KING EDWARD'S ABDICATION.
IS IT IRREVOCABLE?
"THE TIMES" ON A "KING OF SCOTLAND."

MELBOURNE Matrimonial intentions, then, let me say
(very respectfully he takes up the portrait of Prince
ALBERT and looks at it.) I now withdraw all opposition.
In fact I cordially agree. I think your Majesty's choice
is excellent. In your hands the future welfare of the
country is safe.
VICTORIA Oh, that is very kind of you, Lord Melbourne;
and I am glad to hear it. But I feel bound to tell you
that, even had you not agreed, it would have made no
difference at all.
[VICTORIA Regina.]

"The King and the Lady."

Cavalcade (Inveresk House, Strand, W.C.2) has just
issued a revised and enlarged edition of its booklet: The
King and the Lady, *covering events up to and including
the wedding of the Duke of Windsor. Readers should
buy this for reference, because the authors have had time
to complete the verification of the facts contained in the
earlier edition. Further, the lay-out and typesetting of
the new edition is a great improvement, lending it an
atmosphere of responsibility and dignity which was not
easy to capture in the hurry of writing up the crisis in the
midst of it. The extended story remains sub-
stanually the same and so does the moral. In fact the
new events now recorded serve to confirm the construc-
tion that was placed on the old ones. For example, the
Cabinet's refusal to accord the status of "Royal High-
ness" to the Duchess of Windsor explains their earlier
preference that it was not constitutional to deny the wife
the status of her husband. From swearing they would
not consent to the morganatic principle they swung
round to insisting on it. It is the old tale: there is
no stamp so ignoble but there can be improvised a noble
principle to justify it.

The Newspapers' Central Newspaper?

While reading the section of the booklet dealing with
the attitude of the London Press we have been struck
by the resemblance between their sudden change of
attitude to Edward VIII, just before the abdication
and the change of attitude on the part of the Melbourne Age
to Sir Colin Nimmeyer on the occasion of his visit to
Australia. In the latter case the change was one from
hostility to adulation, whereas in the case of the London
Press it was one from adulation ("We want our King"
) to hostility ("The Crown is greater than the wearer of
it"). But the point is in the quickness of the change
—a quickness which in both cases left no room for the
pretense that public feeling had been ascertained or had
even had time to crystallize into an "opinion." Just as the
joint stock banks have a central bank which con-
trols their deeper policy so the have the popular newspapers
a central newspaper which does the same thing. That
newspaper is *The Times*. Behind *The Times* is a Com-
mmittee, and on that Committee are the Governor of the
Bank of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury—
both by virtue of their office. In high politics the office of
the Archbishop is swallowed up in the office of the
Governor: religious convictions (when any) are dis-
sovled in secular calculations. And as for the party-
policies of the popular newspapers, these too must be
reduced to components of a central synthesis whenever
the central bank decides that there must be one. The
old saying: "When Father says turn all back" applies
here. In the bed of financial solvency whose mattress
measures the size of financial subsidies the penalty of not
lying (in both senses) to order face to back along the
pillow of unity is that somebody is going to be edged out
onto the floor. The risk is hidden from the gaze of the
casual public by the counterpart of accountancy, under
which the operations of real-political pressure take place.
All newspapers are on the Dole except the newspaper of
the Dole-creators and dispensers, *The Times*. The whole
fabric of the State's finances is held together by the Dole,
and the ultimate source of that Dole is known by the
Initiated to be "Ways and Means Advances," whose oblo
and flow are regulated by the Bank of England in con-
junction with foreign central banks.

The Church and High Politics.

It is a pity that *Cavalcade's* new edition was in print
before the recent public repudiation of the Dean of Canter-
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by the Archbishop of Canterbury could be included. "I have no power under the law," said the Primate to "appeal to the House of Lords". "Nothing like Mr. Winston Churchill's "cordial acceptance of defeat" over the India Bill. It discloses, at any rate, a compliant acceptance of impotence—an unwillingness to test the law, and an unwillingness to test the strength or weakness of the law strengthened or changed. You would think that if the Dean's action was grave enough to merit a solemn public rebuke from the Primate it was grave enough to incur some sort of disciplinary measure. According to the authors of the book, the reason why Edward VIII was forced to abdicate was because the Dean had begun to usurp the functions of the foreign diplomat—doing jobs which belonged to Mr. Anthony Eden—holding interviews with leading political figures in South-Eastern Europe. When the Prime Minister or the Cabinet had any power under the law to stop him we shall never know, because they were astute enough to trip him up on another count. And if the action of the Dean of Canterbury, however, was of the same nature and significance as that of Edward VIII, had disturbed the powers of High Finance as much as it appears to have disturbed the Primate, we are quite sure that the Dean would have been told where he got off. We conclude, therefore, that the Dean's action was a staged affair. What makes us particularly interested in it is that the Primate's plea of legal impotence reinforces our remarks about the opportunity that the Dean let slip by not going across to marry the Duke. The Dean, as Director of the Social Credit Secretariat was officially committed to the Secretariat's interpretation of the abolition as a financial reform, so he could have justified his action on humanitarian, religious, political and economic grounds—taking place having an unassailable position as a citizen and a churchman.

The Dean of Canterbury's Mistake.

As it is, the Dean's action has raised the question of the Church (or representative officials thereof) to intervene between sovereigns, taking the Spanish insurrection as his background he has occupied an untenable position. In form he is standing up for Democracy against the aggression of Dictatorships. But an influence runs through the British Press in favor- isating the Spanish Government with Com- munist Dictatorship. That view may be wrong, but it is forcibly disseminated and widely accepted. Hence the point of the Dean's gesture is blunted. The trouble is that the Spanish Government, however intent they may have been at the commencement on maintaining the Democratic Party, are being compelled to abandon it in the process of, and as a result of, reversing the insurrection. So the prospect is that whichever side wins, a Dictatorship will emerge, and will justify itself by the plea that the means which were necessary to win the victory must be the means to consolidate it.

The Euro-American Effort.

No: all the Dean has done has been to take sides in a controversy relating to only one problem arising out of the policy of International Finance, whereas he ought to have taken sides on the whole battle of who is to commemorate Lord Baldwin's handing of the Monarchy to the Monarchists. The announcement that he would have done so is followed by a statement that he has decided to refrain. Lang amoible regards the animal at a respect- body can tell what the banking is about. It remains anonymous. The significance of the gift, how- ever, does not attach to the identity of the giver, but to the fact that the gift, for £50,000, was made by a single person. It would have been more discreet if the public had been allowed to suppose that the money had been pulled up by a number of persons—the larger the number the better. It stands to reason that if a single person can afford to solace £50,000 to gratify his pleasure at Baldwin's victory over the Monarchy, he could have spent it last December to assist Baldwin to win the victory, had that been necessary. Or he could have spent it this winter to assist Baldwin that gentle- man faltered in his "duty." A sum of £50,000 can buy a substantial amount of "public opinion"; so the thought to the democratic will get no uncomplacent feeling that he was right in giving (with one vote or (per-haps two votes) can multiply its influence at least several- thousandfold by the expenditure of money. Still more so would this reflect that there are plenty of other people who could have put up comparable sums for the same purpose.

Stabilising the Abduction!

However, the Dean's action was accomplished without the Monarchy, and the present gift may be regarded as the purchase-price of a government which will empty the corpus from rising. Baldwin Trust, as it is being called, is to be sold for 3,000 at a price which will prejudice the nature of the Abdication as described in the "Emperor." And in this political context the operations of the Trust may be likened to the casting of lots by the Roman soldiers in the Palestine Drama, in case the soldiers being the British and Dominion Premiers, and the spoils gambled over being the Garments of Kingly Prepotence, stripped from the deposed and defrocked Monarch.

"Victoria Regina?"

Whether the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street dreams nightly of noughts like Portius Plutus' wife one cannot tell. But there are symptoms of nervousness in high places which incline us to think that some day the turf will be detected in law. Indeed it is only a matter of time when the curtailment will be made on the first night of "Victoria Regina" at the Lyric Theatre, Lawrence Howard was asked whether he intended paying a tribute in his speech to the Duke of Windsor for his making the Duke of Windsor for illustrating the test that had rested on the performance of the play for so long. The tribute was made in the pages of the paper which was not "spoken on the night." One could almost suppose that mention of the Duke's name was calculated to be likely to start a row among the representatives of wealth, rank and religion, and would not have allowed those of their readers who are familiar with the inside story of the abolition will realise that among a theatre audience composed of figures infinitely involved in the story, figures renowned for their unfolding of another and simpler story from a time when Kings and Queens in- sist on an amusing and exercising their prerogatives, it meant that there would be no more trigger-action in the house when the curtain came downs and the author was eaten. Hush! Don't name that. His grand-strategy has won him, and some remnant of the cross of the parties of the Great Betrayal.

"Of Course I Must Choose—"

Readers will do well to follow the play of the text, which has been published annually in Trewenov Standard (as it was on Thursday: 44, 45, day by day). There are episodes in the early instalments which, if it were not known that they were written long ago, might have been taken as having been prompted by the abduction issue. One is where the young Queen is presented by Lord Melbourne with a list of allowable husbands to choose from. Can she peep outside the list? Why certainly, in principle—but, there are reasons of statecraft and stockbroking, explains his Lordship, which must restrict the choice. But you are to exercise your own imaginations, which continue, to which he would feel it his duty to raise firm objection. But, requires the young Queen, of course I must choose my own husband.

"My Discharge My Duties..."

You can imagine how this piece of wisdom from a babe and suckling must have come across the footlights. (It is starting to realise, by the way, that this took place in 1908.) The author of the play has Lord Melbourne covering up by reminding her that if she doesn't take to any of his "desirable" she need not worry, because she is not obliged to marry at all—but it is dis- cussing something rather than mitigating the discomfort of those persons in the audience who were parties to the presentation of the ultimatum to Victoria's great-great-grandmother. Victoria's remark discarded a settled issue. The young Queen had decided on taking a husband, and the only condition on which she envisaged the prospect was not marriage, but she found a man that she fancied. If she did, well then, of course she must choose her own husband, and of course she must choose that man as her husband, and she married him, and there is no question that if she were able to speak to-day she could say, almost in the words of Edward VIII, that if the day should now you found it possible to carry the burden of res-ponsibility, and discharge my duties as Queen as I wished to do, with the help and support of the man I loved.

The Regency RAMP.

It is of course open for anyone to say that Queen Victoria might have taken a point of view like the late Premier and Primate on the moral aspect of the issues of last December, but that is a double-fired argument, for on the assumption implied in the word "only"—namely, that the Prime Minister and Primate did not know what was going on, and that he was unable to speak to-day she could say, almost in the words of Edward VIII, that if the day should now you found it possible to carry the burden of responsibility, and discharge my duties as Queen as I wished to do, with the help and support of the man I loved.

For, whether this expression, so germane rather than mitigating the discomfort of those persons in the audience who were parties to the presentation of the ultimatum to Victoria's great-grandmother. Victoria's remark discarded a settled issue. The young Queen had decided on taking a husband, and the only condition on which she envisaged the prospect was not marriage, but she found a man that she fancied. If she did, well then, of course she must choose her own husband, and of course she must choose that man as her husband, and she married him, and there is no question that if she were able to speak to-day she could say, almost in the words of Edward VIII, that if the day should now you found it possible to carry the burden of responsibility, and discharge my duties as Queen as I wished to do, with the help and support of the man I loved.
fact is that the bankers use occasions of the succession to cajole powers from the Monarchy. The discontinuity of the personal reign subserves the continuity of financial usurpation. Whenever there is a transfer of power in any form the Money Monopolists capture some of it, if not all of it. For example, who inherited the power taken from the great landowners? And to come to the most recent example, the succession of George VI to the Throne. He is the reigning Monarch, it is true; but he reigns under the shadow of a Regency. This Regency has been improvised to serve as an alibi for professional bankers and banker-statesmen in the event of the nominal Monarch’s giving them cause to coerce him. It is a device, in that event, to take the power of decision out of the King’s hands and repose it in a “Committee of Royalties,” the Money Monopolists depending upon the calculation that they can always secure a majority on a Committee whereas they might not be able to deceive or intimidate an individual. If Edward VIII had been reigning under the present Regency last December there is reason for stating that he would have been overruled by the Regency and without embarrassing the Premier and Prime with un-welcoming publicty. Anyhow an inhaled Monarchy is a dead Monarchy; and a Regency is the symbol of inflation. Legal jargon defining the occasions for it to assume responsibility can be written off as eyewash. It is there to be invoked and accredited when and how the bankers wish.

“A King of Scotland.”

Reverting to Canasta’s booklet, it quotes a passage from The Times relating to the visit of the (then) Duke and Duchess of York to Edinburgh. This visit took place on December 18, before Baldwin had had his final interview with Edward VIII. On December 2 the Times published a leading article, referring to the Duke as Heir-Presumptive to the Throne and saying:

"... this visit of the Heir-Presumptive to the great fortress... encourages the speculation whether a time may not some day come when these historic honours may be used again with the free consent of the Scots in the crowning of a King of Scotland on the Stone of Destiny."

This was eight days before the abdication, and the intention of the writer was to hurry up Edward VIII’s decision and to hint that there was an alternative King if he did not make the right decision. We are not interested, however, in the intention of the writer but in his somewhat cryptic speculation. We pick up our ears at his mention of Scotland. For the (then) Duchess of York is a Scot, so is the Prime, and the (then) Duke of York was, and is, at the head of the Scottish Masonic Order. Readers may add other Scots to taste. They may recall that a few months ago we published an article which commented adversely on the influence of Scots and Scottish Masonry on British policy. We do not know whether the writer of the above quoted passage is a follower of our contributor, but what he says chimes in very well with the idea of making Scotland a place fit for Scotsmen to live in. Why not start with a King and Queen of Scotland? What do the Scottish Nationalists think of the idea? Be careful to observe that it is The Times which is responsible for putting it in print: we are only examining it. Scotland already contains Royal residences; so the housing question does not arise. In principle we like the idea of separate Monarchies for smaller areas. It would symbolise and effectuate the principle of decentralisation.

The Bankers’ Allegiance Trap.

It is all very well to object that this would spoil the picture of a King-Emperor enjoying the homage and affection of the Empire. But after all, it is only a picture, and the reality behind it is that the King-Emperor is pictured and advertised in this sentimental manner as a device for covering up his political impotence, and to enforce his economic policy and the economic interests of the bankers more than there is any other country.

Is Thy Monarch a Film Star?

We once wrote some comments which frightened our printers (they related to some action for scandal affecting a big personage) and we did not publish them. But one of them alluded incidentally to a matter which eludes our present case. It was where King George V was reported to have "rejoiced" at the Ottawa Agreement. And we conjured to find whether the intention which had been put into the mouth of Edward VIII (not Prince of Wales) namely that British manufacturers should degrade the quality of their goods in order to increase the volume of their export-revenue was intended at the time that there were two examples of Empire’s allegiance to the King-Emperor being made for financial purposes, or used as a device to manipulate financial interests, or smokescreen the results of financial dealings. The Ottawa Agreement was a formula of assent to policies which, as afterwards became plain, were to thrown the Dominions into disrepute and throw the Dominions into disrepute and were made to carry them out. Not only was it used to mix the King up in the affair at all, but it exposed him to ridicule to say that he "rejoiced" at an agreement of this particular nature. As for the words with which (then) Prince of Wales had to say, identifying himself as the Prince of Wales had to say, identifying himself as the Prince of Wales, they are a self-condemned.

The King Across the Water.

If a centralised Empire-Emperor is to be used to enforce Allegiance to the person of the King-Emperor, then the nature of the operation will be more participation in bankers’ plans than mere acquiescence. If we see it as to have no King at all or else have a King to whom we are not committed, a plurality of Kings would be of interest to us. Of course, the real fact is that there are a plurality of Kings. That is the problem which exists under the existing financial system of mistrust. The reconciliation from this point of view would be a further consolidation of a King of Scotland and a further consolidation of the Scottishpeople. And as the things said about England by the Scottish nationalists are true, we expect that they could justify by argument that England had denied them the means of achieving a national policy of their own to work out, and that King of their own would tempt them back to Scotland. It is another matter. But as The Times suggests, it is the problem of letting them have one is worth speculating about. We suggest of letting them have one is worth speculating about. We suggest that the question is not whether Edward VIII’s abdication and his acceptance of the Throne need be accepted as absolutely and finally irrevocable. Of course this speculation would be based on the assumption that the original Ottawa Agreement was not acceptable to the Royal Family. That England was acceptable to the Royal Family. But the Forces of the Crown, and we write this on the assumption that The Times had assured itself on the matter that The Times had assured itself on the matter that before ventilating it. For ourselves there are two axioms that there are to be two Kings. Therefore there will have to be two Kings. Therefore there will have to be two Kings.