Voices

Natal Law Society opposed his application because he was Indian.

Current president of the Natal Law Society David Randles made an apology in the Johannesburg newspaper *The Star*. “The society apologises unconditionally, albeit posthumously, to the late Mahatma Gandhi for having attempted to restrict his rights to practise as an advocate in Natal,” Mr Randles said.

He said the apology was extended to “all other aspirant lawyers whose access to the profession was restricted in any way on the basis of racial grounds”.

FROM “SORRY GANDHI – 105 YEARS LATER” FROM BBC ONLINE

Just adjust

Consider an individual economic agent. There are two ways in which this agent can improve his/her stock of assets. The first way is by refraining from consuming a part of the revenue earned and using this part either to acquire some physical asset, or to make a loan, directly or indirectly, to someone else to acquire such an asset. In common parlance this is expressed as follows: the individual must ‘save’ and ‘invest’ (either directly or indirectly) in order to add to his/her stock of wealth. This appears well understood but, in fact, is not. The impression which most people have about this process is that wealth can increase only if some ‘sacrifice’ is made in the form of foregone consumption out of a given income. As a matter of fact, it is investment that governs savings, so that wealth increases merely by the aggregate decision to add to wealth, which increases aggregate income until an equal amount of savings is generated (or squeezes an equal amount of forced savings out of the workers through inflation). The question of the acquirers of additional wealth making, in the aggregate, any sacrifices does not arise. This is the way of capital accumulation.

The second way is by the economic agent acquiring an asset of higher value in exchange for an asset of lower value. There are obvious circumstances, even apart from direct physical coercion, where this is possible — the example of the village moneylender being a typical example. While writing *Capital*, Marx deliberately left out of the reckoning such possibilities of enrichment since one asset-owner is such cases enriches himself/herself at the expense of another, the aggregate of asset-owners cannot be enriched by this process. But obviously, a particular aggregate, e.g., the asset-owners of a particular set of countries which constitute the advanced capitalist world, can enrich themselves by this process. In retrospect, one cannot but regret Marx’s decision to have left this phenomenon out of the reckoning, since it is an extremely important real-life phenomenon: capitalism does not exclude away the world, as Rosa Luxemburg (1951) emphasised later, and is also characterised by uneven strengths of capitalists belonging to different countries. Enrichment through this second way at the expense of petty-producers or smaller capitalists is therefore not only possible, but actually occurs. And if these dispossessed producers belong to distant lands, e.g., the backward countries, this fact does not even have the adverse repercussions on the social and political stability of capitalism in its home base that a dispossession of similar producers domestically would have had.


This is London

Last year, at 3000 metres in the Nepal Himalaya, three to four days’ walk from the roadhead, I was sitting with a local family around their open fire. My host was putting the finishing touches to a bamboo mat he was weaving whilst his hostess, my hostess, was cooking mutton paste. I had just finished writing up the day’s notes and was tuning in to the BBC to get the afternoon news. The reception is remarkably clean clear high in the mountains — little to get in the way I suppose. At any rate, as I heard the familiar sounding chimes of Big Ben. I felt a tiny patriotic shiver run down my spine.

“This is London,” said the voice, and as I looked up I saw that my hostess had taken a brief break from stirring the mutton mish. She was smiling at me and nodding slightly. “London,” she said in Nepali. “The voice of London.”

“Yes,” I replied, happy that the BBC could even mean something to someone who spoke no English. I pressed the radio to my ear and tried to catch the headlines. My hostess was still looking at me, more quizzically now.

“What’s he like,” she asked. “London, I mean?” She registered the confused expression on my face and tried again, this time slower. “London, the man speaking now, what’s he like?” Not really being prepared for the question, and knowing that there was no good answer, I tried
to answer diplomatically: "Ah well. He’s OK, I guess, although I don’t really know him well." She seemed content with my answer and returned to the millet paste as I concentrated on the news.

Soon it was dinner time and the news was over. We ate in silence, occasionally stoking the fire to keep it strong. When she had finished eating, I could see that she was eager to ask another question. Obeying the Nepali custom of not entering into long discussions with someone who is eating, she patiently waited until I had finished. When I had, and once we were all smoking a cigarette, she felt the time was right. "This London chap," she said, and then tailed off.

London was clearly still troubling her. "This man who calls himself London," she tried again. "Did you know that sometimes he’s a woman?"

---

**VOICES**

**Philip flap**

Queen Elizabeth’s husband has put his foot in his mouth again—with a cheap swipe yesterday at Asian Indians.

Prince Philip—who in the past has insulted the Chinese, the Scots, Hungarians and even the deaf—sent jaws dropping as he visited a high-tech factory near Edinburgh yesterday.

Noticing a fuse box that appeared less sophisticated than other devices in the factory, Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh, quipped: "It looks as though it was put in by an Indian."

The remark—referring to Britain’s substantial population of immigrants from India—was immediately blasted by the National Assembly Against Racism. "What he said is absolutely abysmal. It’s typical of someone his age, his time and his class to say something like this," said a group spokesman.

Last night, Buckingham Palace issued an apology and insisted the 78-year-old Philip was joking. "The duke regrets any offence which may have been caused by remarks he is reported as making," a spokesman said. "With hindsight, he accepts that what were intended as lighthearted comments were inappropriate."

Philip’s "inappropriate" comments over the years have scandalised the royal family. He once asked a Scottish driving instructor: "How do you keep the natives off the booze long enough to get them past the test?"

On a trip to China in the 1980s, he warned British students: "You’ll get slitty eyes if you stay too long."

And earlier this year, as he visited a group of deaf kids in Wales, he joked that it was "no wonder" they couldn’t hear, because they were standing near a brass band.

Even his daughter, Princess Anne, is not immune to his off-the-cuff blunders. He once said of Anne’s lifelong love of horses: "If it doesn’t eat hay, she is not interested."

---

**MARK TURIN in "LETTER FROM NEPAL" in SHANGHAI PICTORIAL.**

**Bill Hoffman in "NEW PHILIP FLAP OVER FLIP REMARK" in NEW YORK POST.**
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