

UCCA

Great God of UCCA  
We bow down before thee  
Praise and adore thee  
All hail be thy name

UCCA is loving  
and UCCA is kind  
UCCA is living  
and UCCA is mind

O Great God of UCCA  
We bow down before thee  
P.O. Box Cheltenham  
All glory be thine.

R.D. Lloyd.

ANALYSIS OF PROTEST

It is only too easy to regard protest demonstrations as an excuse for hooliganism, but it is a very narrow and dangerous viewpoint. By regarding demonstrations as such the issue behind the demonstration becomes discredited, and is not looked at objectively.

Undeniably, some recent demonstrations have been violent and destructive. Again, undeniably, not everyone who attends these demonstrations is simply there because of a wish to protest about an issue; demonstrations are becoming a part of a ritualistic culture of the young. For a student who has any interest in politics, demonstrations have the same status as free concerts in Hyde Park have for young people interested in music. In some circles attendance at the Grosvenor Square demonstration/riot is regarded as a form of battle honour in much the same way as the Russians used to regard heroes of the 1905

revolution.

Unfortunately, there are many people who are only too willing to look at demonstrations simply in these terms. They do so largely to reassure themselves. They are worried by the 'permissive society' and view these demonstrations as an extension of that society. They particularly disapprove of the fact that many of the demonstrators are "wasting their time at university", time which they as taxpayers have paid for. This attitude is understandable, especially of many of the older generation did not have an opportunity to go to university although they would have liked to.

Why are many of these demonstrations violent? First of all, a distinction must be drawn between demonstrations which are not originally intended to be violent but become so, and those which make violence an essential part of the demonstration. Violence in the first case may arise either from the activities of a minority who are not satisfied with a peaceful protest or simply through crowd psychology, in the same way as football crowds may become violent.

The demonstration which resorts to violence as a form of protest does so usually because it feels that its object can only be achieved by violence, and is not prepared to sacrifice the end for the means. The protesters have looked at past history and unfortunately past history has shown that when reasonable and rational argument and peaceful protest have failed, force has succeeded. Demonstrations that are peaceful now have little importance attached to them by the public and so the demonstrators realise that these are likely to achieve little.

On the other hand, a demonstration which becomes a riot - like the Grosvenor Square demonstration - attracts the press and news media and brings public attention - reluctantly - to bear on the subject. Direct action can be used to threaten law and order, and thus society can be blackmailed: either it must give way or it must fight back, which involves spending great sums of money on the police and accepting the disruption of the everyday life of society.

Society is split on the action it should take. Instincts demand that "young upstarts" who are trying to dictate to the community should be put down firmly; but instincts also demand that the equilibrium of daily life should not be disturbed. Finally society is afraid that if it decides to fight, it may fail. The 'Stop the Seventies Tour' demonstrations show all these elements. "It is obviously intolerable that cricket (which has nothing to do with politics

anyway) should be stopped by young hooligans taking the law into their own hands." However, the expense to the cricket clubs of fighting back would be crippling and as most people realise, it is only too easy to ruin a cricket match. Nothing succeeds like success and the worst thing that could happen is for the community to challenge the protesters and fail. Far better to wait until the issue is important enough and society knows that it is in the right and the demonstrators are wrong in the end as well as in the means of achieving it. If society disapproves of apartheid it is bad for it to risk a confrontation with protesters who are also against apartheid.

I do not condone the violence of these demonstrations, because it is unnecessary, and because it does more harm than good. Not only does it disrupt a society which is, in my opinion, fundamentally sound, but also it arouses that society against protesters both peaceful and violent. This leads to the possibility of a change in the basis of that society to protect itself, such as the banning of demonstrations or the imposition of censorship, which would remove the sound basis of that society. Lastly, I return to the point I made at the beginning - that the feelings of society against demonstrators may well blind us to the issues behind the demonstrations, or even worse, actually discredit the arguments they represent.

R.P. Hatfield.

In this poem the poet attempts to show why he has chosen this particular vocation:

Only the poet knows  
The earth is in a drop of rain.  
I watch as a flower grows,  
I stand among the grain.  
I've held a tiny bird and felt it throb.  
I do all these,  
Anything but a job.

S.L. Hill.

## POWER AND PROGRESS

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles", said Marx, who held that the development of the means of production was the most important factor in this process.

Orthodox economics lists four main ingredients of production: land, labour, capital and management. When land was the most important factor in the economic process, the owners of land had the power and society was feudal. When capital - industrial machinery - took its place, the owners of capital had power and society became capitalist.

Marx held that power would pass to the suppliers of labour - the working class. In fact, Western capitalism has adapted itself to the difficulties which were predicted to bring it down. It has changed so much that the repetition of Marxist slogans is even less appropriate to understanding the situation than it was 100 years ago.

It is the object of this article to investigate the characteristics of this new sort of capitalism and ideology it uses to justify its existence. How, then, has capitalism been able to survive?

### Changes in Capitalism

First, the process of technological development has made industry more and more complex. It has thus given increased power to the suppliers of the fourth ingredient of production, management. It is true (in both senses) that capitalism has managed to survive.

We have seen a separation of management and ownership. The entrepreneur, the one man who owned and ran his own firm, has been replaced by the manager, the man running a specialised part of a firm in which he has no share in ownership.

Second, increasing state intervention in the economy, and a blurring of the boundary between state and business. Some people think this means the West is moving towards socialism. Though there may be other reasons for believing this, state control is not in itself socialist. If socialism is the organisation of the world in the interests of humanity as a whole, and if the state is controlled by an anti-social minority acting in their own interests, then state control isn't socialism.

Seventeenth-century mercantilism, Stalin's Russia, and Hitler's Germany all had a lot of state intervention in the economy, but none of them were socialist.

Third, Keynesian economics has enabled capitalism to end the booms and slumps which Marx predicted would bring it down. Keynes showed that booms could be stopped by the state taxing money out of the economy, and depressions dealt with by extra state spending to increase consumer demand and cut unemployment.

Fourth, with increased production, there is an increasing surplus above what is needed for investment. With Victorian capitalism this surplus provided necessities for a majority and luxuries for a minority. Today, luxury consumption is available to an ever-increasing proportion of the population of the advanced West.

Fifth, changes in social standards. Automation is making people more important as consumers than as producers, thus replacing the work ethic by the consume ethic.

The permissive society is a direct result of the affluent society. It was created by Harold Macmillan. Victorian Capitalism proclaimed the virtue of chastity. Today, modern capitalism finds sexual permissiveness far more profitable.

These are five amongst many of the ways in which capitalism has changed. The trouble is that many on the Right are still trying to justify old-style capitalism, whilst many on the Left are still trying to attack it.

Many traditional conservative attitudes are no longer useful to present-day managerial capitalism. Notice the lack of big business support for Enoch Powe's. Reactionaries are as subversive as revolutionaries.

Take for example the survival, especially amongst American Republicans, of the pre-Keynesian idea that Governments must balance their budgets and never spend more or less than they get in taxes.

The Right still cling to nationalism. Yet modern capitalism is essentially internationalist. Increasingly, companies are crossing national boundaries and setting up departments across the world. Proposals for European economic co-operation are advanced not by farmers and small businessmen, nor by those on the Left, but by those with the best interests of large-scale managerial capitalism at heart.

## The Ideology of Managerial Capitalism

The ideology used to justify the status quo is changing. Though remnants of Victorianism remain since older people respond to it more readily, the catchwords of thrift and work are disappearing: today's mass markets require hire purchase and automation.

I now want to go on to examine the new ideology of managerial capitalism. This ideology is not inherent in the present state of economic development: it is merely the means which are at present found expedient to justify managerial capitalist control. It has five main aspects, each of which I oppose.

First, the overriding priority given to economic growth and technological progress, regardless of the social and environmental costs this often entails. The worship of economic growth has happily recently declined, and instead it is conservation which receives ritual mentions in political speeches. Let's hope all the talk about the environment shows some results. Possibly even someone will be prepared to question the modern doctrine of the Divine Right of Motorists. As material production grows, each extra increase to it becomes less important and thus the priority for non-material benefits must increase. The test for Western society is whether industrial production is going to be seen as a means of satisfying human needs or of keeping people at the service, and under the control of the industrial system. The question is whether goods are made for people or people for goods. Which is consuming which?

Second, the acceptance of specialisation and hierarchical organisation. The perplexity of the old at being unable to tell the difference between boys' and girls' hair, and at the rejection of authority, reflects their inability to see that the Hippy movement follows Rousseau in regarding over-specialisation as industrial man's basic problem. This is why it identifies with the pre-industrial peasants of underdeveloped 'Third World' countries. The Vietnam war is America's last game of cowboys and indians because the young support the indians.

Third, the acceptance of the rationality of the status quo and its standards. Legality is considered more important than morality: the abnormal is always wrong: conformity is sanity. A person is considered successful to the degree to which he fits into the system, a project is considered worthwhile to the degree to which it is financially profitable. Beauty is measured by price, truth is measured by sales, virtue is measured by income,

the 'greatness' of a nation by the size of its Gross National Product.

As Spiro Agnew said, "The young, who will one day have a stake in our society, criticise our materialistic attitude. But what else is materialism than a measure of success?" ('The Sunday Times', 22/2/70)

Fifth, the scientific method. This is not just a matter of the technological application of discoveries, but the encouragement of ways of thought which consider objects themselves rather than their relations to people, and thus attempts the systematic exclusion of human values from a mechanical universe.

The precise measurement of the degree of attainment of particular objectives is used to imply the rationality of those objectives, and the irrelevance of unquantifiable considerations. Modern society is characterised by a despair about ultimate values coupled with precision in the calculation of trivialities.

### The Yippie Alternative

Now that the working class largely support capitalism, any fundamental opposition to it is coming mainly from other quarters. We have seen the rise of a new ideology in direct opposition to managerial capitalism. Parts of this ideology are shared by a large number of different groups, but perhaps most of all it is identified with the Yippies, the American Youth International Party, the political offshoot of the Hippie movement. Yippie ideology has three main principles, and I oppose them all.

First, the total rejection of specialisation and the objective of material prosperity. they are saying "no" to the idea that "what are you going to be?" means "what job are you going to do?".

In many respects they are right. Prosperity is a means toward happiness and not a substitute for it. It is one means amongst many, but it is nevertheless still a means, and without economic growth illiteracy and infant mortality rates would be a good deal higher than they are today. Man cannot live by bread alone, but it certainly helps.

Second, rejection of restraint, including both the laws and the customs, standards, and norms by which society attempts to enforce its moral beliefs. It's true of course that such standards help to prevent an anti-capitalist revolution. But we're going to need self-restraint and social standards to achieve

a socialist society. Immorality and obscenity are very subversive, but subversion of existing society without the construction of an alternative leads to its replacement by some other system. We may succeed in throwing of our present masters, but our efforts are useless if a new form of slavery ensues.

There are two basic conflicts to be reconciled in any society: that between government and governed, and that between governed and governed. Anarchy may deal with the first, but it will fail to cope with the second until non-legal social norms have been developed to such an extent that people will act in the general interest without a state being required to make them do so.

The anarchists' dilemma is this: how to subvert the state without destroying the norms which maintain it but which are essential for anarchism to work in practice.

Third, an irrationalist philosophical attitude providing a basis for believing whatever one wants to. It's quite right to criticize science for an impersonal approach, and to put the emphasis on the quality of consciousness, and to search for non-linear forms of logic and a post-McLuhan view of reality (i.e. one not limited by the biases imposed on thought by the print medium).

But that's totally different from saying that because much of "common sense", a debased form of positivism, is wrong we must go to the opposite extreme of a total rejection of reason and evidence.

Consider, for instance, the implications of the links between irrationalists of Right and Left, between Fascism and some forms of utopian socialism. Nietzsche's statement that "Morality is the abdication of the will to live" is quoted with approval in a recent individualist anarchist pamphlet. Consider also statements like this one, in an editorial in the underground magazine IT (52) - "Other people's opinions are normally a drag and its a waste of time to take such emotionally based phenomena seriously." According to Yippie leader Jerry Rubin, he wants revolution not for the sake of improving people's lives but "for the hell of it".

The trouble with irrationalism is that it provides no criteria for deciding between one faith and another.

### Marxism as Managerialism

Next, the question of the inadequacies of orthodox Marxist theory in present conditions. First, it is designed to fight an enemy that has disappeared. Second, it is in fact provided an alternative ideology for managerialists.



I have said that the present stage of economic development does not necessarily entail managerial capitalism. A similar form of social organisation, though more managerial than capitalist, can exist under the banner of Marxist socialism which can be used to justify the transfer of power not from the capitalists to the people as a whole, but from the capitalists to the managers, state and party bureaucrats, and the controllers of information, education, and communication.

What exists in Russia and Eastern Europe today is not socialism, nor a different form of managerial capitalism, but what I shall call state managerialism. What I want to see is management without managerialism, i.e. the use of the specialised skills of managers in the interests of the people as a whole, rather than in the interest of a minority.

The trouble is that much of the ideology used by the managerialists of East and West is bound up with the socialist tradition and so the Gaitskellism of Labour's Right Wing as well as the professed Marxism of Warsaw pact countries can both be passed off as socialist.

The need today is to develop on the Left a fourth alternative to Marx, Gaitskell, and the Yippies: liberalism without capitalism, socialism without uniformity, and humanism without arrogance.

V.F. Anderson.

There is a substantial body of evidence that moderate use of marijuana does not produce physical or mental deterioration. One of the earliest and most extensive studies of this question was an investigation conducted by the British Government in India in the 1890's. The real motive for the inquiry is suspected to have been to establish that cannabis was more dangerous than Scotch Whisky, from whose sale the Government could obtain a great deal more tax revenue. Nevertheless, the investigation was carried out with typical British impartiality and thoroughness. The investigating agency, called the Indian Hemp Drug Commission, interviewed some 800 persons, including cannabis users and dealers, physicians, superintendents of insane asylums, religious leaders, etc. and concluded that there was no evidence that moderate use of the cannabis drugs produced any disease or mental or moral damage.

I don't like the original title  
many thanks to Mum, Bill, Judy, Dad, Sue & Ross  
and Sheila

It was spring  
and so were your lips,  
and so we sailed and we  
went up round that bend so very quickly  
up to where Frogmore lay -  
and you lay -  
and we leaned out of the boat,  
to balance it but  
we had lots of fun  
and we glided over the water,  
and you shouted  
and waved your hand  
and the people waved back  
and you were smiling  
and

We sat and ate our pasties,  
and we took swigs from the bottle alternately  
and you watched the people  
in their Dorys  
revving their outboards -  
but we showed them didn't we  
and you got up and grinned  
and walked down the ramp,  
and let your sandals touch the rippled water,  
and we watched the fisherman  
and his car  
and like last time

When we sat on that woman's quay -  
(long time ago I remember her from)  
Two Bobcats came in under  
Penta-Power  
and we watched as they stowed their sails,  
but the woman was in the galley peeling potatoes.  
You pointed  
and I explained,  
but there was a Land Rover  
two hedges above,  
and you tossed your hair  
over the back of the bench  
and

We motored up to  
Waterhead lake  
and you got muddy when we  
beached the boat  
and we walked round the cruisers  
(under their stays)  
and up past the farmhouse which sold  
Pentas (so many)  
and you  
and I walked up the hill  
and the cow said hello so you laughed  
and you looked so pretty  
and

We sat on the ramp at Portlemouth  
and you looked at the baby fishes  
who quivered  
Like my sperm,  
but we were lucky,

and we hopped up the crumbling stone  
steps (not before  
paddling in crystal bubble clear  
sea which lapped on the beach:  
but it was spring and  
so were your lips)  
and across the uncrowded road  
(for it was  
Spring  
and so were your  
lips)  
and up up -  
forever up  
the tarmac steps whose angles were so very steep  
and you wondered at the sun  
(which had shone so brightly  
all this time)  
and at the dragonfly -  
and the croaking bird in the field  
and I thought your legs were lovely  
and we climbed  
and  
  
At the top  
(and over the stile  
you fell - )  
we could sit down  
and watch them race,  
and you walked to the tiny shop  
there on top of so much wilderness  
and you came back with two ice creams,  
but the boats had barely gone about, round the marker  
setting off for charleton

When we kissed  
(for it  
was Spring  
and so were your lips)  
and it was many moons  
till we came out of that kiss  
and.

But during all that time -  
I never knew you hated me so much.

Epilogue

Yes the BBC have wrecked your garden,  
next they will do an exposé on your bedroom  
bathroom and drawing room.

H.S. Fulcher.

What's the difference?

between a street salesman and a dachshund dog?

One bawls out his wares on the pavement,

the other's got blue eyes.

between a seagull and a baby?

One flits across the shore,

the other's got blue eyes.

between H\*\* and a bucket of shit?

One's got blue eyes.

Looking at the world through N H S Spectacles

Mr. Anderson's article (Power and Progress) raises some interesting points which I, as one who is at the receiving end of the capitalist system, feel the need to take up.

Firstly, the question of separating management from ownership (apart from the fact that many managers are also shareholders) from Mr. Anderson's remarks it would appear that Marx had never given a thought to this issue: not so. Marx wrote that in separating management from ownership it meant that "the capitalist disappears as superfluous from the productive process". Engels was more direct, he spoke of "parasites"<sup>1</sup>: but more on that later.

Second, the question of state intervention in the economy through Keynesian policies: again according to Mr. Anderson, Marxists have ignored this trend, or worse, they regard it as socialist. Again, not so. As long ago as 1938 Leon Trotsky described this process as an attempt to "drain the ocean of (capitalist) anarchy in spoonfuls of "planning"<sup>2</sup>. Lord Keynes' policies have to some extent mitigated (not ended) the trade cycle, but no national planning can control capitalism because, as Mr. Anderson points out it is international, but it is still capitalism.

Capitalism is a system whereby profit -expropriated surplus value of labour- instead of need, determines what is produced, and thus we get such things as sugar and wheat being destroyed in order to keep the price up, while two thirds of humanity suffer from malnutrition, This sort of unplanned distribution is what Trotsky refers to as "anarchy" and this is a problem which capitalism cannot solve.

Capitalism is also a system whereby a minority (the ruling class) own the wealth, while a majority (us) produce the wealth and thus there is a conflict between the classes. As Karl Kautsky said (before he became a renegade) "the question is: who shall control production, the owner of the means of production or the owners of labour power"<sup>3</sup>. The factory occupations on the continent in recent years have really posed this question. You see, Mr. Anderson, the militant workers (a growing section of the population) are not fooled by the existence of managers. They know in whose interest the system is run.

Keynesians like Wilson and Castle have merely run capitalism to the tune of socialist slogans as their predecessors did to the tune of Tory ones.

The Tories used 'private enterprise' and 'freedom of choice' as slogans

only: they actually responded to the needs of monopoly capitalism quite well (by a strange coincidence it is monopoly capitalism which finances the Tory Party). The Labour Government has also responded to these needs, but for different reasons.

The Labour Party is essentially a radical reformist party; it emerged at the turn of the century during a long boom period when it was assumed, by Fabians and others, that there would be no more crises or class war and that capitalism could be reformed out of existence; this was in complete contradiction to the ideas of past socialists such as Robert Owen and Karl Marx: The main idea of the reformists was that they should take over the state through Parliament, but the fact is that Parliament does not control the state; the reverse is true. Capitalism controls the economy and the mass media, and therefore the heads of the civil service and the army and police have to operate in its interest in order to maintain the status quo, which is, after all, the whole point of conventional government. One adjunct to this process is the Parliament, which is elected by the people in order to provide a 'democratic' facade for the bosses' state, and capitalism is quite capable of disposing of this facade when it becomes a hindrance to national accumulation. More on that later.

Therefore the Labour leadership, in common with Social Democratic leaders in other countries, have become apologists for capitalism in the working class movement, because, to put it crudely, that is the only way they can keep their jobs - hence the wage freeze etc..

The hegemony of the old parties, Labour and Tory, is now being challenged left right and centre (excuse the pun) by the new political trends which have emerged over recent years, which I shall refer to - for the sake of neatness - as New Left, New Right and New Centre.

Some say that these trends are irrelevant because of the small amount of support they have, but a few years ago they had no support at all because they did not exist. However, in recent years we have seen increasing numbers of young people taking to the streets in Europe and America supporting the New Left; Peoples Democracy in Northern Ireland, demonstrations in Chicago and turmoil in British Universities, to name but three; and have you not seen the National Front slogans on walls and heard of the increasing influence of the

Monday Club in the Tory party? Both of these are new trends on the Right. The same goes for the New Center; the Young Liberal 'Red Guards' are certainly getting around. In my opinion these trends are becoming less and less 'irrelevant' as time passes. Having said that they are important I will try to explain what I know about them.

It has often been stated that the Hippies are to the New Left what Methodism was to the Labour Party (in Wales Methodism is synonymous with 'socialism') and a lot of the basic ideas of the rank and file stem from the conflict between the rather naive Hippy ideology and the forces of the state; for instance a Hippy wants to live in a certain way and is soon taught by the police that our present society will not allow it, and this leads him to start questioning the setup of present society, and the process is catalysed when he comes in to contact with one of the New Left organizations and sees it as a political question.

On the whole these groups are just beginning to organize in industry and already they are having a marked effect in raising militancy and putting over their political ideas, but their main effect is in the universities and schools. Enough has been said about the situation in the Universities, where the 'establishment' is reacting in a blind authoritarian manner to the (not particularly revolutionary) demands of the students, while the students are resorting to more and more militant tactics. The same sort of thing is beginning to happen in the schools, and conditions have called forth such things as the Schools Action Union which are considerably strengthened by socialist joining them and putting forward a transitional programme.

The idea of a transitional program, an idea accepted by most left-wing groups, is that all meaningful changes go beyond the limits of capitalist society, in all sections of society: universities, schools, offices and factories: and that in order to achieve anything a movement must be built around demands for change and effectively challenge authority, always realising that only a change in the basis of society can have a lasting effect on conditions, and using these transitional demands as a means of educating people to that fact. (a more coherent analysis is in Trotsky's book index 2 below)

Our society does not reveal its character if it is not challenged, and that is why a superficial analysis like Mr. Anderson's can gain credence; but in the present situation the liberal facade of our society is being stripped away.



The New Left are the ones Mr. Anderson attacks for not understanding the nature of modern capitalism. As I pointed out above, Marx knew more about capitalism than he is given credit for; as it has only changed in form and not in substance the basic tenets of Marxism are the best foundation on which to build. Marxism is a guide for action, not a fixed dogma. The only revision that is necessary is of tactics, and the New Left have proved most amenable to new tactics (from University sit-ins to offset litho printing!).

And now .... The New Right:

As I said above the capitalist class are quite capable of disposing of "democracy". When it begins to interfere with national accumulation in order to do this they use the fascists; likewise, the fascists use the capitalist system in order to gain power for themselves...

The main platform on which the fascists campaign is racialism and anti-socialism, and this is how they gain support from sections of the working class. Working class racialism is largely a reaction to middle class 'liberalism' and anti-socialism is caused by the betrayals of social democracy. As long as Wilson and Co. are represented as the non-racialists and socialists then it is not surprising that the working class oppose them, and the fascists are quick to exploit this.

Also, the Tories campaign on a platform which is well to the right of their actual policies (these in fact being determined by the needs of monopoly capital) and therefore there is a sizable group of people who have been 'converted' to the stated policy only to be betrayed by the actual policy. Thus there is room for a new radical right-wing party to 'expose' the Tory leaders and put forward a real right-wing policy..

Before 1966 there was no such party because the Right were in a fragmented state with new splits and factions every few months, but in 1966 the four largest factions (Racial Preservation Society, League of Empire Loyalists, Greater Britain Movement, and the British National Party) came together to form the 'National Front'.

Their leader, Mr. A.K. Chesterton, is renowned as the author of 'Creed of a Fascist Revolutionary' and former editor of 'Blackshirt' (organ of the British Union of Fascists<sup>4</sup>). The deputy Führer is a Mr. Martin Webster who piled into Kenyatta outside the Hilton Hotel and is quoted as having said "We are busy building a well-oiled (perhaps he was 'well-oiled' at the time) Nazi machine throughout the country"<sup>5</sup>. "Hitler put Germany on its feet. We and fellow Nazis will do the same for Britain"<sup>6</sup> - that's nice of them!

N.F. members have often been in trouble with the law (as well as those who were imprisoned during the war as fifth columnists), one member Mr. Michael Passmore was arrested in Germany for handing out leaflets with a picture of Hitler captioned "He was right"<sup>7</sup>. Another member Mr. John Tyndall once appeared in court and refused to swear on the Bible; asked what book he would swear on, he replied he replied 'Mien Kampf'.<sup>8</sup>

As Mr. Anderson says "reactionaries are as subversive as revolutionaries", but the situation is not that simple. The New Right emerged as a reaction to the New Left and therefore it will help to preserve the capitalist system when the New Left threatens it. But until that time it will be a subversive force as was Hitler until German big business needed him (witness the Munich putsch and Hitler's imprisonment).

And now a word about the New Centre, and the word is ..... LUDICROUS. The first thing to remember is that they do not call themselves centre, and in order to avoid this they have redefined 'Left' and 'Right'. Right is not capitalist but authoritarian, while Left is 'libertarian' - thus, presumably, Powell is to the left of Wilson because he is less authoritarian!

The New Centre are the 'Red Guards' who descended on the Young Liberals a few years ago. I would add that they do not call themselves Liberal, that would be too simple, but 'libertarian socialists'. Their policy (policy?) is one of neither capitalism nor socialism but "Liberalism without capitalism, socialism without uniformity, and humanism without arrogance". I might add "No clear programme, no class analysis, and no support for the working class", (the

working class are too 'authoritarian' for them, anyway!)

That then, is the situation; the old parties sitting in parliament playing according to the rules, while the rules themselves are being challenged by Right and Left.

The battles of the future will not be fought out by the old parties. If capitalism is to be preserved it will be preserved by force, if it is to be smashed we will have to counter that force. It is important to decide between the new forces which are now being pushed Right and Left by the Centrifuge of History. I know which side I am on, and the future belongs to us!

Young Worker.

- 1 'Socialist Standard' May 1967
- 2 'The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International'  
Leon Trotsky
- 3 'Foundations of Christianity' Karl Kautsky
- 4 'Fascism for the Million' published by the B.U.F.
- 5 'Sunday Times' 30 - 3 - 69
- 6 'National Front is a Nazi Front' published by Ex-servicemen against Nazis
- 7 'Sunday Times' 30 - 3 - 69
- 8 'The National Front is a Nazi Front' ibid.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Dear Sirs,

I have always been non-political, but recently I have been more and more deeply shocked by the rising tide of disorder and disrespect for authority throughout this nation.

The weak-minded "moderates" of all three parties seem incapable of dealing

with the criminal and the subversive elements who are trying to undermine and destroy our Christian civilisation. Newspapers are full of reports of teenage vice and perversion, student demonstrations, robbery, and violence, especially to the police, drug taking, wildcat strikes, and various indecent forms of dress passing as 'modern fashion'.

Firm action is needed to crack down on this anarchy and restore respect for authority. The restoration of the death penalty for crimes against society such as murder, rape, kidnapping, and ~~parking-ticket-offenses~~ other kinds of violence especially treason, is necessary, and a good flogging is what is needed for hooligans, homosexuals, and drug addicts. The laws of treason and sedition should be enforced, and need to be strengthened to cover demonstrators and squatters.

As it stands, sports fixtures are broken up by long-haired louts, and even here in Croydon, gangs of youths from New Addington roam the streets making it unsafe for law-abiding citizens to set foot outside their doors.

I don't think the milk-and-water Conservatives under Heath are capable of dealing with the situation, nor is there any hope that Mr. Powell will lead the party in the near future. Is there any organisation in Great Britain, free from right-wing extremists, to which ordinary people like myself can turn?

DISTURBED

Ed:- Try the Labour Party.

Dear Sirs,

My views on most subjects appear to be in direct conflict with the idealistic attitudes of Editor Anderson and in some cases Editor Hatfield. This is why you challenged me to contribute to ACID, which, as you can see, I am doing.

This epistle (!) is being compiled during an English period, legitimately, I assure you, and as I sit here I can see Mr. Glynne-Jones' jaw dropping as Editor Anderson attempts to explain his latest literary masterpiece. Gentlemen, (with apologies to Mr. Fooks) may I submit that if my English master fails to comprehend Editor Anderson's use of the English Language, how am I, a simple (well you know what I mean) scholar, supposed to understand his arguments? (By sign language perhaps? M. De Gaulle has nothing on Editor Anderson.)

Still, back at the ranch (room 2 in this case), Editor Anderson has regained his seat, and it has only taken 40 minutes to explain 5 sides of essay. One could understand this had the essay been in a foreign language, but not in our dearly beloved native tongue - a sore point, Editor Hatfield?

My point, Gentlemen, must stick out like a sore thumb by now. Please, and I appeal on behalf of a large number of the sixth form let alone the younger members of the school who read your publication, make your articles simpler to read.

Perhaps some of us(?) more intelligent economists know just what you are on about, but to be a success financially you need a large circulation, and this demands that you write your articles so as they can be understood, which must benefit yourselves in two ways: one, your point of view will have been read, and not turned aside by the general public as more "boring intellectual nonsense"; and two, you will not be out of pocket.

Think about it (Gentlemen)!

Edward I. Andrews

Ed:- The Editors are cognisant (in advanced industrial society) of mass pressurisation for a de-jargonisation process to be accomplished with the intended function of rendering the constituent components of this publication possessive of a not insignificantly increased degree of comprehensibility.

TOVARISCHI:

ON THE DIALECTICS OF THE REVOLUTION; THE HERMETIC ANDROGYNE, HAROLD WILSON, THE INFLUENCE OF THE TRANS NEPTUNIAN PLANETS, AND OTHER ALCHEMICAL MYSTERIES:-

One year ago, newly liberated and in an impecunious and stoned-out condition, I found myself on a Bundesbahn train passing through the Fatherland; (a bit of background data: I was born in Austria and lived there eight years, and Austria like Germany has a rigidly codified etiquette preserving such things as the tu-vous syndrome and a mandatory how to excuse oneself from one's elders) being tired I attempted to get myself a couchette, in the course of which I ran into the sleeping car attendant (age 50, S.S. (retired)) who's casual remark that I

was "a long-haired communist s'ine, unfit to sleep with the pigs" piqued me, and I fell to the temptation of anger. In my broken but powerful if a little crude German invective, I attempted an appeal to his reason, but when after ten minutes it was to no avail I told him to fuck off, did the mandatory bow to excuse myself from his presence and went off for a smoke and a bite to eat. When I realised afterwards that I had bowed I was horrified.

The question we must all ask ourselves, comrades, is to what extent we are sub-consciously products of the system we criticise. One of the problems repeatedly discussed in ACID is how to avoid replacing one form of slavery with another - to do this we subject ourselves to a ruthless self-analysis - we must not fall into the trap of assuming that because our conclusions seem valid, our precepts are pure.

With respect (see L. J. Sacks the last of the great liberals) to Comrade Anderson who is obviously a highly competent dialectician, how can he seriously expand the life work of Marcuse into four paragraphs, when it isn't worth two.

Fifteenthly, have you ever noticed how many banks there are Laussane - I have met people who say to me "I agree with your goals, but I don't know about your tactics" - this is crap. If we all sat around discussing our goals things would remain just as they are. To refer back to paragraph seven, the reason I wear a headband is to keep the hair out of my eyes.

I would like to leave you with a closing thought. When blowing up a cop-shop, never have a cast-iron alibi as to where you were at the time. Nothing makes the Fuzz more suspicious.

Alan P. Stout, O.W. (exp.)

P.S. Never forget that when having a smoke on top of the armoury, if you stand Mick will see you and he always wants one too.

### GUIDE FOR MODERN MAN (AND OTHER STORIES)

Ever felt that things are changing? Ever wondered why? Here's a short guide to the thought of 4 men who are radically changing the way people are thinking and acting today.

#### TIMOTHY LEARY

"Turn on, Tune in, Drop out." That's the gospel according to Tim Leary, prophet of the psychedelic revolution.

He sees drug taking as a means of producing religious experience. "Drugs

are the religion of the twenty-first century. Pursuing the religious life today without using psychedelic drugs is like studying astronomy with the naked eye." "Drugs are the religion of the people - the only hope is dope."

Leary says that there are seven levels of consciousness, with specific drugs to allow people to experience at each level, as well as a religion to study that experience from the inside and a science to study it from the outside.

For example, level five, which most people are on, is studied by Protestantism and Psychology, and induced by coffee, tea, and Coca-Cola. Level six, emotional stupor, is for Catholicism, Psychiatry, and alcohol.

Psychedelics are the opposite of anaesthetics. Instead of inducing emotional stupor, they give rise to states of increased awareness of what is happening to one's brain, or nerves, or cells, or atoms, (depending on the level). Level one is the level of atomic awareness, studied by Physics and Buddhism, and induced by S.T.P. or alternatively by meditating for about forty years. L.S.D. turns you on at all seven levels.

Leary's teaching is the systematic exploration of Jesus' phrase "The kingdom of heaven is within you", or in Buddhism, "The light is within you. Let the light shine." It is aimed at greater awareness of what is happening to your body. "Man is more than 99% automated, and he is only a very small fraction conscious." (Buckminster Fuller). Leary's aim is to wake us up to awareness of the perceptions constantly arriving at our brains, nerves, and cells, but usually simply ignored.

His advice: "Turn on (take psychedelic drugs), tune in (express your new state of mind by a new way of life), drop out...Quit school. Quit your job. Don't vote. Avoid all politics. Do not waste conscious thinking on TV-studio games (his phrase for the preoccupations of straight society). Political choices are meaningless.....Dismiss your fantasies of infiltrating the social stage-set game. Any control you have over television props is their control over you."

That message has had a great influence on America's young. The new American dream is chemically-induced.

#### MARSHALL MCLUHAN

McLuhan's message too, is awareness. Awareness of the effects of the media. He says that changes in the predominant means of communication determine

changes in society as a whole.

"TV will dissolve the entire fabric of society in a short time. If you understood its dynamics, you would choose to eliminate it as soon as possible. TV changes sensory and psychic life."

The media we get our information through decides which senses we use and each sense has its own set of biases. Our assumptions about the world are assumptions we have picked up by the relative importance we give to each of our senses as a means of perception.

Today we are passing from the age of literacy to the age of electronics. "Words are obsolete." The new electronic media mean a rejection of the values and assumptions created by literacy. These include specialisation, detachment, linear logic, and the Protestant work ethic: what Blake called "single vision and Newton's sleep."

Today we see the end of authority, the rejection of specialisation, the drive for participation, new views of God, truth, and reality. Reality is something you create for yourself out of the raw material of your experiences. Yet literate man thinks of it as fixed and objective: a clock-work universe running of materialistic lines.

"The alphabet and kindred gimmicks have long served man as a subliminal source of philosophical and religious assumptions...philosophy was as naive as science in its unconscious acceptance of the assumptions or dynamics of typography."

The challenge to traditional thought today comes not from science, but from the rejection of it. Or at least an acceptance that its more recent findings have dissolved the world-view of Newton and Descartes upon which so much of present-day thought depends.

#### HERBERT MARCUSE

Marcuse, Professor of Politics at California University, surely one of the trendiest jobs in the world, has been the inspiration of much of the student unrest of recent years, especially in France and Germany.

His work is an attempt to bring Marxism up-to-date with the aid of the teaching of Freud and Hegel. His view of advanced capitalism is critical and pessimistic.

"This society is obscene in producing and indecently exposing a stifling abundance of wares while depriving its victims abroad of the necessities of life;



obscene in stuffing itself and its garbage cans while poisoning and burning the scarce foodstuffs in the fields of its aggression; obscene in the words and smiles of its politicians and entertainers; in its prayers, in its ignorance, and in the wisdom of its kept intellectuals."

His advice: smash the system. Destroy the means of indoctrination which maintain the exploitation and depression not just of the inhabitants of the advanced countries themselves, but of the underdeveloped Third World as well.

Marcuse speaks of a "one-dimensional society", in which Orwell's "Newspeak" has come true, in which so great is the power of The System that it controls the way we talk and thus the way we think as well. He claims it is increasingly difficult to formulate and communicate subversive concepts since these are translated in the mind of the hearer into the categories of thought which serve the status quo.

The System, he says, has defined words like "order", "tolerance", and "democracy" to serve its own ends. Order is when a Nazi hits a Jew: Anarchy is when a Jew Hits a Nazi. Tolerance is when the White South African Government is allowed to continue its oppression of the black majority: intolerance is when someone tries to do something about it. Democracy is when you can choose between different sets of people to run the same system: elitism is when people try to change the system itself.

Our society, he says, is a society of "surplus repression", where goods are produced not because people need them but in order to tie people to the productive process, the industrial system. Advertising - which goes on throughout news, drama, sport, and everything else - serves to ensure that people work for the System even during their leisure time.

"Free election of masters does not abolish the masters or the slaves, Free choice among a wide variety of goods and services does not signify freedom if these goods sustain social controls over a life of toil and fear - that is, if they sustain alienation. The spontaneous reproduction of superimposed needs by the individual does not establish autonomy: it only testifies to the efficacy of the controls."

ERICH FROMM

Fromm is concerned with the creation of a sane society, a society which satisfies the needs of human beings. Today, he says, our society is sick, each man is alienated and controlled, yet the system as a whole is frighteningly out of control.

Like other radical psychologists, such as David Cooper, Ronald Laing, and Timothy Leary, Erich Fromm rejects the idea of much of the rest of psychology that a person is sane and "normal" to the degree to which he is able to fit into our present society.

Psychology, they say, is being misused: it must fit society to the needs of its members, instead of the other way round.

As Laing says, in discussing how each child is conditioned to the acceptance of its environment, "By the time the new human being is fifteen or so, we are left with a being like ourselves. A half-crazed creature, more or less adjusted to a mad world. This is normality in our present age." Or as Leary puts it, "'What will the neighbours think?' is the beginning and end of modern psychology."

Like the others mentioned in this article, Fromm rejects both Russia and the Americanised West. "Both systems are developing into managerial societies, their inhabitants well-fed, well-clad, having their wishes satisfied, and not having wishes which cannot be satisfied; automatons, who follow without force, who are guided without leaders, who make machines which act like men and produce men who act like machines; men, whose reason deteriorates while their intelligence rises, thus creating the dangerous situation of equipping man with the greatest material power without the wisdom to use it...."

"In the nineteenth century the problem was 'God is dead', in the twentieth century is the problem 'Man is dead'.... The danger of the past was that men became slaves. The danger of the future is that men may become robots."

His answer: a society where man no longer worships the goods and machines he produces. The attempt to abolish all radical criticism of society has been celebrated by the technocrats as "the end of ideology". What is required instead, says Fromm, is the end of idolatry. "Capital must serve labour, things must serve life." He calls for "Humanistic Communitarian Socialism" - decentralisation

and democratisation of decision-making and lower priority for materialistic objectives. The power of creativity and individual initiative must be restored. Man must become human.

What then is the future prospect for those mythical entities, The Younger Generation and Modern Man?

Are we moving from a TV-studio world to a psychedelic society (Leary), from a literate to an electronic culture (McLuhan), from an exploited to a liberated condition (Marcuse), from a sick to a sane society (Fromm)?

They are not optimistic. Things are changing, yes, but the shouts of the protestors are muffled beneath the clanking of the industrial machine. Consume! Conform! Kill! These are your orders for today, and, it seems, for tomorrow as well.

Many criticisms have been and should be made of these four opponents of the present society. I neither ask nor hope for agreement with all they have to say.

But if we want to ask what is happening to us today and what we can do to remove the undoubted faults of the existing system, whether these are caused by level 5 consciousness (Leary), literacy (McLuhan), capitalism (Marcuse), or alienation (Fromm), one place to look for the evidence is in the writings of the people whose thought I have summarised here.

In particular, these are the books to read: "The Politics of Ecstasy", Timothy Leary (Paladin); "Understanding Media", Marshall McLuhan (Sphere); "The Medium is the Massage", Marshall McLuhan & Quentin Fiore (Penguin); "One Dimensional Man", Herbert Marcuse (Sphere); "An Essay on Liberation", Herbert Marcuse (Allen Lane); "The Sane Society", Erich Fromm (Routledge & Kegan Paul); "The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise", Ronald Laing (Penguin); "The Making of a Counter-Culture", Theodore Roszak (Faber).

Or perhaps you agree with McLuhan that books are obsolete anyway.

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone "It means just what I chose it to mean. Neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "who is to be master. That is all."

Lewis Carroll

### TECHNOLOGY

Advocates argue that technology involves the systematic application of scientific or other organised knowledge to practical tasks. Technology needs organisation, because of the large amounts of investment required for its development. Therefore, it has led to the establishment of monolithic corporations dominating consumer markets. However, when technology is accepted as a doctrine, production becomes of paramount importance; all other ideals become secondary to it. Life is centred around the assembly line, and the aesthetic requirements of man become superfluous in comparison with his mad obsession with materialism. Technology, further involves the replacement of man by machines and since production has become the nucleus of life, man is led to a subjection by machines.

When technology is controlled by the private sector, there are high profits for the few, a high rate of employment for the few and mass redundancies for the many. Thus, as Harold Wilson argues, technology provides an opportunity for socialism that has never been offered to it before. However, under the 'Wilson Plan', there will be greater state control involving a greater bureaucracy, while the significance of the individual would dwindle.

The rise of technology has led to the development of state activity, but it has also created a new style of thought; 'the doctrine of technology'. Under this doctrine, all society is likened to one factory, in which the state is manager. The happiness of the workers is defined in material terms, it being the surplus of consumer goods that they are able to buy over what is merely needed to survive. The interests of the worker are centred in the factory, the collapse of which would lead initially to the collapse of society. However, since

man has many diverse material needs, the position of the factory will be preserved and the doctrine of technology appears invulnerable. Since things worth doing for their own sake such as art, philosophy and love, are not directly productive, they are deemed inefficient, and because of their irrelevance to production they are frowned upon. Therefore, technology results in the suppression of the arts by the supreme overlord of materialism.

However, there has been opposition to the spread of technology in its control of society. In 1812, for example, English weavers were smashing textile machines, burning factories, and assaulting factory managers in a desperate attempt to prevent the replacement of their traditional crafts by machines. The support of technology was demonstrated by the fact that 12,000 soldiers were deployed against the Luddite machine-breakers, a larger number than Wellington's troops in the 1808 Spanish campaign. The authorities realised that their power was only preserved as long as their control over production was maintained. If their position of power was to be enhanced, the progress of technology had to be furthered, and any threat to this progress was a threat to authority itself.

Marx argued that the subjection of man by machines led to "the mutilation of the labourer into a fragment of a man and to the distribution of every remnant of charm in his work, which could be turned into hated toil". Thus, technology leads to the suppression of the skilled crafts, the work of the labourer being confined to operating and maintaining a machine. He will show no interest in his work, his only motive being the pay packet that he will receive at the end of the week. Therefore, the status of the workman is degraded, so that he becomes just a tool in the process of production. With the introduction of more machinery, his position is furthered weakened by the possibility of unemployment. Thus, technology means that the labourer loses his skills, while when production becomes even more automated, he is made redundant, his difficulty in finding another job being emphasised by the fact that he is now classified as "unskilled" labour, and thus commands a lower wage.

Where technology has developed under capitalism it has always enhanced the wealth of a minority, since the means of production are in the hands of a few, and greater output will mean greater affluence for the minority. It has been claimed that under the private enterprise capitalist system, the machines become the enemy of the people who operate them, since their produce is

utilized only for the profit of their owners. However, technology exploited under socialism results in the subjection of the individual to the state, and eventually one arrives at a '1984' position, where the state is omnipotent. Therefore, although technology itself brings material progress to the world, the doctrine associated with it creates a society where everything is secondary to the aim of achieving greater production. The assembly line is established as a type of God. Technology further involves the greater organization of peoples' lives. In consumer markets, prices have to be fixed by the manufacturer, so that everything produced through technological advance can be sold. The liberty of the consumer is restricted, and the era when he was king of the market is ended. In the end technology must involve the erosion of personal freedom.

R.J.Parker

### Power, Politics, and Industry.

In recent weeks the Daily Express, the Daily Mail, and the majority of the Conservative Party have been condemning Trade Union leaders — and in particular Clive Jenkins — for trying to undermine the British Constitution. It was unfortunate that Clive Jenkins should have chosen such a flamboyant, not to say tactless and stupid, way to present his claims; nevertheless when the issue is stripped of personalities, it could be seen that nothing new had happened — a Union had been using its power to try to influence a decision.

To talk about 'industrial anarchy' defying a democratically elected Parliament, and holding the Government to ransom, is to forget that most pieces of legislation originate in the minds of pressure groups. The pressure group may have some particular way of influencing Parliament — for instance in the nineteenth century the railway companies had their own M.P.s in Parliament — or it may simply try to create a climate of public opinion which will persuade the Government to act. Obviously the current example of this is the policemen's wives who are trying to have capital punishment reintroduced for murderers of policemen.

What is the difference then, between trade unions and other pressure groups which causes the unions to be regarded - at least by some - as threatening our Constitution? As far as I can see they are Power, Purpose, Permanence and Publicity,

Any group which can "hold the Government to ransom" must have considerable power, and it is worth considering from where the unions derived their power. Throughout its history the chief power of the trade union movement <sup>was</sup> the right to withdraw labour. The actual strength of this right depends basically on two conditions, the degree of solidarity of the workers with the union, and on the degree of importance the employer places on keeping the unions at work.

It should follow from this that an effective strike by a union indicates (1) that the great majority of the union support the leadership, and (2) that the employer places a great deal of importance on these particular workers (i.e. he can't bring in strike breakers for some reason). Again it should follow that if the mass of workers wants something and the employer attaches a large degree of importance to keeping them at work then there is nothing wrong with the unions using their power to attain their goals. It must be remembered, however, that there comes a point at which an employer would find it more worthwhile to cease trading than to give in, and at that point all the power of the union is worthless - but neither the employer nor the union wants to reach that point.

Unions differ from most other pressure groups in that they are permanent organisations. This often leads to an attitude which sees their permanence and power as in some way a rival to Westminster. This is not so. The reason for the permanence of the organisation is that its ends are perpetually changing and the unions must always be there to provide the means to those ends.

What are the ends of the trade union movement? Simply to secure the best conditions of work for its members who individually have little bargaining power in a modern economy, but who en masse are just as important for continued production as land, capital and management. In general this end is obtained through negotiation from a position of strength, so that if management is not aware of the importance of labour it must be reminded by seeing how it can man-

-age without.

In other words, by striking! The strike disrupts the economy and the whole nation suffers (the press remind us) and the blame for disrupting the economy is automatically placed on the union. The union changed the status quo and stopped production, therefore they acted irresponsibly.

Management- who also form a very powerful pressure-group use this as one of their main weapons in the war of publicity against the unions. Over the last few years management have been winning this war easily. The press represent every strike as treason, while management are represented as being solely concerned with an export drive.

Strikes are undoubtedly harmful to the economy and should be avoided if at all possible. But there are two ways to avoid strikes: (i) the unions can avoid making demands which the management feel unable to meet and (ii) the management can concede to reasonable union demands without making every issue a trial of strength.

Strikers are not automatically irresponsible. Very often it is the employer who has the attitude of conceding nothing unless it is demanded, and once it is demanded is tempted to try to maintain the status quo in a trial of strength. This often produces the worst result, because if ultimately the management can afford to concede, the unions are likely to win the trial of strength anyway, which means that nothing has been gained and much has been lost by forcing the strike. The prime example of this has been the Government attitude over pay for teachers and nurses - "the community can't do without them, so they won't dare strike" - instead of which the attitude should have been: "the community can't do without them, so they should be paid high wages".

Many people who agree with these rights of the unions to take industrial action to achieve higher wages etc. draw a line between 'industrial' aims and 'political' aims, and then say that unions must not take 'industrial' action for 'political' ends. This ties up with the recent outcry over the threat of strikes in the B.U.A. take over and in the strike over dock nationalisation. These were supposedly political issues and therefore outside the scope of the unions.

Firstly, this line between politics and industry cannot be drawn (neither



can the line between politics and sport) - industrial action taken to increase wages as against profits is political (it can even be represented as class warfare) and the two issues mentioned above could be taken as 'industrial' as in both cases the workers felt their work conditions would be best served by national ownership.

Secondly, it should not be forgotten that both sides of industry are pressure groups extremely active in 'politics'. While the unions are pressing their wage claims openly, management protects its position a little more subtly by financing the Conservative Party (and supplying money to many of its M.P.s).

Industrial power means power, which means political power, particularly when politics is so concerned with the state of the economy. Unions have power because they are important to the economy and it is time that union power is accepted in the same way as management power. The factors of production, we are told, are land, labour, capital and management and all are equally essential to the economy.

A final point about Parliament and Government. Parliament may be legally sovereign, but the Government governs the country. Governments tend to move slowly unless pushed and it is the function of pressure groups to do the pushing. The more powerful the push, the more quickly the Government will take action. To talk of unions coercing the Government is to forget that the Government can push back and to forget that when the Government gives in, it is giving way to a very large section of the population who have a right to try to get the Government to act in a way they think best. A Labour Government is more easily swayed by union pressure because a very large part of its popular vote comes from union members and because the unions finance the Labour Party. The same is true about management influence over the Conservative Party, and thus the strength of union influence with the Government depends largely on the party in power, which depends on the popular democratic vote.

R.P. Hatfield.

SONNET

1/2  
If with surprise your eye should glance this line  
And think how strange a verse for me impart,  
T'is nothing more than a simple valentine  
By nature a sonnet from deep in a burning heart.  
A heart that is large but hath room for only one,  
For when times are bad or the sun hath set too soon,  
And life no longer trifles to be fun, (sick!)  
The thoughts of winter and his chilling Gloom  
Do fill me. T'is always then my mindful strife  
Doth make me long for summer and for thee.  
So when the sun is sometime absent from thy life  
And love hath no place, just think of me.  
For wheresoever I should wandering stray  
I shall love thee more than words can ever say.

R.J. Gower.

---

NEITHER GOD NOR MAN

This is about reality, truth, God, and all that sort of thing. I intend to produce a basic philosophical position and then apply it to Christianity and to humanism .

I hope it will be plain that my views on politics are directly derived from the position I take on these more basic subjects. The socialist who is unwilling to consider the nature of ethical judgements is as short-sighted as the scientist who is unwilling to consider the nature of reality.

These are things we simply cannot afford to ignore: the attempt to do so usually involves the adoption of unexamined assumptions. But whether one's conclusions on these subjects are explicit or not they underly all other decisions.

REALITY

We are born into a world where we find it necessary to make decisions because if we don't we don't like the consequences. The question is thus what is

the best basis for decision-making?

In any given situation, different decisions are generally found to have different results. It is therefore helpful to have a means of predicting what those results will be and a means of deciding which results we prefer.

These have been the roles of science and of ethics, to which both religions and political philosophies have contributed.

There is, then, no need to assume the existence of matter or even to ask whether or not it does exist, since all that we need to know is whether it helps us to assume its existence or not. Traditional science has been based on this assumption and though there are objections to it when it is applied without recognising its merely provisional character it is for most purposes very useful.

There are situations, however, where it breaks down, and where it may be more useful to interpret results of decisions in terms of (e.g.) energy waves rather than matter. Yet ultimately these, like time, colour, length, and all the rest, are merely inventions of the human mind to help us make decisions. Clocks do not merely measure time: they create it. The framework of scientific laws and lines of latitude and longitude are not features of the world itself. They are features of the means by which we seek to explain it.

#### TRUTH

That was reality. Now what about truth? Truth is essentially the communication of reality.

It is usually defined in words. Linguistic philosophy is about words. We think of truth and falsehood as being attributes of statements, series of words.

It is time to build a philosophy adequate not just for words but for other means of communication as well.

Its basis would be a definition of truth something like this - truth is the property possessed by a communication (e.g. statement, picture, sound, etc.) which produces a change in the state of mind in the person communicated to which enables him to obtain a particular objective with a greater degree of efficiency than otherwise.

This implies that truth is relative to (i) what the objective is; (ii) how you measure "efficiency"; (iii) the existing state of mind of the person communicated to.

Thus, formerly contradictory forms of words may each express a different facet of truth and be valid for different contexts and objectives.

## ETHICS

A similar approach to ethics would be to judge actions by their results and to accept that different actions would be right in different situations.

One could say that an action is right if it results in more happiness than would result from any other course of action in the same set of circumstances. I admit it is impossible to justify an ethical criterion as basic as this one since there is no satisfactory answer to why happiness is desirable, except that it is in fact desired.

The aim of the political system, as of everything else, should be to maximise happiness and should be constructed with that purpose in view.

## GOD

Let's apply these views to the existence of God. The question is not "Is there a God?" but "For what purposes, and in what circumstances, is it useful to assume there is a God?"

Belief in God and supernatural sanctions (e.g. hell) may often be an effective way of getting people to behave in the interests of others and in securing commitment to ideals such as compassion, charity, etc., (as well as nationalism, work, and "getting on in life"). It may also be valuable in giving a sense of meaning to someone's life and a feeling of commitment and hope, in a similar way to Marxism, Science, and all the other great religions.

Religious explanations of the universe may often be valuable as a means of answering questions such as "what is the origin of life?", "what is the origin of the earth?" Yet for that function of religion it is becoming less and less useful as science surpasses it in its efficiency.

For example, the case for the traditional Christian God appears to be based on three arguments: (a) everything has a cause, therefore the universe has a cause, therefore God caused it; (b) the universe looks as if it has been designed, therefore God designed it; (c) people have experiences they regard as revelations from God, therefore God causes them.

But, attempting to answer each of these in turn, (a) if everything has a cause, God has a cause, and to postulate Him solves nothing; (b) the universe may look as though it is designed because things have to be well adapted to their environment to survive, (if it is designed, it's been done very badly: there is a considerable amount of suffering which does little or nothing to increase free will or religious faith); (c) I accept the existence of spiritual or religious experience. The

question is how it is to be explained, and there seems no need to bring in God for this purpose, though religions are often powerful means of producing and exploring such experiences. No non-Christian view of life can afford to ignore their existence and significance for the people who experience them.

I have great sympathy with radical theologians trying to salvage the truth from the remains of Christian belief, who will say that the sort of God I have referred to isn't what they mean by the word at all. Their fault is, however, that they are not radical enough: they should continue to throw out the non-essentials as they are trying to, and although this should perhaps result in retaining the word "God" as a label for the source of spiritual experience, for me these non-essentials include the distinctively Christian parts as well. Perhaps that's what some of them have already done.

#### WHAT SORT OF HUMANISM?

I call, then, for a form of humanism based on the affirmation of the importance of what happens to human beings and a rejection of attempts to enslave them.

Yet humanism is all too often the word given not to the spirit of doubt and humanity but to the worship of technology. This is fundamentally anti-humanist. We must say that technology is to serve man, and not the other way around.

I believe that all this entails a form of humanism that is socialist, i.e. believes that things should be run in the interest of humanity as a whole, and not just in that of a section of it, whether an individual, a race, a nation, or a class,

This is opposed both to nationalism and to materialism, which were combined in the 1968 Backing Britain Campaign which culminated in a full-page advertisement in "The Times" signed by amongst others, David Frost, Robert Maxwell, and Arnold Weinstock, and including a wide variety of suggestions as to how every man can do his duty and help "Great Britain Limited" ("Running Britain is like running a business" - precisely the trouble) including suggestions for children ("Organise a Help Britain Pen Pal Club. Write to foreign embassies in London for addresses of kids your age abroad. Make friends for

for yourself, new future business contacts for your country."), millionaires, trade unionists, retired folk ("Hoard old news papers and silver paper."), and motorists ("Drive carefully. Accidents cost the country thousands of millions of pounds every year.>").

So in rejecting the traditional Christian idea of God we must reject its substitutes as well, such as "Great Britain Limited", television, royalty, the motor car, UCCA, Hitler, Stalin, and the pop record charts.

Neither God nor Mammon.

V.F. Anderson.

GET YOUR PRIORITIES RIGHT IN PRISON

PART 3

The Story So Far:

Little Johnny (21), size 3' 1", is picked up for having his share of Communist sense. The democratic policemen are determined that Johnny's strong I.Q. be degraded in order that he should be brought to his knees, making him 1' 8", and so just high enough for a kick (or kicks, probably kicks) from the hip. The police conspire, and plant Johnny with two left boots which they say he stole from the front of Footsore Shoestore. Nobody notices, however, that two of the policemen have no left shoes.

Now all are in the Fuzz Station so READ ON:-

JOHNNY: I'm unguilty.

1ST FUZZ: Too late, you're guiltified.

2ND FUZZ: Never mind, Johnny, (slashing him friendly like with the station razor) we all make mistakes. Look, you cut yourself shaving!!

(CHORUS of HA! HA!)

JOHNNY: Shaving my left breast? (examining slash,) Now they'll never believe your allegations, lousy copper!

3RD FUZZ: According to the rules you are now allowed bail, a phone call, a meal, or as recently legislated, a chat with the arresting officers to come to an arrangement. However, the rules apply only to firemen without permits and illegalities by pensioned-off athletes, and my wife, who got life for assault in a cellar.

Johnny sees he's cornered.

### 1.35. Dinner over

Searched, juverinely (sic!) assaulted by an S.S. Mother, substituted at birth for the original, I laughed for the first time intelligently. My mind threw custard pies in retaliation. My first win!

Clean, I take my seat.

On my father's machine and take £5 from the saddle satchel, 4-year old me accomplished the first rechanneling of the housekeeping money. I was busting the budget and leaving no clues.....

THE END

The outpourings of a tortured  
SPEEDFREAK, smuggled out of one of  
H.M. Prisons.

### FOR THE MORE INTELLIGENT READER

In the non-relativistic approximation, the angular velocity  $w$  of a charged particle moving in a plane normal to a uniform magnetic field is independent of its kinetic energy  $E$ . Show that a relativistic treatment of the motion gives the energy dependence  $w = w_0(m_0c^2/(E + m_0c^2))$  where  $m_0$  is the rest mass of the particle and  $w_0$  the limiting (non-relativistic) value of  $w$  when  $E \ll m_0c^2$ . Find the values of  $E$  in electron volts for which  $w$  is reduced to 99% of  $w_0$  when the particle is (a) an electron, (b) a proton, and (c) a  ${}^6\text{Li}^+$  ion. (The rest energy  $m_0c^2$  of the electron is  $0.511 \cdot 10^6 \text{Ev.}$ )

Why is this calculation relevant to the use of the cyclotron for accelerating breakfast cereal to high energies?

SPRINGBOK CRICKET TOUR, 1970

In recent years the atrocities of apartheid, the discriminatory policy applied by the Nationalist Party in the Republic of South Africa, have been further exposed through the sporting medium. The Olympic Games Committee have ruled South Africa out of the last two games at Tokyo and Mexico on the grounds that no black South African may be selected for a team representing South Africa. This incidentally scorns those who say that South Africa brought politics into sport when they refused to accept the M.C.C. touring side which included Basil d'Oliveira. Politics has been in sport for a long time and the two are inevitably inseparable. The sensation of the 1969/70 Springbok rugby tour has also stirred the minds of many an ignorant observer. At present there is great controversy over the coming cricket tour by the Springboks in England later this year. So far the Government have not interfered with the M.C.C. decision confirming that the tour will take place. But should the tour go on?

A majority, I should think, support the coming tour. Their reasons, and here I am obviously talking about the British people, probably subscribe to one of these three opinions: (1) politics and sport should be totally isolated from each other and cricket fans should not miss an England versus South Africa test match because there is some political controversy between the two countries; (2) to cancel the invitation of South Africa would be to copy South Africa's bad example of not accepting another country's selected team (e.g. the M.C.C. side including d'Oliveira) and Britain should set a better example by not interfering with South Africa's team selection and accepting it; or (3) communications between the United Kingdom and South Africa should be maintained wherever possible so that British opinion, often expounded by demonstrators, may still influence South Africans and that a way to a negotiable solution remains open.

Those who are against the cricket tour also have three main arguments; (1) the British Government or the M.C.C. should not accept the South African team on principle. Sport is a means to enjoyment for all and if the selection of a team is restricted in such a way, it cannot be morally justified in any society which has any sense of humanity; (2) the tour should be cancelled as it would cost Britain a great deal financially and would be a



potential danger to human safety assuming that violent demonstrations would take place. Demonstrations would also completely spoil the cricket matches and they would not be worth playing; (3) Britain should follow a policy of isolating South Africa so that pressure is brought to bear on the people as their freedom is restricted. This would eventually lead to a peaceful solution to the problem in South Africa.

I believe that the tour should be cancelled for the first reason stated above. By supporting the tour one is condoning apartheid whether one likes it or not. One is accepting a team which represents 16% of the total South African population (and which has the audacity to call itself the South African cricket team!); one is accepting the sporting situation in South Africa where facilities for blacks are negligible compared with the luxurious facilities available to whites; and one is accepting that sport has nothing to do with politics despite the fact that politics regulate all sporting rules in South Africa and that the policy of the South African Cricket Association is practically dictated by the Government. I reject these principles purely on moral grounds although they could be faulted by most other criteria one wished to use. The present position in South Africa as regards sport does not even logically follow the stated apartheid policy. The official policy stated its aims to be an eventual division of South Africa into states for black and white with separate black and white institutions. Already there are black hospitals and white hospitals, black schools and white schools, black sports clubs (if they can be called clubs) and white clubs, etc. Why is there not a black South African cricket team and a white South African Cricket team? Taking apartheid to its logical conclusion we see that the apartheid policy is not even being executed correctly. Even those who support apartheid cannot justify the present sporting situation! No sport is, as the dictionary says "fun or diversion" under these circumstances, and I do not support a sporting team which pretends to provide this for a whole country while only providing it for 16%. I believe that one must reject this coming tour on principle and give hope to the unfortunate majority in South Africa whose morale lessens daily.

What about the other 5 points of view mentioned earlier? I have already indicated why politics and sport cannot be separated from one another - to do this would be to see the world in an artificial light. The second

reason for supporting the tour is another preposterous statement. For a person to think that by not interfering with South Africa's team selection, the selection of teams in the future will change is utterly unreasonable. South Africa would in fact gain confidence from such a move realising that however insulting and immoral they are their cricket team would still be accepted in the U.K. This argument is totally unjustified in that it would do nothing to counteract apartheid and might make South Africa's position even stronger. Many people put a very good case for maintaining communications with the Republic and if I thought that this would have any effect I would support it. But what people do not realise is that influence is minimal and that in many cases communications worsen the situation. Demonstrations, it is a fact, alienate South Africans and make them more nationalistic. Peaceful, organised demonstrations with widespread support might have a great effect but such occurrences are inconceivable. South Africans hear (through their rather undemocratic mass media) of the violence of demonstrations and of the long-haired youths who take part in them. They conclude that the mass of British people are not against them and that it is "thugs" that stir up all the trouble. So instead of influencing South Africans towards a more liberal policy demonstrations merely do the opposite. Communications have little effect if any in solving the problem and therefore are no reason for allowing the tour to proceed.

The second reason for cancelling the tour is a purely selfish one. Maybe it is sensible to prevent an unnecessary financial loss but this should not be the primary consideration. If the continuation of the tour would lead to a happy solution it would not matter how much it cost. With respect, I regard those people who hold this view to be rather apathetic and in some ways inhumane. Finally there are those who would follow a policy of isolation. This is all very well, but it is difficult to justify cutting sporting links with South Africa while maintaining trade links with her. As much as I would like to see all links with South Africa broken I regard it as a practically impossible task and probably in the end not worth all the trouble. The effect of isolating South Africa would probably be less than expected because there would be many countries willing to take Britain's place. Isolation is more justified than communication but it is an inevitably inconsistent policy.

The coming tour should therefore be rejected on principle. This would also have the beneficial by-products of: (i) isolating the sporting life of South Africa further and forcing concessions to be made; (ii) preventing violent demonstrations which alienate South Africans and cost Britain dearly; and (iii) proving once and for all that politics and sport are inseparable. Admittedly, it is the easy way out but it is also most definitely the correct way. Many other arguments, not only the limited ones mentioned here, have valid points to make, but all are either unjustified or inconsistent. To reject the tour on principle is not only justified but is also the best way of influencing the deplorable policy of apartheid which all who respect humanity wish to see obliterated.

L.J. SACKS

"President Nixon deserves our understanding for championing the cause of democracy against aggression throughout the world".

- Daily Express, 29th April 1970.

"The Pentagon now has files containing information on 15 million dissenting Americans".

- Daily Express, 30th April 1970.

## SCIENCE VERSUS EXPERIENCE

The twentieth century is the century of the technologist. It is true, of course, that we can trace our scientific tradition back to the Renaissance, but our century is the century of the scientist par excellence. Only in our century has science replaced religion as the predominant ideology in the popular mind.

The scientist has also replaced the statesman as our hero-figure. Gladstone, Disraeli, and Churchill have been replaced by Chapman Pincher, Desmond Morris, and Christiaan Barnard. "Science Fair" shows our children the benefits (and rewards) of measuring variations in the lengths of earthworms, while for us "Tomorrow's World" allows us to project ourselves in fantasy onto Raymond Baxter and James Burke, sampling a new single-seater hovercraft-dodgem car or putting on a space-suit in a mock-up of the Apollo capsule. "Pair-bond", "hexachlorophene", and "extra-vehicular activity" are heard more often and probably more widely understood than "socialism", "God", or "love".

I don't regret the passing of the statesman as the popular hero-figure. Statesmanship, or gunboatsmanship as it might be more properly called, doesn't seem a particularly <sup>pleasant</sup> occupation for us to idolise. It is probably better from this point of view that we have nondescript politicians like Wilson and Heath than that we have 'statesmen' like the Duke of Edinburgh or Enoch Powell, to whom all too many people would be willing to abdicate the responsibility of criticism as well as of government. But how valid is our new ideology?

The scientist is the so-called "detached observer". The true usefulness of science is that it allows us via our experience of the behaviour of things to predict their future behaviour and thus to predict our future experience. Thus, since the process begins and ends with personal experience there is a good case for claiming that science is not objective at all. Nevertheless, the viewpoint of the "detached observer" is all right as long as we are dealing with inanimate objects, which is all that the inventors of the scientific method ever meant to deal with. Since the inanimate objects do not 'experience', we can afford to concern ourselves only with their behaviour. We do not have to go beyond this into realms which natural science cannot deal with, and induce from this behaviour what the experience of the objects themselves are. The approximations made by natural science are allowable.

But the scientific method was too important an invention to keep for the

scientists. The nineteenth century and the early twentieth saw the extension of the scientific method to economics, politics, and psychology. The old approximations were applied unquestioningly to the new field, mainly because the scientists had forgotten they had made any. Social science became the new order of the day.

The difference between people and things, we may speculate, is that the person 'observed' by the scientist experiences the world every bit as much as the scientist. The field of personal relations is essentially different from the scientist's inanimate world for precisely this reason. It is of the utmost importance to us as persons not only to observe other people's behaviour but also to think about their experiences, and most important, their experiences of ourselves, of which their behaviour is a function. As Ronald Laing puts it:-

"People may be observed to sleep, eat, walk, talk, etc. in relatively predictable ways. We must not be content with observations of this kind alone. Observations of behaviour must be extended by inference to attributions about experience. Only when we can begin to do this can we really construct the experiential-behavioural system that is the human species."

Science cannot help us with the relation between behaviour and experience. We can only discover this by our own personal relationships with another person or people. It is a two-way process that is inapplicable by the scientist who takes the view of the "detached observer". And this is where we can criticise so-called social science not only on the grounds that it is inadequate but also on the grounds that it cannot properly function.

There can be no such thing as a "detached observer" in personal relations. Not only is another person's behaviour my experience. My behaviour is another person's experience. Moreover, my experience of you affects my behaviour, which influences your experience of me, which affects your behaviour, which influences my experience of you, and so on. I cannot be a "detached observer" viewing your behaviour "objectively". For your behaviour will depend on your experience of me, amongst other things, and this automatically means I cannot be "detached". Again, Ronald Laing:-

"It is quite possible to study the visible, audible, smellable, effulgences of human bodies, and much study of human behaviour has been in those terms. One can lump together very large numbers of units of behaviour and regard them as a statistical population, in no way different from the multiplicity constituting a system of non-human objects. But one will not be studying persons."<sup>2</sup>

The ultimate nonsense is that branch of "scientific psychology" known as the behavioural school. Psychology, the study of the psyche, without attention to the psyche, the experiential-behavioural relation.

McLuhan was referring to this invalidation of the scientific attitude of the "detached observer" when he said:

"there  
is  
absolutely  
no  
inevitability

as  
long  
as  
there  
is  
a  
willingness  
to  
contemplate  
what  
is  
happening"<sup>3</sup>

By this he meant that the existence of experience would rule out any 'Boyle's Law' of human relationships. Any Law would have to be different for every situation, as there is no inevitability, and this of course would be no law at all.

As a diversion it is interesting to see how McLuhan explains the growth of science and arrives at roughly the same position as I have outlined. Since his explanation is McLuhan-style and therefore completely irreproducible in this literate medium, this is quite difficult. But a characteristic piece might be:

"The Renaissance Legacy.

The Vanishing Point - Self-Effacement  
The Detached Observer.  
No Involvement!

The viewer of Renaissance art is systematically placed outside the frame of reference . A piazza for everything and everything in its piazza.

The instantaneous world of electric informational media involves all of us, at once. No detachment or frame is possible."<sup>4</sup>

But the first McLuhan piece is central. "There is absolutely no inevitability as long as there is a willingness to contemplate what is happening." The question is, has scientific materialism reacted to its own incapacity in the field of personal relations by trying to draw people into its own inanimate field of non-being? The answer to this must be an unequivocal "yes".

Ever since Adam Smith wrote "The Wealth of Nations" in 1776, the scientific treatment of people like things has in fact made them act more like things than people. Take Adam Smith's own theory of the division of labour. In an atmosphere of capitalism and the work ethic the application of his principle did indeed permit mass production, but it also resulted in people being forced to do dull repetitive jobs, narrowly

limiting or perhaps extinguishing their minds altogether: alienation. As Ronald Laing puts it:

"Can human beings be persons today? Can a man be his actual self with another man or woman? Before we can ask such an optimistic question as 'What is a personal relationship?', we have to ask if a personal relationship is possible or, are persons possible in our present situation? We are concerned with the possibility of man. This question can only be asked through its facets. Is love possible? Is freedom possible?"<sup>5</sup>

His own answer is clear enough:

"What we call 'normal' is a product of repression, denial, splitting, projection, introjection and other forms of destructive action on experience. It is radically estranged from the structure of being.....What we think is less than what we know: what we know is less than what we love: and what we love is so much less than what there is. And to that precise extent we are so much less than what we are."<sup>6</sup>

What science then is valid? Must we dismiss science as a method as well as science as an ideology? What I have said implies that I consider natural science's assumptions allowable. But even the natural scientist must be prepared to accept that these assumptions are assumptions and that even things are only things-as-the-scientist-experiences-them. They are not objective. For example, if humans were equipped with a sense-organ sensitive to, say, magnetic fields, the way in which things are described in scientific experiments would be quite different. At present they are "objectively" described in terms of what we can see, touch, smell, hear and taste. The scientist must realise that the results of his experiment are thus not useful because of their "objectivity", but because of their predictions about experience. When this is realised, the fact that science uses 'capta' (Things taken from the world according to how we experience it) rather than 'data' (things given) does not matter. 'Capta' must be the only meaningful raw material for natural science.

But what of social science? If social science is really a harmful force, a cause of alienation, then it must be replaced or at least must realise its own limits and dangers. We are left from the above with the realisation that human situations are essentially inter-personal. To the extent that they are not, they are frustrating, alienating. Inter-personal relations are only capable of study in small groups where the person is completely involved. The novel, the autobiography, will be the books

of the new social "scientists". "Social science" will be valuable in as much as it helps us relate to other persons in our lives, and will be written from an experiential viewpoint. But this doesn't rule out the possibility of large scale theories. What it does mean is that such large scale theories will be recognised as only partly valid and will no longer have to attempt to be "objective".

None of this rules out the benefits of technology but we must have technology without technocracy. The computer was made for man, not man for the computer. Technology has an important part to play in the provision of material goods, for it is impossible for a human being to be a person if his life is limited to doubts about the provision of food, or other such things. Some material goods are necessary to free people from materialism. Any advances technology can bring, in the field of automation especially, will be necessary for the eventual provision of a gift economy. But we must make sure that it is the production processes that are automated, not us. Until then, the best way to cut down alienation will be by socialist distribution of goods, involving a greater degree of equality of wealth.

Moreover, technology will no doubt in future have tremendous effect if used properly to allow us new modes of experience. Even the technology of the space program has managed to give us L.S.D. Technology orientated towards the specific extension of experience will be able to do even better.

But which is going to win, us or them, experience or science? Today's science undergraduates are more and more cut off from the 'art' or 'social science' students who form the rebellion. Links with industry outside the university are considered more important than links with other ideas inside the university. Sealed in the campus equivalents of the Sixth Science Room or the Advanced Biology Laboratory today's science undergraduates must become tomorrow's technocrats. The students at the London School of Economics shouldn't have been tearing down the gates inside their own building, they should have been along the road at I.C.L. We must take 'Nelkon & Parker' and 'Keynes and After' off the reading lists and put Ronald Laing, Marshall McLuhan and Lewis Carroll on instead. Better still, get rid of the reading lists. You don't need L.S.D. in the coffee machine. But it would be nice.



- <sup>1</sup>"The Politics of Experience" - R.D. Laing (Penguin Books 1969) p. 21
- <sup>2</sup>Ibid p21.
- <sup>3</sup>"The Medium is the Massage" - Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore (Penguin Books, 1967) p.25, but better in the original.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid, pp52-53, but infinitely better in the original.
- <sup>5</sup>"The Politics of Experience" P. 20
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid,, pp 23 and 26.

PRIZEGIVING OR 3 OLD LADIES DANCED  
ROUND THE TABLE

If you want to get get a prize  
you've got to wear disguise  
For as we all know  
No scholars<sup>1</sup> let it grow.

So here's to the new prize  
The prize we all enjoy  
Given by Sir James<sup>2</sup>  
To the shortest-haired boy.

R.D. Lloyd.

- <sup>1</sup>.some ancient authorities read scholars
- <sup>2</sup>.some ancient authorities read jam.

We would like to thank the followin' without whose help the production of ACID would not have been possible: M.J. Hugill, P. Gibson, A.E. Smith, H.M. Maslin . also the following, without whose help this production of ACID would not have been<sup>11</sup> legible: A.P. Stout, A.T. Stout, E.F. Stout, B.P. Stout, C.P. Stout.