



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.35, No.44

November 12th, 1999

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"Probably the greatest fallacy of our times is the notion that Reason in itself provides a proof; that because an argument is logical, its conclusion has any concrete embodiment...Reason is especially active in the construction of Utopias; and the most devastating demonstration of its nature lies in the fact that every Utopia we hear of differs from each of the others. As Zeno left motion out of (his) data so did the Planners ignore the organic: Life, the Living, and in particular, Human Nature - the thing-in-itself that produces the diversity in plans. The proof that this is so is not verbal; it is the experience we suffer of Planning."*

— "An Introduction to Social Credit", Bryan M. Monahan, 1966

A WELCOME RESPITE FROM THE MATERIAL DILEMMA by Eric D. Butler:

No sensible person says that there are not successful republican systems, but they all share a common heritage based on English law. A feature of English Common Law is that unlike the Roman system of law, it must serve the Individual; this truth is dramatised in Shakespeare's play *"The Merchant of Venice."*

In the play, the merchant of Venice, Shylock, clearly accepts the strict legality of what was being said, but, as Shakespeare stresses, unless the *spirit* (or intent) of the law is accepted it can only result in tragedy. Roman law was an advance on previous systems, but it lacked the Christian concept made clear in the famous speech by Portia in the Shakespearean play.

It is also true there are a number of honourable people who genuinely believe that a republican system of government is preferable to one based upon a constitutional monarch. But the feature of **most** exponents of the Republican system of government is the philosophy of power wielded by the self-appointed elitists. It is therefore not surprising that the ordinary people distrusted that which the rich and powerful were offering at the referendum.

In her message to the Australian people, referring to the constitutional debate, Her Majesty the Queen offered service. It is the type of service that Prince Charles also offers. He has made the pointed comment that he wishes to distance himself from those Chinese leaders who stress only the material values, such as are offered in 'more trade' with the brutal Communist empire.

The most important lesson of the referendum debate was that the majority of people completely rejected what the so-called 'best educated' or the rich and powerful had to say. The politicians – the

Whitlams, Hawkes and Frasers of this world, did not sway the ordinary people. Although it is not without significance that the *multiculturalists of Victoria swayed the Yes vote*, led by the defeated Liberal leader Jeff Kennett.

The stage has now been set upon which traditional Australians can build to ensure that there is a deeper understanding of what Australia's national heritage really means.

THE PATH OF PELL by Betty Luks:

Two days before the referendum, Roman Catholic Archbishop George Pell came down on the side of the republic, urging the nation's Roman Catholics to consider his arguments and vote yes. Stressing that the views he expressed were his own and not a position of the Catholic Church he "railed against the monarchy, saying the **royal symbolism has ended**" (*The Australian*, 4/11/99). This is the man, who at the Constitutional Convention told John Howard that Jeff Kennett and Shane Stone were the only conservative leaders in the country who can smell the wind, recognise that change is coming (and) tap into these currents of Australian patriotism.

How could he have got it so wrong? This last week Kennett resigned from politics after being so roundly defeated at the last Victorian elections. **Also, one must ask, if the royal symbolism for kingship has ended, has the royal symbolism for the priesthood ended too?**

D.M Beavan in "Why Catholics Should Oppose the Republic" puts the matter in a nutshell: "The Catholic Church at present is not a democracy, nor does it follow republican principles. It has a hierarchical, monarchical structure, based upon *Papal Monarchy* where the Pope is the ultimate (human) source of governmental and jurisdictional authority in the Church. This viewpoint was put strongly by Guillaume De Pierre Godin (born around 1260) in his *Tractatus De Causa Immediata Ecclesiasticae Potestatis* and has been defended by orthodox Catholic theologians ever since."

"...Catholics who call themselves orthodox or conservative in their faith should be concerned about republicanism and its 'modernist' agenda. If political monarchism is flawed, then why is theological monarchism correct? The arguments given by Dr. Paul Collins in his book, '*Papal Power*' in criticism of papalism, parallel the arguments given by political republicanism against monarchy. Why are conservative Catholic republicans feeling so secure?"

REFERENDUM POST-MORTEM by Nigel Jackson:

This comment is written a week before Australians vote in the referendum and the prevailing atmosphere suggests that the NO case will prevail. Where will Australia be then and in what shape will the monarchist cause be?

My own impression is that both sides have sustained serious wounds in the 1999 referendum campaign, but that the monarchist position, overall, has been weakened, not strengthened - in the short term. In a longer perspective, however, the royal cause may be able to benefit from the events of 1998-99.

The republican movement has been exposed as largely dominated by the New Establishment, which is money-based and anti-traditional. Large masses of ordinary Australians have no love for this elite or its hangers-on. It is well understood that a noisome gulf has opened up between the minority of

rich Australians and the great majority of those who are battling and those who have fallen into poverty.

The flight of coalition politicians into the republican ranks has effectively exposed the incompetence of the two parties, Liberal and National, to defend the traditional cause in Australia. It is difficult not to believe that many of those concerned have been jumping on to what they consider to be the bandwagon. Nationalist and royalist Australians thus have a clearer perception that the organisation of a new political movement is essential – something a great deal better than either One Nation or Australia First.

It has also been demonstrated beyond doubt that the major media were unwilling to give a truly equitable coverage of the contest; and no doubt authoritative analyses of this partisan approach will appear in the next two or three years. Monarchists will be in a strong position to ask ordinary Australians why, if a republican model is so much better than a monarchical one, the major media were so unwilling to allow unfettered expression to all substantial monarchist arguments and groups.

A further factor is the notable failure of republicans to enthuse large numbers of ordinary citizens. The republic just seems tawdry and boring, a meagre arena for the new elites and their hirelings to swan about in.

Despite all this, there seems little doubt that the monarchy has lost the affection of the majority of Australians and that the approach of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy has assisted in that fatal dwindling of sentiment. If monarchists cannot revive a deep love of the Crown and loyalty to the Monarch, then the Australian Crown is doomed. The kind of arguments advanced in the official NO case may stave off defeat now; they will not do so next time.

What is needed is a scrupulous analysis of the whole ACM story, from its founding to the referendum result. We need to know clearly why its leadership was willing to see the Australian Monarchist League sidelined and why it also did not liaise with the Australian League of Rights. I am very doubtful that the ACM will retain sufficient credibility to lead the next campaign for the monarchy; but it must be admitted that the two leagues were also unable to make a sufficient public impact in 1999.

A number of important books in favour of the monarchy were released in the late stages of the referendum, including the NO Papers from the ACM, a book by RSL leader Bruce Ruxton and a collection of essays published by the Samuel Griffiths Society. These and other pro-monarchy writings of the 1998-99 period will need to be analysed and summed up; and it is hoped that the Veritas Publishing Company will publish at least one substantial book of that kind.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY IN AUSTRALIA by Ken Grundy:

Some observations from where we have just been – the referendum – and perhaps what needs to be done in the future.

In debate, the first rule is to define the meaning of the words pertaining to the subject. This enables apples to be compared with apples. If allowed to manipulate the meaning, a skilled debater may score points and lure his opponent into discussing "oranges".

The Queen is Queen of Australia – all references to England, Britain, etc., were "oranges".

Similarly, references to the queen not representing Australia on trade matters because she is committed to representing UK trade which at times may conflict with ours, is quite false. She is not the trade commissioner for either country – that is not her role.

Another frequent point made by the republicans was about the UK treating us as aliens when we visit them. A hurtful policy maybe, but it clearly demonstrates our **independence**. Another tempting "orange"!

Head of State: Yes, we do have a type of Head of State, but this "orange" has split in two because we are not sure whether it applies to our Governor-General (an Australian) or is it Her Majesty? As the League points out, this is purely a Republican term. It fits with our system like the "Bishop of the Uniting Church"!

Governor-General: There is no reference that I can find in the Constitution saying the Prime Minister recommends to the Queen, so and so be appointed Governor-General. How could it, when there is not reference to "Prime Minister" in the document?

The Constitution: This document is so valuable (even though it could be improved) that it must have more public airing and the citizens must make full use of it, e.g. Section 59 which permits the Governor-General to annul a law within 12 months of its passing. We must demand full use of these provisions. Banking under Section 51 is another. Although we admire the Constitution, it must not be like the family silver coffee pot behind the glass – to be seen but not used.

The Future: There are not many groups with any depth to their understanding of Monarchy. If the League can find an ally, so much the better, but it may have to do it alone – and that is, compile suitable material of an educational type to reach school age people and upward. There is a huge void out there. Jeremy Lee has had some excellent material as have Arthur Tuck and David Mitchell. There may be others. Emphasis is needed on the Reserve Powers with a factual report of the Whitlam dismissal covered. Printed material, audio and video tapes could all be promoted on the Internet where the younger interest is centred.

The Referendum NO case: This was essentially all negative material which attacked the model without reference to any virtues pertaining to the present system. Maybe they were correct in their tactic – they probably employed marketeers who identified the greatest weakness in the YES case, and concentrated on it. However, we cannot rest on our laurels like that. A positive message is required.

Timing: The dog may retreat with his tail between his legs for a while, but we know these people are persistent. Maybe the subject deserves a rest for a while, but we will have to redouble our efforts when you consider:

- (a) among the NO voters were a huge number of republicans;
- (b) relatively few voters need to change their vote to see the result swing the other way.