

ON THE QUIBBLE THAT THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE

§0: THE PLEA OF JOHN AYLMER.

It will be earnestly pleaded by many, what John Aylmer pleaded:

In **the** 'Harborowe **of** True and Faithful Subjects,' published in 1559 by **Aylmer**, afterwards Bishop **of** London, in answer to **John** Knox's celebrated treatise against female monarchy entitled 'A Blast **of the** Trumpet against **the** Monstrous **Regiment of** Women,'² **the** author thus enumerates his reasons why, in **England**, 'it was not so dangerous a matter to have a woman ruler as men take it to be:' 'First, it is not she that ruleth, but **the** laws, **the** executors whereof be her judges appointed by her, her justices, and such other officers. Secondly, she maketh no statutes or laws, but **the** honourable court **of** parliament; she breaketh none, but it must be she and they together, or else not. If on **the** other part **the** regiment were such as all hanged on **the** king's or queen's will, and not upon **the** laws written; if she might decree and make laws alone without her senate; if she judged offences according to her wisdom, and not by limitation **of** statutes and laws; if she might dispose alone **of** war and peace; **if, to be short, she were a mere monarch, and not a mixed ruler, you might peradventure make me to fear the matter the more, and the less to defend the cause.'**

In the first months of Elizabeth's reign, Aylmer, afterwards bishop of London, published an answer to a book by John Knox, against female monarchy, or, as he termed it, "Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women;" which, though written in the time of Mary, and directed against her, was of course not acceptable to her sister. The answerer relies, among other arguments, on the nature of the English constitution, which, by diminishing the power of the crown, renders it less unfit to be worn by a woman. "Well," he says, "a woman may not reign in England! Better in England than any where, as it shall well appear to him that without affection will consider the kind of regiment. While I compare ours with other, as it is in itself, and not maimed by usurpation, I can find none either so good or so indifferent. **The regiment of England is not a mere monarchy, as some for lack of consideration think, nor a mere oligarchy nor democracy, but a rule mixed of all these, wherein each one of these have or should have like authority. The image whereof, and not the image but the thing indeed, is to be seen in the parliament-house, wherein you shall find these three estates; the king or queen which representeth the monarchy, the noblemen which be the aristocracy, and the burgesses and knights the democracy. If the Parliament use their privileges, the king can ordain nothing without them: if he do, it is his fault in usurping it, and their fault in permitting it.**

- Thomas Pitt Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History from the Teutonic Conquest to the Present Time*, page 488.

See:

<https://books.google.com/books?id=wdorAQAAIAAJ&pg=PA488&dq=%22In+the+%27Harborowe+of+True+and+Faithful+Subjects,%27+published+in+1559+by+Aylmer,+afterwards+Bishop+of+London%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=ra1oVZGbHoq2yATf54PQAw&ved=0CCcQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=%22In%20the%20%27Harborowe%20of%20True%20and%20Faithful%20Subjects%2C%27%20published%20in%201559%20by%20Aylmer%2C%20afterwards%20Bishop%20of%20London%22&f=false>.

And the **one** thing that the defenders of the English monarchy are *always* pleading in favor of the right of the queen to reign, without any sympathy for the cause of woman suffrage is that the Queen cannot act without the advice of her ministers! Here is my answer to their assertions. **Either it is altogether lawful under Divine Law for a WOMAN to exercise the real power inherent in governing in the civil and political sphere, or else it is altogether unlawful.**

§1: FIRST REASON WHY “THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE” CANNOT VINDICATE REIGNING QUEENS FROM THE HEINOUS AND ATROCIOUS GUILT OF UNLAWFULLY EXERCISING AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE.

§1.0: I will now prove it by contradiction. Simple example: The square root of 2 is irrational.

Proof: Suppose that “Square Root of 2” had been rational. But then “Square Root of 2” = a/b , in which a, b are natural numbers. Then $2 = a^2 / b^2$. One of the fundamental principles of arithmetic is that the ratio a/b can always be written so that a, b have no common divisor > 1 . (This is called Simplest Terms.) Therefore $2 \times b^2 = a^2$. Since a^2 is even, ‘ a ’ is even. Therefore $a = 2 \times f$. Thus $2 \times b^2 = (2 \times f)^2 = 4 \times f^2$ and therefore $2 \times b^2 = 4 \times f^2$, ergo $b^2 = 2 \times f^2$, which is even meaning b is also even: $b = 2 \times g$, ergo the ‘Square Root of 2’ = $a/b = f/g$, where a, b have 2 as a common divisor – in violation of the assumption that they have no common divisor > 1 ! **QED**

Corollary: The quibble that f/g can be taken as the new solution cannot be accepted either. For assume that “Square Root of 2” = p/q . The proof above that p and q have 2 as a common divisor can also be applied to f/g . Since this proof applies to ALL fractions P/Q however much you may SINCERELY believe it equals the square root of 2, it shows that NO fraction you propose as being the square root of 2 can be assumed to be the square root of 2 without violating one of the fundamental principles of arithmetic! Therefore all objections are overruled. And the same is also true for the square root of any prime number, or any other number that is not a perfect square.

§1.1: Theorem. Every act of *reigning* (either as king/queen, or any other supposed monarchical title of “sovereignty”) is either an act of having, holding, claiming, seeking, or practicing the right and liberty of *ruling*, or else a heinous violation of the Divine Law.

Proof: Let us consider some particular situation or event E0 at which H. R. M. the reigning or regent king/queen is content to reign under the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule”.

But then, the sum total T of constitutional conditions and constraints (whether legally codified or not) under which the said king/queen reigns, has been assumed not only to be necessary, but also sufficient and actually efficient to affirm and confirm the lawfulness and legitimacy (viz. according to Divine Law and not just merely human laws) of his/her royal majesty’s act of reigning over the kingdom.

Either the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule” is one of these **necessary** conditions or else it isn’t.

If the pretext **is** one of the necessary conditions, well then, on the very INSTANT the king/queen violates this condition, his/her act of reigning IMMEDIATELY and AUTOMATICALLY becomes – at least for the moment – illicit, invalid, null, and void (yea, and contrary to Divine Law, unless possibly he/she corrects this error), and every all and singular subject of that realm is at least temporarily absolved from his duty of allegiance to the reigning king/queen. But the moment the king/queen obeys this condition, along with the other necessary conditions, his act of reigning for the moment is licit and valid, and every subject is bound by law and in conscience (at least for the moment if not permanently) to yield allegiance to the king/queen.

Neither will it make a difference **what** sort of policies parliament or the politicians are trying to make and get enacted into law to be enforced, for these policies or political controversies can do absolutely NOTHING to change the fact the collection of conditions was already assumed to be necessary, sufficient, and actually efficient to guarantee the legitimacy of the king/queen’s reign! The king/queen, by hypothesis, has already done HIS/HER part.

It is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution that **every** human law (or even mere custom) contrary to the Divine Law is repugnant to the order of society, and therefore null and void. And so accordingly, without risk of logical fallacy, we can consider, among all those cases in which H. R. M. the reigning or regent king/queen is content to reign under the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule”, the case C0, such that in the event E0, one or more politicians, ministers, or Members of Parliament, etc., proposes a law which the king/queen KNOWS is contrary to divine law and contrary to the coronation oaths, and they advise H. R. M. to give his/her royal assent to it!

Now because the sum total T of conditions, stipulations, and restraints on the prerogatives of the king/queen has been assumed to be necessary, sufficient, and actually efficient to guarantee the legitimacy of the king/queen’s right to reign, if the king/queen’s right to reign is legitimate in C0, it is so in E0, and vice versa.

If it is legitimate in E0 it remains legitimate in C0 even in the absence of E0, or else, suppose that in the case C1 consisting of the case in which C0 occurs but not E0, it had

been illegitimate. But then because T was assumed to be necessary, sufficient, and actually efficient to guarantee the legitimacy of the king/queen's reign, the only reason for this illegitimacy is the violation of one or more of the constituent items (and J is any one of such items) in T. Since the presence or absence of E0 can do NOTHING to change the fact that J is a necessary condition, and that therefore the violation of J is sufficient and actually EFFICIENT to DISQUALIFY the king/queen from lawfully reigning over the kingdom, it would remain unlawful for him/her to reign in the case C1; but that is contrary to the hypothesis! Therefore, the legitimacy of the king/queen's reign in the case C0 implies the same in E0. Ergo: the king/queen's right to reign is legitimate in C0 if and only if it is also legitimate in E0.

But then, in case C0, either the king/queen accepts the advice of his/her ministers or else he/she doesn't! If he/she DOES, well then, he/she is GUILTY of violating the Law of God. For it is written, "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil"! But if he/she DOESN'T, well then, these ministers are no longer the REAL rulers at that moment, but the king/queen himself, for his/her word overrules theirs, or at least is hopefully intended to do so, even if they try to resist it! Neither will it excuse the king/queen to say that all further resistance to their evil schemes is futile. His/her soul will be judged by Almighty God and not these evil politicians! Even if these evil politicians desired to ASSASSINATE the reigning monarch, IT IS BETTER TO DIE THAN TRANSGRESS! ***QUI NON PROPULSAT INIURIAM QUANDO POTEST, INFERT*** – He who does not prevent an injury when he can, brings it on. It is better to RESIGN and ABDICATE the throne if those evil politicians persist in their evil schemes! Neither will the plea of "inability" excuse the reigning monarch; but on the contrary, such a plea shows a lack of trust in Divine Providence to defeat all their efforts and attempts to overcome all resistance to their evil policies. Again, either mankind has freewill (especially of the Arminian, Semi-Pelagian, or Pelagian kind) or else he doesn't. If mankind DOES, well then, the monarch's "inability" doesn't really exist; therefore his/her failure or neglect or refusal to RESIST the evil schemes of the politicians is all the more inexcusable. But if mankind DOESN'T, well then, how can we reconcile this with all the Bible verses which seem to teach and preach and COMMAND just as if mankind DID have this freewill? Again, the TRUE and ONLY TRUE doctrine of "freewill" is given in Article 17 of the Book of Concord. And again, her plea of "inability" denies the BASIC DOGMA of divine providence which WE BELIEVE, TEACH and CONFESS, pursuant to Psalms LXXXIV.11, according to which God will withhold NO GOOD THING from those who seek to OBEY that very point which they happen to KNOW is the Divine Law. Even if freewill **didn't** exist, the fault is still in the reigning monarch's own carnal and sinful UNREGENERATE nature no less than in that of the evil politicians. The problem is that the monarch's essential being as a mere mortal man, whether young or old, male or female, by virtue of being a son/daughter of fallen Adam, is no less **innately** evil and malicious than that of each and every one of the evil politicians. The monarch's NEGLIGENCE or REFUSAL to RESIST their evil schemes is merely the fruit of his fallen carnal SIN NATURE – and a good tree CANNOT bring forth evil fruit, nor can a BAD tree good fruit. Even if the monarch is already saved, it is no longer he/her but SIN that dwells in him/her that NEGLECTS or REFUSES to OBEY what he/she KNOWS is the Divine Law. Therefore, the pretext of inability or lack of success will not vindicate

the monarch on the Day of Judgment. But again, if the monarch DOES succeed in RESISTING and VANQUISHING the policy of his evil advisers and politicians, then he DOES the very thing that makes him the REAL ruler of the realm on that point. Therefore, **every** attempt the monarch MAKES in order to succeed in this resistance is **objectively** an **intent** to become the REAL ruler of the realm, regardless of his MOTIVES or FEELINGS. Intent is objective and refers to the natural and probable consequences of an action.

But if the pretext is **NOT** one of the necessary conditions, well then, the king/queen's reign remains legitimate even if he/she REFUSES to practice the principle that the king reigns but does not rule. His/her act of actually RULING/GOVERNING as well as REIGNING is licit (and all his/her subjects are bound to yield fealty and allegiance, and presumably, they are bound to obey him/her in all laws not contrary to divine law: but every feeble minded but good-willed NINCOMPOOP already KNOWS that the best proof of their obedience to the king/queen includes their obedience to the **laws** to which his/her majesty the reigning or regent king/queen has given the royal assent).

Ergo: every act of *reigning* (either as king/queen, or any other supposed monarchical title of “sovereignty”) is either an act of having, holding, claiming, or seeking the right and liberty of *ruling*, or else a heinous violation of the Divine Law. QED

§1.2: Corollaries and Scholia of Theorem 1.1:

§1.2.1: Corollary I: If it be true that the divine order of creation of the sexes excludes women from public and civil office no less than from church office, then it follows that NO reigning queen can vindicate herself from the charge of violating the divine order of creation of the sexes by pleading that the reigning monarch reigns but does not rule. For a reading of the Bible from back to front concerning the proper prerogatives of earthly kings shows that the divine law, as recorded in the Old and New Testaments of the Bible grants absolutely NO acknowledgment / acquiescence / concession in favor of the supposed point of constitutional protocol that “the king reigns but does not rule/govern”. Therefore the quibble that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule/govern”, even if (the reigning king/queen conducts himself as though it had been) factually true, cannot exonerate *any* reigning queen, not even a mere nominal one, from the charge of actually claiming the right and liberty of personally and actively exercising the activity of *ruling* and *governing* in the affairs of state; even though she does not consciously *intend* or *wish* to make such a claim, or actually exercise in person, such functions of ruling and governing, nevertheless, such a claim of lawfully having the liberty to rule and govern over the realm is still the tacit and spontaneous logical, metaphysical, and philosophical implication of her act of reigning as a reigning queen, even though the whole kingdom of England had been entirely unaware of it since time immemorial; but this claim of the lawful right of a reigning queen to practice the activities of rule and government in the affairs of state, as opposed to merely just reigning, is **precisely** the thing that John Knox in his “First Blast” condemns as a cardinal sin against divine law.

§1.2.2: Objection: You forgot another possibility: what if the English constitution had allowed the queen to reject the advice of her ministers if she knows it is a violation of the Law of Nature and Nature's God? Since your proof does not take this case into account, therefore your proof is fallacious.

Answer: Oh sure, that may be allowed, but commonly is it not customary, especially in this modernistic day and age. Even in the 19th century, it was not common. The risks were too great. We can now modify T to allow for this exceptional case, and therefore get T*, which can also be assumed to be of such a nature that every item is necessary and the sum total is sufficient and actually efficient to make it lawful *de jure divino* for the queen Q to reign.

But then in that one particular case, it is evident that the *real* rulers under color of the Laws of God are no longer the ministers or parliament: it is the queen herself. In that one case, the queen q is no longer just a mere nominal ruler. She is now the REAL and TRUE enforcer of the Laws of Nature and Nature's God if she chooses to follow the law of Nature and Nature's God by REJECTING the evil advice of her ministers!

As long as she complies with these conditions T* - the permissibility (at least on mere sufferance if by no higher grounds) of the queen's exercise of the distinctive functions of being a reigning monarch simply do not depend on the policies of the day that Parliament may devise or her ministers may advise her to accept. We assumed that the conditions T (or in this case T*) are not only *necessary*, but also *sufficient* to make it *permissible* for the queen to reign.

But being the REAL and TRUE ruler of the realm – however sincere and noble her intentions or motives are – is the very thing FORBIDDEN by the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN”, however plausible may be in any given particular case the reasons for being *de facto* the REAL and TRUE ruler of the realm in that one particular instant – against the normal and ordinary right of the ministers to exercise *de facto* the real power. The “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN” is by nature a NEGATIVE precept. And since the presumption is always in favor of the prevailing terms and provisions of the Divine sentence,

“17. (1.) Negative precepts have no parts of duty, no degrees of obedience, but consist in a mathematical point; or rather in that, which is not so much, for it consists in that, which can neither be numbered nor weighed. No man can go a step from the severest measure of a negative commandment; if a man do but in his thought go against it, or in one single instance do, what is forbidden, or but begin to do it, he is entirely guilty. "He that breaks one, is guilty of all," said St. James; it is meant of negative precepts; and then it is true in every sense relating to every single precept, and to the whole body of the negative commandments. He that breaks one, hath broken the band of all; and he that does sin, in any instance or imaginary degree, against a negative, hath done the whole sin, that is, in that commandment forbidden.” – The Right Rev. Jeremy Taylor,

The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor, page 316. See:
<https://books.google.com/books?id=73ZPAAAAAYAAJ&pg=PA316&dq=%22Negative+precepts+have+no+parts+of+duty%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=JK5oVbqrNda1yATpmoHYDQ&ved=0CCQQ6AEwAQ#v=onepage&q=%22Negative%20precepts%20have%20no%20parts%20of%20duty%22&f=false>.

But if *Q* were truly in a subject state, like all the other subjects of the realm, she *could* actually BREAK the unrighteous law without usurping authority over those MALES who have the *de facto* government (which usurpation is PRECISELY the sin condemned in the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN”). However, because *Q* claims to be the sovereign queen, she simply cannot reject the advice of her ministers, however evil, without thereby being the REAL and TRUE ruler of the realm, thereby USURPING the *de facto* government into her own hands in that one matter – which usurpation, however plausible may be the reasons for it, is PRECISELY the sin condemned in the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN”!

And the **less** the number of cases in which she is under obligation to unconditionally (or even conditionally) accept, and abide by, the advice of her ministers, the **closer** and **closer** she can become to being an absolute despotal monarch - which usurpation, however plausible its reasons, is *a fortiori* PRECISELY one of the **cardinal** sins condemned in the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN”! Therefore Corollary I of Theorem 1.1 still stands as before. **OBJECTION OVERRULED!**

§1.2.3: Corollary II. It will NOT help matters to object, “Women have been queens, yet the cases wherein the king had no sons or male issue but only daughters to inherit thereof, are rare and exceptional, and happen without harm to family. Women are queens for the common good, to keep succession in family and smother ambition. Queens govern through men: ergo, it is lawful (if not by right, well then at least by mere sufferance) for women to be queens (but only under THOSE specified conditions) even if they had no right to vote or hold public office.” For then we can make these conditions, however stringent and seemingly adapted to preserve the commonwealth and preserve the family and preserve the natural distinctions between the sexes, part and parcel of T and therefore get W, which can also be assumed to be of such a nature that every item is necessary and the sum total is sufficient and actually efficient to make it lawful *de jure divino* for the queen *Q* to reign. And let C(T) stand for: “T is of such a nature that every item in T is necessary and the sum total of the items in T is sufficient and actually efficient to make it lawful *de jure divino* for the reigning/regent queen to reign”.

Since the proof applies to every T for which C(T) is true (by Theorem 1.1 and its corresponding Corollary I) and therefore to W itself, it proves that *no* T for which C(T) is true (and therefore not even W) can ever exonerate the “queen” from the guilt of the very “sin” condemned in the “first blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women” even if she complies faithfully with all the conditions definitive of T (or in this case, W)!

§1.2.4: Corollary III. Much more then, under the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN”, is despotic absolute monarchy forbidden to women to exercise, either as sovereigns, or as subordinate authoritative officers thereof!

§1.2.5: Corollary IV. Nor will it be lawful for women to *inherit* the throne. Yea, not even *the law of MOSES for the daughters of ZELOPHEHAD* [Numb. xxvii. 7, and xxxvi. 11] by which daughters shall inherit the estate, goods, lands, monies, and chattels (real and/or personal) of their fathers in default of male issue of the father will *ever* justify or vindicate these daughters in inheriting the prerogative of bearing **rule, superiority, dominion or empire above any realm, nation or city** – not even the very realm, nation, or city whereover their father or guardian or testator exercised **rule, superiority, dominion or empire!**

For John Knox wisely and carefully observed in his *First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women* that nothing unlawful for women to exercise or practice under Divine or Natural Moral Law can be their lawful due or inheritance. Nor can it be lawful for her to transfer it or convey it to anyone else to exercise in her name.

Nor will *the long custom which hath received the Regiment of Women, the valiant acts and prosperity, together with some Papistical laws which have confirmed the same* excuse them from this very guilt!

Nor will it excuse them on the Day of Judgment to plead the following pleas:

(a) Item: *That albeit Women may not absolutely reign by themselves (oh, but on the contrary, they may neither sit in judgment, neither pronounce sentence, neither execute any other public office): yet they shall do all such things by their Lieutenants, Deputies, and Judges substitutes.*

(b) Item: *That a woman born to rule over any realm, may choose her a husband; and to him she shall transfer and give her authority and right.*

For from a polluted and venomous fountain, there cannot spring forth any pure and salubrious (=wholesome) water. *Nunquam Licet – Nunquam Licuit – Nunquam Licebit* – it always IS, WAS, and will always CONTINUE to be unlawful – for any man to grant or delegate the thing which does not justly appertain unto himself! Therefore these titular reigning queens cannot hope to vindicate themselves from this crime by transferring the throne to their husbands on pretext of dowry and coverture.

Another reason why the long-standing customs and laws of men is also an inadmissible plea is because every custom that goes against manifest truth is no better than the antiquity of error. In fact, even the “roman catholics” themselves are FORCED against their will to confess this, for the Pope Pius XI declared *ex cathedra* and *de fide* that in *Casti Connubii* in 1930 that “NO REASON, HOWEVER GRAVE, MAY BE PUT FORWARD BY WHICH ANYTHING INTRINSICALLY AGAINST NATURE MAY BECOME CONFORMABLE TO NATURE AND MORALLY GOOD”.

§1.2.6: Corollary V: One cannot oppose woman suffrage (nor can one oppose even women civil magistrates) in the State and yet consistently and rationally favor female succession to the sovereign throne. For opposition to woman suffrage is usually based on the principle of the subordination of the FEMALE sex to the MALE sex. If it is not just or scripturally permissible for women to vote, it is not just or scripturally permissible for women to hold public office. Every ultraconservative knows that! But this is precisely the essence of the “FIRST BLAST OF THE TRUMPET AGAINST THE MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN!”, which implies Corollary I. **Q.E.D.**

§1.2.7: Corollary VI: Yet there are those who will CONTINUE to staunchly *deny* that the reign of a reigning queen in a constitutional monarchy is civil feminism and gynecocracy. They say that the queen *reigns*, but does not *rule*. The *actual* ruling is done by the ministers (all of whom are males), including most of all, the Prime Minister. Unfortunately, this theorem proved that even *this* proposed distinction will not vindicate the lawfulness of her reign. For if it had been permissible even on mere *sufferance*, it would have *remained* so even if the ministers and/or Parliament make a legislative or political decision or decree contrary to Nature and/or Divine Law – provided only that the constitutional limitations and stipulations on her reign are fully complied with. Her “decision” in this matter is either to comply with the advice of her ministers or overrule and veto it. If she complies, she is going against Divine law. If she refuses to comply, well then her ministers are no longer the ruling *de facto* power – she now is. But then it is now a *de facto* act of gynecocracy. So the end result must either be that the queen is guilty of being a lukewarm Laodicean half-hearted professed “Christian”, or else she has followed a multitude to do evil, or else she must reject the advice of her ministers and therefore overrule and veto her ministers and therefore commit a *de facto* act of gynecocracy – each of which, by hypothesis, is against Divine Law. Thus by a *reductio ad absurdum*, we have proven *de jure Divino* that her title to the throne is unlawful in this one case, and therefore in all other cases whatsoever.

<http://books.google.com/books?id=firHg-GgiQoC&pg=PA11&dq=it+is+the+mere+holding+of+an+office+of+power+WOMAN+SUFFRAGE:>

It will not do to say, as Rev. Dr. Bushnell does, (in another connection, however, and pertinent to the matter he has in hand,) that the women who have reigned have been merely nominal rulers, while men have really administered the government. History I feel sure establishes the fact incontrovertibly against him. But if the fact be as he claims, it has no pertinence here, for it is the mere *holding* of an office of power, not the vigorous *administration* of the office, that constitutes the offense against the Bible.

§1.2.8: Corollary VII: Since negative precepts and negative ukases of the Divine law are of the nature that they have no part of duty, no degrees of obedience, it follows that whosoever shall do even the LEAST degree of the expressly named or implied action(s) forbidden by the given law is therefore *ipso facto* entirely guilty of the *whole* sin. (James 2:10.) Furthermore, whosoever shall suffer even the *least* degree of these things to be

done by others in his name and upon his honor and patronage is just as guilty as if he did it himself. *QUI FACIT PER ALIUM, FACIT PER SE*. I now lay down an important syllogism in the form of *Cesare*:

Major Premise (Ce): No act contrary to nature or universally and perpetually binding Divine law, or the distinctives of the true Evangelical Protestant Gospel, ought to be named even once among Christians. And in particular, no act unbefitting the nature of the sex of the person bearing the title ought to be named even once among Christians. (No As are Bs.) (The *Major* premise is undeniable and irrefutable. Ephesians 5:3/4, 1 Corinthians 5:1.)

Minor Premise (Sa): But every person, of whatever sex, age, creed, or race, or dignity he may be, that bears a title that of its own customary tendency, permits others to do certain expressly named acts in the name of the person bearing the title, has caused these expressly named acts to be named unto himself (even if only nominally). (But all Cs are Bs.)

Ergo (Re): Therefore no person, or persons, can bear a title that of its own customary tendency, even so much as permits others to do in the name of the person bearing the title, even a *single* act contrary to nature or universally and perpetually binding Divine law, or the distinctives of the true Evangelical Protestant Gospel. And in particular, no person, or persons, can bear a title that of its own customary tendency, even so much as permits others to do in the name of the person bearing the title, even a *single* act unbefitting the nature of the sex of the person bearing the title, without therefore *ipso facto* incurring the Divine vengeance and displeasure. (Ergo, No Cs are As. No As are Cs.)

Therefore every reigning Queen who shall permit (even on mere sufferance) adult males to officially do these acts of ruling and governing in the Queen's name, even if the Queen herself only reigns but does not govern or even exercise any discretion about the policies and particular laws that are to bind the kingdom and nation being governed, is just as guilty of the very sin condemned in John Knox's First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women as if she herself exercised in person the act of governing and ruling over men. In particular, she is just as guilty of the same civil feminism and gynecocracy absolutely essential in order to defend the very idea of women exercising acts of civil government over men. (And Gynecocracy means a state or condition in which females rule in political and civil affairs.) Therefore, she cannot hope to vindicate herself from the charge of civil feminism and gynecocracy (any more than can those who permit women to vote and hold public office) by pleading that this is a *constitutional* monarchy.

We have therefore proven as a theorem that every constitution by which even one nation having that constitution thereby permits women (even on mere sufferance) to reign over them even nominally either as reigning or regent queen is *ipso facto* civil feminism and gynecocracy. **QED**

§2: SECOND REASON WHY “THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE” CANNOT VINDICATE REIGNING QUEENS FROM THE HEINOUS AND ATROCIOUS GUILT OF UNLAWFULLY EXERCISING AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE.

§2.0: Introduction. Because a little while ago, I said “It is a fundamental principle of the British Constitution that every human law (or even mere custom) contrary to the Divine Law is repugnant to the order of society, and therefore null and void. And so accordingly, without risk of logical fallacy, we can consider, among all those cases in which H. R. M. the reigning or regent king/queen is content to reign under the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule”, the case C0, such that in the event E0, one or more politicians, ministers, or Members of Parliament, etc., proposes a law which the king/queen KNOWS is contrary to divine law and contrary to the coronation oaths, and they advise H. R. M. to give his/her royal assent to it!” The possibility of such anti-scriptural acts of parliament is not just merely a logical or philosophical possibility or contingency. It has actually happened before, and it is still happening in England, even today.

§2.1: First Case in Point: Queen Lili`u`okalani of Hawai`i and the Opium Lottery Bills. A while before the overthrow of the Sovereign Kingdom of Hawaii by Anglo-Saxon Yankee sugar barons and businessmen, it is well known that the Queen Liliuokalani gave her royal assent to a bill authorizing **exactly** the kind of opium and gambling licenses which demoralized her own native Polynesian “race” of Hawaii! Yet she used the very SAME excuse that many anti-suffragists have historically used, when questioned about the scandalous opium/lottery bills. And here is how she tries to vindicate herself from the charges I am about to indict her withal:

<http://books.google.com/books?pg=PA381&dq=Liliuokalani%20opium%20licens&ei=Q6K0TrvIG8aUtwfD0c3PAw&ct=book-thumbnail&id=QrTCvcy0sE4C&output=text>:

Mr. White was the introducer of the bill providing for a constitutional convention; also the opium and lottery bills. He watched his opportunity, and railroaded the last two bills through the House; but he failed in regard to the first bill. A vote of want of confidence was then brought in. The liberals won; and the cabinet was voted out, partly because they were so sure of their success and on account of their own corrupt practices.

The next day Messrs. Parker, Cornwell, Colburn, and Peterson were appointed. [These gentlemen were accepted by the majority of the people in the House, who applauded them on their entrance](#), because they were men of liberal views [i.e., willing to compromise time honored and irrevocable moral principles being of ancient time known to be ESSENTIAL to the public Good and even the soundness of the Christian faith in order to pander to the changing culture of the times], although they were not considered representative men, because they were not backed by moneyed men. [The same day of their appointment they advised me to sign the opium and lottery bills](#). I first declined, as I wanted to please my lady friends [i.e. certain

CHRISTIAN women who had been praying with her in a female prayer meeting]; **but they said there should be no hesitation on my part, as the House had passed those bills by a large majority, and they had been signed by the president and committee. I had no option but to sign. It took place on [FRIDAY] the 13th of January, 1893.**

Here Liliuokalani used this very SAME exact excuse (viz. the queen reigns but does not rule) in order to shield herself from the charges of unwomanly virago harridan shrewish petticoat government.

But she *knew* as a professing Christian that those opium and lottery bills are contrary to the Christian virtue of sobriety. Yet she followed a multitude to do evil! ‘Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil; neither shalt thou speak in a cause to decline after many to wrest judgment: Neither shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause.’ – Exodus 23:1/3.

‘If sinners entice thee, consent thou not’ – Proverbs 1:10.

Even St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas, the two ancient Roman woman martyrs professing the Christian faith, showed over 10 QUADRILLION times MORE courage and more steadfastness to the Christian faith under conditions far more adverse and far more despised and hated by the world than Liliuokalani did under conditions much milder and more favorable and more highly esteemed as honorable and pleasurable by the world!!

‘Also it does not help that one of you would say: ‘I will gladly confess Christ and His Word on every detail, except that I may keep silent about one or two things which my tyrants’ rather, one or two of my dissenting subjects, are not willing to hear at the moment ... ‘For whoever denies Christ in one detail or word has denied the same Christ in that one detail who was denied in all the details, since there is only one Christ in all His words, taken together or individually.’” – Martin Luther.

And whoever denies just ONE *essential, fundamental, and distinctive* doctrine of Christianity has denied Christ as fully and peremptorily and unconditionally as if he had also denied every OTHER *essential, fundamental, and distinctive* doctrine of the Christian faith.

Elizabeth Rundle Charles stated:

‘If I profess with the loudest voice and clearest exposition every portion of the Word of God except precisely that little point which the world and the devil are at that moment attacking, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing Him. Where the battle rages there the loyalty of the soldier is proved; and to be steady on all the battle front besides, is mere flight and disgrace if he flinches at that point’!

In addition, if I exact without mercy or pity or leniency exact blind unquestioning obedience to every punctilio of the Law of God from my subjects - except precisely that

one point that my subjects are most likely to fail to duly observe, I am not confessing Christ, however boldly I may be professing the Christian faith, yea, however blindly and unquestioningly I myself may be keeping even that very point as well as every other point of God's Law. Wherever the battle rages, and in the precise venue that constitutes the scene of the crime, how a constable or a duly authorized officer of the law reacts to that criminal event is precisely the factor that makes the difference between a GOOD constable and a BAD constable. And to be stalwart and diligent in every other appurtenance of the cop's beat is worth nothing better than cowardice, corruption, venality, and complicity as soon as he flinches at that one point. Every police officer knows that!

Yet Queen Liliuokalani used exactly the same plea that the queen reigns but does not rule in order to comply with the advice of her ministers to accept the very bill she KNEW as a Christian was wrong: and look what happened to the Kingdom of Hawaii! It did not protect the liberty, felicity, peace, and safety of the realm! On the contrary, it aroused the fierce implacable indignation of every Christian missionary and American and white man and woman on the island, which hastened the Revolution, which resulted ultimately in eventual annexation to the United States of America.

Moreover, Queen Liliuokalani, on pretence of these very same excuses, was thereby complicit in all the corruption and lack of integrity in the matter of the business dealings of those opium/gambling cartels coming from Louisiana and having depots in San Francisco and Hong Kong and Vancouver. She claimed that she had no part in the business dealings, but only proposed that her government receive some share of the revenues (or rather, profits) earned by those cartels. She even dared to blame others and make them a scapegoat by saying that even sons of the missionaries, yea, even Queen Victoria and Parliament, have often engaged in the opium and license racket.

Some impenitent persons, calling themselves Christians have made the quibble that "I am as good as these other professed Christians are. They are no more self-denying, sober, or circumspect in their conduct than I am. They love pleasure and self-indulgence as well as I do." This quibble cannot be maintained, because first of all, it shows a lack of trust in Divine Providence to cleanse us from every one of our sins and defects, and secondly, it often shows that the objector DOES have a rather high conception of the peculiar defining hallmark standard of the moral and ethical conduct it is the duty of a professing Christian to fulfill, yet lacks the moral courage to give a better example in this respect. It is a maxim of English Common Law that *MULTITUDO ERRANTIUM NON PARIT ERRORI PATROCINIUM* - the multitude of those who err is no excuse for error, and *TESTIMONIA PONDERANDA SUNT, NON NUMERANDA* – Testimonies ought to be WEIGHED, not NUMBERED!

But if Liliuokalani had decided (or even sincerely believes) that the Opium Lottery is consistent with the true and accurate ideal of Christian virtue, well then, she would have erred greatly, not knowing the Scripture. She had the **opportunity** to ascertain the true nature and effects of the opium business and see for herself the inherent demoralization and subversion of Christian virtue it promotes – and compare this with the true ideals of

Christian virtue revealed in the Gospels and the Epistles of the Apostles and come up with a reasonable just verdict, but either she did or she didn't. If she didn't, then she is inexcusable. If she did, well then her guilt is even greater. **IGNORANTIA JURIS NON EXCUSAT** – ignorance of Law does not excuse.

The truth of the matter is that before she gave her royal assent to that Opium & Lottery bill, she had participated in an impromptu female prayer meeting. Many respectable women inhabitants of the city of Honolulu, especially of the Haole "race", came to her in a body and BEGGED her to CEASE and DESIST from signing that evil Opium Bill!

<https://books.google.com/books?pg=PA301&dq=Liliuokalani+prayed+to+God+for+strength&id=BgMbAAAAAAAJ#v=onepage&q=women&f=false>:

When the good women of Honolulu called on her in a body to implore her not to sign the lottery bill, she shed tears and begged them to pray that God might give her strength to do her duty in the sight of Heaven: and then she signed the bill.

(Our Day: A Record and Review of Current Reform, Volume 11, pages 301, 302.) This very fact PROVES that she KNEW that the bill her "constitutional" advisers advised her to sign was wrong and unchristian. She cannot deny the charges against her. Ah! Before I forget, she also forgot to pray to God to turn the heart of her advisers and her parliament to REPENT in sackcloth and ashes for ever HAVING APPROVED that bill!

Therefore, the thing that the Queen Liliuokalani had done is inexcusable.

§2.2: A Sample of Some Unscriptural and Unchristian Laws Enacted in England since 1950!!!

<http://www.prophecytoday.uk/comment/church-issues/itemlist/tag/laws.html>:

1. **1951: The Fraudulent Mediums Act** ([Deut 18:10-13](#)) which abolished The Witchcraft Act This legalised witchcraft in Britain which had previously been banned for centuries and made all occult arts legal. Through this Act Britain allowed all kinds of spiritual activities to be acceptable. Alien spirits and witchcraft activities are offensive to God and we are severely warned against them in Scripture. In [Romans 1:23-29](#) Paul says that idolatry is the first step in the corruption of human civilisation which leads to "*sexual impurity*" and other "*shameful lusts*" and "*every kind of wickedness, evil, greed and depravity*".
2. **1959: The Obscene Publications Act** ([Mark 7:21-23](#)) was a very weak Act and had the effect of making it more difficult to prosecute pornographers, as lawyers had to prove that the publications had "a tendency to corrupt and deprave". Defence lawyers were able to ask the jury if they had been corrupted and depraved by exposure to a book, film

- or video. Most jurors did not want to say that they had been 'depraved'. The defence were able to claim that it was a 'public good' and an 'educational' value. The Act's Amendment in 1977 ([Col 3:5-6](#)) and The Broadcasting Act 1990 extended the law to cinema and television respectively, preparing the way for the Internet. This Act allowed all kinds of offences to be screened into our homes that certainly are an offence to God.
3. **1965: The Murder (Abolition of the Death Penalty) Act** ([Lev 24:17-22](#)) removed the death penalty from the Statute Book for all kinds of murder and sent a message through the nation about the social acceptability of violence.
 4. **1967: The Abortion Act** ([Gen 4:10-11](#)). We had abolished the death penalty for murder but in 1967 we said it was acceptable to murder unborn babies. Doctors were now allowed to perform abortions if they complied with certain conditions. About 450 abortions take place daily in British hospitals, bringing to more than 6 million the number of unborn children killed since abortions became legal.
 5. **1967: The Sexual Offences Act** ([Lev 18:22](#), [Rom 1:22-27](#)) was a further offence to God and directly against the Word of God where homosexual practices are said to be detestable to God. It decriminalised homosexual acts between consenting men over the age of 21, if done in private. (a) **In 1994, the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act** reduced to 18 the homosexual age of consent. (b) **In 2000, the Sexual Offences (Amendment) Act** equalised the age of consent for homosexual and heterosexual sex at 16. This Amendment Act was brought in against the wish of the vast majority of the population and against the stern opposition of the House of Lords. The Government used the Parliament Act, which is only to be used for extreme measures of constitutional importance, to drive this through. This virtually abolished Clause 28 and allowed homosexual acts to take place between young people of sixteen years of age and upwards. Both boys and girls were thus allowed to be exposed to paedophiles and sexual predators and children in schools were taught that all forms of sexual intercourse were allowable according to each individual's wishes.
 6. **1967: The Obscene Publications Act Amendment** ([Eph 5:4-6](#), [Rom 13:13](#)) further opened the way for all kinds of pornography and literature to be published of an explicit sexual nature.
 7. **1968: The Theatres Act** ([Prov 15:26](#), [1 Thess 4:7](#)) abolished 'censorship of the theatre', although the public performance of plays requires licensing, and obscene performances are prohibited. This Act allowed nudity and all kinds of explicit sexual acts on stage. The effects of this Act in removing censorship were long-lasting and soon began to have a wide effect upon the arts and media.
 8. **1969: The Divorce Reform Act** ([Mark 10:2-12](#)) introduced the principle of the irretrievable breakdown of marriage as the sole ground for divorce, to be proved by adultery, unreasonable behaviour, or desertion; or by two

- years separation with consent to a divorce, or five years separation without consent to a divorce. In other words, it opened the way for easy divorce – the floodgates were opened by this Act for widespread marriage breakdown.
9. **1972: The European Communities Act, the EC (Amendment Acts of 1986 and of 1993) (Ps 9:10,17)** took Britain into the European Economic Community (EEC), and by which the Single Market and Maastricht Treaty both became law. All these measures contributed to increased political control over Britain by unelected non-nationals in Europe.
 10. **1989: The Children Act (Ps 127:3-5)**. Despite the good intention of this Act to increase the protection of children, it had the fundamental effect of removing the traditional concept that parents are the best judges of their children's welfare. Grandparents were no longer recognised in the kin structure of the family that were reduced to 'significant others', thus promoting the breakdown of traditional family life.
 11. **1990 Amendment to the Abortion Act (Jer 7:31, Ps 106:37-38)** reduced the age at which an unborn baby could be aborted to twenty weeks and legalised the abortion of 'disabled' babies at a much later stage than that. King David spoke about God knitting him together in his mother's womb and Jeremiah speaks about being called into ministry from the time of his conception (Jer 1:5). This Act showed our society's total disregard for the principle that life is sacred as the gift of God.
 12. **1990: The Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act (Ecc 11:5)** legalised the creation of embryos for experimentation or storage in laboratories. This Act also amended the Abortion Act 1967, resulting in abortion on demand for handicapped babies right up to the time of birth.
 13. **1994: The National Lottery Act (1 Tim 6:10)** instituted a state national lottery. It pays out 50% of its taking to winners, but is an intrinsically regressive form of voluntary taxation, as the burden falls most heavily on the poor. Further, many of the 'good cause' recipients, who receive 28% of the takings, have agendas wholly opposed to Biblical values. The National Lottery has become an obsession for millions of people wanting to get rich quick and it encourages people to gamble, often with money they cannot afford.
 14. **1995: Removing Prohibitions on Advertisements (Rom 1:24)** legalised sexually explicit images that had previously been regarded as obscene. It marked yet another stage in the corruption of society by exposing the nation to obscenities.
 15. **1996: The Family Law Act (Mal 2:16)** replaced the five grounds for divorce in the Divorce Reform Act 1969 with a so-called 'no-fault' divorce system. The Lord Chancellor announced in 2001 that this part of the Family Law Act would not be brought into effect and would be repealed in due course.
 16. **1997: The Amsterdam Treaty (Ps 2:1-2)** further eroded national sovereignty, bringing Britain increasingly under the rule of a humanist, anti-Christian code of law. This was one more step in Britain being ruled

from Brussels rather than by our own elected Members of Parliament. It was selling our birthright for a mess of pottage.

17. **1999: The Finance Act (Is 61:8)** scrapped the already low value of the Married Person's Allowance for the tax year 2000/2001, thereby signalling the government's lack of esteem for marriage. It was a further step towards the degradation of marriage and the breakup of family life in Britain.
18. **2001: Regulations to the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act 1990 (Ex 23:7)** permitted embryo research for developing treatments for serious diseases. Effectively, this allows cloning of human embryos and experimenting with creating human life.
19. **2004: The Civil Partnership Act (Matt 19:5, Eph 5:3)** granted civil partnerships in the United Kingdom rights and responsibilities very similar to that of civil marriage. Civil partners have the same property rights as married heterosexual couples with the same pension benefits and social security rights. They also have the rights of parental responsibility for partner's children as well as 'tenancy' and 'next of kin' rights with a formal process for dissolving partnerships which is similar to divorce in the case of marriage.
20. **2004: The Gender Recognition Act (Gen 2:23, Is 5:20)** granted transsexual people legal recognition as members of the sex opposite to their birth gender, either male or female. This allowed them to acquire a new birth certificate recognising their new gender within the law and allowing them to marry a person of the opposite sex. The Act required applicants to have transitioned two years before the issue of a certificate but it made no requirement for sex reassignment surgery to have taken place. The act was a further assault on God's act of creation of human beings in his own image, both male and female.
21. **2013: The Marriage (Same-Sex Couples) Act (Rom 1:6-27, 1 Cor 7)** redefined traditional marriage which had always been between a man and a woman. It allowed two persons of the same gender to enter into legally recognised marriage. This Act crossed a red line in British parliamentary history. It passed a law that directly contradicted God's act of creation in creating men and women as complementary human beings to be united in a faithful marriage covenant through which the physical expression of love would produce the procreation of children to ensure the health and well-being of future generations of the human race. The passing of this Act was said to be under strong duress from the European Union upon British politicians.

And what has the Queen of England done about all these UNGODLY laws?

<http://www.prophecytoday.uk/comment/church-issues/itemlist/tag/laws.html>:

Friday, 19 June 2015 10:16

Parliament Crumbling!



Is there any prophetic significance in the warnings given to MPs that the Houses of Parliament are crumbling?

Just look at the facts. It was back in October 2012 that MPs were first alerted to the serious problems in the Grade 1 listed building, part of which is nearly 1000 years old and is listed as a World Heritage Site. A new report this week gives further urgency to the warnings that unless urgent repairs are carried out the building could collapse in 20 years.

Warnings

MPs have also been warned that if they insist on staying in the buildings whilst repairs are carried out it could take up to 32 years and cost up to £7 billion. The building doesn't just require minor repairs. **The whole structure is crumbling.** Built on London clay, it is slowly sliding towards the river. There are serious problems with the roof, the walls are crumbling and the foundations are cracking so MPs are facing a number of options. If they move out the work could take up to 10 years and cost about £3 billion, which is clearly the surveyors' favoured option.

But where do they go?

A number of different scenarios have been proposed including moving out of London to Manchester or Birmingham. Most MPs will probably favour staying within London which would certainly be the cheapest option, particularly if they can stay close to Westminster so that all the Whitehall offices can be maintained and the hugely costly movement of the civil service bureaucracy will be unnecessary.

A number of buildings in Westminster and nearby are being considered such as the Methodist Central Hall, or the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, just across from Parliament Square. Other suggestions include moving Parliament into the Olympic Park

in East London – which is the downmarket option. The upmarket option is to move into Buckingham Palace. But the Queen might have something to say about this! Another alternative is to build an entirely new building somewhere in London and sell the old building to the highest bidder who would no doubt either be an Arab sheik or the Chinese!

Is there a deeper reason for the crumbling condition of the Houses of Parliament? Is God saying something about the laws passed there that have been anathema to his will and word?

Neglect

Why has the 'Mother of Parliaments' reached such a **state of neglect**? We have just been celebrating the 800th anniversary of the signing of Magna Carta and earlier this year we marked the 800th anniversary of the Simon de Montfort Parliament, the oldest in the Western world. The Houses of Parliament are part of our national heritage. Of course, those responsible for the buildings should have carried out many of these repairs as **routine maintenance** over past decades. Surely, to allow the buildings to reach such a state of decay shows a failure in caring for the property somewhere along the line. Why has the building been allowed to drop into this desperate state of disrepair?

Why has it happened?

Could there be a **deeper reason** for the crumbling condition of our Houses of Parliament? Is God saying something to us about the laws that have been passed through both Houses of Parliament in the past 40 or 50 years that have been in direct opposition to biblical standards and the teaching of his word?

As a nation we have acknowledged Christianity to be the faith of our people for more than 1000 years. At the Coronation of each Monarch we expect them to declare their commitment to uphold the Christian faith - and yet we have required the Queen to put her signature to Acts of Parliament that are **anathema** to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whose Bible we claim to revere. [And yet the queen CONTINUES to plead that she cannot act except in conformity to the advice of her ministers!!!]

Unholy laws

We have passed laws abolishing the Sabbath and permitting Sunday trading and Sunday sports and entertainment, making it a day like any other day. We have **undermined family life** through abortion, easy divorce, and same-sex 'marriage'. We have sent our soldiers to fight in wars that had little or nothing to do with our national security. We have passed laws that favour the rich and **deny justice** to the poor.

Greed and corruption have been exposed in every part of the life of the nation over the past 10 years – among the bankers, among MPs, among newspaper moguls and journalists, among the police, among celebrities and entertainers, among all sections of

society – even in the church – because God is shaking the nations as he promised in [Hebrews 12:26-27](#). Now we are seeing our Parliament buildings cracking at the foundations.’

The queen cannot vindicate herself from these serious charges by pleading that she reigns but does not rule (and therefore she cannot act except on the advice of her ministers). The queen herself KNEW that these laws were wrong. The plea that the Monarch cannot act except on the advice of her ministers has put a PREMIUM on all those politicians who pass ungodly and oppressive and subversive laws in torrents!

In fact, the reality is even WORSE:

http://www.cryaloud.com/faith_constitutional_freedom_our_destiny.htm:

Let the great debate begin ...

In 1997, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (and the Commonwealth) has arrived at a new watershed in the long history of its nation state -- a moment more decisive than any other it has faced in preceding centuries. **Powers other than those of the parliament at Westminster now rule and dictate in this the Queen's Realm and other forces, committed to casting aside the basic integrity of society, are undermining the very foundations of the nation.**

As in every other case in history of a collapsing civilization, we are seeing 'every man doing that which is right in his own eyes' having no moral restraints; but what is also apparent is that this lawlessness is a direct cause of a ever-increasing violent dislocation of society. Church and State no longer truly defend the Realm which is the prime responsibility of government.

It is quite evident that the politicians and the clergy, possessed by a fear of the 'politically correct', have given in to what amounts to moral warfare against the supreme standards of nationhood and civilization inherited from our forebears. They will have much to answer for in the years to come.

The 'Divine Right of Kings' eliminated in the 17th century with the establishment of a democratic parliamentary system of civil government, **has returned in the form of a prerogative power exercised by an elite, who, by stealth, have brought about a state of constitutional illegality. Great statutes of the realm still in force, count for nothing in the face of prerogative power exercised by over-mighty subjects.**

The binding of future parliaments and subjugation of our Common law by Roman Civil Law has broken the covenant between those who govern and hold the rod of justice under the Crown and the governed, the subjects of the Queen's Realm. **Parliament at Westminster (and Ottawa) is now but a mere shell of its former self. In any other century, what has happened would have been called treason.**

Our concept of government by the 'The Queen-in-Parliament' under God, consisting of Monarch, Lords (Senate in Canada) and Commons has worked best when all three have been in balance. **For a considerable while now this has no longer been the case, for not only have the Monarch and the Lords (Senate in Canada) lost power, the Commons also has seen the Cabinet and the Prime Minister's department become more and more presidential, if not, dictatorial. Beyond this and since 1972, all have lost very considerable power to Europe, a process which continues daily like the movement of shifting sand in a tidal flow. (In Canada, Europe is having an ever increasing effect on our national policies and economy.)**

When Charles the First was beheaded, the understanding was that he had broken faith with the people. In our day, the Queen has been caused to break faith with her subjects -- or placed in a position known at law as having been 'Deceived in Her Grant.' It is therefore, a legitimate action, which was enshrined by original statute law (Magna Carta 1215, 61st Article) and repeated with great distinctness by Henry III, to restrain and hinder by all means those responsible for the unlawful and unconstitutional use of prerogative power.

The break-up of the United Kingdom into regions will take place if future governments fail to take back the powers given over to Europe. (Canada as well is breaking up, albeit for differing reasons but this still affects the nation because Quebec civil law is European.) It is imperative that the long-term effects of devolution for Scotland and Wales and of the future of rural communities -- affected by decisions made by Europe -- be faced as a matter of the highest national importance. The people of the countryside have already been provoked to restrain those in government who have broken faith with them -- they will certainly not be the last to act. Added to this is the future of Northern Ireland which will remain crucial to the defence of the mainland.

Many other questions on behaviour in our constitutionally Christian society need to be debated, questions which threaten the family>> in its capacity as the material, moral, and pedagogical foundation of society and the State.

<<

It is the law abiding family that requires to be defended, not the single issue of the minority which has become an ever-increasing burden upon and destruction of the foundation family.

At this 350th Anniversary of the great Army debates under the presidency of Oliver Cromwell, we issue a call for a new 'great debate' on the Crown and Commonwealth -- the Spirit of the Covenant. The British nation must know itself once more and reawaken its spiritual and physical gifts of leading the nations in peace.

The foundations of our great nation must be restored. Let us look at them anew and indeed 'unto the rock from whence we were hewn,' as the people of The Faith, inheritors of a unique constitutional freedom and a destiny with global dimensions. Our

imperative at this hour is not only for a great debate, but for a great Alliance to restore the British way of life.

The Divine Law: Foundation of the Nation

There was an extraordinary dedication to our biblical heritage shown in the great Army debate of 1647. In Cromwell our Chief of Men by Antonia Fraser, page 212, we read: "With their breaks for prayer -- the resolution for proceedings of the second day read "from eight to eleven to see God, etc." -- and in their earnest invocation of Scriptural texts and even the laws of the Israelites as equally relevant to the case as English laws, these debates must rank as one of the most extraordinary moots in British history.'

In the context of our heritage of the Divine Law, we should not forget Alfred the Great (871-901) and the fact that this enlightened ruler drew freely upon the Mosaic code and made many of these early Hebrew laws the laws of the Realm.

The one great difficulty regarding the absolute need of observing Divine Law by the nation which is responsible for much of the confusion regarding the relevance of that law today, has been the failure to recognize the distinction between the laws contained in ordinances and those given in Commandments, Statutes and Judgements. The lack of a clear definition of the Divine Law in each of its particular applications, especially concerning the operation of the ordinances, is responsible for most confusion.

In the book Digest of the Divine Law, (pub. 1943) by Howard B. Rand, LL.B, there is set forth the operation of the Law between firstly, those parts which govern the activities and operations of men and nations and secondly, the ordinances or ritual. These ordinances had their place and purpose in the Divine plan fully revealed through Jesus Christ in His life, ministry, death and resurrection. As to the laws apart from the ordinances, if we must obey some, then we are as a nation bound to keep them all! If indeed we can, with impunity, violate some, then God has failed and the Bible has ceased to be an authority for the guidance of our people and the nation -- which constitutionally it just cannot be. God has not failed and the authority of His Word stands immutable for the nation in its teachings and laws. The undermining of this authority is producing the present chaos at all levels in the Realm.

The New Covenant so stressed by the teachings of Christianity is, according to the Bible, definitely associated with the keeping of the law. Jeremiah prophesied and Hebrews affirms, 'I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts' (Jeremiah 31:33). If then the Christian citizen is not bound to keep the law, how can it be written into his heart?

Our leaders in Church and State need to realize that we are not required constantly to rewrite the national laws as if some new path of enlightenment has been received. The ordinances of the Divine law -- the sacrifices -- have passed away now that Christ has come. What remains are the Commandments, Statutes and Judgements. >>But only so far as two conditions are met: firstly the reasons are still applicable, secondly the particular provisions can be deduced from these reasons from good and necessary inference. <<What we have today are many Aarons building golden calves which the citizens of our nation are being encouraged to worship.

We need to familiarize ourselves again with our great heritage of the Divine Law, before the present lawlessness drags the nation fully into the pit of despair and death. As the result of God's recognition of the needs of men, there has been revealed to mankind a supreme standard of law for the nation, the keeping of which will bring prosperity and happiness to all people everywhere. Observance, with the resultant peace and goodwill, will characterize all national and international relationships. We shall be a nation at peace with ourselves and lift high once more a moral standard for the nationals of the world.

For the nation which is founded upon the supreme national code of law, our return to true leadership can but draw us back to the Divine Law. The great Army debates of 1647 took place because a civilian New Model Army was behind Cromwell -- the middle ground majority spoke and acted to deliver the nation from the corrupt court of Charles the First. Today we see Church and State in almost lifeless forms about to be buried by a global paganism and growing politico-economic dictatorship in Europe; it is the only alternative to (unfortunate result of) the rejection of the supreme code of law for the nation.

In remembrance of all those who have fought and died for The Faith and our constitutional freedom and for our children who will come after us -- let the civilian army of the 21st century be an Alliance of all those who know that what Great Britain was in the past, the United Kingdom can be in the future.

>>

Thus the plea that the Queen cannot act except according to the advice of her ministers has nowadays done more harm to the country than good. Therefore I cannot accept such a plea as a valid reason against woman suffrage.

§3: THIRD REASON WHY “THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE” CANNOT VINDICATE REIGNING QUEENS FROM THE HEINOUS AND ATROCIOUS GUILT OF UNLAWFULLY EXERCISING AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE.

§3.0: Introduction. Because it has brought about a state of affairs in which radical jacobinical politicians can deceive her majesty the queen in her grant!

§3.1: Consider another case in point: Queen Elizabeth II. Certain persons calling themselves ministers of Her Majesty's Government have advised her to assent to many things which are contrary to the Law of God and the Constitution of Great Britain. Thus, she has been Deceived in Her Grant! But notice this prayer of the Archbishop over the king/queen that is to be crowned!

<http://www.oremus.org/liturgy/coronation/cor1953b.html>:

O Lord and heavenly Father,
the exalter of the humble and the strength of thy chosen,
who by anointing with Oil didst of old
make and consecrate kings, priests, and prophets,
to teach and govern thy people Israel:

Bless and sanctify thy chosen servant ELIZABETH,
who by our office and ministry
is now to be anointed with this Oil,
Here the Archbishop is to lay his hand upon the Ampulla.

And consecrated Queen:

**Strengthen her, O Lord, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter;
Confirm and stablish her with thy free and princely Spirit,
the Spirit of wisdom and government,
the Spirit of counsel and ghostly strength,
the Spirit of knowledge and true godliness,
and fill her, O Lord, with the Spirit of thy holy fear,
now and for ever;
through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.**

Here the Archbishop confesses that it is the special prerogative, nay, but the most DIRE and VITAL NECESSITY for the Reigning Queen to have the special guidance of the Holy Spirit for her Queenly duties and functions as Reigning Queen.

But every act of causing a superior person to be deceived in his grant in the affairs wherein he enjoys the special guidance of the Holy Spirit is an act of LYING TO THE HOLY GHOST. All As are Bs.

But every reigning queen is a superior person who by the form and order of the coronation oath, enjoys the special guidance of the Holy Ghost. But all Cs are As.

Ergo: every act of deceiving her royal majesty in her grant is an act of LYING TO THE HOLY SPIRIT! Therefore, all Cs are Bs.

It therefore follows that all of those wicked, epicurean, atheistical, jacobinical, and leftist cultural Marxist politicians who CAUSED the Queen to give her royal assent to such ungodly and anti-scriptural laws are GUILTY OF LYING TO THE HOLY GHOST!

§4: FOURTH REASON WHY “THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE” CANNOT VINDICATE REIGNING QUEENS FROM THE HEINOUS AND ATROCIOUS GUILT OF UNLAWFULLY EXERCISING AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE.

§4.0: Introduction. From the previous subsections, it has been shown as a historical fact that “the queen reigns but does not rule” has CALAMITOUS, SCANDALOUS, and OPPROBRIOUS consequences for the realm of England, which can ONLY be avoided and prevented by altogether REJECTING the plea that the queen reigns but does not rule.

§4.1: The testimony of one of the very last and few remaining TRUE Tories of the 19th Century. Furthermore, Henry Drummond, Esq. and M. P., one of the very few remaining GENUINE Tories of the Early Victorian Era, had shown that the principle that the reigning king reigns but does not rule is not a true Tory principle, but a uniquely

Whig principle: and also ‘The larger councils, such as [each and every session of the Parliament] of England, have ever been trenching on the kingly office, and now, unfortunately, **the power of the Crown has been traitorously conceded to them**’. And therefore, let us suppose that we have a particular situation or event at which the reigning or regent king/queen is content to reign under the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule”. But then, either such a pretext could *only* have been made plausible by the fact that the larger councils, or perhaps even the other responsible ministers / politicians have been continually ‘trenching on the kingly office, and now, unfortunately, **the power of the Crown has been traitorously conceded to them**’ or else the mere acceptance of the principle that the “the king/queen reigns but does not rule” would IMMEDIATELY and SPONTANEOUSLY result, in that particular case, in PRECISELY the treacherous concession of the power of the crown to these “responsible” ministers and politicians just as verily as if it had been gained as the eventual result of the continual attempts of the ministers or politicians over the course of time to encroach little by little on the kingly office!

Therefore **every** particular situation or event at which the reigning or regent king/queen is content to reign under the pretext that “the king/queen reigns but does not rule” is an occasion on which the power of the Crown has been traitorously and treacherously acceded to the parliament or the politicians, partisans, and/or other overmighty subjects just as verily as if it had been brought about by their continual attempts over a course of years or centuries to encroach on the kingly office: which is contrary to true Tory principles, and can only be justified on Whig principles!

§4.2: Testimony of the Antimonarchists! Also, the plea that the “queen reigns but does not rule” is precisely one the reasons the antimonarchists plead in order to seek that the monarchy of England should be abolished:

<https://www.lawteacher.net/free-law-essays/administrative-law/arguments-in-favour-of-abolishing-the-monarchy-administrative-law-essay.php>:

Moving on to another reason why the monarchy should be abolished is that even though the queen is head of state she does not exercise any formal power herself, but most prerogative powers are exercised by ministers on behalf of the crown, who are not accountable to parliament for the executive decisions they make. (Democratic Audit, 2008) These powers include sending troops abroad and signing of treaties without consulting parliament before hand. An example of this is when John Major sent troops to take part in the first gulf war. (Barnett, 1994) The crown prerogative is exploited by ministers, and parliament cannot do anything to take away or reduce these powers as they have been derived from the royal prerogative. The queen is powerless and pointless and all her powers are invested in the prime minister. However, officials hide the real nature of this truth by saying the queen “acts on the advice of the prime minister”, meaning she does what she is told. (Republic, 2009) Politically the monarch serves little purpose. There are some powers which she can and has used, in occasions when there is a hung parliament. In an event of a hung parliament the queen will have

to choose who to appoint if the incumbent prime minister resigns straight away or is defeated in the commons. (Kalitowski, 2008) At this point the question arises, should the queen consider dissolving parliament again? It is for this reason some have called for a reform of the sovereign's personal prerogative. The call for this reform is one of the arguments for getting rid of the monarchy as many people do not agree with why an unelected and unaccountable monarch should have the right to play any part in the political process. This brings us again to why the monarchy should be eradicated; she plays no political role for the UK and she gives the government enormous amount of political power which the government take full advantage of because they are not accountable to parliament. There is little the queen can do to limit the powers of prime ministers as they have become more dominant and they are fundamentally the decision makers. It is debatable to say that the "Royal Prerogative" can be described more accurately as "prime ministerial powers" due to the huge amount of power the government exercises.

§4.3: The Testimony of another 19th century English Victorian source. Even more interestingly, the male who is willing to reign under the pretext that "the king/queen reigns but does not rule" reduces the king to the mere level of a political cipher; but according to the received established Victorian prejudices, this would have had the effect of emasculating him in his capacity as a nominal king. See https://books.google.com/books?id=unBPAQAAMAAJ&pg=RA1-PA492&dq=%22a+domestician%22+female&hl=en&newbks=1&newbks_redir=0&sa=X&ved=2ahUKewjF_7fgx-7tAhWitVkKHfkrARMQ6AEwAHoECAAQAg#v=onepage&q=%22a%20domestician%22%20female&f=false, pages 492 and 493. Another effect is that it would render the British Crown far more suitable to be worn by a woman rather than a man.

But these unfortunate effects – even if we could prove them to be condemned in the teachings of the Bible – since they are only (at least some if not all of) the **political** misfortunes inherent to each and every case in which "the king/queen reigns but does not rule", are not the BEST reasons WHY the proposed plea or pretext, though factually true in practice, will not exonerate the reigning queen of England from the charge of monstrously usurping civil and political authority over men. I have already given the BEST reason in Theorem 1.1.

§5: FIFTH REASON WHY "THE KING REIGNS BUT DOES NOT RULE" CANNOT VINDICATE REIGNING QUEENS FROM THE HEINOUS AND ATROCIOUS GUILT OF UNLAWFULLY EXERCISING AUTHORITY AND GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE.

Here is another reason **why** we cannot accept the quibble that the king reigns but does not rule, but is a mere powerless ceremonial figurehead.

Once upon a time, there was a land called *Ailgna*, situated on the isle of *Noibla*, which was divided into the following states, firstly, the aforesaid land of *Ailgna* in the south,

secondly, the land of *Selaw* in the southwest, thirdly, the land of *Dnaltocs* in the north. The kingdom of *Ailgna* had dominion over yet another state called Northern *Dnaleri*, being the northeastern part of the Isle *Ainrebih*.

One day, the king of *Ailgna* went out to be crowned as king at the Church of *Retsnimtsew*, which is a very gigantic cathedral church, located in the district of *Retsnimtsew* in the City of *Munidnol* (but almost all of the citizens and loyal subjects of *Ailgna* call it *Nodnol*). The Pastor of that Church taught him the Divinely revealed principles of good and Christian government.

The King heeded the words the Holy Ghost spoke through the Pastor concerning this thing, and it became part and parcel of the constitution of *Ailgna* that the King shall be bound by law and in conscience to:

<http://www.chr.org.au/books/understanding-our-christian-heritage-volume-one/page6.html>:

- Profess faith in Jesus as Saviour and Lord.
- Worship regularly with the Church.
- Be acclaimed by multitudes, as God's appointed leader, before taking office.
- Promise to govern lawfully, justly and mercifully and to maintain God's law and the true message of the Gospel to the utmost of his power.
- Regard the Bible as the rule for the whole of life and government; as the most valuable thing that this world affords; and as the lively oracles of God.
- Acknowledge publicly that only a powerful anointing of the Holy spirit can equip a leader for government and preservation of the nation in wealth, peace, Godliness, wisdom and justice.
- Seek that powerful anointing before accepting any of the trappings of power and authority by humbly participating in a national Christian service of prayer and worship.
- Accept the responsibility to do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the church, help and defend widows and orphans, restore and maintain things fallen into decay, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order.
- Desire that kind of sincerity and wisdom which attracts God's protection and unites both leader and people.
- Publicly proclaim that the whole world is subject to the power and empire of Christ our Redeemer.

- Display the kind of leadership that is rich in faith, blessed in all good works and reigning with the King of kings.
- Express the need to rule gently with equity and mercy, protecting and cherishing the just and leading the people in "the way".

This covenant of Christian leadership and government expressed mighty faith in action and God blessed the [King] and the nation [of *Ailgna*] exceedingly. Abundance was multiplied in the nation and it prospered in every way. The leader and his successors found great favour with God and with the people.

Nevertheless, on occasions a [King or reigning/regent Queen of *Ailgna*] neglected God's principles of Christian leadership and government. At such times God chastened him with the rod of men and with the stripes of the sons of men, but never removed altogether from the leader His steadfast love.

At each chastening, God hedged in the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*] with wise counsellors and judges for the safety and protection of the nation. In time, God's law became the common law of the land. The Gospel was freely preached, and the cross of Christ was even included in their national flag.

As the Word of God prospered amongst them the people waxed rich and fat. Many learned men and a great many skilled artisans were amongst them and the whole race of them spread throughout the earth and in their fullness became a number of nations. They preached the Gospel to every nation and put the Word of God into every land.

Leadership became very burdensome. But the prophets reminded the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*] and the people of the words of Jesus:

"You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you; but whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave; even as the Son of man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Matthew 20:25-28)

Many of them took these words to heart. They reformed their society accordingly and strengthened its foundations. The [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*] was encouraged in an exemplary life of Godly service to his people and in gracious, inspiring leadership. The people on their part prayed continually for the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*] and elected from among their number learned men whose [Christian] duty and service was to prayerfully meet, seek good counsel and loyally re-present it to the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*].

But alas, Satan filled the hearts of some of those elected servants with pride, and they said within themselves:

We are the wise counsellors, we will rule. We will set our government on high; we will sit on the mount of the assembly in the far north; we will ascend above the heights of the wisest in the nation and we will make ourselves like the anointed [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*].

How corrupt and tyrannical, how contemptible would those elected servants be judged to be if they, having chosen one of their number as a chief servant, began thus to undermine the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*]. What seeds of dictatorship would be sown if the **media subtly supported their ambitions by continually casting the [king or reigning/regent queen of *Ailgna*] in the role of a figurehead, and suggesting that real power belonged to the chief servant - provided, of course, that chief servant had the support of the media?**

Having yielded to God's principles of leadership through service, having graciously agreed to act on advice, should that [king or reigning/regent queen] then be criticised as "a figurehead and unnecessary" by those who lust after his God given authority?

I tell you, the day is coming and is close at hand when God will raise up prophets to declare to the people the deceit of those power hungry servants. Great indignation from the people shall descend upon those wicked servants and great shame shall come upon those churches which, infected by apathy or humanism or worldly cynicism, let it happen.'

Here is the interpretation of the parable:

Ailgna stands for England, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, Great Britain, the United Kingdom, the British Empire, and the British Commonwealth of Nations. *Selaw* = Wales, *Dnaltocs* = Scotland, *Dnaleri* = Ireland, *Munidnol* = *Nodnol* = London, and finally, *Retsnimtsew* = Westminster. The Church of *Retsnimtsew* is merely Westminster Abbey, and the pastor of that church is the Archbishop of Canterbury, who performs the coronation at Westminster Abbey.

The professing Christian King of *Ailgna* 'appointed and anointed by God is the Royal line, currently represented by our Queen. (Romans 13:1-7).

The ambitious servants are the Ministers of the Crown. Minister means servant. Prime Minister means Chief Servant of the Crown. The Parliament which elects them opens every meeting in Christian prayer.

The Lordship of Jesus Christ in Australia's governmental system

The amazing standards of Christian leadership and government outlined at the start of the parable should be read again, because many Christians in Australia earnestly express the desire to have that kind of government leader. But we already have exactly that kind of leader, because the standards in the parable are condensed directly from the Queen's

promises and prayers at her Coronation service. Christians can rejoice that the Coronation service so clearly reveals the Lordship of Jesus in our national life.

No other nations on earth install their head of state in a Christian service of praise and worship.

During the service the Queen seeks the anointing of the Holy Spirit. Later, she holds the Sceptre and the Orb, one in each hand. The Sceptre is the symbol of her kingly authority, but the Orb — a golden sphere surmounted by the cross — is held at the same time to remind her "that the whole world is subject to the Power and the Empire of Christ our Redeemer". Thus, our kings and queens publicly declare to all, including those in positions of delegated authority, that use of the Crown's authority is only legitimate when under the Lordship of the King of kings.'

But this distinctly Christian view of the government of England is under attack by THOUSANDS of secular humanists and radicals.

‘

Christian approach censored

Supremely inspiring, is the best way to describe the tenets of Christian leadership and government set forth in the Coronation service. No Christian home should be without a well read copy.

It is exciting. It reveals God's blessing on our nation in answer to the faith of many generations. But it is also a chilling reminder of the extent to which the apathy of modern Christians and the intense activity of secular humanists have censored these facts from the pages of our history books and TV programmes.

Timeless principles of God

For over a thousand years the framework of the Coronation service has hardly changed, yet its details and central message are today kept well hidden from popular view, the service used for the Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, for example, descends directly from the service used by Archbishop Dunstan at the Coronation of King Edgar at Bath in 973AD.

This means that long before the advent of the Church of England as a denomination, and long before Henry VIII, the church in England had so inspired and elevated politics that the nation adopted this unique, indeed, sublime approach to Christian government and leadership. And its relevance still challenges us in the 20th century.

One of the church's greatest achievements

Conceiving this enduring approach to Christian leadership and government is one of the most outstanding achievements in the history of the Church anywhere in the world. And

it is part of Australia's heritage. It is as practical as it is spiritual, and is a powerful prophetic statement by the Church to the nation. God is calling Australian Christians, particularly Ministries, to voice that statement to this generation.

Australian government standard is submission to Christ as Lord

Obviously, the Coronation service of itself cannot turn Monarchs or their advisors into perfect people, but it does reveal clearly the standard. And the standard for Australia is shown by the Coronation service to be nothing less than complete submission of our government, its institutions and leaders, to the Lordship of Jesus Christ and His Word.

When the churches stop being apologetic and stop feeling threatened, and when we come out of hiding to proclaim this standard as a settled and accepted part of our national life and heritage, ordinary Australians will at last have some clear simple guidelines against which to judge political actions and proposals.

A rod for the wicked and counsel for the wise

Ungodly kings, corrupt judges, malevolent Ministers of the crown and bad bureaucrats will be seen by the people for what they are and will find themselves afflicted "with the rod of men and with the stripes of the sons of men".

In the system of government that God has given us, with its strong emphasis on loyalty and servanthood, the wicked have an Achilles heel: they can never fully implement their policies without grabbing for more power than is legitimately available to loyal servants. This point was well made in a TV documentary entitled "The Royal Family", when one commentator said that what is important is not the power that the Queen exercises personally, but the power that she denies to others.

P.M. not entitled to say "my government"

Demagogues and potential dictators are frustrated and even infuriated by our quaint "old fashioned" loyalty to the Crown. I often smile, for example, as I hear a Prime Minister use the phrase "my Government". Prime Ministers really do know better than to refer to the government as their own, but it frustrates some of them that Section 61 of our Constitution says "The executive power (i.e. government) of the Commonwealth is vested in the Queen..." and she says it is all subject to the Power and Empire of Christ!

P.M. and Cabinet not even mentioned in our Constitution

Ambitious politicians and most of the power lusting media barons would love us to believe that the Prime Minister is the one who holds authority. But the Constitution of Australia does not even mention either the Prime Minister or the Cabinet.

If the Monarchy is powerless, why do they want to scrap it?

What a glorious conception of government our forefathers had: a Royal line appointed by God, publicly in submission to Christ the King of kings, serving the people and ably served by loyal advisers who are in turn responsible to a Parliament which faithfully represents the views of the people to the Crown.

No wonder humanists and ambitious unbelievers in the media and in politics have worked so hard to convince our people that our Monarchy is out of date, purely ceremonial and has no real power or authority. If that were true, why would they want to get rid of it?’

CONCLUSION: For all these six weighty reasons, it follows that if it be true that it is altogether **CONTRARY** to Divine Law for a **WOMAN** to exercise the real power inherent in governing in the civil and political sphere, well then, not even the sanctimonious **QUIBBLE** that the king reigns but does not rule can ever vindicate reigning queens from the heinous and atrocious guilt of unlawfully exercising authority and government in the state any more than female prime ministers or female members of parliament! **QED**