

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTUALISING AUSTRALIAN MONARCHISM AND REPUBLICANISM**

---

#### **Research Problem**

This study examines the ways in which Australian political parties and organised movements constructed the monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s. Specifically, I argue that a number of dominant discourses pervaded this debate. Identifying and analysing the nature and form of these competing and coalescing discourses provides insight into the unique contribution of the Australian monarchy-republican debate to the tradition of republican theory, and the role of political parties and organised movements in the construction and maintenance of debate.

#### **Rationale for the Study**

This is important research as the monarchy-republican debate in Australia holds historical, theoretical, political and sociological currency. The debate is a continuation of centuries-old traditions of monarchism and republicanism. The ways in which the theories of monarchism and republicanism are understood and employed by Australian parties and movements are different from traditional interpretations of monarchism and republicanism. The traditions which the Australian debate has inherited are a continual refinement of the harder edges of monarchism and republicanism which

contribute to a notion of ‘good government’. Good government is defined in terms of ‘democracy’, and features both theories of monarchism and republicanism. All political parties and organised movements in Australia share this interpretation of government. The unique contribution of this research is to illuminate the theoretical and discursive constructions of this debate. It will analyse theories of republicanism which are unique to the contemporary Australian debate, and identify and analyse the framework through which Australian parties and movements view Australian politics.

### **Research Context**

Each political party and organised movement presents a position either advocating change to a republic or for retention of the constitutional monarchy. Within the political parties, the Australian Labor Party (ALP, as it is commonly known and will be referred to hereafter), the Australian Democrats (the Democrats) and the Australian Greens (the Greens) support a republic. The Liberal Party of Australia (the Liberal Party) and the National Party of Australia (the National Party) support the retention of a constitutional monarchy. In the domain of organised movements, the Australian Republican Movement (ARM) supports a republic, and the Australians for Constitutional Monarchy (ACM) and the Monarchist League support the retention of the constitutional monarchy. Australian political parties and organised movements operate in distinctive social and political domains. A sociopolitical domain is understood to be a category of social and political activity (referred to in this study, simply, as a ‘domain’), the members of which share a common *raison d’etre* and social and political context, which distinguish it from another domain. The domains

analysed in this study are those of political parties and organised movements. These domains represent the sphere of political practice to which reference is also made in this study. The sphere of political practice involves domains whose principle objective is to influence political and social practice, as opposed to historical and academic sources analysed in the literature review, including the debate in the media, whose objectives are also to report on and theorise political practice.

Political and social domains have unique political and social contexts, which are important in this study. The stakes for all parties and movements in the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate are high because the successful realisation of their aims depends on how well their audience is persuaded: that is, whether Australia becomes a republic or retains its constitutional monarchy. The stakes are higher for political parties, the objective of whom is to be elected to form government. Political parties need to appeal to the electorate on a broad range of issues such as education, health, taxation, foreign affairs, defence, and law and order. Organised movements, on the other hand, are not subjected to election and are often single-issue in their focus, as is the case with the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League. The different contexts in which parties and movements operate influence the way they construct and maintain debate, as the analyses will show.

The monarchy-republican debate culminated in the 6 November 1999 referendum in which the Australian people voted by a margin of 57% to 43% to retain the constitutional monarchy, rather than change to a republican head of state. It is important to note that, under section 128 of the constitution, successful constitutional change requires not only a majority of voters, but also a majority of

states to approve the proposed change at a referendum. It has been argued that this will continue to produce a 'don't know, vote no' response in voters (*The Australian*, 27 Aug 2001). As a result, since Federation in 1901, only eight out of 44 proposed changes to the constitution have been passed. The ALP and the ARM supported a 'minimalist' republic leading up to the referendum of 1999, with no change to the formal operation of government, but a uniquely Australian head of state to be elected by a two-thirds majority of both houses of parliament. Surveys revealed that 40% of people did not want the Queen as their head of state but also that 65% of Australians did not want a parliamentary appointed head of state. The referendum posed the question: 'Do you think Australia should adopt a republican constitution?' rather than 'Do you think the Queen should continue as Australia's head of state?' or even 'Do you think Australia should retain its constitutional monarchy?' This neutralised the voters' opposition to having the Queen as Australia's head of state. In hindsight, the wording of the referendum question, the difficulties involved in changing the constitution, as well as the insistence of the republicans to endorse a parliamentary elected head of state, despite its unpopularity, doomed the referendum to failure.

The sources for the analyses of the political parties and organised movements are the platforms of the ALP, the Liberal, the National Party, the Democrats and the Greens, posted on the ARM website, but supplied independently by the parties themselves; addresses by the parliamentary leaders of the ALP, the Liberal Party and the Democrats; and the platforms of the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League. These were the major players in the debate. The platforms were downloaded between 4 June and 7 July 1997, and the speeches were received directly from the parties in the week 2-6 June 1997. All of these sources are to be found in Appendix A

of this study. This was a time of rich debate in the parliament and in the media. These samples of the debate, taken from 1997, are located between 1991, marking the ascendancy of former ALP Prime Minister, Paul Keating, a committed republican who put the issue firmly on the public agenda, and the referendum of 1999.

The address by the Leader of the Democrats, Cheryl Kernot, was presented on 21 May 1997. The addresses by the leaders of the ALP, Prime Minister Paul Keating, and the Liberal Party, John Howard, were actually presented in the Australian parliament in the year 1995. Both of these parties were asked to provide the most recent, official addresses presented by their party leaders. The significance of these addresses is evident in the fact that the ALP leader's address was presented on 7 June 1995, and the Liberal Party leader's address was presented in response to the ALP leader's address, on 8 June 1995. This address was entitled, 'Response by the Leader of the Opposition the Hon John Howard MP', and commenced with the statement, '... the Opposition welcomes the statement made last night by the Prime Minister ...'. The provision of these speeches by both parties in 1997 is taken as a current reflection of the discourse of the party leaders at the time.

In this study, the 1997 texts are treated as active and current social reality and will be referred to in the present tense. At the time of writing, the Australian monarchy-republican debate is ongoing, and the 1997 texts form part of a greater whole. Needless to say, this is a snapshot of the debate rather than an indicator that 1997 was a distinctive point in the debate, distinguishable, say, from 1996 or 1998. The data from these 1997 sources will be used in this study to refer to the period from 1991 when Prime Minister Paul Keating first placed the republic on the national agenda until the time of

writing, in 2002. Therefore, reference will be made to the 'contemporary' debate, and the debate 'in the 1990s', rather than to the debate 'in 1997', specifically.

### **Research Aims and Questions**

By analysing texts of the Australian political parties and organised movements, this study has two aims:

- to show that a limited set of competing discourses reveal theoretical underpinnings in the Australian monarchy-republican debate; and
- to show how political parties and organised movements construct and maintain debate.

To achieve these aims, three specific questions will guide the study:

- What is the nature and form of the debate?
- How can the debate be theorised?
- What insight does the debate provide us?

What is the nature and form of the debate? The analyses reveal that the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia is historically constituted, and is dominated by political parties and organised movements. The discourses of the parties and movements appear as two consistent sets of interpretations of key political concepts, which are not necessarily related to their viewpoints in the Australian monarchy-republican debate. Discourses are understood to be sets of concepts that comprise a theory or discursive device.

The 'significance' of a concept has a very particular meaning in the construction of theory in this study. For example, the ALP and the ARM claim to uphold democratic government in Australia. They believe that a republic will not affect the operation of democratic government in Australia. For the ALP and ARM the debate is about Australian national identity. Therefore, the concepts democracy, government, head of state and monarchy, are not 'significant' in the construction of the debate by the ALP and ARM, because they regard the debate on a republic to be outside of these features of the political process. The same applies to the significance of the concept Australia for the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and Monarchist League. They claim to support independent symbols of Australian identity, and that these already exist. They essentially believe that a republic threatens Australian democracy. Therefore, the concept Australia is not significant in the construction of their theory of republicanism.

The significance of a concept, therefore, is not related to the viewpoint of a party or a movement on that concept. It centres on the role of that concept in constructing the theory of republicanism held by a particular party or movement. For example, the Liberal and National parties, as well as the Democrats, the Greens, the ACM and the Monarchist League, believe that a republic will change the operation of government in Australia. This makes the concepts democracy and government 'significant' in the construction of their theories of republicanism, even though they have different viewpoints in the debate. While the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League believe that a republic threatens democracy in Australia, the Democrats and the Greens believe that a republic will make Australia more democratic.

Although the literature review accounts for a distinctive monarchist tradition, the analyses reveal that the theoretical perspectives in the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate are not focused on monarchy, but on competing interpretations of republicanism which are coded expressions for competing views on public opinion and the interaction of political theory and political practice. Therefore, the theory of monarchy is overshadowed in this study by the attention given to the development of theories of republicanism. This study clarifies theories of the interaction of republicanism with the current operation of Australian government, which underpin the debate in the texts developed by the parties and movements.

The discourses of the parties and movements are organised in particular ways to persuade the audience to share their view and reject the opposing view. The audience is understood to be the readership of the texts, that is, the Australian public. The parties and movements understand that the audience will determine the outcome of the debate. Therefore, they must seek to persuade the audience to endorse their position in the debate. Implicit in this organisation is a number of expectations the Australian public has of the parties and movements. The organisation of the discourses by the parties and movements reveal distinctive sets of principles of rhetorical organisation, known as discursive devices, which reflect their status either as a party or as a movement. Discursive devices are understood as linguistic or rhetorical strategies, tools or devices, which are employed in the texts to present the position advocated in the debate in a the most persuasive light possible.

How can the debate be theorised? This account of the debate is made possible by identifying key concepts within the texts and

analysing the interrelationships between these key concepts. This study starts out from the view that language is living social action. Sociology itself is regarded as no less a social practice than doing research (Smith, 1999: 145). The texts analysed are not mere descriptions or representations of another reality. They are themselves the social actors, even though, clearly, they have been produced by the political parties and organised movements. It is assumed that texts can exist as socio-textual action while, at the same time, illuminating the nature of the authors of those texts. Dorothy Smith (1999: 134) suggests that the key to addressing discourses as actual social relations is between people. On this premise she argues:

The printed ... text mediates between the actual people engaged in their particular local activities as participants in a discourse and the intertextual organisation of the discourse.

Therefore, in illuminating the construction of debate by political parties and organised movements, this study compares texts with texts. It analyses the patterns in the language use in the texts, that is, the similarities and differences between uses of the same key concepts within a particular text and across other texts. The enumeration and systematic cross-referencing of each occurrence of a key concept provides an audit trail and confirms that the research is trustworthy.

What insight does the debate provide us? The theories of monarchism and republicanism, which are employed by Australian parties and movements, cut across traditional interpretations of monarchism and republicanism, and justify distinctions between maximalist and minimalist republicanism. The actors highlight

competing theories on the role of public opinion in mediating political theory and practice. The analyses also show that the objectives of social actors reflect the sociopolitical domain from which they originate and determine their patterns of rhetorical organisation. That is, actors who share the same sociopolitical domain and context, be it as a party or movement, will organise their discourses in a similar manner. The analyses also allow conclusions to be drawn on the applicability of language-focussed symbolic interactionist theory, and discourse analytical methods in other social research fields.

### **Parameters of the Study**

This study features language-focussed research, showing the active role of language in society. A comprehensive and manageable amount of appropriate data has provided the opportunity for detailed and comprehensive analyses of the language used in the texts of political parties and organised movements. Since the participants were invited by the ARM to submit their manifestos on the republic, they can reasonably be expected to be comprehensive accounts of their positions. Structural similarities in the presentation of the texts within the same domain, be it from a party or movement, also support this expectation. The trustworthiness of the qualitative method of this study relies on a comprehensive and detailed analysis of the language used in the texts. This study relies in a very deliberate way upon analysing, in detail, the texts submitted and not departing from those texts. Therefore, the study does not address any literature from the parties and the movements other than those listed. The literature review does, however, analyse traditional, academic, general, and other Australian sources on monarchism and republicanism. This provides a context for the political theory and

discursive organisation that characterise the texts of the Australian political parties and organised movements.

This study seeks to illuminate the relationship between political theory and practice. The analyses of the texts of parties and movements locate the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s in the perspective of the wider traditions of monarchist and republican thought. The analysis of traditional monarchist and republican literature is historical, thematic and contextual. The literature review does not claim to be as comprehensive in its account of individual sources as the analyses of the texts of Australian political parties or organised movements in Australia, which are the case studies in this research.

Although this study employs two quantitative analyses, these are not complex statistical accounts of the interrelationships between concepts. The sophisticated account is left to the qualitative analyses. The objectives of the quantitative analyses are more modest, establishing the relative frequency of the concepts and discursive devices. They support the qualitative analyses in two ways. First, as will be clarified in the 'Methods' chapter, the enumeration of the occurrences of each key term ensures that no terms are conveniently or arbitrarily excluded or included in the qualitative analyses. They vouch for the trustworthiness of the method. The link between the quantitative and qualitative analyses is to be found in the appendices, where every occurrence of a concept is aligned to a qualitative interpretation. Second, broad trends in the employment of concepts by each particular party or movement are identified before being subjected to detailed qualitative analysis. While it is not a central aim of the study, this combined approach provides an opportunity to compare quantitative

and qualitative analytical methods. It will illuminate whether or not the quantitative analysis reflects the qualitative analysis, in other words, whether or not the relative frequency with which a concept or discursive device is presented correlates with the importance of that particular concept or discursive device either in terms of constructing a theory of republicanism or in constructing the debate itself.

### **Conceptualising the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s**

In seeking to accomplish the two aims of this study, a number of options for conceptualising the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia are analysed. These options will be revisited in the concluding chapter of the study to conceptualise both the theoretical and the socio-textual constructions of the debate. What are our options to determine the most valuable way to conceptualise the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s? We can conceptualise the debate by:

1. The *position* held in the debate, for or against an Australian republic.
2. The *domain* from which they originate, that is, whether they are a party or a movement.
3. Their *status* as a political party, that is, whether they are a major or minor party; or
4. *Mode* of communication as a political party, that is, whether the texts analysed are party platforms or leaders' addresses.

The third and fourth options only apply to the analyses of political parties. The analyses of political parties and organised movements

will address these options. In doing so, they will analyse, firstly, the theoretical construction of the debate and secondly, the socio-textual construction of the debate (reflecting the two aims of the study).

We are asking the following question: are the theories which underpin the debate, and the ways in which the debate itself is constructed and maintained, functions of the position they hold in the debate, the domain they represent, or, in the case of political parties, their status within their domain, or their mode of communication?

The options for theorising the debate, and conceptualising the construction of the debate itself, are addressed in detail in the following discussion. The two aims of this study, theorising the debate and constructing the debate, will be treated separately in the case studies of political parties and organised movements. However, to show how the analyses will treat the aforementioned options for conceptualising the debate, they are presented together in this discussion. The options are, in any case, the same. Of course, the analyses may reveal any one of a number of combinations of the following outcomes, such as positions in the debate determining the interpretation of republic, and domains determining the nature of discursive devices employed. The potential outcomes of this study are:

1. The *position* held in the debate determines the theoretical underpinnings of the debate, and/or the ways in which the debate itself is constructed and maintained. If this were the case, then the advocates of an Australian republic, irrespective of their domain, or, in the case of political parties, whether they are a major or minor party, or whether the party platform or the leader's address is being

analysed (that is, the ALP, the ARM, the Democrats and the Greens), would share one theoretical interpretation of the debate, and/or set of rules for constructing debate. The opponents of an Australian republic (the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League) would share an entirely different interpretation of the debate and/or set of rules for constructing debate. This occurs irrespective of their domain, and, in the case of political parties, whether they are a major or minor party, or whether the party platform or the leader's address is being analysed.

2. The sociopolitical *domain*, from which the actors originate, determines the theoretical underpinnings of the debate, or the ways in which the debate itself is constructed and maintained. If this were the case, then the political parties, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic, or, in the case of political parties, whether they are a major or minor party, or whether the party platform or the leader's address is being analysed (that is, the ALP, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Democrats and the Greens), would share one theoretical interpretation of the debate, and/or set of rules for constructing debate. The organised movements, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic (that is, the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League), would share an entirely different interpretation of the debate, and/or set of rules for constructing debate.

The textual sources and range of participants in the domain of political parties present two further ways to conceptualise the debate in the case of political parties:

3. A party's *status* as either a major party or a minor party determines the theoretical underpinnings of the debate, or the ways

in which the debate itself is constructed and maintained. If this were the case, then the major parties, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic, or whether the party platform or leader's address is being analysed (that is, the ALP, the Liberal Party and the National Party), would share one theoretical interpretation of the debate, or set of rules for constructing debate. The minor parties, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic, or whether the party platform or leader's address is being analysed (that is, the Democrats and the Greens), would share an entirely different interpretation of the debate, or set of rules for constructing debate.

4. The *mode* of communication, that is, whether the party platform or leader's address is being analysed, determines the theoretical underpinnings of the debate, or the ways in which the debate itself is constructed and maintained. If this were the case, then the party platforms, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic, or their status as major or minor parties (that is, the platforms of the ALP, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Democrats and the Greens), would share one theoretical interpretation of the debate, and/or set of rules for constructing debate. The leaders' addresses, irrespective of their position, for or against an Australian republic, and/or their status as major or minor parties (that is, the leaders' addresses of the ALP, the Liberal Party and the Democrats), would share an entirely different interpretation of the debate, and/or set of rules for constructing debate.

## **Research Overview**

The 'Literature Review' chapter (two) places the Australian debate in the context of the extensive monarchist and republican traditions,

which transcend the contemporary Australian experience. I believe that no study of monarchy and republic ought, in any case, to ignore this extensive experience. More importantly, analyses of the theoretical underpinnings of the debate rely on an understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the monarchist and republican traditions, of which the Australian debate is a continuous part. Therefore, the following chapter surveys monarchist and republican theory and practice in various times and places and sets out the ground rules for locating contemporary Australian monarchist and republican thought within that tradition.

The 'Theory' chapter (three) establishes the primacy of language-focussed symbolic interactionist research in this study. The 'Methods' chapter (four) outlines the specific process by which the key concepts in the texts of parties and movements are analysed. The texts of the major parties and movements are analysed in detail in chapters five and six, respectively. These two chapters will conclude by comparing and contrasting the conceptual themes and discursive devices employed by each of the participants in their domain, and for the domain as a whole. The concluding chapter (seven) will rely on the discourse analyses of the two preceding chapters to illuminate the theoretical perspectives which underpin the debate, and reveal the nature and implications of the construction of the monarchy-republican debate by Australian political parties and organised movements in the 1990s. The study commences by analysing the extensive monarchist and republican traditions in which the contemporary Australian debate is located.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW: THE MONARCHIST AND REPUBLICAN TRADITIONS

---

The theories of monarchism and republicanism have extensive historical traditions. As theories of government, they embody distinctive sets of ideas. The theoretical and practical experiments of monarchist and republican government show the theories of monarchism and republicanism are not fixed and irreconcilable as Maddox (1993), for example, suggests. More specifically, the eighteenth century American experiments with republicanism show that democracy and liberalism intervened to shave the harder edges from classical republicanism, as it was understood in ancient times. This new form of republicanism, 'neo-classical' republicanism, helped bequeathe a shared notion of democratic government, which has features of both monarchist and republican theories of government. The contemporary Australian debate is a continuation of these traditions and, at the same time, transcends them. The lesson of the Australian experience is that not only is political language fluid, but that the Australian debate is not about theories of monarchism and republicanism. The texts in the monarchy-republican debate in Australia employ discourses that articulate competing theories of republicanism, and show how political parties and organised movements construct debate.

This literature review is divided into two parts. The first part is an historical and theoretical analysis of the monarchist and republican traditions. The second part is an analysis of the arguments for and

against an Australian republic. Before analysing the wider traditions that precede the contemporary Australian experience, an account is provided of the method by which the literature was selected for this review.

This chapter analyses literature on monarchism and republicanism, in general, and the Australian debate, in particular. Four types of literature have been chosen. This allows a comprehensive spectrum of literature to be examined, including general primary and secondary sources of republicanism and monarchy, and primary and secondary sources of republicanism and monarchy that have specific application to theory and practice within the contemporary Australian context:

- primary classical republican and monarchist sources (pre-eighteenth century);
- secondary sources on the classical republican and monarchist literature (eighteenth century onward);
- primary academic sources on the theoretical and practical components of republic and monarchy in Australia; and
- primary general sources on the republic and monarchy debate in Australia in the late twentieth century (after 1975).

There is disagreement about the interpretation of ‘classical’ monarchist and republican literature. This becomes important in analysing the various ways that the terms monarchy and republic have been understood. The objective of the search for classical literature is to situate the current Australian debate in the perspective of broader monarchist and republican experiences. There is historical continuity from the monarchist and republican

traditions to the contemporary Australian debate. Therefore, the broadest opportunity to feature 'pre-modern' and worldwide experiences of monarchism and republicanism is sought. Pocock (1975: 506) applies a broad interpretation of 'classical' that spans from ancient Greece and Rome until the American Revolution in the eighteenth century. This interpretation is used to guide the search for literature in this review. This account of the republican tradition will distinguish classical and neo-classical literature. For the purpose of tracing the republican tradition outside of the contemporary Australian experience, the term classical will initially be used to incorporate both classical and neo-classical republican literature. The review of classical literature will encompass literature prior to the Australian monarchy-republic debate.

The method for selecting these four types of sources is summarised below. Confronting an enormous range of literature, the process for selecting the classical monarchist and republican literature is necessarily detailed. In summary, the primary classical writers selected were referred to most frequently in the indices and bibliographies of a canon of general secondary sources, which were taken from the UNE Honours source list. The particular sources selected for analysis were referred to most frequently in association with those primary writers, in the indices and bibliographies in these secondary sources. As a result of this survey, the following classical sources are analysed in this review:

Adams	<i>The Adams-Jefferson Letters</i>
Aristotle	<i>The Politics</i>
Bolingbroke	'The Idea of a Patriot King'
Cicero	<i>Res Publica</i>
Hamilton, Jay & Madison	<i>The Federalist</i>

Harrington	<i>The Commonwealth of Oceana</i>
Jefferson	<i>The Adams-Jefferson Letters</i>
Machiavelli	<i>The Prince</i>
Montesquieu	<i>The Spirit of the Laws</i>
Polybius	<i>The Histories</i>

The primary academic sources for this chapter are twelve articles from the *Australian Journal of Political Science, Special Republicanism Issue* (Vol. 28, 1993). The secondary sources on monarchism and republicanism in general, and the primary Australian sources on Australian republicanism and monarchy in practice, are taken from the reading list for the Honours course 'Republicanism' at the University of New England 1998. The method of selecting these four types of sources, and the literature which comprises them, is fully mapped out in Appendix B of this study.

The analysis is not structured according to the four types of literature to be reviewed. The four types of literature contribute variously to the two parts of the analysis. The pattern is that classical literature, secondary literature on classical monarchism and republicanism, and primary Australian academic literature contribute to the analysis of monarchist and republican theory. Secondary Australian literature and primary Australian academic literature contribute to the analysis of political practice in Australia.

The argument of this literature review is that the social and theoretical constructions of debate, as evident in the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate, are not contrary to the monarchist and republican traditions; they are central to those traditions. The monarchist and republican traditions have always

been driven by language, and political practice has guided political theory. The Australian debate is a continuation of these traditions. Nevertheless, the particular theories of republicanism that underpin the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia, are unique in the republican tradition. The language focus and the comprehensiveness of discourse analytic methods in this study reveal the construction of these particular theories, as well as exemplifying the construction of socio-political debate in general.

### **Political Theory: The Monarchist and Republican Traditions**

The period from ancient Greece and Rome until the American and French Revolutions provides us with the classical sets of ideas on which we hang our notions of monarchy and republic. The key features of monarchist and republican thought are outlined as a backdrop to the contemporary debate in Australia. The discussion of the monarchist tradition combines literature from antiquity with literature from modern times. This is because the various strands of the monarchist tradition have presented themselves thematically rather than historically. The discussion of the republican tradition, on the other hand, is divided into three themes, which broadly correspond to the historical development of republican ideas. This discussion analyses the roles of democracy and liberalism in the monarchist and republican traditions as a context to the current debate on an Australian republic. The discussion commences with a broad outline of the main themes of each tradition.

## **Monarchy**

The five main themes of the monarchist tradition are:

- Rule of one
- Limited by law and consent
- Protector of the people
- Legitimising government
- A single form of government

### *(i) Rule of one*

Monarchies were originally deities, from which there was a natural link to rule by 'divine right' (Springborg, 1990: 202). Aristotle (1981: 217-19, 230-1, 322) applied a broad interpretation of 'monarchia' as the 'rule of one', which, while he makes the distinction, theoretically encompasses the rule of a king and the tyranny of one. Aristotle's preferred system of government is by an absolute monarch, above the law, who is 'outstandingly excellent,' a person of 'sound' qualities, but he appreciated that this is unrealistic. Of the non-tyrannical forms of monarchy, Aristotle distinguished four types: those who rule: subject to the law; with a limited tenure in office; by election; and, by popular mandate. Importantly for the contemporary Australian debate, this represents a theoretical framework, from as far back as ancient Greece, for wider input into government than the single monarch themselves, and for some degree of accountability to, and responsibility for, the people.

(ii) *Limited by law and consent*

The survey of monarchist literature reveals that the monarchist tradition is more about the rule of law constraining the authority of the monarch, and less about deities and tyrants. The need for a monarch to govern with limitations to their authority, and within the law, is a powerful theme in monarchist literature. Cicero (1959, 1: 95) supported 'kingship' as 'by far the best form (of government)', stating that a virtuous king, ruling with the consent of the people, is a 'guardian of the fatherland'. Montesquieu (1966: 117) supported monarchical government over any other form of government but only where the sovereign power of the monarch is executed through laws.

In his essay, 'The idea of a patriot king', Lord Bolingbroke (1967: 377-393) esteemed monarchy as the best form of government. The monarchy that Bolingbroke espoused was also a limited monarchy, defined by his interpretations of tyranny, liberty, government and the law. Bolingbroke understood liberty as 'the greatest good of the people', which is 'to the collective body what health is to every body'. Bolingbroke abhorred the 'detestable spirit of tyranny', which occurred when 'absolute power belong(s) to the office of a king' and, also, when religion and state are fused in the 'fallacy' of divine rule. Bolingbroke argued that rule according to 'general principles', as a frame of reference, was vital to the rule of what he termed a 'Patriot King', and that patriotism 'must be founded in great principles and supported by great virtues'. He argued that 'the obligation to defend and maintain the freedom of such constitutions will appear most sacred to a Patriot King'.

The foundation of the rule of a Patriot King was, Bolingbroke argued, the rule of law. Bolingbroke (1967: 383) maintained that:

kings are obliged to govern according to a rule established by the wisdom of a state, that was a state before they were kings, and by the consent of a people they did not most certainly create; especially when the whole executive power is exclusively in their hands, and the legislative power cannot be exercised without their concurrence.

Bolingbroke (1967: 379, 391) argued that even God would expect a king to obey man's laws, and that '(t)he true end of government is determined by the constitution and the law of nature'. Therefore, the need to limit the authority of monarchs, to subject them to the law, and thereby protect the people from the arbitrariness of a monarch's rule, is well established in monarchist literature.

(iii) *Protector of the people*

The monarch, Cicero (1966, 3: 121-2) argued, has the opportunity to do great and ambitious things without the need for virtue, but with a high need for honour. The main objective of Bolingbroke's (1966: 372) essay was to outline the 'duties of a king to his country'. More recent accounts of monarchy have also focussed on the 'parcel of obligations' which the monarchy has come to represent (Springborg, 1990: 271, 272). Atkinson (1993b: 69) argues that monarchy spawned communism and the welfare state. It has also been argued that an increase in the power of the monarchy has also meant increased responsibility to God, to conscience, and to people (Clarke, 1985: 173-89, in Atkinson, 1993b: 71).

*(iv) Legitimising government*

In the case of the constitutional monarchy, Bagehot (1963: 85, 86) expounded the advantages of monarchy and the positive role it can play in enhancing the political culture and the people's experience of political life. These are: that the monarchy features 'pretty events' such as royal weddings which entertain the people; that the image of government is boosted by adding a layer of mystique; and that a high degree of theatre and pageantry can focus high regard on the monarch as chief representative of the community's morality (Bagehot, 1963: 86; Winterton, 1993: 58). Therefore, the monarchy is an easy way to represent statehood and constitutionalism. Bagehot summarised the contribution of the monarchy by stating that 'these monarchic trappings disguised and legitimated an effective and complex system of parliamentary responsible government'.

*(v) A single form of government*

Bolingbroke's (1967: 396-403) support for a monarchy is underpinned by his theory that a single form of government is a more effective, direct and unifying form of rule than a mixture of forms of government, which is the case in a republic. The government in such a system, according to Bolingbroke, is 'disjointed with shocks' from the different parts. A monarch should, in the view of Bolingbroke, not 'put himself at the head of one party in order to govern his people, (but) put himself at the head of his people in order to govern', given that 'all the good ends of government are attainable in a united state'. Monarchy is most easily tempered with democracy and aristocracy than vice versa, and complete rule of a king is better than no rule by a king. Such

monarchy ought, in the opinion of Bolingbroke, to be a hereditary monarchy. Although the liberty of the people under the rule of law was paramount for Bolingbroke, he questioned the ability of the 'commonwealth' to provide for liberty.

The advocacy of a single form of government is the point of starkest contrast between the monarchist and the republican traditions, the republicans preferring a mixture of various forms of government. Although Bolingbroke advocated hereditary monarchy, the monarchist tradition abhors tyranny and identifies the responsibility a ruler has to its people. A monarchy has also been attributed the role of representing 'good' government to the people. These features resonate well in Australia's contemporary democratic setting.

### **Classical Republicanism**

Republican government is a 'state based on popular sovereignty in which all governmental power is derived from the people and is exercised by their representatives or persons chosen by them' (Winterton, 1993: 40). The result is that 'supreme power lies with the people,' as opposed to a king or such ruler, forming a 'commonwealth' (Galligan, 1993: 57). Pettit (1993: 162) and Warden (1993: 85-6) sketch the development of, and the search for, the republican tradition. Republican government first emerged in ancient Rome, the major source of which is found in the writings of Cicero. Machiavelli picked up the theme again in the Renaissance, and the ideas formed the basis of the 'self-concept' of the northern Italian republics (the first modern European polities). Pocock suggests that republicanism came to England and America when it was adapted from Florence by James Harrington. Following

Harrington, the commonwealthmen of the New Model Army saw it incorporated into the English constitution in 1660. Warden suggests that this tradition has been traced across to the American Revolution, and Wood traced it to the Philadelphia Constitutional Convention. The language of republicanism came to dominate the politics of the modern West and emerged prominently in the Dutch Republic, the English Civil War, and in the lead-up to the American and French Revolutions.

This return to classical forms has been described by Pocock (1975) as the 'Machiavellian Moment'. The early republican phases of Australian history have been separated into three periods, that of Daniel Deniehy and the Reverend John Dunmore Lang in the 1840s and 1850s, the *Bulletin* in the 1880s, and, controversially, the Australia First Movement of the 1930s (Atkinson, 1993: 78). In all of these cases classical republican language abounded.

Focusing on antiquity, Yarbrough (1979: 64) argues that classical (as opposed to neo-classical) republicanism is represented chiefly in the writings of Aristotle, Cicero and Polybius. Neo-classical republicanism represents the eighteenth century return to ancient republican language and forms. As will be argued, this is as much an historical as a theoretical distinction. Some neo-classical and contemporary academic writers have illuminated classical republican theory. Their insights will also be used to analyse the classical republican tradition. There are a number of themes that distinguish classical republicanism:

- Mixed constitution
- Rule of law

- Citizenship and sovereignty
- Liberty and equality
- Civic virtue, the common weal and anti-absolutism

(i) *Mixed Constitution*

Classical monarchist and republican literature does not present republicanism and monarchy as irreconcilable forms of government (Yarbrough, 1979: 69). Despite championing monarchical government, Aristotle, Polybius and Cicero conceded that monarchy could lead to tyranny, and preferred a ‘mixed’ government. Tyranny is undesirable and unsustainable, in Aristotle’s (1981: 250-318) view. Applying interpretations on the basis of wealth and status, Aristotle understood oligarchy as ‘rule of the rich’ and democracy (or ‘demokratia’) as ‘rule of the poor’. Oligarchy organised the people into distinctive classes, rather than the body of people or even the majority. Aristotle argued that both forms of government are unsustainable because each antagonises the other, and aristocracy, while better than oligarchy, also runs the risk of antagonising the poor. Therefore, the most practical form of government, Aristotle argued, is a ‘middle’ or ‘mixed’ constitution, combining sensible features of oligarchy and democracy, so that the system can be ‘described as both’.

Polybius (1979, 6, 4: 275; 7, 3: 173; 9, 2: 293), although a Greek, was an admirer of the Roman Republic as the ‘best and nearest to perfection’ of all examples of government. He argued that, out of ‘kingship, aristocracy and democracy, the best constitution is a combination of all three varieties’. Polybius asserted that there were in fact six types of government, in which monarchy evolved into

either kingship or tyranny, both of which evolved into aristocracy, which evolved into democracy, and which evolved into mob rule 'to complete the series'. Cicero (1952, 1, 4: 104-5; 2, 7: 151) too, argued that, far better than monarchical government, is 'a balanced combination of kingship, aristocracy and democracy'. Cicero feared that, without this combination, kingship could revert to despotism, aristocracy to oligarchy, and rule of the people to mob rule and anarchy.

(ii) *Rule of law*

A hallmark of classical republicanism is the doctrine of the 'rule of law' over the rule of man (Honig, 1991: 98, Winterton, 1993: 41), which Aristotle (1981: 186) endorsed as central to a good constitution. The rule by law was a central tenet of republican government for Cicero (1977: 84-5). In his *Commonwealth of Oceana*, James Harrington (1977: 8-9) distinguished the 'ancient prudence' of the ideal government, in which 'a civil society of men is instituted and preserved upon the foundation of common right or interest'. This, Harrington argued, is an empire 'of laws and not of men'. This contrasts with 'modern prudence' in which laws are designed according to 'private interest,' creating in effect, an empire 'of men and not of laws'.

(iii) *Citizenship and sovereignty*

Warden (1993: 87) suggests that a 'republic differs from monarchy in that the right to govern is notionally derived from the citizen and not from God, tradition or brutalism'. The ancient republican writers incorporated monarchy, but gave the 'citizens' ownership of the 'public thing', *res publica*. Nevertheless, it is important to point

out that ancient republics (in contrast, as we will see, from the neo-classical republicans) were restrictive in who had rights (Springborg, 1990: 9).

Aristotle (1981: 169-185), for example, applied a functional definition of 'citizen' as one who 'participates in giving judgement and holding office', which did not apply to all people in the state. This definition excluded women, men lacking office and slaves. Ancient Greece and Rome were preoccupied with war and defence. The concept of citizenship was consistent with this preoccupation, and the citizens had the authority and the liberty to participate in the affairs of the sovereign community of which they were members. Cicero (1952, 3: 187-224) contended that public affairs were the concern of the citizens, not just one person, and that the commonwealth is 'the property of the people'. For this to be accomplished, Cicero argued, the citizenry needed to be educated in order to be virtuous and public-spirited.

#### (iv) *Liberty and equality*

Aristotle (1981: 362-3) linked liberty and equality by suggesting that, although liberty involved doing as one chose, 'agreeing to be ruled guarantees freedom to rule'. He based the ability to rule on an assumption that all have a right to rule. In contrast with individual-based utilitarian liberty, the law actually constituted freedom (Pettit, 1993: 168), in what Harrington (1977: 70) called 'liberty by the law'. Without the rule of law, Machiavelli (1961: 30-33) contended, freedom collapses. For the republican tradition, liberty comes from full citizenship in a society based on the rule of law (Pettit, 1993: 168). Republican liberty is measured as a quality (rather than a quantity) which involves a freedom from 'slavery' (rather than mere

‘restraint’). It is not enough for the republicans to be *servus sine domino* (‘a slave without a master’). Republican liberty is based on the quality of the rule of law, in other words, the ‘security from non-interference’, shared equally by other citizens of the state. Pettit (1993: 168-170) argues that there is a small step from the concept of full citizenship to the concept of universal franchise. It will be shown later that this conception of liberty through full citizenship of a sovereign state contrasts with the individual liberty of neo-classical republicanism. This, as will be demonstrated, is a significant bequest to contemporary Australian government.

(v) *Civic virtue, the common weal and anti-absolutism*

Classical republicanism was concerned with civic virtue, or ‘public spiritedness’, in which the republican would serve the ‘common weal’ or the common good, rather than pursue personal gain (Warden, 1993: 88). This is not necessarily virtue in a moral sense but, as Machiavelli realised, involves the ultimate realisation of the public good, irrespective of the motives (Pettit, 1993: 176). Aristotle (1981: 265-69, 329-332) argued from the principle that ‘virtue is a mean between two extremes’. Given the wide-ranging classical objection to tyranny, anti-absolutism has always been a theme of classical republican thought (Warden, 1993: 85-6).

### **Neo-classical Republicanism**

The distinction between classical and neo-classical republicanism is central to understanding the contemporary Australian debate. Neo-classical republicanism is the revival of republican expression from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, in which Harrington, Machiavelli, Montesquieu and the American founders represented

the main features of classical (or ancient) republicanism listed above and returned 'to the images and language of classical republicanism' (Warden, 1993: 87). Pocock (1975: 20) was even more dramatic, suggesting that the implication of the American reliance on classical language and forms was that the American Revolution was not the first act of the enlightenment, but 'the last great act of the Renaissance'. Machiavelli is credited with reviving the republican idea from ancient times (Viroli, in Bock, Skinner and Viroli, 1990: 144). Montesquieu (1966, 3: 117-123) elaborated on many of the classical republican themes. In supporting a mixed constitution, Montesquieu suggested key qualities for each form of government that are both virtues and vices, namely, that the key quality for monarchy is honour, for republicanism virtue, for tyranny despotism, and that the shrewd combination of all of them would avoid the worst excesses of each of them. Government by law was also paramount for Montesquieu whose concern with democracy was that popularity could subvert the rule of law.

The writings and nation-building experiment of the American founders represent distinctively republican ideas. The American founders 'perceived the political world through classical thought', and used an 'inherited political language (as) ... the primary vehicle' of American republicanism (Banning, 1978: 173). Warden (1993: 86-7) points out that four main features of republicanism in the American Revolution were: anti-absolutism; civic virtue; the common weal, prudence, reason and the public good; and the language and images of classical republicanism. The American system of government was balanced by its separation of legislature, judiciary and executive, and by its federal division between the centre and the regions.

The form of government in which the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate is set has features of both the monarchist and the classical republican traditions. The most significant contribution of the republican tradition to Australian government is in the two innovations that distinguish neo-classical from classical republicanism, the first of which was mediated by the advent of liberalism. First, the rights of the individual came to prominence and challenged classical republicanism's restriction of rights to those who qualified as 'citizens'. Second, the system of checks and balances replaced the need for 'civic virtue'. The individual came into focus with the rise in rights and economics, but representation enabled large-scale access to the political system. Warden (1993: 88, 91) argues that private enterprise emerged with liberalism, and that its eventual commitment to the public good brought liberalism into prominence. After this, 'republicanism carried the connotation of rebellion; an attack on the person and symbol of the monarch'.

Machiavelli's *Prince*, written in 1513, showed that moral virtue could be separated from the classical notion of civic virtue. Wood (1972: 606-15) succinctly described the absence of virtue in the neo-classical interpretation, stating that liberal representative democracy is dedicated to the protection of private rights, which are to be preserved by the mechanical checks in the political system, pitting interest against interest and power versus power. This renders the notion of virtue unnecessary. Yarbrough (1979: 61) argues that political participation and virtue are the keys to freedom in American republicanism, because democracy needs virtue, although moral virtue rather than active civic virtue. Despite the absence of virtue as a central notion of neo-classical republicanism, Madison (1961, 55: 378; 57: 384) argued, in *The Federalist*, which he wrote

with Jay and Hamilton, that some virtue is necessary. Madison insisted that ‘if there be no virtue among us we are in a wretched situation (... and ...) to suppose that any form of government will secure liberty or happiness without any virtue in the people is a chimerical idea’.

The foregoing discussion has presented the distinctively classical republican ideas thematically, that is, as a consistent set of ideas. There is a more historical and linguistic aspect to the following analysis of neo-classical republicanism, in terms of the influence that democracy and liberalism had on republican ideas. This is not to suggest that political theory and language was static and pure from ancient Greece until the American Revolution, and that political language was suddenly hijacked by unscrupulous political writers and operators. The distinction between classical and neo-classical republicanism serves two purposes in this study. First, the analysis of the traditional theories clarifies the distinctive sets of ideas that have been attributed to monarchy and republicanism as a backdrop to the contemporary Australian debate. Although the argument of this study is the primacy of language as a means of interpreting the contemporary Australian debate, the detailed analysis of the arguments used in the debate allows us to locate the contemporary Australian debate in the traditions of monarchist and republican theory. Second, the influence of democracy and liberalism on republican thought shows the fluidity of political language and supports a language-focussed interactionist analysis of the contemporary Australian debate.

A more detailed exposition of the themes of neo-classical republicanism follows. The first three themes reflect classical concerns. The final three reflect the distinctive themes that emerged

within the literature from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries and which locate the republican components of contemporary Australian government in the neo-classical tradition:

- Separation of powers
- Checks and balances
- Sovereignty
- Liberty and equality
- Participation, representation and democracy
- Private property

(i) *Separation of powers*

The most prominent advocate of a separation of powers (as distinct from mixed government) is Montesquieu. In his *Spirit of the Laws*, Montesquieu advocates the separation of the executive, judiciary and legislature. This, he argued, was the only way to guarantee liberty, as he feared tyranny, or power that was vested in the hands of the few. Montesquieu (1966, 3: 139, 163) argued that:

when the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person or body there can be no liberty, because apprehensions may arise lest the same monarch or senate should enact (and) execute laws in a tyrannical manner ... (W)ere the power of judging joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for the judge would be the legislator. Were it joined to the executive power, the judge might behave with all the violence of an oppressor.

This represents a key feature of republican thought, in addition to

Aristotle's (1981: 276-7) support for a 'balance' between various components of government.

The separation of powers was very important for Madison, Hamilton and Jay (1961, 47: 301-3; 51), in the founding of the American republic. They argued that the separation of powers would avoid centralising power in any one interest, and would maintain a balanced constitution. Madison (1961, 47: 301-3) echoes the 'celebrated Montesquieu' in judging that:

the accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive and judiciary, in the same hands may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny ... (W)here the *whole* power of one department is exercised by the same hands which possess the *whole* power of another department, the fundamental principles of a free constitution are subverted (emphasis in original).

Jefferson (1959, 2: 400), in the collection of the *Adams-Jefferson Letters* was suspicious of any form of government acting without restraint, ironically stating that he 'would trust one as soon as the other with unlimited Power'. In the Australian setting, the founders of the nation sought to establish a separation of power within a federal structure (Maddox, 1991: 104, 129). Limitations were placed on the power of the centre and the states, so that the federal government could administer projects of national interest effectively, and not impinge upon the identity and interests of the states (Aitkin, Jinks, Warhurst, 1989: 19, 21).

(ii) *Checks and balances*

The American founders echoed the ancient republican commitment to placing limitations on power to prevent absolute rule. Their demand for deliberative devices and checks and balances is consistent with classical republicanism, and such limitations were clearly exemplified when the founders of the American republic sought to work out the detailed arrangements of American government. The theoretical framework for replacing moral virtue with checks and balances was laid out by Machiavelli, whose book *The Prince* was intended as a practical guide for effective government. Machiavelli (1961: 51-4) distinguished ‘civic *virtu*’ from Christian virtue, and argued that ‘truth and justice does not always represent the whole-hearted pursuit of the general good of the community’. Machiavelli believed that ‘virtu’ could only come when citizens were fully involved in political affairs, and that social struggles were the product of virtu in controlling competing power centres (Pocock, 1975: 182). Machiavelli (1961) invoked historical examples, from ancient Rome and Greece, to the pre-modern states we now recognise as Europe, and presented a number of maxims relating to acquiring and maintaining power, and relations with foreign states and subjects, necessary for effective government.

The theoretical perspective of Machiavelli was unique in that it was dispassionate and descriptive rather than prescriptive or normative, presenting government as it ‘is’ rather than how it ‘ought’ to be, or, presenting the ‘real’ rather than the ‘ideal.’ Machiavelli (1961: 48) writes:

Since it is my intention to say something that will prove of practical use to the inquirer, I have thought it proper to represent

things as they are in real truth, rather than as they are imagined. Many have dreamed up republics and principalities which have never in truth been known to exist; the gulf between how one should live and how one does live is so wide that a man who neglects what is actually done for what should be done learns the way to self-destruction rather than self-preservation.

The doctrine of the separation of powers was important for the neo-classicists, influenced strongly by Montesquieu. The American constitution represented detailed experiments in applying checks and balances to the system of government. Checks and balances, or deliberative devices, create a 'clash' of interests (Pettit, 1993: 181; Maddox, 1993: 21; Deniehy, 1856b, in Headon, 1993: 144), or, as Uhr (1993: 29-35) puts it, apply 'trip switches' to force debate. The term 'libra' means balance or pair of scales, and deliberative devices, such as three readings of a parliamentary bill, are designed not to represent good policy in itself but as a check against irrationality, to refine public opinion (as opposed to whims and fancies), and to interrupt the flow and energy of executive power, assuming self-interest on the part of the participants (Uhr, 1993: 29-35). Such devices are part of what we know as 'due process', and serve to protect the state against 'ill-contrived government', and generate consent and deliver good and just policy. Checks and balances exist in the Australian system of government, not only in the federal system itself, but in the process of passing legislation in which a proposed 'bill' is debated and must be approved by both houses of the federal parliament before it is enshrined in law.

### (iii) *Sovereignty*

Sovereignty was also important for the American founders, who were concerned with their own defence. Their desire for sovereignty was also reflected in their sense of national pride. Madison (1961, 15, 24, 25) emphasised the importance of union in response to the threat of foreign attack, and the sovereignty of a new American nation. In the Australian context, Headon (1993: 37-41) represents sovereignty of the state and self-determination for Australia as key themes in the writings of Deniehy in the 1850s. Deniehy (1854, c, 1854, 1, in Headon, 1993: 134, 140) eagerly anticipated a 'final separation' from England, objecting to the implication of Australia's colonial status that Australia was inferior to England. He objected to the politician Henry Parkes, 'not of the Englishman in him but of "Englishmanism" about him'.

### (iv) *Liberty and equality*

We had occasion to note earlier that one of the key distinctions between classical and neo-classical republicanism is the replacement of civic virtue with liberty, as a central tenet. For classical republicanism, the 'citizen' (however defined) had a key role to play in government, whereas neo-classical republicanism championed the rights of the individual themselves. The ancient republics, as has been noted, were restrictive about who had rights (Springborg, 1990: 9). The difference between ancient and American republicanism, in the view of Yarbrough (1979: 69), is that the meaning of the term 'freedom' changed. Freedom to the Greeks and Romans meant participating in public affairs, which required moulding the character of the citizens by educating them on how to act. Freedom to the American founders came to mean the

ability to determine their own affairs and destiny. A cornerstone of the democratic appeals of the early Australian republican, Deniehy (1855e, in Headon, 1993: 141-4), is his view that 'man is destined in this world to attain a state of moral perfection'. Deniehy thought that Australia could well do without the 'bastard branches of the English aristocracy'. Deniehy placed a high priority on 'education' and the development of 'self-culture' as described by the Americans, Emerson and Channing. This is eloquently revealed in the following quotation:

The education of mankind is never at an end ... The possibilities of moral and mental growth which GOD (sic) has endowed his human creatures with have an awful grandeur ... The wonders of the starry heavens are less stupendous in the eye of the meditative mind than the fatherless and boundless capabilities of development in the mind and soul of a human being (Deniehy, 1854g, in Headon: 193).

(v) *Participation, representation and democracy*

The authors of *The Federalist* objected to the classical absence of a social contract. Hamilton (1961, 38: 240), for example, argued that the ancient republics did not clearly rest on the authority of the people'. Yarbrough (1979: 68) points out that Jefferson considered American republicanism to be superior to ancient republicanism in that America was ruled by consent. The importance of the liberty of the individual assumed that all people were equal. The American founders were especially inspired by John Locke's writing which established people as being equal in nature (Yarbrough, 1979: 67-8).

For people to have equal access to government, representation was conceived which allowed the people to participate by voting. It also allowed for the expansion of the sovereign nation without increasing the possibility of violent factionalism which had characterised expansion of the public domain in ancient states. The authors of *The Federalist* (1961, 10: 62; 14: 84; 39: 25) explicitly equated republicanism with representation, and argued that republicanism must be democratic, but not necessarily in person. Representation opened up the possibility of participation for all, rather than the ancient notion of the few whom could live up to virtue. Democracy was realised in a participatory citizenship (Madison, 1961, 16). Lamenting those who looked to ancient constitutions and writers with 'sanctimonious reverence', Jefferson (1959, 2: 388-391, 402) argued that the 'new principle of representative democracy has rendered useless everything written before on the structure of government'.

In addition to supporting an independent and federated government for the American nation, Jefferson was a democrat, arguing that the progress he so treasured was impeded by the few dominating the public realm to the exclusion of the many. Jefferson (1959, 2: 388-391, 402) championed 'government by (the) citizens in mass, acting directly and personally according to rules established by the majority'. Jefferson exemplified the combination of republicanism and democracy through his preoccupation with public spiritedness and civic involvement, which he believed was best maintained by re-writing the constitution each generation, and through active local governments debating local issues. By giving the citizens the space to exercise the 'moral respectability necessary to their own safety and orderly government', the citizens would be better able to 'select the veritable *aristoi* for the trusts of government'.

On the theme of democratic republicanism, Headon (1993: 139-44) contends that Deniehy was the first Australian to identify the moral implications and delineate the spiritual groundwork of a democratic community emerging into nationhood. Headon represents Daniehy's commitment to a 'government really responsible' to the people and his eagerness to reflect 'the democratic tendencies of the age'. In the words of Headon, Deniehy turned dramatically from a potentially 'patrician democrat' to a true 'democrat' or 'patriot of the people', by his commitment to franchise. Deniehy was obviously committed to democracy and concerned about 'class interests to the exclusion of the great body of the people'. The Australian system of government is a representative democracy.

(vi) *Private property*

Wood (1972: 418-19) suggests that republicanism in the 1780s was anticapitalist, but that by 1800, with the emergence of the concept of the free individual, capitalism was no longer a threat but, rather, was seen as an instrument of progress. The promotion of property rights is a logical extension of the refined brand of republicanism that relied on individual liberty and achievement (Warden: 85-6). As Warden (1993: 88) argues, 'classical republicanism would not permit the pursuit of personal gain, but after 1776, it was understood that, once monopolies were removed, the pursuit of personal interests would advance the common good'. The economic context of the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s is a free market economy, fusing liberal rights, representative democracy, and the pursuit of private gain.

## **Contemporary Republicanism**

Republicanism has also been seen as an expression of nationalist sentiment, rather than as a distinctive form of government. Such themes are present in the founding of the American republic, and in the early history of Australian republicanism, but are most prominent in the Australian debate in the 1990s. Thomas Jefferson was not merely preoccupied with the sovereignty of the American nation. Jefferson (1959, 2: 400) took pride in the possibilities of his new nation and argued that America was 'far too remote' from the despotism of monarchy, and 'our pure, virtuous public spirited federative Republick will last forever, govern the Globe and introduce the perfection of Man ...' (1959, vol.2: 400). In the early Australian context, Daniel Deniehy (1854 g, 1854 l, in Headon, 1993: 143) envisioned the 'great (ness of the) Australian republic' ... 'among the mighty nations of the earth'. In the latter part of the twentieth century it was argued that it was inappropriate for an independent and modern Australia to have British symbols of government (Dutton: vii, 57, 1977; Faust: 91-105, in Dutton, 1977; Warhurst, 1993: 100; Warden: 166-76, in Winterton, 1994). The nationalist argument in the context of an Australian republic will receive more attention in the discussion of arguments for and against an Australian republic.

## **Monarchism, Republicanism, Liberalism and Democracy**

The aforementioned discussion outlines the development of the theories of monarchism, republicanism, democracy and liberalism. The task remains to examine the status of these theories as a backdrop for the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia. Maddox presents republicanism and democracy as

fundamentally antagonistic and at irreconcilable odds with each other, given that full participation in the 'demos' in Athens ensured 'rule by the poor', as opposed to the restricted access of republican Rome (Maddox, 1993: 16, 18). Nevertheless, the history and development of these theories shows that they have been highly adaptable, and that the sharper edges of all theories have been smoothed, and have bequeathed a shared notion of what constitutes good government, that is, democratic government. Having accounted for the development of monarchism, republicanism, liberalism and democracy, the following discussion shows how these theories have interacted, historically and theoretically, to provide a theoretical and practical foundation for contemporary Australian government.

In support of the monarchy, it has been argued that liberalism has a lot to answer for (Atkinson, 1993: 78-9). Liberalism has also been challenged from a republican perspective (Melleuish, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 87), that, 'given the excesses of utilitarian liberalism, thank God for ... republican values'. In its most individualistic and utilitarian form, liberal democracy leads to self-interest, which undermines the civic spirit of the community (Yarbrough, 1979: 61). Nevertheless, liberalism challenged the notion of restricted access to rights, which was a hallmark of classical republicanism (Springborg, 1990: 9), and, through representation, allowed the body of the people access to government. In terms of the classical republican contribution to democracy, the notion of positive liberty, restricted though it was, provided for freedom not merely from the interference of the state, but, as Pettit showed earlier (1993), provided the ability of the state to intervene to protect the citizens.

Even though classical writers endorsed monarchy, Aristotle explicitly rejected tyranny, and Cicero, Bolingbroke and Montesquieu advocated monarchy limited by law. Atkinson established the paternal and providing role of the monarchy. Bolingbroke, Atkinson, Bagehot and Winterton demonstrated the usefulness of the monarchy, or indeed any head of state, for personifying the state and legitimising a system of government. Such arguments could apply equally to monarchy as to republicanism, and have currency in the contemporary Australian debate.

Republican devices, such as the separation of powers, have been able to adapt to new situations (Cline, in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 146). Representation has allowed for the expansion of the sovereign nation without increasing the possibility of violent factionalism, which characterised an expanded public domain in ancient states (Yarbrough, 1979: 68). The Americans reconciled republican government with representative democracy and free market economics (McKenna, 1997: 6). In Australia, the Crown has accommodated liberal democratic institutions, responsible party government, and the English republican tradition (McKenna, 1997: 9-11). Even Maddox (in Winterton, 1994: 136) writes that Australia could retain the good parts of republicanism but not import the republican tradition wholesale. Turwitt-Fieber (in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 163) contends that a monarchy and a republic can coexist on the assumptions that the source of the state's cohesion is the adherence to democratic laws, and that the monarchy continues to be relevant.

Pettit (1993: 163-84) argues that there are linkages and continuities between the liberal and republican traditions, and that the language

of liberalism came to supersede the language of republicanism because the interpretation of liberty was based on restraint rather than slavery. Restraint, Pettit argues, provided a more useful term to pit the individual against the state, in arguing for non-interference. Pettit points out that liberals were not anti-monarchists. Pettit also argues that liberalism permits social welfare, but not under its definition of liberty. Social welfare can be provided as components of equality and utility, rather than as core liberal values. Uhr (1993: 28, 34) suggests that democracy could be emerging as code for republicanism, and that the Australian political system is not democratic enough because it is not republican enough.

As a framework for the analysis of the monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s, the literature examined shows a theoretical and practical fluidity which reflects common expectations of what modern political systems ought to accomplish. These qualities combine features of monarchism, liberalism, republicanism and democracy, and avoid the excesses of their pure and original forms. Irrespective of the views held, either for retaining the constitutional monarchy or for changing to a republic, there is a shared assumption among the political parties and organised movements involved in the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s, that democratic government should have the following features: (The contribution of particular political theories to each feature is indicated in parentheses.)

- Equal opportunity for involvement in political affairs (liberalism, democracy)

- Input from all/a variety of people rather than a select few (liberalism, democracy)
- Morally virtuous (uncorrupted) public officials (republicanism)
- Checks and balances on power to prevent absolute rule and corruption (republicanism)
- Separation of powers between commonwealth and states (republicanism)
- Welfare and protection of the weak (monarchy)
- Symbols or representations of good government (monarchy)

### **Political Practice: Compatibility of Republic with Australian Government**

The foregoing analysis of the monarchist and republican traditions establishes the fluidity of political language and the prevailing influence of political practice over political theory. This provides the context for a language-focussed analysis of the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s. The analyses in this study show that, in the monarchy-republican debate in Australia, the options hinge not on particular theories of monarchism and republicanism, but on the interpretation of government and the degree to which the change to a republic represents a departure from Australia's current democratic system of government.

Opponents of an Australian republic adopt an interpretation of republic as a distinct form of government that represents a threat to democratic government in Australia. There are two types of argument in support of an Australian republic. One type of argument also believes that a republic represents a qualitatively distinct form of government. There are two variations on this

theme: one, that Australia is already a republic, albeit an unacknowledged one, which should be formally acknowledged; and, that Australia needs to become more republican in its operation of government. The second type of argument for an Australian republic is that an independent nation ought to have political symbols that reflect its unique identity. Australia's system of government is not inconsistent with republican government, according to this interpretation of republic, because the system of government is irrelevant to the argument for a republic. Both of these arguments for an Australian republic rely on different interpretations of the relationship between the political theory of republicanism and Australian government in practice.

**a) In Support of Retaining the Constitutional Monarchy**

Premise: A republic is inconsistent with retaining Australia's current democratic system of government.

*(i) Monarchy is democratic*

The monarchy has explicitly been attributed with providing Australia its democratic constitution, and has been regarded as 'Australia's best constitutional protection' (O'Connell, in Dutton, 1977: 36-43). Gibbs (in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 2) argues that to state that the constitution is unimportant is a 'vulgar error'. The current system has been seen to have 'served (Australia) well' (Kirby, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 75). Supporters of the constitutional monarchy link the monarchy with the unwritten conventions of the Westminster system of responsible government (Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 5-12).

The monarchist argument for retaining Australia's constitutional monarchy has attributed favourable features of Australia's system of government, in particular, the provision of welfare, to the tradition of monarchy in Australia. Atkinson (1993: 68-77) argues that 'the Australian monarchy ... is .... central to our whole traditional approach to government'. It is Atkinson's contention that, because of distance, the 'Crown' became separate from the 'Monarch,' and that, in the form of Crown, the monarchy became embedded in Australian society. The Crown has come to be seen as the font of all mercy and justice, of royal beneficence and authority. Atkinson identifies the positive role of the monarchy as a source of provision and protection through phases of Australia's history, pointing out, for example, that the convicts relied on the Crown for food, clothing and working conditions, and that the 1838 hangings following the Myall Creek Massacre were the first executions of white settlers for the murder of Aboriginal people. The Crown was held to represent security and continuity, and thereby, equity and the general good. After federation, the federal government took over the role of the Crown as the source of moral authority and also when industrial arbitration was required. The Crown became a source of stability and moral authority, not to mention a source of belonging to the Empire during the First World War. Such provisions ensured that Australians developed the 'habits of mind' to look to the state as the guiding hand of the nation.

In a similar vein to Bagehot, it has also been argued that the monarchy represents a nation's system of government, in that the monarch is the personification of the state (Atkinson, 1993: 67). The monarchy, it has been argued, gives 'dignity and practical purpose' to the constitution and that 'people well understand the role of the constitution' (Grainger, in Stephenson and Turner, 1994:

118, 119). The constitutional monarchy has been attributed with ensuring that the nation is 'above politics' (Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 3).

(ii) *Republic is undemocratic*

One familiar line of argument in support of the monarchy is the contention that the best that can be said for a republic is that it is a 'leap in the dark' (Abbott, in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 81). The republic has been targeted as a threat to democracy. The strongest opposition to a republic on the grounds of democracy is from Hancock (in Dutton, 1977: 165-6), who regards the republic as a further step down 'socialism's slippery road'. Hancock attacks the ALP's allegedly centralist agenda and its link with an Australian republic by quoting Lenin, that bank nationalisation was '90% of the way to communism'.

(iii) *Nationalism is an unsatisfactory reason for becoming a republic*

It has been argued that symbols of independence are an unsatisfactory reason for Australia becoming a republic, in the absence of any 'real' benefit that will be incurred (Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 1-4). O'Connor (1977: 41-2) argues that no one thinks Australia is 'less sovereign' because it has higher legal appeals, drawing a parallel with European nations and the European Court of Human Rights. While not rejecting a republic outright, Leaver (1993: 148) challenges the ALP government's republican claims, which, he argues, is based on 'an invented past'. Leaver objects to the major parties' 'pretend republicanism', which he

defines as ‘the instrumental use of the republican banner by the established political parties for their immediate political gain’.

### **b) In Support of an Australian Republic**

Premise: A republic is consistent with retaining Australia’s current democratic system of government.

#### *(i) Monarchy is undemocratic*

One of Australia’s early republicans, Deniehy (in Headon, 1993: 143), rejected ‘Europe and the old world’ as ‘deceitful, wickedly feudal, ferocious and ruthless’. Deniehy pointed out that an Australian republic must have ‘honest ... and zealous patriots’ for politicians, and that there would be no room for ‘nomineeism’ or ‘patronage’. Deniehy attacked the ‘greedy and avaricious ... squattocracy ... (for) ... betraying their country’s freedom’. It was only later, in neo-classical writing, that anti-absolutism came to be equated with democracy. Deniehy warned that ‘government abuse of power could undermine personal liberties and efforts to build community, destroying the fruits of your most holy and sacred efforts to establish a home for yourselves and your families in the wilderness’.

Another brand of anti-monarchist argument is the link that has been drawn between monarchy and conservative thought in Australia in general. Horne (in Encel, Horne and Thompson, 1977: 9) laments that the republican movement has had to bear the brunt of ‘irrational conservative arguments’. Doyle (1993: 122) argues that the monarchy, and the conservative hegemony which he believes dominates Australian political society, and which underpins the

monarchy, has had a constraining effect in Australian political life. Doyle summarises the conservative argument against an Australian republic, as 'if it ain't broke, don't fix it'. The basis of such feeling lie in 'myths,' which Doyle, following Edelman, carefully defines as ideas that are 'rarely questioned and widely accepted'. To re-open the personal and national possibilities of political society, Doyle (1993: 123-34) re-writes the six principles of conservatism, taken from Kirk's *Portable Conservative Reader*, in somewhat less conservative terms. First, the moral order on earth is for human beings and for nature. Second, the devil you don't know may sometimes be better than the devil you do know. Third, the wisdom of the now and the future can be as important as the wisdom of the past. Fourth, substantive change is sometimes necessary. Fifth, variety is acceptable if it does not amount to inequality. Sixth, if perfection exists, it exists in us; if it does not exist, it is a useless and irrelevant construct. The role of such a conservative ideology in the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia would be to reject the role of a political or social elite in leading public opinion.

(ii) *Australia is already a republic*

It has been argued that Australia is already a republic (Hardy: 183-89, in Encel, Horne and Thompson, 1977; McClelland: 141, in Dutton, 1977; Galligan, 1993; Warden, 1993; Winterton, 1993; Davies: 49, in Winterton, 1994; Hirst: 118-23, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994; Preece: 134, 136, in Stephenson and Turner, 1994). There are two variations of this argument. The first is that republicanism has, in any case, always been a part of the political culture (Warden, 1993; Melleuish, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 87),

and the second is that Australia has particular republican devices in its political institutions.

For the first variation of this argument, Brady (in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 145) argues that the economic radicalism and resistance to British colonisation show that Aboriginal Australia was a republic prior to colonisation. Warden (1993: 84-85) argues that Australian republicanism has its origins in the central traditions of a received Anglo-American politics, has been inherent in the ordinary discourse of politics since 1788, and that classical republicanism has been a consistent theme in Australian political language and a (hidden) part of the Australian political tradition. Warden (1993: 94-96) uses three historical events to substantiate this argument. First is the anti-absolutist language evident in complaints about Governor Macquarie's administration in the Bigge report, referring to 'despotic', 'absolute power', 'tyranny', 'rights', and 'the People'. Second, the anti-transportation document *The History of Tasmania*, by John West, quoted Machiavelli, Madison, Jefferson and Harrington, and third, the desire for self-determination evident in federation was seen to involve a similar arrangement to the English constitution of 1660.

The second variation of this argument is that Australia's political institutions are already republican. Winterton (1993: 40) suggested that Australia largely satisfies the requirements for a republic because it is based on the sovereignty of the people. Galligan (1993: 56-7) agrees that Australia already fulfils the institutional requirements of being a 'federal, democratic republic', and argued that this 'merely' needs to be acknowledged and formalised. He defined a 'republic' as a political system in which 'supreme power rests with the people and their elected representatives or officers'; it

was a 'commonwealth', as opposed to a state that was 'governed by a king or similar ruler'. It has been pointed out that Australia has deliberative devices in its federal structure (Sawer, 1977: 65; Galligan, 1995: 12-37; Watson: 102, in Encel, Horne and Thompson, 1977). Galligan (1993: 57-63) frames the analysis with William Bagehot's notion of the 'disguised republic', in which supreme power actually rests with the people and their representatives, but that this is not reflected in their forms and symbols. Indeed Galligan argues that Australia has gone beyond Bagehot's disguised republic, because the *Australia Act 1986* Australianised and republicanised many of its forms and symbols (such as appeals; the UK cannot legislate over the Australian states or the centre; the premiers are more important than the state governors; a confirmation that the parliament, rather than the government, makes laws).

(iii) *Australia should be more republican*

Some supporters of an Australian republic have urged that Australia not only formalise a change to its symbols of government, but take the opportunity to review and reform the whole political system (C. Howard, in Dutton, 1977: 70; Chipp, in Dutton, 1977: 150-3, 154; Davidson, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 97-108; Hudson and Carter 1993: 174; Baker, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 39-45; Emy, in Winterton, 1994: 139-50; Gollan, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 83-9; Irving, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 69-82; Perkins, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 46-52). Uhr (1993: 32) concentrates on the 'checks and balances' aspect of republican government, reflecting his concern that there is insufficient restraint on the executive (government) in Australia. Sharman (in Winterton, 1994: 115) shares this concern. Uhr (1993:

27) warns that strong party government makes minor parties vulnerable. It has been argued that, although Australia has classically republican structures in place, the 'separation of powers ... is mangled beyond recognition', and needs to be revived to restore republican principles and the rule of law (Ratnapala, in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 229).

White called for a more 'democratic republic' (in Dutton, 1977: 201). There have been calls for more direct and localised political involvement and stronger local government (Bulbeck, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 108). Calls have been made for better community decision making, for a 'citizen's constitution' (Fraser, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 36; Uhr, 1993: 31), and for more 'citizen-initiated referenda' (Thompson, in Winterton, 1994: 110-1). Brennan (in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 257, 282) argues that an Australian republic should grant more rights to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to redress past injustices, and that a Bill of Rights is needed to ensure this because the 'minimalist' model will be insufficient. The introduction of an Australian republic has been seen as an opportunity for more radical global, feminist and socialist politics (Beilharz, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 117). Kenneth Wiltshire (in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 93-4), while acknowledging the importance of symbols, sees an Australian republic as an opportunity for Australia to keep what is good in its political system, and enhance Australians' 'knowledge' of the political system and develop a 'code of behaviour' for public officials.

Horne (in Stephenson and Turner, 1994: 48-9) seeks a genuine sense of community rather than obsessive nationalism, or

‘tribalism,’ as he calls it. Horne seeks a distinctive ‘civic’ identity, and implores Australians to:

show the world how to be a state without being a nation, how to provide a civic definition of ourselves as a commonwealth in a way that provides some unity in our beliefs as citizens while allowing also for our distinctive democracy.

The evolving identity of Australia, the cultural diversity of Australia, and the celebration of a ‘community within nations,’ have also been used as arguments for an Australian republic (Curthoys and Muecke, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 177; Kalantzis and Cope, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 144; Keneally, in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 242;).

*(iv) A republic is about symbols of Australian nationhood*

It has been argued that it is inappropriate for an independent and modern Australia to have British symbols of government (Dutton, 1977: vii, 57; Horne, in Dutton, 1977: 7-22; Faust, in Dutton, 1977: 91-105; Warhurst, 1993: 100; Moss, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 136-44; Turnbull, in Headon, Warden and Gammage, 1994: 124-35; Warden, 1994: 166-76). This has been seen to be important to Australia’s unique identity, and for increasing dealings with Asia, for example (Broinowski, in Hudson and Carter, 1994: 157). Various parent-child analogies have been used, such as Johnson’s (in Dutton, 1977: 171) view that a republic would give Australia, as an ‘adult nation’, the chance to say ‘goodbye to mother’. Warhurst (1993) argues for the appropriateness of a republic on the grounds of identity, and points out that symbols and institutions have become less British and more

uniquely Australian over time. The national identity argument has also been expanded to incorporate the call for a more distinctive flag (Murray, in Dutton, 1977: 119). A strongly-worded form of this argument is found in the suggestion that ‘those who do not support the republic do not support Australia for Australians, and are thus betraying us to ... other interests’ (Wynn: 185, in Dutton, 1977). This symbolic argument has also been called the ‘minimalist’ case for an Australian republic, because, it is argued, the symbols of Australian government ought to reflect Australia’s unique identity, while retaining Australia’s current system of democratic government.

A continuation of this theme, with a focus on the monarchy, is the contention that the monarchy is an inappropriate symbol of contemporary Australia. A strongly worded version of this argument is that ‘the monarchy has lost its romantic and political appeal to many Australians’, and that young Australians believe that the ‘old system of imperial honours is utter rubbish’ (Wynn, in Dutton, 1977: 179). Clark (in Dutton, 1977: 6) argues that the ‘most extravagant defence of monarchy’ is to be found in Australia, not the UK, and that there was no honour and dignity in the actions of the Queen’s representative in 1975, in which politics prevailed. Keneally (in Hudson and Carter, 1993: 153) argues that the political stability that Australia has enjoyed has come not from the Crown but from the creativeness of Australians.

#### **a) An Australian Republic in Theory and Practice**

Irrespective of the views in support of or against an Australian republic, there are two practical implications of these interpretations. The first is that Australian writers who subscribe to

the neo-classical school of republicanism, or support monarchy because of the inherently desirable qualities of monarchy and/or the inherently undesirable qualities of republicanism, contend that a change to a republic, or the recognition of the republic that exists, for better or for worse, must be recognised as a distinct form of government. The second implication is that the nationalist, or contemporary, republicans regard the relationship between republicanism and Australia's system of government as irrelevant to the debate. This is because it is assumed that Australia's democratic system of responsible government would, in any case, continue, but with unique symbols of Australian identity.

The following table divides the Australian writers into neo-classical and contemporary in terms of their interpretations of republic, and whether or not they present arguments for or against an Australian republic. The term neo-classical has been chosen over classical because the writers who incorporate the classical republican tradition in their interpretation support a positive notion of liberty, and representation and franchise, rather than exclusive rights. The writers in the 'Arguments for Republic' are all supporters of a republic. Not all of the writers listed under 'Arguments for Constitutional Monarchy' are necessarily opponents of the republic 'against all odds,' as Atkinson (1993: 80) describes himself, but present arguments for the Constitutional Monarchy or against the Republic which they believe have not been addressed.

*Table 2.1: Australian Republicanism in Theory and Practice*

	<b>Arguments for Constitutional Monarchy</b>	<b>Arguments for Republic</b>	
<b>Neo-classical</b>			
<b>Interpretation</b>	Maddox	Uhr	Frazer
	Atkinson	Winterton	Melleuish
	Stephenson	Galligan	Bulbeck
	Abbott	Warden	Beilharz
	Grainger	Doyle	Kalantzis/
	O'Connell	Headon	Cope
	Wentworth	Leaver	Brady
	Hancock	Pettit	Hudson
	Kirby	Preece	Curthoys/
	Smith	Cline	Muecke
		Turner	Springborg
		Chipp	Laing
		Wiltshire	Thompson
		Turwitt-Fieber	Sharman
		Ratnapala	Emy
		Moens	Galligan
		Brennan	Horne
		Clark	Warden
		Colin Howard	Von Beyme
		McClelland	Hardy
		Hirst	Davies
		Gollan	Davidson
		Irving	Baker
		Perkins	

	<b>For Constitutional Monarchy</b>	<b>For Republic</b>
<b>Contemporary Interpretation</b>	-	Warhurst Dutton Faust Murray Johnson Wynn Broinowski Keneally White Turnbull Moss

### **Conclusion**

The monarchist and republican traditions have been presented as distinct traditions that, in their encounter with liberalism and democracy, have nonetheless proven themselves to be adaptable in theory and practice. This study relies on this broad historical and theoretical framework in demonstrating the interplay of theory and practice, through which theories of republicanism in the contemporary Australian debate make an original contribution to the ongoing republican tradition. More specifically, the following chapter establishes that a language-focussed theoretical approach is uniquely placed to illuminate the monarchist and republican theories at work and the ways in which the parties and movements construct discourse in the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **SOCIAL THEORY: LANGUAGE-FOCUSSED SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISM**

---

*It is man who makes monarchies and establishes republics, but the commune seems to come directly from the hand of God.*

(De Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. I, chapter 5).

#### **The Individual and the Collective in Monarchist and Republican Society**

This study starts out from the view that sociology is the art of watching an exciting drama unfold. Although the subject matter of this study is political it is intended that the outcomes are applicable to sociological research in general, by promoting the method of discourse analysis and by revealing the way debate is constructed which is revealed by the discourses employed in debate. The political subject matter of the research project obviously yields information which is useful in itself for the study of politics and political theory. The insights into political parties and organised movements, and into the monarchy-republican debate, in general, is intended to legitimise the use of discourse analytical methods in social research.

The aim of this chapter is to situate the language-based approach of this study in the context of the two dominant approaches to the

analysis of social life. Therefore, three approaches to social life are analysed:

- Functional and systemic theories;
- Symbolic interactionism; and
- Language-focussed symbolic interactionism.

The initial argument in this chapter is that interactionist theory more adequately illuminates social life than systemic or functionalist theories, and that a particular focus on language ensures validity in the research process. Of the first two theoretical options with which we can analyse parties and movements, 'systemic' and 'interactionist', the vast majority of social theorists fall into the systemic category. These two theoretical categories reflect different approaches to the analysis of social life. Systemic theorists study society from the perspective of the social system, and place the individual within that system, a perspective also known as Functionalism. Other approaches, such as Marxism, which analyse society from the perspective of the interrelated whole, are also included in this category. The alternative position is the interactionist position, in which society is studied from the perspective of interaction between individual members of society. The theoretical perspective of this study is a variation on this theme. In this study, the texts are the social action. Social action is translated into socio-textual action. This study draws on manageable and representative samples of data from political parties and organised movements which are readily available. This study analyses the interactions between the monarchist, republican and discursive concepts they employ in arguing for or against an Australian republic.

The assumption of this study is that a perspective which avoids pre-ordained social relationships, an interactionist approach, best serves the excitement of observing both social interaction and the language used in its accomplishment. Nevertheless, interactionism has been challenged on the grounds that it considers action in isolation, and, undoubtedly, the outcomes of sociological research must contribute to the body of knowledge of how social actors interact. The 'Methods' chapter will show that these data allow for rigorous and detailed analysis of the interactions of key terms within the texts, and, at the same time, overcome a perceived weakness in qualitative methodology: that of validity. A detailed ethnographic analysis of the data needs the support of an interactionist perspective. The role of an interactionist perspective in validating the analyses in this study will be clarified by a closer look at these two 'camps' of social theory.

### **Systemic Theories**

The functionalist perspective arose out of the desire for a set of objective rules which could explain social phenomena. Talcott Parsons (1967) argued that social systems existed in their own right and had needs as a whole system. Individuals, Parsons argued, are socialised into the system by internalising norms which sustain the system. Herbert Spencer (1971) popularised the analogy (now out of fashion) that societies are like biological organisms which adapt and change as a unit. Antonio Gramsci is a classic exponent of a systemic social perspective. Gramsci (1971) employed a broad interpretation of the state to encompass all aspects of private (civil) society and political and legal force which exercise control over the individual. Gramsci (1971: 244) gave the label 'hegemony' to the

reciprocity between the individual and the state, in which the ruling class gained the active consent of those over whom it ruled.

Arguably the most influential functionalist was Emile Durkheim who in his book, *Suicide* (1951: 314-5), explained 'anomie', the absence of externally controlling forces which kept one's satiability and needs in check. Anomie resulted from an increasing and unchecked appetite for satisfaction, which served to stimulate rather than fulfil needs. Durkheim argued that suicide resulted from these unfulfilled needs. Locating the individual as part of a broader system, Durkheim argued that anomie could be avoided by the intervention of an external force, respected not feared, to dim the passion for stimulation.

Writers on modern bureaucracy also served to demonstrate the perspective of society from the viewpoint of the whole social system. Max Weber (1946) laid out the principles of the operation of modern officialdom which was necessarily characterised by fixed, impersonal rules and written documents which systematised and routinised rather than personalised authority. Blau (1964) elaborated on the nature of bureaucratic systems, stating that 'formalized arrangements are instituted perpetuating the ... order ... making them independent of individual human beings'. Blau suggested that common values are transmitted through socialisation to outlive individuals and that these were enforced by powerful groups in society. Blau's interpretation of bureaucratic society presented the individual as powerless in the face of social forces.

H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (1953) examined society in terms of various orders which were maintained by sanctions against transgressors. Society could, in their opinion, be divided up into

various orders, for example, political, economic, military, kinship, religious orders, and that the sociologist 'never (isolates) the individual ... from (their) social or historical setting'. C. Wright Mills (1951) also described the emergence of a new middle class in the USA in the 1940s, supported by the unquestioned assumption of a view from the whole social system.

In his *Democracy in America* (1946, 2, 4, 6), Alexis de Tocqueville analysed the precarious power balance in a democracy from the perspective of the whole society. De Tocqueville argued that despotism in a democracy would be mild but extensive, if uniformity were to be imposed. He contrasted this with the despotism of the Roman Emperor, whose influence was severe but localised. Democratic oppression was regarded as less degrading because 'he has chosen the holder of his chain'. De Tocqueville argued that this was allowed to happen because the nation was stupefied into equality and circumscribed action that it had learned to celebrate rather than reject.

Another clear example of social research from the viewpoint of the whole system is David Riesman's *Faces in the Crowd* (1952). Various types of social character were identified as they related to the whole, such as the 'tradition-directed' social character, which was common in underdeveloped societies, and in which obedience and conformity to tradition was the most highly valued trait. These were contrasted with the 'inner-directed' social character, in which individuals were trained to conform to internalised norms, through expanded role possibilities passed on by parents rather than the extended families, but with generalised goals. A third type of social character, 'other-directed' characterised those who were able to cope with rapid change and pursue it to meet individualistic goals,

but short term goals based on reactions of those around them. Riesman's development of these social character types relied on investigating society from the viewpoint of the collective rather than focussing on the individual's role in the whole.

Other writers have proposed models of society with sophisticated analyses of the linguistic and power-based webs that draw human beings together. Recent among these is Michel Foucault. In *Madness and Civilization* (1965) and *The History of Sexuality* (vol. 1, 1978), Foucault provided compelling accounts of the ways in which language and knowledge formed bases for power in their role in the social construction of reality. In terms of power relationships it is difficult to overshadow Marx and Engels. The Marxist perspective starts from the assumption that capitalism enriches the owners of the means of production at the expense of those who provide the labour of production, and that these relations define the social roles of two distinct classes: the oppressors and the oppressed. The systemic nature of their account of society is highlighted in the proposition of Marx and Engels (1968: 42), that:

in the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will ... it is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness.

JK Galbraith (1967) endorsed the role of sociology in economic relations by challenging Adam Smith's notion of the 'invisible hand' in the market place, so cherished in the field of economics. Galbraith argued that all technological, economic and demographic change was interrelated. Because higher profits means higher risks,

he argued, human beings were not subject to the authority of the market. Rather, in Galbraith's view, the imperatives of technology and organisation (that is, social planning), not the imperatives of ideology, determined the shape of economic society. Jurgen Habermas (1984) analysed the roles of knowledge, language and power in society. His 'theory of communicative action' used currently distorted language to show how communication would occur without those constraints. In doing so, Habermas challenged the assumption that scientific knowledge necessarily advanced and enlightened a people. Habermas argued that capitalism restricted free and open dialogue which stifled access to scientific knowledge, thereby supporting the status quo.

### **Systemic Theories and Monarchist and Republican Society**

It is important to note that these writers considered the individual to be important, but only in so far as they are part of the whole. The difference between systemic and interactionist writers is the perspective from which society is examined. The account above featured three types of systemic theorists: functionalists, such as Durkheim and Parsons, who conceived of society as a unit, often using analogies of organisms from biology; organisationalists, such as Weber and Blau, who did not necessarily regard society as a single organism, but simply choose to focus on the ordered way the parts come together; and power-structure writers such as Foucault, who believed that social analysis revealed power structures in society through the use of language.

Having examined literature representing the most prominent perspective of social research, what makes a systemic approach less desirable than an interactionist approach for research on the

contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate? The problem with applying this framework to the analysis of contemporary social actors such as parties and movements is that certain a priori assumptions are made about the interrelationships between the participants which may not be justified. In the case of the functionalist and organisational writers, this may mean, for example, assuming a hierarchy of the concepts republic and monarchy, under which all other concepts can be organised. This may bias the research and fail to uncover other possibilities, such as the fact that the key issue is democracy, for example, and that it means different things for different participants. For example, how would the research proceed from a power-based perspective, such as that applied by Marx and Foucault? A power-based systemic analysis could commence with the context in which the research is set, that of political parties seeking election and single-issue movements who are not seeking election. An assumption may be made that all behaviours of political parties can be explained by the need to attract votes. The researcher may consciously or unconsciously exclude data that does not demonstrate their thesis, biasing the research against revealing other explanations. The accomplishment of the comprehensive and detailed application of discourse analyses in this study is that it reveals the social and theoretical constructions of debate, recommending the discourse analytical method to other social research settings. The focused attention of the language as the social actor assumes an interactionist perspective.

One may ask: what is wrong with presenting an hypothesis and testing the data to confirm or reject it? However, the systemic approach is not simply about hypothesis testing given that there has, to the author's knowledge, been no attentive, discursive analysis of

the texts of the participants of the Australian monarchy-republican debate. Given the newness of the content, there may be few options for the analysis under a particular umbrella, such as Marxism. The purpose of this account of systemic theories is not to diminish the role or contribution of the aforementioned writers to sociological theory, method and content, but to show them to be less suited than an interactionist perspective to illuminating the construction of the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s.

### **Interactionism**

Interactionist, functionalist and systemic writers share the same objective of explaining social phenomena. Whereas functionalist and systemic writers study society from the perspective of a whole social system, an interactionist approach involves the study of society through the interactions between individual actors. Two of the most prominent interactionists were George Herbert Mead and Erving Goffman. Goffman (1959) analysed social interaction from the perspective of the individual. Nevertheless, he was concerned with how 'establishments' governed the ways in which individuals communicated with each other and projected their perceptions of themselves.

Mead (1934) argued that human thought, experience and conduct are essentially social and that they owed their nature to the fact that human beings interact in terms of symbols, the most important of which are contained in language. Interactionism has also been called 'symbolic interactionism'. The object or event being described in the interaction is not taken to be of value in itself, but is valuable in so far as it represents the meanings which the social actors convey in describing the object or event. The interactions

reflect shared meanings of the object or event (interpretations), and the responses and subsequent interactions inform the observer of the roles which the actors have in relation to each other. It is assumed that reality is itself socially constructed. Garfinkel (1967: 3), for example, argued that the influence of external factors on social situations is overrated and that people use their creative abilities in social situations to construct reality.

Mead (1934: 26) argued that 'it is impossible to conceive of a self outside of social experience'. Individuals, Mead argued, experience themselves not directly, but in relation to how others experience them. They use the experience of others as their frame of reference. It is language, Mead (1934: 7, 34-6, 71) argued, that gives rise to a self which is experienced through social interaction. Language is the mediator between the self and society by facilitating role-play between actors. Language allows the individual to be an object to itself, or another to oneself. Role-playing links the self with society in that the realisation of one's self is the same event as the discovery of society. The child learns to play roles, that is 'to take the role of the other', and, in doing so, learns the significance of the roles being assigned to them. The child takes on roles with 'significant others', whose attitudes are central to the formation of their self-concept. The later learning of the significance of roles for society as a whole coincides with a discovery of the 'generalised other'. Mead summarised the role of the individual in society by suggesting that social interaction can only occur when the individuals use as reference points the attitudes of the rest of the community.

The role of interaction in creating social beings was also explored by Cooley (1939: 13, 23, 54), who argued that the essentially social nature of human beings arises in their interaction with others in their

‘primary group’. ‘Human nature’, Cooley stated, ‘is not something existing separately ... In those simple face to face groups that are somewhat alike in all societies ... human nature comes into existence. Man does not have it at birth; he cannot acquire it except through fellowship, and it decays in isolation’. Cooley argued that ‘intimate face to face interactions and cooperation’ are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual, who identifies with and has sympathy with others in their primary group. The individual desires to be well thought of in the group. Cooley argued that ‘primary groups are primary in the sense that they give the individual (their) earliest and completest (sic) experience of social unity, and also in the sense that they do not change in the same degree as more elaborate social relations, but form a comparatively permanent source out of which the latter are ever springing’. He also concedes that, ‘of course they are not independent of the larger society, but to some extent reflect its spirit...’. The experience of the individual in the group is extended to Cooley's account of society, that ‘always and everywhere men seek honour and dread ridicule, defer to public opinion, cherish their goods and their children, and admire courage, generosity and success ...’.

The socially constructed nature of interaction is borne out through social role-playing. Berger (1963: 111-2, 115-25) extended the analysis of the relationship between role-play and individual identity. ‘Role theory’ is the view that a person *is* the mask that they must wear in playing a social role. Berger argued that ‘identity is not something “given”, but is bestowed in acts of social recognition’. Every act of social affiliation involves a choice of identity. Interactionism does not attribute a fixed role to the individual in their relationships with others. Roles change as

circumstances change. Each situation in which an individual becomes involved holds specific expectations and demands particular responses of them and a role is the typified response to a typified situation. Roles carry with them both certain actions and the emotions and attitudes that belong to these actions. Although role-playing is generally spontaneous and unplanned, the role forms and shapes both the action and the actor. The 'true' identity of the actor is in the enumeration of the roles that they play. Normally one becomes what one plays at and pretending is difficult. The obvious response to this is the question of consistency, reliability and trustworthiness. To this question Berger responded that the preparedness of others to role-play with a person, and the psychological need for a consistent self-image, depends on them presenting a relatively consistent picture to the world.

The assumptions of interactionism, therefore, are that:

- the meanings given to objects and events are man-made and make human interaction possible;
- the meanings are not pre-existing but are created, developed and changed;
- the language used to describe objects and events is meaningful and active in itself, not merely a reflection of reality; and
- the role the actors take on in the interaction is not fixed but depends on how the actor perceives the situation, because, it is assumed, in interacting with others, social actors create their own meanings and construct their own reality.

## **Interactionism in Monarchist and Republican Society: a Focus on Language**

This study is situated under the umbrella of interactionism. For methodological reasons, the focus is, more specifically, on language. The next chapter will show that the language-focussed research undertaken in this study overcomes challenges to the trustworthiness of qualitative research. It is worth recalling the aforementioned authors for whom language was a primary focus. Language, as a focus of study, has come to the fore in the writings of Foucault and Habermas, although through systemic perspectives. Chomsky (1988) used linguistic analysis to show a ‘manufacture of consent’ and ‘propaganda’ in American foreign policy, but the approach was primarily linguistic rather than political or sociological. Fairclough (1989: 5), a Marxist, used ‘critical language study’ to show ‘generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as the hidden effects they may have on that system’. Although Fairclough justified a domain of sociology for the study of language, he, a priori, linked language to power relations and, thereby, structured his study of language to demonstrate his original argument. Although this study, as the Methods chapter will explain, is also set up or organised to reflect the findings, the structure of the write-up of this study is designed to present a convincing exposition of social activity of the language itself.

It has already been made clear that this study parts company with the systems perspective. Nevertheless, Fairclough (1989: 6-14) provides a valuable account of the role of language in social research. Fairclough identifies five forms of language-focussed study, the most fundamental of which is linguistics, which has

developed the understanding of phonology, syntax, morphology and semantics to provide a wide range of resources, and which retains language as a study for its own sake. Sociolinguistics developed in response to linguistics' ignorance of 'socially conditioned variation in language', although it retains the same emphasis on language study as an end in itself. Pragmatics focuses on 'speech acts' to suggest that utterances are themselves social actions conveying intentions and meanings. It has been argued that, in isolating patterns of speech, the emphasis on pragmatics has overestimated the extent of people acting strategically in their speech acts, and, in focusing on single utterances rather than extended discourse, has underestimated the difficulty in reconciling what is said with what is meant. Cognitive psychology has focused on the comprehension of language from the perspective of the individual. These approaches have analysed language in disciplines other than sociology. Fairclough argues that a focus on language, which he calls 'critical language study' (CLS) to emphasise the value of studying language for its own sake, is a part of a broader 'cross discipline' of 'discourse analysis', and has the potential to reveal the social structures which underlie the use of language.

For the researcher who finds the study of language interesting, discourse analysis provides an opportunity to analyse the interaction of social actors. Nevertheless, an interest in language as the sole reason for applying discourse analysis to sociology is insufficient. For the uniquely sociological context and, in relation to the political subject matter of this research, Chilton and Schaffner (1997: 211) outline the socio-political significance of discourse analysis by asking the following question: 'in which ways can the linguistic choices of the author be interpreted as functioning in a ... strategic

manner, given the wider political culture and the narrower political context?’.

Murray Edelman (2001) and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1992) are concerned with the modalities of political persuasion, and successfully engage political analysis in a social context. Their illumination of the active role of language in the sphere of political practice provides a specific context for the analyses of discursive devices which political parties and organised movements employ in their attempts to persuade their audiences. Edelman argues that the pressure-filled context of modern politics drives political ‘elites’ (such as political parties) to strategically organise language to achieve short-term goals. Successful leaders already share conventional beliefs that are held by influential groups. The influence of language is its appeal to shared beliefs and ‘images’:

All the elements that constitute language are influential symbols and, therefore, readily shaped into meanings that serve particular interests ... (Edelman, 2001: 103).

Kathleen Hall Jamieson analyses strategic devices which the media and politicians use to hide and distort the truth in order to appeal to voters. These include lying, employing dramatic language or images, creating dualities of us/them and good/bad, and being strategic without being seen to be strategic. Jamieson argues that such ‘dirty politics’ demean the democratic process and polity. She argues that political campaigns should, instead, feature:

fair, accurate, contextual, comparative, engaged discourse by candidates ready to take responsibility for the claims they make, and to either defend or repudiate claims made by others on their

behalf ... (They) should engage argumentation rather than assertion, differentiation rather than vilification (and) substantive engagement rather than storytelling (Jamieson, 1992: 11, 266).

The way that discourses in this study are illuminated is by analysing the consistency and variation of uses of the same key term within the same texts and across texts by other parties and/or movements. In summary, no overarching ideology or view of society will govern the process or the theoretical approach. Rather than subjecting the data to hypothesis testing, this study starts out from the assumption that the best use of the data will be made by subjecting it to a detailed discourse analysis. The sample is generalisable, appropriate and manageable. This certainly does not exclude the possibility of unearthing an explanation similar to that of the systemic writers. Indeed the data available provides the best of both worlds. The specific manner in which the data will be analysed to explain the theory and practice of monarchy, republicanism and the constructions of discourse is the subject of the 'Methods' chapter.