



Old Hickory's Diary - 9

Diary Entry date 1st August 2005 ...

This time Old Hickory looks at::

- 1) The death of Edward Heath and thus, reflections on his life;
- 2) The bombing of London and the aftermath
- 3) The topic of the G8 summit; aid to Africa and climate change.

Heath

Sir Edward Heath died on Sunday, 17 July 2005, some days after his birthday celebrating the age of 89. He died at home with some of his friends in attendance. All parliamentary business was suspended on Monday, 18 July 2005 as a mark of respect for him and some of the members of the House of Commons competed to pay tributes, most of them very friendly. He was the first of those who are today the walking oxymorons ruining the Conservative party with the fetish of the need to change viz. a sincere moderniser. Many thought him more of a Whig than a Tory and that idea seems to have something in it. But he was certainly no liberal. He hated the market and loved the state.

Oddly, the Tories allowed him to fight four elections, despite him losing three of them. They never let his successor fight a fourth election, though, she won three in a row. Heath thought himself thereby hard treated and he rejoiced when Thatcher was ousted from power. The man was confused all his life as to what justice consisted of. He never was good

at seeing things as they were. But then none of the modernising epigones are either, including Michael Portillo, the latest daft “moderniser” – or is that now to be Alan Duncan?

Heath worshipped power all his life, and his main quest was to create a superstate in Europe that could influence the world. He was brought up to be British and, for some reason, he even thought of himself as a conservative. But he swept that all away in his quest to have power and influence in the world. Why people feel he covered up the aim for the superstate in the 1975 referendum has never been clear to me, but many do say that he only pretended that the project was a common market that year. He seemed to be clear enough about the superstate at the time to me. I wrote him a letter in 1975 saying that he was a warmonger, who realised that Europe had the potential to be top state, even ahead of the USSR and the USA, as it had a bigger population and only needed some organisation to become number one. He wrote back saying that he was glad that I agreed with him! This could have been my bad handwriting, or it might have been that he just thought that anyone who saw the chance of belonging to the potential top dog state could hardly object to it.

Lady Thatcher, as she now is, made her peace with Heath a few years back after a long campaign against her by him. She commented on his death thus: “Ted Heath was a political giant. He was also, in every sense, the first modern Conservative leader -- by his humble background, his grammar school education and by the fact of his democratic election. As Prime Minister, he was confronted by the enormous problems of post-war Britain. If those problems eventually defeated him, he

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

had shown in the 1970 manifesto how they, in turn, would eventually be defeated. For that, and much else besides, we are all in his debt.”

Tony Blair and Michael Howard also paid tribute to Heath. Blair said: “He was a man of great integrity and beliefs he held strongly from which he never wavered. He will be remembered by all who knew him as a political leader of great stature and significance.” That tends to forget the great U-turn, that Mrs Thatcher learnt from his folly not to repeat.

Howard described Heath as: “one of the political giants of the second half of the twentieth century. He was the last Conservative leader who had served in the Second World War. As chief whip, as a senior cabinet minister and, of course, as prime minister he made an enormous contribution to the political life of our country. He will always be remembered as a prime minister who took Britain into the European Economic Community but his achievements went far beyond that. His passing will be mourned far and wide.” Others will not regret the passing of Heath. Heath did phone up the Central Office of the Conservative party to say “rejoice, rejoice, rejoice!” when Mrs Thatcher fell from power, and maybe some rang up to say the same about the passing of Heath on Sunday. But, as Heath is said to have lost interest in politics in his final years, many others may well have got rather tired of waiting for him to die. They too, might well have lost interest in ringing up by then.

Heath is a useful example of social mobility. Few from the masses rise to the top but, by contrast, quite a few at the top have come from the bottom; and though this has long been the case, but there is no shortage of sociologists that overlook that fact. Edward Richard George Heath was a carpenter's son from Broadstairs in Kent. His mother was also of the same humble beginnings. She

had been a lady's maid before her marriage. It just shows that the class society is the open society, but the sociologists all too often tend to conflate class with caste, in thought if not in word. Their case depends on caste and makes nonsense if we think of merely class. The difference they overlook, or forget, is that class is fluid and caste is needed to make the unrealistic points they want to make about British society today.

After winning a scholarship at the age of ten, Heath went to a grammar school at Chatham House, Ramsgate, from where he won an organ scholarship to Balliol College, Oxford. He had been playing the piano in formal lessons from the age of eight and he soon became accomplished on the organ to win this scholarship. He also joined the school debating society and showed an interest in politics whilst very young. Despite being in the school orchestra, politics took the helm with him early on. It has been said that this made him a bit of an outsider at school.

In October 1935, Heath went to the University of Oxford to be a commoner of Balliol College. Heath read philosophy, politics and economics, and he eventually got a second-class degree. He was disappointed not to get a first, but he had pursued such an active social life, in music societies as well as political ones, that he eventually felt he had not really lost out. In addition to the organ scholarship, his parents supported him and he got £90 a year from the Kent Education Committee. Balliol was then alone among the men's colleges of Oxford in having competitive entry for commoners. He was elected president of the junior common room for 1938-39. He took part in music as well as politics at Oxford but the latter was his chief interest. He was opposed to the Chamberlain government as he took a dim view of Hitler's Germany, where he visited to see for himself, and he also spent time in Spain and was against fascism there also. On Monday 18 July

2005, Michael Howard told the House of Commons: "In the famous 1938 Oxford by-election he [Heath] opposed the Conservative candidate, Quintin Hogg, and campaigned instead for A. D. Lindsay, the Master of Balliol, who stood on an anti-appeasement platform". He did this, though he thought of himself, long since, as a Conservative.

He was elected to Parliament for the Conservative party in the 1950 election, at the age of 34. He was sent by Macmillan to attempt to get into the slowly growing European superstate in the 1950s and it remained his chief cause from then on. For some reason, Heath was chosen as the Conservative leader in the first democratic election (1965) that the Tories organised. Alec Douglas Home, the leader they were replacing, hardly seemed to be a smart Alec and indeed he confessed to going the way the wind blows in the title of his autobiography. Most must have thought that an election instead of the traditional 'emerging leader' method that the Conservative party had hitherto used would be better. Weak as Home seemed, he does look to be a bit better than Butler, whom Macmillan (himself a bit weak) kept out by pushing for Home. But the 1965 election turned up Heath! He looked weaker than any of them. Far weaker than Enoch Powell or Reginald Maudling, whom he beat in the election for leadership. Powell came last, but it ought to have been Heath that came last, for he was inferior to the other two. The Tories have been hopeless at getting leaders ever since, and it was only by luck that they got Mrs Thatcher and William Hague, their only two adequate leaders since. Geoffrey Howe tells of how hard the decision was for him. He supported Powell on principle but on meeting Michael Alison, who had worked with Powell, he was surprised to hear that he favoured Heath, as he supposed that Heath had better judgement. Howe put the case for Powell, but was impressed by what

Alison said and changed his mind to vote for Heath. Howe discovered, later, that Alison was so impressed by what he had said that he had voted for Powell [*Conflict of Loyalty* (1994) p39].

It was no surprise that Heath lost the 1966 election. But what a turn up for the books when he won in June 1970! He soon set about making mistakes. Before long, he put the UK on a three day week, and power cuts, the result of his inept confrontations with the unions, were a norm of his rule. Unemployment was soon over the million mark for the first time since the 1930s, and this number has not dropped significantly below a million ever since. Heath's love of Keynesianism resulted in stagflation, showing the trade off between inflation and mass unemployment to be a myth. The Phillips curve was refuted. Heath's old teacher at Oxford, John Hicks, wrote a book *The Crisis of Keynesianism* (1975) as a result. Heath finally put the question to the public in 1974 as to just who was to rule; himself or the miners? As the British constitution stipulated that it was Wilson rather than the miners who was the alternative to Heath, it was Wilson who was returned at the election. But Heath would not accept this answer. He attempted to form a Liberal/Tory coalition. After a bit of Jeremy Thorpe, the then Liberal leader, coming and going from Downing Street, Heath realised that he would have to let Wilson in. The grand piano had to be moved out. He had another go in the second election of 1974, but the answer was an even more convincing No.

Heath was very discontented at being removed as party leader in 1975, after those two 1974 defeats. He was an opposition member to the Conservative party for the rest of his life, boring from within and thinking – or at least saying – that by his U-turn he had reached political perfection. He thought it exceedingly silly of Mrs Thatcher to go back to the market rather than try the three day week that he seemed to think was

so clearly better. In this quest to put Mrs Thatcher right, he went on and on and on and on.

In the 1975 common market referendum, he took second place to Roy Jenkins. He was yesterday's man, but he continued with the quest of criticising the new Conservative leader. There really was not much else he could do in politics. He hated the House of Lords, far too traditional for him, and it often seemed that he had vague hopes of a comeback as leader. It has not been usual, until very recently, for ex-leaders to resign from the cabinet and Heath wanted to go on implementing his plans for the warmongering superstate at the Foreign Office. He was under the firm impression that he would become Foreign Secretary but, as Stephen Berry said on the LA discussion list: "He hated Thatcher and she disliked him. In 1979 when she took power, she offered Heath the job of ambassador to the U.S. A double insult. He expected a job in government and he was very anti-American". He served 50 years in the Commons but most of them were on the backbenches. Heath fought the 1997 election but on October 24, 2000, the day after he conducted the election for the new Speaker, he announced that he would be retiring from the Commons at the end of that Parliament. He would certainly not go into the House of Lords. That was a bit too traditional or conservative for him. He consequently retired at the June 2001 general election.

Heath did have the merit to see that the Gulf War of the early 1990s was not about oil, as many people felt at the time. He correctly saw that if there was a war, some oil would be destroyed and that would make oil that bit more expensive, though Bush senior got the Saudis to largely pay for it. That ploy tended to obfuscate the objective waste the war caused for those that did not want to think much about it. In that first war with Iraq, Heath played the part later

played by George Galloway in the second war by attempting to make peace rather than have a war. He asked Saddam Hussein to release the British hostages as a gesture of good will. But this quest to smooth things over peacefully failed.

Heath never married. He would not have been too good at seeing his wife's point of view. He was eminent in music and sailing as well as in politics. He once conducted a top orchestra at the Albert Hall with reasonable success, and he competed at an international level at sailing by being the captain of Britain's winning Admiral's Cup team in 1971.

Summing Heath's life up, the sometime Labour MP Tony Benn, who became good friends with Heath, having in common with him an infinite capacity for sheer error, said, with his usual unwitting irony: "He was a far greater figure than Mrs Thatcher. She did enormous damage and his analysis of what she did was correct. He was to the left of Tony Blair". If we take "left" as free trade and "right" as protectionism, as they were on the wings of the eighteenth century French Assembly, then that is exactly wrong. But most have got the left/right split exactly wrong since the rise of the Fabians in the 1880s had the old Tory ideas as "socialist" and claimed them as "left". If we take Benn as an anti-authority then he sums Heath up fairly well.

The London Bombings and the Aftermath

The biggest news so far this year has been the London bombs of 7/7/2005. More than 55 eventually died from the injuries caused and over a hundred others needed medical attention. Three bombs went off, all at 8.50am, on the Underground and a later one on a number 30 bus at Tavistock Square, near

Russell Square. The four bombers were Mohammad Sidique Khan, 30, Germaine Lindsay, 19, Hasib Hussain, 18, and Shehzad Tanweer, 22. CCTV caught them with the bombs on their backs in Luton at 0720 BST on Thursday 7 July.

On Thursday 14 July 2005 two major opponents of the war in Iraq, Robin Cook of the Labourites and Kenneth Clarke of the Conservative party appeared on *The Week* BBC1 to say that whilst the said war was a factor, it was by no means the only factor, and maybe not even the major one, in the London bombings. They conformed, as much as they could, to the idea that was pushed by the leadership of their parties, to deny any link to the invasion of Iraq, and to say that it was part of the great problem of worldwide terrorism. Others, not those two, had even suggested that the bombings justified the said invasion after all, rather than, as common sense might suggest, that Iraq was a stimulus to the London attack. But they could only go so far to meet this official response, and both of them did admit that the invasion was a factor.

The proponents of this official denial make a few good points, as one needs to do when up against common sense. Common sense is like a big hill that makes any new theory set against it uphill work, but it can be overcome with good arguments or true observations and the advantage of novelty and freshness. When the arguments against common sense are refuted, or even when they get older, it is often as if one is suddenly on the far side of the hill and heading rapidly down the other side. We have been told that the 9/11 happened before the invasion of Iraq, rather than after it. That many terrorist bombings round the world, like the recent one in Turkey, were in states that did not support the Iraq invasion. The bombings were against our way of life instead, runs this official cross-party response.

On Monday, 18 July 2005, the issue was highlighted in a report from a British think tank, *Chatham House*, which said that “the UK government has been conducting counter-terrorism policy 'shoulder to shoulder' with the US, not in the sense of being an equal decision-maker, but rather as a pillion passenger compelled to leave the steering to the ally in the driving seat”... The invasion “gave a boost to the al-Qaeda network's propaganda, recruitment and fundraising... There is no doubt that the situation over Iraq has posed particular difficulties for the UK, and for the wider coalition against terrorism.” Professor Paul Wilkinson of the University of St Andrews is one of the authors of the report that nevertheless tends to back the official response: “There is no doubt that Britain was on the target list before the invasion of Iraq” he said. Yet he still maintains that: “The conflict itself was a setback in our struggle against al-Qaeda.” His case is that Iraq is a factor, but not the only factor. André sees a big role for al-Qaeda though books like *Al-Qaeda* (2003) by Jason Burke tend to hold that it is more of an idea than an actual organisation. Wilkinson clearly does not agree with that thesis. However, it does seem to be largely the case.

It is clearly the case that the invasion has stimulated opposition, but it seems to be true that this stimulus is not the major factor in the London bombing. The major factor is the meme that links belief in Islam to death amongst many teenage Muslims, if not amongst the adults. I first noticed this meme in the early 1970s in Birmingham and I witnessed it many times since. On meeting Muslims, they invariably told me how eager they were to die for their belief in Islam. My reply was that no one can die for a mere belief, as they maintained, and that they were conflating beliefs with values. There was nothing political in any of the discussions I ever had with them. It was my atheism up against their religion. We

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

had similar ideas to each other as I held they did not really believe in Islam, but valued it as a tradition, owing to loyalty and the like, whilst they, invariably, held that no one was truly an atheist. They said that I was really a Christian. But this highly emotional willingness to die for the faith was a major feature of all the young men I met over a few decades up till 1997. This has now found an outlet in recent politics rather like all the practice of grandiose public speaking on the part of Churchill finally found a suitable topic in his wartime speeches from 1939 on. Clearly, Iraq is a factor but the reaction might not be in the form of any suicide bombings without this repeatedly rehearsed meme of seeking to die for Islam. That, I take to be the major factor. Islam remains a live religion, and thus it is political – as was Christianity before modern society pushed it into being a personal matter. Modern society is doing the same to Islam, but we are, at the present time, witnessing a reaction. That was what the Rushdie affair was all about. Liberalism and science do not mean to destroy religion, and they welcome religion of all types on principle, but any live religion needs to monopolise, thereby forcing conformity, hopefully by law, and that is illiberal. To become apolitical, to become a mere personal matter, is to spell death for religion. To do otherwise, to be a live religion that forces people by law to conform, is to be illiberal. So there is a clash. Similarly, there is a clash with science, for any religion will make claims as to the truth, and there it may well clash with science, even though this is the last thing that science, *qua* science, wants to occur. What is miscalled “the West” is thus seen as the great enemy of Islam and therein lies the modern clash of this religion with the West.

How great this clash is depends on how seriously people take their religion. Most will take a modern interpretation that takes the edge off any such clash, but others will look at Christianity today and fear that it

shows Islam its “dead” future. I think it does, and that Islam is already dying and in a few hundred years, at the most, it will be as lame as Christianity is today. Moreover, “the West” is not really needed for that result, just as it was not needed to weaken Christianity. The weakening of religion occurs as progress is made. This process has not been completed yet; though it clearly has long since begun. And therein lies the problem.

The media allows all to see what goes on in Israel and in Iraq and the teenaged Muslims see their side losing out. Many of them identify with Muslims abroad rather than with the people of the UK. Although there has been no end of denying this on the media since the bombings, there has also been plenty of affirmations of the fact. We have seen as many Muslims affirm it as deny it on television in the last few weeks. The Internet adds to the stimulus of grievances from abroad, and what has been going on in Iraq is clearly part of this. It is fun for Muslims to associate with the threats of violence to the enemy made on the various Internet Websites if they do not pull out of Iraq. Islam sees the West as its enemy. But Iraq and the Middle East is not the main reason it sees the West as an enemy. It is the corroding affect of liberalism, as was plain in the Rushdie affair; and the fact that science also will claim to be superior to Islam on the truth that forms the ethereal basis of Muslim discontent. The other reasons are handy as understandable grievances to the West that Islam can lead with. The Blairites are right that it is the modern world that is objected to, but wrong that this is only a new extremism. It is mainly the issue of Rushdie continued viz. Is Islam to live or die?

There is a lot of talk about brainwashing but why should we think it exists? Clearly, Muslims choose to indoctrinate themselves and, in any case, we do reconsider all that we think to be the case; such that if it were possible to wash

out our brain and replace it with alien doctrines we could soon think ourselves out of such doctrines in the aftermath of the brainwashing. No doctrine is alien from criticism and revision. What we get from enthusiasts is willing self-indoctrination. The main factor in all this, the eagerness to die for Islam, is an exciting meme at the heart of the creed judging from the ranting of the propagandists. Trips to Pakistan no doubt reinforced the ideology, but it was not there that the 'willingness to die' meme was first adopted. It is up front in almost any Islamic propaganda outreach to the public. It is seen as a test of how important the creed is.

But for Tony Blair the main thing is the "evil ideology", that is not really proper Islam, and that is a cause sufficient unto itself of the bombing of London of 7/7. On Monday 11 July 2005, he said, in the House of Commons: "It seems probable that the attack was carried out by Islamist extremist terrorists, of the kind who over recent years have been responsible for so many innocent deaths in Madrid, Bali, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Kenya, Tanzania, Pakistan, Yemen, Turkey, Egypt, Morocco, and of course in New York on September 11, but in many other countries too." John Reid took the official line against the *Chatham House* report. "Terrorism is an international problem," he said on the wireless, and he too cited a long list of places where bombs had been used: "New York, Tanzania, Kenya, Bali, Saudi Arabia, Russia, Yemen, Egypt, Pakistan, India and Turkey, all of which occurred before Iraq or in countries which opposed the intervention in Iraq."

A few Labourites did not follow the official line. John McDonnell, Labour MP for Hayes and Harlington, was one and he held that it was "intellectually unsustainable" to hold that the invasion of Iraq had no bearing on the motivation of the bombers: "For as long as Britain remains in occupation of Iraq the terrorist

recruiters will have the argument they seek to attract more susceptible young recruits. Britain must withdraw now." Similarly, Clare Short appeared in a number of television programmes to say the same sort of thing, not least on *Newsnight* BBC2 18 July 2005. She had no doubt that there was a link to Iraq.

Tarique Ghaffur, the Metropolitan Police Assistant Commissioner, and also an Indianid, said Muslims and their leaders must do more than condemn the bombings. He urged members of the community to inform on potential terrorists and their supporters. The police would have to engage better with minorities, but minorities must take the first step, he said.

Meanwhile the government is pushing through a sop to the Muslims in order to get this co-operation in the form of the Racial and Religious Hatred Bill. There was a BBC/ICM poll on the popularity of this, based on interviews with 1,005 people between 8 and 11 July 2005 for the BBC News website. It showed an indifference on the part of the majority to this creeping totalitarianism or it could merely be conformity to what they thought the researchers wanted to hear. It found 51% in favour of such a move but 44% against the governments plans to ban incitement to religious hatred. The people who wrote into the website in response were against the new legislation, almost to a man, so much so that I thought there was little point in my adding to the protest against the totalitarian aspects of the new law. Maybe such people are self selected and it is also the people who are indifferent to such issues who are also usually indifferent to civil liberties. But some commentators are also indifferent or at least think the danger is worse than the loss of liberty and, like Brian Walden on Sunday morning of 24 July, they often still call themselves libertarians.

On Thursday, 21 July 2005 there were four more minor explosions in London. No one was hurt. But the next day, a man, Jean Charles de Menezes, was shot at Stockwell tube station by plain clothes policemen. He soon turned out to be an innocent man from Brazil. He was something of an Anglophile, who spoke good English, but he was not to know that the plain clothes men after him, for some reason, were police. Most living in the UK all their lives expect police in uniform or in suits, not in rough looking causal jeans and ragged clothing and this could be why he did not stop when they commanded him to do so. His pursuers did not look friendly, nor as if they were in any position of authority whatsoever. It later emerged that his visa had run out, and later still that it had run out over a year ago, but that is not likely the reason why he would disobey armed police.

It is not easy to gauge how serious the terrorism problem in Britain is today. If Charles Clarke was truly surprised as he claimed on first hearing the news that the bombers were British then he is too stupid to be the Home Secretary. If this is just a political Noble Lie to give Islam a good name in the hope that it will live up to it, then it is perhaps about as good as the Noble Lie gets and it is clearly the more sensible way of pursuing things. But this should be done without the sops of the new intolerant laws on free speech. In the modern society religion is a personal matter and that does mean that Islam cannot rule the roost in the UK. It is going to have to follow Christianity sooner or later; better for humanity that it is sooner.

The G8, Aid to Africa and Global Warming

To take people's minds off the Iraq invasion fiasco as well as a fresh attempt to make an impact on the world, Blair has launched an African aid year. In the wake of a fresh version of the Band Aid record, that bored

the shoppers stiff with its cant over the Yuletide days of 2004, Bob Geldof decided also to repeat the 1984 Band Aid live concert 20 years later, but felt he has learnt much from the first time. Back then, it was all about charity but this time he was out to get political action on the issue. This is to move from the free actions of charity to proactive coercive, and thus unfree political taxation of some to transfer earnings to others.

Blair set out to make his bid to the G8 summit and Geldof set up to back him up, at one stage by suggesting that a million men should demonstrate outside the G8 meeting place of Gleneagles, Scotland. Michael Grade of the BBC put on an Africa week to back Blair up. But before the G8 meeting took place, a meeting of the 53-nation strong African Union took place in Gaddafi's home town of Sirte, Libya, where Gaddafi told the other African leaders that they ought to be too proud to beg. An odd convert to liberalism, you might think, but he then went on to say that it is really the conditions put on the aid that he did not like. You do not tell a man you aid how to pray or what he should wear, Gaddafi said. He was really only asking for the ties to aid to be removed. He is not a liberal convert after all. Kofi Annan was also there, as he was later at the G8 meeting, and he announced at Sirte that there would-be United Nations Democracy Fund rewards for all the progress that African states had made in democracy of late! Almost all of the 53 states of the African Union were now democracies, he said, and they needed help with their election expenses. But the headline caused by Gaddafi's moaning might well give some of the others ideas. The African Union replaced the Organisation of African Unity three years ago. Like the EU, it looks like a very slow attempt at a superstate. But it is mainly used to encourage aid.

But why should Africa need aid? Why should they not make their own way in

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

the world, as people elsewhere have? In the last 20 years, India and China have finally got round to exploiting the opportunities before them, and they have begun to grow economically but with no real thanks to foreign aid. There is no reason why there is going to be a special road via aid for Africa and there clearly was no such way for Europe, Japan and the USA. It does get easier and easier to make progress as lands can be brought up to date by free trade, and it is only protectionist folly that prevents that from happening. Fallacies like the old “infants industry argument” of List, though as popular as ever on the media and in the aid and charity lobby, are exactly wrong as the later a firm enters the market the more up to date its equipment is likely to be. So why all this clamour for aid?

The first answer to this is because we can see on our television screens that people are starving, but not all of them are starving. At the time of the first Band Aid there were up to a million in Ethiopia that were in trouble, and they had been put in trouble by a war with Eritrea that was backed by the USSR on both sides at one stage. However, the population of Ethiopia in 1984 was then about 55 million so most were not in trouble. Today they are up to 77 million, so they have largely thrived since and before 1984. They were about 5 million in 1945. Moreover, if Welsh nationalists blew up Birmingham's water supplies in the 1980s, we might well have had even more than a million in the UK in trouble.

A good book to read on all this is *Equality, the Third World and Economic Delusion* (1982) P.T. Bauer. The author's thesis is that the “Third World is the creation of foreign aid: without foreign aid there is no Third World” (p87). The thesis is similar to mass unemployment being down to the dole that supports it. There is an enormous gap between tacit practical thinking that tends to be geared more to the world and the more explicit ideas that we adopt as

special opinion from discourse with others. Those are often adopted as things we value rather than what seems to immediately fit the evidence and they usually relate to things that we do not experience at first hand. Most people seem not to think explicitly of the economy, but insofar as they do, they tend to think in zero sum terms so they are open to the idea that people in Africa are poor as a consequence of the UK being rich. Lenin's theory of imperialism fits this bill and rough versions of it are very popular in the colleges. It is part of college common sense amongst college students, most of whom do not study economics. But also many economic students take the subject's doctrines as abstractions that are not considered to be true. It has been said that visitors to Milton Friedman's Chicago seminars expressed surprise that many of the participants took economic theory so seriously. They too might think the exploitation theory of imperialism to be roughly true and their chosen subject to be mere abstract theory. This scepticism is very common in the colleges. The common exploitation theory of imperialism feeds a widespread feeling of guilt, that Bauer talks about. Those ideas give rise to the feeling on the media and in politics that there should be aid for Africa and other poorer parts of the world. There is also the task of politicians finding something to do, that leads to all sorts of trouble in the world. When they make a mess of things, as they have done of late in spreading the ideology of democracy to Iraq, then they need another cause to distract attention from that mess. So one mess leads to another as men like Blair seek to leave a mark on history.

The African Union, as well as aping the EU superstate, pits itself against the EU by exploiting this guilt. The main way the Third World aid can be mustered is by politics via taxation. The Third World thus sets up such political entities as the African Union to make its

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

demands, as well as by joining in the political institutions set up, rather masochistically, by the West, like the United Nations, to use for making those demands. They have an interest in maintaining this guilt. A way of doing that is to keep up the attack that the Western masochistic outlook tolerates, or even welcomes, as it is already intellectually convinced that it is just in some way. Any aid given is considered both by African Union leaders but also by those who support them in the West to be just the beginning of what they are after and to be far less than their due, if justice is to be done.

Bauer has long since shown this whole outlook to be crass ignorance. He was no imperialist but he nevertheless holds that the truth about it, though it was way more inefficient than free trade with independence, was better than the nationalism and attempt at state running of things that replaced it. In his *Dissent On Development* (1971) he demolished Leninism by showing it to be utterly unrealistic. He holds that it is most likely the case that imperialism promoted rather than retarded material progress in Africa and Asia [(p149), page numbers refer to the abridged Student Edition of 1976]. Imperialism introduced new lines of production and many new crops as well as contacts with the wider world. “Those changes engendered a new outlook on material advance and on the means of securing it: For good or evil those contacts promoted the erosion of the traditional values, objectives, attitudes and customs obstructing material advance (p149). The fact that many of the lands that remained free of conquest also remained poorer hints at the fact that imperialism aided progress(p150). Hobson pioneered the idea that imperialism got outlets for exports from rich nations on the odd idea that they were over-producing but Lenin did most to popularise it. Lenin's book on imperialism was not of high intellectual quality, says Bauer, being

inferior to the books of Marx but also of other books by Lenin, but it had vast political influence. It was largely his grabbing power in 1917 in Russia that gave it its prestige. It both explains why imperialism occurred and why the predictions of falling real wages made by Marx failed to emerge (p150). However, contrary to what Lenin said, investments from the advanced lands did not go into what was generally, if rather ineptly called their “colonies” but into other lands that they had no jurisdiction over like Argentina. Trade was mainly then as now between advanced lands and unrelated to empire. The British Empire was not in any imperial preference mode, much to Joseph Chamberlain's chagrin as he favoured this policy, but in free trade mode that he opposed. Bauer notes that most of the literature on imperialism fails to ask the obvious question of how poor lands could pay for this capital investment, or commodities pushed onto them by the capitalists (p51). The plain answer was that they could not be paid for and that is largely why they did not occur.

The theory of Leninist imperialism contrasts with the facts, in that the poorer nations have nothing to extract whilst most trade is between advanced nations. Many of the lands in sub-Saharan Africa had no schools, few if any roads or even paths and little contact between the various tribes in the nineteenth century before the imperialists came in. Any poorer nation that does have contact with the advanced nations tends to be richer than the ones that do not, and the nations that have not been conquered are amongst the very poorest. All of that is in stark contrast to the account and policies of Marxist-Leninism, that holds that relations with the advanced world is impoverishing. A body blow to the theory of imperialism was the sketch from the Monty Python film “The Life of Brian” on what have the Romans ever done for us. Bauer's books show in great

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

detail that this applies to the imperialist stage of Africa too.

Bauer also looks at the even more superficial idea of “neo-colonialism”, where authors such as Nkrumah attempt to make out that post imperialist Africa fails owing to the legacy of imperialism and further contact with the advanced lands, and Bauer concludes “In recent years the term neo-colonialism has been introduced into discussions on foreign aid in three contexts. First, to protest against the imposition of conditions in the granting of intergovernmental aid; second, in support of the demand that aid should not be tied to purchases of specific commodities from specific sources; third, especially in support of multilateral aid, on the ground that bilateral aid involves dangers one-colonialism. Whatever the merits of those arguments, the term neo-colonialism obscures rather than illuminates the issues.”

Blair claimed that the G8 has agreed a \$50bn (£28.8bn) aid boost, as leaders sign the communiqué, saying that it was “very substantial progress”. But he admitted that: “We do not, simply by this communiqué, make poverty history.” Nevertheless, he thought that the G8 had the “political will” to end global poverty and to tackle the effects of greenhouse gas emissions.” The USA had now accepted that global warming was an issue. International development secretary Hilary Benn, the son of Tony, said: “This is politics demonstrating its capacity to make a difference.” Bob Geldof supported Blair throughout and held that the measures agreed on Africa would save 10 million lives: “Never before have so many people forced a change of policy onto a global agenda. If anyone had said eight weeks ago will we get a doubling of aid, will we get a deal on debt, people would have said ‘no’“., he said Bono added: “600,000 Africans, mostly children, will remember this G8 summit at Gleneagles because they will be around to remember this summit, and they wouldn't have otherwise.” The summit agreed on \$3bn for Palestinian

Authority for investment in infrastructure; to training 20,000 peacekeepers for Africa; that African leaders commit to democracy and good governance as part of the deal; That the debts of the 18 poorest countries be forgiven; that universal access to anti-HIV drugs in Africa by 2010. Summing up the G8 meeting, Mr Blair acknowledged: “It isn't all everyone wanted, but it is progress.” But Blair then rather oddly said that the “only people who can change Africa ultimately are the Africans”. Clearly, he sees himself as a meantime man.

Blair expects to make more progress in his aims later this year. He hopes to use trade discussions in Hong Kong to end agricultural subsidies. There is a meeting that Blair will preside over in Britain in November on climate change, where he hopes to make more headway than he managed to do on that topic at the G8 meeting. But this cause too has more to do with guilt than with reality, and the target sinner of the USA is nor really more guilty of the sin even if we accept the Green outlook for the sake of the argument. As Philip Stott says: “In Europe there has been a predictable hysterical and moral outrage at the decision of the Bush administration to withdraw from Kyoto. But we must look very carefully at Europe's own position - is that moral outrage justified? The EU, which politically and militarily wants to be compared to the US actually produces more CO2 per unit area, more CO2 per person and more CO2 in total than the USA.. But who knows that? Moreover, out of the 15 EU member states, only 2 are predicted to be even near to meeting their Kyoto targets, that's the UK and Germany. Germany, however, with a precipitate withdrawal from nuclear energy under pressure from their Green movements is unlikely to do so, and there are some estimates that the UK will be 20% short. And when we come to those wonderful moral countries of France and Sweden, that helped to scupper John

This article is written by Old Hickory

For further details please visit www.libertarian-alliance.org.uk

Prescott's attempts in the Hague to get an agreement, we find they are miles off meeting their Kyoto targets." So this is hypocrisy saving the day again for to live up to, or should that be, down to, the Green ideals is to be daft. The Green case seems to be that we should all ride round on bicycles today just in case we have to do so in the future. But we can soon get used to having to ride round on bikes if that is what we truly have to do. To do it now just in case we might have to in the future seems to be mere tomfoolery.

OLD HICKORY

"The inflow of foreign capital did not harm the receiving nations. It was European capital that accelerated considerably the marvellous economic evolution of the United States and the British Dominions. Thanks to foreign capital the countries of Latin America and Asia are today equipped with facilities for production and transportation which they would have had to forego for a very long time if they had not received this aid. Real wage rates and farm yields are higher today in those areas than they would have been in the absence of foreign capital."

(Ludwig von Mises)