

## Restoring the Spiritual Commons

M. Oliver Heydorn

Today, I will be speaking about the restoration of ‘the spiritual commons’ in our Western civilisation, i.e., the restoration of the specific spiritual heritage – broadly conceived – upon which our Western civilisation and culture are built. Graeco-Roman philosophy, law, and government, on the one hand, in combination with the belief in and the practice of the Christian religion, on the other, are the two single greatest factors that were responsible for the emergence of Europe as we know it. The universal truths that were transmitted to us, from these two sources, while never perfectly embodied in the course of our history, nonetheless provided us with certain guiding lights. These metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and political touchstones were the means by which both individuals and society as a whole sought to navigate their way through the course of time; they provided a template for the correct orientation of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours.

Unfortunately, for various historical reasons which I won’t go into here, our civilisation has deviated more and more as the centuries have passed from that cultural highpoint that had been attained in the Middle Ages ... when, England, for example, had been described as ‘Merrie’. As it has deviated, and in spite of the exceptional technical progress that simultaneously accompanied this process of devolution and that has, to some degree at least, masked its effects, there has been a growing entropy, disease, or disorder that has increasingly threatened the very stability of society itself. Indeed, this entropy or disorder has continually grown to the point that, at the present time, in 2022, it is now so great as to threaten the long-term longevity of our civilisation on a variety of fronts.

The object lesson, or, as we say in modern ‘parlance’, the ‘take away’ from this experience of progressive degeneration, both for individuals and for society as a whole, is that we do indeed need boundaries – provided that they are the right boundaries – because it is only within the correct boundaries that we can function optimally. It is only within the boundaries that we can flourish. As it says in the Gospel according to St. Matthew: “And you shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free”.

In other words, there is something out there in the make-up of reality – call it X – that we MUST obey, both because obedience is right and just (*dignum et justum est*) in and of itself, but also because it is only through that obedience, that alignment, that we can flourish, that we can release the superabundant goodness with which reality is impregnated at the level of sheer potentiality. And then there is this third matter: either we willingly ‘bend the knee’ and cooperate with this numinous reality and receive the corresponding blessings, or else it will eventually compel us to bend our knees before it and without the receipt of said blessings. As we read in the book of Deuteronomy, 30:19:

“I call heaven and earth to witness this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Choose therefore life, that both thou and thy seed may live.”

There is no escape from reality. The principle, that X, which constitutes the very heart of being will dominate, by necessity, all the other parts of reality. That supremacy can be experienced by us in either a pleasant or an unpleasant manner, depending on whether we willingly submit to its rule or choose – in a futile way – to rebel against it.

So what are the correct boundaries? What are the true guiding lights? What are the proper orienting principles? What is this 'X' which must be obeyed?

There is, of course, the datum which C.H. Douglas, the founder of the original Social Credit, referred to as 'the Canon', and what others have termed the Platonic theory of forms and/or the natural law. The basic idea here is that the universe, or more broadly 'reality', has been created according to a certain set of blueprints, and if we wish to flourish, both as individuals and as a society, then we must discern what those blueprints are in every field of human life and of human endeavour. Once discovered, it is then our duty to find ways and means of embodying or applying the truths that are found in those blueprints through effective mechanisms. Douglas expressed it this way in his essay "The Pursuit of Truth":

**[T]here is running through the nature of the Universe something that we may call a "canon". It is the thing which is referred to in the Gospel of St. John as the "Logos," the "Word" (Logos: "The Word" or "Reason"). [St. John 1:1, "The Word (Logos) was with God, and the Word was God." ...] It has an infinite variety of names. The engineer and the artist refer to it when they say that they have got something "right". Other people mean the same thing when they talk about absolute truth, or reality. By whatever name you wish to refer to this idea, it does not matter very much; we all instinctively recognise its existence whether we meet it in something like architectural proportions as, say, the cenotaph, or even in the grim lines of a battleship."**[2]<sup>1</sup>

As the quote from Douglas intimates, there is a great deal of overlap between the Graeco-Roman root of Western civilisation and Christianity with respect to this notion of eidetic blueprints. There is one dimension, however, in which Christianity surpasses the Graeco-Roman approach to the nature of things and that has to do with its positioning of the person of Christ, of God made man, as the Word through whom God made the universe. Ultimately, in Christianity, that which must be known and obeyed is not an abstract principle, but a concrete and indeed incarnated divine person who stands at the origin of all of those aforementioned principles. What is now known in Catholic doctrine as the 'Social Kingship' of Christ served historically as both the foundation and the pinnacle, or the Alpha and the Omega, of Christian civilisation, i.e., Christendom.

What I want to suggest for your consideration, in the course of this presentation, is the following claim: If we wish to restore the spiritual commons, our spiritual heritage, we have to restore, before all else, the social reign of Christ the King, both in theory and, more particularly,

---

<sup>1</sup> C.H. Douglas, *Major C.H. Douglas Speaks* (Sydney: Douglas Social Credit Association, 1933), 52-53.

in practice. In what follows, I intend to expound on the doctrine itself, to provide its theological justification to, examine some of the broad political implications that ensue if the doctrine were taken seriously, and then, finally, to highlight some of the points of contact between the Social Kingship of Christ and the political theory developed by C.H. Douglas, the founder of the original Social Credit movement.

Perhaps the clearest articulation of this doctrine as the theological, metaphysical, and indeed political centrepiece of the Western project of civilisation – what used to be called Christendom – can be found in Pope Pius XI's 1925 encyclical *Quas Primas*. The use of the word 'King' in reference to Christ is, of course, metaphorical. The idea is that Christ possesses a special kind authority, indeed a supreme sovereignty, over the whole of the created world. In the words of St. John in 18:17 of the Apocalypse, Christ is "the ruler of the kings of the earth".

According to Pope Pius XI in *Quas Primas*, the chief cause – not the only cause – but the chief cause for the many difficulties, the many evils under which mankind have been labouring, more particularly in recent centuries, has to do with the fact that the majority of men have "thrust Jesus Christ and His holy law out of their lives". That is to say that Christ and His commandments are not accepted as they should be, either in private life or in public life. The Pope goes on to claim that so long as individuals and states adamantly refuse to submit themselves to the rule of Christ the King, there will be no deep and meaningful or lasting peace amongst the nations. Men must seek and yearn for the peace of Christ, which can only be found in the Kingdom of Christ - Pax Christi in Regno Christi. This follows the teaching of Saint Augustine that peace can only come as the fruit of order.

The first thing to note about this doctrine is that, as it is conceived by the Church, it applies to all men, both Catholic and non-Catholic, both Christian and non-Christian. In the words of Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Annum sacrum*:

His empire [that is, Christ's empire - MOH] includes not only Catholic nations, not only baptized persons who, though of right belonging to the Church, have been led astray by error, or have been cut off from her by schism, but also all those who are outside the Christian faith; so that truly the whole of mankind is subject to the power of Jesus Christ."<sup>2</sup>

The second thing to note about this doctrine is that it applies to both individuals in their private lives as well as to nations in their public lives. In other words, it is not enough for individuals to recognise, adore, and obey Christ as their individual King, it is incumbent on the state to do the same on behalf of the nation. The responsible public authority, in the name of the nation, is called on, through its institutions, laws, and public pronouncements, etc., to embody that same recognition, adoration, and obedience in the exercise of its various responsibilities. In sum, the obedience that we owe to that which I referred to earlier as 'the big X' is not just individual or private in nature, but is also communal and public.

---

<sup>2</sup> Leo XIII, *Annum Sacrum*, 3.

Quoting once again from the encyclical *Quas Primas*,

“Nor is there any difference in this matter between the individual and the family or the State; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ. In him is the salvation of the individual, in him is the salvation of society. "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved." [29] He is the author of happiness and true prosperity for every man and for every nation. "For a nation is happy when its citizens are happy. What else is a nation but a number of men living in concord?" [30]"<sup>3</sup>

In the interest of being ecumenical and of demonstrating that the gist of this principle is not restricted to Catholicism, but can also be found amongst Protestants, consider the following words of the 19<sup>th</sup> century British Baptist preacher Charles Spurgeon:

“I long for the day when the precepts of the Christian religion shall be the rule among all classes of men, in all transactions. I often hear it said ‘Do not bring religion into politics.’ This is precisely where it ought to be brought, and set there in the face of all men as on a candlestick. I would have the Cabinet and the Members of Parliament do the work of the nation as before the Lord, and I would have the nation, either in making war or peace, consider the matter by the light of righteousness. We are to deal with other nations about this or that upon the principles of the New Testament.

“I thank God that I have lived to see the attempt made in one or two instances, and I pray that the principle may become dominant and permanent. We have had enough of clever men without conscience, let us now see what honest, God-fearing men will do. But we are told that we must study ‘British interests,’ as if it were not always to a nation’s truest interest to do righteousness. ‘But we must follow out our policy.’ I say, No! Let the policies which are founded on wrong be cast like idols to the moles and to the bats. Stand to that most admirable of policies,—‘As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.’ Whether we are kings, or queens, or prime ministers, or members of parliament, or crossing sweepers, this is our rule if we are Christians.

“Yes, and bring, religion into your business, and let the light shine in the factory and in the counting-house. Then we shall not have quite so much china clay in the calicoes wherewith to cheat the foreigner, nor shall we see cheap and nasty articles described as of best quality, nor any other of the dodges in trade that everybody seems to practice now-a-days. You tradespeople and manufacturers are very much one like the other in this: there are tricks in all trades, and one sees it everywhere. I believe everybody to be honest in all England, Scotland, and Ireland until he is found

---

<sup>3</sup> Leo XIII, *Quas Primas*, 30.

out; but whether there are any so incorruptible that they will never be found wanting this deponent sayeth not, for I am not a judge.

“Do not put your candle under a bushel, but let it shine, for it was intended that it should be seen. Religion ought to be as much seen at our own table as at the Lord’s table. Godliness should as much influence the House of Commons as the Assembly of Divines. God grant that the day may come when the mischievous division between secular and religious things shall no more be heard of, for in all things Christians are to glorify God, according to the precept, “Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.”<sup>4</sup>

### **The Justification of the Obligation**

So, if there is this obligation to recognise Christ as King on the part of every individual and on the part of society as a whole, why does it exist? Why does it bind? According to the teaching laid out in *Quas Primas*, we are to recognise Christ as King in both private and public life quite simply because it is the correct or due relationship which should obtain between God and ourselves. God is the uncreated principle in reality that is responsible for the existence of everything else. That is, He is the Creator and we are His Creatures. Since God made us out of nothing; since He sustains us at every moment in existence; since every good thing that we have comes directly or indirectly from Him, since we therefore owe Him everything, whereas He owes us nothing, we creatures have an absolute obligation in justice to give God the response that is due to Him as the source of all being, as the supreme being, as the Alpha and the Omega of all that there is, of all that there ever could be. No human being or society has any legitimate metaphysical or moral right to refuse to recognise God’s dominion.

The second reason or justification laid out by Pius XI for our duty to recognise the social reign of Christ the King has to do with the doctrine of the redemption. That doctrine teaches that Christ, by willingly embracing the suffering and death that was unjustly inflicted upon him out of love for His Father and indeed for us, made up for all the moral evil, for all the disobedience, that would ever occur in the world. In the words of Pius XI: “Would that those who forget what they have cost Our Savior, might recall the words: ‘You were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a lamb unspotted and undefiled. We are no longer our own, for Christ has purchased us ‘with a great price;’ our very bodies are the ‘members of Christ.’ Thus, through the act of redemption, Christ has acquired an additional right to be regarded as the supreme Sovereign of the human race. By sacrificing Himself, His life and welfare, in order to secure our temporal and eternal well-being, He is likewise deserving to be recognized as our King.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://caffeinatedthoughts.com/2012/11/charles-spurgeon-saltiness-and-light-are-the-power-of-christians/>

So Christ can make a double claim on our allegiance. As God, as our Creator, He has a *natural* right to be recognised as our King. As God-made-man, as our Redeemer, He has an *acquired* right to be recognised as our King.

### **The Practical Meaning/Application of the Doctrine:**

Now, if this doctrine were taken seriously, in the way that Pope Pius XI and the constant teaching of the Catholic Church would intend for it to be taken seriously, the social reign of Christ the King, His right to rule over societies as well as over individuals, would constitute the very foundation of our society moving forward. In a country where Christ ruled as King, many things would have to change, both concretely and in more general or theoretical terms. In what follows, I will limit myself to three broad changes involving the re-orientation of the political regime under which we live. Afterwards, I also wish to show that, in his political writings, C.H. Douglas was in general agreement with these three fundamental changes as part and parcel of a functional societal order that is based on Christian principles.

So if Christ were to rule as King – which, as I have said, is the necessary means for restoring the spiritual commons – what would have to change?

#### **1. In the first place, it would be the end of the purely secular state.**

Whatever the principle of the separation of Church and state might mean, it cannot mean or ought not to mean that the state has no obligations to God, or that it has the natural right to remain neutral with respect to fundamental questions of morality or religion. Instead, it would be widely recognised that the state has responsibilities in these matters and that it has an obligation to conform itself in its operations to the Kingship of Christ. Even those laws which are currently in force and which are sound and would therefore be retained would have to be re-conceptualized. Immoral acts, for example, that destroy our capacity to live together peacefully and prosperously in society, such as murder, theft, etc., would continue to be prohibited, but not merely because the majority might wish for them to be prohibited. They would be prohibited first and foremost because they are at odds with Christian principles, because they violate the law of Christ the King.

#### **2. In the second place, if Christ ruled as King, it would be the end of the notion that authority resides in or comes from the people (i.e., the masses).**

This follows directly from the first consequence: if the state has to answer to something above and beyond itself as the ultimate authority in reality, i.e., to Christ, then clearly any social theory which asserts that authority in society somehow originates from below, from the people, must be in error. Indeed, the constant teaching of the Church is that “All authority comes from God” (*Omnis potestas a Deo*) and that if any person or any group (including ‘the people’) exercises any kind of authority or power in a society it’s because it has been delegated to them by God. They are therefore *responsible* for

the uses that they make of it and will be answerable to God if they abuse that authority. No one is morally free to do with social power whatever he or she pleases.

As Pope Leo XIII explained in his encyclical *Immortale Dei*:

“Every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its author. Hence it follows that all public power must proceed from God. FOR GOD ALONE IS THE TRUE AND SUPREME LORD OF THE WORLD. Everything without exception must be subject to Him, and must serve Him, so that whosoever holds the right to govern, holds it from one sole and single source, namely, God, the Sovereign Ruler of all. “There is no power but from God.” [Rom. 13:1].<sup>5</sup>

**3. In the third and final place, and as a direct consequence of the 2<sup>nd</sup> point I just made, if Christ ruled as King, it would also be the end of any theory or practice of political democracy that is built on the supposition that power comes from the people.**

The popular idea of democracy, i.e., that government is based on the alleged power or authority of the people, can be traced back to the “Declaration of the Rights of Man” that was part and parcel of the French Revolution. Within its historical context, “*Omnis potestas a populo*” was, in fact, a deliberate repudiation of the Social Kingship of Christ. It was the cry of a true revolution, i.e., the forcible overthrow of an established and, in this case, rightful conception and system of government. The world has been revolving and devolving in a particularly brutal way ever since.

For her part, the Church is totally opposed to any concept of democracy in which authority is said to reside in the people and/or in which those who govern are said to receive their authority from the people. Pope Leo XIII insisted in *Immortale Dei* that:

“In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people; and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler . . . The authority of God is passed over in silence, just as if there were no God; or as if He cared nothing for human society; or as if men, in their individual capacity or bound together in social relations, owed nothing to God; or as if there could be a government of which the whole origin and power and authority did not reside in God Himself: Thus, as is evident, a state becomes nothing but a multitude, which is its own master and ruler.”<sup>6</sup>

Now, this opposition to the popular theory of democracy on the part of the Church does not imply anything about democracy itself. There are, of course, different political systems, different forms of government that can be envisaged, and the merits and demerits of these would have to form the subject of a separate discussion altogether. As far as democracy is concerned, the Church is not opposed to democracy in and of itself, i.e., as a system of

---

<sup>5</sup> Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 24-25.

government, so long as all that we mean by democracy is that those who govern are chosen by means of a vote (whether that vote be based on a system of limited or universal suffrage). The crucial point is that even in a democracy it must be understood that those who govern derive their authority ultimately from God and are therefore responsible to Him, in the same way that an absolute monarch would hold his authority from God and be responsible to Him. If the people in a democracy somehow govern, let's say in a direct democracy of some kind, they govern as God's legates, and cannot or ought not to be permitted to pass any legislation which is contrary to the law of God (even if the passing of that legislation is the demonstrated will of the majority of people in a democratic society). In other words, the social Kingship of Christ means that there are definite limits to what the people can authorize in any democracy that has previously chosen to accept the Kingship of Christ as its corner stone.

### **C.H. Douglas, Social Credit, and the Social Kingship of Christ**

Now, as far as CH. Douglas is concerned, it is true that he never wrote explicitly on the topic of the Social Kingship of Christ. It is likewise true that He never used the term and was quite possibly not even familiar with it. However, when one considers what the 'Social Kingship of Christ' would mean in practical terms, namely, a well-defined role for a responsible Church in the spiritual, cultural, political and economic life of a nation, it is clear that Douglas was in favour of a lived application of the doctrine. In defending this interpretation of Douglas' thinking, I will rely heavily on two speeches which Douglas made in the latter part of his life: "Realistic Constitutionalism" and "The Realistic Position of the Church of England". For example, in his speech, "The Realistic Position of the Church of England", Douglas wrote in support of a "... general policy which appears to lead to a re-incorporation of the Church as a living and vital element in daily life, ..." <sup>7</sup> But what exactly would that entail?

- 1) To begin with, Douglas was also opposed to the purely secular state. For example, in *The Realistic Position of the Church of England*, he writes:

"Before the Church of England can become what it should be, an integral, primary, and effective part of the Constitution, so that the phrase '*Christianity is part of the Law of England*' may have real meaning, it is faced with the problem of restoring its *locus standi*.

"It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration.

"The Roman Catholic Church has always recognised this, and has never wavered in its claims. It may be (and here I write with diffidence and proper humility) that the most direct path to an

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Realistic%20Position%20of%20the%20Church%20of%20England.htm>



effective Church, is at least, close rapprochement, and at the most re-union of all the Churches making claims to Catholicity.”<sup>8</sup>

- 2) Likewise, Douglas disparaged the Rousseauesque notion that the consensus of the mob or the masses has any special claim to consideration, or that the masses are equipped to set the correct parameters for political activity. In *Realistic Constitutionalism* he writes:

“*Vox populi* is not only not *vox Dei*, but such empirical psychologists as Gustave le Bon have demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that in itself it is far more likely to be *vox diaboli*.”<sup>9</sup>

In other words, the alleged ‘voice of the people’, that is to say ‘the mob’, is not only not the voice of God, but it is more likely to be the voice of the devil.

- 3) Finally, Douglas also rejected the popular notion of and justification for democracy. In *Realistic Constitutionalism* he writes:

“To an audience of this character, I do not need to enter into a discussion of the merits or otherwise of democracy, because whatever else it may be, Great Britain is not, and never has been, an effective democracy, and was never less so than at present. Nevertheless, short of a *coup d'etat*, I do not think that the idea of democracy, which is of course very nebulous, can be abruptly abandoned. It has been too much propagandised, and means too many things to too many men. But whether by the strengthening and elevation of Common Law, and its repository in the care of an effective Second, non-elective, Chamber, or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority principle. It ought to be clear to any unprejudiced individual that a majority is always wrong in its reasons for a given situation, and cannot, therefore, possibly be right in its remedies, although a homogeneous, native-born majority is often instinctively right in its judgment of the nature of a situation.”<sup>10</sup>

In the same speech, Douglas went on to emphasise that, in his view, the foundational principles of our society should be, in a sense, pre-democratic and therefore should not be regarded as changeable by any democratic vote:

“Speaking, not of course as a lawyer, but as a student of history and organisation, it is my opinion that the restoration of the supremacy of Common Law, the removal of encroachments upon it, and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is *ultra vires*, is an urgent necessity. The locus of sovereignty over Common Law is not in the electorate, because Common Law did not derive from the electorate and indeed ante-dated any electorate in the modern sense. In the main, it derived from the

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> <http://socialcredit.com.au/uploads/221109516.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> <http://socialcredit.com.au/uploads/221109516.pdf>

Mediaeval Church, perhaps not directly, but from the climate of opinion which the Church disseminated.”<sup>11</sup>

One of the roles for the Church in Douglas’ constitutional schema would be, in conjunction with the aristocracy, to safeguard these unchangeable preambles of the regime:

“Common Law is something which, if it changes at all, ought to change very slowly indeed, and the greatest difficulty should be placed in the path of an attack upon it, both by insisting on its supremacy over House of Commons enactment, and by making it subject only to something at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution. It appears to me that a properly empowered and constituted House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, is the natural guardian of Common Law, as the Barons demonstrated at Runnymede.”<sup>12</sup>

According to Douglas, the Church, on behalf of Christ the King, is to have a politics and also a distinct role in politics:

“not only should I not object to the interest of the Church dignitaries in the matters of the everyday life of this world, but it appears to me to be axiomatic that a religion must have a politics, although not a technical politics.”<sup>13</sup>

But this is to be distinguished from any kind of theocracy because the nuts and bolts of legislation would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Church: “It does not appear that legislation is a proper function for the Church, ...”<sup>14</sup>

In fact, what Douglas is basically arguing for is a re-establishment of the tri-partite or Trinitarian constitution which characteristic of the Middle Ages. Consider the following two passages from his work:

“To summarise, so far as it is possible with so wide a subject, the ideas I have endeavoured to present to you, it is firstly necessary to recognise that we have allowed ourselves to accept a false theory of sovereignty, false not merely politically but structurally; a theory which is a departure from our own Constitution. To a very considerable extent, we must retrace our steps, in the face of many false guides, to the fork in the road somewhere about the time of the so-called Reformation.”<sup>15</sup>

8: “... we are to-day fighting a war which began in England in 1644, and has broken out sporadically at intervals. The real Britain, and the real America, have sustained one defeat after another. But the final battle is still to come.

---

<sup>11</sup> <http://socialcredit.com.au/uploads/221109516.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> <http://socialcredit.com.au/uploads/221109516.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Realistic%20Position%20of%20the%20Church%20of%20England.htm>

<sup>14</sup> <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Realistic%20Position%20of%20the%20Church%20of%20England.htm>

<sup>15</sup> <http://socialcredit.com.au/uploads/221109516.pdf>

... Detached investigation has convinced me, firstly that the real line of demarcation in the world is cultural, not economic, and that economic inequality is consciously produced and employed to provide troops for an attack on Anglo-Saxon culture. And secondly, that sooner or later the spurious Whig culture of New York and London, equally with that of Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini, which are mere derivatives of it, must crash in ruins, because of the fundamental weakness of absentee management.

To hasten that desirable end, a rapprochement between the pre-Civil War spirit of both England and America, which, if care is taken to avoid too narrow an application of the word, is Catholic, is the most urgent need.”<sup>16</sup>

So we see here that Douglas implicitly recognises that the doctrine of the social Kingship of Christ would serve as the linchpin of the whole system. It was the lived application of this doctrine which made Christendom what it was and it is only by restoring the social Kingship that we have any hope of recovering our spiritual inheritance as Western peoples and of restoring the spiritual commons. Thank you.

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. C.H. Douglas, “*This ‘American’ Business*” [*The Real America*] (K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1940?).