

Southern Africa —THE ROAD TO REVOLUTION

THE PATTERN of events in South Africa and Rhodesia confirms the impression recorded earlier that the right-wing oligarchy in Southern Africa has consolidated its position of late. In South Africa Dr. Verwoerd's Nationalist Government is even stronger after the provincial elections there. The rather pathetic 'opposition' in South Africa—in the constitutional sense—has shown itself to be completely incapable of opposing Dr. Verwoerd and the rich, small-minded South African whites have opted for the neo-fascist Afrikaaner rule which gives them the security they crave for.

Stanley Uys' reporting from Cape Town in the *Observer* (28.3.65) writes that 'Any hopes that the Nationalist Government can be defeated or weakened at the polls in the ordinary course of electioneering—that is barring major factors external to political campaigning—must be abandoned now'. The road to revolution is thus clearly seen to be the only practical course for those who oppose the evil of apartheid—that the scene for a conflict without mercy is being set is confirmed by the political murder of the European terrorist John Harris. Appeals from every corner of the world for humanity and mercy to be shown to John Harris by the South African Government were ignored by President Swart. Harris, who placed a bomb in a Johannesburg railway station which killed an elderly woman, was but 24 years of age. His act was foolish and ill-advised, but so was the action of the South African Government in murdering him.

In Rhodesia, Mr. Smith surprised several people by calling a snap election for May 7, which will probably follow the pattern of the South African elections, by destroying the aspirations of those who support the 'opposition' Rhodesia Party. According to the *Daily Telegraph* correspondent in Salisbury (1.4.65), the election has been called in order to obtain a two-thirds majority in Parliament for the governing Rhodesian Front. The way is then open for

Mr. Smith to alter the constitution towards the apartheid set-up the Rhodesian Front supporters desire.

It is likely that Mr. Smith will win an overwhelming victory in the polls, with the required two-thirds majority easily obtained. It is considered by some commentators that this would result in the extreme elements in the Rhodesian Front forcing a unilateral declaration of independence with or without Ian Smith as Premier. One hopes this is the case.

The *Daily Telegraph* (1.4.65) editorially writes, 'The duty of Britain is to prevent outside influences, including Commonwealth extremists, from provoking a still worse situation in Rhodesia'. Yet Mr. Iain McLeod, writing in the *Telegraph* supplement (12.3.65) remarked to the contrary that 'We should jointly (Britain and Rhodesia) invite the services in a goodwill mission of Commonwealth statesmen from the old and the new Commonwealth, for this dangerous situation (in Rhodesia) is a challenge and a threat to the Commonwealth. With the help of this Commonwealth mission we should begin to work towards a conference'.

That Mr. McLeod is not half as clever as some people think (though one would hardly refer to him as a cretin) is emphasised in the article already referred to in the *Telegraph* supplement, for he comes out with the argument that Rhodesians will not declare independence because they would then be isolated from the world. 'A position of such isolation,' he claims, 'could only drive her closer to South Africa, and it is by no means clear that Dr. Verwoerd would welcome this. After all the South African ratio of white to non-white is about one to four; in Rhodesia it is nearer one to sixteen.'

It is however very clear from a recent trade agreement between South Africa and Rhodesia that Dr. Verwoerd has realised the importance of Rhodesia as a buffer state between South Africa and 'the Black North'. The *Financial Times* (16.12.64) commented that 'The agreement is as much a political as an economic document. South Africa is now freely admitting it has a vested interest in Rhodesia's economic viability. . . . Ever since the Rhodesian Front came to power the emphasis has been on closer links with the rich, strong and forthright White supremacist South, and the pact will strengthen Mr. Ian Smith's hand politically. The pact also brings nearer to reality Dr. Verwoerd's scheme for a Southern and Central African Common Market, bringing in Portuguese Mozambique and Angola, Rhodesia, and any Black states who feel inclined to join'.

This writer does not think the Rhodesian whites have any fear of being isolated from South Africa as a result of a unilateral declaration of independence; the above comment surely makes hay of McLeod's contention that Verwoerd has no welcome for Rhodesia. Yet, I still hope that the Rhodesian Front will declare independence unilaterally because of the reaction it would create within the Commonwealth. The *Daily Telegraph* wants Britain to prevent 'Commonwealth extremists' provoking a still worse situation in Rhodesia. Mr. McLeod wants to send these same 'extremists' along with old Commonwealth statesmen to Rhodesia itself on 'a goodwill mission'. There might be some point in asking the young Commonwealth countries what they would like to do. It might also be possible to inquire of the Labour Government what it might do. For myself, I thought I'd find out in advance what the Labour Government might do by reading the *Telegraph* and Iain McLeod.

J.W.

If you Can't Beat 'em—Burn 'em

FOREIGN POLICY IS the subject every politician has at his finger tips, and British politicians are no exception.

Last Friday Foreign Affairs were debated in the Westminster gasworks. As was to be expected, Vietnam was the topic highest on the foreign affairs agenda.

Michael Stewart, the Foreign Secretary opened the debate by referring back to 1954 and the settlement in Vietnam. His whole speech sounded like a US Embassy hand-out, being read by an official seconded from the American State Department. His speech was warmly supported by Sir Alec Douglas-Home. Viscount Lambton was more overwhelming in his praise. He pointed out that when Mr. Ernest Bevin was Foreign Secretary he won such constant applause from the Conservative benches that Conservative Members were asked in private not to applaud him in the House of Commons. He went on to say that it took Ernie Bevin a year to win this affection (my italics) but the present Foreign Secretary had won the same 'affection' in an

afternoon. The 'on Member for Fulham had a Tory ball. Pseudo left wing Labour MPs put their spoke in throughout the debate, so that it sounded like North and South Vietnam politicians arguing the toss. The word 'Freedom' was kicked around by Right, Left and Centre, nowadays this word is used more frequently than yes and no, but with far less sincerity.

The Prime Minister wound up the debate by reaffirming the Government's support for American policy. The Government has anxieties about certain developments within this war but, according to Mr. Wilson, it's far better to have an off the cuff chat with the Americans about these points than wash dirty linen in public. One wonders what murderous schemes are cooked up under the cloak of secret diplomacy.

If anything came out of the Foreign Affairs debate it was proof of the fact that Tory and Labour are one on Foreign policy with the Liberals flirting to the left. S. East Asia has become a training ground for troops, and the people are guinea pigs for new types of weapons. The Vietnamese are expendable in the name of face saving ideology, and the progress of scientific warfare.

Russia and China are up to their necks in 'courting' of North Vietnam, how much is bluff and how much is 'for real' is matter for conjecture. Both have claimed they have volunteers for N. Vietnam. Both wish to claim leadership of the Communist world and will use N. Vietnam to pursue these claims irrespective of the tragedy of prolonging the war. Russia will not join Britain as co-chairman and invite all powers to state their views

until America withdraws its troops. This is a pretty safe bet for the Soviet Union, it still keeps her in the 'courting stakes' on a par with China.

America will not talk until the Vietcong disarm, which has as much chance as a 'snowball in hell'. The Pentagon are well in command and President Johnson is their Charlie McCarthy. General Maxwell Taylor, US envoy to Saigon, told reporters, 'There's nothing and nobody to negotiate with. We don't have to take new or dramatic action against the Vietcong—we've just got to do better what we've been doing there.'

In *Newsweek* (5.4.65), they point out that the effect of gas was disappointing from a military point of view, it blew away. The Pentagon have at their disposal gases that paralyse the nerves, derange the liver, sear the lungs, cause convulsions, blisters or headaches. If the wind is dodgy, friend or foe are affected alike.

American policy is to bring N. Vietnam to its knees and force them to come crawling. Frankly I don't think this will ever happen. Asia is fertile soil for Russian and Chinese Communism, the Vietnamese peasants are not interested in Western Coca Cola, Russian Marxist Leninism or China's People's Liberation effort, they are interested in existing to live. Vietcong are the peasants and workers, the ordinary people—so, there are Communist cadres amongst them, they are the minority. The majority want the Yanks out, to be left alone to make their own mistakes if they have to. Some day the East and West must wake up to this fact or face the dire consequences.

BILL CHRISTOPHER.

FASLANE INVADED, SABOTAGED

ON THE NIGHT of March 27 and 28 we broke into Faslane—a Polaris Base near Garelochhead. We then immobilised a truck and a pneumatic compressor which works the cement silo. We removed 50-100 wooden levels (this means the whole of the new road will have to be replanned).

Our purpose was to halt or to slow down building of the new road for as long as possible and to be as much of a nuisance to the building of the base as possible. We will continue to do this for as long as we can.

Yours,
SCOTS AGAINST WAR.

ALL OUT FOR RETURN TO FASLANE

THE SCOTTISH COMMITTEE of 100 have cancelled their Holy Loch project on June 5. Instead they are holding a 'Faslane Come-All-Ye' on June 26. Attempts will be made, through the medium of the Factory for Peace, to 'get at' the workers on the site. The Committee have offered one worker from the site a job in the factory. They also intend to try some 'public relations' in Clydebank, Dumbarton and Helensburgh, by showing films and canvassing.

GND Easter March

WHETHER you are marching or not we need sellers for FREEDOM and *Anarchy en route* and in Trafalgar Square. Please get in touch with Freedom Bookshop for supplies or pick them up at 10 Gilbert Place, Thursday, April 15, 6 p.m.-8.30 p.m. or watch out for suppliers near the anarchist banner. March starts Easter Saturday 9.30 a.m. at H.Q. British Bomber Command, Walter's Ash, Nap Hill, nr. High Wycombe. Sunday from Ruislip, Monday from Acton with a short rally in Trafalgar Square.

Government Hits Small Farmers

THE GOVERNMENT'S Farm Price Review is coming in for a great deal of criticism. One can expect this from the Tories, but their own record in this field is not very good, although they managed to step it up last year prior to the election.

Most people have the impression that farmers are doing very well, but paying their workers a very low wage. Of course this is partly true, but I think that there is another side to the picture. In Sussex, which is the centre of the revolt over the milk prices, the average size of the farms is around 90 acres, but according to present day economics of farming, about 300 acres seems to be the viable unit.

Unlike other types of farming, a dairy farm needs a seven day week, adding further expense to the farmer who only owns a small unit. He faces the dilemma of expansion in order to be able to carry on or packing it in. Quite often he is willing to carry on seven day working on his own for a very little return, so the Government's new review was a bitter disappointment to him.

It seems to me that the Government's

idea is bigger farm units. Farming is now termed 'an industry' and the methods used are becoming more like those used in the manufacturing of cars than in the growing of food or feeding livestock. If there are larger and therefore more viable farms, then these are in a better economic position to be able to afford the capital outlay for equipment and buildings for the modern farming methods. Do we want our foodstuffs produced on factory-like lines? For this seems to be the implication.

Militant action by the farmers certainly seems to be one way to try to defeat the government, but welcome as this may be, it appears that they not only face opposition from the Government, but also from the powerful farmers who own large farms and who no doubt will eventually swallow up some of the smaller units.

The formation of co-operatives between the smaller farmers might help for in this way certain costs could be shared. They would also form an alternative to the ever increasing trend towards 'factory farming' and at the same time enable the small farmer to survive.

P.T.

HIYA SHERIFF!

OUR COMRADE Alan Albon recently received at his ranch a missive reading: 'Sheriff's Office. By virtue of a precept directed from the Sheriff of the County of — I hereby SUMMON you to attend at the ensuing ASSIZE to be holden at THE COUNTY HALL —, in the said County on Monday, April 5, 1965 at 10.15 o'clock in the Forenoon precisely, there to serve on the JURY and until you shall be duly discharged.'

Cowboy comrade Albon replied, 'With reference to Jury Summons dated March 15 couched in terms as anachronistic as the institution which you represent, I would refer you to previous correspondence with you in which my attitude to Jury Service is clearly stated.

'If you persist in coercing me to attend I must give notice that nothing, I repeat, nothing will induce me to find any person guilty.'

'Furthermore since my previous correspondence my situation has changed, I now relief milk for several farmers which necessitates reliability, unless of course the sheriff would like to take my place, during my absence for an unspecified period in Court.'

'In addition I would hardly have thought from your point of view that a person who on several occasions has deliberately broken the law and is now bound over is suitable for jury service.'

Over to you Sheriff!

J.R.

ANARCHY 50

ANARCHISTS & THE COMMITTEE OF 100

Discovering Malatesta

NOW ON SALE

ANARCHY is Published by
Freedom Press at 2s.
on the first Saturday of every month

Overtime ban by Exhibition workers

EXHIBITION HALL WORKERS

are operating an unofficial ban on all overtime working in an effort to force the employers to concede their demands for 10s. an hour for craftsmen and 9s. 6d. for labourers. Their unions have recently, through the National Joint Council, negotiated pay increases giving craftsmen 8s. 6d. per hour and labourers 7s. 9d. At a meeting at Hammer-smith Town Hall, workers in the industry expressed their disgust at these recent increases and said they were not enough, considering the profits that the contractors are making in the industry. (See **FREE-DOM**, January 30, 1965.) They are also demanding a three week holiday with full pay, a severance pay scheme and an adequate sickness pay scheme.

It seems that the past dissensions between craftsmen and labourers have now been overcome and they are united in their struggle. Through their own stewards' organisation, the Exhibition Stewards Co-ordinating Committee, a campaign of action has been organised.

INDUSTRY RELIES ON OVERTIME

The exhibition industry, because it has to keep to a tight schedule of opening dates, relies very much on overtime, and by banning overtime, workers can affect this schedule, in fact even throw it all out of gear, hitting the employers harder in fact than they can by all out withdrawal of labour, as the employers have safeguarded against this eventuality by insurance coverage.

This ban on overtime is of course not just an attack on the employers, but also a revolt against what the unions have deemed fit to negotiate. The executives of the unions were well aware of what the rank and file wanted, the stewards having given them the full details of the feelings of the men. The unions chose to ignore this, accepting what crumbs were handed out. Now, with an organisation at rank and file level, the union leaders have been made redundant and it is the membership who are in control.

EMPLOYERS' APPEAL

The employers fully recognise this and they look upon the probable delayed opening of the International Engineering Exhibition at Earls Court and Olympia with some horror. Their organisation, the National Association of Exhibition Contractors have sent each one of their workers a letter. In this they say that they support the National Joint Councils 'because they believe that they are doing a very fair job of work in the field of industrial relations'.

In another paragraph the letter attempts to undermine the solidarity which the operatives have shown so far in this dispute. They say that 'On many occasions during past years operatives have been misled into following the advice and leadership of a small number of workmen whose interest is not really in the Exhibition Industry. This is clear from the statements which have been put out to the effect that operatives have in any event alter-

native sources of employment. Such elements in the Exhibition Industry can, therefore, best be described as disruptive.' Further on the letter says, 'Past history also shows clearly that operatives have never gained anything at all from unofficial action of this kind. However long a ban on overtime may be imposed the employers will not budge and intend to uphold in every way the full authority of the two National Joint Councils and the Working Rule Agreements for the Exhibition Industry.'

RANK AND FILE ORGANISATION GETS RESULTS

The reason why the exhibition workers enjoy a higher basic wage rate than men doing similar work on building sites, is that through their own unofficial efforts their industry is 100% unionised. Time and time again it is the organisation on the job that has gained improved conditions. In the past the unions have conceded to the employers on points like notice of dismissal, giving them (the employers) the right to sack men at two hours notice on any day, all for extra coppers.

These are some of the reasons for the type of action that is taking place now. The unions do not represent the men in the industry, in fact if the present solidarity can be maintained and further strengthened, I can see no reason why the union leadership cannot be by-passed altogether. After all it is the strength of the organisation and the solidarity of the men that can win the demands. There is no need to get round the table with the bosses. The employers hope 'that commonsense will prevail and that normal working will be resumed' and say that until this happens they will halt the talks on the Sickness and Accident Scheme. But the employers are in for a shock, for judging by a chat I had with a steward, the exhibition workers feel that the most 'commonsense' thing he can do is to continue the overtime ban. They will express this view by sending their individual letters back to the employers, *without stamps*.

P.T.

Freedom For Workers' Control

APRIL 10 1965 Vol. 26 No. 11

Breakthrough by Plumbers

SCOTTISH PLUMBERS ARE once again showing the way for the whole of the building industry, for they have just gained a 10% increase. In 1962 they were the first group in the industry to get a 40 hour week. Later, other building workers in Scotland achieved this, but it still has to be gained in England and Wales.

In 1962 the Plumbers' Employers Federation was criticised for this agreement and the first job of the National Incomes Commission, set up by the Tories, was to investigate this agreement and pronounced it as being against 'the national interest'. Well it seems that although the Labour Government has done away with the NIC, they still do not like the extent of this pay rise. In fact Mr. Brown has intervened, and had a chat with the employers asking why they gave in to this demand.

MODERNISING THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE

It is certainly ironical that this should happen and it shows just how much the Government is for the working man. Far from supporting his efforts to gain a substantial pay increase, they came out against it with just as much vehemence as the Tories. One cannot expect them to do any different and those people who think and believe they should be labouring under an illusion. It is plain to see that the Labour Party has no intention of abolishing capitalism. Any reforms it brings in (welcome as some may be) only modernise the social structure of our society to meet the present day needs of a capitalist system.

An example of this is the Redundancy Payment Bill, or more bluntly 'a bit of a hand-shake when you're sacked'. This hand-shake has been described as 'generous' on the whole, it works out at a week's pay for every year of employment with the firm. Better than nothing maybe, but the very fact of having a scheme

of this sort admits the right of an employer to sack a man when his skill is perhaps not wanted any more. It makes the individual a mere unit to be dispensed with when not needed.

If the Labour Government is prepared to smooth the path for a better competitive position for British goods in the world markets, then it will attack any agreements which go beyond the accepted norm of 4%. We know that the building industry is hardly an exporter of goods, but they nevertheless think that this agreement can have some effect in this field. After all it is not a very good example to set for workers in other industries. Mr. Gunter, the Minister of Labour, has also expressed the view to the union leaders that the Government would like a 7% increase in production.

NO MORE TIE-UPS

At the moment the building employers have 'never had it so good' with profits breaking all records. For instance output has gone up by 11% in the last year with hardly any increase in the labour force. So it seems that the employers can well afford to pay a 10% increase not only in Scotland for the plumbers, but for the whole industry.

With the present three-year agreement for England and Wales ending in November, it is essential that another tie-up is not negotiated next time. There is already considerable opposition being expressed through union branches to this type of agreement, for it has tied down wages while output and profits have increased. Demands like those of the London-based unofficial Joint Sites Committee, who are asking for a 1s. 6d. per hour increase, a 40 hour week, three weeks holiday with full pay, and sick pay on a realistic basis compared with the cost of living, are ones which make sense. For as the profits show, the employers can pay and the building worker is fully entitled to the substantial increase. P.T.

BUA Pay Up

AFTER A THREE weeks' struggle the British United Airways dispute is over. ASSET was the first union to reach an agreement and to sign a three year deal, but the members did not return to work until the other six unions had reached an agreement.

The unions have agreed to drop their insistence on parity with State airlines in exchange for substantial wage increases over three years plus a shortening of hours. A labourer's present rate of £12 8s. goes up immediately to £13 6s. 3d., to £14 13s. next March, £24 4s. in 1967. All workers on 42 hour week will be cut to 40 hours from May.

Gatwick shop stewards claimed that the settlement was quite a victory. From the very beginning of the dispute solidarity began to build up and the 'sympathetic strike' began to have an effect right up to the time of the conclusion of the agreement. Of course, if the lads had asked nicely in the first place they would have got it without a struggle according to our Cambridge Don.

18 WEEK STRUGGLE

After 18 weeks in dispute the first 12 of the 80 on strike at Fairview Caravans are to return to work. Over a period of a couple of months all will be reinstated including the nine shop stewards and branch officials whose dismissal sparked off the strike.

In terms of solidarity the strike was well supported, railwaymen, seamen and dockers blacked goods going out. Supplies coming in were also stopped. The company estimated that the 'blacking' of its goods cost them in the region of £200,000. When the last man is finally back at work the dispute will have been won. It is to their credit that the workers stood firm in support of their victimized mates.

SOLIDARITY WAS ABSENT

Some say that yesterday's newspapers are well out of date. Nevertheless I refer to the voice of Labour or is it Tory? No Labour or is it Liberal? Depends which way the wind is blowing *Daily Mirror* (18.3.65). Its middle page double spread was almost entirely devoted to the sixteen month Denby Strike in Yorkshire, the strike that no one wanted

to know, including the TUC and the Minister of Labour. The banner headlines of the *Mirror's* spread was 'The astounding balance sheet of the strike that failed'. Denby's claim that despite the lengthy dispute the share of the year's profit increased. Mr. Sharp, the General Secretary of the Dyers' union, claims that the reason for the increased profit was that the firm took on only the most profitable lines. Obviously the longer the dispute went on the more skilled the blacklegs became. The penultimate paragraph of the article headed 'Defeat' states: 'Nevertheless, the Denby affair has been a massive defeat for the union. Not because of the money it cost them; but because they hoped far too long for a miracle to pull them out of the mire.'

THEY FAILED to get other unions to help them.

THEY DISCARDED the idea of spreading the dispute to other factories.

THEY FAILED to prevent the firm recruiting non-union labour.

THE TUC leaders decided they were powerless to intervene.

FINALLY, Labour Minister Ray Gunter refused their request for an independent inquiry.

The final paragraph ends with the statement: 'They fought a power struggle without enough power... believing that conviction of the rightness of their cause was enough to make things come right in the end.'

Even now, as their union is actively seeking to place the former pickets in jobs in the area, the men who took part in this epic fight believe they were right to do what they did.

The firm will believe, equally, that the union were wrong. AND THE FIRM HAVE THE FIGURES TO PROVE IT.'

The Managing Director Mr. Wright demands the right to select his own labour thus claiming and securing 'open house'. Of course, it is out of order for a trade unionist to refuse to work with a non-unionist, this so called 'freedom' lark only works one way. Our middle class intelligentsia are concerned about Freedom, freedom to be 'stitched up' by our class mates', the employers.

B.C.

AUTOMATION

To the Editor,

I WAS RATHER shaken by the Automation idea (put forward, I believe, in a recent article of yours) of newspapers being sold from machines to save labour. Now the newspaper seller is usually unskilled, disabled or something of a misfit, and acutely aware of the fact. He preserves his 'independence' and self-respect by performing a service, **directly to people**, which he understands and enjoys—in his way. I know such a man; illiterate, uncouth and impossible—but he delights in giving presents, especially at Christmas, to his pub friends. He feels he **belongs**.

Similarly with hospitals. A Doctor of Science recently advocated computers for hospitals on the grounds that there are two nurses (or their equivalent) to every patient and that machines would replace many of them and thus save the health service £30 million a year. From recent experience I can say that everybody in my particular hospital has been kind, considerate and has anticipated every snag. They enjoy helping people, enjoy the gratitude-prestige that is so apparent. They don't do this for money, or power. Their very presence has eased my suffering and depression. Just imagine a hospital where instead of hordes of delightful women one is 'attended to' by a computer and a roll of magnetic tape!

The same in industry. A Black Country

iron firm I know is a family-owned affair and the gaffer got talked into computerising his office. A very clever young woman was engaged to supervise. In less than three months the gaffer paid her off and got rid of the equipment. He told her 'it's like this love—all these people in our offices are friends of my family—generations of 'em have been with us. Now they don't like all this modern stuff—they won't have it—and I don't blame 'em. They've always trusted me—and I trust them. And I ain't having them bloody well upset. We're making plenty of money, we're doing a good job and the whole world wants our stuff. Now I'm not blaming you—I'm not blaming anybody—but I ain't having it! I don't want it. And if that's what modern science means they can keep it'. He asked what severance pay she wanted. Having an acute mind she left it to him—and was he generous! She had a holiday abroad out of it, replaced her car with a good one and got a glowing testimonial. And the old gaffer still has his pint with the lads and tells Black Country tales (mostly dirty!) and always insists that 'Science is all right—but we've got to keep it in its bloody place'. And I heartily agree with him.

I can quite understand scientists keeping computers as pets—unlovely, lifeless lubrications. When the world is filled with them there will be nothing to do, so they say; not even to make love. I don't believe them. The world will not be as they say. The reason? People. People like work. Not too much—but enough. They like making things—like making

things together—like doing things for fun, crosswords and arguing in pubs and climbing mountains and playing violent games. People want excitement and they'll get it, and they'll get it without war. They will not only continue to make things but they'll make things happen—and all the computers and capitalism and communism and other complexities in the world won't tie them all down all the time.

They'll break out—some have already. And they will break state boundaries and start using the world—wholesale. The means to do this exist and will rapidly develop. And they'll tire of cars and walk—for fun. And some will stay at home and do gardening—and they'll ride horses and ponies and tend greenhouses and grow flowers—beautiful flowers—for fun! Why am I so sure? Because people have done these things for generations because they are good—and others will do the same. They use cars like that—personal transport, like personal clothes; and cars are changing the entire world.

Some of the computers will do the mechanical and dirty work and of course people will let them. And the computers people don't want will be in their hutches ticking away helplessly without programmes, untended and uncared for simply because we don't want programmes—don't want to be told what to do—don't want a computer for a gaffer. Who the hell wants a gaffer that can't argue back anyway? And if scientists want to play silly buggers with computers, well we'll let 'em—as long as they leave us alone. Coventry REG WRIGHT.

LETTER