COUNCIL AFFIRMS CONFIDENCE IN ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

Exclusion procedures to be considered by Joint Committee

The regulations and procedures for excluding students are to be referred to the Joint Committee of the Council, the Provost's Board, and the Students' Association.

This decision was taken at the Council meeting on Monday 9 March. The Council, however, affirmed its confidence in the Academic Committee and described it as "conscientious", its handling of appeals being supported against exclusion.

The appeal procedure, as outlined by Vice-Chancellor Dr D.B.C. Taylor, is that appeals after being received and processed in the Registrar's Office, are considered by Dean of Faculty in early February.

Dr Taylor pointed out that there is provision for appeals to the University Council and that this has been in operation since 1974. Ty Meeting, attended by over 100 students, was informed by Bill Logan that the exclusion procedures adopted in 1970 involved secret, closed and anonymous action by the Council Sub-committee set up to review the work of the Academic Committee of the Provost's Board.

Mr Logan argued that the Council can call on appeals. He added, however, that he would not agree with any request for an Academic Committee to deal with these matters.

According to the Pro-Chancellor, Mr K.B. O'Brien, the power of the Council to deal with exclusion resides delegated to the Provost's Board. The validity of the Council sub-committee on which Mr Logan had set out, was to ensure that the appeal procedures should be fair and reasonable.

In a note to the Council, Mr Logan had simplified his earlier allegation to the Students' Association that he was "unfairly treating" the way in which the decision was reached was "unfair". Commenting on the meeting of the Academic Subcommittee which was set up to review the work of the Academic Committee in excluding students with records of academic failure, Mr Logan reported that: "No student has been considered to the members before the meeting. Members were given a four-week overview of the aforesaid and were specifically advised not to undertake a personal review of the appeals.

In a note to the Council, Mr Logan had simplified his earlier allegation to the Students' Association that he was "unfairly treating" the way in which the decision was reached was "unfair". Commenting on the meeting of the Academic Subcommittee which was set up to review the work of the Academic Committee in excluding students with records of academic failure, Mr Logan reported that: "No student has been considered to the members before the meeting. Members were given a four-week overview of the aforesaid and were specifically advised not to undertake a personal review of the appeals.

"Details were given" he continued, "of only six of the forty-nine apergrants and the Committee agreed that it agreed with the Academic Committee's decision in these six cases. On the basis of this "sample" it approved the whole report of the Academic Committee."

Describing the exclusion procedures, the convened of the Academic Committee, Professor S.G. Slater, said that a total of 252 appeals against exclusions which a total of 183 appeals had been upheld by Faculty Deans.

Professor Slater explained that, of the 49 students whose cases were referred to the Academic Committee, a further 18 were "upheld" on exclusion were notified on their Examination Results Cards in 1959 which were the interview of their Head of Department or Faculty Dean. Generally all themselves very fully of the chance to make their case in writing and all who requested interviews were granted them.

In reply, Mr Logan alleged that there was no procedure to ensure that all students appealed personally. He added that it would seem appropriate to discuss the exclusion procedures with a member of the Student Counselling Service before reviewing the cases of failed students.

Council members expressed some confusion about the procedure adopted in the exclusion process. While endorsing the work of the Academic Committee, the Council resolved that all students excluded were to receive an appeal for 1970 would be granted temporary remission pending reconsideration of their appeals.

Students whose appeals were not upheld may now seek assistance for personal interviews by the Academic Committee. If this request is agreed to, the Committee will be augmented by two of the students representatives on the Provost's Board.

In preparing their cases excluded students may, in terms of the Council's Motion, consult the Counselling Service.

We spoke to Professor Campbell on the morning of Monday, 9 March, to ask why he had rejected the meeting which was to be held in the afternoon.

Professor Campbell said that he felt that the whole question of the exclusion of students should be the subject of discussion at a special meeting. He believed that the Council sub-committee should have considered all cases and not merely considered a random sample. The calling of a special meeting was justified because, as the term has already started, urgent action should be taken if there is any possibility of any of the Academic Committee's recommendations on appeals being overturned.

Professor Campbell said that he had no reason to believe that the Academic Committee had been other than thorough and fair in its examination of the cases of excluded students. In fact, he said, "the only specific cases of which I have any knowledge would incline me to the view that the Academic Committee was over-generous."

Professor Campbell said that, while he felt that a Council through its sub-committee should have considered all cases and not merely a random sample, he did not believe that the Council needed to review the decisions of the Academic Committee.

Bill Logan, the student representative on the Council who initiated the Special Meeting of Council on Monday, 9 March, said after the meeting:

"We got more or less what we wanted which was a review of the decisions made in 1970 and the right for students to be heard by the Committee which is coming to the decision. We got this improved consideration for the urgency in the consideration. We thought that because the Council was scared rather than because the Council genuinely thought that there needs to be some procedure to stop the wrong people from being excluded.

The Vice-Chancellor, Dr D.B.C. Taylor, said after the Council meeting on 9 March that one or two amendments to the procedure would be made clear. "No letter was sent to students whose appeals were rejected by the Deans prior to the Academic Committee's consideration of individual cases" he said. Dr Taylor said that Bill Logan had been taken up on this point by the Pro-Chancellor, K.B. O'Brien, at the meeting but that it had not been made sufficiently clear that no letter had in fact been sent.

Dr Taylor said that no change in principle in the exclusion procedures had been involved in the appointment of a special sub-committee of the Council to consider the recommendations of the Academic Committee. This had merely been done to ensure that the Academic Committee's decisions could be considered by the Council as soon as possible. Dr Taylor said that he felt it might surprise some students to know that the Council was aware of the need for urgent consideration of appeals but this was, in fact, the reason for the decision to make this change.

He said he had complete faith in the way in which the Academic Committee had handled appeals and said that it seemed obvious that for the Council to hear all appeals was impractical.
Dr Taylor’s article
Sir,

I should like to thank you for publishing extracts from Professor Taylor’s recommendation (which I regard as being crucial). “More attention must be given to the personal qualities of stability, enthusiasm, loyalty and responsibility of academics as well as to the quantity of their degrees.” I presume that this is an amplification of Professor Taylor’s earlier homage to academic freedom.

Malcolm Ascroft

Illicit Union Liens?
Sir,

In SALIENT 2 Mr. Browse-White offered an reply to the ‘notion’ that the student union in the Sutton campus which would only be seen by most of those who would not want to be seen from the Common Room is magnificent, and for最大程度 to that of those of Auckland, Money or Rain.

The awkward site, a deep gully, allegedly owned to the Student Union, which would greatly detract the principal and the usual students naturally conform with this structure.

The balcony will almost certainly be a popular place in fine weather and on dark rainy days for those who would not have the heart for his studies.

In the matter of design every architect would find himself confronted with the contrasts in form and colour both inside and outside; the design of the M. R. W. I. is interesting, attractive and livable and there has been nothing but favourable comment amongst those who have visited.

GREG ROVE

Over a period of 22 years as a Construction Manager on many and various university and industry engineering and commercial projects.

I have the privilege of reading many divergent opinions of the merits and nonmerits of the various aspects of the policy of today.

I can truthfully state now, that I have never read a more biased one-sided opinion from a critic in all my life. I feel that it was an extremely biased opinion of an opinion, written by Mr. D. Browse-White, who I consider to be a great loss to the Sutton campus.

I am an old member of the Sutton Campus and I am shocked to see the amount of bias that is being printed in the SALIENT.

There is no need to publish this letter as it will be sent to the Sutton Campus Committee.

Mr. D. Browse-White

Victoria University Staff

I am indeed a member of the Technicians Certification Authority, although I have only sat on that body for a relatively short time. My position on the Authority is, however, in no way whatsoever connected with my position in my business and I do not represent either this University or the Vice-Chancellor’s Committee.

I am a member of both the Engineering and Authority by its Executive Committee for Science, on which I have served for a number of years as a member of the N.I. Institute of Chemistry.

The “matter of possible Diplomate Courses by the Sutton Campus Committee of the Authority, communicat to the Vice-Chancellor’s Committee that should invite further discussions by the Sutton Campus Committee. I was present at the last meeting of the Sutton Campus Committee, at which the Sutton Campus Committee was invited to discuss the mooted proposal at a recent meeting of the Sutton Campus Committee. I was present at the last meeting of the Sutton Campus Committee, at which the Sutton Campus Committee was invited to discuss the proposal at a recent meeting of the Sutton Campus Committee.

I believe that the Sutton Campus Committee has had an opportunity to consider the proposal, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Sutton Campus Committee. I believe that the Sutton Campus Committee has had an opportunity to consider the proposal, and I welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with the Sutton Campus Committee.

J. D. Petteys

One Per Cent Aid, Sir,

Mr. James Mitchell (formerly of the Sutton Campus) seems to me to be doing a good deal of work for One Per Cent Aid, and I should like to see him doing a little more, especially for the Sutton Campus Committee, in order to put some of the good points of the Sutton Campus Committee's work into practice.

The Sutton Campus Committee is, however, in no way connected with my position in my business and I do not represent either this University or the Sutton Campus Committee.
EXCLUSION from page 1

The view that if a student is sufficiently keen to continue his studies to make the effort to appeal he should be given the chance to do so unless he is plainly incapable of completing a university course.

The Academic Committee, a sub-committee of the Professional Board, considers all cases where the Deans has (sic) been appealed. (1) It should be remembered that an important function of the Academic Committee is to ensure that difficulties peculiar to step in the application of the exclusion rule—from the Vice-Chancellor’s memo for the members of the Council, dated 6 March, 1970). The Academic Committee allows another appeals. This year it upheld 15 of the 49 appeals referred to it by the Deans.

The Council has always rubber stamped the Academic Committee’s decisions. That the Council has to consider the Academic Committee’s decisions at all arises from a provision in the Victoria University of Wellington Act 1961 which specifically directs the Council into the exclusion procedure. ("The Council shall have power to decide to enroll or to reject an applicant to the University, or in any particular course or courses or classes in a particular subject or subjects. . . ."—section 24, subsection (2). A number of specific grounds upon which students may be excluded follow, among them is paragraph (e)—"Insufficient academic progress by the student after a reasonable attempt at the University or at any other University . . .")

There is no reason whatsoever, of course, why the Council should not delegate power to "decide any student's fate at the University". The Council has, in fact, defined the broad criteria (two units of exclusion was delegated to the Deans and the Academic Committee the power to set aside this rule) and the Council continues to review the decisions of the Academic Committee is not entirely clear. It is perfectly obvious that the Council is not directed towards reversing decisions of the Academic Committee to decide appeals. If the Council did uphold appeals against the recommendation of the Academic Committee it would, in effect, be itself regulating the regulation which it has defined.

It seems much more likely that the Council's review of the Academic Committee's decisions was originally intended to ensure that the Academic Committee and Deans were not too liberal in their consideration of appeals. This process has become a rubber-stamping because the Academic Committee is doing a good job, though individual members have qualms about its liberality.

This year, a sub-committee of Council was set up to review the decisions of the Academic Committee. In previous years the decisions of the Committee have been reviewed by the whole Council. The sub-committee was established in order that the rubber-stamping could take place in time if the allow students whose appeals were upheld to be readmitted to the University as early as possible in the academic year. For reasons which at completely unknown, the sub-committee took a sample of the appeals considered by the Academic Committee and examined four cases of students whose appeals had been rejected and two cases where appeals had been upheld. In other words, they considered a sample of about one in eight students. On the basis of their consideration of this sample of four students of the sub-committee, with Logan dissenting, agreed that the decisions of the Academic Committee should be ratified.

EXECUTIVE ELECTION

The by-election to fill four positions on the Executive will be held on 8 and 9 April.

Nominations close on 23 March. Mr. Atkinson Mitchell, Secretary of the Carrera Advisory Board, is the Chairman of the Executive Committee and Mr. Gles Bouquet has been appointed Returning Officer. The other members of the Committee are David Sand and Gerald Curly.

The three main submissions are as follows:

1. That pregnant students who wish to continue their University studies be entitled to receive the full benefit payable to unmarried pregnant women, for the usual term of such benefits.

2. That the criterion of need should always be taken into account in determining such benefits, as well as that of loss of income.

3. That the proper degree of consideration and notification of the availability of such benefits be considerably accelerated in recognition of the urgency of demand.

overcrowding

In the first week of the University of Wellington’s Three Stage I units appeared to be seriously overcrowded. During lectures in Sociology 1, Administration I, and Quantitative Analysis students were forced to sit in the aisles. This situation existed despite the fact that arrangements for these units were held in L12 or 300 which are the biggest lecture halls in the University.

In Quantitative Analysis, this situation arose because only about 40 of the 422 students who were enrolled for the unit were actually attending the second stream of lectures—this despite the fact that both streams are delivered in the second stream as in the first. The lecturer, Mr. P. H. Huycke, was under the impression that all students attended the lecture at the first time. Few of them have responded.

Woolshed Benef of Shearers

The proposed new hairdressing salon in the Student Union has been met with little interest.

The contract was originally to be let to Anthony News, a student who had some hairdressing experience. Last week, however, Mr. News wrote to the President advising that he would be unable to operate the salon because of his imminent departure for the United States. Building regulations.

During discussions on the matter, a Student Union Management sub-committee decided to call for applications for the contract instead. Mr. Boyd, Managing Secretary of the Student Union, was pleased to learn that a number of applications were posted immediately.

The Woolshed is to occupy a renovated men's toilet on the first floor of the Student Union. It is hoped to have it open in the second week of the term. However, the present condition of the room and Mr. News' departure will mean that the service will not be available until well after the estimated opening date.
MORE LETTERS

It makes people feel good to give, and all that feels too bad can't be that bad.

If Mr Mitchell wants to find logical reasons for leaving or going, or meeting for himself what he needs them with rather he keep his inquiries to himself.

Lion Sacken

Sir,

I cannot say of Mr Mitchell that he has never had a successful pressure group on campus in 1969, and in fact I contend that his article with the contempt which it deserves. However, many people who had worked hard and for 1969 felt so offended by their innocence and I thought I would give him the satisfaction of a rejoinder.

PLD, thanks for acknowledging that 1969 was the most successful student pressure group in 1969. We always had a low tolerance suspicion that we were but having Mitchell say so is some indication of the extent to which we managed to generate the total political spectrum from far right to far left. Before we know where we are the Aud Auditorium Society will be clambering for New Zealand assistance to Southern Africa.

Fourth, Mitchell's non-arguments . . .

(a) Noone in I.A.D. has ever said sole aim as a bribe, nor has it been implied in any of our statements. It has certainly not been proven that it is poor traditions to invest in a developing region. On the contrary, the development will only achieve 'lift off' if there is some degree of capital investment as well as an investment of necessary skills. Why doesn't Mitchell read Teach Yourself Economics? It's a very simple book and readily available.

(b) 1969 is not a Christian organisation and it has never mentioned increasing aid as a sop to the Christian conscience—as the founder of Christianity said the words are yours. Could it be that Mitchell is feeling guilty about something and is transferring his guilt onto his own organisation? He sets his head eyes on!

Rick Smith

Pioneer coffee lounge
76 Wiltos Street. —
Gives you a pleasant atmosphere and old time decor.

AMOS ON CAMPUS

Elite groups of "captains of industry" and "thought-throwing people" are having too much influence on government in New Zealand.

This was the view expressed by Phil Amos, Labour Party spokesmen and a Member of Parliament for Manukau, who spoke at the University of Auckland. Amos introduced his topic—Cost Benefit Politically—by saying that he sets a socialist and a believer in the welfare state. "There is a level below which nobody should be allowed to fall," he said. "Society should provide for equality of opportunity for the individual to develop and realise his or her potential." Active participation by all groups of activities in government and the safeguarding of minority rights are conditions of society.

Amos applied the term "cost benefit politics" to the system in New Zealand where, he said, progress is measured solely on a cost benefit basis. He claimed that there was a "figure-measuring" approach to life can have, and is in New Zealand, adverse effects. "An increasing proportion of our people are being persuaded that all that really matters is the size of their pay packet," he said. "The present Government for this. "Accountants are only recorders—not innovators. They are mere employees," he said. Amos warned of the dangers of concentration of ownership of news media and means of production and distribution. "What we need," he said, "is a participatory of our social purpose—of the quality of life. Arts, recreation and cultural patterns must become an integral part of our life, a reorientation of the dynamics of a democratic society is required. The dynamics are dialogue-unique and a deficit in the communication, discussion, exchange of ideas, and, above all, the questioning and scrutinisation of conviction."

Amos concluded his address by saying that society must be measured in other ways than through a cost benefit analysis. Democracy will only prosper when other means are used. Men had to be thought of as individual, as creative beings and not productive animals.

Students who 'abuse drugs' are likely to be expelled from Canterbury University.

This warning comes from the University's Disciplinary Committee. A student, developing a charge of growing cannabis last term, has been expelled. The University's Disciplinary Committee, he said, was "giving realisation that any further drug use would end his university career."

This incident has recalled the concern expressed by some Canterbury students who say that the discipline regulations were brought into force as a means of "the Professional Board shall have full disciplinary powers over the conduct of all students, in any case where the Board considers that the interests of the University or the students are effected."

The regulations are such that the possibility of punitive action by University authorities after a student has been convicted (or acquited by a Court of Law has not been excluded. Provision exists in the regulations for hearing representations from students charged with breaches of discipline, but it is not mandatory to give such hearings (... the Board shall ... give any student charged ... such opportunity as it thinks fit to make representations regarding the matters.)

SALIENT

Drugs & Discipline

The question I wish to ask is "Are Victoria students going to ever get off their chuffs and actually do something about the accommodation problem?" For years, in fact for generations, there has been talk and complaint but done all action.

Rick Smith

NZUSA offices

Establishment of a building fund for new NZUSA premises was discussed at the NZUSA National Executive meeting on 1 March.

At present, NZUSA is accommodated in Bock House in Villissent Street. The present office space is generally acknowledged to be so cramped as to hinder efficiency. Movers are being made to secure better temporary accommodation until permanent plans can be begun.

NZUSA constituents disagreed about the methods by which such a fund would be raised. A number of students suggested a levy was one suggestion. Victoria's President, Margaret Blyon, suggested that low interest long-term loans should be raised from constituent Students' Associations. Other delegates pointed out that several of the institutions are already involved in building programmes and would therefore have little to contribute to such loan schemes.

It was also suggested that the scheme be financed by a $2 increase in fees to Australia arranged by the Travel Service. Student travel fares are already, however, subject to an increase of $1.50 necessitated by a recent rise.

Treasurers of the constituent Associations will discuss ways in which the building fund could be established at Easter Council.
BIAFRA RELIEF AND SHARPEVILLE DAY

All universities have been asked to hold a Biafra Relief Day and a Sharpeville Day. The matter was raised at the NZUSA National Executive meeting on 1 March.

The President, Margaret Bryson, asked Mr Bruce Sabin to organise the day at Victoria and an appeal was in fact held on March 12 and 13. All funds are to be sent to Biafra through UNICEF—the only relief organisation whose credentials are recognised by Federal Nigeria.

All nighters are also planned at each university for Sharpeville Day on 25 March. Margaret has asked SRC for a controller but as yet no one has come forward.

BOOKLETS CONCERNING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Students' Associations at both Canterbury and Otago Universities are to publish booklets on specific social problems.

Canterbury is to publish a booklet about abortion, contraception and related topics and Otago is to publish a booklet on mental health.

The Canterbury booklet is to be free to Canterbury students and will be on sale on other campuses for about 30 cents.

The Otago booklet publishes the texts of addresses delivered at a seminar on mental health held under the auspices of NZUSA at Otago about 18 months ago. This booklet was originally to have been edited for NZUSA by Richard Fisher, NZUSA Student Welfare Officer. Fisher, however, failed to organise publication of the booklet. The editing will now be done by Mrs Wendy Low, a graduate in medicine, who organised the NZUSA seminar when she was Student Welfare Officer on the Otago Executive.

The Otago booklet will be available through the Students' Association at a nominal charge.

OTAGO THREATENS NZUSA WITHDRAWAL

The Otago University Students' Association has threatened to withdraw its delegation from NZUSA's Easter Council unless other constituents guarantee that their capping magazines will not be sold in Otago. If Otago were to withdraw from Easter Council, NZUSA would be unable to meet.

The following telegram was received by the Executive on 1 March unlesS FORMAL WRITTEN AGREEMENTS ARE RECEIVED FROM AUCKLAND, MANUSA, VICTORIA AND CANTERBURY CONSTITUENTS GUARANTERING THAT THEIR CAPPING PUBLICATIONS OR EQUIVALENT WILL NOT BE SOLD SOUTH OF THE WAITAKI RIVER.

THE OTAGO UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSN. WILL WITHDRAW ITS DELEGATION FROM EASTER COUNCIL STOP COPY SENT TO ALL ABOVE NAMED STOP LETTER FOLLOWED ANDERSON OTAGO

news briefs

Members of the Executive expressed the view that Otago's attitude amounted to blackmail. A motion in the effect that "the matter of Otago's telegram be treated with severe gravity" was only defeated on the casting vote of the Chairman, Margaret Bryson.

Paul Gravett, President of NZUSA, said, when questioned by SAULENT that Otago would be "well advised" to attend Council. "The only hope of satisfactory agreement being reached over this matter is full discussion at Easter Council" he said.


The four vacant positions are as follows:

- Woman Vice-President
- Secretary
- Publications Officer
- Sports Officer

Publications Officer: The Association Constitution provides that any person offering himself for election as Publications Officer shall, where possible, have been a member of the Board for at least six (6) calendar months before applications for the position close.

Applications including address and telephone number must be placed in the box provided at the counter of the Association Office.

Applications close at 4.30p.m. on Monday 23 March.

Applications may be withdrawn by written request at any time until 4.30p.m. on Tuesday 24 March.

Voting will take place on 8 and 9 April.

Giles Brooker Returning Officer

STOP PRES

AFTER MR BOYD, WHAT?

At present Mr Boyd holds a double position—he is Managing Secretary of the Union and Director of Student Welfare Services. However it seems highly probable that within the next few months the post will, at the suggestion of Mr Boyd, be separated into the two parts. There is certainly enough work for two people, one in the Union, and the other in the Welfare Services.

While this proposal is going through this seems an ideal time for the Association, and others, to rethink the whole idea of 'The Managing Secretary' and what we want of the position. It seems, according to rumour, and breaching no confidences, that Mr Boyd is primarily interested in the position of Director of Student Welfare Services. There will consequently be a vacancy in the Managing Secretaryship. I suggest it would be an ideal time to change that position into one named 'Administrative Secretary'.

The Administrative Secretary should retain the duties of keeping accounts and drawing budgets for the Union, the day-to-day administration of the Union and a certain amount of long-term planning. He should, however, be employed by the Student Union Management Committee, paid by it (not by the University alone), and be responsible to it. That Committee has a student majority. I also suggest that the disciplinary powers at present vested in the Managing Secretary be vested in the Association Executive and/or the House Committee, who could sub-delegate as they chose (even to the Administrative Secretary if they wished). These are my thoughts: what are yours? Come to the next SRC and discuss it.

Margaret Bryson
I cannot pretend to know what is going on in drama in New Zealand. I doubt whether anyone else can either. In Wellington, we, that is those of us who are interested, hear the occasional cry of pain from Dunedin when Putric Carey threatens to abandon his struggle to keep the Globe Theatre alive, we try to keep the I-told-you-so look out of our eyes as we listen to rumours of trials and tribulations at Auckland’s Mercury Theatre, we avert our thoughts from the professional theatre debacle in Christchurch, and, return, gratefully, to the Wellington theatrical scene.

This is perhaps the most surprising attitude of all. Somehow we feel safe with the Arts Council on our doorstep; we enjoy basking of financial wheeler-dealing at its best (as if to suggest that while things are murky, there will always be a dinner-and-show there, albeit of unpredictable quality in either department); we continue amazed that Nola Miller’s Theatre-in-the-Lab is still flourishing (“I believe her drama classes are marvellous!”); we grandly admire—and envy—Ngāio Reyne’s acumen in getting a piece of the Town Belt to build it monstrosity un-aesthetic club rooms on (and its greater acumen in getting the Mayor for its patron); we cast a benign eye over Unity Theatre and Stageworks. In the main, we admire them all, and, in the main, we go none of them. Most of the theatres exist as a hobby for their members, and it can be said even of Downstage that its ability to stay solvent (come now, be kind) rests too heavily on patrons more interested in wine and dicing than in being seen where others are being seen, than in dedicated theatregoers.

Following World War II, there was a tremendous interest in amateur theatre. Visiting professional groups—including the best in the English-speaking world at the time—played—to packed houses. There were so many applicants for seats that ballots were held. During this euphoric period, the New Zealand Players came into existence and, for a while, flourished. Soon the real level of interest was reached and, even with Government assistance, the somewhat grandiose scheme failed. Bitter debates were held, individuals were blamed, and nothing was solved. One uneasy fact the joined—New Zealand (and, of course, Wellington) was once more without a professional theatre. Not, in truth, that this was of much concern to many people except those directly involved.

Television caused a further slackening of interest in live theatre, and the amateur theatres (if, as in the case of Thespians, they didn’t go out of existence) were forced more and more to leave the larger, public theatres for performances in their own club rooms. Now, going from the occasional ‘mame’ production in the University Little Theatre, the theatrical scene, in Wellington at least, is made up of small groups playing in small theatres, limiting their work to what has been described as ‘private theatre’. In itself this has only, in expression of what has become a trend overseas anyway. Where we once looked to the West End and Broadway successes for plays to present, we are just as likely to look to the experimental theatres in both England and America.

In New Zealand

Professional theatre in New Zealand was a long time recovering from the collapse of the Players. Hindsight has shown us that they collapsed when they were on the verge of becoming stabilised both artistically and economically, but the country was not ready to acknowledge that no national theatre can exist without state subsidy. Then, in the early 1960’s, Downstage came into existence and gradually New Zealand’s first restaurant-theatre became a recognised part of the Wellington theatre scene. As it grew in popularity from its small beginnings, so in Christchurch we saw the collapse of the more grandiose venture into a combined professional theatre and drama school.

Auckland, as one of the few remaining cities where the taint of professional failure had not been felt, was chosen as the centre for yet another venture into the commercial world of theatre. It is still too early to measure its success, and it has not, up until the present time, ventured outside Auckland with its productions. Downstage, on the other hand, has made forays to such places as New Plymouth, Levin, and even Christchurch, and the latest news is that the small-east production of The As Paun Man has taken off on a short tour. Dunedin, which used to be the centre for the also now-defunct Southern Comedy Players, has now permanently stationed there a semi-professional theatre under the direction of Warren Skofield. Its commitment to professional (in the sense of full-time work on a paid basis) theatre remains at the moment on a modest scale compared with, say, the Mercury Theatre.

As in the past, communication between one centre and another is remote, and apart from the occasional prestige production (as with Canterbury University’s Musical/Sojourn making a trip to another town, little is known of what is going on elsewhere. Nor is there much, if any, interchange of actors and producers, of administrators and backstage workers, between theatre groups of the different cities. The two linking organisations, New Zealand Drama Council and British Drama League work, for the most part, in their own way. Indeed, there just merged into the one organisation in order to strengthen both their resources and their influences. If Wellington is any example, there is also very little communication between theatre groups, although actors and producers move fairly easily from one society to another, not out of any special regard, but basically going where the work is offering.

The most serious lack, I would suggest, is that of any form of repertory, where the best productions are kept ‘on ice’ and revived for further consideration. Not, and I believe the case to be true also for Auckland now, is there any contractual system operating at the professional level, that would guarantee actors and producers work. In Wellington, many actors, for instance, are dependent on radio and TV work in order to earn enough to live on so that they can also continue to work in live theatre. Actors and producers will often take on unpaid work in the theatre in order to gain further experience.

It may be only my imagination, but I do think I note a revival of interest—particularly among young people—in the theatre, both as participants and as audiences. Experimental plays at Downstage for instance (as in the case of the Sunday night Golubkian Series) has been good, and audiences have contained a high proportion of young people. It is to the credit of Downstage that they have attempted to gain some sort of hearing for New Zealand playwrights. As yet, they have been very limited in the use of New Zealand playwrights in their regular theatrical programmes.

Theatre still lives a hand-to-mouth existence in New Zealand, as do, indeed, all of the arts. Theatrical groups can be formed, die, and even be resurrected without too much surprise being elicited. Actors still leave for their training overseas (although the start made by the Arts Council in sending students to train at Auckland’s Mercury and Wellington’s New Theatre is an interesting one). Persuading them to return is much more difficult, and who can blame them? If one trains to be an actor, one expects to act, and if the work is lacking, or is too spasmodic, or if the chance to become a ‘name actor’ does not exist, actors will continue to remain where the chances are, no matter how remote.

New Zealanders seem to like being in plays, while their ‘hobby’ continues to absorb their interest, they are less likely to play the more passive role of spectator. It is on this almost insurmountable difficulty that most professional theatre has founded. While the local amateur groups continue to feel (and often justifiably so) that their work compares favourably with work being a professional group can do—forgetting, of course, that their one major production a year cannot be compared with a year-long programme—the professional position will remain a precarious one. But there are small signs of change.

Downstage, for instance, has wisely kept a programme going all year, and this means that the public, which is now finding for the first time in our history that dining out can be a pleasure, are becoming used to the idea that an evening on the town can include both food and entertainment. Downstage must next graduate, of course, to a more flexible season of plays so that in any one month, patrons can choose from a programme of plays instead of having to wait out a season of perhaps seven weeks before seeing a new play. (It would be too much to expect, of course, audiences to return to see a play they have enjoyed. They reserve such luxuries for The Sound of Music).

by George Webby
Look Back in Anger by John Osborne. Produced for the Drama Society by Matthew O’Sullivan. REVIEWED BY ANDREW WILSON.

Look Back in Anger, the Orientation play directed by Matthew O’Sullivan, was fortunate from the start in having a striking set by Peter Coates. A dominating cold grey view of rooftops jutted beyond the proscenium into the audience. The cut-away garret which was the acting area was small, and looked even smaller, but surprisingly proved to be adequate.

The play’s main strength lies in Jimmy Porter’s ebullient and ingenious metaphorical language. The whole responsibility of making the play convincing, therefore, falls on Jimmy. Alan Hinkley played the part with intelligence and dedication but without the spontaneous fiery naivete that characterises Jimmy. He seemed to be trying hard to fill out the part, realising well enough what was needed but never convincingly getting to the gut of the man. This is hardly a question of fault, though any more of his being rather tall unfortunately made him look more awkward than necessary. At times too there was the uneasy feeling that what natural ability he had brought to the part had been ‘produced’ into a rhythm which suited neither the character nor the situation. One could point to the9 pulling rabilento of his father’s deathbed speech, dabling self-pity, but overdone. Yet there were good moments of fine driving colloquial rhetoric. There was great relish, for example, in the speech about his mother-in-law and her acidic worms.

It seemed that Jimmy could free-associate his ‘done rotten’ griping on any topic, but in fact he had a limited range of starting points. Allison, her family, her friends, the newspaper or Cliff. These characters never became very much more than starting points for Jimmy, although Osborne had given them all time and space in which to enlarge their appeal as individuals. Helen McGrath as Allison stood like a rag doll and moved badly, particularly with Jimmy and especially in the scenes involving the bears and squirrels, which were actually embarrassing in a way beyond the pathetic poignancy intended.

Cliff’s dialect was a barely recognisable, uncertain Welsh, but he moved with tact and assurance in the tiny acting area. Even lighting Allison’s cigarette (which could have been horribly bungled) was done with admirable skill. But Paul Holmes will have to watch that he does not get himself stuck with a number of tricks of the trade—particularly in his delivery—which will be awkward to unlearn.

Geraldine Whyte played Helena Charles in a plausible, unembellished fashion which one suspected was as much Miss Whyte as Helena when the plum remained after Act II—from which time it needed to be toned down far more than it was. Helena’s turning to Jimmy was rather sudden in execution, despite all the graduated hints earlier (playing with the bear and squirrel, for example) so that as instant seduction it was more embarrassing than competent.

Colonel Redfern is an interesting case; one feels he was one of the most sympathetically conceived of the characters. He was played tactfully, but more as a literary exercise than as a dramatic one, by Terry Baker.

If one were to wonder, before seeing the play, whether this 1956 kitchen-sink drama set in the Midlands had any relevance to 1970 New Zealand, then the answer would be one shared by all significant dramas: it deals with recognisable people rather than an historical situation. The social situation has changed but not so very much and it will, hopefully, become increasingly remote. Yet the character of Jimmy, fierce in his condemnations, inconsistent in his positive loyalties, and secure only when he knows his rage to be fruitless and his happiness a toddy bear story, continues to be a current dramatic force. The director, Matthew O’Sullivan, deserves a large measure of praise from all in the four full houses that this time play has drawn.

INSPECTORS OF POLICE
FOR HONG KONG

Applications are invited from single men aged 19-27 years, of good physique and normal vision without glasses, height at least 5 ft 6 ins., for service with the Royal Hong Kong Police Force as probationary Inspectors of Police.

Candidates must possess a degree from a recognised Commonwealth University.

Salaries commence at N.Z. $3,390 a year and thence by eight annual increments of approximately N.Z. $143 to N.Z. $4,536 a year, including expatriation pay. On successful completion of a probationary period of 3 years, Inspectors will be placed on the permanent and pensionable establishment and good opportunities exist for promotion to higher ranks in the Force. Approximately 4 months’ leave on full salary with free passages to New Zealand is granted after 3½ years in Hong Kong.

Further details obtainable from the Dominion Liaison Officer, Government House, Wellington.
Easy Rider is a stumbling block. Affiliation or antipathy, not to its merits and defects as a film, but to the lifestyle it portrays and advocates, may blind both the ardent admirers and the ignorant scornful to the beauties they might otherwise have perceived. Those, and there are many of them, who wouldn't know a good film if it kicked them in the teeth, will performe ride in either camp, ignoring the movie and blearing about social values. I feel no obligation to say I like Easy Rider because Fonda and friends represent a rustic singularity (my interpretation) and individual freedom I dream about in odd, anarchic moments. There is, fortunately, much more going for it than that.

A liberal fellow I know, who aspires in a minor way to that same ideal, made a jaundiced observation about the film when prompted for his opinion. I asked him if he liked Easy Rider as much as I did (a typically leading question), to which he replied that he didn't think much of it, then adding the curious rider, "well, it wasn't great." This gratuitous and unnecessary remark is symptomatic of the kind of confusion that results when appreciation of aesthetic qualities is allied to and tied down by adherence to some social philosophy or other. Commitment and art make uneasy bedfellows and spawn many a stunted offspring: when this confusion arises (his particular hang-up was the rural commune, which he thought overdone), when presuppositions obscure the vision, simply make some pernicious observation about the film not being great.

The point has, I think, been bludgeoned home. Viewers and reviewers who base their like or dislike of Easy Rider on their responsiveness to its "Message" will do the film little justice. I don't really know whether or not this is a great work, but it is certainly more memorable than most other films that aspire to greatness or have that stifling mantle cast upon them by those who should know better. Take Butch Cassidy, for example, a film that seems to be the rave of the moment. As a whimsical diversion it is charming enough, and decked out with a fine lustre to be sure (all praise to the great Conrad Hall), but there is no heart to the film, no bite that shines through the sly humour and beautiful landscapes.

We should at least feel some pain at the deaths of Newman and Redford, some identification with their plight, but nothing that has gone before belies our suspicion that this is just another well-timed jest. One would not have to abandon the humor: in Butch Cassidy or the distinctive attractions of its characters in order to achieve the cutting edge. Perhaps this choice of scepaticum stramman is uncharitable, and I grant the film its good intentions and considerable achievements, but I mention it here to highlight what I consider to be a vital point. I enjoyed Butch Cassidy and then promptly forgot about it: the images of Easy Rider linger in the memory, and the taste is indeed sweet. The mantle is being cast on the former from all directions, the latter will be, with a few exceptions, the object only of unthinking adulation or irrelevant, pretentious debate.

The beauties of Easy Rider are specific, and could be catalogued at some length. This swoon by Hopper and Fonda through their life and times is presented with much feeling and considerable technical expertise. Dennis Hopper's work as director is almost always assured, and inspired in those delicate scenes where a foot wrong would result in the kind of sentimentality bound to alienate those not already turned on or tuned in. He has a fine visual appreciation of the splendid and ugly side of Americana, given substance here by Laszlo Kovac's beautiful colour photography. Hopper as actor strikes a chord: he looks like a couple of friends of mine rolled into one. At times he trays a bit near buffoonery, but eventually impresses by playing what is surely himself, rather than assuming any fictional and inevitably less attractive character. Fonda frequently looks merely blank, but occasionally the filial spaniel eyes and distinctive voice lend some conviction to his performance. Thanks for his money anyway.

The influence of Terry Southern, credited with a share in the screenplay, might be detected in Jack Nicholson's marvellous little exposition on the presence among us of aliens from another planet, although perhaps this gem was improvised as a dash of garnish to his already astonishing performance. This incredible creature has been seen before as something worse than a blatant ham (Roger Corman's The Terror). In Easy Rider his playing as the quixotic, dyspeptic lawyer is just about the best piece of character acting I've seen. This Southern Gentleman is one of nature's angels, daubed with only the most minor of reservations. The scenes in the hippie commune, which my friend thought were done (maybe so, but how would be know?), are more convincing for the presence of Robert Walker and Luana Anders.

Apart from Jack Nicholson, however, the best 'acting' comes from the various skinheads in the Deep South,
The degree of verisimilitude in their performances, if they can be called that, remind me of their counterparts in Roger Corman's film The Intruder (U.S. title: I Hate Your Guts). Both directors seem to have employed something akin to a candid camera technique, where real-life emotions and expressions have been caught on film and used to dramatic effect.

Much of what has been written here, and anywhere for that matter, reads hollow in the face of the very life of the film itself. Easy Rider is such a personal creation for all involved, for those who made the film and for those who watch it. We who admire it are reduced in the end to reciting our favourite bits and pieces. I need do no more than list a few of mine here: the various night rides against the evening sky, the two exchanges with the pushers at the beginning of the film, Hopper's frenetic anxiety throughout, the Mardi Gras (a tawdry, ghastly beautiful 16mm), the tragically moving and unexpected conclusion. And so forth. I love the Hippies in Easy Rider and am excited by the way it was made. A noble conception superbly executed—it must be a great film.

Inevitably people are going to rave over Easy Rider. It is, after all, the first film for some time that many people will be returning to see again and again. Yet, apart from the outstanding photography, the music, and the realistic acting of Fonda, Hopper and Nicholson, there is a much more important aspect of the film which many viewers may not have seen—nor would prefer not to admit.

Essentially, Easy Rider is a religious play. The ride itself is the dramatic representation of the life quest of two motor-cycling members of the young. Although the Easy Riders occasionally use their names, Captain America and Billy, they are effectively standing in for the nameless generation which is being told that its responsibility is to inherit the earth. Relentlessly the Easy Riders seek out their goal (in this case a trip to San Francisco) and their experiences towards this goal belie the essential uncertainties in mankind's purpose.

The story of Captain America and Billy is of a struggle not to find, but to retain freedom. All along the way they are contended with elders who have given up the struggle and found harmony rather than freedom. A Mexican-American family, a hippie colony in the Indian desert, the young members of the American Civil Liberties Union, and finally the whores themselves in New Orleans all represent different forms of freedom from that which the Easy Riders are seeking. To some extent these very people are offended. Far more offended and afraid, however, are the American majority. As George tells Captain America and Billy: "They're not scared of you, but what you represent—freedom. Talking about it and being it are two different things. Don't ever tell anybody they're not free, because they are going to maim and kill to prove that they are. It makes them dangerous."

In fact this is exactly what happens, and through no fault of the Riders. Simply by being what they are as Captain America says, sadly: "I never wanted to be anybody else" they are an affront to the society that surrounds them. Thus, like Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid, the Easy Riders have to burst a hole in the wall that contains their freedom. Captain America has guessed the fate of the Easy Riders in this society and prepares to face what lies ahead. "Billy, on the other hand, equally successfully prepares to ignore what is happening around him. "We've done it. We're rich. We can retire in San Francisco. You go for the big money and we're free!" "No," says Captain America. "We blew it. Goodnight." It is their last message. Next day, the Easy Riders are blasted from the scene. The unfree society has exerted its authority against those who would dare to question it. The antitheses between the old and the new, harmony and rest, peace and struggle are portrayed in the religious tone of the film. At every encounter with the superficially liberal community around them the Easy Riders are confronted by the church militant: a grace before meals on the Mexican farm; the Thanksgiving ceremony of the Hippie colony ("Thank you for a place to make a stand. Amen."); the experiences in the jail and around the campfire discussing the mystery of life; the ostentatious setting of the whore house surrounded by religious paintings; and the sound of the Kyrie eleison.

Finally, in a New Orleans Christian cemetery while the Easy Riders and their girl friends make love and take an LSD trip, they drown out the rude noises of The Lord's Prayer and the Apostle's Creed. The conflict between the orthodox and the unorthodox rages. A grave symbolizes a dead church while the youth of the country seeks a new life. Even the name of the Captain's girl, Mary, seems to be a mockery of the traditions of the church. Its members have failed to provide a meaning for life.

And so Captain America knows that he will have to go on fighting for his freedom. The quest has only begun. "Death only closes a man's reputation and determines it as good or bad." Perhaps this was the final message. In the end it will be for each person to decide what freedom means, and possibly more important to decide for themselves just how much freedom is given.
One of the most noticeable sociological changes in recent years has been the transformation in New Zealanders' attitudes towards the finer arts of eating and drinking. When one looks back only ten years the choice of red wine in New Zealand restaurants was up to a very high international standard and at present there is every possibility of 'secondary' licenses being granted in the near future (to more ordinary establishments wishing to serve lager or New Zealand wine with their meals). The influence of professionals like Graham Kerr and John Buch has had its effect on many people who previously would never have thought of slushing some wine into a casserole, let alone drinking wine with the resultant culinary effort.

But let's not get too complacent, we still have a long way to go. After all, wine is one of the greatest pleasures of life, to become proficient in it appreciation one must keep learning. There is no excuse for not experimenting these days because relaxation in import control has engendered a sense of competition amongst importers and there is now a good range of wine available at reasonable prices.

"Those who wish to study the developments and refinements of wine should ignore the ponderous pronouncements of the pundits. There is no need to be challenging and aggressive in order to cultivate a palate for the finer qualities of expensive wine. Understanding is much more likely to come to the hopeful and modest student who has the courage to be ruthlessly honest with himself."

This is Allan Sichel's advice to readers of the Penguin Book of Wines. New Zealanders' task is much more difficult because firstly one must refute numerous basic generalizations about wine which are a hangover from our good keen rugby players' image. These myths usually revolve around the following pre-conceptions . . . All varietal taste is a form of snobbery. Usually spoken by a member of the older generation. After six years in the licensed restaurant business I consider that the generation gap is extremely pronounced in the appreciation of wine. It is much easier to get through to a youthful imbiber than it is to evaluate the worth of various wines with older people more set in their ways and more staid in their taste. This is usually preceded by: New Zealand wines are as good as any and followed by "mind you I don't like wine myself. Give me a gin and tonic any time." We must have sweet wine for the girls. What a load of rubbish! Women's palates can be accustomed to drier wines just as easily as men. It must be sparkling. Sparkling wines such as Asti Spumanti, Nederburg, Sparkling Liebfraumilch, Lasserre and so on, are a good starting point. Their lack of finesse and subtlety palls on the refined palate. Also the worst wine is used in these and consequently, value for money is not very good. (An example of this is the common buying practice of German houses. They will buy in from whichever European country has a glut of poor—that is, cheap—wine, blend with the minimum amount of German wine then carbonate and market as Sparkling Liebfraumilch, Moselle, Hock and so on.) It doesn't matter what type of wine you have with your food, drink what you like. The perfectionist's exasperation for serving the cheapest of Nelson apple cider with main courses. Nowadays the excessive formality of white wine with white meat and red wine with red meat has gone but it can't be denied that a broad rule must be kept to. For example, one may drink white wine with a roast, but a sweet white wine will take away most of the full-bodied taste of the food. Reading on the subject only leads to intellectual snobbery. On the contrary, the enthusiast can't expect to be stimulated by what he tastes. Half the enjoyment comes from reading about certain bottles and then managing to get hold of some of the wine. I recommend the Penguin Book of Wines and Hugh Johnson's Wine (published by Nelson—retail price approximately $10) for a broad, general background. John Buch's excellent book Take A Little Wine (Whiteabe & Tombs $4.50) provides a well-balanced discussion of European, Australian and New Zealand wine. All this talk about treating wine as if it were human is a load of nonsense. Good wine is as delicate and often very shy. When one considers the care and attention that has gone into the making and keeping, followed by careful storage for years, it is unreasonable to expect the wine to be at its best if dragged out of storage, thrown on the table, jolted up and down during efforts to get the cork out and then promptly drunk. If your bottles are treated in this manner then you are getting neither the full enjoyment possible nor the maximum value for money.

If possible drink out of clear, stemmed glasses which hold 6-10 ounces, allowing the drinker to receive a sizeable amount of wine without filling the glasses by over two-thirds. Temperature is most important. Do not get carried away with the American habit of overchilling white wine—more than two hours in the refrigerator results in the loss of many of the delicate characteristics. Ideally, red wines should be bought the day before drinking and stood in the room so as the sediment will settle at the bottom. An hour or two before drinking the cork should be pulled and the wine poured gently into a decanter. (If you hold the bottle against the light it should be easy to see the first cloudy streaks of sediment approaching the neck of the bottle: stop pouring at this stage). The time in the decanter is variable. If the wine is old, more than a half an hour might result in a loss of much of its delicate character. A young wine might need two or three hours to liven it up and remove the harshness of youth. Good wine must be expensive. Much of the enjoyment of drinking wine is finding the best value for money.

Recognition of these Kiwi myths is the first step towards getting value for money when buying and drinking wine. The next step is to turn to the German wines. Liebfraumilch is the "in" word with German wines and many houses have recognised the sales potential of an attractive label coupled with the magic name, Beauneidr and Chateauvau du Pape hold similar places in French lines. More of both these is exported than is actually produced in France—many houses are content to blend the wine with other types, just as long as they can market it under the well-known name. Similarly, there is much shoddy wine amongst the labelling of Australian and New Zealand wines. Do not be taken in by attractive and grandly titled labels. Also do not make a practice of buying wine from botte makers. Not only is it cheaper to buy from wholesalers but you also get a better selection and can be sure that it has been stored correctly. There is no exception to this: the Galton Hotel prides itself on its wine cellar and has the good sense to store wines correctly.

By insisting on having your bottle pointing to the north when the cork is being drawn, and calling the waiter Max, you may induce an impression on your guests which you have used to succeed in about face because will be powerless to achieve. For this purpose, however, the guests must be chosen as carefully as the wine.

—from THE CHRONICLES OF CLOVIS by Saki

I recommend that you buy from one of the following merchants. They offer a good range of wine and constructive advice as to what is good value for money: Levin and Company, Featherston Street, Murray Roberts, Adelaide Road, T&W Young Ltd., Egmont Street, E.T. Taylor Ltd., Courtenay Place, Avalon Wine and Spirits, Ticker Street, Taits.

It would be impossible to comment in detail on these merchants' lines. A listing of the reasonably priced bottlings that I do know to be good value follows:

**FRENCH**

Chateau Lafite 1964
Chateau du Monfety 1964
Chateau Baudette 1964
(Three basically sound bordeaux, all around $2.30. Available from Levin and from Murray Roberts. Murray Roberts has Pradel Rouge, a light, quaffable Provence red, and Pradel Blancs de Blancs, a white with similar qualities.)

Chateau Cote de Beaune Villages 1963. (An excellent burgundy, very smooth and refined, From Youngs or Avalon, $2.50.)
Chateau Haut Rounafe 1965
(Outstanding value from Avalon at $1.65. Honourable SAINTJET Editor David Harcourt is still raving about the bottle he drank three months ago!)

**GERMAN**

Gustav Adolf Schmidt Meißlbeermüden ($1.60 Levin and Murray Roberts.
Nollen and Co. Bernkasteler Riedling ($2.00 Youngs.)
Richard Langguth Moiselle and Bernkasteler (Approx. $2.90 E.T. Taylor)
Valkenberg Rudesheimer Rosenarten ($2.00 Avalon.)

**SPANISH**

Siglo y Rojas Marques de Murrieta. (Two excellent reds for casual drinking. Both approximately $1.60 a bottle from Levin, Murray Roberts and Avalon.)

**AUSTRALIAN**

Wynns White Burgundy ($1.40 Youngs.)
Wynns Hermitage ($1.75 Youngs.)
Stoneyfell Malles ($2.00 Youngs.)
Agniefs Brightlands Burgundy ($1.50 Avalon.)

The New Zealand wine ranges are too numerous to list. Avoid the more commercial houses which are marketing rubbish with only sales potential in mind. McWilliams, Corbaro, San Martino, Western Vineyards, Babich's, Nobilla and others have a more honest approach towards wine-making.

---

Don Hewitson
"I'm never gonna stop the reign by complainin'"
SALIENT looks at

THE MONARCHY

By the time this feature is printed everyone (including our seditionists) may have lost the ability to weigh argument sanely. Rationality may have been dissolved in a saccharine solution of blind sentiment and jingoistic hysteria engendered by the New Zealand media's reportage of Dukal quirks, Royal infallibility, and instances of starving, but still loyal, pensioners standing in driving rain for hours in order "to catch a glimpse." Nevertheless we feel that the Royal Tour provides a good opportunity to examine the role of the Monarchy and the assorted paraphernalia which surrounds it.

There are those who claim that the Monarchy is above criticism and on these grounds seek to assert that no one should therefore even attempt to criticise. We could not disagree more. Ideally no institution should be universally accepted as valuable unless it can be proven to be so. This ideal notwithstanding, much of the fervour and sentiment reserved for the Crown seems to be unreasoned, irrational and based on false premises, if based on anything real at all.

It is obvious that the Monarchy, built on the concept of privilege by birth, strong in statute while weak in reality, fabulously wealthy in a society that knows poverty, is bewildering, awe-inspiring, contradictory and anomalous. For these reasons the question of the value of the Monarchy must, if we are to be at all rational, be an open one.

One of the most notable and perhaps most telling features of our preliminary research was that we found that while it was easy to find people willing to attack the Monarchy with what they considered to be rational argument, supporters of the institution were in short and silent supply. Many, it seems, are willing to stand and be counted only when the pointer rests, for one glorious moment, on their shoulder. We endeavoured, with some success, to draw on a community cross-section for the articles printed in this issue. Prince Charles was asked to contribute, but felt disinclined to do so, he did, however, "hope you will understand." Sir Arthur Porritt felt roughly the same way (although he is very interested in receiving a copy of SALIENT.) Sir Leslie Munro was unable to prepare his contribution in time for publication. However, we hope to print his article later in the year.

Clive Thurbsy is a Commonwealth scholar with an English public school background. At present studying at Victoria. He attempts to discuss some of the sociological aspects of the Monarchy. The article by Colen McPherson, a discussion of the rights and wrongs of the honours system, is a reprint from 10 January 1963 issue of New Society. Alister Taylor went along to Parliament to interview the P.M. Did he get there? Make up your own mind—I believe him.

Bruce Jesson, the President of the New Zealand Republican Society, argues that the Monarchy and the sentiment which surrounds it is used to assist British neo-colonialism. He maintains that British businessmen, and indeed, the British Government, use the Monarchy (a form of moral blackmail if you like), to keep us "backing Britain."

Sir James Donald, President of the Constitutional Society, writes of the need for a second legislative chamber for New Zealand, roughly analogous to the House of Lords. Thus, he argues for a system which would tend to make our society more similar to Britain—the sort of society in which a Monarchy, with its Royal Appointments and Honours, would prosper. Gavin Scott, winner of the Royal Commonwealth Essay Competition, 1964, tells us of a psycho-sociological need for the Monarchy. Who is putting on whom becomes a little obscure.

The presentation of the material in this issue may reflect an editorial bias. We assure Mr A.F. Manning, Chief Executive Officer of the Constitutional Society, that "any editorial comment will be confined to an editorial column and will not permeate the whole issue."

We have clearly neglected this assurance. As the material took shape, however, we found that the two other approaches which could have been adopted—the WOMAN'S WEEKLY/WEEKLY NEWS "look at Prince Charles chortling with his school chums" style or the dactyly "this is the real Prince Charles" pedantry of a Sunday Times coloured supplement—were both inappropriate. We feel that the style that we have chosen is more in keeping with a newspaper which sees its principal function outside providing news as questioning the mores of society.
From the international viewpoint the 20th century has been a disastrous period for monarchical systems of government. However, it has also witnessed another form of monarchy - the British Monarchy - which, unlike some others, has remained relatively unscathed. The Monarchy is a constitutional monarchy, a system of government that has evolved over time. This system is based on a combination of tradition, constitutional constraints, and the expectations of the people. The Monarch is the head of state, and the role of the Monarch is largely symbolic. The Monarch is expected to carry out certain ceremonial duties, such as opening Parliament, but the day-to-day running of the country is in the hands of the Prime Minister and the government.

The Monarchy is seen as a unifying force in the country, and as a symbol of stability and continuity. It is also seen as a way of ensuring that the country is led by a figure who is above political party politics. This is because the Monarch is not involved in the political process, and is therefore not seen as a source of conflict.

The Monarch is also seen as a way of ensuring that the country is led by a figure who is above political party politics. This is because the Monarch is not involved in the political process, and is therefore not seen as a source of conflict. The Monarch is also seen as a way of ensuring that the country is led by a figure who is above political party politics. This is because the Monarch is not involved in the political process, and is therefore not seen as a source of conflict.
Colin McInnes

TO KNEEL IS NOT TO KNEE

When the letter arrives from Admiralty House informing us that you will accept a New Year Honour, do you dignify accept, or disdainfully reject? The question is not a probe, unless experience affords the real reply, for nothing is easier to mankind than rejecting temptations that have not been offered.

My maternal grandmother's first cousin, Ridyard Kipling, enjoyed a certain personal popularity, as was evident from the number of times he was offered a knighthood, though he declined all such offers. Throughout his career he was the subject of much derision, but that he was never the Byzantine of popular supposition.

I must say I admire his gesture, and wish more English artists had been content with wreaths of laurel. The real thing set in with Tennyson, the first artist nobleman, and though these dizzily heights have since been reached, I think, in the absurd case of Lord Leighton, the lesser honours soon proliferated. My grandmother's father, Edward Burne-Jones, succumbed to a baronetcy at the kind instance of Mr Gladstone - the family legend has it that his wife Georgiana, a staunchly Ruskinian radical, disapproved, but that his son Philip, later to be the academic portrait painter, looked at his pre-Raphaelite father wistfully.

I feel Burne-Jones was diminished by this appendage because so far as he was an authentic artist it is perhaps not very fast, that fact surely couldn't be improved upon. I also conceive the artist as being a personality not exactly hostile to society but, since inevitably a critic of it, one who must treat it with distinct reserve. But evidently great men have thought otherwise, for Titian and Rubens, among many others, became ennobled, and the late Baron (James) Evers had his statue, thus describing him, outside the Old Stained municipal buildings during his lifetime. On the other hand, one simply cannot imagine a Chevalier Paul Cézanne, a Conde de Pezaro or even a Sir William Shakespeare.

Nonetheless honours like the Order of Merit and Companion of Honour are generally considered a puerile compromise. My grandfather, for instance, in his youth a disciple of William Morris, rejected a Lloyd George knighthood (but kept the prime ministerial letter in an autograph album), but later settled, in his old age, for an OM. This gave him enormous pleasure, but his disreputable grandson was preserver of his forbear's chair of poetry at Oxford.

Yet even these more plebeian appendages seem to me to constitute a lot of true distinction, rather than a gain. This feeling is certainly not shared by my fellow countrymen. Most men (women rather less, I think) adore belonging to exclusive organisations, bedecking themselves with orders, and placing words and letters round about their names; and serious arguments can be adduced to attest the social value of this custom.

The first is that exclusive society merited society's formal recognition and, by this, binds the man honoured to even greater loyalty. The disadvantage here is that conferring an honour is, basically, a political act (I mean even when it is not awarded for directly political services), so that the individual's freedom - and duty - perpetually to reform society is thereby curtailed. In the case, for instance, of the grandfather referred to, he evolved from a militant Morrisian socialist to an acceptable Tory, and his OM set the seal on what I would ungenerously regard as his defeat.

A better justification is that the hope of honours does keep men honest - at least financially speaking. I expect that the incorruptibility of a civil servant, for example, is related to the expectation of these distinctions. Yet I believe the promise of honours does not ensure moral courage (though it may moral rectitude) and probably even specialties at. And I would like to add - at the risk of perpetual punishment from these chaste columns - that a civil service financially corruptible is frequently, if not less, more humane. I feel more respect for, at any rate, foodiness, for customs officers to whom one can pass, say, pesetas, than I do for those par-facced immaculates yet when one reflects what multitudes of Bordellos there now are, and for what, as in the massive Lloyd George creations, they were enobled, let alone that the creation of life peers undermines the whole pleasant fantasy anyway, one may ask, does anyone really want to be made a peer? The almost universal answer undoubtedly is yes, since this ridiculously archaic conferability still possesses, if neither great power, talent nor authentic glamour, a kind of startling allure. To be confronted, at a party, by someone called Daphne Ponting, and to understand instinctively a noble prefix hovers about her person in the unseen air, is to be brought up with a mild jerk. I confess to feeling this myself though would add I experience an equivalent frisson when encountering, unexpectedly, an eminent jockey, variety artist, or liver on immoral earnings.

The fact is few men and women can bear anonymity, especially in a corrupt age like our own when to be a "personality" is thought more as being a person. Few lands seem to escape from the disease - the Russians are loaded with stars and Herodotus was as tastefully as the decadent West. It is true most peoples have found substitutes for the Almanac de Gotha - though not, one supposes, many of the new African nations which remain as oddities with hereditary Obas, Timis and Sardauzas as do we.

We all deplore (or do we?) the inhibiting class structure that still blights our land, yet contemplate acceptively, or with cordial or envious admiration, the annual honours list. Not so, I believe, seems that this is a skeleton round which the whole spirit of class divisions forms the sickly body. Of politicians one might expect that they will not succumb, though so long as Sir Winston Churchill remained a commoner one might have some cause to wonder. As for the artists, I do with the fashion for staying Mr Wells or Mr Shaw or Mr Kipling would return, and that our actors in particular - who, heaven knows, collect disproportionate adulation anyway - would test content with their supposedly traditional role of rogues and vagabonds, and bow gracefully excuses when tempted to become knights or dukes.

Since these notes have taken on a vaguely autobiographical flavour I am evidently determined to get in on the act somehow - I would conclude by describing the narrow escape of my dear father. James Campbell Mcelwes was, in Edwardian days, a noted bartender singer who performed Ralph Vaughan-Williams' earliest songs, and for whom Graham Peel wrote most of his. He was a working class wonder boy, gifted with a divine voice and a somewhat demonic temperament, and he made the great, if inevitable, mistake of marrying into the intellectual bourgeoisie. (I once asked my mother why she accepted his manifestly disastrous proposal; she replied most drily, "he was the first man I met who could speak French").

Anyway, retiring after a sensational divorce and multitudinous accompanying disasters to the haven of Toronto, Canada, he there embarked on a second and even meritorious career as grand old man of Canadian song. Although they made him a professor I think he always hankered for some more notable honour; but as Canada has sensibly rejected all such nonsense, the chances seem slim until the Italian Consul, grateful for his presidency of the Friends of Italy, announced that Mussolini proposed to make him a Commendatore.

Sadly for my dad's ambition, the Duke then invaded Abyssinia, and feeling in Canada was such that the ceremony had to be postponed. With each fresh folly of the Italian dictator it had to be deferred again and again, so that my poor father died plain mistier, as his second son will.

KELBURN BUTCHERY
(1965) Ltd

CHOICE TENDER 1ST GRADE MEATS AND SMALLGOODS

(Prepriet: Kevin Parkinson)
15 Upham Road, Kelburn
PHONE 758-098
Well, I wouldn't say that all the press and TV have been good to me. There was a time you know when there was one paper, the GREY RIVER something I think it was called, which didn't support the party. But now things are better. Danny boys got TRUTH and the SUNDAY NEWS as well as the SUNDAY TIMES and the DOMINION, and that's a help, especially when we need to show visiting politicians how faithful we are to the American flag. That's one of the reasons why I made him Minister of Justice—to keep my tabs on him. He'd been mucking around a lot as Chairman of the Statistics Revision Committee, organising all sorts of little tricks. You'd never think of it old Daz, but sometimes he can move. The old eyes flicker beneath those cloven eyelids, you know. What I am worried about is this new TV-thing in Auckland, the thing with Sir Robert Kerridge, Sir James Doig, Sir James Watters and Sir Clifford Plimmer in it. They're organising it, and they've got some chap called Bredden in running it for them. I must say that I am a little concerned at this whole business. After all, we did set up the Broadcasting Authority to give our boys a bit of the cake, and now these Big Four try and horn in. It's not really fair. Private enterprise means giving the other chap a chance, and I've given Bob and Jim and Jim and Cliff all kneighthoods, so what do they want to do in television? They've got this chap Dredding saying things about the NZBC coverage of Vietnam—saying that it's not been good. Well I see television quite a lot, especially when I'm on, and I would say, without the word of a lie, that the New Zealand Broadcasting coverage of Vietnam and our boys' wonderful part in it has been dealt with magnificently. There were one or two slight hindrances but these people have been removed. I don't see that there is any need whatsoever to say that emphatically, no need whatsoever to improve our television and its coverage of Vietnam. We may be there for some time, especially if young Thomson and Muddon have their way, but there's no need to improve the standards. I go along with what Gilbert Stronger says, that it's a medium for the people, and this is between you and me—the people have very low tastes, very unsophisticated. Just look what happened in the Marlborough Sycrofection. 

But to the original point, sir, what about the men in the media?

I must say that I thought I'd been covering that very point. One thing I don't like is being interrupted. That fellow Austin Mitchell had that very annoying habit, and I put him in his place. Well, as I was saying, we have been treated very well by the press in New Zealand and that's something I would expect because we have been returned, for how many years now, well three times since 1960. And that is something I'm very proud of. We have led four administrations—Holyoake Governments they're now being called, I believe. That is something of which I'm very proud. And Sir John Allan has helped us a lot. They do all our advertising of course, and then there's Denis Blundell. Sir Denis now of course, now High Commissioner in London. That's where Honours come in very useful. I see you see because we can pension blockoffs. Send them to Canada like old one-eye Gote, Sir Leon, and when they've finished being embarrassing they come back here and are too old to do much, so they just retire. It was just lucky that when Gote had to retire his place was vacant for my old friend, Dean Frye. And since he's been there I've seen only one cable from him, and I sent all the cables which pass through because I am, as you will remember, Minister for Foreign Affairs. Very good place Canada, I like my friend Pierre very much and we're expecting him here very shortly. No doubt we haven't got a big French population and we haven't arranged a trip to Alaska, so it will be a very quiet visit. No demonstrations.

Why do you hand out so many knighthoods and important jobs to retired generals and admirals and air marshals?

This has a very long tradition, and I don't like breaking with tradition. I suppose you could call me a Conservative, the same as our old friend Tom Shand. And then too I'm Liberal, all the same, or one day you see recently, Ralph Hanlon. The two are very much the same, that's why I've succeeded, so being adaptable. Well, to answer your point the 'Services,' as they're called, have a very long tradition. And the tradition is that these men get many more Honours, knighthoods, C.M.G.'s, O.B.E.'s and that sort of thing, then any other section of the community. We are more than politicians. I reckon I could name at least twenty military men who've received knighthoods to their names. Of course they have a very difficult job, especially with this ruddy section of the community. So the tradition is that in a knighthood they reach a certain level, and there was only one exception to that. When Walker McDowall was a Member of General Staff we didn't give him a knighthood, we let him potter around his garden for a while, and then he left the chairmanship of the NZBC. That's another form of Honour, of course, for we've got quite a few jobs which are the equivalent of Honours and can be dispensed much more freely. No need to get a signature from the Queen, that sort of thing. But one realises that these jobs are political appointments—just look, we've got the Broadcasting Authority, and don't there are dozens of Chairmanships, all the Governor-General's appointments to University Councils all round the country, the NZBC, the Directors of the Tariff and Development Board (sweet thing that, nearly $7,000 a year for doing damn all). Why I could retire to that and take Kevin O'Brien's place? Some smart aleck political scientist worked it all out once and he said he had over 400 political appointments, well I'd say that was a very conservative estimate.

What about your own knighthood?

Well, that would be too much to tell you at this stage, but the Queen and I had a talk when I was last at Buckingham Palace, and I have arranged an invitation in the Wellington Town Hall when she's here. Very similar to the occasion when she visited here and Sidney Holland and well I'd better not go into that at this stage.
The only good thing about a Royal Tour is the criticism it provokes. Unfortunately, much of the discussion is rather futile. Critics tend to harp on the cost of the Tour (a point easily countered) to argue away the Queen's right to visit her subjects. But this argument is beside the point. Vietnam is a far worse problem, and we should be far more concerned about our relationship with the United States, in the context of the Cold War.

The obvious point is that the Queen's tour is good for New Zealand. The Royal family is likely to be even more important in the country's future. Although the Queen's visit may have been badly organized, it is a symbol of the country's political stability.

The basic case of our dependence on Britain is economic. Our economy is stable and growing, but we remain dependent on Britain. The country's economy is dependent on the UK for many goods, such as clothing, food, and automobiles.

The Queen's visit has been widely criticized. It is not clear what she accomplished. However, she has made a positive impact in the country's relationship with Britain.

Politicization of the British Royal family has led to a decline in its influence. The Queen's visit has been criticized for its cost and the lack of a clear message. The Queen's role as a symbol of unity has been questioned.

The government's actions toward the Queen's visit have been criticized. There is a perception that the government is trying to use the Queen to promote its own agenda.

The Queen's visit has been widely criticized. It is not clear what she accomplished. However, she has made a positive impact in the country's relationship with Britain.
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towards Rhodesia is an example. The Aid Rhodesia Movement claims—probably correctly—that Cabinet really sympathises with Smith; doesn't really favour the idea of sanctions, and only imposes them because of pressure from Britain.

Market dependence is the most obvious limit on our freedom of action, but it isn't the most important. In each of the above cases a less glibly government could have ignored the pressure from Britain. Admittedly the consequences might have been serious, but we could have chosen to accept them, where a particular industry is dominated by foreign capital we do not even have this choice. The decision are made for us by foreigners, often without our realising it.

In recent years we have had a series of development conferences culminating last year in the National Development Conference. The delegates are these are bureaucrats and businessmen. Seemingly, New Zealand industry is cooperating with the New Zealand Government in planning for New Zealand's future. The Agricultural Committee of the National Development Conference must have been dominated by representatives of British concerns.

The recommendations made reflect not so much what New Zealand needs New Zealand should do in the future, but what London thinks New Zealand should do in the future.

The same was true for other sectors of the economy. This is most strikingly demonstrated in our shipping. So long as it is dominated by the British Conference Lines we can only huggle about things like freight charges. We cannot decide. Containerisation, an immensely costly project for New Zealand and ruinous for a number of provincial centres, was decided on by the Conference Lines. The Government and the Harbours Board organise and pay for the new port facilities; but they are providing them for the Conference Lines. It isn't everyone who can demand a several-day conference with the four senior members of the New Zealand cabinet, as the shipping line's officials did in 1967. The Lines, of course, are responsible to their shareholders, not to New Zealand. Whatever the value of their periodic decisions, the motives behind them are very clear.

A particularly alarming feature of the Conference Lines' containerisation report is the underlying assumption that the future must consist of new products sold will be the traditional ones. This is in line with the reluctance of the Lines to cross our newer markets which are kin profitable for them.

Nowadays we notice the power of foreign capital more than we did, say, ten years ago. Possibly this is because we are importing more of it. But the power of payments difficulties have necessitated the development of secondary industries, and foreign capital has established many of these. Another possibly is that recent foreign investment is more international in character.

We don't, however, have the emotional hang-up or the illusions about such countries as Japan and America, that we have about Britain. Americans are seen as grasping capitalists; none like the British, anyway. The British, however, are thought of as legitimate businessmen. Foreign investment was acceptable when it was predominantly British. It did not seem foreign because it supplied more than anyone else, but enough of it comes from other countries to upset us.

Even the left-wing writers, Smith and Rosenberg, have a sentimental grip (with Britain). With them it takes the form of denying our dependence on Britain and asserting that New Zealand is becoming a colony of America and Australia. They see as proof figures for recent years that show that the American and Australian share is growing. As left-wing writers both men have a political interest in abusing America, neither seems interested in criticising Britain. But they cannot excuse their misuse of statistics. The figures quoted by Smith and Rosenberg demonstrate only the cosmopolitan trust American or Australian nature of our new industries. Obviously the British haven't relinquished control of our financial system or of our primary industry. They still, therefore, have more power in New Zealand than in any other country.

Still, the fact that our colonial status is being disguised at all is an improvement. It has been discussed so much just recently that the argument has become routine. Colonials take a helpless attitude; we cannot provide our own skills and capital; they must come from abroad. How can we stand alone in a hostile world, without allies—or is it masters? Nationalists complain about the loss to the country of profits, employment (the investment in converting a trading surplus into a balance of payments deficit). They forget the power that foreigners have in New Zealand, and the Government's humble acceptance of this.

Even the concessions each side makes to the other become routine. Nationalists agree that not all foreign investment is bad; but in practice they oppose every instance of it. Colonials agree that our exports should be processed to a greater degree; but they know it won't happen, because the highly processed product attracts far more import duty than the raw material.

These arguments are important, not because they convince anyone they don't, but for what they reflect a developing New Zealand nationalism. The difference between the nationalist and the colonial is basically one of attitude, and the more abstract, the more the sharper the clash in attitudes. In some ways Royalty has a kind of abstract nature and so argument tends to be futile. It is simply a question of preference. If someone likes the "Britishness" of royalty there is little point in telling him that the British live in the United Kingdom. If he wants to extend the definition of "British" to include people of British descent he might as well, for his definition, have no more logic. All the same, the idea of" British" probably means something which is important. The difference in attitude derives from a number of things: age, sex, intellectual activity and social position (this really means class but we are a little sensitive about that word).

The colonial attitude often derives simply from self-interest. The parents, occupation (clerks, shopkeepers, lawyers, Canterbury's landed gentry, the municipal auditors) make a good living out of colonial New Zealand. They support Royalty, not only because of sympathy for a fellow-passatee, but also because they take New Zealand's colonial function seriously. This is why the colonial attitude is so strong in the universities. Most students are either being trained to be parasites or to work overseas. Usually they do not support Royalty. They are a bit young for that yet. But they speculate for it, which is just as bad.

In a way students are worse than the royalty-obsessed older generation who at least have the excuse of having formed their attitudes at a time when Bill Maisy was picking the last New Zealand to defend the British Empire. Noone is really surprised when the Mt Eden Borough Council offers to show the Queen around Mt Eden (the hall), or when the mayor of Napier and Nelson complain about being left off the royal itinerary. "The kids will be disappointed", but then the kids don't get to shake the royal hand like some people... All that can be said in defence of the students is that they are being trained in a university system that is little more than an extension of the British one (the modelling of the University of Waikato on the University of Sussex is the most striking recent example of this). They consequently run out on the healthily-biased nationalism that less-educated New Zealanders spontaneously develop. Even intellectual nationalists pick up British habits of thought in the universities, such as an aversion to pissing at extremes and a refusal to see us in black and white. Unfortunately they tend to be the spokesmen for nationalism, which probably accounts for its lack of vigour. So long as the leaders of New Zealand nationalism are people of this kind the only hope for nationalism is for Britain to sink beneath the North Sea. With, that Britain the British might do something very similar. Quite the common Market's had even this unlikey to invite New Zealanders to pissing against Poms. Still, one can always hope.
AN ODE TO THE REIGNING MONARCH ON THE OCCASION OF HER MAJESTY'S VISIT TO PIC ISLAND

Madame, I beg perjured with Your trip across the water— Pic Island needs no English myth To keep its gites in order. Though our halfwitted housewives yearn At your image on the TV screen. Forgive me that I cannot praise The Civil Service State Whose blueprints falsify the maze It labours to create, And plants above that sticky mess Yourself in an icing sugar dress. The dead who drink at Bellamy's Are glad when schoolkids clap A Fairy Queen who justifies The rabble and the bureaucrat, In a land where a wharfie's daughter Can marry someday the squatter's son.

While the stuffed monkey, dog and sow, Play Judo in the void, The Auckland pavements carry now Six hundred unemployed, And the bought clerks who sneer at them Will crowd to kiss your diadem.

The girls at Arohata jail Are very rarely dressed in silk— Let us make a Glasgow cocktail Bubbling coal gas into milk, Drink up Mary, Kate and Prue, No better and no worse than you.

Before my birth your soldiers made A football of my skull At Mud Farm when they crucified My father on a pole Because he would take a gun And kill another working man. I give you now to end our talk A roast you will not like: McSwartin the Lord Mayor of Cork Who died on hunger strike. It took him eighty days to drown In the blood and shit that floats the Crown.

While Big Ben bangs out stroke on stroke And the circus wheel spins round, The Maori looks at Holyoke And Holyoke looks at the ground, And there will be more things to say When the Royal Yacht has sailed away.

James K. Baxter
(originally published in ARGOT, March 1963)

THE CASE FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY

I am glad to accept the invitation of the Editor of SALIENT to express my views about constitutional aspects of the Monarchy. I assume that the Editor wishes me to discuss the British Monarchy because it is the only one of which we in New Zealand have an intimate knowledge and I believe that the opinions which I shall put forward are generally representative of those of members of the Constitutional Society who are spread throughout the Dominion.

To my mind the Monarchy as it has evolved for Great Britain, the dominions and the colonies is ideal for those countries. It is a great stabilising influence and it seems to me that the British Commonwealth is united under and behind the monarchy in a way that would be quite impossible if the Head of State of all those countries were a political figure. After all, the Commonwealth countries represent almost all possible political shades of opinion in completely independent states which are governed by widely differing political parties. Yet almost all acknowledge loyalty to the Crown as a fundamental part of their political system.

In Britain itself the Labour and Conservative parties are bitterly opposed to each other on many questions, yet the leaders of each party when in power pay due deference to the Monarch. The Prime Minister has a weekly audience with the Monarch to outline the intentions of the Government. At these private audiences it is impossible to tell how much influence the Monarch—whether it be a Queen or a King—exercises, but history suggests that the Monarch has had a modifying influence on a number of occasions when a political party has sought to go beyond the mandate which it has received from the people at a general election.

In New Zealand, the people see the Monarch all too seldom, but her representative, the Governor-General, is always with us and exercising her functions, except during the brief period between the terms of office of Governors-General, when it is customary for the Chief Justice to act for the Monarch.

In exercising its right of self-determination this Dominion has chosen to depart from the original concept of the form of government granted to New Zealand by the Imperial power. Under the Constitution Act of 1852 it was laid down that there should be a legislature consisting of the Governor (as he was then known) and two Houses of Parliament with power to make laws, provided that they were not repugnant to the laws of the United Kingdom. The Government in office in 1950 chose to abolish the second House of Parliament, the Legislative Council. It should not be thought that departures from the established system of government passed unnoticed by the Monarchy.

As Speaker of the House of Representatives Sir Matthew Onslow visited London a few months later for the opening ceremonies of the new House of Commons which replaced the one destroyed by bombing during the war. Among the events during that visit was a dinner at Buckingham Palace in honour of all the visiting Speakers of their countries' legislatures. The host was, of course, the late King George VI.

As soon as the introductions were over the King sought out Sir Matthew and questioned him closely about the reasons for New Zealand abolishing its Second Chamber of Parliament. He appeared startled, almost shocked, that a government of the type then in office should do such a thing. Sir Matthew could only say, as had been said persuasively, almost incoherently, in the New Zealand Parliament, that “something better” would be put in place of the Legislative Council.

It is interesting to speculate that if the King had been resident in New Zealand and in constant communication with his Prime Minister in this country he could have exercised his influence, based on the wide constitutional knowledge of the Royal Family, to modify what has proved to be one of the most serious constitutional actions of our New Zealand Parliament.

Governors-General are selected for their eminence in some service or professional career, but they cannot be expected to assimilate all the constitutional knowledge possessed by a family which has ruled for centuries. For this reason there is more than passing interest in a recent suggestion that the Monarch should reside for a time in each of the dominions, or even act as Governor-General in one dominion while the heir apparent gains experience in the duties which should one day be his.

On this aspect, a striking example of the lamentable state of our New Zealand Constitution is the fact that when the Monarch was expected to visit New Zealand for the first time in history, Parliament was advised that there was no place in the Constitution for the Monarch to act on such an occasion as the formal opening of Parliament. Consequently the House of Representatives had to pass hastily in 1953 the Royal Powers Act which, in effect, provides that anything that the Governor-General can do the Queen also can do. This is surely a classic case of putting the cart before the horse.

I am convinced that a return to the original constitutional concept for New Zealand is long overdue. The restoration of a Second Chamber of Parliament should be one of the first duties to be tackled by our political leaders. The Constitution will then be in balance once again, and we will be able to fully benefit from our Monarchical form of Government.

Editor's note: Sir James' article has been edited through the omission of several paragraphs relating to the Second Chamber question.
One listened to the Investiture (of Prince Charles as Prince of Wales) with one's heart in one's mouth, and adults felt for his parents and other relatives. They too showed great bravery... God bless our Monarch who continue to enjoy their happy family life for many years to come. They are an example to many of us.

This letter to a Wellington newspaper clearly demonstrated that face of the Monarchy which is its mainstay emotion. Surrounded by an aura of mysticism and adulation, the Monarchy survives in a time of stainless steel sinks and plastic flowers to provide a breath of antediluvian grace. A thread of sentimentality—a yearning for the finer things in life, perhaps, or a respect for tradition—runs through any discussion of things Royal.

One of the official handouts would have it that the principal purpose of the Monarchy is to provide "a personal focus of loyalty." This focus of loyalty becomes ingrained in our characters at a very early age. Rare is the New Zealand primary school that lacks a portrait of the Queen. Equally rare is the New Zealand wedding reception during which the Queen is not toasted. Picture theatres still begin or end with scratched and fruitless shots of a Queen blessèd with the quality of eternal youth. On a more official level all Government action is initiated in the name of the Queen or the Crown—that is, the state is the Crown. It is obvious, however, that this focus of loyalty need not be a personalized one. One only need remember the awe and respect with which the American Constitution is held by camera-toting, globe-trotting Middle America to realize this. What we are talking about here is the final analysis, patriotism: respect and admiration for one's country may be enough but it is obvious that a theoretically omnipotent personality may provide a stronger focus by being extremely easy to identify with.

An extension of the above is the idea that the Monarchy serves a sense of stability and continuity. Governments change (hopefully), politicians fade away (hopefully), policies change, but the Crown remains—stodgy and immutable. British subjects can thus see their country in the Monarchy, rather than in changing, and often bungled, governments. Thus, in the words of a British romantic poet, "Our King is an image of God on earth."

Consequently the combination of pomp (the physical manifestation of the state), and power (the actual running of the state), may necessarily mean that serious dissent is dangerous to the state itself and not merely dangerous to the continued whole of those who are administering the state. A possible conclusion is thus that the British Monarchy, by remaining aloof from partisan affairs, actually helps to ensure the continuity of the political system, quite apart from merely providing a sense of continuity.

Not all the purposes for which the Monarchy exists, however, are as abstract as these. According to TIME "the Queen and her relations provide the finest body of bazaar openers, foundation stone layers and medal awardees that a ceremony-loving people could wish for." This, of course, is a feature of the Monarchy's "focus of loyalty" function. To a Lithuanian the sight of Princess Anne presenting a leek to the Welsh Guards during St. David's Day celebrations may be a little odd. To all those involved, however, (with the possible exception of the leek), the act is important as an example of regal involvement in everyday life.

Besides these functions the Monarchy still has some remaining political functions and discretionary powers—the right to ride the Army and to dismiss the Civil Service, for example. The exercise of this power has long been forbidden by constitutional convention but is, nevertheless, still theoretically possible. Even those functions on the way out. Principles of equal opportunity for all, and advancement solely on the basis of merit, are more in tune with the supposedly egalitarian nature of our society. Much of the ceremonial which surrounds the Monarchy is derived from the days when the divine right of kings was in vogue. The right that is now largely discarded—has the ceremony any relevance now that its basis is nearly forgotten? The Royal Family have perhaps already answered this question by attempting to place the Monarchy on a less formal level. The success or failure of their endeavour may be more important than even they realize.

Closely allied to this notion that the Monarchy is irrelevant is the fact that it is also head of the Establishment; which, as described by Kingsley Martin in The Crown and the Establishment, is "that group of government that has not been subjected to democratic control." The Establishment's core has always been, and is, aristocratic or neo-aristocratic. The catch is that the Establishment exists, with the Monarch as its focal point (prejudices as unwisely one, in an age when most societies profess to be classless. The Honours which are handed out twice a year form an integral part of this Establishment. Although there have been no hereditary peers granted in any recent years, there have been quite sufficient life peerages and knighthoods to create the framework of a class structure. It is not uncommon for the politician, even if he is not a member of the Establishment, to find himself unable to be knighted a knighthood because of this point in his article by outlining the contradiction involved in our admiration for those who receive these honours and our denunciation of anything associated with snobbery.

A final point on which the Monarchy has been criticized is its cost. This issue, directly involving the taxpayers' money, must surely be one of the most basic. Those who argue that the Monarchy is a drain on the United Kingdom's exchequer, however, often forget the money which the Monarchy draws to the U.K. as a tourist attraction. It is true, nevertheless, that many superficial Crown poesesses could be cashed without lowering the Queen's standard of living, destroying her regal image. This could be an area where the Royal Family could help bring up its own image. The Commonwealth taxpaying, however, the House of Lords for complaint—Royal tours and Governors General cost money, much money, the returns are small, at least in a tangible sense.

It has been argued that the economics of it all are irrelevant, if the people want a Monarchy, and it seems that most people do, then they should have one. As long as curious crowds can remain engrossed in the sight of an excited bureaucrat indistinguishably swept up in the Queen's train to tread (as they did at the Overseas Terminal last week) the Monarchy needs no justification.
Her Majesty's a pretty nice girl

But she doesn't have a lot to say

Her Majesty's a pretty nice girl

But she changes from day to day

I want to tell her that I like her a lot

But I gotta get a belly—full of wine

Her Majesty's a pretty nice girl

Some day I'm gonna make her mine