



LOVE'S RICH WATER.

Love's rich water  
 springs from the fountain in your eyes,  
 the source of patterned singing  
 gushing myriadly in sunlit laughs  
 that sparkle bubbly 'neath the gold  
 of your silky wind-blown hair  
 that caresses the air and the tangible green,  
 intangible blue - the secret of you  
 is concealed in your smoky young skin,  
 an ocean of pleasure upon which I float,  
 dimly gazing through mysterious wavering forms  
 to the faint undulating bloodstreams  
 flowing passionately along the bed,  
 the surface strangely opaque,  
 its shadows mingling with rays of the sun:  
 honey and lime and salt and blood  
 in the heart and mind of you,  
 almost a dream or a sea-tapestry  
 glowing in every soap-bubble  
 blown by a child through time,  
 hidden in the glint of a girl's needle  
 weaving an embroidery with colours of a rainbow:  
 perfect, secure, hushed  
 like the grasshopper stitching through blades  
 on a silent, scorched summer day;  
 love's deep sun  
 beams from the sky in your apple-juice mouth,  
 your tongue soft and moist as a glistening fish  
 gently panting in golden rays,  
 lying among reeds of emerald

or upon a single sheet of frosted glass  
with rainbow edges:

a smile brings the fire of a crocus into your eyes,  
petals of a blood-red rose gleam

with the burning silver essence of you,

the proud bloom of a lordly daffodil,

the pale gentle blue of forget-me-not

swaying in love's cool breeze,

your running fingers rippling through time's

changing paint, the air its canvas:

your voice swimming through the wind,

flowing through whispering leaves,

gliding as golden smoke in spirals

softly down to brush clear petals

bright as polished bronze,

then sailing through the sappy stem

down even through the frailest roots

and into darkest earth, the heart of life;

love's rich water.

shines within your veins

and in the nerve-strings of your brain

where I am living:

may it bathe my twisted heart

and wash my mind pure as snow

and warm as the tongue of the snapdragon:

for your life is the slippery fire

that is found in the eyelash of the swan,

the liquid clear white dream of the full moon.

P.J. Riches.

BRITAIN'S CHOKING CITIES.

Many of Britain's roads are frequently congested to an intolerable degree. Those who are in a position to help remedy this should take the action needed without further delay.

The remedy I would like to put forward is road pricing, the operation of which I shall discuss later. We must first, however, consider the problem as it exists today.

There are many parts of the country where, especially at certain times of the day, road traffic congestion delays and frustrates those travelling to work and holds up freight going by road. To deal with this appalling situation, successive governments - at both central and local levels - have endeavoured to improve and increase the provision of road space.

We have now reached the situation where there are widespread fears that the motor car will take over and destroy the environment, bringing with it noise, air pollution, the elimination of historic or pleasant surroundings, and a general lowering of the quality of everyday life.

How are we to strike a balance between the pressures of traffic upon road space and the wishes of people who want to stop road building schemes from taking away their homes, livelihood, or peace and quiet?

Increased supply of road space inevitably generates increased demand for its use. More roads, as the USA has found, mean more people find it advantageous to use cars, and so merely increasing the road programme does not, in the long run, reduce congestion.

Congestion will not, however, increase indefinitely if the amount of space available is kept constant, since there comes a level at which it no longer becomes worthwhile for additional people to use cars.

But the level at which people choose not to increase demand for road space is higher than the level that would be best for all of us. The problem is to make it no longer worthwhile for extra people to come onto the roads after the point which is best for society as a whole has been reached.

The remedy I propose is to apply to road space the economic principles on which we rely for the allocation of most other goods and services. That is, we must charge the users of roads for the costs of the road system.

It is not sufficient, however, merely for total income from petrol tax, road fund license, etc. to equal total expenditure on roads. It is vital that we should require each user to meet the costs he himself would otherwise impose on the rest of the community by his use of the road system. These costs largely depend on the degree of congestion at any one time.

Let's consider exactly what these costs are - (1) the costs of maintaining and running the roads, including repair and lighting; (2) the cost of the use of land for roads; (3) the cost of constructing roads; (4) the cost imposed on other road users by each motorist making congestion worse and thereby impeding others; (5) the costs inflicted on the community by noise, fumes, accidents, knocking down historic buildings, destroying the countryside, etc.

If each potential road-user was faced with the decision of whether to pay the full cost or go without the use of his car, he would only decide to use his car if he could thereby get more benefits than the benefits others consider they derive from his not using his car.

This is the way we fix other prices. Schemes for road pricing amount to a demand that roads should be used only to the extent to which their use is beneficial to society, as judged by the choices made by its members.

Much research has already been carried out into the detailed theory and method of enforcement of road pricing, notably by the Government Road Research Laboratory, which has already placed contracts for prototype equipment.

The most practicable scheme envisages each vehicle carrying a meter to count impulses generated by electrical cables, like the wire loops already used for speed checks, which would be laid across the road at intervals. Road-users would have to pay according to the number of impulses counted by the meter.

The cables would be energized continuously so that any vehicle moving across a cable would receive an impulse. Rates charged would be made to vary according to time and place by laying cables in groups and having different numbers of them activated at different times, so that the high degree of congestion in Central London rush hours as compared with uncongested roads could be reflected in the charges made.

The Road Research Laboratory has estimated that the capital cost of a pricing cable system would be £5 million. Such pricing points would be unnecessary in areas of low traffic density, but could prove useful to reduce congestion and restrict the use of road space in areas where traffic density is proving to be a problem.

The decisions of road space consumers as to which roads are of most value to them could prove useful in making decisions about building extra roads.

We could also then tackle the problem of the railways, which are, unlike the roads, widely expected to pay their way. We cannot determine the efficiency of the railways in isolation from the means of transport which compete with them.

Thus, whilst road pricing cannot be the whole answer to the transport problem, it does have an important part to play.

V.F. Anderson.

CLOSED DOWN.

Love like the confident flushing of a lavatory cistern  
Washed all my fears away  
I lost my love for you last night upon the sand  
Stretched out awaiting a fate worse than death  
aha! Avidly.

Your eyes were wide  
Your arms were wide  
All of you was rather wide

But last night I lost my love for you  
And if I felt my duty compelled me  
Not hot-headed exploration  
But cool detached  
Smoking in one hand  
And thinking of a film in the other  
Chops again for tea in my tongue.  
Once I loved you well  
Now I have seen you well  
goodbye.

Please shut yourself up  
Please  
shut yourself up.

R.D. Lloyd, Esq.  
(whom God preserve and vice-versa).





FUNNY, BUT ....

Funny, but he didn't quite feel the same that morning. He got out of bed; his wife still lying there asleep; and so would he have been practically, but he didn't quite feel the same that morning. He walked across the bedroom, taking his pyjama jacket off and putting it on a chair, and shuffling into his slippers as he walked, (must remember not to do that, the back of the left one's already torn a bit) trying to think what was different. He felt his way out of the bedroom door in the darkness, onto the landing, and then through the bathroom door. He reached out and flicked the light switch on; he doesn't need to see to do that, he's done it for thirty odd years; and had to shield his eyes from the sudden glaring brilliance with his arm (why the hell do I paint these walls so shiny white, if this is the first light I switch on in the morning, it always hurts my eyes, maybe I should go to an optician or something). He turned the hot tap on in the washbasin and went straight through to the toilet. He picked up his razor on the way back over to the washbasin, and plugged it in, (mustn't do it with wet hands, you can't be too careful) then he washed and dried himself and shaved. Funny, he looked different that morning, in the mirror; older, greyer, no- something else.

He went back into the bedroom and got dressed, (cold this morning, better put a pullover on). His wife was sitting up in bed, "Better put a pullover on, it's cold this morning", "I have, dear." He went downstairs and got out a saucepan to make the porridge, just as he always did in winter, and then laid the table, and turned on the fire (it is cold this morning). He drew the curtains and as he was about to turn away, the corner of his eye caught the first glint of sunlight on the underside of a cloud. The horizon was dark grey blue, harsh and cold; but there was a slight pinkish glow, almost unnoticeable unless you looked for it, and this was echoed like a small clear note on the clouds above. As he watched, the colour spread, across the eastern horizon, and as it began to touch the edges of the smokey grey clouds just becoming visible in the lightening sky above, an orange warmth diffused through it.

His wife came into the kitchen in her pink plastic fur-trimmed slippers and dressing gown, her hair in curlers under a hairnet; "The porridge is ready dear.. what are you standing there like that for?..The porridge is ready." He turned;

"Look at .... oh, never mind". He walked over and sat down to his breakfast, and all he could see out of the other window was the dark sky and some murky, dirty, greyish yellow reflecting the glare of the sodium street light, just as he always could. That was the same as ever, but ...

He picked up his bowler hat, his umbrella, his briefcase and his newspaper (the Independent newspaper), and opened the front door. He brushed his bowler as his wife walked along the hall towards him (looking very shabby, I'll need a new one soon; they don't make them like they used to). He kissed her on the cheek and left, "Goodbye"... "Goodbye, dear"... He closed the front gate after him and noticed a crack running right down the wood between the screws which kept the hinges on, and damp marks in the paint. He walked down the street towards the west, past the bare and miserable flowering cherry trees and the brown, dry, hydrangeas. He reached the station, and crossed the footbridge to platform three, as he always did, showing his season ticket at the barrier at the top of the steps. He got on the train as it drew in and was in a smoking compartment as it left. He had one all to himself, one of the rare occasions on which he had, so he lit his pipe. He passed through East Croydon, recognising the station almost instinctively and then went past the yards just before Norwood Junction. Funny, though, the nameplate on the platform said Selhurst and later he could make out Thornton Heath, Balham, and Wandsworth Common as he passed. He was sure they should have been Anerley, Forest Hill and Honor Oak Park.

He crossed the river just near a big power station with a huge, white-smokey chimney at each of its four corners, and the bridge looked different too. Funny, but nothing seemed quite the same that morning. As his train drew into the terminus, that looked very different; he could see a building marked B.E.A., and there had been some very odd carriages outside the station in some sidings on the right hand side, marked "Wagons-Lits" but although the words seemed familiar, they seemed to be spoken in a voice from the past which he could not quite recall. He got off the train and wandered along the platform. He went the same way as normal but everyone seemed to be going the other way. He came to some steps and went up, and then turned right and walked along a long footbridge with some doors marked "Staff Only" on the left and once he caught a glimpse of a bus through some railings, but the gates were locked and he could not get out into the street, so he went along the bridge. He went down some more

steps onto a platform; there was no train there, so he went into a small door, there was no one near, and he walked through and found himself on another platform.

A train came in, and he got on and sat down in a smoking compartment (hope it doesn't take too long to get started or I'll be late for work). The train shuddered and started, and he was thinking; the loud-speakers are not good and he'd bet the voice wasn't English, but he was sure he had something about boats and trains and some very strange sounding station names. His hand felt inside his jacket pocket and came to rest on a dark blue leathery wallet, but it had something stamped on the front in gold and didn't seem the same as his wallet. Then he relaxed and lay back in his seat, after all it would probably be more use than his wallet where this train was going, and he could still see the last of the colours of the sunrise out of the window. Funny ..... he had never really noticed that before.

P.J. Roberts

?

Death is life.

God is dead-alive is eternal.

People will always believe, whatever their beliefs.

Do you question your journey?

From where? To where? via life.

Pregnant matricide.

What are you doing here?

Reduce your thoughts to utter simplicity.

Forget Freud, and live.

J.R.S. Taylor.

VIETNAM AND PEACE

After R.P.Hatfield's extreme, if not unexpected, rantings about sending British troops out to fight with the Americans in Vietnam in last term's ACID, I shall try and give some constructive views on what I think the Vietnam war is about, and how it may be settled.

What is the war about? Not an easy question. Certainly any easy answers like "stopping the threat of world communism" are now seen by most thinking people to be, to say the least, incomplete. The true answer is a complex blend of nationalism, communism, and simple power politics.

In a sense, the nationalistic influences are the predominant ones. They are certainly the oldest. Ever since Louis Napoleon, Emperor of France, looked to South-East Asia to satisfy his dreams of a world empire, the Vietnamese have been trying to throw out one set of invaders after another. As a young man, Ho Chi Minh's dream was an intensely nationalistic one; of a united Vietnam free from the foreign aggressors.

The communist-capitalist issue must be seen against this nationalistic background. Unfortunately a democratic compromise seems impossible at the moment, for Saigon's 'democratically elected' regime of President Thieu and Vice-President Ky will not only not accept communists in the government, but they insist it should be a crime even to talk of a government which is not anti-communist. (the latest abomination in the supposedly democratic nation of South Vietnam, the sentencing to five years hard labour of the candidate who 'ran third' in the fixed Presidential elections two years ago on a non-communist ticket, has raised loud protests). What we must not forget is that President Thieu and Vice-President Ky are none other than Marshal Ky and Vice-Marshal Thieu who rose to power in a coup, and whose anti-communist views come not through any desire to stop communism but through the desire to maintain their personal power. Thieu and Ky have stayed in power, not because the Vietnamese people want them, but merely because the Americans have supported their anti-communist policies.

Another myth to explode is that the Vietcong are just North Vietnamese Army personnel who have infiltrated the South. As Robert Kennedy pointed out, before he was assassinated last year, if all the Vietcong the U.S.Army claims to have

killed were really North Vietnamese Army, the North Vietnamese Army would have become a little short of personnel by now. There is no doubt that the Vietcong as a separate delegation in Paris has been merely a recognition of the actual situation.

What then are the alternatives for the Americans in Vietnam, if they are not to give in completely to the Vietcong. As I see it they are

- (1) To escalate the war and include either the use of tactical nuclear weapons or an invasion of North Vietnam.
- (2) To continue the war at stalemate, as it is at the moment.
- (3) To withdraw American troops leaving the Saigon Government and its troops to try and continue the war.
- (4) To try and set up some sort of a coalition government.

The first alternative, although subscribed to by many high-up politicians in the U.S.A., like George Wallace, Barry Goldwater, Ronald Reagan and Curtis LeMay, is generally accepted to be a suicidal measure, since such action would almost certainly bring in Russia or China, or both, and a direct U.S. - Chinese or U.S. Russian conflict would entail a nuclear war without doubt.

The second alternative, although theoretically possible, is obviously not politically desirable for the U.S. politicians. Resentment in the American electorate is understandably growing, as their sons are sent 'out to war', and the American people will not tolerate the war indefinitely.

The third alternative cannot, I think, be considered a practical possibility. Although the Saigon Government, having realised the reality of eventual American withdrawal, has decided to try to slow this down until the fighting can be done by South Vietnamese troops alone, no-one really thinks that the Saigon Government could stand one month without American support.

The fourth alternative, by Holmesian logic, however improbable, must be the solution. Coalition government in South Vietnam has, of course, been put forward by both Eugene McCarthy and Nelson Rockefeller last year. Since both Thieu and Ky will not accept the idea, the thing would appear to be doomed from the start. Also, experience in Laos has shown that the communists are not usually satisfied with a coalition government, and so the situation is difficult. However, I think that any answer to the Vietnamese problem, even

if it is only a temporary answer, will be the establishment of a coalition government, followed by a referendum on whether North and South should be united. This, again, was part of Rockefeller's plan.

At the moment, the U.S. delegation is showing an unrealistic attitude at the Paris talks by trying to have the Demilitarized Zone set up again, or in other words a return to the state when Vietnam was first divided. The communists cannot accept this as it would be a negation of all they have been fighting for for the past thirteen years.

This is what the British Government can do. It can put pressure on the new American administration- and Britain's influence on America should not be underestimated- to try to get President Nixon to break the initial deadlock by dropping the unrealistic DMZ proposals. In this way Britain can make a real contribution- and an infinitely more valuable one than sending British divisions to prolong the war.

D.K. Brown

ROCKS

We rocks, we stand jutting out,  
eroded by society's sea:  
waves of convention,  
salt of hypocrisy,  
tossed roughly by the wind of common madness:  
we vulnerable rocks, we crumble.

P.J. Riches

NOT ME

Brought up to  
obey his parents  
do his homework  
and always call his teacher sir  
no matter how much lower he is  
He does his homework  
he learns the facts  
but not of life  
collects exams like stamps  
with equal mindlessness.  
On he goes  
to his college  
worked for his scholarship  
works to stay there  
not like some who grow their hair  
Leaves his schooling  
gets his job  
in some office or maybe  
somewhere else where he can  
oil the wheels and grab.  
Finds a wife,  
poor little mouse  
keeps on grabbing  
crawling, to buy his house  
to give his kids the same as he had.  
Dies  
goes to hell - or maybe nowhere.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS:

Dear Sir,

I am writing to you as a last resort. Through no fault of my own, I find myself in the only house which still has the archaic system of 3 changes a week. My health is suffering, so can you suggest what I should do. I won't mention the House's name, but suffice it to say that the cross is more than I can bear.

Yours sincerely

'Desperate' of S. Croydon.

(Ed - there are two things you can do.

(1) Passive resistance - Faking of changes, undermining of House's morale, etc.

(11) Direct action - assassination of Housemaster, tearing down of notices, change sheets, etc.)

To BBC Controller, BBC 1.

Dear Sir or Madam,

I really must write to express my relief that the obscene programme 'Hector's House' has at last been taken off the air. During its run, children of up to 30 years of age were treated to a disgusting variety of filth. Hector, a dog was plainly living with Zsa-Zsa, a cat, although they were plainly not married. I can imagine children in every home asking "Mummy, why isn't Zsa-Zsa wearing a ring", a traumatic experience for them all. Even worse, whenever Zsa-Zsa wasn't looking, Hector called over Mrs Frog - a plain case of adulterous behaviour, which I am sure could not be missed by even the smallest children. As Hector might say himself 'I'm a big naughty lascivious Hector'

Yours faithfully,

Mrs. Mary Blackcottage.



SUGGESTION FROM THE POPULACE : Please may we have some new outside lavatories.

THE DYING FLAME.

Inside my mind,  
buried under more important  
things,  
I found a flame  
that burned glass-bottled  
with a choking  
black-smoked light.  
I groped to find it  
lost but now found,  
to feed its dying glow,  
to keep a hold on what  
was mine alone.  
I could not reach.  
With burning hands  
I lit the match  
and by the rough-stoned  
wall the flame  
burst into naked life,  
to show the world  
that darkness does  
not stretch for ever.

N. E. Godsiffe.

PARTICIPATION AND CHOICE.

"Participation" was the key word in trendy politics in 1968, and there's every sign that the demand for greater involvement of the individual in the decision-making which affects his life is going to continue to be discussed in the coming years.

The raising of this issue by member of the Government (especially by dynamic Wedgbenn) has been attacked as a ploy to divert attention from their own failings, and as an irrelevant luxury in a nation beset by more pressing problems concerned with the economy.

I don't think this is altogether fair, however, and one must ask why, at this time rather than any other, there is such widespread demand for participation and so much talk of the gap between the governors and the governed, and the communicators and the communicated to.

But what does participation mean? As often described, it turns out to be the process by which more and more people get on more and more committees with the purpose of running other people's lives for them.

This is not the sort of participation I want to see. Rather than finding more democratic ways of determining the people who occupy particular positions, we ought to question whether anyone should be occupying those positions at all ("Free election of masters does not abolish the masters or the slaves" - Herbert Marcuse).

Indeed, it is my opinion that the supposed failings of politics today arise from expecting politicians to do more than they should be allowed to.

The calls for "inspiring leadership" are, I believe, very dangerous since a Prime Minister inspiring complete national confidence would inevitably increase his own power. Trust in leaders means abdication of criticism of them (I draw a distinction between demands that politicians be worthy of trust, with which I agree, and demands that they should in fact inspire it, which I consider to be dangerous).

We must not expect too much of our politicians. Rather, we should be concerned to reduce the degree of control they exercise over our lives.

With the decline of institutionised religion, we are expecting political ideologies to fulfill the functions hitherto the responsibility of the Church, namely the maintenance of social cohesion, the enforcement of morality, and the provision of a ready made code of belief. It has also been a challenge to, and a curb, the power of the State.

The downfall of the Church, while welcome in many ways, is nevertheless leading to a search for new ways of fulfilling the need of large numbers of people for something to follow and trust. The rôle of organised spectator sport (especially soccer) and popular sub-culture (especially pop groups) in providing substitutes for religion has been widely noted. More dangerous than these, however, is the fanatical adherence to totalitarian leaders, as with the religious-like devotion to Adolf Hitler.

Whilst I am not setting out here to analyse the problems of a society deprived of organised religion, I think it is relevant to present-day politics to give a warning about expecting a political ideology to provide an object for total personal commitment as in fascist and communist totalitarian states.

This is where participation too is relevant, since demands for participation must be channelled into pressure groups to take some of the power from the politicians and hand it over to the people, in order to let each individual make the choices which shape his own life.

It is important to realise that even the most meticulous and democratic ways of finding out the will of the majority do not justify the imposition of that will upon a dissenting minority. While I am far from proclaiming a desire for a complete absence of law and order, the increase in democracy in Britain in the past century does not invalidate the pleas of those who warned us long ago against the tyranny of the majority, which is no less tyranny because it is by the majority or because they have all been interviewed by opinion pollsters.

As John Stuart Mill wrote in his essay "On Liberty", such phrases as 'self-government' and 'the power of the people over themselves' do not express the true state of the case. The 'people' who exercise the power are not always the same people as those over whom it is exercised; and the 'self-government' spoken of is not the government of each by himself, but of each by all the rest. The will of the people, moreover, practically means the will of the most numerous or most active part of the people; the majority, or those who succeed in making themselves accepted as the majority, may desire to oppress a part of their number, and precautions are as much needed against this as against any other abuse of power. The limitation, therefore, of the power of the government over individuals loses none of its importance when the holders of the power are regularly accountable to the community; that is, to the strongest party therein.

Absolute power corrupts no less absolutely because it happens to be exercised by people who are democratically elected, still less if it is by self-appointed Guardians of The Public Interest, like David Frost, or by the statistically-

selected button pushing audiences without which no television programme any longer seems complete).

If democracy and participation just mean finding better ways of pursuing unjustified interference with other people's lives, then I am against them. Democracy, I believe, should mean the continuing power of the individual to choose for himself. Rather than having what is merely a choice of entrusting to one of a limited number of groups of men, the individual should be permitted to exercise such responsibility for himself.

It should be the business of the State not to choose for the individual, but to arrange things so that individual demands can be effectively translated into the things that are actually provided in response to decisions and choices.

This is far from being an exhortation to anarchic laissez-faire. It is a demand for a programme of action designed to allow us to take effective control of our own destinies.

This means a large number of things -

First, redistributive taxation to break down concentrations of wealth and adequate provisions for those with low incomes. Effective choice is an impossibility in conditions of poverty.

Second, making people pay for the costs and inconveniences they would otherwise impose on others, whether by road congestion (see the article in this 'ACID', "Britain's Choking Cities"), by crime, or by changes in the environment. Those wishing to destroy amenities, even if they do get planning permission, should be forced to compensate those who suffer by such action.

Third, allowing people the power to make choices concerning their own education and housing, health and pensions (See the scheme for subsidy by vouchers outlined in "Alternative to the Welfare State" in the last "ACID").

Fourth, ensuring that those who produce goods and services are dependent upon producing what consumers want. This entails controls on misleading descriptions of goods, controls over monopolies, mergers, and restrictive trade practices, reforms in taxation and subsidies, and the eventual denationalisation of telephones, steel, and much of transport.

These are the sort of measures we need in order not only to produce decisions which are better able to provide for individual needs, but also to give people a much-needed sense of being in a position to run their lives. The answer lies primarily not in devolving power to Edinburgh or Cardiff, but to each and every household in the land, so that we can all think and choose for ourselves.

V.F. Anderson

APARTHEID

The white domination of the black or non-white majority in South Africa is deplorable and unjustifiable. The legislation and encouragement of racial discrimination by a minority group is not only immoral but unchristian.

The policy of apartheid as presented by the Nationalist Party is that black and white are not suited to live together and never have been; that historical accidents have brought the races together; and that a separation under white leadership must take place. The aim is to eventually create several black states. Every point of this policy can be shown to be irrational at a glance. Firstly, although the fact that different races are not suited to live together may be partially true, there is no reason why they cannot live or learn to live together. Secondly, the statement that historical accidents have been the cause of mixing is hardly ever true. Peoples have moved to a place for a purpose and in the case of South Africa, Europeans moved there with the intention of collecting some precious stones and they are now partially ruling a country in which they did not originate. Third and last, a policy of separation is in itself a policy of discrimination and therefore should certainly not be condoned;

However, in practice these policies are not the same. This in itself shows how unreliable and untrustworthy the South African Government is. In practice the races have not been separated. They are being segregated and in order to do this the blacks have to undergo severe discrimination. Blacks work for and are the servants of the whites in the towns, in industry and in white homes. They therefore live near the whites (although in separate quarters) and work under the whites. This is clearly not a policy of separation. It is the aim of the whites to retain their labour resources (coloured people) and make white rule stronger. It is abundantly clear that there is no intention of setting up independent states for the blacks.

In segregating the white and the non-white, all citizens of South Africa have to be classified by an Act of 1950. Whites are classified as people who in appearance obviously are, or who are generally accepted as white people, but not people who, although white in appearance are generally accepted as coloured. This classification ridicules the system.

A person of mixed race namely a Coloured (ignorant of his race) may look white and be accepted as white and therefore can use all white facilities. But if he is later discovered to be coloured he must change to the much lower class facilities of the non-whites. This instance shows difficulties in justifying segregation. Asians are classified as non-whites with the exceptions of Jews and Syrians who are white!

The volume of race legislation since 1948, when the Nationalist Party came to power for the first time, has been huge. Many Acts have been amended several times and all of them are complex and are expressed tortuously so that the whites do not bother to examine them. Here are a few examples of early legislation.

1945 - An African who has lived in a town for fourteen years and still lives and works there is not entitled to remain in the town for more than seventy-two hours.

1952 - Any policeman can call upon an African (over 16) to produce a reference book. If this is not produced, the African is liable to a fine of up to £10 or imprisonment for up to one month.

1953 - If there is only one waiting-room on a railway station, the station master can reserve it for whites and if a non-white enters he is committing a crime.

1957 - It is unlawful for a White and Non-White to drink a cup of tea together in any tea-room in South Africa.

All legislation nowadays is much stricter.

The life of a Non-white is of course greatly restricted. In politics, the power of the whites is almost complete. For all the Non-whites in South Africa, seven white members of Parliament can be elected. In education, five times as much revenue is spent on a white child than a non-white child. White children are usually at school for 8 to 9 years whereas non-whites hardly ever stay for more than five. The limited University education for non-whites is separated from the white university. The whole aim is to prevent a non-white receiving too good an education or else he might be a danger to the white supremacy in the future.

Lastly as far as sex is concerned, there is certain imprisonment for whites who have extra-marital connections with non-whites. For that matter they cannot have marital connections because mixed marriage is illegal.

Having studied the situation in South Africa and seeing the absurdity of it, one must wonder why there is not any great opposition to apartheid. This is mainly due to the fact that freedom of speech in South Africa is very difficult. If anyone speaks against the government or apartheid he or she is quite likely to be imprisoned for a reasonable length of time. The press is also therefore not strictly free. It is forced to publish articles about the building of new hospitals, schools, etc. for non-whites but cannot publish articles on the bad conditions of the non-white reservations and such like. The public consequently do not find out much about the blacks but know only that some things are being done for their benefit. Another reason for this lack of opposition is that the South African is given a feeling of superiority over his dirty, untrustworthy and brutal servant 'so-called'. The amazing thing is that his servant is permitted to take care of his children although he is inferior and supposedly covered in filth! The one stock reason that a South African churns out for not opposing apartheid is that there are so few of his race that they would be overrun if the policy were not pursued.

If you ask me, it was probably apartheid that put this fear in the South African in the first place as it has agitated the non-white majority towards hostility.

What will be the eventual outcome of perpetuated apartheid policy? This is practically unanswerable but I can suggest two possible occurrences. Firstly, after a long period of white dictatorship in which the black countries of the rest of the African continent will have developed rapidly, pressures will be put on South Africa and either a compromise or a racial war will ensue. Secondly, if South Africa becomes very isolated, and this depends on the actions of the other countries, the white population will revolt against the Government. Either way, I hope that no blood is lost and that the day of true liberty will come soon.

L.J. SACKS.

Chaucer's Boeuwuff Fragment II

I haf ne mayde  
Ne y ne sade  
I haf ne bede  
Ne y ne babe

(Discovered in the Bodleian by R.D.Lloyd)

Jack and Jill

Jack and Jill went up the hill  
To fetch a pail of water  
Jill came down with half-a-crown  
But not for carrying water.

Traditional.

THOUGHTS ON A VIRUS

"Powellism is a virus which must be wiped out" - Harold Wilson

Powellism has become a dirty word in some circles; in other circles Enoch Powell is hailed as a realist and a patriot. What is Powellism? Why has it come to the fore? Why is it condemned by some, hailed by others? These questions must be answered if one wants to get some insight into why an extremely able politician is being treated as an outcast by his contemporaries.

What is Powellism? It is not racism; it is not fascism. All too many people are of the opinion that Powellism means racism, or at the very least, that it represents an extreme policy on immigration. But Powellism is more than this; Powellism means floating the pound; Powellism means no foreign aid; Powellism means denationalisation and above all, Powellism stands for free speech.

Why has Powellism come to the fore? On April 20th last, Enoch Powell made a speech on immigration in Birmingham. It was much the same speech as he had made before - but, the language and tone were 'inflammatory'.





The press realised it was a good story, and because of a lack of other big news all papers gave it banner headlines. On Monday the 22nd Mr. Heath sacked Mr. Powell from the Shadow Cabinet. This naturally gave the issue even greater weight. In November Mr. Powell once again revived the issue by a speech at Eastbourne. The Press hardly paid any attention to a speech he made during the Conservative conference in which he called for the abolition of foreign aid, and for the introduction of a floating exchange rate.

Why is Powell condemned by some, acclaimed by others? Powell is naturally condemned by the establishment in the genuine fear that he will increase racial hatred, and in the fear that not to do so would lead to incriminations of racism being levelled at themselves. Immediately following Enoch Powell's first speech the nation saw the amazing sight of dockers marching to Westminster to support Powell. Amazing because the dockers are traditionally left-wing (many in fact are communists) and Enoch Powell is by any measurement a right-wing Conservative M.P. The simple reason for this was also fear. A fear of immigrants taking their jobs, their houses and altering their lives. These dockers also had the feeling of betrayal:- their Government had legislated to protect the immigrants, and (it seemed to them) at the expense of themselves.

Whether these fears are justified is not so important as their existence. Mr. Powell brought this into the open. Few could have thought that such strong feeling against coloured immigration existed amongst so many. This was a warning to the Government to act; if such a store of animosity exists, to allow continued immigration is inviting trouble. To stamp out this 'virus' would be to stamp out free speech. Only Mr. Powell had the courage to bring this issue into the open in time.

SECRETS OF THE PETAL

Faces faint behind the smoke  
Fade in the general gloom,  
A whimper falters through the air,  
Falls beside my shoe;  
I grasp a stem that leads to a bloom,  
A petal falls, is lost from view.  
And dreams of wavering flowers  
In the burning garden  
Whisper through my field of vision,  
Dare defy the snow therein:  
I think I laugh.

My painted hand moves out to touch  
The shapes the buff smoke hides;  
A pettle drops on to a puddle,  
Floats a little:  
I gaze, I muse, I wonder  
At the secret of the petal.

Earth repeats the mystery past  
The emerald grass the zephyr blows,  
The singing sky and I divulge  
The secret of the lady moon,  
And laugh in sleep though tired with joy,  
The cranium peaceful, lashes still:  
While Hermes, son of mighty Zeus,  
Brings news of flowers dead or dying,  
News of widows still or crying.

Misty corners of the room  
Hiding silence in a gloom  
Uncomprehended as the moon:  
O quiet darkness, soft and bare,  
Enclose my lady in your snare;  
Remember too the petal fair,  
Remember flowers everywhere.

I know you laugh, great oak,  
I've seen your twittering branches before  
That time when I reached out for a leaf  
As I lay on bank beneath your shade-  
I slipped and sprained my mind:  
You hissed.  
And now as I clutch this precious stem,  
Having now far more than a leaf,  
You laugh again as I watch  
These petals that drop:  
Do you their secrets know?

Millions of bubbles are floating in line,  
Each one is coloured, a face in each:  
I recognize all and I close my eyes,  
And another petal falls from the stem in my hand.  
Softly the wool of my hands is woven,  
The needles of smoke make a pattern that forms  
Like the smile of a child  
Whose eyes are the gold of the sea,  
The sea where ships are drowned.

I have gazed, I gaze and will gaze  
In the hearts of many heaps of petals,  
Longing to know their secret,  
As the bird hovers wondering,

Singing to the sun that gleams on the windows  
Of passing carriages  
Clattering by and blowing  
One more petal from my stem away;  
I wonder:  
Who will first discover  
The hidden meaning,  
The essential basic latency,  
That preciously guarded, over-concealed  
Secret of the petal?

P.J.Riches.

TEA IN AN ENGLISH COUNTRY GARDEN

Among the tea leaves in the sink  
The patterns in the Vim  
In the refuse-disposal I vanish  
With an aluminium din.

S.R.Haggard.

Old age isn't so bad when you consider the alternatives.

THE ELECTRIC REVOLUTION

What Freud did for sex and Marx did for economics, Marshall McLuhan has done for media. Professor Marshall McLuhan of Toronto is Prophet of the electric revolution.

The enormous influence his views have had is due to his analysis of history in terms of changes in the media of communication. He has used this theory to look into the future, and has made outspoken predictions concerning, among other things, Western man's return to tribalism, which he claims will result from new electronic media.

McLuhan has been described as "a passing craze", "the high priest of Popthink", and "the foremost cultural spokesman of the Corporate Establishment". His obsession with media has been condemned as monomania; his theses are widely regarded as an attack on rational thought and literacy.

McLuhan's theories are summed up in the most famous of his many slogans, "the medium is the message". He says that different ways of communicating bring different ways of receiving the information communicated, and that since different media change the relative importance of our various senses (i.e. our sense-ratios), changes in media bring about changes in sense-ratios which in turn change the way we see the world.

McLuhan sees these changes in media as crucial to historical development. As he puts it, "Media, by altering the environment, evoke in us unique ratios of sense perceptions. The extension of any one sense alters the way we think and act - the way we perceive the world. When these ratios change, men change." "The medium determines the modes of perception and the matrix of assumptions within which objectives are set."

Looking back over man's confrontations with communications media, McLuhan attributes the emancipation of women to the typewriter, the rise of Hitler to the radio, anticolonial revolt to the movies, the fall of the Roman Empire to the cutting off of papyrus supplies, the growth of nationalism to the printing press, and the integration of the American negro to the commercial vehicle.

Today, he says, literate Western man is confronted by the first stages of a revolution in communications media. Whilst largely unaware of it, Western man, due to his literate culture and visual bias, brought about by the invention of the phonetic alphabet and the printing press, sees the world from a visually-biased point of view. He has not realised that his assumptions have been coloured by his particular sense-ratios.

According to McLuhan, these sense-ratios are today changing. With the rise of television, radio, telegraph, computers, and automation, Western man's traditional view of the world is disintegrating. The assumptions made under the influence of a literate society cease to be valid. McLuhan foresees the retribalization of Western man.

Just as writing and print gave pre-literate man "an eye for an ear", so today the process is being reversed so that man is being plunged back into a tribal world where the senses of hearing and touching regain the position taken from them by sight.

This is coupled with an immense increase in the speed of communications and the increased scope and penetration of the new media. McLuhan sums up the coming world as a "global village", in which communications media bring us closer together and in which we are forced to relinquish our old detached view of the world.

The effect of television in bringing the world into our homes has become increasingly apparent in recent years. The Czechs were the first nation to see themselves invaded on T.V. Vietnam is the first war to be fought on T.V. In Nigeria, an execution was delayed to give the cameraman time to load his camera. The life - and death - of the world has been transformed into a gigantic T.V. show with a cast of millions, many of them starving. Assassinations, Ibos, Grosvenor Square, Paris, Chicago, Prague : and now the moon.

McLuhan interprets the media as extensions of the body and senses. The wheel is an extension of the foot, the book is an extension of the eye, clothing (which also comes within his wide definition of media) is an extension of the skin. With electric circuitry, telegraph, and T.V., we have extended our central nervous systems outside our own bodies.

An interesting, intermeshing, seamless web of human nerves now covers

the earth. We are literally tangled up with one another. The new electronic technology involves us with each other as never before. We are confronted with instantaneous information that serves effectively to abolish distance - whatever is happening now is, in effect, happening here.

This is what McLuhan says about T.V: "T.V., in a highly visual culture, drives us inward in depth into a totally non-visual universe of involvement. It is destroying our entire political, educational, social, and institutional life; T.V. 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."

Here is McLuhan on education: "The young today live mythically and in depth ... The student finds no means of involvement for himself and cannot discover how the educational scheme relates to his mythical world of electronically processed data and experience that his clear and direct responses report. It is a matter of the greatest urgency that educational institutions realise that we now have civil war among the environments created by media other than the printed word. The classroom is now in a vital struggle for survival with the immensely persuasive 'outside' world created by new informational media."

"Education will become reorganized as civil defence against media fallout. The only medium for which our education now offers civil defence is the print medium. The educational establishment, founded on print, does not yet admit any other responsibilities."

It is understandable that such statements should have attracted attention. A convert to Roman Catholicism ("It gives me emotional stability"), Professor Marshall McLuhan, aged 57, has become one of the most widely-quoted and widely-discussed men in North America. Already a sort of McLuhan avant-garde cult has grown up.

McLuhan is saying things that matter. But are they true? In answer to what are, I think, justified accusations of blatant exaggeration, over-statement, and inaccuracy, he has replied: "I'm perfectly prepared to scrap any statement I ever made about any subject once I find it isn't getting me into the problem. I have no devotion to any of my probes as if they were sacred opinions ... You have to push any idea to an extreme, you



have to probe. Exaggeration, in the sense of hyperbole, is a major artistic device in all modes of art."

This is, I believe, how McLuhan's work should be treated. In fiction, we don't worry about a novel not being literally true. This is the spirit in which McLuhan writes too: his over-statements (he calls them "probes") may not be entirely true, but they nevertheless provide valuable insight about the world.

There are, however, many criticisms to be made of McLuhan. I would like to make three in this article:-

First, McLuhan is so obsessed with media that he finds no place for anything else in his unconvincing, deterministic view of history. Just as Marx twisted the facts to fit his theoretical conclusions (i.e. that economic relationships, as opposed to media and the relationships between the senses, are really the determining factors of historical development), so with McLuhan.

Second, McLuhan is so concerned with the media themselves, that he denies any role to the content of the media, e.g. the content of a T.V. programme as opposed to T.V. itself, or the content of a book, as opposed to the medium of the book. He is right to stop people concerning themselves entirely with content and not at all with form, but that is no excuse for him to take the other extreme.

Third, McLuhan refuses to make any value-judgements about the new environment he tells us we are entering. As a result of his deterministic and fatalistic attitude, he sees man as powerless to reverse the effects of the media.

His dismissal of content leads him to treat all T.V. programmes or all speech or all books as not essentially different from each other, and thus he ignores the effects of advertising or corruptive violence on T.V., since he regards T.V., not its content or intended message at any one time, as the important factor.

This is a marked alteration from the view he takes in an earlier book, "The Mechanical Bride", an analysis of press advertising and commercial pop culture, which seeks to combat the effects of advertising (a form of "media fallout") by making people beware of the pressures they are being subjected to.

His unwillingness to consider content or to continue his project of awakening people from a commercially-induced trance, as evidenced in his most famous book "Understanding Media", has led to criticisms of him as having sold out to big business by embracing even the most debased forms of content of communication as indications of a great new world.

The character of this new "global village" which McLuhan foresees is something about which I have mixed feelings. Individualism, specialisation, rationality and detachment are, he says, products of a literate culture and will perish with it, to be replaced by an iconic world of total involvement. "All-at-once-ness" replaces "one-at-a-time-ness": the iconic replaces the Sequential.

Foreseen too is the integration of the world into one tribe united by a web of electronic kinship. As we are exposed to the experiences of other people, we start to care more about them. This is something which could, and indeed is starting to, both break down nationalism and save the underdeveloped countries of the "Third World".

Automation and the end of work will bring with it too, not only increased leisure, but the end of specialisation (educational vocation-training will cease i.e. that orientated to filling particular specialised jobs) and the end of the producers' need for labour. In order to maintain consumption levels, companies are going to have to give money away.

Whilst the thought of increased cooperation amongst peoples and the the end of drudgery are attractive ideas, the possibilities for domination manipulation, and totalitarianism in a society where the mass media are so effective and extensive and the individual is less important (both due to his involvement with others and his obsolescence as a unit of labour) are frightening.

Far more effective as a means of domination than making people do things they don't want to do, is to make them think they do. With control over the means by which the individual gets the information he uses to make his choices, it will, effectively, be possible to decide for him what choices he makes. Such a form of dictatorship is in many ways more dangerous than one operating by brute force, since its actions may more easily go unnoticed. Indeed, many would claim that such a corporate dictatorship already exists in America and Britain today.

Without agreeing with that point of view, it is nevertheless quite evident that the means by which we get our information about the world largely determines our view of it, and that we should consider critically not only the content of what we get, but also, with McLuhan's help, the biases we may derive from getting it through one medium rather than another.

V. F. Anderson.

Aphrodisiac - someone who fancies himself

Nymphomaniac - someone who fancies himself

Kleptomaniac - someone who fancies himself

Narcissus - Daffodil

GROWTH

I once was a man  
Like you and me  
But then I left  
To go to sea  
My beard was long  
And touched my toes  
My hair was strong  
And hung in rows.  
My feet were rough  
My legs were raw  
My fingernails  
Were rather sore  
**And the sea** wept  
And the sails cried  
And this is the way  
The miller cried:  
He lost his thumb  
On a carving knife  
And I lost mine  
In the sailing life  
One day we went to London  
And saw ten thousand men  
Although we saw them clearly  
We never lost our eyes  
They were selling us pies  
Full of salmon and sausages  
And books with plenty of pages  
We read the pages  
And gave our flowers  
And then went home  
To our lonely hours  
Dancing on the foam.

R.D.Lloyd.

COMMENTS FROM THE COMMON ROOM

- P.L.G. Pocket was still looking for his opening.....
- J.A.B.K. We cannot continue a policy of sending Russia to Coventry....
- J.R.C. Keep your tongue shut.
- G.B.B. Once warned, twice in the bush....
- T.E.S. It made men out of people who were perhaps not naturally that way inclined.
- T.R.P.L. You're barking up a gum tree.
- J.S.O. Mathers, you must wrap yourself around me, not the corps....
- R.V.F. Over the age of 18 there are more women capable of child-bearing than men....
- J.C. Diluted water.
- H.L. You get the occasional odd parent....
- R.W.M. What he wanted to do with the nude, he achieved with the apple.
- W.D.H. A man called Pennington and Brunden, or two men actually....
- D.P.R. It says "Most boys want to play football", but, I mean, it doesn't say what constitutes a boy....
- M.E. Turn to page 8; it's probably opposite page 9 - although it isn't there.
- W.D.H. Leave a fresh paragraph....
- J.A.B.K. During the Second World War, Britain came very near to starvation, especially in the case of foodstuffs.
- W.C.E. The Catholic army was enormous; well, no, actually it wasn't large; in fact, it was quite small.
- J.R.S. We usually get through one or two planes on each visit....
- P.L.G. I think I'm being played with.
- G.B.B. If you've never done it, you can't appreciate it.
- ONSLAUGHT In baring girls from Whitgift....

SEVEN LINES OF LOVE

Deeply soft in silence rare,  
Touch of velvet warm as hair,  
Eyes of jelly, melting suns,  
Shaded by blonde silk; the air  
A puff eternal, gently comes  
To dryly wash the skin so fair  
And amplify the love both share

P.J.Riches.

PLUNK?...

A speckled-quack bird  
flew into a thundering great oak tree.  
Plunk!

C.M.S.Ottowell.

1966 and all that.

Since it has now been proved, beyond all doubt, that a General Election in Britain can lead to the country being governed, for an eternity of five years, by a political party which breaks all the promises on which it was elected, and also allows the economic position of the country to deteriorate catastrophically, it is perhaps a good moment to examine the factors influencing the democratic process by which we elect a government. For although most of the electorate are content to think that the party with the most votes wins, and thus the people get the government they want (and deserve?) there is more to it than that.

It is a fact that the last time a Government polled 50% of the vote was in 1935 - and that was a coalition (Conservative-dominated), and in 1951 the Conservative Party was elected to power with less votes than the Labour Party got. So it will be seen that the Parliamentary majorities are what counts, and it is the DISTRIBUTION of the votes which decides this, and various factors influence this.

Party Personalities. It has been said that nowadays General Elections are really to choose the Prime Minister, rather than a party. To some extent this must be true, for as the more direct control is vested in a Prime Minister, the more important become the party leaders. Thus any party hoping to be elected must have a leader who will be accepted by the public. At the same time the leader needs the party to give him the power to govern if elected. So it is important to all parties to have a popular leader, and to show that he and the party are united. This is particularly important at General Elections, as for many people their contact with the parties' policies may be limited to watching broadcasts by the various leaders.

In the election of 1966 only the Labour Party was able to make real capital out of its leader. Mr. Heath had only been leader of the Conservatives for nine months and except for the month following his takeover of power, he never surpassed the popularity of Mr. Wilson and by March 1966 his rating had fallen to the same low level as that of Sir Alec Douglas-Home at the 1964 election. He naturally inherited the troubles of a defeated and demoralised party, and it is quite likely that many people were unable to visualise him as a successful leader.

Mr. Wilson went to great trouble to protect himself as the Prime Minister, with little time left over from governing the country to devote to partisan

electioneering. However, whenever he made speeches, he went out of his way to gain headlines by his method of dealing with hecklers. An indication of his success may lie in the fact that his majority in Huyton trebled in 1964, which was probably due to a large personal vote, increased still further due to this.

Due to the tragic death of his son, Mr. Grimond made little impact on the campaign and Lord Byers (Chairman of the Liberal Party) performed adequately as a stand-in.

As for the next election - well- Mr. Heath's standing is as low as ever (the N.O.P. gave him 37% on Dec. 19th 1968) but Mr. Wilson has lost the confidence of the nation completely (34% on Dec 19th).

Situation of the country and the results of the government. This naturally features strongly - a government seeking re-election points to its successes and asks the people to allow it to continue. The Opposition points to the failures of the government (eg. 'thirteen years of Tory misrule' etc.) and claims that it will remedy the situation. To many people what counts is how hard they are taxed, whether their wages are being kept down by the government etc., and so the outgoing government will bring in some popular measures at the end of its term if it possibly can, in order to gain support (eg. the National Insurance Bill, 1966).

In 1966 the Labour Government had a particularly strong case, since it was able to point to its achievements and say, "Look what we've achieved with a small majority; give us a proper mandate to govern and then see what happens". The next election is bound to concentrate on what happened - something most of us know only too well, and unless there is an 'economic miracle', it augurs ill for Labour.

Mass Media. The press, radio and television have little direct effect on the course of an election beyond supplying news which may influence the result. However, they may also affect the election more indirectly, eg. the television broadcasts may enable a party leader to gain popularity, or an opinion poll may show one party so far ahead that it could lead to apathy.

Just a word on the accuracy of opinion polls, which although improving, still have too wide a margin of error (which leads to situations like - Nixon 1% in the lead, but the poll may be up to 2% out!). In the 1966 election, the four main polls: Gallup, N.O.P., Research Services and the Daily Express all overestimated the Labour support by 2.3%, 1.9%, 1.0%, and 5.4% respectively - quite an error.



Campaigning. The question is: what effect do the press conferences, whistle-stop tours, party rallies etc., have on the voters' choices? The answer in the short run is probably very little. While a small number of floating voters (possibly a vital number all the same) may decide as a result of the party campaigns, the campaign has other effects equally important. First of all, it involves the electorate in the running of their democracy, (democracy must not only work, it must be seen to work); secondly, the campaign usually brings important issues to the fore and gives them a public discussion (like immigration in Smethwick in 1964, the Common Market in 1966, and immigration nationally in 1970?); thirdly, the campaign usually leads to the parties promising the introduction of some popular measures in the hope of gaining support, and whether or not these are kept may well influence future elections.

The election at the local level. This I feel is extremely important, as besides electing a national government, the voters are electing representatives to look after their local interests. This subject breaks down to two main parts; the effect of local issues and the effect of the candidates' personalities.

The effect of local issues seems to me to have been much overrated lately. However, in 1964, there can be little doubt that the introduction of the race issue by Mr. Griffiths (Cons.) was a major factor in ousting Mr. Gordon Walker from a safe Labour seat at Smethwick. Mr. Griffiths made a great play of the fact that he was a local man (Mr. Gordon Walker was a 'carpet-bagger') and that he understood local issues, and in particular that he realised that Smethwick did not wish to become a multi-racial community. Further confirmation of the effect of the local issue on the 1964 election can be seen in the fact that in 1966, when he played down the racial issue (under pressure from the Conservative leadership), Labour regained the seat.

The opposite was true of Preston in 1966, where the Conservatives hoped to hold the extremely marginal Preston North (maj. 14) and regain Preston South. Their hopes were based on the fact that the Labour aviation policy had resulted in the cancellation of the TSR-2, causing the redundancy of nearly 2,000 Preston aircraft workers. Both parties sent main speakers to the area: Mr. Wilson, Mr. Jenkins, Mrs. Castle, Mr. Hogg, and Mr. Macleod all appeared. However, most of the redundant workers had been re-employed by 1966, and the campaign failed to arouse any enthusiasm. In the event, Labour gained Preston North and held Preston South with an increased majority.

There has been little general evidence in the past to suggest that candidates' personalities have much effect on their vote. Two exceptions to this were true in the 1966 election. Firstly, where a Liberal candidate was a woman in 1966 but a man in 1964, the Liberal vote dropped by about 6.2%, but where a man replaced a woman the Liberal vote dropped by only 3%. Secondly, evidence shows that where a sitting Conservative M.P. had withdrawn, the new Conservative candidate suffered from an above average swing to Labour. This suggests that the previous M.P. had built up a small personal vote (about 300 on average). It is quite likely that about eight Conservative M.P.s have survived the reverses of 1964 and 1966 purely on the basis of a personal vote. One man who undoubtedly has survived due to a fairly substantial personal vote is Edward Heath.

Miscellaneous Factors.

(i) Apathy. In some of the mining seats, with overwhelming Labour majorities, there has been a substantial drop in turnout over recent years, and in both 1964 and 1966 these mining seats have registered the lowest swings to Labour. It is popularly imagined that in marginal seats the turnout increases dramatically. This is not strictly true. Perennial marginals show only a slight improvement on the national average, but new marginals and super-marginals (i.e. seats with majorities of less than 100) do experience a significant increase in turnout. A second very noticeable effect in marginals is that the vote of the third placed party falls very dramatically, and in 1966 the Liberals suffered particularly badly because of it.

(ii) Constituency type. For whatever reason, it is undoubtedly true that city and urban constituencies always show extremely high swings nowadays and rural seats show below-average or just-average swings. Thus the city constituencies have in 1964 and 1966 held the key to the result as rural constituencies tend to be Conservative and remain so.

(iii) The electoral register. Two things are important: the time at which it was compiled, and its accuracy. An election fought soon after the new register comes into force (March) benefits Labour, because the Conservative Party organisation has proved in the past to be more efficient in arranging postal votes and tracing removals, which will be more numerous on a dated register. In the 1966 election, although the register was brand new, it was unusually inaccurate, but due to the concentration of the errors in safe seats this had little effect on the result.

(iv) Weather. The weather conditions naturally tend to affect the turnout, and

this conclusion is borne out by the fact that seats experiencing heavy rainfall in 1964 noticeably increased their turnout in 1966. Which party benefits most from a decreased turnout.

(v) Third party intervention. Where the Liberal Party withdrew from a marginal seat, the Conservatives gained very slightly (0.5% on average). Thus Liberal intervention may well have cost the Conservatives a handful of seats - including Croydon South.

The Communists cost Labour Hornsey and Mitcham, but the effect of the nationalist vote is uncertain in the 1966 election. The only independent to obtain a significant vote was Mr. Downey, standing for the reintroduction of capital punishment in Nelson and Colne, who got 13.7% of the vote.

(vi) Lastly, a word about the Bias. In the 1950 election the Conservatives won 35 more seats than their share of the vote would deserve, but this bias has now been reversed, and in 1966 the bias was worth about 27 seats to Labour - no wonder the Conservatives want the proposed boundary redistribution to take place.

#### PREDICTIONS.

The next election will take place on October 22nd 1970 unless the economic situation is particularly bad at that time, in which case it will take place on March 26th 1971. If the figures of the December 19th N.O.P. poll were realised the Conservatives would have a majority in the region of 290. Among notables who would lose their seats would be Mrs. Castle, and Messrs. Brown, Jenkins and Callaghan, and Mr. Wilson himself would be lucky to have a majority of more than 1000.

However, I feel that when the time comes, Labour's position will have improved somewhat and the swing will be in the region of 8-9% to the Conservatives, giving them a majority of between 150 and 200, with Mrs. Castle and Mr. Brown leading those Labour M.P.s ousted. The Liberals will probably win 5 seats, and the Scots and Welsh parties 3 each.

Roll on October 1970! Roll on Salvation!

R.P.Hatfield.

ERRATUM. It has been brought to my notice that in my article in the last edition of ACID about disarmament, 'creditable' was used in error instead of 'credible' about nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons are never creditable, though they may be credible. Britain's are neither. D.K.B.

We would like to thank the following, who in addition to the contributors, have helped with the production of ACID: M.J.Hugill, P.L.Gibson, H.J.Maslin, A.E.Smith, S.R.Haggard, C.D.Whitfield, P.I.Moss, K.Towers.

The lino-cuts for the cover and inside illustrations of ACID were produced by P.J.Roberts.

PURPLE IS PASSION

Purple is Passion  
Violet is Blue  
Green is Envy  
And I am you.

Traditional.