

"All that is necessary  
for the triumph of  
evil is that good  
men do nothing . . ."  
— EDMUND BURKE



# THE NEW TIMES

## SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 19 No. 10

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

October 2018

### CONTENTS

Seeing Reality Beyond the Veil by Bill Daly	1
Social Credit and the Basic Income Movement by M. Oliver Heydorn Ph.D	3
The Crown in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century by David D'Lima	6

## SEEING REALITY BEYOND THE VEIL by Bill Daly

*Bill Daly was one of the speakers at this year's annual League of Rights Seminar in Adelaide on October 6th. He also spoke to audiences in Launceston and Melbourne. The following is an amalgam of his three talks.*

It is beyond dispute that our two nations, and the entire west, face a serious and all-embracing crisis. We may lose our countries, I don't know. I hope not. But one positive feature of a crisis is that it forces those who are still capable of some independent thinking to take stock of their situation and seek better ways, more truthful ways, of understanding events and then searching for ways to do things differently.

I think one of the factors of how we got to where we now are is that collectively we forgot that evil exists, conscious and organised evil, and it is at war in every conceivable way against truth. There would never have come about any western or Christian civilisation if our forebears had not appreciated this factor. If nothing else it is becoming increasingly impossible to ignore that there is design behind all the major human calamities affecting our world.

What influences were behind the appalling destruction of Iraq and Libya? Whatever sort of man Gaddafi of Libya was, that country was relatively well run and a huge amount of beneficial infrastructure had been built over the last few decades. But the navy and airforces of the US, Britain and France, supported by other western governments, smashed much of that to smithereens. They not only hunted Gaddafi down and brutally murdered him but made sure the country would not be able to function properly for a very long time.

The same fate of total brutal destruction was planned for Syria and it is happening right now in the Yemen. The only reason Syria hasn't been totally destroyed, at least not yet, and hopefully it won't, is because the Russians went in and have given some essential though limited support. But sufficient to halt and drive back the well-supplied Israeli/US backed terrorist forces. Syria is an ancient country. It was, I am told, the very first officially Christian nation.

Considering how much damage has been deliberately done to ancient sites in Iraq and Syria I ponder sometimes if this is not a secondary objective as any honest investigations of such history might potentially raise some questions concerning some of the dominant narratives of our present time.

How can such things happen? Why aren't there massive protests? I think there are at least two factors at play that provide a clue. One is the very highly controlled mass media and the other has been the West's loss of the Christian faith along with the instincts and intuitive insights that go with this faith.

We generally like to think today that we are more advanced than in the days of our earlier European forebears; that we don't have those "terrible" monarchs any more. I hate using the word democracy because it is so appallingly misused to screen us from the fact that we do live with an almost all-powerful ruling and brutal elite, and that is the hidden world of finance, or central banking, and it's power is simply based on the fact that dopey and ill-advised or corrupt politicians have at different times over the past few centuries given the monopoly of money creation to these private institutions.

The role of the mass media is to misinform and mislead us. It does not always outrightly lie but it presents often a tiny bit of a much larger story and on issues like the Middle East 'wars' it may sometimes report correctly on what has happened on a particular day but never ever exposes the background of why the war started and what forces brought this about. However, outright lies are told also. But the main or primary role of the mass media is to screen out the power of the world of banking and money creation. This is the real world power and reigns supreme over most of the globe. As for the likes of the George Soros' and the organised protest movements, these wouldn't last 5 minutes if they were not supported by this power. *(continued on next page)*

*(continued from previous page)* This money power has long been at war against nationhood, family and community and ultimately every intimate detail of God's creation. It denies the enormous abundance of God's creation and constantly and arbitrarily denies correct access to this.

The other factor is the West's loss of Christian faith. Why Christian? Because without that particular understanding of God there would never have been any sort of Christian civilisation. In our time we have been betrayed by the clergy, not all but too many of them. Why and how could this be? I suspect a significant factor is that while theology likely has a valid place it has frequently led to a view that our ancient religion is quite complicated and can only be grasped and explained by highly-trained experts. But is that really the case. Perhaps that road too easily leads back to the sort of pharisaism that Christ opposed. I like the story sometimes told that when Saint Francis of Assisi was setting up his little community someone donated a number of thick theological books which he promptly burned.

Isn't the Christ story really quite simple. Among His other teachings Christ said that God was as a Father to each of us that accept Him. He also said that we had to become like little children if we were to enter the kingdom of heaven. Does a small child attempt to analyse his relationship with mum or dad? No, never. The parent for them is as God and knows everything. Even a bad parent is still considered as such by their child. Later it can be quite a significant event to discover that mum or dad actually doesn't know everything.

From Christ we learn quite a few things about the nature of the true God. Yes, He is a father, also a leader, a king, a teacher, a guide and good example, a source of courage, a brother and very significantly, also our servant. Isn't that what prayer is all about, asking our God, the one true and only God for help and protection and favours. This surely is one of the main and very important distinguishing features of the real God.

Could it be that the demise in the health of our society and the loss of hope of a good future stems in large part from our collective dismissal of the actual simplicity of truth - "unless you become like little children"...

It seems to me that the terrible loss of practical Christian faith in the clergy has here and there fortunately spurred a revival of that deeper, more real Christian faith in a few lay people. I read a website called "lifesitenews.com". It's run predominantly by Catholics in North America and Canada but others contribute. I understand it initially focused primarily on the abortion issue but with the collapse of any worthwhile Christian clerical leadership and the increasingly satanic nature of certain affairs within and without the churches it's scope of activity has widened. There are other also excellent sites.

To be fair to today's clergy their training has become primarily intellectual and so they are fair game to the liberal crap that gets spewed out by modern academia. We need scholarship, and true scholarship involves the humble search for truth about things. However, the world of conventional academia is dominated by the ideology of liberalism which is only a mind forged unreality and at it's root is satanic because it is at war against all that God created. It now denies even the reality of the different sexes, it detests family and parenthood, hates and wants to pervert childhood and when it can't get it's way it turns to utter hate and brutality. How else can the wanton destruction of whole countries and deliberate harm to millions of people be explained?

To return to the Syrian issue. Why have the Russians gone there? Why have they respected and given protection to the Syrians and their very long history? It has been suggested that one of the influences was the reviving Russian Orthodox Church which has a long history of association with Syrian Christians. Not reported by the western press is that the worst treated victims by the terrorists are the Syrian Christians.

Also still yet barely grasped in the West has been a huge return to Christianity in Russia and also in the eastern European countries that were once under communism. It is reported that for the last 20 or so years there has in Russia been a new church built, or restored or repaired on average every day. Churches themselves don't prove a return or revival of Christianity but they are a great indication that something is happening and that something indicates there may be a huge spiritual revival there.

Recently a new Church was opened in Moscow and from pictures it looks like a beautiful Medieval church or cathedral. The work of creating the beautiful interior was done voluntarily by local students from an art school. When I read about this and saw those pictures I recalled the late Jeremy Lee (whom most of us here very fondly recall) and an article he wrote some decades ago titled "How did they build those Cathedrals".

We can't do this in the West any longer. It's not that technically we couldn't do it, but the underlying spirit needed to create such beauty just isn't there. To my mind most of the modernist western church constructions are ugly and can never offer the intimacy with things Holy that must be the primary aim of a Christian church.

In preventing the utter destruction of Syria, which is what was planned, Russia has also halted, at least physically, the whole satanically insane programme of globalism. We live in an era when nationhood is abused and derided. However, when a people cannot form natural associations among those of like mind and shared history and cultural outlook then they are doomed. Such associations are essential for the protection of families and communities.

*(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page) When Donald Trump recently spoke at the UN in defence of his country's sovereignty the dopey Marxist-orientated New Zealand Prime Minister responded that she was a globalist. I borrow a friend's explanation when I suggest she and others of that ilk are typical of those who have rejected reality and replaced it with a mind-forged unreality. Only a return to truth, to reality can save the West. I strongly believe we can gain hope and inspiration from the regeneration of Christianity in Russia and the old European East.

The smashing of our nations has been devastating. It's not that all is bad all of the time. Many people still can enjoy reasonable lives but there is appalling dislocation for huge numbers of people. Most younger people now have little hope of home ownership and creating secure families of their own, drug use is out of control. Financial indebtedness is beyond comprehension and all pervasive while the schools of economics continue to teach new graduates a pack of lies and "our" governments are in reality bankers' puppets.

Our societies need rebuilding and we won't get that from the Christ-hating satanic liberalism. Organised liberalism can only offer more lies and increasing chaos.

In seeking to restore our societies and our nations we do have to return to basics, by which I mean a revival and new awareness of the factors essential for successful lives: families, nationhood, healthy communities, protection of others especially of women and children. Womanhood and manhood has to be restored. I'm especially mindful of the great need for a restoration of manhood.

I don't assume that all is sweet and rosy in Russia while there is only degeneracy in the West. It is never quite as simple as that. However, an incident not too long ago does illustrate a significant difference in where our societies are at. Europe has been recently swamped with large numbers of unassimilable refugees, most of

them coming from the countries physically smashed by the western militaries at the behest of maniacs like Tony Blair, George Bush and Hillary Clinton and their coterie of nasty advisers.

In Germany and France for instance a patriotic German or French or Swede criticising this refugee policy can face legal prosecution and of course the usual treacherous media condemnation. The reported story goes that about a couple of dozen recent migrants to Germany visited Russia and one night in a bar began the not unusual groping of women. They were promptly set upon by the Russian men, the police arrived and gave them a bit more of the same well-deserved treatment and they were then promptly deported.

We seriously need a regeneration of manhood in the West. A man is rightfully a protector of women and children. We men must learn to ignore the attacks on manhood. Some years ago at a mens' group it was pointed out that in the modern West there is no longer a process whereby a boy is helped and encouraged into manhood. Traditionally some societies had various sorts of rituals for this. I think it can also just happen naturally when the social environment is such that it recognises, supports and encourages this. I much admire the work of one group in New Zealand - there may be similar groups that operate elsewhere - where responsible men are encouraged to take a fatherless boy under their care initially for at least one day each week. There are some wonderful success stories.

Of course without the restoration of the family there is no future for our societies. The restoration and protection of the family should be the priority of any sane society. This necessitates acknowledging the existence of conscious evil - which must be totally rejected - and its war against the family and all things that a successful society requires to thrive. Thank you.

\*\*\*

## **SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE BASIC INCOME MOVEMENT by M.Oliver Heydorn Ph.D**

*from Douglas: There is a well-known story, probably apocryphal, of a successful General in the American Civil War who was asked by a European officer what school of strategy he favoured. 'Don't know nawthin' about this yer strategiee, but I gets there firstest with the mostest.'*

There is a lesson in this story which is important to Social Crediters, bearing in mind that the General was, pardonably, confusing strategy and tactics.

***Fix your objective in relation to your resources.***

This is rather more than to say concentrate on a narrow front - it means narrowing your front until you *must* break through. Nowadays most people who have heard of Social Credit are thinking of the newly installed Chinese totalitarian monitoring system - which has nothing to do with (Douglas-ed) Social Credit; in fact, if anything, it's the opposite. The "Universal Basic

Income" or UBI, which is also confused with Social Credit, bears certain similarities to Douglas' proposal for a National Dividend. The chief similarity, of course, is that the UBI would be an income delinked from any work requirement, an income which everyone would receive. The chief difference, however, is that while UBI supporters typically advocate that the basic income be funded out of redistributive taxation. Social Crediters advocate payment of the dividend through monetary reform, i.e., through the creation of just enough 'debt-free' credit, to replace the compensatory debt that the current system relies on in its quest to achieve financial equilibrium. So the key difference comes down to the funding. Now this matter of how to fund or finance a full-fledged basic income constitutes an intractable problem for the UBI crowd ... a problem for them, but an opportunity for us.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) Because you see, many authorities believe that it is impossible to fund a UBI on conventional financial lines: the taxes and/or public debts would be too heavy, too onerous, for such a programme to be viable. Potentially, it could crush the economy. So long as UBI supporters are operating within the context of conventional finance, they will be hounded by this question: where is the money to come from? And stymied, I believe, by their inability to answer the question in any reliable and/or satisfactory manner becomes an opportunity for Douglas Social Crediters to provide the solution.

To give you just one concrete example of what I am talking about, the Ontario provincial government was, up until very recently, running Basic Income Pilot Projects in three cities: Hamilton, Thunder Bay, and Lindsay. The government divided participants into two groups: a control group, which would not receive the basic income, and an experimental group which would. Single participants could receive up to almost 17 thousand dollars per annum and couples up to 24 thousand. The aim was to see whether, over a period of three years, the experimental group would derive any significant benefits – social, economic, health or otherwise – from their reception of an unconditional basic income. If the outcomes were positive, then presumably the programme would have been expanded.

There was just one problem .... Ontario is, per capita, the most indebted subnational jurisdiction in the whole of North America (and some people claim in the whole world). On June 7th of the past year, there was a Provincial election and the “Progressive Conservative” party, led by Doug Ford, defeated the governing Liberal party. Although they had promised not to touch the basic income pilot project during the election campaign, a month or so after the election the Conservatives summarily cancelled the programme. At a press conference that was held on July 31st, the Minister responsible, Lisa Macleod, said that the reason the pilot was being cancelled was money, or rather the lack of it:

“MacLeod said the ‘broken’ program isn’t working.

Asked by reporters how she knows the program isn’t working if the data hasn’t been studied yet, MacLeod said, ‘for the amount it was costing the province of Ontario ... it was certainly not going to be sustainable.’”

Now this turn of events is sort of ironic, because just two months prior, at the end of May, five of us Social Crediters had made presentations at the 2018 *North American Basic Income Guarantee Conference*, which took place in Hamilton, Ontario.

The chief message which we were seeking to convey at this conference was that while a basic income is a great idea and indeed a necessary one, because of how things like automation promise to restructure the job market, the big problem that basic income supporters

are going to come up against is the thorny question of financing: again, where is the money to come from? We stressed that the Social Credit monetary reform provides an answer to that question, and now that the Ontario government has pulled the plug on the pilot programme and ripped the carpet up from underneath the participants, and cited financial reasons in doing so, perhaps more and more UBI supporters will start to listen to what we have to say.

So one of the things I want to suggest when it comes to strategic thinking is this: it may very well be that the easiest way of introducing a Social Credit style monetary reform, the easiest way of obtaining our objective, is to convince the UBI lobby, or some significant part of it, that Social Credit is the necessary means for getting anything even remotely similar to a universal basic income. That’s one way of selling the SC message: if the UBI is your end, SC is the required means.

If we can do that, if we can foster a SC wing within the wider basic income movement – and I don’t see why that couldn’t be done – we would be so much further ahead. I submit that investing our relatively scarce time and other resources in marketing Social Credit to the Basic Income Movement would be worthwhile, since such an investment may pay very great dividends, perhaps larger dividends than could be had from approaching any other movement at the present time.

To that end, one of the projects that I have been working on is a documentary on Social Credit, entitled: “From Brisbane to Hamilton: The Quest for a National Dividend”. You will see some familiar faces there. What I did was this: I filmed the trip that we made to Canada for the NABIG conference and used that footage as the underlying and unifying thread for a documentary to introduce Social Credit to the wider basic income community. We are still working on tidying it up, but hopefully a final version will be available on youtube soon. But this leads to another question: how exactly do we market Social Credit to the basic income community? It is not enough to say that Social Credit resolves the financial issue with the UBI. We have to explain, at least a little bit, about why Social Credit is the solution, or how SC manages to fix their problem.

When it comes to the task of explanation, nothing is as useful as an analogy. If you can provide an apt analogy, where you explain the unknown or the new by what is already known, already understood, you can communicate the essence of complicated ideas in a very quick and effective manner. But analogies, by their very nature, are not perfect. They compare two things in virtue of some similarity, but those two things also have differences and, for that reason, analogies sometimes break down and can be misleading. One of the analogies that we often use in Social Credit circles in order to get the concept of the dividend across is the analogy of the free lunch.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) That is, like a free lunch, the dividend is something that is given or received without any necessity of having to work for it or otherwise earn it. And we say further that one of the key problems with the existing financial and economic orders; is that they deny the reality of the free lunch; they are *do ut des* systems, a 'this for that'. They insist that everything must be earned through work or the fruits of work. Something must always be given in exchange for what we receive. Nothing can be free.

But this feature of the present systems is a problem because there are many components of economic life that involve a free lunch: natural resources such as air, water, sunshine, land, minerals, etc., or, the unearned increment of association, the cultural heritage of civilization, and the labour and magic of (modern automated and computer controlled-ed) machinery.

What the SC dividend achieves is this: it is a way of recognizing on a financial plane, the free lunch factors that are components of the physical economic systems of production. And this is as it should be, for clearly some of the things we derive benefit from through economic processes we obtain for free. We don't have to work to create them... We say in Christianity that grace is a free gift ... and that means that not only can we not earn it, but that whether it is given or the degree to which it is given is dependent on the free choices of God. God is not obligated by natural law or by justice to give us grace in its various forms and that is one of the wonderful things about it ... that He chooses to give it when He does in the way He does.

This is the way I see it: All gifts are free lunches .... But not all free lunches are gifts (at least not in this, the strictest of senses)...

In the case of free lunches that are inherent to the nature of reality, we can rightfully expect that when we put things in the right sort of association, the right sort of order, the desired result will be forthcoming automatically and inexorably.

Now this distinction between free lunches that are free gifts and free lunches that are not free gifts has important implications for the analogies that we use when attempting to communicate the essence of the Social Credit idea and how, for example, a National Dividend might be funded...

The free lunch, the physical free lunch, on which the idea of the National Dividend is based is not – strictly speaking – a free gift. Rather, it is something to which we have a right and can assert a right. We can claim that the dividend is actually something that is owed to us in justice, on account of the nature of reality, and that since the present financial/economic system denies us any sort of universal dividend, we are all being gypped. We are all being cheated. If, describing the dividend as a grace or a free gift, we describe it more accurately as a profit to which we, (each of us, as shareholders in our societies),

have a right in strict justice, then it's a completely different type of narrative.

The economy is inherently profitable and that – by not having a dividend – we are actually being denied what is ours by right, what is ours in strict justice, this will set up a completely different psychology in people's minds... and the energy that that would induce would probably be greater and more easily applied to effecting a change in the financial system for the better.

Now this should be stupendous news for the basic income community because what it means is that there is a way around the chief objection that they have to deal with: which is the concern about money. There are hugely influential constituencies that don't want to be taxed to support other people, especially if those others aren't working. Well, the Social Credit proposal of a dividend through monetary reform provides a bullet-proof answer to these sorts of concerns... We know, for example, that there is a sizeable gap between what was sold in the US economy in the form of consumer goods and services in 2014 and what people were paid in all forms: wages, salaries, and corporate dividends.

According to the National "Supply and Demand" or "Profit and Loss Account" which was published as appendix #2 in my 2017 book, *Lives of Our Own*, there was a gap or a deficiency of purchasing power in the US economy in 2014 of at least 2.4 trillion. The real underlying gap is even larger than that ... but 2.4 trillion, if monetized in the form of debt-free credit and distributed to each individual in the US, is something like 7,500 USD per person and 30,000 for a family of four.

That would be a very solid basis on which a universal dividend could be initially constructed and then extended later on. While not as large an income as what UBI supporters typically demand, it would be nothing to sneeze at either. **Are we, as a community, paid enough in wages, salaries, corporate dividends, profits, rents etc., to offset the cost-prices of what we, as a community, produce in the form of goods and services?** Social Credit teaches there is a structural problem in the economy and incomes are chronically insufficient to automatically offset cost-prices; whereas, economic orthodoxy and public policy assume, that there is always enough income being simultaneously distributed to meet the flow of corresponding prices.

Social Crediters are correct, and have empirical, statistical evidence to show that correctness. And addressing the problem along Social Credit lines would be the most obvious and logical thing to do if one has any interest at all in providing the population with a universal basic income.

If we were to take Australia as an example... if Australia Inc., or Australia LTD, makes a profit every year and it does, then it follows quite naturally that the citizens of Australia have a right to their share of that profit as a free lunch, as a dividend. \*\*\*

# THE CROWN IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

By David D'Lima, National Secretary of the Australian Monarchist League

In 1999 the people of Australia comprehensively defeated a referendum on the republic. The score was zero out of six. As the twentieth anniversary of that ignominious defeat approaches, the republican cause has received renewed momentum by the appointment of Peter FitzSimons as leader and major funding secured from corporate sponsors. Additionally the ALP has appointed a shadow minister for the republic. Presumably that means that should the ALP gain government in 2019 a minister for the republic would be commissioned. That is a simply outrageous possibility.

Each MP is duty bound to give allegiance to the sovereign, and while ministers are not required to make an additional promise of allegiance when taking up ministerial office, the Constitution in section 64 refers to “the Queen’s Ministers of State”. However the good news is that since the referendum popular support for royalty continues to grow. Royal Weddings continue to break records for international television coverage. The recent marriage of Prince Harry to Meghan Markle who on that day became Duke and Duchess of Sussex was enjoyed by nearly two billion people. Its strong African flavour sent a powerful message about the inclusive nature of the modern Crown.

In 2017 in Australia the number one name for newborn girls was Charlotte and the second most popular name for new born was William. Support for the monarchy continues to grow. That is very good news because in truth the battle for the monarchy is not really a battle of ideas but of sentiment - in the same way that people often buy a new car because it is beautiful, not because it has superior specifications.

Nevertheless, there are many powerful reasons why Australia should remain as a constitutional monarchy, and even if people have mainly sentimental or perhaps instinctive inclinations towards the monarchy it is good and right that the goodness and rightness of monarchy be understood and explained. So allow me to answer ten questions that I’ve handled over the years when people have raised them with the Australian Monarchist League:

## **1. What are the advantages of our system of constitutional monarchy compared to a republic?**

Constitutional monarchy provides a politically neutral means of supervising the civic system. Since a monarch is not elected and doesn’t have to face re-election, the monarch is able to provide neutral and long-term supervision of the civic system. Republics are always led by partisan or politically active heads of state, who often come and go. MPs, the police, judges, justices of the peace, and the military all promise to serve the Crown and therefore inherit obligations from the Crown. The promise to serve the monarch, when rightly understood,

is a very powerful personal pledge to a person, which is very different (for example) to the promise to “pledge allegiance to the flag and to the republic” (as occur in the US).

## **2. What are the major issues with becoming a republic?**

The Crown is a conduit of grace for our civic system. Australia is a richer place because we have a gracious servant-leader who is informed by the Christian worldview and has behind her “the splendid traditions and the annals of more than a thousand years” (as Queen Elizabeth explained in 1953 in her Coronation Speech).

A direct civic connection to the past would be lost if Australia were to become a republic. The concepts of regal and gracious behaviour, in which the monarchy is highly expert, would not be so easily replaced.

The Coronation is the epitome of the Crown’s spirituality. At each Coronation, a Bible has been presented to each sovereign since the Coronation of Queen Mary II in 1685 (she co-reigned with King William III). The Queen was also anointed.

## **3. Why are you against becoming a republic?**

While every human system will be imperfect, the republican movement has not presented a model which is superior to the current splendid stability, grace and depth of meaning in our system of constitutional monarchy.

Consider how in theory the US President is chosen by an electoral college (whose members are elected by the people). In theory, the electoral college should then meet to discuss who is the best person for the presidency. In practice, there is nothing to discuss because the members of the electoral college are elected in support either of an endorsed democratic or republican candidate. Or to give another example, the role of Congress to choose the best person to fill a vacancy in the Supreme Court, who would then be appointed by the President, has been turned into a political disagreement. Hence in the last few months of the Obama presidency the United States could not fill a vacancy on the Supreme Court (its top court) because Congress and the President could not agree. Congress makes the recommendation and the President appoints judges to the Supreme Court.

In Australia, executive government, on behalf of the Parliament advises our neutral Governor-General to make appointments to our top court, which is called the High Court.

## **4. What implications may arise if Australia became a republic?**

The change would most likely replace a neutral servant-leader

*(continued on next page)*

*(continued from previous page)* (the Queen, represented in Australia by the Governor-General) with an activist, politically ambitious person who would not enjoy widespread public confidence. Such a person would not be a unifying figure, but a source of controversy (such as the US presidents always are).

### **5. What examples can you provide as to why Australia should not be a republic?**

None of the world's republics provide a system better than that which we enjoy here in Australia. Some republics are moderately successful, such as Singapore, where the people are rich but not free. But many of the republics are problematic. In 2014 in Greece the politicians couldn't agree on who the President will be. That could have happened here under the model proposed in 1999. The Pacific nation of Nauru had three presidents in one week, during November 2011.

### **6. What about the proposal that instead of the Prime Minister asking the Queen to make the appointment of Governor-General, that the Prime Minister himself makes the appointment?**

The problem with the Prime Minister appointing the President is that the President would owe his position to the Prime Minister and presumably would serve at his pleasure. That is entirely the opposite of the current role of the Governor-General, who appoints (or removes) the Prime Minister who serves at his pleasure. If the President holds office at the pleasure of the Prime Minister, he would lack the security needed to challenge a Prime Minister who is operating illegally or improperly, as in the 1975 crisis.

### **7. Who does the Governor General work for, and to whom is he answerable?**

The Governor-General serves the Australian people by giving his allegiance to the Queen of Australia, and doing here what she would do here, if she were here supervising the civic system. The Governor-General supervises the federal system whose mode of operation has been endorsed by the voters who approved a Constitution which came into operation in 1901 and which is suffused by what has become known as The Australian Crown. As the representative of the Queen of Australia, the Governor-General is mandated to serve the Australian people as would the Sovereign - if Her Majesty were present and overseeing the nation.

The fact that we share the Queen with several nations requires us to have a Governor-General as Her Majesty's representative. He is responsible to the Australian people, and to the Government, and to the Queen, though he takes no directions from Her Majesty as he is the holder of an independent office which exercise powers that belong to the Queen.

### **8. Is it proper that the Queen and the Governor-General are not elected?**

The Queen exists by agreement of the people and has made it clear that she will continue to serve as long as the people wish her to serve. The inherited nature of the monarchy is certainly not democratic, but each monarch effectively holds their position by the consent of the people expressed through constitutional and parliamentary processes. If enough people reject the monarch, he or she will not continue. Inherited positions are also perfectly acceptable in the world of business in which family business may pass ownership from one generation to another. The father-son rule in Australian Rules Football is also coherent with a socially approved concept of dynastic inheritance. The political system also has informal dynastic inheritance (eg the Kennedy family, the Bush dynasty in US politics).

### **9. Is it not the case that the Queen is absent from Australian political and popular culture?**

There is something quite modern about sharing resources internationally (such as the space station). The Queen and the Royal Family exercise a remarkable influence on Australian culture. Time and again, Australians who meet the Queen come back changed and enriched. Even the arch-republican Malcolm Turnbull in 2017 proclaimed himself "an Elizabethan" following his visit to the Queen.

As Governor-General, Her Excellency Mrs Quentin Bryce, who turned out to be personally republican, made these remarks when still in office, during an interview with Kerry O'Brien in 2008:

QUENTIN BRYCE: I recently visited Her Majesty at Balmoral Castle, and she is always very warm and welcoming. I think I was down in the program for a 20-minute private conversation with her that lasted well over an hour. We talked about many things.

KERRY O'BRIEN: You are quite struck by her knowledge of Australia, I think and interest.

QUENTIN BRYCE: Always, about how superbly briefed she is always, and, of course, her long experience. I have to say when I walk away from meeting with her, and I have had a few of them, the words that come into my mind are about service and duty.

While Her Excellency didn't make the following point, it is the case that the influence of the Queen flows through the Governor-General and from there to the ministry. Administration and ministry have the word servant contained within.

The ambition for life-long service is the hallmark of royalty. When asked by a journalist what I thought the Queen would do when she retires, I said she is not going to retire, she is going to die. Queen Elizabeth is among the most influential people. The Queen retains great affection for Australia and is very knowledgeable about Australian developments. *(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

The Queen was especially mindful of Australia during the 1975 political crisis, as may be seen in this excerpt of a message communicated by Buckingham Palace to the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

*Her Majesty as Queen of Australia is watching events in Canberra with close interest and attention.*

(Quoted in *Matters for Judgment* (1979), by Sir John Kerr, p374).

Although residing elsewhere, the Sovereign's image is featured on all Australian coins and on the five dollar note. Many civic authorities promise allegiance to the Queen. Each Naval vessel is titled *HMAS* (Her Majesty's Australian Ship). The Queen's portrait (which previously graced the walls of many government offices, council chambers and community halls) is still displayed at each citizenship ceremony. The EIIR Royal Cypher that was featured on Australian post boxes and post offices, is still to be seen in places where it is built into the architecture.

The Christmas message is watched by one million Australians each year - a remarkable figure for one of the busiest and alcohol-fuelled days of the year.

The Queen turns up at 50% of football matches.

## 10. What does the Queen do?

In answer to the enormously complicated question of what is the Queen's role, we may simply say she keeps her Coronation oath.

What does the Queen do? She loves her people.

To give just one example, the Queen would send mini jars of Vegemite to Australian nurses who were working in Windsor Castle.

True love involves sacrifice. The role of the suffering servant in the modern world is perhaps one of the most overlooked, misunderstood and yet valuable contributions the monarchy makes to modernity.

"'Tis not so glorious as doth appear" - said Queen Elizabeth I, commenting on royal life. Royal duty never ceases; it continues unrelentlessly. A few years later, Shakespeare noted about the king: *His greatness weighed, his will is not his own. For he himself is subject to his birth.* After yet another attempt on her life, Queen Victoria said it was "worth being shot at—to see how much one is loved".

When her son Prince Alfred came to Australia in 1867, as the first member of the Royal Family to visit our great island continent, someone tried to murder him. Prince Alfred spent five weeks in hospital recovering.

Prince George the republic slayer. An Islamic State supporter has been jailed for at least 25 years in Britain for plotting his murder.

Then, of course, love and service go hand in hand.

The Queen's loving example is every bit as important as her role as Sovereign.

Hence I conclude with these remarkable anecdotes about the Queen's loving example. It's by sharing these kind of anecdotes that we help secure the monarchy.

*While not a great user of Facebook, a reflection uploaded by a fellow called Andrew Simes is worth repeating, as he describes the monarch's love for her people, giving the example of his grandfather's custom of sending a Christmas card to the Queen each year:*

*Ever since Grandpa could remember, he made sure to send a Christmas card to his king/queen. So naturally, since 1952, Elizabeth II kept receiving his mail. As chance would have it, their paths crossed at a reception in Izmir, Turkey in 1972. When it was his turn to be introduced to the Queen, instead of a formal handshake, she paused, smiled, and quipped: "So it's you who keeps sending me those lovely Christmas cards."*

*Of all her subjects, Grandpa stood out (perhaps because he mailed his letters from Turkey), but what a memory and level of kindness on the Queen's part. She even wrote him to congratulate him on his 100th birthday.*

*Sadly, Grandpa passed away in the summer of 2011 at the age of 102. As a loyal grandson, admirer and student of his, I took it upon myself to continue writing to our Queen every year to show our appreciation. And I started that very first Christmas after Grandpa's passing. In January 2012, about a month after Christmas, I received a letter from Buckingham Palace. In it was written: "When I received a letter from a different Simes this Christmas, I instructed my office to research your grandfather's whereabouts. Therefore it is with much sadness, I have learned of his passing and extend my condolences to you and your family."*

*I couldn't fight back the tears then, nor can I fight them back every time I remember this story of two people who left a lifelong impression on each other.*

I also highlight a story from our friend Lou Cook when he told his father about the death of King George.

"My father declared, 'The King is dead,' stood to attention and said: 'God Save the Queen'.

"As a 16-year-old it made an unforgettable impression on me. The republicans say their time will come when the Queen dies. Well - they will have to be quick!

My Dad knew what to do and I will do the same!" \*\*\*

"The New Times Survey" is printed and authorised by  
K. W. Grundy. 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8387 6574      **email:** heritagebooks@alor.org

**Head Office Hours** - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm