

# THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

*"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31.*

VOL. 62, No. 2.

Registered Australia Post • Publication PP481667 1002S9

FEBRUARY 1998.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

## "THE FIGHT FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CROWN"

*by Nigel Jackson*

Because of the subject's vital importance, and the brilliant manner in which it was dealt with by Melbourne teacher and scholar, Mr. Nigel Jackson, at the Melbourne Conservative Speakers Club on Monday, February 2, most of this issue is devoted to an edited copy of Nigel Jackson's address. The complete address will subsequently be published in booklet form. But in the meantime we are pleased to announce that an audio taped recording of Nigel Jackson's address is available from MEA Tapes, Box 184 The Basin, Victoria 3154. Single copy \$6 posted. However the director of MEA Tapes can supply bulk orders of this historic tape at discounted prices. The response to the address was such that the director of MEA Tapes was hard put to meet demands after the Melbourne meeting.

The following is the edited copy of Nigel Jackson's spirited defence of the Australian system of Constitutional Monarchy:

Monarchy or republic? Which political form is Australia to have in the coming century? That is the great question, which we are being asked to answer as the present century draws to an end; and the Constitutional Convention is deliberating upon it at the present time. Contrary to opinions voiced in certain quarters, it is not a trivial matter but one of cardinal importance for our political and cultural future. Moreover, despite other claims, it is untrue that it will not make much difference which choice we make.

The fact is that what is happening in Australia is a civil war without the guns; and, as often happens in such contests, outside interests are involved. Immensely powerful forces are clearly determined to try to force a republic on us in the very near future, by 2001 (the anniversary of Federation).

These forces effectively control the major media (print and electronic), both major political parties and the majority of national politicians. Mr. Ken Gifford, former Queen's Counsel and a Victorian representative at the Convention on behalf of the Monarchist League, told me last November that he believed that at least one multi-millionaire was funding the republican campaign. An important letter in *The Australian* on 19th January by P.L. Gibson referred to "an Australian Republican Movement budget of \$5 million to \$6 million, plus the full support of the Labor Party and ACTU - 10 to 15 times the budget of those rejecting change."

### **BIG MONEY BACKS REPUBLIC**

Big Money - and it is almost certainly largely International

### **OUR POLICY**

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

Money rather than Australian Money - wants us to become a republic.

Facing a challenge of this dimension, we Australian monarchists, loyalists, patriots will be wise to pray for guidance and support from Almighty God, in whose name our monarch reigns and in whose name our constitution was drawn up. And I will begin this address with two relevant quotations from the Holy Bible. The first is from the ancient book of Genesis, which our Jewish predecessors bequeathed to us with so much else that is inspirational in the Old Testament. I will read from verses 29 to 34 of Chapter 25:

*... and Esau came from the field, and he was faint.  
And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage; for I am faint. . .  
And Jacob said, Sell me this day thy birthright.  
And Esau said, Behold, I am at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me?  
And Jacob said, Swear to me this day; and he swore unto him: and he sold his birthright unto Jacob.  
Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentils; and he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way: thus Esau despised his birthright.*

Australians are being tempted to sell their birthright; the story is a permanent warning of the danger of exchanging something precious for something of infinitely lesser value. Esau felt that he was starving; times may be hard for us; but we should not yield to insidious temptations by those with interests other than our own.

My second biblical quotation comes from the Gospel of Saint Matthew and reports some of the inimitable words of our master, Jesus. I am reading from Chapter 7, verses 9 and 10.

*Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone?  
Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent?*

These words remind us that we can often find ourselves offered possibilities which are not merely much less valuable than what we have, but also downright dangerous, May the wisdom of God, which spoke to us in these quotations, guide us in all our efforts to defend Christian monarchy in this country.

## **THE REPUBLIC AND INTERNATIONALISM**

Why does Big Money want an Australian republic? You don't pour millions of dollars into a small nation just to achieve a cosmetic change or to give the citizens ("Suckers" Harry Lime would have called them in the immortal film *The Third Man*) a blissful sense of mystical maturity!

The republican campaign has the support of a significant number of Australians who, by temperament or background or both, are attracted to its freshness, independence and egalitarian spirit. Republican spokes people include a large number of intellectuals, artists and church leaders. The majority of republican Australians are decent and honourable citizens who have no idea at all of what really lies behind the intense pressure on Australia to become a republic. They are victims of years of suggestion and conditioning through the mass media.

The truth is that the plan to republicanise our nation is a deadly trap, which has serious implications not only for all Australians (of whatever ethnic background and religious faith) but also for the other peoples of the world. You can read about this trap in Australian Jeremy Lee's 1997 book *Australia 2000: What Will We Tell Our Children?* The facts, the references, the

indications of wider reading needed are all given there. Allow me to quote just a few lines from his foreword:

*"This is the story of the near-dispossession of the richest country in the world . . . (of) a predetermined policy, discernible throughout the world, for the transfer of political and economic decision-making away from parliaments elected or otherwise to a global government. The idea has appeared under a number of names; globalism, the New World Order, global governance, the New International Economic Order and so on . . .*

*"It is seldom, if ever, that those on whom the public gaze is focussed are the real wielders of power. The most ruthless force moves silently, untroubled by the journalist's pen or the cameraman's scrutiny, which it owns. The whip in its hand is finance. . . .*

*"Today it has the world by the throat. There is no community or locality untroubled by the fingers of debt.*

*"It needs a little more time to quell the growing misgivings appearing everywhere. It fears exposure and informed opposition even at this advanced stage of its programme. It has reason to fear. It was always inevitable it would have to come into the open in the later stages of its advance. "*

One of the key facts in the present controversy is this: that, once Australia has become a republic, it will be easier to incorporate it in a world government which in fact will be a world tyranny controlled by a group of the super-rich. The British people and their royal house were long seen as major obstacles impeding the progress of this project; and snatching away Australia from the House of Windsor is seen as a splendid way of attacking and belittling the Crown of Britain, which is the ultimate target. Glenn Milne in *The Australian* on 24th November last year published an opinion piece entitled "*An Unexpected Royal Seal of Approval on the Road to a Republic*", in which he claimed to adduce evidence that the Queen would be happy to see Australia become a republic so that she could concentrate on the battle to retain the affections of her subjects in Britain. That is surely a classic piece of disinformation or misinformation, calculated to depress monarchists striving to retain the Australian Crown. A rejection of her rule in Australia is only likely to further erode the Queen's image in her own country.

## **THE EROSION OF CHRISTIAN CULTURE**

A penetrating critique of the modern world, which supports the thesis of Jeremy Lee has been made by a Scotsman named Ian Dallas who became a Muslim and also writes under the name of Shaykh Abdalqadir al-Murabit. His Melbourne follower, Riyadh Asvat, summarised this in an essay, *The Relevance of Islam to Modern Society*, published in December last year. Asvat shows how mediaeval Christian culture was gradually destroyed by the growth of scientism and rationalism associated with such figures as Francis Bacon, Rene Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, Sir Isaac Newton and Charles Darwin. Republicans are by and large the intellectual heirs of this movement, which was misleadingly named the Enlightenment.

Europe has been wracked by political upheavals from the English Civil War of the 1640's to the collapse of Soviet Communism a decade or less ago. Asvat writes:

*"The result of these events was that political and economic power were systematically removed from their traditional bases. The world was transformed radically with such speed that most people are left totally confused. On the one hand is all the*

*propaganda of liberty, equality, technology, progress and development. On the other hand is the reality."*

The key to understanding is the clearing away of webs of deceit. Asvat gives a grim analysis of our plight:

*"The reality is that we are in a state of crisis . . . Rationalisation of the state and economy has brought about a major transformation of thought and culture. Rationalisation has led to the control of the world through calculation as well as an increase of rules and regulations in daily life. The administered uniformity of the bureaucratic state has severely limited freedom. Secularism, scientism and hedonism are the order of the day. Being modern means being wealthy, and free from familial and religious authority . . . Private life has lost its richness and become narrow . . ."*

After considering approvingly the profound analysis of modernity made by the German philosopher Martin Heidegger, Asvat points out the core problem of modern societies, including Australia:

*"The current economic system is based on usury or what is commonly called interest . . . if usury is eradicated, all of the world's major problems will disappear."*

Following on from the percipient unravelling of modern history accomplished by Shaykh Abdalquadir in his 1988 essay *For the Coming Man*, Asvat makes an observation uncomfortable for British and Australian monarchists, when he refers to a recent well-known tragedy:

*"The death of Princess Diana assumed momentous proportions for our society because it is the tragic poetry of our time. People could relate to it because it is the fairytale, the story of the modern world. Royalty without power. Constitutionalism, which is unable to protect the people."*

### **ABANDONING CONSTITUTION FOOLISH**

The matter is not, in my own view, quite as complete as this suggests. The Australian constitution may yet prove an effective defence of our people if enough of us unite to reject the republic that the super-rich internationalists want so much. And our task then will be to find ways of strengthening, not weakening, the power of the Australian Crown, which does not mean reverting royal absolutism backed by an intransigent and narrow-minded church.

If Australians are foolish enough to allow themselves to be cheated into giving up the protection of the Crown, we are highly likely to lose much of what remains of our stable and free way of life, something made possible by its basis in the guardianship of a royal house devoted in principle to the service of God, realm and people.

In our daily life we and our families are kept relatively secure by an inherited and still largely intact moral atmosphere and system of just laws which depend for their very existence on the sanction of divinity. A hereditary monarchy, endorsed (as is the case with the British and Australian Crowns) by the sacred witness of the Church, enables the continued operation of that law, morality and public decency. The light of the Crown's protection shines into the daily life of every Australian person, whether or not he or she is aware of this.

By contrast, a secular and profane republic, in which (as stated in the Howard Government's explanatory lift out statement *Republic - Yes or No?*, published to advise citizens on the vote for the convention) "*all those who hold public offices gain their authority from the people*", is likely to be in a much weaker

position to guarantee our traditional lifestyle, with all its safeguards for ordinary people. This is partly because "the authority of the people" is likely to be only a polite fiction to mask the identity of the powerful minority that is really in control.

It is tempting for adolescents to throw off the yoke of parental authority; but all responsible parents know of the terrible and seductive dangers, which lurk in the outside world for the unwary immature. It is tempting for adults, overconfident in their knowledge and independence but not yet wise, to throw off allegiance to what seems like yesterday's authority and the ruler of another land on the other side of the globe - especially when, just as parents are fallible, that royal house has shown itself to be well less than immaculate in its behaviour and conduct of affairs. The matter is not helped when the tradition of the supporting church has too often in practice degenerated from wisdom teaching into the limited form of an irrational, dogmatic and narrow minded cult.

### **PUSH FOR REPUBLIC NOT COMING FROM THE PEOPLE**

Despite a torrent of media propaganda seeking to persuade us otherwise, it is obvious that the present push for an Australian republic is not just an irresistible surge of popular feeling. P.L. Gibson in his aforementioned letter in *The Australian* wrote pertinently on this topic as follows:

*"The basic facts (of voting for the Constitutional Convention) are: 46.6 per cent of the electorate voted and 60 per cent of those voted for change; that is, 60 per cent multiplied by 46.6 per cent, which equals 28 per cent of the electorate voted for change."* Where then does one of the main republican catch cries - that a republic is inevitable - stand?

We are all familiar with the siren voices around the place that are loudly proclaiming this faith. There is no such inevitability at all; but there are certainly smooth operators who think that if you repeat a statement of opinion long enough and loudly enough, the masses will come to believe it is fact. We have here a typical ploy in the field of mass suggestion.

These claims of inevitability cannot logically mean that there is no choice for Australians. In some cases they may express the wish fulfilment syndrome of republicans. In other cases they may express the failing resolve of those who would really prefer to keep the Crown - and we need to rekindle sturdy resistance in such hearts. Sometimes, however, these inevitability claims have a sinister ring and seem to be telling us that we are not going to be allowed a choice! In this case, we are entitled to ask: "*On whose say so? Who are the secret dictators?*"

### **THE CHINESE EXPERIENCE**

The ancient Chinese, creators of one of the world's greatest and most profound traditional cultures, spoke of the cardinal importance in human endeavours of finding the favourable moment for action. Clearly the salesmen of the Kwik-slick Republic have grasped that for them the present time is that favourable moment. An ageing Queen, possibly of liberal tendencies, sits on the throne, her image weakened by the marital disaster of three of her four children, including the heir himself. Justin Mortimer's recent surrealistic portrait of a gloomy lady with head separated from body sums up her plight

and seems plainly a malicious attack on her image which the Royal Family should promptly disown. Prince Charles, wickedly maligned for years by a barrage of media lampoons and attacks, has got himself in a tangle with Camilla Parker-Bowles. The rhythm of history, like a surfing wave, may be able to be picked up by trying to match the creation of a republic in 2001 with the creation of the Federation in 1901. At the same time the populace is morally weakened by ten years of recession and excessive unemployment. Fantasies and follies associated with the end of a millennium may also be usefully played with.

All of this perhaps explains the undignified rush with which the push for a republic has been accelerated since Mr. Keating lit the fuse; but, on the principle that opposites meet, it also suggests that, unbeknown to Big Money and its servants, a favourable moment has also arrived for traditionalists in Australia. There is an excellent chance that sufficient ordinary Australians can be rallied in time to frustrate the republican plan. This is surely why *The Australian* in its editorial on 3rd/4th January asserted that the Prime Minister should do "*all he can to ensure the Convention produces a genuine alternative to our present system that can be put to the people in a referendum or plebiscite.*" Shrewd heads among the republicans fear a referendum! They would much prefer a plebiscite in which the conditioned townfolk of the two bigger states would ensure, they think, an absolute majority for their cause. But the constitution protects us from their machinations! In an unpublished letter to *The Australian*, dated 3rd January, I commented that "*approval by referendum is the only acceptable mode of change; attempts to side-step this constitutional requirement would lead to a national crisis that would dwarf 1975.*" So far as I know *The Australian* published no adverse criticism of its invocation of the spectre of an illicit plebiscite.

If in a referendum traditionalists achieve the rejection of the republican Trojan Horse, this victory can be used as a foundation for a gradual but firm rebuilding of the pillars of traditional monarchical society in Australia. Having come so close to losing all, traditional-minded Australians are likely to be much readier to fight to fortify their heritage. The republican bubble will then burst. Freeloaders will desert their bandwagon. God willing, Australians would then in good time see the crowning of a new King - Charles the Third - with all the magnificent pomp and ceremony that accompanies British coronations. A royal visit to Australia would certainly soon follow. Imagine how deeply republican strategists and their hidden masters must fear the effect of such glorious spectacles on the hearts of Australians! It would spike all hope of a republican victory for a generation. And by then, God willing, Prince William would be being crowned. It looks like now or never for the Australian republicans. Let's make it never!

## REPUBLICAN SUBVERSION IN AUSTRALIA

A great deal of underhand change, if not swindling and cheating, has been associated with the republican project. Three zones in which this has occurred can be identified. Firstly there has been the Fabian Socialist tortoise approach of gradualism - the chipping away at royal icons in our public affairs by politicians without authentic mandate from the people. Thus, too rarely can we buy stamps with the Queen's head on them; and the Royal Mail is now called Australia Post. Our beautiful national anthem GOD SAVE THE QUEEN has been sidelined in favour of the banality of ADVANCE

AUSTRALIA FAIR. Oaths of allegiance and naturalisation ceremonies have been deprived of reference to fealty to the Crown.

Secondly, there has been an infiltration of anti-British and anti-monarchical propaganda into the teaching in schools of history, politics and social science. One text for the monstrously named Studies in Society and Environment which I studied last year was so biased that, while including several favourable extracts and exercises puffing the republic, it could find space for only one pro-monarchy text - and this text was a small section of an editorial from the strongly pro-republican Melbourne newspaper *The Age*. Inevitably it was a most unsatisfactory (and boring) presentation of our case! Men and women attracted to the narrower worldview of Enlightenment secularism seem habitually more prone to one-eyed fanaticism than devotees of traditional sacred traditions and societies. The mentality is widespread in the teaching profession, especially in the humanities area. There is good reason to fear that large numbers of Australians in the eighteen to thirty-five age bracket have never been adequately informed about the value of our traditional monarchical system. The Howard Government signally failed to remedy this in its pre-Convention voting handout.

Thirdly, there is the obvious bias of the major media in the present campaign, with the huge numbers of articles and editorials favouring a republic and a sly attempt to suggest that the national debate is about what kind of republic we want, instead of whether we want one at all.

I contend that the more honest and decent supporters of the republic ought to be feeling ashamed of all this. And we monarchists are entitled to ask: "*If republicans cheat like this now, what further kinds of swindle will occur if they are given power?*"

A particularly notable example of cheating is the way in which republican partisans are using one important issue to confuse public thinking on another important issue. The question of whether we need a completely separate head of state must be kept quite separate from the other question of whether we want a republic or a monarchy. Sir David Smith has argued cogently in many outstanding speeches and essays on our constitution, including his curiously unreported address at the 1997 Victorian RSL conference, that we have, and have had for many years, an Australian head of state. While the Queen of Australia is our symbolic head of state, as he puts it, the Governor-General is our ceremonial head of state. In the longer term this situation may not suit our national soul in its own organic growth and natural unfolding. It is clear that an utterly independent Australian head of state in the form of an actual Australian monarch is feasible. The first such monarch, ideally, would be related reasonably closely to the direct succession of the British Crown, but married to an Australian spouse. Such an arrangement can certainly be achieved when the time is right by wise statesmanship. The successors of that monarch would be Australian monarchs, born and bred. If the idea seems fragile at the present time, that is only because an unfavourable atmosphere has been created in Australia by a quarter of a century of conditioning, of mass suggestion. A change of public sentiment would make it seem much more soundly based in reality.

Australian monarchists should insist that the phrasing of any referendum is fairly and equitably worded. If any details are

to be given on the referendum voting paper and/or preceding Government advisory handout about a proposed republic, and these include any kind of reference to "our own separate head of state" or words to that effect, then the option of a completely Australian monarchy should also be explained and offered as a third possibility.

### **WHAT WOULD FOLLOW A REPUBLIC?**

In the meantime Australians should not only be asking themselves whether they want a republic, but also what will lie behind or beyond a republic, once it comes in. How many others of our institutions and customs will go? How long will the flag remain unchanged? It is difficult to believe that a republic, managed by politicians, would allow us to keep the union jack in it with its Christian and British symbolism. And how would our traditional common law freedoms fare? Many of these depend philosophically on chivalrous ideals associated with the Christian monarchies of the Middle Ages. One of these freedoms is the right at law to be presumed innocent of a charge until found guilty by due process of a properly constituted court.

Yet right now the Howard Government is considering a proposed change to our immigration laws that flies in the face of this principle. *The Australian Jewish News* in its edition of 28th November last year carried a news report by Bernard Freedman titled "New Law will help keep Irving out". The first two paragraphs read as follows:

*"Sweeping new powers enabling immigration authorities to shut the gate more firmly against unwelcome controversial visitors - like revisionist historian David Irving - are included in amendments to Australia's immigration laws now before federal parliament.*

*"The government's main new weapon is a character test which puts the onus on visa applicants to demonstrate their good character, rather than requiring immigration decision-makers to prove the applicants are of bad character."*

Freedman adds that the new law was passed in the House of Representatives! Is this the kind of justice that will proliferate under the Brave New Republic of Malcolm Turnbull and Tom Kenneally? Are we in for an Orwellian regime of political correctness presided over by the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission and other commissars in their inquisitions and star chambers?

Australians indeed need to ask themselves what life is likely to be like under a republic. We can gain a further idea of this by observing the behaviour of republican partisans and by looking at the track record of republics in history.

The conduct of the present Governor-General, Sir William Deane, is instructive. An avowed republican, appointed to his regal office by the pro-republican Paul Keating government, he has departed from the reticence and impartiality associated traditionally with this role, in order to opine on a variety of controversies. For him, the conviction that his views are correct and worthy of attention is sufficient justification for this jettisoning of convention. It is as though an umpire in a sporting game suddenly began to barrack loudly for one of the teams. Conditions of equity for the public discussion of points of view on important matters in dispute are thus destroyed. It is only a step or two from this to paralysing dissidents with huge fines or gaol sentences - all for the "public good" and "to accord with our international obligations" and "to appease world opinion", of course.

By contrast, under the British monarchical system, which we have inherited, the monarch and his or her representatives remain aloof from controversies. Thus they maintain an arena for equitable discussion and so preserve the national unity. This restraint is analogous to the ancient Chinese wisdom; whereby the true mandarins do not themselves engage in action, although offering advice to rulers. We have a choice between an atmosphere of gracious selflessness and a murk of propagandists busy bodying.

### **THE PROBLEM WITH THE HIGH COURT**

Recent decisions by the Australian High Court are also relevant. It is common knowledge now that majorities of this court, particularly but not exclusively in issues relating to the Australian aborigines, have handed down decisions based rather on their personal opinions than on clearly set out laws of the land. This has amounted to usurpation of power; and, like the speeches of Sir William Deane, these decisions seem always to result in the further erosion of the traditional political order of our nation. The latest criticism of the High Court was made recently in the *Australian Law Journal* by a senior New South Wales judge, Mr. Justice Roderick Meagher, as reported in *The Australian* on 20th January. Mr. Meagher has asserted that the Court has manufactured so-called civil rights out of thin air, rights that have no basis in the Constitution but merely reflect the judges' personal views. Justice Meagher has added that "every newly discovered implied right" diminishes the sovereignty of Parliament and is undemocratic. In its editorial on the same day *The Australian* admitted that "academics, politicians, even retired judges have been among the public skeptics of the 'implied right' doctrine of the Court." We have, in the last decade or so, been witnessing the erosion of the impartiality of our highest court, an impartiality in principle guaranteed by the monarch, whose appointed officers all our judges are. It seems certain that under a republic political dissidents can expect much less equitable treatment within the courts than under a monarchy. Their persecution is likely to be carried out behind the barrage of verbiage, blared out with unctuous moral righteousness, with which we are already familiar from various "human rights tribunals", "war crimes trials commissions" and "reconciliation boards" in varying contexts in less fortunate nations past and present.

Boris Pasternak, Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Mikhail Bulgakov in their great works of literature gave us earlier this century an unforgettable picture of life under Soviet Communist tyranny. It should not be overlooked that Babeuf carried the red flag through the streets of Paris in 1795. Socialism, social democracy and communism are linked by many similarities of worldview. There is good reason to fear that a republic, yearned for by our own socialists, will bring similar oppression to hitherto free Australia.

Nor does a look at the history of earlier republics lead to confidence in the idea of Australia taking that road. Republicans played a major part in the destruction of traditional French society in the late Eighteenth Century. King Louis XVI, an honourable and reforming monarch who genuinely loved his people, as Nesta Webster showed in her peculiarly neglected studies, was, with his family, wickedly defamed and then murdered. Napoleon Bonaparte temporarily restored order, but, unrestrained by a traditional royal house, embarked on the grandiose folly of his Russian campaign, bringing death to

nearly six hundred thousand Frenchmen. After a period of monarchical restoration brought to an end by the 1848 revolution, France fell into the hands of a less endowed adventurer, Louis Napoleon, suffered the humiliating defeat at Sedan by the German army of Bismarck, experienced the appalling savagery of the Paris Commune in 1871, was invaded in both world wars and groaned under another Red Terror in the 1940's, when more deaths occurred than in the French Revolution and Paris Commune put together!

Germany lost its king after World War One. By the early 1930s it was a sink of decadence. The nationalist revolt led by Adolf Hitler brought temporary prosperity to the nation, but, in the face of overwhelming numbers of Allied armies and as the result of a number of misfortunes and bad errors of its own, lost a major war and brought enormous suffering to the people. Neither republican France nor republican Germany can truly be called a free state today. In France you can have a university doctorate cancelled if the Government (or those who control it) dislikes your political thesis, or you can be denied an academic career or fined huge sums of money - just because you express dissident views about recent history! In Germany you can be put in gaol for dissenting from the politically correct line.

In Russia, chief centre of Orthodox Christianity, Czar Nicholas II unwisely abdicated in 1917 and Kerensky's republic appeared on the scene. Within less than a year there followed the Bolshevik coup and seventy years of Soviet Communist tyranny. In Spain the nationalist revolt in 1936 led by the gallant Christian General Franco was needed as a result of republican efforts under Manuel Azana to destroy traditional Spain, which would probably have led to a Communist takeover soon afterwards. Franco proved his fundamental decency by re-establishing a monarchy instead of engaging in Cromwellian or Napoleonic nepotism.

## LESSONS FROM THE REPUBLICS

Recent events in the republics of Algeria and Turkey are instructive too. A Muslim party in Algeria won a general election and was promptly banned, this leading to years of bloodthirsty civil war. In Turkey we have just seen the major Muslim party banned and its leader, a recent prime minister, banned from politics for five years. It is doubtful if fear of Muslim fanaticism, real or imagined, was the cause of the banning. A more likely reason is that the Muslim movements in each country would obviously not be subservient to the internationalists.

As for the corruption and instability of Latin American and African republics - they are a byword for social and political disaster. In the Asian sphere the experience of China in this century also supports the thesis that monarchies offer much more peace and prosperity to citizens than do republics. Many Australians have viewed the beautiful film *The Last Emperor*. Reginald Johnston, tutor to the last Manchu emperor from 1919 to 1924, was played in the film by Peter O'Toole. Johnston published in 1934 his book *Twilight In The Forbidden City*, which contains a profound account of the misery and devastation brought to millions of Chinese after they were swindled into becoming a republic in 1912. And after Johnston's death in 1938 there were still to come the humiliating invasions by Japan and the horrendous misery of Communist tyranny under Mao Tse-tung and the Red Guards, under which scores of millions of Chinese were murdered.

Australians should realise that becoming a republic is not just a matter of creating a few new documents, titles, public offices, ceremonies and laws. It is the opening of a door; and there is abundant reason to dread what may lie beyond that door.

The republicans also rely much on spurious claims that an Australian president will be fully independent and a symbol of our national self-sufficiency; but they show no concern whatever at our ever-increasing subservience to that very dubious entity the United Nations Organisation, to say nothing of the International Monetary Fund. Who, by the way, really controls those bodies? Our hypocritical or unwittingly contradictory republicans are just like those so-called Welsh and Scots nationalists who wish to prise Wales and Scotland out of Britain, only to hand them over to the more tyrannical regime of the European Economic Community and the bureaucrats of Brussels. Our mass media are happy to give such folk snippets of favourable publicity, while the real patriots and loyal nationalists in Britain are ignored or defamed. And the fact that these incongruities occur in a variety of nations strongly suggests the evidence of an internationalist Master Plan sinister, hidden and making use of those whom Kruschev and others have called "useful idiots".

Just as there are many negative factors that warn us to avoid becoming a republic, so there are many positive factors that show strongly that Australia should remain a monarchy.

Consider first the profound attachment that a royal family may be expected to develop for its nation and country over a period of several hundred years or through many generations. A king or queen has very good reason, indeed, to govern well, since the royal estate will in due course be passed on to the children of the family and those children's children. The fact of blood inheritance also brings in a spiritual or mystical possibility, which should not be disregarded. The theory of the divine right of kings is too foolishly mocked in the contemporary world. While it was no doubt inadequately articulated at times in the past and also misused by some of the less admirable monarchs, this does not mean that a particular monarch cannot have a special and real status as the person chosen by God to rule at that time. By accepting a hereditary monarchy, a people shows humility and makes a sacrifice of its power. If the faithful of the nation pray regularly for the well being of the monarch and for good governance at the royal hands, it is reasonable to believe that God will respond to their benefit. Old wisdom tells us that peoples get the rulers they deserve.

On the occasion of the birth of Prince Charles, John Masefield, the English Poet Laureate, wrote a moving quatrain, which Jonathan Dimbleby quoted in his excellent 1994 biography *the Prince of Wales*. Here it is:

*May destiny, allotting what befalls,  
Grant to the newly born this saving grace,  
A Guard more sure than ships and fortress-walls,  
The loyal love and service of a race.*

## THE CROWN AND PUBLIC DECENCY

In the heightened mode of idealism appropriate to ceremonial verse, this reminds us of the deep bonds of mutual loyalty between monarch and people, which can develop over the passage of years into profound love which strengthens and purifies the nation. Such a web of loyalties brings inner order to the national soul. American poet Robert Bly wrote well in his best-selling book *Iron John* of the enrichment to families afforded by fathers who are strong and present, and related their beneficial influence to that of kings over their realms. He did not write about presidents. A monarch, as has been shown notably

in the recent lives of Queen Victoria, King George V, King George VI and the present Queen, can play a major role in upholding an atmosphere of public decency. By decency is meant much more than sexual restraint. Coming from the Latin word "*decent*", meaning, "it is seemly", decency means every kind correct, courteous, considerate, pious and virtuous behaviour. And such an atmosphere is especially conducive to the maintenance of national pride and morale.

We have recently viewed the very moving and exquisitely gracious funeral for Princess Diana, in which the organisers found an effective balance between traditional ceremonial and popular feeling, and in which the leading men of the Royal Family showed great dignity in walking together behind the cortege with the brother of the dead princess. The ceremonies of the British monarchy, in which the Australian monarchy participates, have a beauty of style and depth of symbolism, which no republic could match. They are based on irreplaceable sacred revelation and liturgy, together with customs, regalia and robes filled with ancient and profound meaning. Their style and elegance, both visual and of language, enhance the soul life of the nation in a way nothing else can.

The great German philosopher Nietzsche identified resentment as the core attitude in many of those who are destroying European civilisation. This meanness of spirit lurks in many of those otherwise quite well meaning republicans who respond to the magnificence of royal procedures by proclaiming their preference for a political order that allows equality to all citizens. We need to point out that such equality is usually a figment promoted by the propagandists of the super-rich, who have no intention whatever of sharing their wealth equally among the people; and we can add that monarchies, supported by hierarchies and aristocracies of various kinds, stand for quality as opposed to an equality which may end up meaning no quality. Nations without quality at the top are doomed; and Australia has plenty of hungry neighbours in South-East Asia.

The Australian Crown is for us the linchpin of our constitutional structure, which derives from organic growth of the parent British political order over a thousand years, an order which made British nations the envy of peoples all around the world, as well as attractive destinations for migration. This constitutional structure grew from roots in mediaeval Christian theology. The famous signing of Magna Carta on the Island of Runnymede by King John in 1215 established the vital principle of limitations on the royal power. Gradually the wonderful system of common law based on precedent delivered by wise judges who knew their own people intimately, developed to protect the common man with such important elements as habeas corpus (inviolability from arbitrary arrest). Integral to this constitutional process was the understanding that the power of government should not be unlimited, that there should be no centralised monopoly of control - for that means tyranny. Australian republicanism threatens this whole protective structure.

### **THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE**

After the American revolt of 1776-1785 the Founding Fathers tried valiantly to incorporate the British constitutional principle of the separation of powers into the American constitution, in order to avoid dictatorship. They achieved considerable success, but were never able to solve the problem of how to replace the British monarch with a new head of state. The disastrous result can be seen today, in the corruption of presidential elections, the expensive ballyhoo surrounding them every four years, the poor quality of the candidates and the fact that fewer than 50% of US citizens bothered to vote in the last ones. What a contrast with the quiet dignity, usually after a

substantial period of time for the previous reign, of the announcement of the accession of a new British and Australian monarch and the subsequent glorious coronation ceremony!

The situation in which the Queen of Australia is also the Queen of Britain is not an impossible one. Children can share the same parents happily enough. Australian Catholics do not object to having a non-Australian head of their church who lives in a different country on the other side of the planet. The truth is that this is not the right time to change our constitutional structure; the nation is still too immature to make the attempt successfully.

The British monarch is currently an indispensable symbol of the unity of the British people. I mean those who are British by race, not by acquired citizenship. This is a touchy issue but must be confronted. In an age when the need for the conservation of the environment and its range of flora and fauna is well understood and widely supported, it is amazing that human communities have been so easily hoodwinked into imagining that the conservation of peoples does not matter. At present the unity and very existence of the British people is seriously endangered in all their countries by policies of encouraging mass immigration by non-British and often ethnically unassimilable peoples. This has been accomplished by sleight of hand, without proper consultation with the British themselves, using suborned politicians of all major parties and an intensely malicious barrage of media propaganda against "racism", so-called. The chief planners of this erosion are the same Big Money interests who wish to republicanise Australia. They are the enemies of peoples everywhere, as Shaykh Abdalquadir al-Murabit (a Muslim who cannot possibly be indicted for "racial prejudice") has lucidly shown. It must be remembered that membership of a coherent ethnic and racial group is membership of Big Family. Individuals of all ethnic backgrounds are protected by their membership of Big Family, just as parents and children are protected by being members of Family, both nuclear and extended. Citizens whose Big Family has been destroyed will be able to be enslaved much more easily by the elite that plans a world tyranny. Think of the symbols of this elite as McDonalds, Coca-Cola and the policy that "anything and anyone can be bought" and you won't go far wrong.

It is in this context that I appeal to all Australians who are not of British ethnicity. It is in your interests, too, that the British political order and moral atmosphere of Australia be maintained and strengthened, not destroyed. It protects all Australian citizens and their children. There is no injustice here. Our language and origins are those of the British. No other basis for national unity is conceivable, help us and we may one day be able to help your own peoples of origin to regain integrity and unity that they have lost to the internationalist culture vandals. The defeat of Big Money and the reform of the world's use of money is in the interests of all peoples.

### **THE ROLE OF PRINCE CHARLES**

It is now time to consider the important subject of the character of Prince Charles. Although the Crown itself is of prime importance and the personalities of particular monarchs are only of secondary importance, it ought to be widely understood that, contrary to lying propaganda spread widely about by the media, the current heir to the throne, the Prince of Wales, is a very impressive man indeed. It may be that in the negative scales must be placed his failure in marriage, although he shares this failing with a huge number of great and successful persons, past and present; but a reading of Jonathan Dimbleby's biography shows just what an enormous heap of talents and achievements can be placed in the positive scales, he is one of

the first members of the Royal Family in history to obtain a university degree (and it was awarded by prestigious Cambridge University); he was captain of his school; he is a qualified officer and pilot; he is a very competent polo player and skier; unlike his parents, he is well read in classic literature; he appreciates deeply the beauty of Nature and the joys of music and the arts; he has always been an extraordinarily kind person, modest and with a genuine wish to help the less fortunate; he has always been intuitive and religious and has been able to make the difficult voyage that leads to the appreciation of the sacred validity of other religious traditions while remaining devoted to his own. Even more importantly for us, he has a deep and unfeigned love of Australia, which has grown steadily since he attended Geelong Grammar School's Timbertop adventure school as a boy.

It is significant that the Australian media ignored the 1992 publication of *The People's Prince* by Veritas Publishing Company. This collection of nine addresses by the Prince has an Introduction by the former lieutenant governor of South Australia, Sir Walter Crocker. Sir Walter was a distinguished Australian ambassador who later wrote scathingly of the Internationalists' prototype for world government, the United Nations Organisation. The book is subtitled *Discovering the Real Prince Charles*. Evidently powerful interests did not want the Australian people to do this! As these essays make very clear, Prince Charles is a deeply patriotic man who understands the importance of tradition in the life of the British people, whether those of Britain or Australia or elsewhere, and is capable of saying so in eloquent language of his own. In his 1991 Shakespeare Birthday Lecture he said:

*"For us all, roots are important: roots in our landscape and local communities, roots in our cultural and literary heritage; roots in our philosophical and spiritual traditions. If we lose touch with these, if we lose track of where we have come from, we deprive ourselves of a sense of value, a sense of security, and, all too frequently, a sense of purpose and meaning."*

He sees the preservation of our roots as essential for the maintenance of our national identities and the prosperity of our peoples. His most recent address in Swaziland in southern Africa showed that he is well aware that love of tradition does not mean mindless resistance to all change, that he knows that for prudent nations change occurs organically, under the wise guidance of the elders of the tribe, both those living and those dead.

More importantly, in the context of the present world crisis, the Prince has shown that he is no internationalist and that he is willing to publicly take on politicians. He has, for example, stated correctly that international debt is one of the major obstacles to realistic strategies for conservation; and he defended French peasants against the threat to their way of life posed by economic rationalism. Prince Charles is exactly the kind of man the Internationalist planners do not want on the thrones of Britain and Australia! As regards his friendship with Camilla Parker-Bowles, it is in our interests to exercise the Christian attitude of forgiveness here. One of the greatest metaphysical writers in the contemporary world is the Muslim Perennialist Frithjof Schuon. In an essay entitled *"The Problem of Sex"* in his book *Esoterism as Principle and as Way* he argued that the disasters associated with the reign of King Henry VIII could have been avoided if European and British civilisation had been willing to allow monarchs, if not other citizens, to take several wives, he suggested that the very narrow-minded attitude to sex and marriage taken by the Christian Church involved a misplacing of a sexual morality appropriate for monasteries and initiation societies on to ordinary society. A man in the outside

world needs a woman beside him who can truly be his helpmeet, his loyal supporter and affectionate companion. It seems plain that Camilla Parker-Bowles is that woman for Prince Charles. We should accept this as part of his destiny and ours, with magnanimity and compassion. A part of the providential stature of the Prince, as Dimbleby's Chapter 14 makes particularly clear, is his ability and willingness to confront the ossification of the Christian tradition, which has occurred during past centuries. His public statement that he hoped to be "defender of faith", rather than "defender of the Faith", was a conscious and necessary expression of his position. In due course the Church of England should accept his remarriage to Camilla Parker-Bowles, if the couple wish that, and that such a remarriage is no impediment to his taking the throne and the governorship of that church which goes with it. Christians who doubt this should study the writings of Schuon and the other Perennialists and also John Davidson's monumental 1000-page book *The Gospel of Jesus* (Element Books, England, 1995) that analyses the corruption of the message of Jesus during the development of the Church.

Charles of England is now potentially capable of being one of the greatest monarchs in the history of the British people. The republicans cannot find anyone of remotely comparable stature to be their fist head of the Australian republic.

### THE POTENTIAL OF PRINCE CHARLES

It seems possible that there may be a referendum as early as 1999. We can expect a financial blitzkrieg in favour of the republican campaign. This is not a time for any complacency or defeatism in the ranks of Australian monarchists. Older citizens should not allow themselves to be sidelined as "old-hat" and "not with it". It is precisely the wisdom of their mature experience Australia needs. We can expect every possible stratagem to be used by our opponents. They will offer us, if necessary, the currently most popular and saleable model of a republic, while being perfectly ready to change that to a different one, once they have destroyed the Crown. It is plain that the powers behind the scene require a president elected by the politicians. They thus display their fear that in certain circumstances they might not, for all their power with media propaganda and bought political parties, be able to fool the people as a whole into picking the sort of puppet they desire.

Every Australian supporter of our traditional way of life needs to grasp that we are already in a national crisis which dwarfs that of 1975. It is a civil war without the guns. A curious anomaly is that the mass media and republican voices, though ready to pounce on any anti-Aboriginal (as they interpret it) policy as "nationally divisive", are utterly silent about the way in which an artificially induced push for a republic has divided Australia. Clearly our opponents expect us to lie down quietly or be swept aside and to accept our fate without resistance. They are unlikely to allow us to continue to campaign for monarchism if they win the referendum; but, if they lose the referendum, you can be sure they will be demanding another one as soon as possible. That is the nature of both Big Money elitism and post-Enlightenment political fanaticism. We are in for a long haul.

### BASIC FUND LAGGING

As we go to press the League's annual basic fund is lagging as the deadline for the conclusion to the fund approaches. It is still \$10,000 short of the target of \$65,000. Can we please hear from all the latecomers? All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.