

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 22. No. 25.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) Id.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 20, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

One of the curious, not to say sinister, features of the current period is the prevalence of that form of Black Magic which consists in saying and affirming that evil does not exist. With the decline of institutional Christianity, a decline by no means inexcusable, even if regrettable, a myriad of "interpretations," most of them perversions of Gnosticism or Neo-Platonism, have invaded the more or less swept and garnished chambers of the public mind. Christian Science is perhaps the best known and most widely distributed, although it would be straining the meaning of words to term it non-institutional. The non-existence of Evil appears to be one of its teachings.

May we say at once that a great deal of valuable instruction, and much help and comfort have been disseminated by the Christian Science organisation, and its activities in many directions command real respect?

One of its outstanding achievements is the production of perhaps the most popular "Centre" newspaper in the English language, the *Christian Science Monitor*, widely read on its merits by many people who would not accept, and in many cases are not interested in, its metaphysics. Yet they probably absorb the atmosphere unconsciously.

Nevertheless and notwithstanding, the Devil never did a cleverer piece of work than when he persuaded his victims that he does not exist.

The proofs of it are everywhere. The growing inability to distinguish good from evil, with its corollary that nothing matters, there are no objectives except the whim of the moment (and the whims themselves are giving out), no absolute values; nothing is "proper," therefore there is no property; that since it is now much easier (temporarily) to vote yourself into your neighbour's house than to build one for yourself, work is foolish and politics without preparation is the universal career. These are the logical outcome of a crude *monotheism*.

The combined inability and unwillingness of so many of the pseudo-educated, firstly to recognise the wave of Evil which is sweeping the world, and secondly to realise the extent to which its Servants rely upon absence of publicity and criticism is a major factor in the spiritual Armageddon which is in progress. It is becoming increasingly true that only one metaphysical, dialectical materialism, is presented, in various forms, to a conditioned majority: (nothing could be more remarkable, outside a Russian "Trial," than the acceptance of responsibility for the present chaos by those who are the greatest sufferers by it). Good and evil have no place in this; Power is Lord of all.

The denial of evil is an affirmation of equality—having no quality. This is the end of entropy unmodified—Power which renders itself powerless.

"More than two thousand youths enter the Army each year who cannot even sign their name."—General Sir William Slim.

We aren't told how many who don't enter the Army each year can't sign their name. But they can all make a cross on a "secret" ballot paper, even if they can't read the name of the candidate. So they just about cancel the votes of the few thousand whose opinion on political matters is worth attention.

• • •
"Early in the morning, while it was still dark, Schofield took leave of his host . . . Since it was impossible for a traveller to leave the country or to take abroad any sum of money exceeding £20, the old courtier had procured a pass made out in his name (which, as the forgery of them had under the recent restrictive rule of the revolutionary government, become a minor industry, was not difficult) . . ."

The foregoing quotation is from "The Silver Bowl," by Hugh Ross Williamson, and refers to the times of Cromwell. We would recall to our readers the spate of Cromwelliana which heralded the present afflictions; the attempt to label the Home Guard "Ironsides," the admiration of Cromwell and his policies by Moritz Mond; and the present attempt to revive the Liberal (Whig) Party under Jewish patronage now in progress.

• • •
With the inclusion of 'citizens of the Republic of Ireland' in those who are entitled to vote by the secret ballot in the coming General Elections in England, Scotland and Wales, the electoral system would appear to many to have reached the *reductio ad absurdum*.

Unless we are much mistaken, however, there is a technique in operation, of which this is perhaps one instance, which may be described in military terms as that of the flying commando. It is common in Canada. Constituencies, such as, for instance, the Cartier Division of Montreal openly carved out to provide a safe seat for Jews and Communists, form one example of the technique, which may either move the constituency to the voter, or, as we suspect is being arranged in this country in addition to the gerrymandering of the constituencies, to move the voter, or at any rate his cross on the ballot paper, to where it will produce the planned result. With the aid of the postal vote, it should be quite easy, and Mr. Sidney Stanley, or Wolkan, can again render service to "the Government." And, so far as we are aware, not a voice is raised against revolution by racket, outside our own.

• • •
"We must now be satisfied with lowlier aspirations; science is to lead the state as the Red Queen led Alice—the most rapid progress is necessary to remain in approximately the same place as before."—P. B. Medawar, in *XIX Century and After*.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: July 11, 1949.

Finance Bill—Report

Clause 24.—(ABOLITION OF DUTIES).

Mr. R. A. Butler: I beg to move, in page 16, line 31, to leave out Clause 24.

We now come to one of the major Debates of this afternoon, that is, on the subject of the alteration in the Death Duties and the abolition of the Legacy and Succession Duties. You have suggested, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that the Debate on these Clauses should take place together. I think that will be convenient, and we should like to reserve our position in regard to voting on one or both of these Clauses. The Debate thus gives us an opportunity to consider what the Chancellor described in his Budget speech as a moderate lift in the Death Duties. The more we have examined this matter, either from the angle of the desire of the Chancellor not to favour the family or from the point of view of the lift, the more we think this is a subject which deserves, and will get, further Debate upon the Report stage of the Bill.

Now, there appear to be several propositions put forward by the Government with which we disagree profoundly. The first proposition was put forward by the Solicitor-General in the course of our previous Debates, and that was that the present law is unjust in its operation. The second proposition put forward by the Government, and the Chancellor during his Budget speech, is that it is better not to favour the family when making a will. The third proposition is that the burden of the Death Duties should be increased. . .

Mr. Eccles (Chippenham): . . . There cannot possibly be anything more likely to discourage people from saving than the Death Duties. When we read in the newspapers that in the first 14 weeks of the financial year the net result of small savings in this country was a deficit of £10 million I wonder what hon. Gentlemen opposite consider are the prospects for savings in this country over the next few years. We have not the figures for the big savings, and in this Clause we are largely dealing with people who make big savings. But we can be quite sure that if there is any dis-saving on the part of small people then it is even larger on the part of big people. I submit to the House that we shall not recover our position in the world if we destroy the sources of savings.

The fact is that the original conception of Socialist policy was that it would be self-financing. It was originally supposed that it would be independent of taxation upon individuals. The State was to acquire the ownership of all means of production, exchange and distribution, and of course, having got that ownership into its hands, the State could decide how much of the national income the people could consume. It would be the complete arbiter over the proportion between savings and consumption. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have gone through a revolution in their thinking. They have quite abandoned the idea of Socialism being self-financing; now they seem to think that we can have Socialism financed by high taxation upon individuals.

I wonder if they realise how new a doctrine that is, and whether they have put it to their people that if they go on as they are going on now it means that it will be the wage earners who will have to bear the whole cost of the

State. I am firmly convinced that they have not thought this out, and that they will find the people of this country did not expect that from their State Socialism. They expected it would be paid for by somebody else, but that has been abandoned; and now we have a system of taxation which will wipe out all the top fortunes. It may be that for reasons of social justice, hon. Gentlemen opposite think that is a good thing to do. But from the point of view of economics it can have but one result; the wage earners will have to pay the whole cost of the State, and they will not like to do that.

I myself do not like great extremes of wealth; I think they are incompatible with the age in which we live; but here we have a proposal which is not really attacking the great extremes of wealth. It is levying a duty on that middle band of fortunes which, as I have said previously, I think represent the most enterprising section of the whole population. I do not think the British people really dislike inequality. . . .

Mr. H. Strauss: I think it was very much in the interest of our Debate that it was ruled that we might discuss these two Clauses together. Having regard to the admirable speeches to which we have just listened I shall detain the House for only a few minutes. I wish to deal with what seem to me, as to the previous speakers, to be two separate points; the discrimination against the family and the height to which the total duties are being raised. In my opinion those two things together are quite disastrous. I was astonished by one sentence of the right hon. and learned Solicitor-General in his speech on the last occasion. It seemed to me to be very characteristic of what looked like logic, but as a matter of fact was quite foolish. In resisting the Amendment put forward from this side the right hon. and learned Gentleman used these words:

"Either Estate Duty is wrong or it is right."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 27th June, 1949; Vol. 466, c. 790.]

Thus implying that the height to which the duty was raised had nothing whatever to do with its merits. I cannot imagine a more short-sighted or a more foolish argument.

Let me take first the question of the discrimination against the family. I do not wish to repeat the admirable statement of the facts which had been made by my hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Mr. Eccles) and others. But let us see what is admitted. It is admitted that over a large section of all the estates in this country, if the testator leaves his fortune to a stranger, that stranger will be better off after this change in the law than before; while, if he leaves it to his wife and children, the wife and children will be worse off under the change of law than they were before. I have not heard any justification of that at all. On a previous occasion the learned Solicitor-General drew a pathetic picture of a maiden aunt, who, he thought, might not under the existing law get quite what she might otherwise get. I do not know why he thought that.

If this Finance Bill goes through in its present form, every well-advised person who has drawn a will will certainly reconsider all the legacies that he or she has left in order to minimise the great injury done to the family. But why should hon. Members opposite wish to do this injury to the family? It looks like a simplification of the law, of course, to abolish Legacy Duty and Succession Duty and only to have Estate Duty, but, if Legacy Duty and Succession Duty are the only convenient method for securing

some advantages to the wife and family over the stranger, then I think we should certainly resist their abolition. I hope that before this Debate ends, some hon. Member opposite will say why the Socialist Party desire to do this admitted injury to the family. So far, we have not been told, though the injury to the family is now not disputed.

The other matter is the greatly excessive height of these duties, when we look at the rates in the Seventh Schedule. It is quite useless for Ministers to say that comparatively few people will be injured by this proposal. Even if it were true, and it is not, there is no real ground for being unjust to a few. It is thoroughly bad policy to discourage, and even to end, saving, nor will it further the policy, if any, of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

There are a few hon. Members opposite who, as my hon. Friend the Member for Chippenham (Mr. Eccles) said, may think it very desirable as a matter of social policy to wipe out great accumulations of wealth. Assume that that is a desirable end. I think that if they study the economists who have given the most thought to this subject they will find out that, if that is their object, there is no need to raise even the maximum rates of Estate Duty to anything like the heights mentioned in the Seventh Schedule. A rate of Estate Duty between 30 per cent. and 40 per cent. would itself in a comparatively short time wipe out great accumulations of capital. It is wholly unnecessary for any purpose which I believe hon. Gentlemen opposite have in mind to raise the duty to the heights now suggested. With other measures that they have taken, it clearly discourages and, I suggest, ends saving.

I know that hon. Members opposite can often satisfy their consciences by taking steps which will have these effects which they deny and then, a year later, they express extreme surprise that the financial state of the country entirely justifies the warning previously given them from these benches, the force of which they had hitherto denied. But I think even those hon. Members who have thought least should begin to think when they have these two Clauses before them. They should begin to wonder whether there is not something slightly wrong in a philosophy that says that it is right to benefit the stranger, the cat's home, the mistress or any outside body to whom the testator may leave his money, and it is also right to penalise the widow and the children.

I ask them to think again of the figure which has been mentioned of the size of estate which falls within the mischief of the Clause, according to their calculations—an estate over £35,000. An estate over £35,000, with the £ at the value that it had before the last war, may have sounded a fairly big estate. But I wonder if an estate of £35,000, at the present value of the £, is the sort of estate which has been much mentioned even by hon. Members opposite when they have sought to rouse the passions of the mob against great accumulations of wealth.

Mr. Hugh Fraser (Stone): What about the value of the £ in future?

Mr. Strauss: I doubt if I should be in Order if I went into that. No reason has been given for this differentiation against the family. If the only effective legal method of differentiating in favour of the family is to have Legacy Duty as well as Estate Duty, then I am against the abolition

of the former. But, if there is an alternative method, let the Government and their skilled advisers advise us what that method is. What is quite certain is that they have not accomplished anything but injury to the family under the Clauses as they now appear in the Bill.

Secondly, I say that the height of these Estate Duties is obviously and demonstrably too great. Some hon. Members have used the revolting word, "disincentive," which I imagine to be the latest jargon for what used to be called a "deterrent." Certainly, now we have deterrents to saving. I think that it is time that we stopped deterrents to saving. Thirdly, I say that even if it were true that only a few were affected, and it is not true, that is no argument in support of the Clauses. Lastly, I say that it is quite unnecessary to have duties of this height, if the aim in view is to end great accumulations of capital.

The Solicitor-General: . . . I have said that, to start with, in 98 per cent. of the cases, the testator or the intestate leaves less than £7,500. I pointed out to the Committee that, in the case of estates up to £15,000, the new rates are the same as the old Estate Duty without the addition of Legacy and Succession Duties, and that, indeed, is the case for estates up to £17,500. In that sense we preserve the position, and in the case of estates up to £15,000 they do not have to pay the 2 per cent. Legacy and Succession Duty. As for estates between £15,000 and £17,500 the combined duty is not raised beyond what Estate Duty was alone. That covers about 98 per cent. of the cases of death in this country either where there is intestacy or a will.

I think that any impartial observer must say that, so far as 98 per cent. of our people are concerned, it cannot possibly be said that we are invading that principle. Indeed, it would be a complete travesty to say that we were. It is true that, although we are not lightening the burden for the widow, except for estates between £15,000 and £17,500, we are at the same time lightening the burden of the relative who is not so close as the wife and also for the stranger, because we remove from them the burden of having to pay Legacy Duty and Succession Duty. We put them on a par in cases of estates up to £17,500, which covers the vast majority or 98 per cent. of the people in this country.

Next, it is said that we are removing a preference in favour of the wife and child. We are preserving the rule of law, under which at the moment, upon the death of a spouse upon whom money has been settled by his or her deceased spouse, Estate Duty is not payable, so that there is to that extent a preference given in the cases of wife and child, and that exists not only in cases of estates of £17,500, but below. That is the position with regard to the majority of people in this country. It is then said that we are invading the principle in regard to estates over £35,000.

In the case of the other estates of between £15,000 and £17,000, the new Duty is the equivalent of a combination of the three, and it is said that when we get to estates above £35,000, we are beginning seriously to invade the principle that there should be some preference in favour of the family. I ask the House not to base their arguments on the great principle of the sanctity of the family, because that has nothing to do with it. It is true that we are now, in the cases of estates above £35,000 and those up to

(continued on page 7.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
 Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: CENTRAL 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFTon Park 435.

Vol. 22. No. 25.

Saturday, August 20, 1949.

Exercise in the Paddock

Our readers may remember that our introduction of "A Light Horse" to the political course had some slight connection with the vicissitudes of the King of the Belgians. Whether there is any further or fortuitous relationship may await confirmation, but certainly something is stirring in enemy quarters. For a long time it looked as though heavy rains had made the course unridable, or racing had been forbidden by law, or all the Heavy Horses, by some process of atavism, had reverted to the condition of Hipparion at least, and did not deem it fair and just to exhibit their elongated dew-claws (which a cruel world might mistake for cloven hooves) on the green sward. But now, if you can find the secluded paddock, you may see a shy competitor now and then out to exercise. Hence, Lord Macmillan, who suitably heads his article in a Sunday newspaper, "Let's Pretend." Quoting Sorel (who quotes Rousseau) and Dicey, Lord Macmillan thinks that "systematic party government violates the essential principles of democracy." For this opinion (which admittedly is not comprehensive) and for other reasons the article (which is not a long one) is interesting—and unsatisfactory, as we might expect. Since politics swallowed the Moral Philosophers, few voices are heard in public on the side of Truth, and politicians are freer than they were to venture unrebuked into the sphere of Moral Philosophy.

"We live," says Lord Macmillan, "in two worlds, the world of fact and the world of fancy. In the one we are the bondsmen of intractable actuality, in the other we are the freemen of untrammelled imagination. At every stage of our existence our minds constantly pass from one to the other of these contrasting realms. In childhood, make-believe delights the nursery with tales of fairies and giants, and the favourite bedtime story is a farrago of soothing fantasy. The doll and the teddy bear are invested with imaginary personalities, and the best games are those which begin with 'let's pretend' that there are Red Indians in the shrubbery or tigers in the attics."

This takes him to the position that "As long as the game of make-believe is honestly played and its fictions are recognised as such, no harm is done. No one is really deceived." We doubt whether Lord Macmillan is really interested in Red Indians in shrubberies. He is only pretending to be. He is primarily interested in putting over the doctrine that what is not (in his opinion) dangerous in imaginative literature is dangerous in politics. Observe further that he makes this hang upon whether or not anyone is deceived. This, applied to politics, is the now familiar

Satanist view that provided that as near as may be to "all of us" are in the conspiracy, everything is all right. That's what the Marxists say. Does Lord Macmillan agree? He is really saying that nothing agreeable to human taste is a fact; that only the disagreeable pretences of Planners are facts (things done). He does not, of course, call these pretences. He calls them facts. What is dangerous in this connection is not to accept them as facts. Going back to his ethics, we see that he has used the wrong word. 'Dangerous' is the wrong word to describe the taking of a lethal dose of potassium cyanide *twice*; it is not *dangerous* to take a powerful poison *twice*; assuming a suitable interval of time for the first dose to act, it is impossible.

"It is a sorry comment on the intelligence of the electorate that it should be found *necessary*" [our emphasis] to deceive it. Who is deceiving it? Why, only the Socialists, and they are doing it "because it would be *unpopular*" [our emphasis] to charge the real price for essential commodities." Would it? What is the real price? It is unpopular to recover the financial cost whether through prices or prices plus taxation. Would Lord Macmillan say that the deceit resident in the confusion of true and financial cost is not dangerous because no one is really deceived? Our diagnosis differs from his. We should say that while it would doubtless be an exaggeration to say that we have reached the point that most members of the public now know that modern states are being run on strictly conspiratorial lines, they don't know the details, or in what the conspiracy essentially consists, and Lord Macmillan isn't going to do much to enlighten them. If they should be enlightened through some other agency, (*i.e.* if no one is deceived) will the defects apparent to Lord Macmillan disappear? Not if the conspiracy continues.

The "Attack on The Constitution"

The Editor, *The Social Crediter*,

Sir,—British institutions take after their mother, that quaint old hen the British Constitution. So they are all somewhat eccentric, and perhaps a little queer in the head." (Bernard Hollowood in *Punch*, July 27). "The rise in the number of accidents (on Great West Road) and the continuous traffic jam made the opening of a bye-pass urgent. At this point the British Constitution broke down . . ." (R. G. G. Price in *Punch*, July 30). Doubtless this is just the 'inimitable humour' sanctified by *Punch*, and both these inimitable humourists follow a fashion which invites rather than surpasses imitation.—Yours, etc., H.E.

STATES ACTUAL, REAL & POTENTIAL

by

TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

(The substance of an Address to the Speke Discussion Group
on 7th December, 1948).

PRICE 6d.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

Data of Freemasonry

Reviewing Professor Northrop's *The Meeting of East and West*, *The Times*, in its literary supplement, says that this author "assumes that each 'nation and cultural group' does have a 'particular moral, religious, economic and political doctrine from which it proceeds traditionally,' and that there is a peculiarly close relation, almost an identity, between the moral, religious, economic and political doctrines of any society and between all of these and its art."

"History is crystallised policy."

The subtitle of Professor Northrop's work discloses that it is an enquiry concerning "world understanding," a phrase which, even in 1949, might, from an Englishman's pen, have a syntax comparable with that of 'pen-pushing' or 'vine-growing' (world-understanding); but from an American it can imply only something to do with cultural osmosis, the pushing-impulse of fluid into fluid observed when solutes in different concentrations are separated by a barrier which is permeable.

This journal is *not primarily* concerned with such matters; but, increasingly, it has become, by force of circumstances, concerned with 'world-understanding' in the alternative, Englishman's sense. And, to effect a 'world-understanding' of any practical value, it has become more and more necessary to identify the forces which are favourable to the flow of ideas across barriers, the identification of idea-systems, the criteria of consistency, *etc., etc.*

We make Professor Northrop the pivot of this brief introduction, because the reference places Art in what we should consider to be its correct perspective, and to show that the topic and related topics are receiving more widespread attention than is reflected in the day-to-day operations of the market place.

For some time past, we have desired to compose some summary of the results to date of the attention we have paid to Freemasonry. The recent republication of Dr. Dillon's revelations concerning Lord Palmerston have aroused wide interest, and although the work from which we quoted does seem to have been driven pretty deeply 'underground,' the partial disinterment may have effects. It is, of course, a matter for comment that a British Prime Minister of not so long ago should be even suspected of affiliations so questionable as those suggested for Lord Palmerston. Also, it is found to be confusing to consider many citizens of kindly manner and not unduly pallid with philosophy in any melodramatic guise whatsoever. That we find it quite easy to resolve whatever may seem paradoxical in this situation by no means makes it as simple as it should be to explain the lines upon which such a resolution as is desirable can and must be effected. There are at least two reasons for this: the unfamiliarity of most people in this so-called 'scientific' age with the nature and manipulation of abstract ideas and the predominant rôle nevertheless which abstract ideas play in society. *Ars est celare artem*; but it is necessary to know what, besides 'art,' is concealed. Possibly we shall not get deeper (or higher) than the seventh chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew—but, even so, grapes are becoming rather unfamiliar objects although there is an increasing assortment of vines. Further, even perfectly sound vines may hide a lurking parasite, from which good vine-growers would desire to be free.

So, concerning the extracts which follow, we have no remark to make, except that they are repeated here quite objectively, as evidences of fact and opinion. They are

from Professor Edward J. Dent's book on *Mozart's Operas*, a second edition of which was published by the Oxford University Press in 1947. They all refer to Freemasonry:—

Chapter 2. The Early Operas.

"... He returned from Italy to Salzburg and devoted himself once more to writing symphonies; to the same year also (1773) belong the first sketches for the incidental music to Gebler's play, *Thamos, König in Aegypten*, which brought Mozart for the first time into contact with the mystical ideas embodied in Freemasonry. How much of Gebler's inner allegory Mozart understood at this date we cannot attempt to guess; but the noble dignity of this music, completed in 1779, shows at least that he was profoundly impressed . . . (p. 26).

Chapter 6. LE NOZZE DI FIGARO—1.

"... At the time of his engagement to Constanze Weber he had been a sincere Catholic; his great Mass in C minor was begun definitely as a thank-offering for his marriage. He never finished it. Vienna brought him into a wider social circle, and it is curious to note that he became well acquainted with leading men of science. How this came about can only be conjectured—possibly through van Swieten, possibly through the Mesmer family. His intimate friend Gottfried von Jacquin was the son of a distinguished botanist and he also frequented the house of the Greiner family, a notable centre for music and for science and literature as well. In 1785 he became a Freemason. This must have brought him into close association with Ignaz von Born, one of the most eminent scientists of his time and a great leader in Masonic circles, and the result was that Mozart began to think seriously about problems the solution of which he had hitherto accepted unproved from the mouth of authority. For the present we must imagine him not as having cast off Catholicism—that step he never definitely took; but as being at that stage of intellectual development when he might well begin to realise that the religion of his fathers did not provide him with so complete a philosophy of life as he had been hitherto taught to believe. The abandonment of the Mass in C minor, which might, if completed, have been one of Mozart's greatest masterpieces, and one of the greatest settings of the Mass ever produced by any composer, here acquires a significance to which we shall revert more in detail when we come to consider *Die Zauberflöte*. After 1782 Mozart never wrote another note of Church music until the *Ave verum corpus* of June 1791 and the Requiem which he did not live to finish. . . .

"Lorenzo da Ponte is so important a factor in Mozart's development that it is worth while studying his personality in some detail. He was born on March 10, 1749 at Ceneda, at the foot of the mountains to the north of Venice. His father was a Jew, by name Geremia Conegliano, by trade a *cordovaniere*, which may mean a leather dresser or a shoe maker.

"Wishing in 1763 to take a Catholic as his second wife, he had himself baptised with great solemnity along with his three sons Emmanuel, Baruch, and Ananias, who received the Christian names of Lorenzo, Girolamo, and Luigi respectively. According to some custom of the time, Geremia, now Gasparo, assumed the surname of the bishop who administered the sacrament, Monsignor Lorenzo da Ponte. Our future poet was then fourteen. . . in the autumn of 1774, he and his brother were summoned to Treviso to teach 'humanity,' rhetoric, and grammar at the local seminary.

"A poem which he (Lorenzo da Ponte) wrote for public

recitation, inspired by the doctrines of Rousseau, caused a scandal and he was dismissed in December 1776. . .

" . . . it was Mozart himself who first suggested turning *Le Mariage de Figaro* into an opera. . .

"Da Ponte and Mozart have been blamed, on the one side, for depriving one of the greatest of French comedies of all its savour, and turning a prophecy of revolution into a sordid intrigue; on the other, they have been commended for eliminating all that was political, satirical, and erotic in the original and turning all things to chastity, favour and prettiness. It is easy for those to whom both works are classics to pronounce such judgments. But in 1786 neither Beaumarchais nor Mozart were classics; to that Vienna audience, *Figaro* was a play of modern life, and although the scene was laid in Spain there was no great effort wasted on trying to obtain local colour. . . ."

Chapter 12. LA CLEMENZA DI TITO AND DIE ZAUBERFLOTE.

" . . . Schikaneder and Mozart were both Freemasons, and we shall eventually see that this was probably the most cogent reason of all" [why Mozart accepted the libretto of *The Magic Flute*].

Chapter 13. DIE ZAUBERFLOTE—II.

" . . . We may consider this libretto from various points of view. On the face of it, it is a mere agglomeration of absurdities; the language of the dialogue is for the most part a ludicrous mixture of theatrical commonplaces and trivial jests, while the versified portions are clumsy doggerel relieved occasionally by passages borrowed from popular Masonic songs. From Schikaneder's point of view as manager, it contained excellent theatrical situations, all opportunities for spectacular effect, and a very conspicuous part for himself, although it is said that after the first performance he remarked: 'Yes, it has been a success, but it would have been far more of a success if Mozart had not ruined so much of it!' But it is clear that whatever may have been the opinion of Schikaneder's own audiences (and they were none too favourable at first) the opera can appeal to later generations only in a symbolical sense. About its Masonic significance there is not the least shadow of doubt. Jahn mentions a Masonic interpretation published as early as 1794. In 1838 the opera was performed in London in a translation by Planche; in his autobiography he speaks very well of the whole performance and production, and resolutely defends the libretto and its symbolism of good and evil. . . . Whether he realised the Masonic sense of the story is not clear. The most important Masonic commentary on the opera is an anonymous pamphlet published at Leipzig in 1866; it is now known to have been written by Moritz Alexander Zille (1814-72), a well-known theologian and teacher in Leipzig. He was an ardent Freemason and a man of unusually wide religious views in the Leipzig of the fifties and sixties—half mystic, half rationalist, with a great sympathy for the old pietists. According to Zille, Tamino represented Joseph II, Pamina the Austrian people, Sarastro Ignaz von Born, a Freemason and a scientist of great eminence; the Queen of the Night was the Empress Maria Theresa and Monostato stood for one Leopold Aloys Hoffmann, a traitorous Freemason who in 1792 persuaded the new Emperor Francis II that the Freemasons were organising a revolution in Austria; but we cannot be certain that his machinations were known at the time of the first appearance of *Die Zauberflöte*. The moral sentiments with which the opera abounds were drawn largely from Masonic teaching.

The reader will at once notice the importance assigned to manliness and friendship, to the secrecy of the mystic rites and to the subordination of the female sex. The second act contains, besides many things intelligible at once to the initiated, plenty of lines which any reader can recognize as characteristic of the ethical and political tendencies of the period. Whether it was true or not that the Viennese lodges were organising a revolution, it is plain that the writer of this libretto was saturated with the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. Thus in Act II, Scene I, when the candidature of Tamino is under discussion, a priest says, 'Yet will Tamino have strength to endure the ordeals that await him? Remember, he is of royal blood.' Sarastro replies: 'He is a man; that is enough.' In the next scene the Ladies allude clearly to the Catholic condemnation of Freemasonry, which Tamino treats with just contempt. Sarastro's air, *In diesen heiligen Hallen*, and the song of the Genii with which the finale begins, recall in their sentiments and phraseology many of the Masonic songs of the day, some of which were set to music by Mozart himself. The attempt of the Queen to destroy the 'impious band,' with fire and sword is obviously based on the events of 1743, when Maria Theresa, instigated by the Jesuits, ordered a raid to be made by soldiers on the lodge of which her own husband was a member. . . .

"We must proceed . . . to the original source of the author's Egyptian inspiration. In 1731 a certain Abbe Jean Terrasson (1670-1750), who in 1721 had become professor of Greek and Latin philosophy at the College de France, published anonymously a romance entitled *Sethos, histoire ou vie trise des monumens anecdotes de l'ancienne Egypte. Traduite d'un manuscrit grec*. . . . Terrasson was a somewhat eccentric scholar, who made a French translation of Diodorus Siculus, with the object, it is said, of showing the admirers of the classics how dull a classical author could be. Sethos is an Egyptian prince, born in the century before the Trojan war. The first part of the book deals with his education and his initiation into the mysteries; the second part describes his travels in Africa as a universal lawgiver for savage tribes; finally, he returns to Egypt and retires into a college for initiates for the rest of his life. The fourth French edition was printed as late as 1813. The book appears to have been much read in Masonic circles, and it is cited by French Masonic historians of a century ago as if it were a standard authority on the Egyptian mysteries. Wieland knew it, and so evidently did Gebler, the author of the Egyptian play, *König Thamos*, for which Mozart had composed incidental music in 1773. The author of *Die Zauberflöte* must have known it intimately, for there are innumerable allusions to it in the opera, and at least two places where passages are borrowed practically word for word.*"

"*[note] The connection of *Sethos* with *Die Zauberflöte* seems to have been first pointed out by Thomas Love Peacock in a review of Thomas Moore's tale, . . . *The Epicurean* (1827); in Germany it was first noticed by Carl Gollmick in 1842. Julien Tiersot mentions it, but does not pursue the problem, in a series of articles in *Le Menestrel* (1893). It was thoroughly worked out for the first time by Viktor Junk (*Goethes Fortsetzung der Mozartschen Zauberflöte*, Berlin, 1900), who apparently was not acquainted with Tiersot's essay. I had myself arrived independently at the same conclusion before meeting with either of these works, and have added a few details not given by Junk. See note at the added a few details not given by Junk. . . ."

" . . . How far the Abbe Terrasson's ideas of Egyptian

mysteries correspond with the mysteries of Freemasonry, it is, of course, not for an uninitiated writer to conjecture. It is, however, noteworthy that a German writer on Freemasonry in a book published in 1836 and based on an anonymous French original quotes the passage above ('Quaconque fera cette route seul,' etc.) as being not only a part of the ancient Egyptian ritual (citing *Sethos* as his authority), but also the inscription on the tomb of Hiram, which was read aloud at certain Masonic ceremonies. The passage as given by him in German corresponds closely with the original German words of the duet sung by the Armed Men. I must leave it to more learned investigators to decide whether these words, with many other details of Masonic ritual, were handed down simultaneously and independently through Diodorus and other classical writers on the one hand to the author of *Sethos*, as well as by unbroken and secret tradition on the other hand to the Freemasons of the later eighteenth century, or whether possibly some branches of these latter merely found it convenient to draw upon the learned Abbe's popular romance for a portion of their mysterious liturgy.

"The Masonic symbolism of *Die Zauberflöte* is quite definitely accepted by Freemasons in this country and elsewhere where who are learned both in the history of their own craft and in that of music.

"Mozart's connection with Freemasonry has been thoroughly investigated by competent Masonic researchers, and his Masonic music is not infrequently performed; at any rate in England, in its proper framework of Masonic ceremony. None the less, there are three classes of persons who do their best either to deny altogether, or at any rate to minimize, the Masonic significance of *Die Zauberflöte*. The first group is that of Catholics, Freemasonry being officially condemned by the Catholic Church. A typical example of their attitude is the following extract from *The Universe*, London, May 29, 1942:—

"Mozart was 'liberally' inclined as a Catholic and was undoubtedly mixed up with Freemasonry, but this had not yet been formally banned by the Church, which may be held as an excuse for him so far as it goes. . . . Suffice it that *The Magic Flute* contains some of the most beautiful music ever written to a nonsensical libretto."

"Another group is that of Freemasons imperfectly instructed in their own doctrines who find it safer to deny any Masonic significance in the opera rather than run the risk of giving away secrets to the uninitiated. This group may be left to the teaching of their own brethren. The third group is that of non-Masons who, without any doctrinal hostility to Freemasonry, merely resent its supposed mystery and generally imagine that it is a foolish if well-meaning masquerade. With Freemasonry after the time of Mozart this book really has no concern, but a rough outline of its origins and activities may be useful to readers who are not Freemasons."[*]

*There follow passages quoted from writers who may be assumed to be, or who claim to be speaking for or on behalf of Freemasonry, (e.g. Sir Alfred Robbins, 1930), opponents, (e.g. *The Catholic Encyclopedia*), and 'neutrals' among whom, apparently, the author would number himself. In these passages some light is thrown, if not intentionally, on the nature of the problem of Freemasonry relatively to the rise of that "Power which renders itself powerless" referred to in *From Week to Week* in the present issue. We propose, therefore, to print these and other extracts from Professor Dent's book, for their evidential, not their Socratic value, hoping later to deal more analytically with the question of symbolism in relation to subversive heterodoxy.—Editor, T.S.C.

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

£17,500, putting the relatives, the cats' homes and the wife on the same footing. We have one duty now instead of three, and we really think that that works out more fairly than the present system. It is true that we are not giving the wife and child in any case any preference. We do not think that justice requires that we should, nor that the principle requires that we should. We think it is proper to put them upon the same footing in relation to this combined duty.

Viscount Hinchinbrooke (Dorset, Southern): I am sure the House enjoyed the incursion of the hon. Member for The Wrekin (Mr. I. O. Thomas) on the subject of Death Duties, and I trust that the House will hear from him again. His speech seemed to be an admixture of "It is more blessed to give than to receive" and sweet revenge for the Socialists. If he looks upon Death Duties in that light then I think he has yet very much to learn.

The Debate has centred round two things—what is left of the Death Duties and the elimination of the discrimination as between relatives and non-relatives. It was because the Solicitor-General chose to combine both the principles, in replying in such an intricate way, that on this side of the House we were unable to follow what he said. He reminds me of the electronic brain in Manchester University. The scientists, or Members of the House of Commons in this case, set up the conditions for the apparatus by their speeches, and then the brain responds, but it produces an answer on a cathode ray tube which nobody understands. Laymen as we are, we are not always able to follow all the legal intricacies in the speeches of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. That was our position. He did not make his meaning clear, and he did not deal faithfully with the points that were made.

I deplore the increase in Death Duties. I think that they are extravagantly high and do grave social damage. I want to make a comment in passing. I shall deal more specifically with the main part of what has been said. I deplore the fact that neither the Socialist Party nor any other party over the last 20 years has been able to devise a principle in Death Duties which married wealth to responsibility. Except in the case of agriculture, which is specially treated, there has been no attempt to set aside the case of the man who has ended his life, with, say £2 million in securities from which, on his death, the duties were extracted by the Treasury and the residue went to some distant relative, from, on the other hand, the case of the man who is surrounded by a multiplicity of responsibilities in a firm, a business or an estate.

Farmers, bankers, merchants, lawyers, manufacturers, heads of distributive houses and hundreds of other important men and women in business end their lives and their estates are taken and subjected to penal taxation. In the process of that penal taxation their share in the business is broken up, although it may have been a most vital one. It is handed over to someone else. The business may be forced into becoming a limited liability company. The shareholders take over, and the family interest disappears. The whole connection is lost. Both political parties ought to turn their attention to the possibility of differentiating sharply between the case of men and women whose wealth is proportionate to their responsibilities and, on the other hand, the case of men and women whose wealth is absolutely intact and does

not affect the lives and businesses of others.

I should like to say a word or two about the principle of differentiation. We feel that the same differentiation should have been carried through into this Budget this year and should apply to the enhanced scheme of Death Duties. Here the Solicitor-General was not entirely accurate in what he said, I think. He told us that 98 per cent. of persons leave less than £17,500 and are not touched by what is done in this Clause. I have before me a table which shows that the destruction of this principle of differentiation proceeds upwards from estates valued at £4,000. That is exactly what we complain about. All the way up from £4,000 to estates of the greatest magnitude the Chancellor has made a change this year between what a man leaves to a distant relative or stranger and what he leaves to his widow or to a close relative. We are not trying to dispute the right of the Treasury to exact duties, but are trying to maintain the differentiation that always existed between those who were close and those who were further away.

My right hon. Friend gave a figure for an estate of £4,000. It is quite wrong that the Chancellor should come along and say that a man's estate should pay £784 less this year than it would have done last year in leaving the money to a stranger. In the case of an estate of £23,000, the difference is made up this year with £286 more in duty when the estate passes to the widow or lineal descendant, and £3,358 less when it passes to a stranger. That is the kind of example of which we complain. The Chancellor decides to take so much money every year in Death Duties. This year he has made a change in the principle. We ask: Is it right for him to take more this year than he did last year from the widow and less this year than he did last year from the mistress or the cats' home? We think that in this matter the Chancellor is devoid of finer sensibilities.

Sir S. Cripps: As I have to go in a few minutes, perhaps I may be allowed to address the House and to give my views on points which have been raised. First, as to the quantum of Death Duties, that is the general financial point whether further charges should be made upon the estates of deceased persons. The second point is the question of how those charges should be levied.

As regards the first point, I do not think that any further arguments are required than those which were put forward in the Budget speech this year. Though we have by taxation done a great deal to bring incomes into a more equal relationship than they were originally, we have not recently done very much by way of Death Duties to bring estates into a more equal relationship. There still remains plenty of opportunity for bringing these estates into a more equal relationship by the imposition of further Death Duties. That principle I expressed then as being the basis, or the reason, for putting forward increases in Death Duties at this time.

The second point, which has occupied more of the Debate than the first, is as to whether any damage is done to the family life by this method of taxation. I am bound to say that I do not take quite such a depressed view of the sanctity of home life as to think that it is affected by 2 per cent. or 20 per cent. on Succession or Legacy Duties. I believe there is something a good deal deeper in it than that. I hope there is. . . .

. . . This alteration in the Death Duties will not make

the slightest difference to any testator who likes to re-adjust his will. He can re-adjust it to give exactly the same results as he would have got under the old system if he wishes to do so. He will have time to do it. . . .

House of Commons: July 12, 1949.

Town and Country Planning—Development Charge

Mr. Stokes asked the Minister of Town and Country Planning what development charge will be paid by the British Electricity Authority to the Central Land Board on account of hydro-electric development in North Wales.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Town and Country Planning (Mr. King): As my right hon. Friend told the House on June 28, the proposals will have to be submitted to Parliament in a Private Bill. Until the details of the scheme have been settled, the Central Land Board cannot determine what development charge will be payable.

Mr. Stokes: Is it quite clear that a development charge will be paid to the Central Land Board?

Mr. King: Yes, I endeavoured to make that clear. A development charge is payable in these circumstances.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-..... (Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage Odlum v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.M.W.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-
(Please allow for posting when remitting).	

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,
7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.