

ities

this physically and mentally harmful intrusion daily will have no hesitation in accepting the cost of the inconvenience.

Clearly Mr McMillan and Mr Cousin, in their comfortable distance from the local neighbourhood which was driven to conduct its campaign, have not had this experience and thus can place more weight in their personal inconvenience.

Certainly it is difficult to discern the sensibleness in their "sensible alternatives".

DRM. GLASSER,
10 Nutley Terrace, NW3.

IT IS sad to see the Lindfield and Angland Neighbourhood Association opposing Camden Council's plan to reduce the absurd traffic pressures we face in this small area — not only rat-runners, but also commuter parking and an enormous number of school drops and collections.

Over seven years, the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association has undertaken extensive research on residents' concerns; made a video to demonstrate the need for remedial traffic measures; and persuaded Camden to agree the Netherhall Way closure. We would be more than happy to share our experiences with LLNA in order to help them achieve a similar aim. But I hope they will not begrudge us our good fortune in having made a successful case to Camden.

Incidentally, it seems improbable that a field diverted away from the NNA area could increase any problems they may have.

FRANKIE de FREITAS,
8 Maresfield Gardens, NW3.

ark plan

Chester Terrace are contemplating a council tax strike.

If this scheme goes through, there will be nothing to stop the council designating residential streets as lorry parks. Councillors seeking re-election should be in no doubt as to people's opposition to these proposals.

KATE GODWIN,
8 Mornington Terrace, NW1.

Everyone has a right to a view on the eruv

I AM sure Ham & High readers will have been grateful that you published Mr Schreiber's letter last week. It provides an excellent example of the disharmony that the proposed eruv continues to engender. As, however, it does make a few gratuitous accusations, I trust you will afford me the right of reply.

I am accused of being one of those "individuals with no mandate . . ." who "claim to speak for the silent majority".

And I thought I was just encouraging others to express their views in a simple, democratic way! Anyway, you don't need a mandate to write to the Ham & High, yet! No doubt readers would have had no problem recognising that non sequitur for what it's worth.

Then we have the "anti-semitic Jewish" ploy mentioned in earlier letters. I am labelled as being among "... a number of Jewish people who are embarrassed by the continuing and overt observance of their religion", preaching 'harmony' and 'mixed community', but really seeking 'assimilation', being 'curiously intolerant of harmless religious practice — particularly by other Jews'.

Wrong again! The name may sound it but I ain't Jewish! But that's irrelevant. These remarks are self-demeaning; and worse, highly insulting to fellow Jews.

And, of course, we have the old 'we should not let the intolerance of a few' spiel. Previous writers to the Ham & High have often alluded to their fear of being branded intolerant if they voiced objection, even to the extent of their being afraid to have their name and address printed beneath a letter.

I trust others will not be kept silent by such sophistry, claiming to be sweet reasonableness but designed expressly to intimidate. This issue affects us all and we all

have a right and an obligation to make our views known.

DEREK COLTMAN,
135 North End Road, NW11.

WE FIND David Schreiber's letter in the Ham & High last Friday an insult to any rational-thinking person; in this case anyone who does not agree with him.

He writes of "Jews being embarrassed by overt observance of their religion". We hate to disappoint you, Mr Schreiber, but the only thing that embarrasses us is that our roots were founded in a religion, or set of beliefs, that does not permit the lame to use walking sticks, the handicapped to use wheelchairs, and mothers to wheel their children to a house of prayer on the Sabbath without the erection of poles and wires to designate a specified area of special religious significance to a certain sect.

This would eventually alter the now pleasing balance of a mixed community that we are proud to live in. This is only one of the reasons for our objections to this whole ridiculous concept.

Mr Schreiber and his cohorts appear to be so narrow-minded that they cannot conceive that to many, many people, any religious symbols that designate the boundaries of a public area as of special religious character, be they Church of England, Catholic, Moslem, Buddhist, or any religion, is an anathema.

Also, his statement that "thousands would benefit" from an eruv is a gross exaggeration, which he must know all too well. What about all the Jews who live outside the eruv? It's not going to do them any good at all.

Finally, the eruv committee cannot seem to comprehend that eruv poles and wires that will serve a small segment of a particular religion are not the same as public utility poles and wires that serve the community as a whole.

WILLARD and EDNA WEISS,
3 Maurice Walk, NW11.

A better use for campaigning energy

IT SEEMS that, not content with stirring up residents against a scheme to rejuvenate the ailing Kingswell Centre and bring back business to some of its empty shops, Mrs Shipkey has now ap-

finally ousted her.

May I say at this point that I am not a member of the society but I feel that she should concentrate her energies towards something more positive and

stead Society's rebel members calling for a special meeting to "restrict the discretionary powers of chairmen and chairwomen", you printed a report on the successful defeat of a plan to build a five-storey block of 24 flats on the edge