

DAWNING OF A REPUBLIC

BRIAN
BUCKLEY

1979

Published by
OBERON ENTERPRISES PTY. LTD.
SYDNEY

Sponsored by
THE REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION

This move gave the Liberals an unfair advantage. The final election result would possibly not have altered much, but the resultant effect was that many felt an abuse of constitutional and social proprieties had occurred.

Kerr's action advanced the cause of the Republic by bringing public contempt upon his Office. It reminded us of the problems and disadvantages inherent in links with the monarchy, and by involving it in a constitutional process which in the long run could only destroy it. I venture to suggest that Kerr was unwittingly an unpaid volunteer for our Republican cause.

CHAPTER 3

Arguments for a Republic

PART 1

Many Australians consider themselves egalitarian and, as a consequence of their deep belief in the democratic constitutional process, they find it unacceptable for appointments to be made without election by general suffrage. Therefore even if the British Queen renounced the title "Queen of Australia" and sent her son here to be "King of Australia", this would undoubtedly be opposed and felt to be unacceptable as he would be:

- a) an imposed head;
- b) unelected;
- c) not one of us (i.e. an Australian with the same national feelings and aspirations).

Since Britain has pretty well retreated from Australian affairs it is unrealistic, unfair and undemocratic to continue to impose her Head of State on Australia. The traditions and appendages of the monarchy still retained here are anachronistic, archaic and unacceptable. Queen Elizabeth herself was quoted in the 'Sydney Morning Herald' as saying, whilst visiting the U.S.A. during the Olympic Games in July 1976 "If any country in the Commonwealth wants its independence from Britain we would not stand in its way". Thus it is obvious that the British Queen recognises the need for change. All that remains is for Australians to overcome their apathy and conservatism and for once in their lives ask themselves to consider 'not what Australia can do for them' but '*what they can do for Australia*'.

Many Australians have a high regard and respect for Britain. This can only be maintained if it is changed to a "special preferred friendship" on a country to country basis. It cannot be maintained if we are forced to

continue to owe allegiance to a country some 13,000 miles away — a country that today has a declining significance here and cannot rightly claim the role of absentee Head of State.

The current Establishment in Australia is for the most part controlled by the WASP (White Anglo Saxon Protestant) influence. This relies heavily on an uninhibited belief in the Protestant ethic and God, Queen and (Mother) country. Because of the influence wielded by this power structure the ordinary Australian citizen has very little chance to participate in real decision-making. The greater shame is that the New Australian citizen who becomes naturalised has even less chance. This lack of opportunity also applies to minority groups such as the aborigines and the poorer sections of the community because the construction and maintenance of the system and society is loaded against them.

Australians have in general taken a very irresponsible attitude towards migrants. They have generally been looked on as providers of factory and other manual labour.

Some will say that this occurs because of their lack of education and inability to speak and understand English. What we Australians should understand and accept is that we had no right to assist such people to migrate here knowing full well their disabilities, and then treat them with the contempt and anti-social behaviour that is commonly practised.

Australians owe a great deal to the immigrants who have enabled us to expand our population, diversify our interests and enhance our culture with the knowledge and the lifestyles they brought to this country.

It is because we have such old concepts and prejudices of the infallibility of the British system that things are not likely to improve until there has been a national review and reorganisation of priorities. Australians can only realise their national ambitions if a social and political climate is provided so that all citizens may be encouraged

to believe that Australia is a real democracy based on the American dream of Government and society "for the people, by the people, of the people".

Prior to the Labor administration in 1972, New Australians seeking naturalisation had to swear allegiance, firstly to the Crown in Britain, secondly to Australia — in that order. That was partly changed in 1972 when Elizabeth of Britain was given the title "Queen of Australia". It is this very title that the whole Republican issue is about.

Migrants to Australia who wish to become naturalised are asked to renounce their former allegiance to their old home and swear it to the Crown in Britain, via Australia. The migrants, particularly Europeans, must find it very confusing to leave Europe and come to Australia, only to have to swear allegiance to another Crown in the same hemisphere they left. For example, Dutchmen transfer allegiance from the Dutch Crown to the British Crown. If they were really so anxious to give loyalty to the British Crown they would have migrated to Britain rather than Australia.

The life they seek in Australia is different to that they sought in their previous homeland and it is wrong to impose British values and customs on these migrants.

If we look more closely we find that presently in Australia there is a vast number of migrants and aliens who have no intention of taking up Australian citizenship. One estimate available is that approximately two million Britons reside here in Australia who are not naturalised. It seems to suit these people not to become naturalised. They feel they can enjoy the continuing advantages of their British passport. Some who do become naturalised retain their other passport. This practice of dual passports is unfair and discriminates against the Australian citizen with his single Australian passport. The dual passport system should be discontinued. The current situation is untenable. We have a large number of foreigners, including Britons, who are not naturalised and could not have the

Australian national interest at heart. In fact in some ways they possibly work directly against it. In times of possible strife there could arise a situation where a vast number of likely dissidents, in fact the makings of a viable fifth column could work against the Australian national interest.

Anyone who becomes an Australian citizen should be prepared to forego all the rights and privileges pertaining to their previous homeland and be prepared to live up to the responsibilities, rights and privileges that go with being an Australian citizen.

I wonder how different the electoral result would have been in 1975 had the right to vote been withheld from those citizens from other sections of the British Commonwealth who exercised their vote but are not naturalised Australians.

Further, it would be very interesting to know just how many people did vote who were of British extraction. Some would say that by refusing the vote to these people, it would be unfair and disadvantageous, as they have become a part of the community. They live in Australia, work, pay taxes and are part of the Gross National Product. I feel that if these people are not prepared to take up Australian citizenship they should not be entitled to benefits earned by Australians, and in fact should be made to register twice a year as aliens (currently aliens register once a year).

The rule that residents or citizens from any Commonwealth country can vote in any other Commonwealth country, including Britain, after a residence of six months, is offensive to the citizens of that nation state they currently reside in. For Australia to be recognised and completely respected by other countries, it will be necessary to throw off the archaic appendages from another century and give the impression that what we do and say is totally Australian and not some voice box mouthing platitudes of another nation.

"Why should we have a Republic?" — can best be

answered by quoting the famous Republican analogy "No one is born to rule". If some countries choose to retain monarchies of sorts, that is their business. In the case of Britain, the Crown set-up is probably its biggest tourist income earner and no doubt worth tolerating.

What is good for Britain is not necessarily good for Australia and it is high time Australians faced reality and came up to date in the twentieth century.

PART 2

The detractors have invalidly compared Australia, if it were to become a Republic, with some of the unstable countries in the world which have had considerable internal upheaval.

Before we can condemn these counties outright, we should be prepared to investigate thoroughly the cause for such dissention.

Many of these so-called 'banana Republics' were previously British colonies. Whilst the British controlled these domains they maintained order by active suppression of the locals. Upon the withdrawal of British personnel, minimal expertise or capability was left to cope with the government of the newly independent country whose resources had been heavily exploited. Little in expertise or economic value was left to help build the new nations.

Australia has had little internal overt upheaval because the British implanted loyalty to the Queen in the minds of young Australians through its quisling representatives in Australia. This has sufficiently convinced the average Australian to leave government and reform to the few activists and to avoid any involvement.

Only now can we Australians see just how low in the world's eyes we have sunk because we have miserably failed our citizens.

The failure to provide for a realisable national identity or common aspiration has resulted in mass apathy and undesirable lusting for materialist acquisitions.

We have failed to meet the needs of our countrymen and the perpetual question being asked is 'How does one make the Australian aware of his rights and privileges without causing too much friction or upheaval?'

CHAPTER 4

Governmental Irresponsibility

PART 1

Since the Liberal administration took Government in 1975 they have been doing their best to reverse some of the progressive changes that had been implemented with Australian society's approval, by turning everything back to yester-year. The Liberals would be well advised not to pursue their un-Australian activities. They should look more closely at this nation's future requirements and begin to accustom themselves to the necessary changes inevitably required.

As the current Government, the Liberals have the opportunity to do something constructive for Australia. By putting their own secular party interests behind those of the Australian national interest they could well go down in history as innovators and statesmen with national foresight, rather than as free enterprise economic caretakers who held Australia's advance back from viable responsible government and leadership.

For the Republican movement to succeed it will be necessary to win friends and influence in the Parliament as well as from outside. In pursuit of this end a political party will be formed which will stand candidates in seats against disloyal and un-Australian Members of Parliament who oppose the Republic, irrespective of what party they belong to.

No doubt there will be many Republican sympathisers in both of the major parties and we look forward to active participation on their part in achieving this end.