



UNIVERSITY
OF TASMANIA

Consent and Loyalty as Bases of Legitimate Political Authority

by

Jason Grant Allen

B.A. & LL.B. (Hons) (University of Tasmania)

LL.M. (Universität Augsburg)

Grad. Dip. Leg. Prac. (College of Law Australia)

School of Law

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Laws

University of Tasmania July 2013

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for a degree or diploma by the University or any other institution, except by way of background information and duly acknowledged in the thesis, and to the best of my knowledge no material previously published or written by any other person except where due acknowledgment is made in the text of the thesis, nor does the thesis contain any material that infringes copyright.

All translations are my own, except as otherwise noticed.

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying and communication in accordance with the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth).

J.G. Allen
July 2013

Dedicated in gratitude to my mother

Sincere thanks to my supervisors, Professor Gino Dal Pont and Mr. Michael Stokes, to whom I will remain indebted for their help and guidance at all stages of this project. I have benefited greatly from their criticism and encouragement as needed. The errors that remain despite these efforts are no reflection on their engagement as supervisors.

CONTENTS

TABLE OF CASES	iv
TABLE OF STATUTES	v
REFERENCES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE	
<i>Genuine Consent as an Act of Meaningful Choice</i>	
Introduction	4
The Consent Theory of Political Obligation and Legitimacy	5
A Critique of Consent Theory	12
Revised Consent Theory	18
Conclusion	39
CHAPTER TWO	
<i>The Unconscionable Social Contract</i>	
Introduction	41
Non-Consenting Subjects in the Liberal Democratic Polity	42
The Problem of Partial Legitimacy	63
Conclusion	75
CHAPTER THREE	
<i>The Impartial Benevolent Spectator as Fiduciary</i>	
Introduction	77
The Trust Theory of Government	79
The Forgotten History of the Forgotten Trust	87
Objections to Public Fiduciary Law	104
The Theory Applied	118
Conclusion	122
CONCLUSION	124

CASES

Aboriginal Development Commission v Treka Aboriginal Arts and Crafts Ltd [1984] 3 NSWLR 502

Australian Communist Party v The Commonwealth (1951) 83 CLR 1

Alfred Kinloch v Secretary of State for India in Counsel (1882) 7 App Cas 619

Bennet v Easedale (1626) 79 Eng Rep 821

Canada (Auditor General) v Canada (Minster of Energy, Mines and Resources) [1989] 2 SCR 49

Civilian War Claimants Association Ltd v The King [1932] AC 14

Coe v Commonwealth (1993) 118 ALR 193

Driscoll v Burlington-Bristol Bridge Co., 86 A.2d 201 (N.J. 1952)

Earl of Shrewsbury Case (1611) 77 Eng Rep 798

Edgington v Fitzmaurice (1885) 29 Ch 459

Frame v Smith [1987] 2 SCR 99

Guerin v The Queen [1984] 2 SCR 335

Howe v Lord Dartmouth (1802) 7 Ves 137

Judd v McKeon (1926) 38 CLR 380

Mabo v Queensland (No. 2) (1992) 175 CLR 1

Marbury v Madison, 15 US 137 (1803)

Mitchell v MNR [2001] SCC 33

R v Boston & Ors (1923) 33 CLR 386

R v Ewanchuk [1999] 1 SCR 330

R v White (1875) 13 SCR (NSW) L 322

Sir George Reynel's Case (1612) 77 Eng Rep 871

Tito v Wadell (No. 2) [1977] Ch. 106

Town Investments Ltd v Department of the Environment [1978] AC 359

Union Steamship Co of Australia Pty Ltd v King (1988) 166 CLR 1

Wewaykum Indian Band v Canada [2002] 4 SCR 245

STATUTES

Constitution of Pennsylvania 1776 (USA)

Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918 (Cth)

Criminal Code Act 1924 (Tas)

Declaration of Independence of the United States of America 1776 (USA)

Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina (1669)

Migration Act 1958 (Cth)

Minnesota Criminal Code, Minnesota Statutes 2011 §609 (USA)

Virginia Declaration of Rights 1776 (USA)