

## LOVELY JUB-ILEE

By Gareth Seward ([Facebook](#), [Twitter](#))



Source: Daniel Jo, [Wikimedia](#) (CC BY-SA 2.0)

With the recent Platinum Jubilee, no doubt there has been much you have seen written or heard spoken about pertaining to the pros and cons of the monarchy, the debates about the costs versus the benefits, the morality of democracy and so forth. So here, I will instead offer an alternative approach and take a look at the UK economy during the time the Queen was crowned head monarch in comparison to the present day.

When we saw the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in 1952, we had the third largest economy in the world behind the USA and the USSR. Today we sit in fifth place, following the USA, China, Japan and Germany. Our national debt was high, approximately 170 per cent of GDP, having accrued debts of close to £25 billion following the Second World War. As of 2022, our "official" national debt stands at £2.3 trillion, roughly 95 percent of GDP, though is likely much higher in reality. Of course, the debt to GDP ratio whilst still extremely high, flatters to deceive. It may seem lower now than it was in 1952, but that is because our economy is now more than five times larger.

This also masks the increase in government spending. In 1952 it was forty-one per cent of GDP, whereas today it is forty-three per cent. It may seem only a marginal increase, but again it is over a base ratio more than five times greater than when Her Maj first ascended the throne. Inflation was also over ten per cent, a figure we would have exceeded in the present day had we still used the same methods of measurement, however today's CPI inflation is already at nine per cent and still pushing upwards.

The UK was also lending military support to the United Nations in the Korean War, a war that was partially blamed for the cost-of-living increase people were feeling at the time. Today we are seeing the ridiculous over-simplification of a similar squeeze being attributed to the Ukrainian-Russia conflict. Whilst that particular situation may be contributing to certain price hikes, that is a market force – supply issues – driving up prices, not inflation as it is so often and incorrectly attributed to. We seem to live in a time where we have forgotten that there are still factors that can affect prices other than inflation (inflation being the weakening of a currency's purchasing power due to inflating its supply).

One of the hot topics during the current economic climate is those good old house prices. How do today's prices compare to when the Queen first took the throne in 1952? Back then the average house price was £1,891. Today, the average price is £260,771. The equivalent of the 1952 average would be

£39,065 in today's money, so even adjusting for inflation house prices were still only fifteen per cent of what they currently are today! So why is housing that one commodity market in which price increases have far exceeded wage increases? State intervention and interference in the economy. Artificial demand has been created through suppressed interest rates making mortgages cheap, whilst ever increasing legislation, regulations, bureaucracy, red tape, and planning laws have inhibited supply, thus sending prices rocketing.

So in this year of the Platinum Jubilee, it may seem economically we are (relatively) in a fairly similar place to where we were seventy years ago – on paper at least. However, in reality I just think our establishment has become more efficient at bamboozling the general public with smoke and mirrors to cover their inefficiencies.



Source: AK Rockefeller, [Wikimedia \(CC BY-SA 2.0\)](#)

# IF IT AIN'T BROKE, DON'T FIX IT

By Mike Swadling ([Website](#), [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [YouTube](#), [Gettr](#))

The Jubilee proved a great opportunity for local neighbourhoods to come together for street parties, for local communities to decorate town centres and hold festivals, and for the nation to celebrate as a whole. This was an almost unique opportunity for a nation like the United Kingdom, that doesn't otherwise have a "National Day of Celebration", and being formed by four component nations, doesn't have many natural ways to bring our United Kingdom together except in honour of our Monarch.

The World Population Review [list their Best Countries to Live in 2022 as Norway, Ireland, Switzerland, Iceland, Hong Kong, Germany, Sweden, Australia, Netherlands, and Denmark](#). Five of them are, like the United Kingdom, [parliamentary constitutional monarchies](#). [The twenty Happiest Countries in the World In 2022 according to Forbes includes ten parliamentary constitutional monarchies](#). Looking at regions, Japan (monarchy) is arguably the best country to live in its region, Malaysia and Thailand (monarchies) are probably preferable to Myanmar, Vietnam, or Indonesia. The Bahamas (monarchy) is perhaps the best of the Caribbean islands states to live in, and Belize (monarchy) the best country on the mainland of Central America. Are you starting to see a pattern forming? There are 208 countries in the world, just thirteen per cent or twenty-seven countries are parliamentary constitutional monarchies, yet they are overrepresented on every list of countries where you would want to live.



Source: PolizeiBerlin, [Wikimedia \(CC BY-SA 4.0\)](#)

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. No matter how illogical monarchies are, they clearly work. The parliamentary Brexit wars of 2016-2019 confirmed to me the hereditary House of Lords and judicial functions of the House of Lords worked better than what we have today. For all its faults and failings, the undemocratic house full of hereditary peers frankly worked quite well. Under it we extended the franchise for men and gave women the vote, passed multiple Factory Acts aimed at improving working conditions, pursued laissez-faire economic policies whilst legalising trade unions, had agricultural and industrial revolutions, and built and started giving up an empire. We won two World Wars against Germany, and arguably two more wars against France. It wasn't democratic but it was a system that, albeit sometimes rather slowly, worked.

The best argument for a monarchy is often said to be President Thatcher and President Blair, one or both of these options will appal most people. Despite both winning multiple elections, neither can be argued to be unifying figures. But more than a rebuff to an unpopular president, the monarchy provides several practical benefits:

- They ensure even the most powerful politician has a boss. Yes, in a democracy we the people are the politicians' real boss, but they only get feedback at election time. Needing to explain themselves to the Queen once a week is a good opportunity to experience some humility.
- They are the embodiment of the nation as a person. The nation is a fairly amorphous concept, but one that can come together and be represented under one figure.
- Being apolitical, and it is critical they remain apolitical, they become a blank canvas for us to all paint our own ideas and views on. We can all be satisfied we are fairly represented in our establishment by a royal family whose views we can believe are as similar or not as we like to our own.
- For a democracy to work we need opposing views, and for a nation to work we need some unity. Most of the content on Netflix and Disney wants to impose some political views on me, woke corporations abound, and sports are full of political gesturing. The more places in life we can find without a political slogan the better. Royalty gives us that.

But don't take my word for it. Take the word of the fifty-four member states of the Commonwealth of Nations, countries that choose to belong to a body headed by the constitutional monarch of the United Kingdom. The soft power the monarchy provides is a huge boost to British interests, economic, cultural, and political. Is the system perfect? No. Is it democratic? No. Is it even logical? Not at all. Does it work? A resounding yes!



Source: U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, [Wikimedia](#) (Public Domain)

## TIME FOR A NEW MONARCHY?

By James Goad ([Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Gettr](#), [Rumble](#))

Looking at our constitutional monarchy, we have a parliament supposedly set up for the people, with the Crown as a figurehead. Is the latter bit true though? The Queen is head of state, head of the Church of England, its armed forces, head of the Commonwealth and the head of state of other countries.

The Queen sits within the English Constitution, made up of Magna Carta (1297), the Bill of Rights (1688-9), Act of Settlement (1700), Acts of Union (1707), Acts of Parliament (1911 and 1949) and the Coronation Oath (1953). Within this framework of statute, oaths and acknowledgement of rights, our Queen is in the position to wield power. She is one of the checks that is supposed to balance out Parliament. Amongst the tools at her disposal are the power to create governments and the power to sign, or not to sign, Acts of Parliament that come before her.

It is also within the Queen's range of powers to replace the executives in any of the Commonwealth nations in which she is head of state. This includes Australia, Canada and New Zealand. The Queen assented to Aussie PM Gough Whitlam's dismissal by the Governor General in the 1975 'Dismissal'. It

also includes the British Virgin Islands, where Her Majesty has recently assented to the removal of the Prime Minister there and the imposition of direct rule from London. The power is there, you see.

If you lived in the United Kingdom, you would be forgiven for thinking the Queen was a powerless figurehead. She seems there for Trooping the Colour and all that, which puts a colourful veneer on the fact that she has readily put her name to a range of atrocious laws. Dr Sean Gabb has labelled this as '[Seventy Years a Rubber Stamp](#)'. Examples of heinous betrayal of her people include the 1973 European Communities Act which, when presented to her the previous year, she should have refused to sign unless a referendum be held on the matter.

Her Majesty appears more than unwilling to confront the political forces represented by parliament. Dr Gabb argues that the Queen is actually a constitutional paperweight. She could refuse to sign into law any Act that erodes the fundamental principles of the English Constitution, amongst which are every Englishman's inalienable rights. The proof is in the pudding regarding her failure in this most fundamental of duties, living as we now are in the soft tyranny of a burgeoning technocracy.



Source: Chatham House, [Wikimedia \(CC BY 2.0\)](#)

There are clearly instances in which the Queen has exercised her Constitutional powers. That she has not done so begs many questions, amongst which are the fitness of the institution of the monarchy, or the fitness of the incumbent to carry out its duties. When we complain about "rotten institutions" are we commenting on their range of functions, or the people in them not behaving as we would like?

The author has no special animosity toward the monarchy. Looking at republics across the world makes one think the alternatives are no better. The solution? Retain the monarchy. Expel the House of Windsor / Saxe-Coburg-Gotha and replace with a new dynasty.

James II was chased off into exile and replaced by the Dutch William and Mary. The Glorious Revolution prompted the creation of a new settlement with the English people as set out in the Bill of Rights. With monarchical wings clipped, under the new Constitutional arrangement this country underwent the most amazing of transformations – emergence from feudalism to a modern society.

This brings us to another question: who do we install? There is no one trustworthy at the top of society. They've all been feeding at the same trough forever. The King and Queen of the ongoing constitutional monarchy should be a commoner, a complete outsider. Bearing this in mind, I offer myself as the lead candidate.

My appointment would be desirable on the number of different levels. I would refuse to sign any Act of Parliament presented to me that conflicted in any way with the Bill of Rights. Bearding every politician within earshot about the tide of effluent flowing from the Houses of Parliament would be just the start. Being vocally pro-gun would make a point. Politicians would learn to live in fear. It would also be my pleasure to exert the power of the monarchy and replace any Commonwealth executive within the orbit of the Crown proven to be complicit in the Covid scam. Farewell Justin Castro...

---

## DO YOU WANT TO WRITE FOR US?

WE HOPE YOU'VE ENJOYED READING *FREE SPEECH*. IF YOU'D LIKE TO SUBMIT AN ARTICLE FOR THE NEXT EDITION, PLEASE HEAD OVER TO [OUR WEBSITE](#) FOR MORE INFORMATION. IT'S EASY TO GET YOUR WORK PUBLISHED AND A GREAT WAY TO REACH OUT AND CONNECT WITH OTHER PRO-LIBERTY INDIVIDUALS. MEANWHILE, YOU CAN FOLLOW BLACKLIST PRESS ON [FACEBOOK](#), [TWITTER](#) AND [TELEGRAM](#) TO KEEP UP TO DATE WITH OUR NEW RELEASES.