

46
GOOD EVENING EVERYBODY:

(Let's put aside the imperial stateliness of the drama today, the pageant of royalty and the dignity of kings. Let's take the simple human slant, and look at those two people - a man and a woman.

47
(What must be the thoughts of the forty-three year old man who may be most simply named as David Windsor. He was the world's darling as the glamorous Prince of Wales. He became the most popular of kings. Now, abdicated.) In that tense drama which he played out before the eyes of the world, what were his impulses and motives? History will try to analyze that some day, but right now it's a blank impossibility for us to hazard more than disjointed guesses.)

It isn't hard for a sentimental species like the human race to understand what it is to be in love. But, so deeply, so head-over-heels, so madly as to 'toss aside the most gorgeous of crowns - most of us have never been infatuated like that. Or have we? Can it be that the devotion of many an adoring bridegroom is

such that if it were thwarted by kingship, he'd fling away the crown? Can it be that more than one of us in Edward's royal robes would have acted as he has done? That surely would reduce the drama of the British Empire to the most sentimental simplicity.

In the contrary extreme, it might be argued that even without any romance, even without any Mrs. Simpson, Edward was likely to get into a constitutional crisis anyway. He is strong-willed, impatient of restraint, the sort that might inevitably rebel against dictation. He was always resentful of the formalities and the conventional rituals that hedge in royalty. He wanted personal freedom, and a king is not free - least of all a constitutional king. Even before he took the throne he told his ministers that his private life was his own. Could it be that his determination to marry Mrs. Simpson was something of a symbol of his desire to be free? May^{be} it was just the striking example in the struggle to make his private life his own.

Perhaps analysts of the future may discover all these things:- devoted love, chivalrous romance, impatience of restraint, desire for freedom. The only one who might give us the answer tonight

is the abdicated monarch, who waits in seclusion in his castle, Fort Belvedere. Tomorrow he will speak to the world-over the air. I wonder how much he will tell us. Tomorrow, at 5:00 P.M. our Eastern Standard Time.

(In a villa on the French Riviera, a woman sits and thinks. And what are her thoughts?) The news tells us of the strange state in which Mrs. Simpson finds herself. She's deluged with threatening letters, denunciations, hatred, menace. She is under vigilant guard, so that no harm may come to her. Her food is tested, every bite that she eats - to make sure that it isn't poisoned. Angry complaint is heaped upon her - as the woman who caused the most popular king England ever had to give up his crown.

(What were her motives? As a woman in love, you can fancy her feelings as she sees Edward - an ex-king. Was she beguiled by the dream of becoming the wife of the monarch of the British Empire - perhaps a queen? What woman wouldn't be beguiled by that dream? Did she encourage Edward to force a decision, once and for all, with his ministers? Did she think he could make them back down? Or did she try to restrain him, try to moderate

LEAD - 4

his wilfull determination? Now presumably she is to marry a monarch in exile. Heart searchings and heart burnings for the American woman in the villa at Cannes - and it must be left for history to pry into her sorrow and agitation.)

(This afternoon Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin ^{Finally} revealed to the House of Commons the conferences between himself and the King which led to today's abdication. The Prime ^{M.} Minister told his story in full, and the picture he presents is one of unswerving determination, a king with an iron will.) Baldwin tells how during the Autumn he received many inquiries from British subjects in the United States, or American citizens of British origin -- asking him about the stories appearing in American newspaper, reports ^{about} the King and Mrs. Simpson. The Prime Minister says he was disquieted by the flood of rumor in the Trans-Atlantic press. ^{So-} Of his own accord, he went to the King. This was in October.

(He told ^{Edward VIII} ~~the King~~ how gossip about himself and Mrs. Simpson was spreading far and wide ^{in America.} ~~across the Atlantic.~~ He added that he was worried about the effect it would have in the British Dominions -- especially Canada which was getting its stories from the United States.) ~~Not could the flood of rumor be kept out of England. It would get there sooner or later.~~

The Prime Minister says the King listened in friendly fashion.

BALDWIN - 2

Baldwin asked him to consider the matter, not to make any reply just then, but to wait and think it over.

(The next time the Prime Minister called on the King it was in November -- at Buckingham Palace. Baldwin began the subject -- spoke of the idea of the King's marriage to Mrs. Simpson; said the nation would be against it; added that the King's wife would necessarily become queen, therefore the British Empire had a right to some say in the selection of its queen.

The King responded: "I'm going to marry Mrs. Simpson and I am prepared to go." From that determination he never swerved an inch said Baldwin.)

Subsequent meetings were pretty much of the same pattern. The Prime Minister begging the King not to abdicate, but to renounce the marriage instead; and always met with that same changeless determination. The Prime Minister declares that there was never any ill-feeling, the King always friendly. In that same friendly way the royal determination proceeded by inevitable logic to -- the abdication.

What of the British public? Tonight there are lively scenes in London. Are they scenes of indignation? Not at all! This evening in front of Buckingham Palace a crowd has been gathered. They've been singing and shouting. Singing - "God Save the King". Chanting - "He's a Jolly Good Fellow." Shouting - "We want Albert". Amid all the chorus and the hubbub, there was one word which was not heard, one name not mentioned. And that name was - "Edward". The king has abdicated -- long live the king!

NAMES

Now let's ask - who is the King of England tonight? The answer is - Edward the Eighth. Although he has renounced the throne, he remains monarch until tomorrow, when the House of Commons will enact laws to make the abdication effective.

Then the question will arise - is Edward the Eighth still a king? If so, King of what?

A curious possibility is raised by the news tonight, not from England, but from the dominions. (Canada led the way today, ratifying the abdication and the accession of the Duke of York to the throne. That was followed by action in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa - as the dominions accepted the day's event.) But, no such action was taken - in Ireland.

President deValera announced today that the change of kings ^{can}~~will~~ not be effective in the Free State until the Irish parliament ~~has~~ ^s passed the necessary laws. ^{It meets tomorrow. There is a} ~~This leads to a~~

belief that some Irish political leaders will try to block the succession to the throne of the Duke of York. There might even be an attempt to use the situation as a way of freeing Ireland from the British Empire altogether. There have been rumors of

something like this in the past few days.

As a matter of legal theory, all this leads to curious possibilities. Supposing that Ireland should refuse to ratify the abdication of the one king and the accession of the other? Then I suppose Edward the Eighth would remain King of Ireland. Wouldn't that make Ireland an independent kingdom? There's one of those weird theoretical visions that commonly arise out of unforeseen complications.

The throne name of the new monarch of the British Empire is still uncertain. Apparently he hasn't decided yet. He may call himself George the Sixth, continuing the British line of Georges, or he may become Albert the First. It would be odd, to say King Albert! - That's so reminiscent of the Belgian War-time King. His name, by the way, comes from the same origin as the new King's in England. Albert has been common in the British royal family ever since Queen Victoria's consort, Prince Albert. He was of the Coburg family, of which both the English and the Belgian royal families are branches.

What's the name of the new queen? The daughter of a

NAMES - 3

Scottish nobleman, who became the Duchess of York, baptized "Elizabeth". So she becomes - Queen Elizabeth, a most reminiscent name.

Now about the new heir-apparent - I suppose you can't say "heiress-apparent;" the little daughter of the Duke of York. If the royal couple have no sons, she'll become a ruling queen. Most queens are merely wives of kings, but the little princess would become a queen in her own right - like Elizabeth and Victoria. What's her name? Why, Elizabeth, of course. If she should succeed to the throne, she'd become Elizabeth the Second. A ruling queen takes the numeral after her name, just as a king does, after his. All quite Elizabethian, tonight.

Jim
Wilson

Dec. 10, 1956.

WILSON (Follow King)

I had intended to have a globe trotter - explorer - friend of mine tell us a little about his adventures in Africa, tonight. But, with all our thoughts on the historic events in London, a travel anecdote would be rather out of place. My friend made an almost incredible journey right across Africa, for three thousand eight hundred miles, by motorbike -- he and a companion. Twelve hundred miles of their journey over a route never before travelled by any American explorers. Six hundred miles of the journey along caravan routes where no wheeled vehicle had ever passed.

When they started for the interior, at the seaport of Lagos, in Nigeria, the British were betting two to one that the two young Americans would never come out alive. At that, they nearly lost their lives half a dozen times.

At Zinder, a French outpost on the southern edge of the Sahara, the French Commandant at the Fort implored them to turn back. When they refused this official wrote on their passports: "Last seen at Zinder December 24th." Just in case their bodies or some of their possessions were found later.

Jim Wilson, one of the two who made this prodigious journey, has written a book called "Three Wheeling Through Africa."

Jim, soem other time, perhaps we can get you to tell us about it. But right now our thoughts are turned toward London. And I am going to ask you a question. Let's for a moment, regard you as Mr. A, Mr. The-Average-Man. What do you, The-Average-Man, think of King Edward's abdication?

MR. WILSON:- Lowell, people everywhere, I believe, are worrying about the possible effects of what has happened in London, the effects of King Edward's action upon the British Empire -- or shoul d I say its effect upon modern civilization? But, why haven't we been worrying for the last twenty years about the effects of modern civilization upon King Edward? Somewhere there may be the key to the whole situation.

L.T.:- What do you mean by that?

MR. WILSON:- Just this:- In Central Africa I found a simple people whose lives were geared to a neutral, normal, human pace. Perhaps cruelly hard sometimes. But, never

synthetic or artificially stepped up. A life close to the earth. A world that is genuine.

I wonder if it wasn't King Edward's misfortune, and the misfortune of the British Empire (in fact the misfortune of all of us), that he was born into the most complicated, baffling, unstable civilization this world has ever seen. Am I right in saying that he has been living in a society (like the rest of us), where people seldom say what they think, and seldom come into contact with elemental human problems? In other words, aren't we living in an unreal world? Isn't the whole trouble the dizzy pace at which we moderns live?

All of which may be a stupid observation, because what can we do about it?

EXILE

Tonight one might take ^{the} news from around the world and base it on the theme of exiled royalty. There are now seven dethroned kings living in various places outside of their own countries.

There's former King Alfonso of Spain, ^{pondering} ~~pondering~~ over the news from his one-time kingdom. Today was anticlimax in Madrid. Everything was building up to ^a big battle -- then nothing happened. General Franco's men were bombarding with artillery and air bombs. This was expected to be the prelude to the decisive attack. Infantry supported by tanks started to advance. Then suddenly all was changed. The firing suddenly ~~xxxxx~~ ceased. The din of guns subsided into silence. The attack was broken off. Nobody seems to know just why.

Another king in exile is the former German Kaiser, at his villa in Doorn. He must brood moodily over the story of King Edward's abdication -- Edward the grandson of the Kaiser's own cousin, that former Edward; the Seventh. It took a World War to put the Kaiser off his throne, while ^{now} with the English King it ^{'s} ~~was~~ mere romance.

There's news today that personally concerns the ex-Kaiser. His stepdaughter has married. King Edward wanted to marry a Commoner. The Kaiser's stepdaughter has done just that; she has wedded a sales agent for gasoline.

Haile Selassie! King of Kings! lingers in exile, and what does he hear from his country? News that the Italians are steadily taking possession of the last parts of Ethiopia that have remained unconquered.

There is no news from Siam, Bulgaria, Turkey, Afghanistan. The exiled kings of those countries seem to hear little that's startling from home. Nothing to interrupt as they with the rest of us scan the bulletins from London. And s - l - u - t - m.