

ON THE DIGNITY OF THE CROWN

It is a truth, universally known, that sovereignty lies with him who wields the greatest power. The power to translate one's commands into action. Without understanding this natural law of executive power, a subject risks his freedom, and with it his life. And what greater dishonour could there be than this? Sir William Blackstone highlights in his 'Commentaries' and Nature concurs, that the dignity of the Crown of England, nay of any state, lies in its sovereignty, perfection and perpetuity. And yet, opponents to the natural law — especially the ideologists of the socialist persuasion — would declare that it is the will of the people (in reality for them, their vile oligarchy of excessive and deficient vice) who do have, and may have, the choice of where executive power lies. And so, we must answer, does the dignity of the sovereign lie with the natural law or consumer taste? As it is expedient as it is true, Sir William Blackstone's categories of sovereign dignity will be defended by the natural law: as interpreted by Aristotle, Cicero, Thomas Hobbes, Nietzsche and Machiavelli at least. And thus, to prove the folly of ideological interpretations against sovereign dignity. Nevertheless, we shall leave the verdict to the carefully thought and praiseworthy judgement of the people. Let us begin with the sovereignty of the Crown.

The first element of the dignity of the royal prerogative — necessary for facilitating the happiness of the people — is its sovereignty. By sovereignty, we mean ultimate control of affairs under one's jurisdiction. That is, in all disputes — and all matters of public policy — the King is the final authority in determining such issues. As Emperor Augustus in accumulating his offices, or King Henry VII's usurpation of the throne, in the beginning, sovereignty is a simple matter of the will to power. It is he who knows, and who wields power, most successfully who will achieve his aims in statehood. It is only then out of expedience that the common law expects a king's blood heir to inherit the office of supreme magistrate; unless a stranger dares take the throne for himself. And so, whilst any kingdom lives with the mask of Salic monarchy, in reality, all monarchy is openly contested. It is only by failing to submit to fear, or disregarding the lofty ideals of virtue, that a non sovereign becomes sovereign lord of his state. In this way, the Crown is best designed to achieve the happiness of the people. For by uniting all power in the land to one individual, this best facilitates strength, unity and independence for the Crown's interests. And happiness manifests itself in strength, unity and independence. So a king is the best guarantor to achieve happiness. And this we see in many examples: King Henry V's heroic warfare; King Henry VII's prudent policy or King William I's wisdom in protecting the old institutions through the new. This element of regal authority is the best to ensure the growth and preservation of the state. And unlike tyranny, especially in England's mixed constitution before the House of Lords Act 1999, a splendid balance was achieved between monarchy, aristocracy and polity to ensure the common benefit of the people was achieved in a way that prevented incompetent government. Ideologists would starkly wail it is foolhardy to grant the Crown sovereignty, as it is unrepresentative and so somehow against the common good. Not only are the concepts unrelated, they are irrelevant to a discussion of sovereignty. A tyrant, even under the cloying name of President or Prime Minister, is simply the sovereign magistrate of his people. Surely it is better to separate the office from the individual in a fashion which ensures that the power of sovereignty remain under the king's (and therefore, the people's) perpetual control than the mere matter of a vote cast every five years or so? A vote cast on consumer trends and middlemen to the state and the people. Furthermore, ideologists often forget that a king is as representative as an elected magistrate; if not, more so. For it is from the absence of

rebellion or mutiny that the people must consent to a ruler. For if the disgust in government was so great, the people would rise up to overthrow it and reform it: as in 1789 France or 1917 Russia. And so, sovereignty is an essential element to the dignity of the royal prerogative, and one that is as useful as it is invaluable for the common good.

After sovereignty, the next chief element in the dignity of the Crown is its perfection. By perfection, we mean that the Crown can never be at fault. Like God, the Crown is a temporal manifestation of God: omniscient, omnipotent, omnibenevolent. It is an office, and not purely a person. In this way, succession is rather like the inheritance of heirs to estates, and that is why crown princes, like our Prince of Wales, is called the heir. It is also why usurpers — from Napoleon Bonaparte to King Henry IV — do much to preserve a heredity claim to a throne; a demonstration of natural succession. This is also why, as an office, the office and the person of the Crown are different bodies; with the person simply being himself entrusted with the Crown's power for the duration of his life. It is in this context that when a challenge is levied against incompetent government, it is not the Crown at fault, and not the holder of it by natural law, but by the power enforced and advice of king's counsellors. It is in this way that we say that the Crown is perfect. Naturally, the holder of the office may be fallible to incompetence, and yet the office itself is beyond such possibility: legally and logically. Needless to say, a Marxist perspective on the perfection of the Crown would resort to sophistry. It would resort to equating the office with the person, and in so doing totally destroy the truth of English government for something alien and foreign. How foolish is it to punish the fisher when it is his line which is at fault? And so, the perfection of the Crown is a necessary element in its dignity; as well as, therefore, for the strength, unity and independence of the state.

With sovereignty and perfection explored, the final element of the Crown's dignity is its perpetuity. By perpetual, we mean its eternity. In a similar vein to the Crown's perfection, its perpetuity derives from the natural law. Following Aristotle's natural law, the law of cause and effect is essential for understanding this concept of the dignity. As all things have an efficient cause, so too does the Crown. All objects have an efficient cause: a force which causes something to come into being. And as the universe is derived from God, so too is the Crown derived from authority. Of course God ultimately, but in England's particular case, the Act of Union 1800 (for the United Kingdom), the Act of Union 1707 (for England and Scotland), the Act of Union 1536 (for England and Wales), the unification of King Æthelstan in 927 (for England) and even the intercessions of the Roman empire, republic and kingdom, and the Greeks who preceded them. In this way, whilst the municipal law simply affirms what is already known in nature, it is the natural law which ultimately upholds and protects the perpetuity of the Crown. And the Crown must be perpetual; for it is the physical endowment of the state. And as long as there are people, there are states to govern them: hence the folly of tyrannies and temporary governments like 'Western democracies' (truly the grandest sophistry of oligarchy the world has even played). But naturally, the ideologists of a socialist persuasion would argue that power truly resides in the people, and so the perpetuity is relative to such with power. And yet, whilst it is a credible lie that even my ears fell fancy to its tastes, it is a fallacious one. The chief reason being that it is an unfaithful reflection of the natural law. Does a forest grow by the consent of the animals? Of course not. It happens simply by the everlasting laws of cause and effect, and the laws of Aristotelean causation. That is why such ideological assumptions of statehood — especially with respect to the dignity of the Crown — are ridiculous. And so, perpetuity is a necessary and vital competent of the dignity of the Crown.

The dignity of the Crown lies with its sovereignty, perfection and perpetuity. Ideologists would say it lies in the consent of the people; making their choices (much akin to choices consumers make on

shop shelf). As children of England, it is our duty of birth and honour to uphold what is ours. Truth, of course. And especially one founded on reason and sensibility over assumed causes. Support this categorisation of the dignity of the Crown, and England will continue to prosper ever more — as it has under Queen Elizabeth I, King Henry VII and Emperor Augustus. Neglect it; vandalise it, and you destroy all that is valuable and honourable and sacred for the realm. Submit to the Crown's dignity, support the Crown, defend our laws.