you not as an opponent but as someone who has been forced—under duress—to participate in a system that fundamentally violates the natural rights and sovereignty of individuals. Public service carries a profound moral obligation: to act with integrity in safeguarding the natural rights of the people.

True governance is built on voluntary participation, not forced compliance. Yet here in Australia, we find ourselves living under a structure where public servants—entrusted with administering legislation for the benefit of the people—have instead misappropriated it to enforce coercive control. This is not governance; it is dictatorship masquerading as democracy.

Consider my situation, [Recipient’s name]. Under Section 245 of the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918,* I, like every other eligible individual over the age of 18, am required to enrol to vote, attend a polling station on election day, and cast a ballot—or face fines, legal penalties, and even prosecution. Consent given under threat of punishment is not consent at all; it is coercion dressed up as legitimacy.

Worse still, this coercion exposes a deeper betrayal: public servants are no longer serving the people but controlling them, wielding legislation as a tool of violent domination rather than an instrument of genuine justice.

At the heart of this betrayal lies another critical distortion—the creation of political parties. Political parties are an aberration of true democracy, a Trojan horse crafted by collectivists to obscure the truth of how individuals are imbued with the holistic intelligence of their moral faculties to govern themselves.

Genuine democracy arises not from allegiance to factions but from the activation of each individual’s sovereignty, guided by their innate capacity for moral reasoning. Political parties hijack this process by reducing governance to a binary choice between pre-packaged ideologies, stripping individuals of their autonomy and replacing it with manufactured consent.

By dividing society into partisan camps, political parties cultivate artificial conflict while masking their shared agenda: the consolidation of power within a centralised domination hierarchy. They claim legitimacy through elections, yet they manipulate public discourse, suppress dissenting voices, and enforce conformity—all in the name of "unity." In reality, the purpose of political parties is to distance individuals from direct participation in governance, undermining the very essence of self-determination.

Far from empowering the people, political parties serve as tools of coercion, embedding collectivist ideologies within institutions and eroding the foundation of personal sovereignty upon which true democracy rests.

For those of us who see through this deception, withholding consent becomes a principled stand against systemic violence. Imagine my position: I understand that political parties are not legitimate representatives of the people but mechanisms of control designed to perpetuate centralised power. I recognise the voting ritual for what it truly is—a falsely constructed process masquerading as democracy.

Adult suffrage, in this context, serves as a surrogate for genuine self-governance, legitimising decisions made without meaningful or voluntary consent. By choosing to abstain—not out of apathy but out of conscious awareness—I am exercising my right to withdraw consent from an immoral structure that violates the principles of individual sovereignty and self-governance. Yet, under the current system, of which you are an integral part, even this act of conscience is met with punishment, further exposing the authoritarian nature of the system you consciously enforce.

A structure that penalises individuals for opting out does more than violate personal freedom—it undermines the foundation of self-governance, [Recipient’s name]. When public servants use legislation to suppress autonomy, they cease to be stewards of service and become agents of violent domination.

Legitimate authority comes from the people, measured not by rules imposed from above but by the shared conscience of those who live under it. Public servants exist to advocate for the people’s wishes, guided by principles that respect individual choice and build mutual trust. Yet when legislation is subverted to enforce compliance rather than empower participation, the result is a betrayal of public trust and a descent into authoritarianism.

The correct structure under the English constitutional monarchy system places the levers of power in the hands of jury equity—a natural expression of the people's holistic intelligence and their ability to use the neutrality of their conscience to scrutinise the justice of legislation in any given case they are called upon to decide.

Jury equity does not "grant" the people power; rather, it acknowledges the inherent authority they already possess as sovereign individuals. Jury equity provides the necessary conditions that cultivate civic responsibility within members of the community who serve on juries, embodying the highest form of self-governance ever devised: the power to judge both the facts of a case and the fairness of the legislation itself.

Parliament cannot enact law; it can only create legislation, which is repealable. True law emerges from the consciences of independent juries, who determine what constitutes just conduct in specific cases. Thus, the independence of the jury ensures that no legislation holds weight unless it aligns with the moral compass of the community. For example, if a jury believes a piece of legislation disproportionately harms certain groups or violates individual rights, they have the authority to nullify it. This approach empowers people to shape the rules they choose to live by according to their values, cultivating accountability and restoring trust in the administration of justice.

Some might argue that letting Australians opt out of voting entirely could lead to low turnout or apathy. But evidence from countries with voluntary voting tells a different story. Societies thrive when people are free to contribute willingly, knowing their voices matter. Apathy doesn’t come from freedom—it comes from being disempowered by rigid, coercive systems. On the other hand, a voluntary model invites active involvement because it respects individual agency, creating a culture of trust and collaboration.

To uphold a system that suppresses freedom is to perpetuate harm, [Recipient’s name]. Such a system blocks the ways society ensures its elected officeholders remain accountable to the people. Public servants who abuse legislation to enforce compliance are guilty of betraying their role as advocates for the people. Their actions reveal a pattern of dictatorial behaviour, where the purpose of public service—to serve, protect, and empower—is subverted for the sake of control.

Suppressing personal freedom breeds resentment, disorder, and escalating social problems. These aren’t abstract ideas—they’re real harms affecting communities every day. Think about the growing disillusionment among young Australians, many of whom see politics as irrelevant or corrupt. Is it any surprise, given the lack of meaningful choice and the punitive measures used to enforce obedience?

I invite you to reflect deeply on the role you play in maintaining authoritarianism by stealth, [Recipient’s name]. Are you complicit in a structure that abuses legislation to coerce compliance? How do you reconcile enforcing policies that suppress freedom while remaining indifferent to the suffering caused by your actions? What is preventing you from taking a hard look at the societal impact of your actions? And what would it take for you to align your behaviour with the principles of justice, freedom, and rightful service?

There are natural consequences to denying people their autonomy—consequences that exist regardless of personal belief. The facts of life demonstrate that actions which undermine individual freedom erode the moral foundation essential to a fair and just society. My hope is that you, [Recipient’s name], will find the courage to examine whether your current role perpetuates systemic violence—and consider how you might instead become an agent of transformative change, steering the system toward one that truly serves humanity.

The choice remains yours, [Recipient’s name]. A structure built on coercion can never serve the people, and those who sustain it bear responsibility for the harm it inflicts. I invite you to imagine a world where public service earns trust rather than demanding obedience, welcomes participation rather than enforcing compliance, and encourages open dialogue rather than punishing dissent. Such a world is possible, but it begins with individuals like yourself choosing to act with integrity and moral clarity.

What you choose to do now, in light of this knowledge, will define your legacy. Will you be remembered as someone who upheld a system of coercive control upon your family, friends and neighbours, or as someone who had the courage to stand for truth and justice? The answer lies in your hands.

With sincerity and unwavering regard for truth,

[Your Name]