

THE NEW AGE

INCORPORATING "CREDIT POWER."

ORGAN OF THE NEW AGE SOCIAL CREDIT SOCIETY

No. 2338] NEW SERIES Vol. LXI. No. 9. THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1937. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION TO THE SOCIETY 30s.

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 are 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 the crisis. The extended story remains substantially the same and so does the moral. In fact the new events now recorded serve to confirm the construction that was placed on the old ones. For example, the Cabinet's refusal to accord the status of "Royal Highness" to the Duchess of Windsor explodes their earlier pretence that it was not constitutional to deny the wife the status of her husband. From swearing they would ne'er consent to the morganatic principle they swung round to insisting upon it. It is the old tale: there is no ramp 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 Otto Niemeyer 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 pretence that public feeling had been ascertained or had even had time to crystallise into an "opinion." Just as the joint stock banks have a central bank which controls their deeper policy so have the popular newspapers a central newspaper which does the same thing. That newspaper is *The Times*. Behind *The Times* is a Committee, 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 dissolved 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 we all turn" 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 counterpane 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 ebb and flow are regulated by the Bank of England in consultation 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 reproof of the Dean of Canter-

* Copies may be ordered from the office of THE NEW AGE, 12-14, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4.

bury by the Archbishop of Canterbury could be included. "I have no power under the law" said the Primate to "remove" the Dean. This sounds something like Mr. Winston Churchill's "cordial acceptance of defeat" over the India Bill. It discloses, at any rate, a complacent acceptance of impotence—an unwillingness to test the law, and much more an unwillingness to get 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 booklet the chief reason why Edward VIII was forced to abdicate was because he 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. Whether 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, which, observe, 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 Primate's rebuke 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 abdication as a financial ramp, so he could have justified his action on humanitarian, religious, political and economic grounds—thus placing himself in 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 right of the Church (or representative officials thereof) to intervene in high politics, but by taking the Spanish insurrection as his background he has occupied an untenable position. In form he is standing up for Democratic institutions against the aggression of Dictatorships. But an influential section of the British Press insists on identifying the Spanish Government with Communist 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 system, are being compelled to abandon it in the process of, and as a means of, resisting the insurgents. 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 necessary to consolidate it.

The European Blood-Clot.

No; all that 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, and could have, based his intervention on the ground that the conflict in Spain is the ultimate work, not of Franco, nor Mussolini and Hitler, but of the Money Monopolists, who indiscriminately exploit Autocracies and Democracies according to how their book is made. The Spanish war, he could have declared, is a blood-clot in the veins of Europe, and has, for the time being, lodged in Spanish territory. The battles

being fought there, whoever wins them, will only shift the clot elsewhere: they cannot disperse it because it is the product of financial coagulation—in technical terms it is the resultant of the flaw in the price-system. In short the Dean should have declared: "I believe in the soundness of the Social Credit diagnosis of war in all its planes—social, commercial and military—domestic and international—and by virtue of this my belief I claim the right, and must hold it my duty, both as a churchman and a citizen to intervene in the present high political counsels of State."

Why do the heathen rage
And the people imagine a vain thing?

He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh:
The Lord shall have them in derision
Then shall he speak to them in his wrath
And vex them in his sore displeasure.

And His name shall be called
Wonderful
Counsellor
The Mighty God
The Everlasting Father
The Prince of Peace

It is not meet for the Church to take sides on issues created by the mistakes of deceived man; it is her mission to proclaim Truth and denounce Deceit.

Triangular Boycott of Social Credit.

We notice that amidst all the vituperation poured on the Dean's head by the self-described anti-Red Press no allusion has been made to the Dean's connection with the Social Credit Secretariat or the Social Credit Movement. You would have thought that if the inspirers of attacks on him had wanted to do their job thoroughly they would have grabbed with both hands the opportunity of pointing out the fact that the Dean is a registered director of the Social Credit Secretariat and is thereby entangling the Church with a political organisation—one which, moreover, has publicly rebuked the Primate for his part in the abdication crisis, and, by implication, for his order that no clergyman should officiate at the Duke's wedding. It is a curious situation. The anti-Reds ignore the Social-Credit factor as a weapon of attack: the Dean of Canterbury ignores it as a weapon of defence: and the Archbishop of Canterbury appears either not to be aware of it, or, if aware, not to be able to make up his mind whether it mitigates or accentuates the offence allegedly residing in the Dean's exercise of diplomatic functions. To the question: "What is Social Credit" one might almost say: "The answer is a hedgehog." Its friends won't praise it, its enemies won't abuse it, and neutrals don't notice it. And this is all the more remarkable because everybody has now the option of regarding it in one of two ways, an instrument of economic reconstruction or a symbol of democratic renaissance. Yet no one will invoke it by name under either interpretation. Rothermere, Hewlett Johnson, and Lang amble round the animal at a respectful distance, and stop to bark with their tails towards it, so that nobody can tell what the barking is about.

The Monarchy's Costly Epitaph.

The announcement that someone had given £250,000 to commemorate Lord Baldwin's handling of the abdication crisis was followed by a statement that Sir Henry Strakosch was the donor. This statement was promptly and stoutly denied on Sir Henry's behalf. So the donor

remains anonymous. The significance of the gift, however, does not attach to the identity of the giver, but to the fact that the gift was made, and made by a single person. It would have been more discreet if the public had been allowed to suppose that the money had been put up by a number of persons—the larger the number the better. For it stands to reason that if a single person can afford to spend £250,000 to signify 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 to discredit Baldwin had that gentleman faltered in his "duty." A sum of £250,000 can buy a substantial amount of "public opinion"; so the thoughtful democrat will get an uncomfortable feeling when he reflects that one person with one vote (or perhaps two votes) can multiply its influence at least several-thousandfold by the expenditure of money. Still more so when he reflects that there are plenty of other people who could have put up comparable sums for the same purpose.

Stabilising the Abdication!

However, the murder of the Monarchy was accomplished without the assistance of private donations; and the present gift may be regarded as the purchase-price of a tombstone heavy enough to keep the corpse from rising. The Baldwin Trust, as it is being called, is to expend the dividends on the £250,000 in the interests of that abstraction described as the "Empire." 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 this case the soldiers being the British and Dominion Premiers, and the spoils gambled over being the Garment of Kingly Prerogatives stripped from the dethroned and deported Monarch.

"Victoria Regina."

Whether the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street dreams badly o' nights like Pontius Pilate's wife one cannot tell, but there are symptoms of nerviness in high places to be detected in unexpected quarters. For instance when the curtain went down on the first night of "Victoria Regina" at the Lyric Theatre, Laurence Housman was asked to desist from his intention of paying a tribute (in his speech to the audience) to the Duke of Windsor for lifting the ban that had rested on the performance of the play for so long. The tribute was published in the papers on the following day but was not "spoke on the night." One could almost suppose that mention of the Duke's name was calculated to be likely to start a rough house among the representatives of wealth, rank and power assembled there. And certainly those of our readers who are familiar with the inside story of the abdication will realise that among a theatre audience composed largely of figures intimately involved in that story, figures now watching the unfolding of another and cleaner story from a time when Kings and Queens insisted on asserting and exercising their prerogatives, there must have been something like hair-trigger tension in the house when the curtain came down and the author came forward. Hush! Don't name that name. His great-grandma may burst her shroud and come rustling restlessly among the parties of the Great Betrayal.

"Of Course I Must Choose—"

Readers will do well to follow the text of the play, which is being published serially in *The Evening Standard* (as from Thursday, June 24, 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 abdication 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 stockbreeding, explains his Lordship, which must restrict the choice. There are certain names, he continues, to which he would feel it his duty to raise firm objection. But, rejoins the young Queen, *of course I must choose my own husband.*

"— and Discharge My Duties . . ."

You can imagine how this piece of wisdom from a babe and suckling must have come across the footlights. (It is startling to realise, by the way, that this took place almost exactly a hundred years ago.) It is true that Lord Melbourne covers up by reminding her that if she doesn't take to any of his "desirables" she need not worry, because she is not obliged to marry at all—but it is dubious whether this reply did not intensify rather than mitigate the discomfort of those persons in the audience who were parties to the presentation of the ultimatum to Victoria's great-grandson. Moreover, Lord Melbourne's remark reopened a settled issue. The young Queen had decided on taking a husband, and the only condition on which she envisaged the prospect of not marrying at all was that she would not find 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. Well, as it transpired, she was not baulked in her choice; she married her man, and there is no question that if she were able to speak to-day she could say, almost in the words of Edward VIII—"But you must believe me when I tell you that I 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."

The Regency Ramp.

It is of course open for anyone to say that Queen Victoria might have taken a point of view much like the late Premier and Primate on the moral aspect of the issues of last December, but that is a double-edged argument, for on the assumption implicit therein, namely that she applied the standards of her time to the affairs of the present time, there are other matters on which she would have held views far different from those held by the aforementioned personages. We cannot imagine her, for instance, consenting tamely to the removal of her image and superscription from the currency (which in her days was of course the golden coin called the sovereign, but the substitution of the currency note would not have altered her attitude towards the substitution of a private banking company's premises for her face and figure). Did she not, by the way, voice her queenly wrath during the Boer War about the issue of some emergency postage stamps at Mafeking bearing the image of a British general, regarding even this small (as one might call it) accident as an affront to her dignity? And speaking of the Boer War, which was essentially a smash-and-grab raid on the gold mines of the Dutch Republics, it is said that this war hastened her death. What was poison to the Queen was meat to the Bankers; and a little reflection on this clash of spirit between the Monarchy and the Money Power, sensed by the Queen though imperfectly realised by her or her advisers, heightens the probability that, had she lived on, she would have given the bankers more trouble in putting over their ramps than they actually encountered. This is not necessarily to disparage her successors; for the

fact is that the bankers use *occasions* of the succession to filch 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 bankster 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 on 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 over-ruled by the Regency and without embarrassing the Premier and Primate with unwelcome publicity. Anyhow an inflated Monarchy is a defunct 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 *Cavalcade'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 1, 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 prick up our ears at his mention of Scotland. For the (then) Duchess of York is a Scot, so is the Primate, 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 Monarchs 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 way purely as a device for covering up his political impotence, and partly for getting the people of Britain and the Dominions to tolerate their economic distresses patiently, and to forget the economic fact that there is no more mutuality in their economic interests under the secret domination of the bankers than there is between any other countries.

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 elucidates our present case. It was where King George V. was reported to have "rejoiced" at the Ottawa "agreement." And we conjoined to this the injunction which had been put into the mouth of Edward VIII. (then Prince of Wales) namely that British manufacturers ought to degrade the quality of their goods in order to increase the volume of their export-revenue. We said at the time that here were two examples where the Empire's allegiance to the King-Emperor was being made the vehicle for financial ramps, or used as a smokescreen round the results of financial ineptitude. The Ottawa Agreement was a formula of assent to policies which, as afterwards became plain, would have thrown the Dominions into dissention directly attempts were made to carry them out. Not only was it wrong 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 which the (then) Prince of Wales had to say, identifying him as they did with the bankster doctrine that "we live by our export trade," they stand self-condemned.

The King Across the Water.

If a centralised Empire-Monarchy is to be used to entangle allegiance to the person of the King-Emperor with participation in bankers' plans, then the moral as we see it is to have no King at all or else have a lot of them! A plurality of Kings would at least symbolise the real fact that there are a plurality of interests—interests incapable under the existing financial system of mutual-reconciliation. From this point of view the enthronement of a King of Scotland would have a logical significance, and maybe a practical use—particularly if half the things said about England by the Scottish Nationalists are true. We expect that they could justify the alleged influence of Scotsmen on English policy by saying that England had denied them the means of having a national policy of their own to work out. Whether a King of their own would tempt them back to Scotland is another matter. But as *The Times* suggests, the idea of letting them have one is worth speculating about. It gives rise to another speculative question, namely, whether Edward VIII.'s abdication from the English Throne need be accepted as absolutely and permanently irrevocable. Of course this speculation would have to be based on the assumption that the original idea and *The Times* about separate Thrones for Scotland and England was acceptable to the Royal Family and the Forces of the Crown, and we write this on the presumption that *The Times* had assured itself on the matter before ventilating it. For ourselves we rest simply on the axiomatic proposition that if there are to be two Thrones there will have to be two Kings.

LONDON SOCIAL CREDIT CLUB.

Public meeting at Blewcoat Room, Caxton Street, Westminster, S.W.1, on Friday, July 2 at 8 p.m. Subject: "A Call to Action." Speaker: Mr. W. L. Hunt.

Published by the Proprietor (ARTHUR BRENTON), 12-14, Red Lion Court, Fleet Street, E.C.4, England, and printed for him by THE AROUS PRESS, LIMITED, Temple-avenue and Tudor-street, London, E.C.4, England. (Telephone Central 3701).