

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 26. No. 19.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, JULY 7, 1951.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

Since the — States are (thanks to The Magnificent) out of bounds to Mr. Churchill (temporarily), Mr. Baruch is making a festival of it in London.

• • •

For ruin and the deeds precluding change,
Fear not great Beasts, nor Eagles when they range:
But dread the crawling worm and pismire mean,
Satan selects them, for they are unseen.

George Meredith: *The Shaving of Shagpat.*

• • •

If we were asked to suggest one sound reason why the English would not, despite their manifest qualifications, fulfil the early promise of their centuries, we might say: "Because of their aversion from Allegory." This two edged sword of truth, in which even the Celtic pit-boy revels, demands *continuous* concentration. Not even King George's well-merited advertisement could make *The Pilgrim's Progress* popular. Nor was Shagpat popular, as it ought to be with us, since it concerns the Mastery of The Event. Shibli Bagarag (of Shiraz) mastered The Event: he shaved Shagpat.

"The chronicles relate, that no sooner had he mastered the Event, than men on the instant perceived what illusion had beguiled them, and, in the words of the poet,—

The blush with which their folly they confess
Is the first prize of his supreme success.

Even Bootbac, the drum-beater, drummed in homage to him, and the four Kings were they that were loudest in their revilings of the spouse of Kadza, and most obsequious in praises of the Master. The King of the City was fain to propitiate his people by a voluntary resignation of his throne to Shibli Bagarag, and the King took well to heart the wisdom of the sage, when he says:

Power, on Illusion based, o'ertoppeth all;
The more disastrous is its certain fall!

Surely Shibli Bagarag returned the Sword to the Sons of Aldis, flashing it in midnight air, and they, with the others, did reverence to his achievement. They were now released from the toil of sharpening the Sword a half-cycle of years, to wander in delight on the fair surface of the flowery earth, breathing its roses, wooing its brides; for the mastery of the Event lasteth among men the space of one cycle of years, and after that a fresh Illusion springeth to befool mankind, and the Seven must expend the concluding half-cycle in preparing the edge of the Sword for a new mastery. As the poet declareth in his scorn:

Some doubt Eternity: from life begun,
Has folly ceased within them, sire to son?
So ever fresh illusions will arise
And lord creation, until men are wise.

He adds:

That is a distant period, so prepare
To fight the false, O youths, and never spare!
For who would live in chronicles renowned
Must combat folly, or as fool be crowned."

And nearby in the text we find the verses:—

"When nations with opposing forces, rash
Shatter each other thou that wouldst have stood.
Apart to profit by the monstrous feud,
Thou are the surest victim of the crash.
Take colours of whichever side thou wilt,
And steadfastly thyself in battle range;
Yet, having taken, shouldst thou dare to change,
Suspicion hunts thee as a thing of guilt."

Not that Mr. Churchill, rumour notwithstanding, ever dared to change.

• • •

From "A Scotsman's Log": *The Scotsman*, June 28:—

WHEN WE WERE YOUNG.

When we were young, a little show of strength
By Britain made the naughty people pause;
The Lion seldom had to go the length
Of standing up, or opening his jaws;
A cruiser was a gesture that could make marauders
quail:
A calm grey-coated cruiser—just a flick of Leo's tail.
The pallid little worshippers of Marx
Had not thrown dust in British workmen's eyes,
Or poisoned all the air in public parks
With multitudes of miserable lies;
And navvies and their children slept more happily at
night.
From knowledge that the Lion could display a Lion's
might,
The lovers of the Empire and the Flag
Were not despised as jingoists and Tories,
And every soldier's knapsack was a bag
Designed to hold the baton of the stories;
And every child of Britain stood by Mother Britain's side,
In filial affection and a decent British pride.
The cruiser was a symbol of the Fleet,
The Fleet the silent symbol of the Land,
The Land a limb of Empire—whole, complete
From Rajahs to a Bobby in the Strand;
And over all serenely shone the Sceptre and the Crown;
And none but fools would twist the Lion's tail to make
him frown.

• • •

We cannot see that great comfort can be derived from the result of the much advertised Identity Card case. Is it comforting that one man in millions should push such a matter, affecting everyone, to an issue?

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: June 19, 1951.

National Finance (Net Incomes)

Sir T. Moore asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the approximate number of persons with net incomes of £2,000, £3,000, £4,000, £6,000, £8,000, £10,000, £25,000 and £50,000 per annum for the years ended 31st March, 1914, 1938, 1945 and 1950, respectively.

Mr. Gaitskell: The available information on this subject to the years 1938-39 and 1948-49 was published in Table 86 of the 92nd Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. The corresponding figures for 1949-50 will be published in the next report in January. Estimates for the

year 1944-45 were published in the National Income White Paper for 1945, but owing to the lack of statistical data for the war period these figures must be treated as subject to a wide margin of error. Information for the other years is not available.

Sir T. Moore asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer the amount of net income retained by a married man after payment of income tax and surtax on earnings of £1,000, £2,000, £5,000, £10,000, £20,000, £50,000 and £100,000 respectively, in the years 1913-14, 1938-39, 1944-45 and 1950-51, also showing its purchasing value at the depreciated pound sterling, and basing the pound sterling at 20s. in 1913-14.

Mr. Gaitskell: The following table gives the required information in the case of a married man without children:

Income (all earned)	Net Income after payment of Income Tax and Sur Tax (or Super Tax)										
	1913-14		1938-39		Equivalent in July, 1914 £'s *	1944-45	Equivalent in July, 1914 £'s †	1950-51	Equivalent in July, 1914 £'s ‡		
£	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	£	s. d.	£	£	s. d.	£
1,000	962	10 0	855	7 6	547	648	17 6	273	777	5 0	256
2,000	1,925	0 0	1,607	17 6	1,029	1,173	17 6	493	1,417	5 0	468
5,000	4,708	6 8	3,446	0 0	2,205	2,192	12 6	921	2,554	15 0	843
10,000	9,241	13 4	5,888	10 0	3,769	3,167	12 6	1,330	3,629	15 0	1,198
20,000	18,408	6 8	9,976	0 0	6,385	3,855	2 6	1,619	4,354	15 0	1,437
50,000	45,908	6 8	20,451	0 0	13,089	4,605	2 6	1,934	5,104	15 0	1,685
100,000	91,741	13 4	36,076	0 0	23,089	5,855	2 6	2,459	6,354	15 0	2,097

Note.—The July, 1914, pound sterling is taken as a base because this is the date the cost-of-living index started.

* Based on movements in 1914 cost-of-living index.

† Based on movements in 1914 cost-of-living index up to 1938, and thereafter on movements shown in price index for all consumers' goods and services published each year in the National Income White Paper.

‡ As for † up to 1950; thereafter by reference to movements in the Interim Index of Retail Prices.

Coinage (1½d. Piece)

Lieut-Colonel Lipton asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what practical difficulties prevent the issue of a 1½d. piece.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Gaitskell): Mainly the additional burden imposed on the Mint, which is already working at full capacity, and the inconvenience of having to change ticket machines.

Lieut.-Colonel Lipton: If the difficulties are insuperable, will my right hon. Friend consider as an alternative the re-valuation of the 1d. on the basis of 10d. to the 1s., thus at one stroke introducing a decimal coinage and at the same time making price increases unnecessary for bus fares, newspapers, beer and other items of daily expenditure?

Mr. Gaitskell: That is a quite different question, which I think is under consideration as a result of a report to my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade.

Sir Herbert Williams: Is it not the case that because of the inflationary policies which the Chancellor is now pursuing the thing would be out of date as soon as it was made?

Mr. Churchill: Would it not be a matter of very great convenience to have a common copper coin which took the place of the old 1d., even though we have to pay much more for it, and which we should at any rate want available

for an enormous number of basic transactions—a myriad of basic transactions—which are of great common usage amongst the masses of the people? Surely that ought to be considered. The 1d. now really does not cover anything that we are confronted with under the present dispensation.

Mr. Gaitskell: I am not quite sure whether I follow the right hon. Gentleman's thought in this matter, but as I have said, the question of a decimal coinage and of a change in the measurement system has been brought up in a recent report to my right hon. Friend the President of the Board of Trade and is under consideration.

Mr. Churchill: I was not speaking at all about decimal coinage—that is another question altogether. The idea is that a coin should be made which takes the place of the penny, which, since the end of the war, has ceased to play its normal, natural and, I believe, necessary part in the ordinary life and transactions of the great mass of the people.

Mr. Gaitskell: There is, of course, no evidence to that effect. The 1d. is used—[*Interruption.*] The right hon. Gentleman will, I am sure, distinguish the question of changes in the value of money from the question of what coins are or are not suitable for general circulation.

Mr. Churchill: Surely the coins in common usage ought to bear an effective relation to the value of money?

Mr. Speaker: We are getting a little wide of the

original Question which, after all, asked what practical difficulties prevented the issue of a 1½d. piece, not whether it is desirable or not to have one.

Mr. Eric Fletcher: With all respect, may I put this to the Chancellor of the Exchequer—[HON. MEMBERS: "No."] Is my right hon. Friend aware that newsvendors and others are becoming increasingly reluctant to give ½d. change if one gives them 2d. for a newspaper?

Mr. Arthur Colegate: Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer explain why making a central hole in a threepenny bit would throw a heavy burden on those in charge? It is a common form of coin on the Continent and would fulfil the purpose we all have in mind.

Mr. Gaitskell: Certainly it would mean additional machinery in the Mint and, during the interim period, it would increase the total output.

Lieut.-Colonel Lipton: Can my right hon. Friend give a definite assurance that, although the proposal for some change has received unexpected support from the Leader of the Opposition, it will, nevertheless, receive favourable consideration when it comes before my right hon. Friend?

Mr. Gaitskell: I do not think the question of what coins are or are not suitable is a major party political issue.

Mr. Nicholson: Will the right hon. Gentleman pay attention to the inscription, which is important? Is it not true that so long as the Labour Government are in power the less this coin will buy?

House of Commons: June 21, 1951.

Imprisoned Scientists

Mr. Fernyhough asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department how far facilities have been given to the prisoners Klaus Fuchs and Alan Nunn May to carry on scientific research work for the benefit of His Majesty's Government.

Mr. Ede: These prisoners have not been engaged on any form of scientific research for the purposes of His Majesty's Government; no approaches to that end have been made to them; and they have not been in contact with other scientists engaged in research on behalf of His Majesty's Government.

Mr. Fernyhough: Can my right hon. Friend assure the House that despite their special scientific knowledge the two prisoners will not be released earlier than other prisoners serving a similar sentence?

Mr. Ede: I am not aware of any grounds to justify my advising any interference with the due course of the sentences passed on these two men by the courts.

Mr. Emrys Hughes: Could not these inventors be set to scientific work to devise a fool-proof screen for the Foreign Office?

Persia (Anglo-Iranian Oil Company)

Mr. Crossman (Coventry, East): . . . We all, on both sides of the House, agree on the importance of Persia and the effect that this matter may have not only on the oil companies there but on the whole of the Middle East, including the possibility of a British base at Suez.

Equally, I think we are agreed that one of the objectives of our policy is to prevent a *coup d'état* by the Tudeh Party in Persia. The Tudeh Party is the only efficient politically organised machine in the whole of Persia; there are no other genuine political parties; everything else consists of factions, groups and conspiracies among a rich and corrupt ruling clique. Against that ruling class stands one well organised party, underground, but none the less well organised for that. . . .

. . . It is a pity that the Opposition should imply that everything is always the fault of the Labour Government when they know as well as I do that a series of most unfortunate interventions by our American allies took place in Persia.

It is surely far better, when we are assessing the situation, that we should assess it frankly. What are the causes? Talking a few days ago to someone high up in the oil world who should know, I asked him "Would any of this have happened if it had not been for American oil company intervention?" He said "Of course not. Of course the whole negotiations would have gone through." What was happening? I agree with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick and Leamington that the Anglo-Iranian Company put forward a supplementary agreement which was as good as the 50-50 basis of the Aranco agreement in Saudi-Arabia, from the Persian point of view. Some ill-disposed people in Teheran were concerned to stop that agreement.

After all, Anglo-Iranian produces sterling oil, which is not very popular with dollar oil magnates next door. They were concerned to make it as difficult as possible for General Razmara to sign the agreement to which he had pledged his honour and in consequence of which he was shot. A deliberate attempt was made to stir up Persian public opinion in Teheran by certain agents of certain oil companies. There is really no doubt on this issue.

Mr. Eden: As the hon. Member has mentioned me, I would say that I did not state that because I did not know about it. It is entirely news to me that American companies tried to stop the signature of the initial agreement. If I had known of that, I would have said it. I hope that the Foreign Secretary will tell us later whether he has any information on that score or not.

Mr. Crossman: All right, I will go into details to make the charges precise. There is first of all a gentleman about whom I need only repeat the report in the *New York Herald-Tribune*. He is Max Thornberg, an ex-Standard Oil man, and he was out there in Teheran as the chief adviser on nationalisation to the Persian Government. He had to be slung out by the State Department after an official protest from us.

Secondly, there was a great deal of whispering by Americans that if the British were got rid of the Persians would find available to them American technicians. I am not saying that this was done formally in Teheran. As we know, the whisper is everything in the Middle East. What is significant is that the Persians were led to believe that if they did not sign the agreement with Anglo-Iranian they could get a better deal from one of the American oil companies.

That was certainly the reason General Razmara found it so difficult to deal with the Majlis. Let us have no illusion
(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. 26. No. 19.

Saturday, July 7, 1951.

Authority

We should have thought that the distinction between Power and Authority was one which both the clear lines of Major Douglas and the unending repetition of *The Social Crediter* had jointly and severally established. But it is not so, and some of our correspondents suffer perplexity through still mistaking the one for the other.

If not coterminous with it, the whole field of interest of Social Credit is with Authority and outside the field of interest of Power. And, even with this in mind, we should say that Authority is that which can and does make a man change his Real Mind, and go on changing it, until. . . . But, so far as we can see, the process is not one which belongs to Time. Life does not move in straight lines. Only Planners move along straight lines, and they belong to the damned. That life does not move in an orbit either, seems to imply that it does not belong to the world of matter any more than to the universe of Time. We are glad to see that our instinct did not err when we welcomed a recent remark by the Dean of Winchester. At Easter Dr. Selwyn preached a sermon in the Cathedral which we should like to cite extensively. Evidently Mr. Selwyn understands the difference to which we have alluded. He mentions "what the Apostle calls 'power,' namely, that whole network of invisible influence which goes by the name—a German name—of the *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of the age. Can we deny that, just as our outward lives are conditioned, to an insecure extent, by machines, so too our minds are conditioned by mechanistic ways of thinking? Is it not clear that vast numbers of people to-day are quite content to regard themselves as cogs in the social machine, to look to governments who manipulate the machine as the proper authorities to regulate their whole lives, to let decision after decision go by default, because in their circle, or their trade union, or their nation, a majority, whether real or faked, is on the other side? Morality to-day seems to have become submerged under seas of politics and economics; and the robust foundations of the individual conscience on which our country's greatness has been built, seem to be in peril of being swept away.

"Such, as I see it, are some of the principal mind-conditioners of the present day; and they are formidable enemies, all the more because they insinuate themselves so peacefully and catch us unawares. . . . Few things are more mischievous than the light talk you sometimes hear about the spiral of Communism being inevitable, for little more reason than that it is the latest political theory in the field, and has been imposed on in an increasing number of nations in recent

years. Does that make it any more true? To think so, to take this 'whispering campaign'—for that is what it is—at its face value, to accept the fatalistic assumptions on which it rests—all this is treason to the Christian faith. Nothing is inevitable for those who are resolute to defeat it. . . ."

The S.P.C.K.

According to *The Church Times* for June 29, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (whose organ *Theology* gave publicity to Mr. Hannah's article on Freemasonry) is faced by a serious financial crisis. It is said that the Society's general reserve fund would have disappeared by the end of June. At the annual general meeting, the Rev. F. Noel Davey, editorial secretary, replied to criticisms, which, he said, had been made concerning the Society's policy towards the Church and the Festival of Britain. "If we have not tried to put the Church specifically on the map, it is because we believe that the best way of doing this is to keep our normal work going, and not to engage in stunt productions."

Despite a worsening in the position of book publishers, through lack and cost of paper and labour, there were great encouragements. "There are far too many religious books being published each year. If the number is cut down drastically, it might raise the standard of authorship. With tracts we find great difficulty in discovering new authors."

Hydro-Electric Board's Houses

In the House of Lords on June 21, the Earl of Mansfield asked whether it was correct that the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board had recently constructed several houses for its employees at Pitlochry, at a cost of over £4,000 each: and if so, why the Board had been permitted to expend approximately three times the amount per house as is allowed to a private person or to a local authority.

The Parliamentary Secretary, Ministry of Works (Lord Morrison) said: "The average cost of eight houses built for employees of the North of Scotland Hydro-Electric Board at Pitlochry is estimated to be about £3,800, but this figure includes £735 for the price of the land on which the houses are built, the cost of site preparation on unfavourable sites, development charges, architect's fees and legal costs. The houses in question are built of stone, and are in the nature of an experiment to aid the revival of the Scottish stone-building industry. The houses may, of course, be expected to have a longer life and lower maintenance costs than brick and rough-cast houses."

Pension Awards

In the House of Commons on June 19, Miss Ward asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would institute a full enquiry into the advisability of continuing the practice of reducing pensions awarded on conditions of service by the amount payable under the National Insurance scheme as in the case of P.C. Baxter, deceased.

Mr. Gaitskell said, "No."

The Genealogy of Gnosticism

Dean Mansel's third lecture continues:—

The theory of the Zohar is an attempt to exhibit all definite existences, spiritual and material, as a series of emanations, more or less remote, from a primitive abstraction called *En Soph* ('that which has no limits'). This *En Soph* is the highest of all possible abstractions, an incomprehensible unity, having no attributes and no definite form of existence, and which therefore may be regarded as, in a certain sense, non-existent. At the same time, it virtually comprehends within itself all existence; for all that is emanates from it, and is contained in it; for, as it is infinite, nothing can exist beyond it. The first order of emanations, by which the primitive infinite becomes known, consists of the *Sephiroth*, a word which has sometimes been explained by *Intelligences*, but which may more probably be identified in meaning with its root [Hebrew], 'to number,' and with the verbal [Hebrew], 'a numbering,' which is by some supposed to be the origin of our own word *cipher*. These ten *Sephiroth* are the attributes of the infinite Being, having no reality in themselves, but existing in the divine Being as their substance, while he (or rather it) is wholly manifested in each one of them, they being but different aspects of one and the same reality. They are divided into three pairs, represented as male and female, with three combining principles, and a final emanation uniting the whole. This system of the ten primitive *Sephiroth* is arranged in a form bearing a fanciful resemblance to the human body, and their combination is from this point of view called by the name *Adam Kadmon*, the primordial or archetypal man, a figurative expression of the theory which regards man as the microcosm, as the miniature representation not only of the sensible world, but of the intelligible systems of which the sensible world itself is a further development. The division of these principles into male and female was considered by the Kabbalists as essential to the production and conservation of all that is derived from them; and this fancy reappears, as we shall hereafter see, in some of the Gnostic systems. From the conjunction of the *Sephiroth* emanated directly or remotely three worlds; two called the worlds of *creation* and of *formation*, being spiritual, though of different degrees of purity, and inhabited by spiritual beings; the last, called the world of *action*, being material, subject to change and corruption, and inhabited by the evil spirit and the hosts subordinate to him. The final destiny however of these worlds, as of all finite existence, is to return to the infinite source from which they emanated. Even the evil spirit and the hosts subordinate to him. The final angel of light. The souls of men however will not return to the infinite till they have developed all the perfections of which they are capable, and if this is not effected in a single life, the soul must migrate into another body until the development is complete. Sometimes two souls are sent into the same body, that the stronger may help the weaker.

The resemblance of this strange theory to some of the Gnostic speculations is undeniable, but the question as to the actual historical relation between the two systems is involved in considerable chronological difficulties. If indeed we were to listen to the claims of some of the Kabbalists themselves there would be no difficulty, so far as its antiquity is concerned, in supposing their doctrine to have influenced every school of philosophy from the creation downwards; for the Kabbala, we are told, was studied by angels in Paradise, who communi-

cated it to Adam after the fall, as a means of restoration to his lost happiness. Even one of its written documents, the Book of Creation, was supposed by admiring commentators to have proceeded from the pen of the patriarch Abraham, whose meditations it records. The most popular tradition however confines itself within much more modest limits, attributing the composition of the Book of Creation to Rabbi Akiba, the standard-bearer of the insurgent Barcochab, who was put to death by the Romans after the suppression of the rebellion (A.D. 135), while the book Zohar is popularly ascribed to Rabbi Simon ben Jochi, a few years later. There are not wanting however other eminent critics who maintain an internal evidence that the Book of Creation cannot have been written earlier than the ninth century of our era;* while the Book of Light is brought down to a still later date, and regarded as the composition of a Spanish Jew in the latter part of the thirteenth century. It is admitted on all hands that there are portions of the book which must be regarded as comparatively modern interpolations; and even those critics who contend for the antiquity of the doctrines allow that the book in its present form cannot have been completed earlier than the end of the seventh, or beginning of the eighth century. But it is probable that some at least of the doctrines existed in a traditional form long before the date of the written authorities. Notwithstanding the fundamental antagonism between the monotheism or rather pantheism of the Kabbala and the dualism of the Zoroastrian religious philosophy, the numerous resemblances of detail which exist between the two systems seem to warrant the conclusion that the remote origin of the Kabbalistic traditions must be referred to the period of the Captivity, and to the influence upon the Jewish mind of the philosophy of their Persian masters. Many of these resemblances refer to points which have no direct relation to our present subject; but the parallel between the *En Soph*, the abstract Infinite of the Kabbala, and the *Boundless Time* which stands as a first principle in one form at least of the Persian doctrine, as well as that between the six Amshaspands or first emanations of the one doctrine and the ten *Sephiroth* of the other,† with the innumerable subordinate developments of spiritual beings in each, constitute a similarity of first principles which can hardly be explained except on the supposition of a common origin. The very similarity however of the two systems makes it difficult to decide whether the Gnostic theories were in any degree directly influenced by the early traditions of the Kabbala, or whether the relation between them may not be accounted for by their common descent from a Persian source. Matter, the learned historian of Gnosticism, propounds this question without venturing to give a decisive answer to it; and it may be doubted whether we are in possession of sufficient materials for a complete investigation of the case. Yet though the direct influence of the Persian doctrines must be recognised in some portions at least of the Gnostic teaching, there are others in which it seems more probable that the influence has been conveyed through a Hebrew channel. Such, for instance, is the division of the supreme emanations into pairs as male and female, a representation which, if it appears at all in

* Zunz in Ginsburg, p. 77. Franck on the other hand asserts that the language of the book shows that it must have been written not later than the middle of the first century, if not earlier, *La Kabbale* pp. 80, 91. (Author's note).

† That the Persian Amshaspands, like the Jewish *Sephiroth*, are but allegorical names for the attributes of the Deity, see *Quarterly Review* for October, 1867, p. 456. (Author's Note).

the original Persian theory, occupies at least a very subordinate place, while in the Kabbalistic teaching it is made essential to the production of an enduring offspring in the inferior emanations. The same distinction appears at the very beginning of the Gnostic teaching. Simon Magus, who, if not, as he is usually considered, the founder, must at least be regarded as the precursor of the Gnostic heresies, and who professed to be 'the great Power of God,' is described as carrying about with him a certain woman named Helena, 'of whom he said that she was the first conception of his mind, the mother of all things, by whom in the beginning he conceived the idea of making the angels and archangels; for that this conception (*hanc ennoian*) proceeded forth from him, and knowing her father's wishes, descended to the lower world, and produced the angels and powers by whom the world was made.' The relation thus profanely asserted to exist between Simon himself claiming to be the first power or emanation from God, and his female companion announced as his own first *ennoia* or conception, almost exactly corresponds to the Kabbalistic account of the highest pair of Sephiroth, proceeding from the crown or primordial emanation. At first there proceeded forth a masculine or active potency designated *Wisdom* [Hebrew]. This *Sephira* sent forth an opposite, *i.e.* a feminine or passive potency, denominated *Intelligence* [Hebrew], and it is from the union of these two, which are called the *Father* and *Mother*, that the remaining seven *Sephiroth* proceeded. Another remarkable parallel may be found in the language of Irenæus with regard to a later school of Gnostics—the Marcosians, or disciples of Marcus, a follower of Valentinus. 'Some of these,' he says, 'prepare a bridal chamber, and perform certain mystic rites of initiation with incantations addressed to the persons being initiated. This ceremony they say is a spiritual marriage after the similitude of the celestial unions. Others bring their disciples to the water, and baptize them with the following form of words: *Into the name of the unknown Father of the universe, and into truth, the mother of all things, and into him who came down upon Jesus, and into unity, and redemption, and communion of powers.* Others repeat Hebrew words over the initiated, the more to amaze them. The words themselves are given by Irenæus in the continuation of the passage, but the text is so corrupt that hardly any sense can be made of them. Yet the mention of the *celestial unions* and of the *father and mother of all things*, as well as the employment of Hebrew words in their incantations, seem to indicate not only that these heretics had, in common with other Gnostics, adopted a classification of divine emanations as male and female, but also that they had derived their classification from some source in which the language employed was the same as that of the Jewish Kabbala.

Other parallels will come before us when we proceed to treat of the details of the several Gnostic sects. At the present stage of the inquiry it will be more appropriate to sum up the results in a general and provisional form, which we may do by borrowing the language of the learned French expositor of the Kabbala. Of the two more distinguished leaders of the Gnostic schools, Basilides and Valentinus, M. Franck remarks: 'In the remains which have descended to us of these two celebrated heresiarchs we can without difficulty detect the presence of the most characteristic elements of the Kabbala; such as the unity of substance, the formation of things first by concentration, then by gradual expansion

of the Divine light, the theory of pairs and of the four worlds, the two Adams, the three souls, and even the symbolical language of numbers, and of the letters of the alphabet. . . . We have already shown that the metaphysical ideas which form the basis of the Kabbala are not borrowed from the Greek philosophy; that, far from having been the native products of either the Pagan or the Jewish school of Alexandria, they were imported into those schools from Palestine; and finally we have shown that Palestine, or at least Judea properly so called, is not even itself the cradle of the doctrines; for, notwithstanding the impenetrable mystery with which they were surrounded by the doctors of the synagogues, we find them, though in a form less abstract and less pure, in the unbelieving capital of the Samaritans, and among the heretics of Syria. . . . The foundation of these ideas remains always the same; nothing is changed in the relations between them or in the formulas in which they are clad or in the strange traditions which accompany them.*

I shall conclude this lecture with a brief account of the various attempts that have been made in modern times (the early authorities in this respect are altogether deficient) to form something like a classification or systematic arrangement of the several Gnostic schools, so as to exhibit the scattered notices which we possess of their several tenets with some regard to their philosophical affinity and connection with each other. It must be premised however, that all such attempts coming as preliminaries to an account of the details of the different systems must be regarded as merely general and provisional. The grounds which may be alleged in justification or in condemnation of one or another cannot be fully understood till the details themselves are before us; and though a preliminary account of these classifications is of interest in itself, and may help to throw light on what is to follow, we are not yet in a position to judge between the several principles, and to decide which is best supported by the actual features of the several systems with which they attempt to deal. Nevertheless, as such classifications have occupied the attention of some of the most learned and acute inquirers of modern times, and as most of the recent writers on the subject have attempted something of the kind as a preliminary to a more detailed examination, I shall venture in this respect to follow their example by giving a short statement on what has hitherto been done in this province.

(To be continued).

**La Kabbale* p. 350 seq.

Grand Orient

FREEMASONRY UNMASKED

by MGR. GEORGE E. DILLON, D.D.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

5/-

On Planning The Earth

By GEOFFREY DOBBS.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd.

6/- (Postage extra).

PARLIAMENT.

(Continued from page 3)

about the Majlis. It is a tiny collection of very rich gentlemen who have prevented any social advance in Persia or any advantage from the oilfields coming to the Persian people. Parliamentary democracy is being used in Persia not to help the common people but to obstruct social change and defend the privileges of a decadent minority. The Majlis were alarmed by General Razmara because he intended not only to get more money from the British but to use it for raising the standard of living of the people instead of putting it into the pockets of the wealthy.

When they felt that some American company might help them to get a better deal and receive bigger profits, their resistance to General Razmara and the Anglo-Iranian offer was greatly increased.

In the third place, I would add an even more serious charge. Mr. McGhee made a most unfortunate impression in Teheran during his visit. We know that Mr. McGhee, who was primarily an Oklahoman oil tycoon and a millionaire, is a very high official in the State Department who visited the Middle East on a tour of inspection. It is common knowledge that, in American parlance he "shot his mouth" in Teheran about the weaknesses of Anglo-Iranian. Whether he was right or wrong in his criticism of Anglo-Iranian, the impression he made on the Persians was that if the British were kicked out they could rely on somebody else and they might do a little better.

I say that because if we are to succeed in the Middle East we cannot have this sort of division and disloyalty between Britain and America. If we ever behave in the same way in any other part of the world, I hope that it will be exposed in Congress. It is far better to have this out in the open. The crisis that has developed in the last four months—in which the State Department had in the end to make it clear that American technicians would not be available to the Persians—was a crisis created by American oil-parties in Persia. It was not the Russians who stabbed us in the back! As my hon. Friend the Member for Wednesbury said, the fatal thing was the belief among the Persians that they could find some Americans who would help them through their difficulties when they chucked out the British occupier of the house at Abadan.

In the Middle East a whisper grows into a fact within an hour; and people always calculate from a phrase or an expression what is the real policy of a Government. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Warwick and Leamington knows what I am talking about! Persians see everything in terms of that sort of Philip Oppenheimer diplomacy. So what would they conclude when they hear Mr. McGhee from the State Department saying nationalisation was a good idea?

What he said in Teheran and Cairo, where he made it quite clear that in his view it was not necessary for the British to retain their Suez base, was a singularly unfortunate kind of assistance to us in this moment of grave difficulty with the Persian Government. It is not fair to the British Government for hon. Members to speak as they do and omit the main reason why this position has grown up. The reason is not the Tudeh Party, the Russians or the Communists. It is traditional oil politics, which disregard national interests and think solely in terms of commercial profits, of one company against another of dollar versus sterling. It is that which has let us down in the Middle East.

I turn to the practical problem of what should be done. I have given my reasons why I think that, unless we really get to a much more serious situation than that which we are in at present, we should think twice before advising a military occupation of this area. . . .

Mr. M. Philips Price (Gloucestershire, West) During the course of this debate a number of points have been raised in connection with American oil magnates and a sinister individual whom I met in Teheran last October and who has, I agree, been no help in this whole situation. But I think it is an over-simplification to say that the intervention of certain American oil magnates is really at the bottom of this trouble or has even played a very important rôle. It has undoubtedly played a rôle, and has encouraged the Persians. I have had over 40 years' experience of Persia; I went there first in 1912. To my mind, the matter is much deeper than that. I feel that it is political movements that are governing the situation which we have to consider. Therefore, I will put before the House certain propositions which I think govern the situation as regards the internal position of Persia.

My first proposition is that the Persian nationalist movement is directed against all foreigners, as much against the Russians as against us. That is the impression I got when I discussed the matter, not with Mr. Mossadeq—I could not see that gentleman; perhaps he was in hiding at the time—but with some of his supporters in Teheran. It must be remembered that they and people with a similar mentality tore up the Russo-Persian Oil Agreement in 1947 when Qavam-es-Sultaneh was Prime Minister, and right away through these last few years there has been a strong rising of nationalist feeling in Persia. Naturally, the Russians are going to make very good use of it. Part of the Communist thesis, as laid down quite early on in the days of the October Revolution, was that the nationalist movements in Asia should be used to strike at the Western Powers. But do not let us think it is just a Communist plot. It is something much deeper.

My second proposition is that this Persian Nationalist movement is a Persian variant of the general anti-European movement which runs from Suez to Singapore, right through the Arab world to India. Only the republic of Turkey is immune from this. That is why they are so anxious to make their contacts with the West. It is not a movement which can be ignored. There are some hon. Members on this side of the House who think we must do all we can to work with the Persians and to meet their demands as far as possible. I am completely with them in that. But I must point out that these Persians are very irrational and almost uncontrollable on political issues. The nationalisation of oil is only one issue in this matter, and perhaps not a very important one. Even if we agreed to nationalisation—indeed, we cannot do otherwise—I doubt very much whether that line would do now. I do not think it would have done even some time ago.

The Persian mind today has got into such a state that it is almost impossible to deal with it unless one is very firm. Only the other day, I asked a Persian well up in the oil world what the Persians would do if they tried to run the great Anglo-Iranian oilfields, how they would get on in the world market. They are so naive that his reply was, "Oh, you would lend us the money to do it." It is just as if the fourth form of a public school had put itself in the position of the headmaster.

My third proposition is that there are various elements behind this Persian nationalist movement. There is a very sincere element with which I tried to get in touch in Teheran and Tabriz when I was there last autumn. It consists of university students, young intellectuals, teachers, journalists and civil servants, all of whom are growing up in the towns of Persia as industry grows. It is true that there have been no real reforms in Persia, but nevertheless these industrial developments have brought with them this type of intellectual who are fervent nationalists, and we have to recognise that fact.

Then there is something else. There are the old corrupt territorial magnates and merchant princes. There are the hundreds of families who have ruled, or, rather, I should say, misruled Persia for generations. These people have joined the anti-foreign movement in order to divert attention from the need for internal reform in Persia itself. The intellectual dishonesty of men like Mr. Mossadeq, the Prime Minister, knows almost no bounds. He said the other day that the poverty of the Persian peasant is due to the Anglo-Persian Company. Everybody knows that Mr. Mossadeq and his class are responsible for the poverty of the Persian peasant. If Mr. Mossadeq must be a parasite, he need not also be a hypocrite.

The fourth proposition I make is that the extreme Persian nationalist movement may not last, and probably will not last. If these Persians show any signs of wavering and of being ready to negotiate or talk with us there is a religious murder society in Persia known as Fidayan Islam. They will lay them low just as they laid low the late Prime Minister, Mr. Razmara. If that should happen, and if chaos further develops in Persia, there is only one party which will benefit—the Tudeh or Communist Party, and that means that Russian influence will become supreme in Persia.

We may think that if the Tudeh or Communist Party come into power, if we walk out of Abadan, and if they call in Russian experts they will not be able to run the machinery. I do not know. I am not too sure. In 1945 I happened to be in Baku; I think I am the last Englishman to have been there. I went over the installations in the oilfields there and I also saw the technical college which the Russian Government have there. They have a very fine college, so far as I can see—although I am not a technician. There were a lot of young people there—Tartars, and Mohammedans from Eastern Russia who were being trained in this very job. I see no reason why Russia should not be able to run the oil installations of South Persia.

I quite agree with some of my hon. friends who argue that the oil cannot be used for Russia itself. That is quite right. There are two ranges of mountains and high plateaux for 800 miles in the way, and they cannot get the oil across. The oil must go outside, but I should not like to be sure that the Russians would not use any position they can get far down south if they are given the opportunity.

It is no use wringing our hands now and saying that things might have been different. I am quite prepared to admit that the Anglo-Iranian Company might have been a little less superior and a little less patronising in their attitude towards Persian public opinion. But they have done the right thing now in making their recent offers. The installations out there are marvellous and the Persian workers in the oilfields and in the refineries are looked after far better than are the workers in any other part of Persia. That is perfectly true,

as my right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary has said in his various statements.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that because the company were so successful these sensitive Persian nationalists see it as an affront that a foreign concern, with a 60-year agreement, should work the great oil reserves on which so much of Persian prosperity depends. We must take that into consideration. It does not, of course, justify the Persians in tearing up the treaty and in refusing all attempts to negotiate or talk with them. On the other hand, no matter how good their intentions, we must not allow the company to ride the high horse in a delicate and dangerous situation of this kind.

Will it be necessary to intervene by force? Like everybody else, I hope not. One of my hon. Friends talked about American officers and said if we met any trouble in Persia and there was a clash, we should meet American officers. I do not think we should. According to my information when I was there, it seems that American officers are advising the gendarmie, and there are one or two American officers attending to transport matters, but apart from that we should meet no American military commanders if there were trouble. I hope we shall not have to take this action. If we did, it would indeed send a shudder right through the East. On the other hand, I am not at all sure that a little healthy growl from the lion would be a bad thing.

What I am more concerned about, however, is the morning after the night before—not so much the action we take now, but the action we may have to take following present action. You can do anything with bayonets, it was said, Sir, except sit on them. We may have to use armed force to protect the installations as well as lives. But that is a military matter, and I do not think that there are many of us in this House who can really say whether that is possible or not. It is for the Government to say. . . .

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas: —

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	3/6
Social Credit.....	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit.....	(Reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy.....	6/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
Communism in Action	
U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England.....	8d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

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