

CHAPTER 6

ORGANISED MOVEMENTS IN AUSTRALIA

This chapter also puts forward two arguments. First, it is argued that the analyses of the texts of organised movements, like those of political parties, reveal two competing interpretations of republic: minimalist and maximalist. These mutually exclusive interpretations of republic centre on the perceived compatibility of a republic with Australia's current democratic system of government. The patterns in the employment of concepts by the ACM and the Monarchist League show that they, like the Liberal and National parties, believe that a republic constitutes a different form of government from the system of democratic government operating in Australia. This interpretation of republic relies upon linking the concepts of constitution, head of state and monarchy as indispensable components of democratic government. The reliance upon these concepts to frame an interpretation of republic justifies the recognition of a maximalist interpretation of republicanism. The ARM advocates an Australian republic. Nevertheless, the patterns of concept use show that the ARM, like the ALP, does not advocate changing Australia's system of government but is about changing the symbols of Australia's democratic system of government to more appropriately reflect Australia's status as an independent nation. In other words, the ARM's interpretation of republic relies on the notion of Australia, and is quite independent of notions of constitution, democracy, government, head of state and constitution in constructing its interpretation of republic. Because the intention of the ALP and the ARM is for the actual operation of Australian

government, the Constitution and the head of state to remain unchanged, they espouse a minimalist interpretation of republicanism.

What makes the discourses of the organised movements different from political parties is that the interpretations of republicanism of the movements do indeed coincide with positions in the debate. That is to say that, in advocating an Australian republic, the ARM relies upon a minimalist interpretation of republic, and the endorsement of the constitutional monarchy by the ACM and the Monarchist League is underpinned by a maximalist interpretation of republic. The analyses of political parties did not show the same correlation between positions in the debate and interpretations of republic, the Democrats and the Greens, for example, drawing on a maximalist interpretation of republic to advocate an Australian republic.

The second argument of this chapter is that the analyses of the discursive devices in the texts of organised movements show that, compared to the texts of political parties, the texts of movements are less cautious and deferential and more forceful in the manner in which they construct and maintain the debate. The analyses also show that some discursive devices correspond with positions held in the Australian monarchy-republican debate and, like the texts of political parties, reveal opposing views on whether political elites should lead or follow public opinion. This establishes sets of discursive devices which make organised movements and political parties distinctive in the ways in which they create and maintain debate, as well as constructing models of public opinion.

The movements selected are the three high profile movements in the debate: the Australian Republican Movement (ARM), the Australians for Constitutional Monarchy (ACM), and the Monarchist League. These movements were chosen because they have exclusive claim to the domain of organised movements. This is evident in the fact that the websites of each of these movements make reference to each of the two other movements and refer to no other movements. This is taken to be confirmation of their dominance of the monarchy-republican debate at the level of organised movements. The three movements represent the range of positions in the monarchy-republican debate in Australia, the ARM supporting a republic and the ACM and the Monarchist League supporting the constitutional monarchy. The data for this chapter is taken from websites for the three movements, as they appeared on 7 July 1997. As for political parties, this is generalised to represent the 'contemporary' debate, and the '1990s', from the pro-republican Prime Ministership of Paul Keating and leading up to the 1999 referendum.

As expected, each website contained a multitude of links and was structured differently from each of the other two websites. This raised the challenge of finding a manageable amount of data to analyse and a comparable format across the three movements. This challenge was met by selecting only those documents which, by their title, suggested that they were a summary, an introduction or a statement of views. All of the optional headings and subheadings which appeared on the websites are presented below. The documents chosen for analysis, on the basis of their 'summary' format, are italicised. It is important to note that neither the word length of the articles, nor the number of articles chosen, are relevant either for the quantitative analysis or for the qualitative analysis.

This is because the analyses consider, first, the *relative* frequency of the occurrence of the concepts and, second, because the analyses consider the ways in which the concepts are used by the author to convey their views, irrespective of how frequently the concepts are mentioned.

The documents which were available for analysis were presented on the websites of each of the movements and are as follows. The documents which are analysed in this chapter are italicised (refer to Appendix A).

ARM – Introduction, Platform, The Australian Republican Movement, Why do we want a Republic?, Key Issues to Promote, Towards an Australian Republic (not analysed because it is a word-for-word replica of the Introduction), Republican Events, Membership, Branches, Forums, From the Chair, Newsletter.

ACM – Charter, Platform, Objectives, Policy, History, Strategy, Local Grass Roots Autonomy, Grass Roots Supporters, Overview, Finances, Speeches by Neville Bonner, Sir Harry Gibbs, Justice Michael Kirby.

Monarchist League – *Platform, Noticeboard, Monarchist Shop, Membership, Articles, Constitutional Convention, Constitutional Research and Studies, Links.*

Discourse Analyses of Organised Movements

The structure of this chapter mirrors the structure of the analyses of political parties and is organised into the following four sections:

1. Relative frequency of concepts
2. Analysis of conceptual themes
3. Relative frequency of discursive devices
4. Analysis of discursive devices

Each of these four sections has two parts, the first of which is an investigation of the individual movements. The second part is an investigation of the movements as a collective domain. An overall perspective of the chapter can be gleaned by briefly introducing the concepts and the discursive devices which are derived from the analyses to follow. Each concept and discursive device employed in the texts is defined in appendices D and E.

Concepts

Republic

Government

Head of State

Democracy

Constitution

Monarchy

Australia

Discursive Devices

The text places the debate in a formal and structured context.

The text seeks to persuade the audience to adopt their position in the debate.

The text seeks to appear to be objective.

The text seeks to identify as one of the audience.

The seeks to appear to be consultative.

The text seeks legitimacy by appealing to credible sources.

The text expresses disapproval of the conduct of the debate itself.

The text minimises the perceived weakness in its position.

The text employs strong or emotional language.

Table 6.1 presents the raw data, that is, the total number of key terms within each concept group and the total number of concepts all together. The ARM and the ACM are evenly matched, with 133 and 120 concepts respectively, while the Monarchist League has only 33 concepts. The number of concepts in an article (which can be taken to mean the length of an article) is itself no indicator of the way in which each movement understands the monarchy-republican debate. Table 6.2 is more important because it shows the relative frequency of the occurrence of each concept, that is, it compares the proportion of the total concepts for a particular movement that each concept group comprises.

The occurrences of an individual concept, as a proportion of the total concepts, are even across the three movements for concepts of republic and democracy. The relative frequency with which the concept republic featured in the documents of the ARM, ACM and Monarchist League are 13.5%, 12.5% and 12.1%, respectively, with a mean of 12.7%. The relative frequency with which the concept democracy featured in the documents of the ARM, ACM and Monarchist League are 11.3%, 10.8% and 9.1%, respectively, with a mean of 10.4%. The relative frequency of occurrences of the concept government, for the ARM, is 16.5%. The relative frequency for the ACM is 21.7% and for the Monarchist League is 12.1%. The mean is 16.8% which is above that of the Monarchist League and below that of the ACM. The concept of Head of State

is referred to more than twice as often by the ARM than the ACM, and four times as often than the Monarchist League, at 12%, 5% and

Concepts in the Texts of Organised Movements

Relative Frequency of Concepts in Texts of Organised Movements

Table 6.1: Quantity of Concepts per Movement

CONCEPT	ARM	ACM	Monarchist League	TOTAL
Republic	18	15	4	37
Government	22	26	4	52
Head of State	16	6	1	23
Democracy	15	13	3	31
Constitution	5	16	11	32
Monarchy	10	20	5	35
<u>Australia</u>	<u>47</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>76</u>
TOTAL	133	120	33	286

Table 6.2: Quantity of Concepts as a % of each Movement's Total Concepts

CONCEPT	ARM	ACM	Monarchist League	AVE
Republic	13.5%	12.5%	12.1%	12.7%
Government	16.5%	21.7%	12.1%	16.8%
Head of State	12%	5%	3%	6.7%
Democracy	11.3%	10.8%	9.1%	10.4%
Constitution	3.9%	13.3%	33.3%	16.8%
Monarchy	7.5%	16.7%	15.2%	13.1%
Australia	35.3%	20%	15.2%	23.5%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	

3%, respectively. The differences in relative frequencies of concepts are even starker for the concept Constitution. One-third (33.3%) of all concepts used by the Monarchist League are devoted to the Constitution, which is around 2.5 times the relative frequency of Constitution concepts presented by the ACM (13.3% of total concepts) and more than eight times the relative frequency of the

ARM (3.9% of total concepts). The concept of Monarchy is referred to approximately twice as often by the ACM (16.7%) and Monarchist League (15.2%) as the ARM (7.5%). References to the concept Australia featured prominently in the texts of the ARM, accounting for 35.3% of all concepts. References to Australia accounted for 20% of total concepts for the ACM and 15.2% (just under half that of the ARM) for the Monarchist League.

The enumeration of concepts provides a context for the qualitative analyses. The qualitative analyses are more important in buttressing the arguments for unique theories of republicanism and discursive devices which characterise the context of the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s. Nevertheless, a quantitative analysis provides the opportunity to see if there is a correlation between the relative frequency with which a concept is used and its significance in the text's interpretation of republicanism. The relative frequencies of the concepts Constitution, Monarchy and Australia reflect their importance in the movements' interpretations of republic. The concepts Constitution and Monarchy are referred to more frequently in the texts of the ACM and the Monarchist League than the ARM, and the concept Australia is referred to more frequently in the texts of the ARM than in those of either the ACM or the Monarchist League. Nevertheless, the relative frequencies of the occurrences of the concepts Republic, Government and Head of State do not reflect their significance in their respective movements' interpretations of republic. One would have to conclude, therefore, that, as for political parties, the relative frequency of concepts in the texts of organised movements is not a reliable indicator of the concepts' significance in the theoretical construction of the debate.

Interpreting the Concepts in the Texts of Organised Movements

The following analysis is a step-by-step account of the interrelationships of the concepts in the texts of the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League, revealing the minimalist and maximalist discourses at work. As for the political parties, this a summary of the findings. (The comprehensive account of the allocation of key terms to concept groups and the identification of conceptual themes, on which the trustworthiness of this research is based, are to be found in Appendices C and D). Because the texts comprise no more than three pages for each movement, page references will not feature in the analysis (but can be verified in Appendix A). As with the texts of political parties, the language used to present the data is deliberately taken directly from the texts, although, to maintain the readability of the discussion, inverted commas will only be used for special emphasis.

Interpreting Republic

The contexts in which terms in the category republic are presented, reveal that the ARM supports Australia's move to a republic and the ACM and the Monarchist League oppose the move to a republic in preference to retaining Australia's constitutional monarchy. There are two strands to the ARM's interpretation of republic. The first is that the ARM seeks a uniquely Australian head of state with symbols which reflect Australia's independence and uniqueness. Much of the ARM argument centres on unique symbols of nationhood, and the argument that a republic, more so than a monarchy, reflects the 'reality of Australia today'. The second strand is that it would be more appropriate for the Australian nation to have symbols of sovereignty rather than Australian citizens being

subjects of the British monarchy. The ARM points out that many members of the Commonwealth of Nations are republics and that the commitment to changing to a republic is gathering momentum among various politicians and parties, such that the debate has changed from a question of whether Australia should become a republic, to what type of republic Australia should become. True to the minimalist interpretation, the ARM claims that it wants to retain Australia's current system of parliamentary democratic government, with a continued separation of the roles of head of state and head of government.

The ACM opposes and resolves to defeat 'republicanism', which, it argues, threatens the unity and stability which Australia's current system of government has provided. The ACM argues that Australia currently has egalitarianism and independence, and that 'some members' of the ACM contend that Australia is, in any case, a 'crowned republic', with the most desirable features of republican government. The ACM points out that many people have immigrated to Australia, having escaped republics in which Presidents routinely abuse their power. A republic will give more power to politicians, suggest the ACM. The ACM is concerned about the disunity that they believe would eventuate if some states become republics and others remain constitutional monarchies.

The Monarchist League also opposes a 'presidential republican system of government' on the grounds that it cannot guarantee the freedoms Australians currently enjoy under the constitutional monarchy. A republic will, in the view of the Monarchist League, introduce an extra political figure into the system of government. The Monarchist League argues that there is nothing inevitable about Australia becoming a republic. Like the National and Liberal

parties, this reflects an anti-elitist view even though organised movements also seek to influence public opinion. In summary, the ARM assumes the continued operation of Australia's parliamentary and executive democracy in an Australian republic, because the ARM sees the transition to a republic as compatible with the current system of government. The ACM and the Monarchist League, on the other hand, regard an Australian republic as incompatible with democratic government. This polarisation relies on two competing theories of republicanism: minimalism and maximalism.

The treatment of the concept republic in the texts of the ARM requires clarification in relation to the distinction between maximalist and minimalist republicanism. There are instances in which the texts of the ARM appear to go beyond the minimalist interpretation. Specifically, the ARM objects to the hereditary nature of the monarchy. From a discursive point of view this would appear to carry the anti-monarchist overtones of classical republicanism. After all, in the previous chapter, the Democrats and the Greens were relegated to the status of maximalist republicans because they sought more equality for disadvantaged Australians. One may well ask: is the distinction between minimalist and maximalist republicanism so flimsy that the inclusion of a couple of sentences about equality throws the text into a completely different ideological camp? Another way of asking this question is: would the inclusion of a couple of sentences about equality mean that the ALP would now be regarded as maximalist republican thereby rendering the distinction impotent? This is a serious question because it is not inconceivable that the ALP would advocate greater equality in our political system. On what basis, then, are the Democrats and the Greens recognised as maximalist republicans and the ARM, despite its apparently anti-monarchist arguments,

recognised as minimalist republicans? Is it simply too untidy or uninteresting to have three movements in the maximalist camp?

There is a key difference between the republicanism of the ARM, on the one hand, and the Democrats and the Greens, on the other. This difference is the cornerstone of the language-focussed analysis of political practice, as opposed to a purely theoretical analysis. The answer to the aforementioned questions is that the minimalist-maximalist distinction hinges decisively on the impact of a republic on the operation of Australian government. The positions in this regard are very clear. First, the Democrats and the Greens advocate a new political system; the ALP and the ARM do not. Second, the ALP and the ARM explicitly claim not to want to change the actual operation of Australian government. Therefore, the texts of the ALP and the ARM represent minimalist republicanism and the texts of the Democrats and the Greens represent maximalist republicanism. The analysis of the remaining concepts supports this dichotomy, the concepts forming consistent sets of discourses with which we can understand the monarchy-republic debate in Australia in the 1990s.

Interpreting Government

The relationship between the concepts of republic and government is a point of contention between the ARM, on the one hand, and the Monarchist League and the ACM, on the other. The ARM states that a republic would retain 'our successful system of parliamentary democracy', based on elections. This desire is confirmed by quoting the Republican Advisory's 'options for making the minimal constitutional changes needed to achieve a viable republic in Australia without changing our way of government'. The ACM, on

the other hand, sets out to ‘defend our constitutional system of government.’ The ACM presents Australia’s system of government as ‘unique’ in its provision of unity and stability. The ACM explicitly seeks to defend Australia’s system of government against republican government, and the accompanying threat of instability and insecurity.

The concept of government is tied to democracy, the Constitution and the Crown, even more explicitly in the text of the Monarchist League, which states that ‘the Australian Constitution was formulated by Australians, for Australia and ultimately voted on by Australians and (that they) resolutely oppose all moves to change our constitution from a constitutional monarchy to a presidential republican system of government’. The Monarchist League argues that a President would be a threat to stable democratic government, and that the debate itself is an example of governments seeking to impose their will on the people. This is a stark example of anti-elitism. The two competing interpretations of republicanism, minimalism and maximalism, are revealed by the uses of the concept government, the ACM and the Monarchist League contending that a republic is incompatible with democratic government in Australia, and the ARM contending that a republic is compatible with Australia’s current system of government.

Interpreting Head of State

Most references to head of state by the ARM refer to national identity in its insistence that ‘Australia’s head of state becomes an Australian citizen chosen by Australians’, not the head of state of another country, much less the ‘head of state for 15 other countries’. In supporting the retention of Australia’s current system of

government, the ARM emphasises that, for the most part, ‘the President will have the same role as the Governor-General,’ that ‘the functions of the President will be spelt out in the Constitution’, and that ‘the President (like the Governor-General) will act on the advice of the duly elected Government’. In terms of actual operation, the ARM expects the head of state to continue functioning as it has done.

The references to the concept head of state in the texts of the ACM involve a defence of the current role of the Governor-General, who, true to the maximalist interpretation of republic, is presented as an active participant in the democratic process. The ACM challenges republicans on the grounds that the Governor-General has played a protective role in Australian democracy, arguing that republicans ‘fail to tell us how they would safeguard the current Governor-General’s power to call and dismiss parliament, appoint and dismiss ministers, and command the armed forces’. In support of the interdependence of the head of state and the functioning of Australia democracy, the ACM states that the Governor-General ‘is always beyond political interference and will act to protect all Australians’. The role of ‘politics’ is again pitted in opposition to democratic values, although politicians themselves are the products of the democratic process. The ACM suggests that the current Governor-General is impartial, but that presidents routinely abuse their powers. In contrast with the argument of the ARM, that the head of state should be uniquely and exclusively Australian, the ACM suggests that ‘the Queen is represented for all practical purposes by the Governor-General, an Australian’.

The Monarchist League makes only one reference to the head of state, choosing to concentrate on the crown, the constitution and

democracy. The Monarchist League believes that the head of state should remain in the current form of the Governor-General. This is demonstrated by the single, unambiguous reference to the term president which reveals the fear that a 'republican president' would threaten Australian democracy. Consistent with the maximalist interpretation of republic, the interpretation of head of state is indispensably tied to interpretation of democratic government. For the minimalist interpretation of the ARM, the question of the head of state does not have a bearing on the question of an Australian republic.

Interpreting Democracy

The ARM, like the ACM and the Monarchist League, supports continued democratic government and the tradition of 'egalitarianism' in Australia, in which the Australian people vote, elect or choose their political leaders. As shown in the 'Literature Review' chapter, various strands of the traditions of monarchism and republicanism, as well as democracy and liberalism, have helped shape these notions of egalitarianism and franchise. The ARM foresees that a republican president will 'act on the advice of the duly elected government'. The head of state is linked not only to national identity and Australia in a 'past era', but also to democracy, the ARM insisting that the head of state should be chosen by 'merit rather than birthright'. The key point here is that all three movements claim to support the continuation of democratic government in Australia. Yet, the monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s, in the domains of political parties and organised movements, reveals that there are two opposing interpretations of the impact of a republic upon democratic government. One, the maximalist interpretation, is that a republic threatens democratic

government, and the other, the minimalist interpretation, is that the notion of a republic has no impact on the operation of democratic government in Australia.

The ACM and the Monarchist League regard the Constitution and the monarchy as sources, custodians and guarantors of Australian democracy, and not in opposition to or merely incidental to democracy. The Monarchist League and the ACM value Australia's enviable record of free, democratic and stable government, which they believe would be threatened by the introduction of a republic. The Monarchist League argues that the Australian people originally voted for the Constitution, and that 'no republican Constitution, however fashioned, can give Australians the near gilt edged guarantee of stable constitutional government and protection of our freedoms that the present Constitution has'. Although the ARM claims to endorse Australia's democratic system of government, the ACM and Monarchist League doubt the ability of a republican government to protect democratic government precisely because they regard republicanism as an entirely new system of government.

Interpreting Constitution

The ARM disapproves of the current Australian constitution on symbolic, rather than operational, grounds, stating that it is 'inappropriate' for an 'independent nation'. The ACM and the Monarchist League directly link the constitution to Australia's system of government, the ACM vowing to defend Australia's Constitution and 'constitutional' system of government which the Monarchist League also 'proudly upholds and defends'. The Monarchist League states that the current Constitution has guaranteed the 'freedoms' that Australians enjoy. The ACM also

links the Constitution to democracy by stating that '(t)he most free and stable countries in the world today tend to be constitutional monarchies'. In contrast with the ARM's symbolic objection to the Constitution, this commitment by the ACM to the current Constitution establishes the Constitution, in addition to the head of state, as crucial concepts for the maximalist interpretation of republic underlying the texts of the ACM and the Monarchist League.

Interpreting Monarchy

The ARM explicitly rejects monarchy on symbolic grounds, arguing that it is inappropriate for citizens of a democratic country to be 'subjects' of an 'hereditary', 'sectarian' monarch whose legitimacy derives from 'birthright' and 'discriminates' on the basis of 'gender' and 'religion'. The ACM, on the other hand, vows to defend the constitutional monarchy, on the basis of its contribution to Australian democracy, contending that Australia's democratic system of government is embodied in the constitutional monarchy and the Crown. The ACM argues that the Crown has served Australia well and has earned its place in the Constitution. The ACM also suggests that the Crown symbolises duty and service in government, and that, while politicians represent the majority, the monarch represents the interests of 'ALL AUSTRALIANS' (emphasis in original).

The Monarchist League also argues that the Crown plays an integral role in the Constitution. While the ACM states that some of its members simply 'admire Her Majesty', the personal aspect of the monarch's role is given even more weight by the Monarchist League who opposes not only any change from a constitutional

monarchy, but are hurt by any attempt to denigrate, vilify or subjugate the role of the Crown. The Monarchist League argues that the oaths of allegiance should remain intact unless the Australian people want to change them. The ACM suggests that the change from a constitutional monarchy to a republic will not be straightforward, if only because of the fact that Australia has seven constitutional monarchies.

In summary, the interrelationships of the concepts used by the ACM and the Monarchist League reveal the maximalist interpretation of republicanism in the following way. For the ACM and the Monarchist League, the head of state and the constitution are the guarantors of democracy in Australia. Since the monarchy guarantees the status of the head of state and the constitution, any change in the status of the monarchy is seen to be a threat to democratic government in Australia.

Interpreting Australia

The concept of Australia is centrally important in the texts of the ARM, which argues that Australia deserves a uniquely and identifiably Australian head of state, an Australian citizen elected by Australians. The ARM argues that the Queen does not represent the Australian people, as opposed to a representative who is internationally recognised. The ARM contends that the current arrangement, in which the Commonwealth of Australia is constituted under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, which comprises another 15 countries, is inappropriate for an independent nation. The ARM argues that a republic symbolises that Australia is a nation not defined by race, 'religion' or cultural background, but by a commitment to this land,

and to Australia's own unique institutions. The ARM points out that Australia today has a population from all over the world, with a diversity of tradition, united by geography, identity, our future and that of Australia's children. The ARM states that Australia would continue to be involved in international and regional associations, such as the Commonwealth of Nations and the United Nations were it to become a republic.

The ACM rejects the notion that the monarch is not Australian by pointing out that she is the Queen of Australia by an Act of the Australian Parliament. The ACM seeks to neutralise the issue of Australia in the debate by suggesting that Australia still has its independence which is not related to and does not require a change to a republic. The ACM also suggests that defenders of the constitution and the role of the Queen of Australia in it are not less Australian or less patriotic than are advocates of change. Indeed the ACM argues that the debate itself is based on an ignorance of history, outdated and discredited national fervour, and drawing on imported prejudices. The ACM links the debate itself to the unity of Australia by contending that we should not disrupt our nation with a divisive debate.

The Monarchist League also seeks to neutralise the issue of Australia by arguing that the Constitution was formulated by and for Australians. Reflecting their disapproval of the republican agenda, the Monarchist League argues that the Australian flag and other symbols of national identity should be retained unless the people of Australia choose to change them. This implies that, for the Monarchist League, the current symbols of Australian government appropriately reflect Australian identity.

Because the maximalist interpretation considers republicanism to be a different system of government than Australia's current system, the concepts of democracy, monarchy, Constitution and head of state are interrelated and employed by the ACM and the Monarchist League to construct the maximalist interpretation of republic.

Because the minimalist interpretation does not rely on democracy, government, head of state and Constitution to change the way they currently operate, the ARM employs only the concept of Australia to construct the minimalist interpretation of republic.

Discursive Devices in the Texts of Organised Movements

As stated in the previous chapter, the texts of the Australian political parties and organised movements are parts of the ongoing literary traditions of monarchism and republicanism that seek to adopt the most appropriate form and structure to accomplish their objectives. The analyses of the concepts revealed the theoretical underpinnings of the debate, an accomplishment of discourse analytic method and a language-focussed interactionist, rather than functionalist, perspective. The analyses of the discursive devices illuminate the various linguistic strategies, tools or devices that are used in the texts to persuade their audience to endorse their position in the debate. The analyses of both concepts and discursive devices in the domain of organised movements in this chapter will be compared with the analyses of the political parties. This will enable the concluding chapter of this study to paint a more complete picture of the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s and determine the most valuable ways to conceptualise this debate.

Relative Frequency of Discursive Devices in Texts of Organised Movements

Table 6.3: Quantity of Discursive Devices per Movement

DISCURSIVE DEVICE	ARM	ACM	Monarchist League	TOTAL
Formal Setting	8	8	2	18
Persuading Audience	21	43	19	83
Objective	1	1	-	2
Identifies with Audience	19	39	13	71
Consultation	5	-	2	7
Credible Sources	7	7	-	14
Disapproval of Debate itself	2	35	5	42
Minimising Weaknesses	12	-	-	12
Strong/ Emotional Language	-	14	5	19
TOTAL	75	147	46	268

*Table 6.4: Quantity of Discursive Devices as a % of each Movement's
Total Concepts*

DISCURSIVE DEVICE	ARM	ACM	Monarchist League	AVE
Formal Setting	10.7%	5.4%	4.3%	6.7%
Persuading Audience	28%	28.8%	41.3%	32.7%
Objective	1.3%	0.7%	-	1%
Identifies with Audience	28%	27%	28.3%	26.2%
Consultation	6.7%	-	4.3%	5.5%
Credible Sources	9.3%	4.8%	-	6.9%
Disapproval of Debate itself	-	23.7%	10.9%	11.5%
Minimising Weaknesses	16%	-	-	12.4%
Strong/ Emotional Language	-	9.6%	10.9%	9.9%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	

The three movements outlined the formal setting of the debate by introducing themselves and their positions (10.7% for ARM, 5.4% for ACM and 4.3% for Monarchist League). All three texts made relatively frequent use of terms which showed that they were seeking to persuade their audience to share their position in the debate and reject alternative positions (28% for ARM, 28.8% for ACM and 41.3% for Monarchist League). The only discursive device which appears in equal proportion across the three movements is the desire to identify with the audience, which accounted for approximately one quarter of each movement's total number of discursive devices (28% for ARM, 27% for ACM and 28.3% for Monarchist League).

The difference between the results for the discursive devices and the concepts in the domain of organised movements is that not all movements employed all of the discursive devices. The ARM did not employ strong or emotional language, although strong or emotional language accounted for approximately 10% of each of the ACM's (9.6%) and Monarchist League's (10.9%) total number of discursive devices. The ACM did not demonstrate the importance of being seen to consult with the Australian people, although this accounts for 6.7% of the ARM's total number of discursive devices and 4.3% of the total number of the Monarchist League's discursive devices. Although the Monarchist League did not demonstrate a need to appear to be objective, such references account for only 1.3% of the ARM's total number of discursive devices and 0.7% of the Monarchist League's total number of discursive devices. Deriving legitimacy from the credibility of other sources is a discursive device which the ARM uses twice as often as the ACM (9.3% as opposed to 4.8%), although it is not used at all by the

Monarchist League. Similarly, the ARM is unique in demonstrating that it perceives the audience to have an aversion to change, which accounts for 16% of the total number of discursive devices. This means that the ARM, like the ALP, minimises, or plays down, the amount of change that a republic will bring. This contrasts strikingly with the ACM and the Monarchist League, who do not exhibit the need to minimise their perceived weaknesses. The reverse is the case in questioning the nature of the debate, which the ARM sees no need to do, but which features substantially in the text of the ACM (23.7%) and also in the text of the Monarchist League (10.9%).

As for the political parties, the quantitative analysis of the discursive devices plays a different role in the qualitative analysis than for the concepts. The quantitative analysis necessarily mirrors the qualitative analysis and is, therefore, a reliable predictor of the nature of the discursive devices in the texts. It will mirror the qualitative outcomes and is, therefore, a summary of the findings as well as bearing witness to the thoroughness of the investigation.

The Nature of Discursive Devices in the Texts of Organised Movements

In summary, then, the organised movements construct debate in the following ways. The texts of all three movements establish the formal setting of the debate, seek to persuade their audience to share their position in the debate, seek to identify with the audience, and acknowledge that they are competing for audience approval. The ACM is the only movement not to seek to appear to consult the Australian people. The Monarchist League is the only movement that does not seek to appear to be objective and does not appeal to

the credibility of other sources to legitimise its position. The ARM is the only movement not to question the nature of the debate and not to use strong or emotional language. The ARM is the only movement to show evidence that it seeks to play down the degree of change involved in becoming a republic. This is further strong evidence for a distinction between leaders and followers in public opinion. The strong or emotional language is evident in the texts of the movements who believe that they have more to lose from the debate, namely, the ACM and the Monarchist League. The worst outcome for the ARM is the maintenance of the status quo. The ACM and the Monarchist League are also concerned about the nature of the debate, and their claim that republicanism is being forced onto the Australian people demarcates them clearly as followers of public opinion. The ARM does not respond to the conduct of the debate itself. The ARM, advocating a leadership perspective in public opinion, but acknowledging that it must convince its audience, seeks to play down the amount of change involved in the move to an Australian republic.

Therefore, the following analysis does not present the discursive devices in mutually exclusive, coherent sets, unlike the analysis of the concepts which located the movements into one of two theoretical interpretations. The following account is a summarised exposition of the discursive devices employed in the texts of the organised movements. (The comprehensive account of the allocation of key terms to particular discursive devices, on which the trustworthiness of this research is based, is to be found in Appendix I). Because the texts comprise no more than three pages for each movement, page references will not feature in the analysis (but can be verified in Appendix A). As was the case in the analyses of the political parties and the concepts employed in the

texts of the movements, the language used to present the data is deliberately taken directly from the texts, although, to maintain the readability of the discussion, inverted commas will only be used to highlight particular points.

The text places the debate in a formal and structured context

This is an important discursive device which all political parties and organised movements share. Formally setting up the debate establishes the significance of the debate. The three movements introduce themselves before setting out their arguments. This shows the reader that there is a formally defined arena in which the debate or forum takes place, rather than a random presentation of views. This also suggests a structured format which enables comparison between the three movements. The ARM issues its declaration in the introduction to the document, and makes reference to its central aim and objectives, and the platform which is comprised of four elements. The pro-republican position of the ARM is introduced, as are the variety of options and policies including what some participants believe should happen and what they are supporting. The ACM outlines its charter, mandate and policy. The ACM provides details about the structure of its organisation, that it is a non-profit company whose objectives are in accordance with its charter which is annexed to its Memorandum of Articles of Association. The Monarchist League does not provide further information about its organisation. In general, the texts of the political parties and the organised movements exhibit a clear and formal structure and format that formalises the debate and, which they share with the traditional and contemporary monarchist and republican writings examined in the literature review.

The text seeks to persuade the audience to adopt their position in the debate

All three movements make it clear that their explicit objective is to persuade the audience to accept their point of view in preference to that of another/other positions. This involves a combination of promoting their own view or presenting the opposing view in a less attractive light. The language choice is designed to persuade the reader to share the viewpoint espoused in the text. The ARM's arguments are couched in persuasive terms, referring to the 'inappropriate' nature of the British head of state. The aim of the ARM is to ensure that Australia has a uniquely Australian head of state which will confirm Australia's identity, while retaining Australia's successful system of government. The ARM devotes most word space to promoting its own position, whereas the Monarchist League and the ACM challenges the republican arguments more frequently than they present their own view. This is not surprising, given that, in the general context of debate, the ARM is 'promoting' and the ACM and Monarchist League are 'resisting'.

The ACM outlines what it believes should happen, and the views or notions that they hold, suggest, maintain or are advocating. They support and defend, and are committed to defending, the role of the Crown in the Constitution and believe and assert that it has served Australia well. The ACM opposes, resists, and rejects a republic. The ACM makes explicit reference to republicans, a minority group or select few, who are trying to divorce important issues from the debate. Republicans are portrayed by the texts of the ACM as if they are arguing among themselves, and as behaving like used car salesmen who want you to buy their car without telling you about its

make, model or safety devices. The ACM differs from the ARM and the Monarchist League in that it leaves itself open to ‘contemplate’ all positions.

The Monarchist League has a simple, clear and unwavering platform or stand. The Monarchist League states that it has always maintained, and will continue to uphold, the Constitution and endorses the role of the Crown in it. In defence of the constitutional monarchy, it opposes a change to a republic. The Monarchist League also argues that it is wrong for the symbols of Australia’s constitutional monarchy to be removed or amended, reflecting what its members believe. The three movements present their positions in the monarchy-republican debate with force and, as single issue, non-elected entities, in a less guarded fashion than do the political parties.

The text seeks to appear to be objective

Both the ARM and the ACM feature only one example of perceiving their audience to expect objectivity in the reporting. The ARM states that it has undertaken a detailed examination, and the ACM states that it has examined the evidence. The Monarchist League presents no examples of perceiving their audience to expect objectivity. In general, the movements are less occupied with the need to appear to be objective than are the political parties.

The text seeks to identify as one of the audience

The three movements present a small number of examples that they believe that the audience expects the movements to identify with

them. The ARM, the ACM and Monarchist League make use of the terms 'our' and 'we', and the ACM shows that they expect their audience to take an interest in the variety of people it represents, by pointing out that the ACM comprises people representing different ethnic groups, generations, and different experiences in life. Although the movements do not exist in isolation of public opinion, the relative frequency with which the political parties, who rely on appealing to the electorate on a broad range of matters, appear to seek to identify with their audience exceeds that of the organised movements.

The text seeks to appear to be consultative

The ARM and the Monarchist League present a small number of examples that indicate that they believe that the audience expects to be consulted. No such examples are shown in the texts of the ACM. The ARM seeks discussion with Australians, to encourage people to participate through grass-roots involvement, and to promote an understanding of the issues. The ARM's promotion of the issues is included as one of the objectives of the ARM, in the same list as desiring the outcome that Australians support the move to an Australian republic. Therefore, the interpretation of the ARM's consultation with the people is to educate them sufficiently that they come to share their desire for an Australian republic. The ARM's desire to lead public opinion is again evident. The Monarchist League states that it wants the Australian people to have an awareness and knowledge of the issues.

The text seeks legitimacy by appealing to credible sources

Both the ARM and the Monarchist League use terms which show that they derive legitimacy from people whom they presume to have credibility with their audience. The Monarchist League presents no such terms. The ARM draws support through reference to the then Prime Minister, Paul Keating, the Republic Advisory Committee, and the fact that there was relatively broad based support from the ALP, Democrats, Greens, Independents, and, most importantly, many prominent Liberal MPs. The ACM derives support from a survey conducted by Dunn and Bradstreet, in the *Business Review Weekly*. The ACM also consulted Australia's most eminent constitutional lawyers, judges and ex-High Court judges. The ACM states that it has 14 000 supporters. The text of the Monarchist League does not appeal to credible sources for legitimacy. Apart from the Democrats and the Greens (the two minor parties) the ALP, Liberal and National parties are more cautious than the movements in not drawing on the credibility of other sources to legitimate their position. In general, the discursive devices used by the political parties, relying on their audience for election, show them to be more cautious and deferential to their audience and the discursive devices of the movements, as single issue, non-elected advocates, show them to be more overt and forceful in the presentation of their positions.

The text expresses disapproval of the nature of the debate itself

The ARM does not question the nature of the debate itself. The ACM and the Monarchist League take very strong views against the conduct of the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia. The ACM argues that the debate is divisive, unnecessary,

irrelevant and distracting from the 'real' challenges, and that the debate is an experiment in theory to satisfy the envy and ambition of a select few. The ACM argues that the costs would be better spent on issues of greater 'urgency', including reducing Australia's unemployment among youth, the future of Australia, reconciliation with Aboriginal Australians, improved relations with our Asian neighbours, restructuring the economy, public health, education, and working to the benefit of business. The ACM also argues that the debate is founded on 'ignorance of history', and 'outdated national fervour' and draws on prejudices. The Monarchist League argues that the debate is not of the people but of a vociferous, privileged 'minority' supported by a 'biased' media.

The patterns in the use of this discursive device by political parties and organised movements show an interpretation by all parties and movements of public opinion as a leader-follower relationship. The difference is, however, that the parties and movement which advocate change, the ALP, the Democrats, the Greens and the ARM, do not question the nature of the debate. Opponents of an Australian republic believe that public opinion should involve the decision-makers following the people. This is the basis of their objection to the nature and conduct of the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s.

The text minimises the perceived weakness in its position

The ARM is sensitive about change, appearing to play down constitutional 'changes' as 'minimal', and emphasises what the ARM would be retaining, that is, what will remain unchanged and still continue or stay the same. The ACM and the Monarchist League actively resist change, the ACM committing itself to

preserving the present system of government, and arguing that they are not less patriotic than are proponents of change. The ACM is also careful not to be seen to resist change unreasonably, pointing out that the Queen's title has already been changed to Queen of Australia. The text of the Monarchist League does not use change as a discursive device. In addition to questioning the nature of the debate, the attempts, or lack of attempts, to minimise weaknesses is consistent with the proposition that the participants of the monarchy-republican debate in the domains of political parties and organised movements are also debating whether elites should lead or follow public opinion. The texts of the ALP and the ARM seek to minimise the degree of change involved in advocating a republic and the texts of the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League, trumpet the unsavoury risks that democratic government in Australia faces if Australia changes to a republic.

The text employs strong or emotional language

The texts of the ACM and the Monarchist League employ strong or emotional language in attempting to persuade their audiences that an Australian republic invites unforeseen and undesirable consequences. Strong or emotional language can be considered terms which go beyond what is basically necessary to present the facts. The platform of the ARM does not employ such language. The 'agitation' or 'demands' for a republic are described in the platform of the ACM as a 'push' which should not be 'forced' onto Australians when there are other important issues, such as Australia's 'shockingly' high unemployment level. The ACM states that Australia's system of government should not be 'tinkered with', a phrase that conjures images of unskilled experimentation. The ACM contends that the republicans draw on 'outdated' and

‘discredited’ national fervour, as well as ‘imported’ prejudices. This qualifies as strong or emotional language in light of Australia’s immigrant history. Some members of the ACM are ‘hurt’ and ‘angry’ at the ‘attacks’ on the Queen. The platform of the ACM also uses metaphors, likening the republicans to a ‘bunch’ of used car salesmen who ‘demand’ that you buy their car without knowing without informing the customer of its make or model. The Monarchist League uses equally strong or emotional language in ‘vigorously’ opposing any attempt to ‘denigrate’, ‘vilify’, or ‘subjugate’ the role of the Crown under the Constitution, and ‘impose’ a republic.

Yet again the nature of discursive devices reflect distinctions between those who advocate change and those who resist it. While strong or emotional language is not a feature in the texts of the ALP, the Democrats, the Greens or the ARM, it features in the texts of the National Party, the ACM and the Monarchist League. This is explained by the fact that, as mentioned earlier, opponents have more to lose than do the advocates of a republic. The language of the ACM and the Monarchist League is more vigorous and emotional than that of the National Party, which can be understood in light of the political parties’ need to tread more carefully to appeal on a wider variety of platforms. The success or failure of organised movements is not defined by election, and the fact that the texts of the Liberal Party, although presenting arguments against the change to a republic, do not exhibit strong or emotional language, can also be understood in this light.

Conclusion

The analyses of the texts of organised movements show that, like the political parties, minimalist and maximalist interpretations of republicanism underpin the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s. In the cases of the movements, these interpretations also correspond with positions, for and against, in the debate. The comparison of the texts of political parties and organised movements show that these interpretations of republicanism are the primary theoretical determinants of the debate in the domains of political practice, and transcend particular positions in the debate. In establishing minimalist and maximalist theories of republicanism, the method of discourse analysis reveals that the way in which the concepts interact is to form two distinctive, interdependent and mutually exclusive sets of concepts. The defining point of these two sets of concepts is the actual operation of government and whether an Australian republic is seen to constitute a new and distinct form of government or is seen to be a continuation of Australia's current form of government with changes to the symbols of that form of government. The two interpretations of republic are comprised of the following combinations of concepts:

Minimalist

Australia

Maximalist

Head of state, Government, Democracy, Constitution, Monarchy

This accomplishment of discourse analysis places political practice at the centre of this study, making the theoretical basis of the Australian monarchy-republican debate unique in the republican tradition, recommending the use of discourse analysis in other social research settings, and justifying a language-based interactionist perspective on the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate.

There is some overlap between political parties and organised movements in the discursive devices employed in the texts. The texts of most or all parties and movements establish a formal setting to the debate, seek to persuade their audience, seek to appear to be objective, seek to identify as one with their audience and appeal to the credible sources to support their position, to varying degrees. This is not surprising given that their shared objective is to persuade the audience to endorse their position to effect or resist change. The analyses of the texts of organised movements also mirror the subsets of political parties, in that, for some discursive devices, the positions in the debate are more reliable indicators of use of a particular discursive device than are the domains of parties and movements. This is the case for disapproval of the debate, redressing perceived weaknesses, and use of strong or emotional language. These three devices, in particular, shape a shared understanding of political society, which cuts across the two domains, as a leader-follower relationship. Advocates of change endorse a model of strong leadership of public opinion which the opponents of a republic reject.

Nevertheless, there are three patterns in the employment of discursive devices in the texts of parties and movements, which establish the primacy of the social domain, and not the views for or

against an Australian republic, as the primary determinants of the nature of discursive devices. First, even in cases in which the position held in the debate prevails over domain in terms of discursive device employed, the patterns of such employment mirror the broader trends in the distinction between parties and movements. Specifically, the disapproval of the nature of the debate by opponents, the minimisation of perceived weakness by the advocates of change, and the use of emotional language by the opponents in the debate, were more pronounced in the texts of the movements than for the parties. Second, there are, in any case, discursive devices which are employed by the parties and not by the movements, and vice versa. Third, even in the cases of the discursive devices which are employed in the texts of both parties and movements, there is a discernible difference in the frequency and intensity of the use of these devices. The domain to which a participant belongs is more indicative of the discursive devices it employs than the views held or the interpretations which underpin those views.

The political and social context of parties and movements was established in the introductory chapter of this study. Political parties depend for their survival on being elected, and are, therefore, at the mercy of their audience on this and other issues, while organised movements are not elected and are often organised around a single issue. Reflecting these different contexts, the distinctive sets of discursive devices employed in the texts of parties and movements are as follows:

Political Parties

Organised Movements

Acknowledge two sides of debate	Strong persuasion of audience
Opponents of change/ mass theorists on public opinion avoid 'politics'	Attempt at objectivity
Strong identification with audience	Identification with audience
Strong attempt at objectivity	Strong disagreement over debate by opponents of change/mass theorists of public opinion
Appeal to credible sources for support	Strong use of emotional or strong language by opponents of change
Strong commitment to consultation	Commitment to consultation
Persuade audience	Minimisation of weaknesses
Use of strong language by opponents of change	
Disagreement over debate by opponents of change	
Strong minimisation of weaknesses by advocates of republic	
Establish formal setting of debate	
Appeal to credible sources for support	

These sets of discursive devices are applicable to other social research settings in that the parties and movements would be expected to apply these devices in other debates. In other social research settings this also means that the political and social context of any particular domain dictates the discursive devices it employs. Central to the validation of the discourse analyses of the political parties and organised movements is the commitment to account for each occurrence of each concept and discursive device. This has occurred in the appendices and in the quantitative analyses. This also provides an opportunity to examine the bearing of relative frequency of a concept or discursive device on the manner in which

it is employed by a party or movement. The distinctive, interdependent and competing sets of concepts which make up the maximalist and minimalist interpretations of republic are only able to be understood through a qualitative analysis. The quantitative analyses of the discursive devices, on the other hand, bear a direct relationship with the manner in which discursive devices are employed by parties and movements to construct debate. The concluding chapter will establish the contribution of these analyses to conceptualising the monarchy-republican debate in Australia in the 1990s, to understanding the ways in which political parties and organised movements construct and maintain debate, and how the knowledge and methods of these analyses may best contribute to future social research.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION: THEORETICAL AND SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE AUSTRALIAN MONARCHY- REPUBLICAN DEBATE IN THE 1990S

Conceptualising the Australian Monarchy-Republican Debate in the 1990s

The introductory chapter outlined the aims of this study as:

- 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.

The foregoing investigation of the texts of political parties and organised movements shows us that, for each of the two questions raised as the aims of the study, there are five ways that the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia can be analysed:

1. According to the *position* held, for or against, on the monarchy-republican issue. This cuts across the domains of parties and movements and pits the ALP, the Democrats, the Greens and the ARM against the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League.

2. According to the *interpretation* given to the concept 'republic'. This cuts across both positions for or against an Australian republic and across domains of parties and movements. According to this perspective, we would contrast the maximalist interpretation of the Liberal Party, National Party, the Democrats, the Greens, the ACM and the Monarchist League with the minimalist interpretation of the ALP and the ARM.
3. According to the *domain* of the participants. This involves contrasting the political parties: the ALP, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Democrats and the Greens, with the organised movements: the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League.
4. According to the *status* of a political party, depending on whether it is a major or minor party. This perspective would combine the ALP, the Liberal Party and the National Party on the one hand, and the Democrats and the Greens, on the other.
5. According to the *mode* of communication of the texts of political parties. This would contrast the party platforms of the ALP, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Democrats and the Greens, with the leaders' addresses of the ALP, the Liberal Party and the Democrats.

So which is the best way to conceptualise the theoretical and the discursive foundations of the Australian monarchy-republican debate in the 1990s? There are short answers to both parts of this question. The analyses reveal that the Australian monarchy-republican debate is not a debate of monarchism versus republicanism at all. It is about two competing interpretations of republicanism: maximalism and minimalism. What is more, these interpretations are unique in the republican tradition. To date, existing literature has failed to acknowledge the important

distinction this study has uncovered between minimalist and maximalist interpretations of republicanism.

With regard to the construction of discourses, the analyses show that political parties and organised movements employ sets of discourses which are unique to their domains either as political parties or organised movements. More importantly, the manner in which a social actor organises its discourses is dictated by the sociopolitical context of the domain from which it originates. The construction of these discourses illuminates the relationships between political history, sociological methods, and political theory and practice.

Maximalist and Minimalist Republicanism

The method of discourse analysis uncovered competing sets of discourses that yield two distinct interpretations of republicanism. The categories of maximalism and minimalism cut across viewpoints held in the debate, for or against an Australian republic. The distinction between the two theories centres on the ability of democratic government in Australia to cope with the introduction of a republic. The minimalist perspective is held by the ALP and the ARM, both of whom advocate an Australian republic. They believe that a republic does not constitute a new form of government and that Australian democratic government can continue to operate as it has done. They interpret the change in symbolic terms, believing that the move to a republic will endow Australian government with symbols of a uniquely Australian identity.

The maximalist interpretation maintains that a republic constitutes a new form of government that promises to replace or change Australia's current system of government. This interpretation

underpins the opposition of the Liberal and National parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League, who argue that a republic places democratic government in Australia under threat. The Democrats and the Greens are advocates of a republic but also rely on a maximalist interpretation of republic, arguing that a republic will make Australia more democratic.

The theories of minimalist and maximalist republicanism were constructed by analysing the relationships between the concepts in the texts of the parties and movements. These concepts were themselves identified by an extensive coding system.

Interdependent sets of concepts were found to have constructed the two theories of republicanism. In the cases of the Liberal and National Parties, the ACM and the Monarchist League, for example, the interrelationships between the concepts in their texts established a maximalist interpretation of republic, on the basis of the following logic:

1. The monarchy, represented by the Governor-General as the head of state, underpins democratic government in Australia.
2. The monarchy is protected by the Constitution.
3. Therefore, any change to the Constitution, which the move to a republic inevitably requires, is a threat to democratic government in Australia.

The interdependence of the concepts head of state, democracy, monarchy, Constitution, and government, sustains what can be called a maximalist theory of republicanism.

The position of the ALP and the ARM, in contrast, can be summarised as follows:

1. Australia is already a soundly established democracy.
2. As established by the Australian Constitution, the office of the head of state is held by the Governor-General. The person appointed to this position represents the British monarchy.
3. The office of the head of state has symbolic status only.
4. For the sake of Australian national identity, the office of the head of state should represent Australians only.
5. Therefore, a change to a republic will consolidate Australian identity without undermining its democratic foundations.

The ALP and the ARM position sustains what can be called a minimalist position. The Democrats and the Greens agree that a republic is important for symbols of Australian identity. Yet, they disagree with the first notion, about the quality of Australian democracy. They advocate an increase in access to the political system. Because their republic is qualitatively different from the current system of government, the Democrats and the Greens also espouse a maximalist interpretation of republicanism.

Monarchist and Republican Traditions and the Australian Debate

As stated in the 'Literature Review' chapter, Australia's political inheritance has the following features:

- 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)

These are features of a political system that all parties and movements within Australia claim to cherish. Australia is called a constitutional monarchy, and yet republican language remains obscure. It has been argued that the language of liberalism superseded the language of republicanism, as the latter carried connotations of rebellion (Pettit, 1993: 163; Warden, 1993: 88). The wider traditions of monarchism and republicanism show the fluidity of political language and theory.

How does this relate to the monarchist and republican traditions and the distinction between classical and neo-classical republicanism? What are the features of traditional theories of monarchism and republicanism that make them unsatisfactory as models to explain the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate?

Classical monarchism denotes the rule of a hereditary monarch. Nevertheless, the monarchist tradition has contributed to the welfare state, and the ceremony associated with monarchy has created, for the people, symbols of good government. Interpretations of monarchy as deities and tyrants came to be overshadowed by notions of moral fortitude, protection of the people, and monarchy limited by the rule of law.

Classical republicanism is an ancient form of government that represents the rights given to a very limited set of 'citizens'. Neo-classical republicanism is a combination of republicanism and more democratic ideals. It involves the eighteenth century revival of classical republican language and theory, centred on rights and a mixed constitution. It heralded the emergence of liberal theories centred on the rights of the individual. The republican tradition was always founded on the rule of law and an abhorrence of corruption and arbitrariness. It came to champion enhanced political access.

As demonstrated earlier, both monarchism and republicanism bequeathed many essential features of contemporary Australian government. The very fact that all parties and movements wish to retain the basis of Australian democracy (the Democrats and Greens wanting to improve it) shows the power of political and historical continuity. All Australian parties and movements want to retain, enhance, protect or symbolise 'democracy', which is code for a combination of monarchism, republicanism and liberalism. This essentially makes the Australian monarchy-republican debate an exercise in political practice rather than political theory.

The shared consensus over the preferred model of government in Australia has meant that the debate is not centred on the benefits of monarchism versus republicanism. Neither monarchist theory, nor the classical/neo-classical dichotomy explains the Australian monarchy-republican debate. The debate is about competing interpretations of republicanism. Therefore, while there is historical continuity with the monarchist and republican traditions, there is not theoretical continuity. The theoretical bases for arguments for and against an Australian republic are founded on the ability of Australian government to cope with a republic, justifying a new

theoretical framework. The ability to demonstrate that the split occurred not between monarchism and republicanism, but rather, over competing interpretations of republicanism, serves to justify a language-focussed symbolic interactionist approach to the monarchy-republican debate in Australia, as adopted by this study.

Discourses of Political Parties and Organised Movements

The second aim of this study was to determine the ways in which political parties and organised movements construct and maintain debate. In terms of the discursive devices that parties and movements use to seek to persuade their audience, the analyses clearly establish sets of discursive devices according to the domain represented. These devices are governed by the sociopolitical context of the two particular domains investigated in this study, namely, political parties and organised movements.

Given the influence of political practice on political theory in the monarchist and republican traditions, what are the practical implications for the analyses of discursive devices in the texts of parties and movements? Many of the discursive devices employed in the texts of parties and movements overlap on account of the shared need to persuade the audience. Both domains establish the formal and structured setting of the debate, seek to persuade their audience, appeal to credible sources for legitimacy, appear to be objective, appear to identify with the audience, and appear to be consultative. There are some devices that are distinctive to particular domains. For example, only the political parties formally acknowledge both sides of the debate, and the role of the audience in determining the outcome of the debate.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, in some cases, the employment of a particular discursive device appears to reflect the position held in the debate, rather than the domain from which it originates. For example, opponents of an Australian republic, within the ranks of both parties and movements, object to the dangers of an increase in 'politics' that would be caused by the move to a republic. Opponents of an Australian republic use strong and emotional language, and disagree with the conduct of the debate itself. Advocates of a republic minimised their perceived weaknesses, in particular, the degree of change involved in moving to a republic.

Yet, even in these cases, the relative frequency of the employment of these devices, and the manner in which they are presented, strongly mirror the aforementioned contexts of parties and movements. The texts of political parties exhibit a strong desire to be consultative, to identify with the audience, and to minimise perceived weaknesses. The texts of organised movements exhibit a stronger desire to persuade and polarise the audience and to use strong or emotional language, than do the political parties. The distinct pattern that emerges is that political parties present themselves as being balanced and even-handed. In this manner, they attempt to engage as wide an audience as possible to persuade voters. The movements are much more forthright (relative to parties) in presenting their views. Hence, they run the risk of appealing to only the converted as they will attract voters of similar concern and opinion. This makes sense in light of the fact that political parties depend for their survival on being elected, and are, therefore, at the mercy of their audience on this and other issues. The movements, on the other hand, are not elected and are often organised around a single issue. The environment in which a

domain of political activity operates dictates the discursive devices it uses. At the level of political parties and organised movements, the domain from which an actor originates is more indicative of the rhetorical devices that will be employed than the views held, or the interpretations on which these views rely.

The analyses of the discursive devices of political parties and organised movements have shown that the sociopolitical contexts of parties and movements demand that they persuade their audience to adopt their positions in a debate. The competitive environment of parties and movements demands forceful and uncompromising positions to be advocated. The effect of this context upon the texts of parties and movements is 'spin-doctoring', or dressing up the case, rather than an objective search for the truth. For example, the opponents of a republic knew that an argument based on the benefits of monarchism would not convince their audience to oppose the republic. Instead they presented a case for the dangers inherent in Australia becoming a republic. The supporters of a republic knew that their audience would not celebrate major change, and so, they sought to convince their audience that an Australian republic would be symbolic only and that there would be no changes to democratic government in Australia. Neither the ALP nor the ARM sought to explain how the change to a republic would not present any threat to democratic government. Neither the Liberal nor the National parties, nor the ACM nor the Monarchist League, sought to demonstrate or explain how a republic could not be contained in symbolic form only. No parties or movements sought to address the arguments surrounding the interpretation of republicanism. One of the undesirable effects of adversarial politics in the monarchy-republican debate is that the debate does not benefit from engaging various arguments and perspectives in a reasoned analysis. The

employment of discourse in the sphere of practical politics, which includes political parties and organised movements, endorses the research undertaken by Jamieson (1992) and Edelman (2001). Discursive organisation is a powerful tool for persuasion, and the competitive, 'elite', and adversarial politics of the Australian monarchy-republican debate champions perception over reality, and style over substance.

Language-focussed Interactionism

The contribution of the analyses of the monarchist and republican traditions to the theorisation of the contemporary monarchy-republican debate in Australia is that the language-focussed symbolic interactionist approach is validated. The fluidity of language and theory, evident in the monarchist and republican traditions, has shown that language can be coded in terms of its attempts to justify social or political action. The application of discourse analytical method revealed the minimalist/ maximalist distinction as the most valuable way to theorise the contemporary Australian debate. The point is that this theoretical distinction is revealed through discourse analysis. It suggests the use of discourse analytical methods in other research settings. The analyses of the discursive devices employed in the texts of the parties and movements also affirm the dominance of the socio-political context in shaping the language employed in the texts. Language has been chosen as the guiding frame of reference and method to illuminate the social practices in these texts.

Contributions of the Research

A summary of the contributions of this research is as follows:

Maximalist-minimalist republicanism – This is an original conceptualisation of the theoretical underpinnings of the contemporary Australian monarchy-republican debate.

Sets of discursive devices – The conclusion of the ‘Movements’ chapter presents original sets of specific discursive devices which predict the manner in which political parties and organised movements construct and maintain debate in general. These can be applied to any other research setting that involves political parties and organised movements. The methods for discerning these discursive devices are also applicable to wider social fields.

Rules for coding language – The ‘Methods’ chapter presents a set of guidelines for grammatically coding language of a manageable set of data to maintain the validity of qualitative research. These guidelines are also original.

Documentation of arguments for and against an Australian republic – The ‘Literature Review’ analyses literature from a wide range of Australian sources and comprehensively organises the arguments for and against an Australian republic.

Applicability of discourse analysis – The conclusions which have been drawn from these analyses stand as an accomplishment of discourse analysis. The discourse analyses produced consistent sets of interpretations of republicanism, and yielded sets of discursive devices, which reflect the distinctive sociopolitical contexts of the parties and movements. The comprehensiveness of the method

ensures validity and reliability by accounting for all occurrences of concepts. This does not merely account for those that support a particular hypothesis, but also accounts for those that require further clarification, as shown in the discussion on the classification of the Democrats and the Greens as maximalist republicans, and the ARM as minimalist republicans, in the fifth and sixth chapters, respectively. This degree of rigour and transparency recommends discourse analytical method to other social research settings.

Relationship between political theory and practice – The ability of political practice to influence political theory is illuminated within the literature. Tying the historical with the theoretical development of monarchism and republicanism has shown language and theory to be reflexive.

Active and constructive role of language in debate – The revelations of the discourse analyses rely upon language as the focal point, and reveal the theoretical underpinnings and modes of constructing debate. The importance of a language-focused study was validated in the analyses of the patterns of discursive organisation in the wider monarchist and republican traditions.

Role of discourses in social life – The study presents original analyses of the ways in which concepts in a debate combine to form sets of ideas and distinctive discourses. Maximalist and minimalist interpretations of republicanism have been shown to be constructed from limited sets of competing discourses. For example, minimalism relies on the concept ‘Australia’. The concepts head of state, monarchy, government, democracy and Constitution are not needed to construct minimalism. This does not mean that the ARM and the ALP do not like democracy, for example. It means that because democracy is assumed to continue in a republic, it is not

significant in the construction of minimalism. The same applies to the concept Australia for the interpretation of maximalism.

Public opinion – The discourse analytical method yields strong evidence for a wider view of public opinion in the sphere of practical politics. Polarised positions were taken on whether or not political ‘elites’ should lead public opinion.

Comparative research – This study demonstrates the benefit of comparative research across two sociopolitical domains. For example, an analysis restricted to organised movements would not have distinguished positions from interpretations as a means of theorising the republican debate. Analysis of the political parties, on the other hand, demonstrated not only shared positions in the debate, but alternative interpretations of republicanism, which cut across positions held in the debate. This was the case with the ALP, on the one hand, and the Democrats and the Greens, on the other.

Quantitative and qualitative analyses – Insight was gained into the relationship between quantitative and qualitative research methods. Although quantitative analyses can support the validity of qualitative analyses by documenting and accounting for data, the relative frequency of data is an unreliable predictor of the relative importance of a concept in theorising debate. Nevertheless, in terms of searching for instances of a particular social phenomenon, quantitative analyses help to guide the qualitative analyses.

The Ongoing Debate

The monarchy-republican debate in Australia is ongoing. A survey of Australian print media between January 2000 and July 2002

reveals that the republicans still face an uphill battle (eg. Steketee, *The Australian*, 11 June 2001; *SMH*, 4 December 2001). The pro-monarchy Howard government was re-elected (Craven, *The Australian*, 7 December 2001), republicans continue to disagree on what is the best model of republican government (Cassin, *The Age*, 22 July 2001; *The Courier Mail*, 6 December 2001; Gordon, *The Age*, 24 July 2001, 28 July 2001; MacKenna, *The Australian*, 25 June 2001), clear information on either position in the debate is still unavailable (Williams, *The Australian*, 27 August 2001), and many Australians, particularly women, are reported to have felt alienated from the debate (Dodson, *The Age*, 22 June 2001). Overall, however, the reporting of events and opinions expressed in the media since the 1999 referendum was defeated, although considerably less than prior to the referendum, has been overwhelmingly favourable to the republican position. These events and opinions are as follows:

- ALP leader Beazley re-affirms the party's support for a republic (*The Age*, 22 June 2001).
- ARM vows to consider a direct election model at Corowa conference (Steketee, *The Australian*, 15 June 2001).
- High profile republicans, including Professor George Winterton and Father Frank Brennan, advocate direct election of the head of state, deemed to have a greater chance of success in a referendum (Cassin, *The Age*, 22 June 2001; Barnes, *The Australian*, 4 December 2001; *The Courier Mail*, 6 December 2001; Craven, *The Australian*, 7 December 2001).
- 'Old' era was seen to have sufficiently passed for a republic to be considered by most Australians (Barnes, *The Australian Financial*

Review, 2 April 2002), exemplified by the death of the Queen Mother (*The Australian*, 20 July 2002).

- High-profile members of the Liberal and National parties came out in support of a republic, including Tim Fisher (*The Age*, 1 August 2001; Gordon, *The Age*, 28 July 2001; Irving, *The Australian*, 9 August 2001; Price, *The Australian*, 30 July 2001; Shanahan, *The Australian*, 28 July 2001) and Mark Vaile, Deputy Leader of the National Party (Price, *The Australian*, 28 July 2001). Pro-republican Treasurer Peter Costello's high prospect of becoming the next Liberal Prime Minister was seen to overshadow the impact of the re-election of the pro-monarchy Howard government (Peatling, *SMH*, 20 October 2001). Former Liberal Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser observed that Prime Minister John Howard was being increasingly isolated on the republican issue (Nicholson, *SMH*, 29 July 2001).
- Year 2001, being the centenary of Federation, is seen as symbolically important (Verghis, *SMH*, 1 January 2001).
- Popularity of Sir William Deane is used as a model for a non-executive head of state (Irving, *The Australian*, 9 August 2001; Winterton, *The Age*, 12 July 2001).
- The potential 'yes' vote among those who reported to have voted for the Coalition, in the previous federal election, and who also reported to have opposed a republic in November 1999, but who reported to have become supporters of an Australian republic, increased by 7% (Shanahan, *The Australian*, 6 August 2001).
- Media and academic debate continues over the inadequacy of the Constitution regarding the legal relationship with the United Kingdom, over-emphasising state rights, and failure to enshrine Indigenous rights (Day, *The Daily Telegraph*, 24 October 2001; Kelly, *The Australian*, 11 April 2001 and 21 August 2001; Marr,

SMH, 10 March 2001; Murray, *SMH*, 29 November 2001; Putney, *The Herald Sun*, 29 June 2001, 5 July 2001, *SMH*, 1 January 2001, 5 June 2001; Stephens, *SMH*, 10 March 2001; Williams, *SMH*, 7 August 2001).

- Prince Phillip allegedly remarks that, by rejecting the republic, Australians 'can't see what's good for them' (Brown, *SMH*, 19 January 2002).

The ALP, Democrats, Greens and the ARM continue to support a republic. The Monarchist League and the ACM continue to support the retention of the constitutional monarchy. However, positions in the debate were no longer as clearly partisan within the Liberal and National parties as they were prior to the 1999 referendum. More importantly, the republic has retained some media attention, even if politicians have used it to accuse each other of 'diversionary tactics' from the 'real issues' (Gordon, *The Age*, 24 July 2001) or of playing 'dirty politics' (*Australian Financial Review*, 28 July 2001). There is much to suggest that the 1999 referendum did not spell the end of the monarchy-republican debate, and the next referendum is only a matter of time.

Much has happened since the 1999 referendum. This study has, however, been restricted to analysing texts developed prior to the referendum. The discursive analyses of parties and movements, developed within this study, utilised a symbolic interactionist framework to assess their desire to persuade the Australian public either to support a republic or retain the constitutional monarchy in the forthcoming referendum. To this end, the websites of the parties and movements, and the addresses by party leaders in the lead-up to the referendum, were deemed to provide the most concise and

dramatic illustrations of the discourses of parties and movements at work.

Does the maximalist-minimalist distinction and the sets of discursive devices continue to dominate the current debate? The account of the organised movements in the previous chapter enabled us to compare various positions and interpretations of the republican debate. It allowed us to compare the discursive devices used by political parties with those used by organised movements. It is interesting to take a brief look at the positions of the movements five years onward, especially in light of the referendum which has been conducted on the issue. Such an analysis of political parties cannot be undertaken as the party platforms have all but disappeared from the web. The ALP and the Greens made minor references to the republican issue. Appendix J shows the positions of the ALP, the Greens, the ARM, the ACM and the Monarchist League on 26 November 2002. The Australian Republican Movement's website has changed considerably since 1997, and shows that it is very conscious of being seen to consult with the people. Of the six aims of the ARM, three are dedicated to 'promoting community discussion', 'encouraging greater understanding', and 'emphasising that Australia will only become a republic if Australians vote to support it'. The ARM offers six models of selection of the head of state, from a Prime Ministerial appointment through to direct election by the people of Australia. The ARM is still minimalist but has changed its position to support the election of the head of state. Given that the 1999 referendum was defeated, this is a powerful confirmation of the impact of the sociopolitical environment on the ways in which debate is constructed and maintained.

This confirms that the ARM believes that the referendum for a republic was lost on the grounds that:

1. The community was not widely consulted and involved.
2. That the preferred model was direct election of the head of state by the people, rather than by parliamentary election.

The ALP and the ARM, to date, do not appear to recognise the need to allay fears aroused by opponents that the move to a republic involves major change to Australia's democratic system of government.

The websites of the ACM and the Monarchist League remain untouched. This is an indication that both of these movements believe that they had been given a vote of approval by the people of Australia. As noted earlier, the ARM, having the most ground to make up, has been much more consultative than it was. This is evidence of the strong impact of the sociopolitical context on the organised movements. The success of the 1999 referendum in resisting the republic has created little incentive for the ACM and the Monarchist League to alter their websites.

As mentioned, the dramatic outcome in terms of the comparison of websites of the political parties, five years on, is the stark absence of any substantial new material and the removal of old information. The positions of the parties have been taken off the ARM website, and the parties have not developed their own websites or even created links relating to the monarchy-republican debate. Only the ALP and the Greens featured material on the republic. These are brief references, in contrast with the platforms that existed prior to the 1999 referendum.

The ALP lists eight principles of 'quality government'. The second of these is 'Respect for the Constitution' and the third is 'The Republic and National Identity'. Respect for the Constitution deals with the federal compact. The fact that the Constitution is deemed worthy of respect, and that it is not subjected to attack, shows that the ALP is seeking to appeal to the audience that rejected the republic in 1999. Of the six points listed under The Republic and National Identity, three are concerned with the people being 'fully involved', engaging in 'community debate', and participating in 'plebscites' on the republican issue. This shows the impact of the referendum result on the ALP. The ALP and the ARM have sought to re-engage the people in the republican debate, but, as mentioned, they have not engaged the arguments of opponents of a republic. The Greens expressed their commitment to a republic. This is listed as the first of 11 'short-term targets'. The Greens polled exceptionally well, attracting approximately 10% of the vote in the Victorian election in December 2002, and won the previously safe ALP seat of Cunningham in a by-election in October 2002. The organisation of parties into major and minor party groups may need to be recast at some stage in the future.

The political and media attention given to the monarchy-republican debate subsided after the 1999 referendum. The political and media agenda have been dominated by terrorism, following the terrorist attack on New York on 11 September 2001 and in Bali on 12 October 2002, in particular. This has contributed to the reduced attention given to the monarchy-republican debate. The lack of available material on the monarchy-republican debate by the political parties since the 1999 referendum reflects the election-based sociopolitical context of political parties. The movements, on

the other hand, have sought to strengthen their appeal to the reader, and there is little doubt that their role in the debate will become increasingly important.

Political Climate

Finally, there are some conclusions which can be drawn from the analyses which, given the practical focus of this study, could be of use to assist the pro-republican position. These are worth presenting as recommendations:

- The objection to ‘politics’, made by those opposed to a republic, is nonsensical. Politics is germane to democracy itself. Politicians, as the elected representatives of the people, are meant to debate policy issues and seek the views of their constituents. Civic education could provide a better-informed citizenry, and, therefore, a better quality of politician to redress this kind of rhetoric, which could be argued to be an abdication of democratic responsibilities of elected leadership.
- The argument put forward by some opponents of an Australian republic, that Australia is a ‘crowned republic’ and, therefore, does not need any change, contradicts maximalist arguments that a republic threatens Australian democracy and is, therefore, undesirable. This contradiction should be highlighted to assist the Australian public evaluate arguments for and against a republic.
- The foundation of the republican support for parliamentary election of the head of state was that not even the current head of state is elected, and not even the current Prime Minister is directly elected. It has been argued that this would create an American-style

executive presidency that Australians have reported to have opposed, and change Australia's current system of government. The ALP and the ARM must realise (and the signs are promising) that argument alone will not win the debate. They must focus on the motivations and sentiments of the Australian people, as well as its opposition. This was ignored in the 1999 referendum campaign. Following arguments by Bagehot, Atkinson and Winterton, the current arrangements, in which the head of state is understood to be a representative of the Queen, has served worthwhile purposes in representing 'good' government to the people. Australian voters need to be reassured that 'good' government will be retained by a nominally republican system containing wholly Australian symbols.

Further Research Recommendations

The accomplishment of the two aims of this thesis, and the aforementioned insights gained from the findings which are less central to the aims of the study, raise the need for further research:

- The most pressing research need is for the texts of political parties and organised movements to be compared with the print media. The mediating influence of a critical and persuasive print media could confirm or recast the aforementioned findings of the theoretical and discursive construction of debate, and further illuminate the interaction of political theory and practice. We have seen the impact of the different contexts of the debate, that is, the objectives, motivations and vested interests, of the elected parties and the non-elected single-issue movements, in defining the discursive devices employed in constructing and maintaining debate. Comparative social analysis across domains is invaluable, and could be expanded to include editorials, political writings and

letters to the editor in the media. I have already argued that an analysis of organised movements alone would have produced an overly simplistic view of the relationship between positions held in a debate with the theoretical interpretations that underpin those views. It will be interesting to compare these contexts with the media representations of the monarchy-republican debates. Such an exercise could work:

- To confirm that the nature of discursive devices are more related to the domain from which they originate, rather than in the view held, even on topics that do not involve fundamental change to the political system. Such research could also compare two opposing views from two different domains, and compare them across two issues, one involving significant change, for example, the monarchy-republican debate, and one not perceived to involve a change to the policy-making structure itself.
- To analyse the interpretations of concepts, and the nature of discursive devices found in the discourses of classical and academic texts as unique domains, in addition to parties, movements and media.
- To investigate other models, such as the Irish republic, in which the introduction of a directly elected president does not appear to have subverted the rule of parliament.
- To expand the comparative analytical devices by analysing the texts of a minor party that advocates the retention of the constitutional monarchy. This would reaffirm or recast the primacy of rhetorical devices according to domain, status as a major or minor party, or position in the debate.
- To compare the dynamic and interactive nature of internet-based material with 'hard copy' material. For example, unless the platforms of the political parties and organised movements,

analysed in this study, had not been printed out and included in the appendices, it would not be possible to reclaim those platforms in their 'original' form.

- More sophisticated statistical analysis would be better able to compare the relative frequency of concepts with qualitative interpretations.
- The same research project could be undertaken from the point of view of public opinion to determine if the findings can be generalised to broader political ideologies, such as liberalism, conservatism or Marxism. This could also help to explain why opponents of the republic are espousing 'anti-elitism' while still leading public opinion. Edelman (2001) suggested that the pressure-cooker environment in which political parties operate produces short-term solutions to problems. Jamieson (1992) targeted the 'dirty' devices to which political 'elites' and the media resort to win votes. A study of public opinion could identify the degree to which the public and the wider political culture must take responsibility for cynical or 'anti-political' attitudes, which cause political leaders to behave this way, and the role the media, the education system, and the political leadership can have in changing this culture.
- The fact that the Australian people did not endorse the proposed change to a republic, in the 1999 referendum, shows that the ALP and the ARM were unsuccessful in 'containing' the debate to a minimalist interpretation of republicanism. It could be valuable to investigate the first stages in which the ALP and the ARM lost control over the debate. This could assist in the development of effective strategies to countermand maximalist interpretations of republicanism in the future.

REFERENCES

Adams-Jefferson Letters. 1959, L.J. Cappon (Ed.), Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

The Age. 22 June 2001, 12 July 2001, 22 July 2001, 24 July 2001, 28 July 2001, 1 August 2001.

Aitkin, D., Jinks, B. and Warhurst, J. 1989, *Australian Political Institutions*, 4th edition, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Appleby, J. 1986, 'Republicanism in New and Old Contexts', *William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 43, pp.20-34.

Aristotle. 1981, *The Politics*, Ringwood: Penguin Books Australia.

Atkinson, A. 1993, *The Muddle-Headed Republic*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

_____, 1993b, 'The Australian Monarchy: Imperfect but Important', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.67-82.

The Australian. 11 April, 2001, 11 June 2001, 15 June 2001, 25 June 2001, 28 July 2001, 30 July 2001, 6 August 2001, 9 August 2001, 21 August 2001, 27 August 2001, 4 December 2001, 7 December 2001, 20 July 2002.

The Australian Financial Review. 28 July 2001, 2 April 2002.

The Australian Democrats. 1997, 'Policy Statement', Retrieved from 4 June, 15:52:00, <http://www.republic.org.au/party/democrats/htm>

The Australian Greens. 1997, 'Policy Statement', Retrieved from 12 June, 21:59:20, <http://www.republic.org.au/party/greens/htm>

_____, 2002, 'Democracy', Retrieved from 26 November, <http://www.greens.org.au/g1democracyfull.htm>, pp.1-7.

The Australian Labor Party. 1997, 'Policy Statement', Retrieved from 12 June, 22:00:17, <http://www.republic.org.au/party/labor/htm>

_____, 2002, 'Chapter 16: Delivering Quality Government', Retrieved from 26 November, http://www.republic.org.au/policy/platform2000/chapter_16.html, pp.1-4.

The Australian Republican Movement. 1997, 'Introduction', 'Platform', 'The Australian Republican Movement', Retrieved from 11 June, 13:27:41,
<http://www.republic.org.au/arm/towards/htm>

_____ 2002, 'Six Models Introduced', Retrieved from 26 November, <http://www.republic.org.au/arm/towards/htm>, pp.4-5.

Australians for Constitutional Monarchy. 1997, 'Charter', 'Platform', 'Objectives', 'Policy', Retrieved from 12 June, 22:04:48,
<http://www.mq.edu.au/hpp/politics/platform/htm>

_____ 2002, 'Charter', Retrieved from 26 November, http://www.norepublic.com.au/Identity_Charter.htm, pp.1-3.

Bagehot, W. (1867) 1963, *The English Constitution*, London: Collins/Fontana.

Banning, L. 1978, *The Jeffersonian Persuasion: Evolution of a Party Ideology*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bean, C. 1993, 'Public Attitudes on the Monarchy-Republic Issue', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.190-206.

Berger, P.L. 1963, *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*, USA, Doubleday and Co.

Black, A. 1997, 'Christianity and Republicanism: from St Cyprian to Rousseau', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 91, no. 3 (Sept), pp.647-656.

Blau, P.H. 1964, *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, John Wiley and Sons Inc.

Bock, G., Skinner, Q. and Viroli, M. (Eds) 1990, *Machiavelli and Republicanism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolingbroke, 1667, 'On the Spirit of Patriotism: The Idea of a Patriot King', in *The Works of Lord Bolingbroke*, London: Cass.

Bryman, A. and Burgess, R.G. 1994, *Analysing Qualitative Data*, London: Routledge.

Chilton, P. and Schaffner, C. 1997, 'Discourse and Politics', in van Dijk, T. (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London: Sage Publications, pp. 206-226.

Chomsky, N. 1988, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon Books.

Cicero, 1952, *De Re Publica*, London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Cooley, C.H. 1939, 'Primary Groups' in *Social Organisation*, Elsie Jones Cooley.

The Courier Mail, 6 December 2001.

Cowen, Z. 1994, 'Reflections on an Australian Republic', *Quadrant*, vol. 38, no. 12, (December), pp.14-21.

Cuff, E.C, Francis, D.W and Sharrock, W.W. 1990, *Perspectives in Sociology*, Sydney: Unwin Hyman.

The Daily Telegraph, 24 October 2001.

de Tocqueville, A. 1946, *Democracy in America*, vol.1, book 5 and vol. 2, book 4, London, Oxford University Press.

Doyle, T. 1993, 'The Conservative Mythology of Monarchy: Impacts Upon Australian Republicanism', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, vol. 28, pp.121-135.

Durkheim, E. 1951, *Suicide*, New York: Free Press.

Dutton, G. 1997, *Republican Australia*, Melbourne: Sun Books.

Edelman, M. 2001, *The Politics of Misinformation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Encel, S, Horne, D. and Thompson, E. 1977, *Change the Rules!* Ringwood: Penguin Books.

Evans, H. 1992, 'A Note on the Meaning of Republic', *Legislative Studies*, 6, 1, pp.21-3.

Fairclough, N. 1989, *Language and Power*, London: Longman.

Foucault, M. 1965, *Madness and Civilization*, New York, Pantheon.

_____ 1978, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, New York, Pantheon.

Galbraith, J.K. 1967, *The New Industrial State*, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Galligan, B. 1993, 'Regularising the Australian Republic', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, vol. 28, pp.56-66.

_____ 1995, *A Federal Republic: Australia's Constitutional System of Government*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garfinkel, H. 1967, *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall.

Gerth, H. and Wright Mills, C. 1953, *Character and Social Structure*, Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.

Goffman, E. 1959, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, New York: Anchor Books.

Gramsci, A. 1971, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Grant, M. 1971, *Cicero: Selected Works*, London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Habermas, J. 1984, 1988, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vols 1 and 2, Boston: Beacon Press.

Hamilton, A., Jay, J. and Madison, J. 1961, *The Federalist Papers*, C. Rossiter (Ed.), New York: Mentor.

Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 1995, *Ethnography: Principles in Practice*, second edition, London: Routledge.

Harrington, J. 1977, 'The Commonwealth of Oceana', in *The Political Works of James Harrington*, J.G.A. Pocock (Ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Headon, D. 1993, 'God's Aristocracy: Daniel Henry Deniehy's Vision of a Great Australian Republic', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol.28, pp136-45.

_____ 1994, Warden, J. and Gammage, B. *Crown or Country: The Traditions of Australian Republicanism*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

The Herald Sun, 29 June 2001.

Honig, B. 1991, 'Declarations of Independence: Arendt and Derrida on the problem of founding a republic', *American Political Science Review*, vol.85, pp.97-113.

Howard, J. MP, Hon. 1995, 'Republican Debate: Response by the Leader of the Opposition the Hon John Howard MP', Parliament House, Canberra, ACT, 8 June (received 16 June 1997).

Hudson, W. and Carter, D. 1993, *The Republicanism Debate*, Sydney: New South Wales University Press.

Jamieson, K.H. 1992, *Dirty Politics: Deception, Distraction and Democracy*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Johnson, A.G. 1995, *The Blackwell Dictionary of Sociology*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Keating, P. Hon Prime Minister. 1995, 'Advancing Australia', in *The Speeches of Prime Minister Paul Keating*, Ryan, M. (Ed.), Sydney: Big Picture Publications, speech delivered 7 June (received 17 June 1997).

Keneally, T. 1993, *Our Republic*, Melbourne: William Heinemann.

Kernot, Senator, C. 1997, 'Ladies, Bring a Template: Women and the Australian Republic', *The Australian Republican Movement*, Perth, 21 May.

Lawson, S. and Maddox, G. 1993, 'Introduction', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.4-8.

Leaver, R. 1993, 'Biting the Dust: The Imperial Conventions Within Republican Pretences', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.146-161.

Lee, D. and Newby, H. 1983, *The Problem of Sociology*, Sydney: Hutchison.

The Liberal Party of Australia. 1997, 'Policy Statement', Retrieved from 12 June, 22:00:43, <http://www.republic.org.au/party/liberal/htm>

Machiavelli, N. (1513) 1961, *The Prince*, Ringwood: Penguin Books Australia.

Maddox, G. 1991, *Australian Democracy in Theory and Practice*, second edition, Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

_____, 1993, 'Republic or Democracy?', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.9-26.

Marx, K. and Engels, F. 1968, *Marx and Engels: Selected Works*, Lawrence and Wishart, London.

Mead, G.H. 1934, *Mind, Self and Society*, C. Morris (Ed.), University of Chicago Press.

McKenna, M. 1997, *The Captive Republic: A History of Republicanism in Australia 1788 - 1996*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Monarchist League in Australia. 1997, 'Platform for the People's Constitutional Convention', Retrieved from 12 June, 22:14:16, <http://www.monarchist.org.au/platform.htm>

_____ 2002, 'Our history, our aims, our purpose and our achievements', Retrieved from 26 November, <http://www.monarchist.org.au/history.htm>, pp.1-2.

Montesquieu, Baron de. 1966, *The Spirit of the Laws*, trans. T. Nugent, New York: Hafner Press.

The National Party of Australia. 1997, 'Policy Statement', Retrieved from 4 June, 15:57:18, <http://www.republic.org.au/party/liberal/htm>

Pangle, T. 1990, *The Spirit of Modern Republicanism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, T. 1967, *Sociological Theory and Modern Society*, New York, Free Press.

Pettit, P. 1997, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ 1993, 'Liberalism and Republicanism', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.162-89.

Piquet, M. 1997, 'The Republican Debate in Australia 1788 – 1997', in *Cultures of the Commonwealth*, no.3 (Autumn), Paris.

Pocock, J.G.A. 1975, *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and Atlantic Republican Tradition*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Polybius. 1976, *The Histories of Polybius*, W.R. Paton (Ed.), Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Potter, J, and Wetherell, M. 1987, *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*, London: Sage Publications.

Rahe, P. 1992, *Republics Ancient and Modern*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Riesman, D. 1952, *Faces in the Crowd*, Yale University Press.

Silverman, D. 1985, *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*, Aldershot: Gower, 1985.

_____ 1993, *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analysing Texts for Talk, Texts and Interaction*, London: Sage Publications Limited.

Skinner, Q. 1978, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2 vols, vol. 1 *The Renaissance*.

Smith, D. 1999, *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigations*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Spencer, H. 1971, *On Social Evolution: Selected Writings*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Springborg, P. 1990, *Royal Persons: Patriarchal Monarchy and the Feminine Principle*, London: Unwin and Hyman.

The Sydney Morning Herald, 1 January 2001, 10 March 2001, 29 July 2001, 7 August 2001, 20 October 2001, 29 November 2001, 4 December 2001, 19 January 2002.

Stephenson, M. and Turner, C. (Eds) 1994, *Australia-Republic or Monarchy: Legal and Constitutional Issues*,

Turner, B.S. 1998, *Classical Sociology*, London: Sage Publications.

Uhr, J. 1993, 'Instituting Republicanism: Parliamentary Vices, Republican Virtues?' *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.27-39.

Warden, J. 1993, 'The Fettered Republic: The Anglo-American Commonwealth and the Traditions of Australian Political Thought', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.83-99.

Warhurst, J. 1993, 'Nationalism and Republicanism in Australia: The Evolution of Institutions, Citizenship and Symbols', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.100-120.

Weber, M. 1946, 'Formal Characteristics of Bureaucracy' in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, Oxford University Press.

Winterton, G. 1986, *Monarchy to Republic: Australian Republican Government*, Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

_____ 1993, 'Presidential Power in Republican Australia', *AJPS, Special Issue: Australia's Republican Question*, Vol. 28, pp.40-55.

Wood, G.S. 1972, *The Creation of the American Republic: 1776-1787*, New York: Norton.

Wright Mills, C. 1951, *White Collar*, Oxford University Press.

Yarbrough, J. 1979, 'Republicanism reconsidered: some thoughts on the foundation and preservation of the American republic', *Review of Politics*, vol.41, pp.61-95.