

A LETTER TO ALL SCIENTISTS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.
The developments in all fields of science during the last hundred years have been watched with awed wonder by all but the most bored and unimaginative of us. Your achievements, and those of your forerunners, the pioneers of genius and the many who have developed and consolidated the inspirations of the few, have pushed further and further the frontiers of man's knowledge until the deepest secrets of matter are being disclosed.
In the service of medicine and technology and the new social sciences, your achievements are bridging the difference between life and living death for people the world over. Malaria, yaws, typhus, the killing plagues which have decimated mankind through the ages are being brought under control. Millions of children are growing up today who would not have survived their first year had it not been for the devoted and untiring efforts of scientific workers in laboratories and in the field—in many cases giving their own lives in the service of others. And while much remains to be done in the treatment of the sick and the blind, the general attitude is changing from regarding them as monsters possessed by devils to sympathetic attempts at understanding the working of that most delicate instrument—the human brain.
In all the applications of the physical sciences to satisfy human—and animal—needs, we stand indebted to you. In agriculture, continually expanding knowledge of the soil and

the needs of growing organisms open the way to the abundant production of food, while the development of farm machinery eliminates much of the tedious labour previously necessary. Indeed, abundance in all things becomes at last a conceivable possibility as electronics and automation make possible tremendous increases in productivity without the soulless monotony of assembly-line work reducing men and women to the status of mere adjuncts to the machine.

Man-made fibres and plastics, only at the beginning of their development, offer boundless opportunities for raising standards in clothing and furnishing materials: new techniques with building materials and the inventions of labour-saving devices in the home offer possibilities for leisure our grandmothers would not have dreamed possible.

Food, clothing and shelter: the basic necessities of mankind. Thanks to your efforts we can at last see the means by which these needs can be satisfied. Thanks also to your efforts a more rational attitude to sex is pushing out the old taboos, and greater knowledge and more widespread availability of birth control facilities are conquering the fear of unwanted children which marred the lives of so many women. But not only does this provide for the mental tranquility of women in advanced societies like ours: it provides the key for the conquering of the grinding poverty of the over-populated, under-developed countries.

In all these matters and many more we stand indebted to you and your forerunners in the sciences. We wish this were the whole story.

Unfortunately, the pace at which technology—with your help—has advanced, has not been matched with similar advance in social thinking—even by yourselves. It is a matter of sad amazement for many of us laymen that whereas all scientists have to be rational and logical

and honest in their work, have to be (like artists) responsible to their medium and their material, so many of you shrug your shoulders when the question of responsibility for the application of your work is concerned.

"This is not our concern" you say. "We are not responsible for the use or mis-use of our knowledge you declare. But if you are not, who is?"

For the tragic fact is that side by side with the benefits which you have provided for mankind and the high hopes you offer for the future, you have developed such ghastly means of destruction of life and property that you may well ensure that there simply is no future.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be respected for the good you do, the lives you save, and not be condemned for the misery and the deaths you cause. What is the point of it all? What is the good of providing the means by which millions of people live longer, healthier, better than ever before if you also provide the means to kill them more quickly and in greater numbers than ever before? Do you keep them alive in order to demonstrate your ability to slaughter them rather like the grazer fattening cattle for the butcher?

Oh we know that 'science' is neutral; that it is the ends to which your disinterested knowledge is used that may be right or wrong. A kitchen knife of shapely, functional design may be used to peel a potato or to kill a man—but how many of you would plunge that knife into the heart of your neighbour?

It depends how your knowledge is used. . . . But your knowledge is your knowledge and can only be used through you. How your knowledge is used, therefore, depends entirely upon how you are prepared to be used. How, by whom, and for what.

When Nazi doctors performed inhuman experiments upon helpless

inmates of concentration camps, the world was disgusted and they merited the condemnation of the rest of their profession throughout the world, for doctors take the Hippocratic oath, swearing to do no harm to those in their care.

Where does the rest of the scientific world stand on this issue? Does it bang the door of its ivory tower and claim that its duty is solely to scientific truth and objective knowledge and disclaim responsibility because they are not policy makers?

The world's experience of Nazism provides us with the answer to that also. At the Nuremberg trials it was not only the top policy-makers, the psychopathic leaders of a criminal system, who were judged and found guilty. The guilt spread right down to the lower rungs—to the guards of concentration camps who only did as they were told.

Does that not apply to us all? At least two of your number obviously thought it did. Mr. Leslie Williams, head of the chemistry department at the Government's Microbiological Research Department establishment at Porton, Wiltshire (the botulinus toxin factory) killed himself by taking cyanide five years ago. His wife told the coroner that he sometimes came home late, explaining that he had stayed out 'until he felt civilised again'. And a woman doctor from Porton, after a stay in a mental hospital, killed herself. Electricians have been horrified at what they saw at Porton and have quit their jobs—one apprentice to spend many months in a mental hospital.

You of the scientific professions, like the rest of us, will have heard many persuasive arguments to justify the production of atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, missiles to deliver them, and, now that it is in the news, toxins of such fantastic properties that a few ounces could wipe out the human race.

You can, if you will, accept those arguments. You can use them as

justification and you can sell yourself to the Government and be well looked after. A secure, well-paid, well-pensioned job with accommodation provided. The very best and latest in equipment with unlimited resources for inspired guesswork or humdrum development or mass production.

There are only two factors you need to crush in order to do this work: your respect for your profession and your respect for yourself. If you sell yourself for purposes of mass murder, if you prostitute your rare knowledge and skill to dream up more effective means of torturing or poisoning masses of ordinary people, it is clear that you have already lost your respect for them.

And if they retaliate by losing respect for you, you will have only yourselves to blame. If the layman, finding your work loathsome, finds you loathsome for doing it, can you blame him?

It is up to you, of course. You don't have to do this work. As we indicated at the beginning of this letter there are so many fields in which you can do so much that is wonderful and good. Unhappily, such is the position today, the good you do may be interred with all our bones.

Feminine Emancipation Goes East

It is generally accepted in the West that women have freed themselves from the male yoke, but whether they are emancipated in all other respects is debatable. With the exception of Switzerland, women have attained the franchise and are free to compete with men in most jobs, but the curious thing is that few women are attracted by revolutionary ideas and the impetus for social change generally comes from men. The Suffragette Movement was an important exception although its aims were limited, but the things for which suffragettes fought are now taken for granted in many countries. In others the struggle for equality with men still goes on but unfortunately in the relationships between the sexes the trend always seems to be authoritarian. It might be argued that there is an unconscious desire on the part of women to punish men for holding them in slavery for so long, but can any movement claim to be liberative if it imposes its own yoke—even on previous oppressors? To fight for equal rights is one thing, to prevent others exercising freedom of choice is another.

In South Viet Nam last week a bill on the rights of women instigated by Madame Ngo Ninh Nhu, sister-in-law of the President, was accepted by the Assembly, which should change the status of women considerably in a country where the laws demanded that women could not marry without their parents' consent whatever their age, or refuse a husband of their parents' choosing. In addition:

"They had to live with their in-laws, endure without protest their husbands' infidelities, could be turned out on the flimsiest charge of "disobedience" or

Hazards of Nuclear Weapon Tests

NUCLEAR explosions release radioactive fission products, e.g. strontium 90, the harmful effects of which are fairly well known. In addition, neutrons are produced which react with nitrogen in the air to make carbon 14, which has a half-life of about 5,600 years.

Reassuring statements by W. F. Libby, an American "official" scientist have played down the danger of this latter effect, until Professor Linus Pauling made some calculations of his own (*Science*, 1958, 728, 1183). He concluded that the carbon 14 produced during one year of nuclear weapon tests (30 megatons of fission plus fusion bombs) could be expected to cause in the world 425,000 embryonic and neonatal deaths, 170,000 stillbirths and childhood deaths and 55,000 children with gross physical or mental defects. These numbers are about 17 times the numbers usually estimated as the probable effects of the fallout fission products from one year of tests. In addition, radiation damage to bone tissue and bone marrow (causing leukaemia and bone cancer) and to other tissue could be expected to be about equal to that of fission products.

Prof. Pauling is one of the world's foremost scientists, but that did not prevent a rather hostile official reception when he visited this country recently. Apparently foreigners (including Americans) are not encouraged to come to this country to make statements which are contrary to (British) government policy!

This is hardly surprising when such statements clearly indicate the stupidity and irresponsibility of continuing to explode nuclear weapons. Now that it is possible for anyone who really wants to, to bump off the human race (Prof. E. M. Backett) we hardly need any more people with gross mental defects.

Apartheid in British Territory

Negroes are barred from Parliament, are excluded from most hotels, must use separate entrances to Post Offices and banks, are denied entrances to some shops which serve them through hatches opening on to the pavement.

THE above reads like an extract from a description of South African apartheid policy, but in fact it refers to a few of the laws which govern Africans in British-controlled Southern Rhodesia. There are about 211,000 whites in Southern Rhodesia and with measures which differ very little from the fanatical South African Nationalists' they manage to deprive millions of Africans of rights and dignity.

Anyone, black or white, who speaks out for African rights outside the limits of those conceded by law is banished or jailed. Black "extremists" are treated like criminals, but not so white individuals who encourage hates and divisions, which makes nonsense out of the claim of the white authorities that extremists have to be curtailed because their actions lead to disorder. If "extremism" and not colour is the crime why is it that organisations such as the European National Congress

which originated in Salisbury and has now spread to Northern Rhodesia, Kenya and Tanganyika, and whose members must swear not to "contribute to multi-racialism in any form" and to resist all efforts to give power to Africans in their present "immature state", is allowed to flourish?

It is not enough for the Prime Minister, Sir Roy Welensky, to feebly state that: "the Congress is not the sort of organisation I believe will benefit the Federation, you can't fight extremism with extremism with any hope of success", particularly since his own policy for African "advancement" is practically meaningless.

We might ask why the extreme European organisation has not been condemned and its leaders treated like Dr. Hastings Banda from Nyasaland for example, who was classified as a "prohibited immigrant" and escorted out of Southern Rhodesia because he was rash enough to suppose that the principles of free speech made so much of by western politicians applied to Africans as well. He is not the only African with any influence to be

mistaken in this interpretation of British democracy.

The key to the racial conflict is largely economic. Southern Rhodesia is a rich territory which holds economic possibilities for Britain and the white settlers. If "natives" were allowed equal educational and social advantages together with their numerical superiority the dominating position of the white man would be threatened. It never occurs to them that relationships based on equality makes for a more stable environment and could lead to plenty for all if white men were willing to share the undoubted benefits of western technology which could be applied with wisdom to underdeveloped areas.

Unfortunately, apart from materialistic considerations, there is an irrational element contained in racial prejudices which can only begin to be overcome by the willingness of people to accept and understand cultural differences without being afraid of the consequences or of mistaking different levels of development for innate superior racial attributes. Racial mixing in every way seems the soundest way of breaking down barriers.

IMPRISONMENT
AND
COMPROMISE

LAURENS OTTER, one of the two Swaffham direct actionists arrested during their recent imprisonment, asks his anarchist friends in a letter we publish this week what, in their opinion, should be the attitude of anarchists in prison. Should they court discomfort? Should they break the rules and disorders and inevitably be punished? Should they behave in a way calculated to upset prison routine as well as the tempers of their wardens? Should they refuse to call "Sir" to the Governor and his staff, and take their hands out of their pockets when ordered to do

so? Do you believe there can be no compromise forward yes or not answer to these questions. If we are asked our opinion as to whether an anarchist should be a "political" prisoner should he be in a "red band", special "privileges" or report fellow prisoners to the authorities our answer is an emphatic No! If we are asked whether we should protest against the treatment or provocation of fellow-prisoners by the staff, our answer is an emphatic Yes! Again, if we wish to protest against wrong imprisonment then it seems to us the obvious thing to do to draw attention to one's case by whatever means we think will serve these ends.

★
Qualifying our use of the term "wrongful sentence"—all prison sentences are wrong if one is opposed to the penal system—we may explain why we do not think there is a black and white answer to our correspondent's questions. On many occasions in these columns we have argued that though the system under which we live is immoral by definition, there are moral and immoral ways of behaving within that immoral society. We may not believe in the money system but the shopkeeper who gives the wrong change or the wrong weight cannot be put on a par with the shopkeeper who does not; we may be opposed to the property system, yet is one blinded to the fact that there are extortionist landlords and "fair" landlords? We may be opposed to the system of law but we can still distinguish between its honest and dishonest application. Similarly we may be opposed to the prison system but cannot deny—those of us who have tasted its bitter fruits—that there are those in its service who carry out their jobs in a more humane way than others.

★
NO-ONE in his right senses goes to prison willingly. But revolutionaries of every complexion must approach the possibility of imprisonment as one of the many consequences of their actions. For our part we see no special virtue in "breaking the law" as a principle, just because all laws or rules today are imposed from above. To do so apart from its consequences in permanently removing us from the outside world, encourages a fanaticism, and a concentration on the Self which may be good for the purity of our souls, but which in the end, however, divorces us from the realities of the social struggle.

We believe that the revolutionary who can hope to make some real contribution to this struggle of humanity for a better world, is the one who sees the problems of society as concerning individuals yet whose actions and decisions rise above the individual self, the ego. For this reason we are always wary of those who are introduced to us as anarchists because they are considered as individualists.

chists because they are considered as individualists.

We believe that every man should learn to make his own decisions, yes. But we also believe that he should have a breadth of vision, and feeling towards the ideas he seeks to further to make it possible for him to distinguish between those actions which truly serve the cause he has espoused and those which only serve to give him, as an individual, a feeling of satisfaction or self-righteousness. Conscious martyrdom, we think, is an unhealthy symptom.

★
A TERM of imprisonment, on condition that one sees this curtailment of one's liberty as serving useful ends, can be (if not too prolonged!) for some individuals a valuable experience. It can help one to see more clearly many social problems as well as strengthening those qualities which make up an integrated human personality. We do not think, however, that this is achieved by a calculated attempt to disrupt the prison routine at every turn. (That is, not unless it is a concerted effort by at least a majority of the inmates). An individual who breaks all the prison rules can hope for neither sympathy from outside or from most of his fellow prisoners nor from his gaolers who are obliged to work overtime as a result! What is important, and a positive achievement, is the ability of the prisoner to broaden his personality, to earn the respect of his fellows and his gaolers by his bearing at all times. One can be uncompromising in prison without breaking the rules!

★
FOR many politicians, imprisonment has been a stepping stone to power. There is probably not one nation which has achieved "independence" in these post-war years whose leaders have not served considerable terms of imprisonment. To court imprisonment as a means of shaking the public conscience is a good thing: as a means of furthering the cult of the personality it is harmful. If the result of an individual's imprisonment for breaking the law in protesting against an injustice or for upholding what he considers a fundamental right, is that of giving others the strength to do likewise on other occasions, or to provoke reflection among them, away from the traditional patterns, then, to our minds, that action, and the personal inconvenience as resulting from it, have been more than worth while. If, on the other hand, imprisonment serves only to build up a personality in the mind of the public, then the privations involved have been of no avail—unless, as we pointed out earlier, one happens to be an ambitious politician, in which case they are the very results one was hoping for!

★
THE question our correspondent, Laurens Otter, should ask himself is whether he went to prison to further a cause, to court martyrdom (in the pure, unadulterated, masochistic sense!) or to further any hidden or open desire to gain approval among his circle of friends. (As the writer of these lines knows our correspondent only by name we are neither "hinting" nor being personal in our 'reflections'). To our minds (and we hope we are right), the majority of the Swaffham demonstrators accepted 14 days in prison rather than the alternative of undertaking to be "of good behaviour" for 365 days, for tactical reasons. Firstly because for a propagandist or

PEOPLE AND IDEAS:

Keeping it off the Streets

THIS year marks the centenary of the birth of Havelock Ellis and two biographies are being published to celebrate it. The general tone of their reception can be predicted: a faintly amused and patronising superiority to this mid-Victorian mystic of sexual enlightenment. How little we can afford to adopt this attitude is illustrated by Mr. G. F. Seddon, discussing the Ellis centenary in the *Manchester Guardian*. He points out that

"the legal attitude to homosexuality advocated by Ellis in 1897 is roughly that now reached by the Wolfenden Committee, and for that, says Mr. Butler, 'the time is not yet ripe'. (Seemingly all that the time is ripe for is a retrograde Street Offences Bill; under it Ellis's one encounter with a prostitute—in sight of a policeman he gave her a shilling for an interesting conversation—would have landed her in gaol without a doubt)."

The Wolfenden Commission was libertarian, or relatively so, in its proposals on homosexuality, and authoritarian in its proposals on prostitution. We need not be surprised that it is the libertarian side of the Report which the government has shelved, and the authoritarian side which it is enacting in the Street Offences Bill which had its second reading in the House of Commons last week.

We have continually claimed that for all the problems of social life there are authoritarian and libertarian solutions, and that we are faced with a daily choice between them. How do we apply this axiom to the Wolfenden proposals? In the case of homosexuality the problem posed is a problem of the law, and the libertarian solution is to get the law liberalised, and for this purpose the Homosexual Law Reform Society, of 32, Shaftesbury Avenue, W.1, appeals for your support. In the case of prostitution, the pros and cons (so to speak) of the Wolfenden proposals have been debated interminably, and it is sufficient to say that almost everyone closely concerned with the problem except from the punitive angle, whether the probation officers or the Church of England Moral Welfare Council, is opposed to the Bill. As Mr. F. E. Jones said in the debate:

"Seldom had a measure, purporting to be one of social reform and moral welfare, been so generally condemned as to its fundamental provisions by almost all the responsible organisations concerned with social reform and moral welfare. Most people would think prostitution was deplorable, demoralising, and wasteful but it had persisted in many civilisations over many centuries and the failure to stamp it out by repressive legislation showed clearly that it could not be eradicated through the agency of the criminal law."

'direct actionist' 14 days in prison is the lesser of the two punishments for their "illegal" actions. Secondly because as good propagandists they saw the added publicity value as well as the moral impact on some people of (a) being remanded in custody over the Xmas holidays and (b) serving 14 days rather than abandon their plans for more 'direct action' during the next 12 months. In the circumstances the social aspects of imprisonment *per se* were of secondary importance, and one cannot be surprised if the public, and some Swaffham supporters among them, found some difficulty in relating the hunger strikes to the main issue. This is not a criticism of our young friend, who did what he did in all sincerity, without, if one is to judge from his letter, much considered thought. It is simply a point of view informed by some experience of prison and propaganda which we hope may stimulate discussion. Not just for the sake of discussion but in order to propagate more effectively ideas which, many of us connected with FREEDOM, sincerely uphold as the bases for a new way of life.

Mr. Butler himself in introducing the Bill admitted as much. It was not intended, he said, "to make prostitution illegal or to provide a cure. The history of the world would show this to be impossible, at any rate by statute". Even the *Times Educational Supplement* feels bound to point out that

"to leave it to the police to decide that a girl is a common prostitute and has been soliciting looks worse than fraught with danger of error. It looks like creating a category of second-class citizens; for prostitution, whatever we think of it, is no crime."

The *Daily Mirror*, whose progressivism, like that of all who wear their heart on their sleeve, is only skin deep, is behind the government on this issue, since it hopes to "drive vice off the streets", though sweeping the dirt under the carpet is the more honest way in which Mr. R. T. Paget put it in the Commons debate. (He also declared, by the way, that "Experience shows that the more lax the moral standards, the fewer are the prostitutes".)

The barrenness and uselessness of the authoritarian approach to the question of prostitution is obvious. What is the libertarian attitude?

★
A LIBERTARIAN approach would declare, first of all, as Mr. Winthrop Parkhurst did in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* last month, that prostitution,

"is the answer, however inadequate for some and repulsive for others, to the question of what the human race is to do with a biological force that exceeds by a hundredfold the procreative ends that it can be put to. In this sense, prostitution is a compromise between a biological mandate and a social convention. The convention says that sexual activity is socially proper only within the domain of matrimony. The mandate says that sexual continence is physically impossible for some, neurologically harmful for many, in complete disregard of all social conventions."

"Leaving aside such aspects of the biological case as homosexual and auto-sexual activities, the willingness of women to rent their bodies, and the readiness of men to lease them, represents a nearly inevitable meeting place for monetary needs and sexual hungers. To blame the women for the needs, the men for the hungers, is to lay an accusing finger on the wrong culprits. The real ones are the laws of society and laws of nature."

Once one has accepted this rational view of the phenomenon, and got away from the urge to punish and the urge to moralise, it is possible to see in prostitution the usual market situation where supply and demand meet. (Even the M.P.s last week talked knowingly of the girls "plying their trade"). Now in almost every trade certain conditions of work and safeguards for the worker are enforced either by legislation or by the demands of trade unions. A British government would never do anything so vice-condoning as to regulate prostitution (even though that is what the present police supervision amounts to), so the task rests with the union.

But the girls have no union, and as in all non-union trades, are consequently exploited; their conditions of work are onerous (I can't imagine that they really enjoy hanging around in the street); they are exploited by middle-men, as we are so constantly reminded; the customer does not get value for his money (to judge by the police evidence on the rapid turnover); there is no provision for retirement; nor have they any facilities for free and competent defence in the courts; they are at the mercy of the police.

★
SO if people are really concerned at finding libertarian solutions to the question of prostitution, they should start by getting some of the well-intentioned public figures who always do start societies for reforms of one kind and another, to start a union, under a fairly innocuous title (it would be perfectly legal, and, as Mr. Butler has reminded us, prostitution as such is not a crime), and persuade the girls to join. Considering what we are told about the attitude of professionals towards ama-

teurs who invade their pitches, it should not be difficult to get that minimum degree of solidarity which assures the success of trade unions. The union would work for improved working conditions (thus clearing the streets for Mr. Butler), it would eliminate the middle-men (thus satisfying the opponents of Mr. Butler's Bill), it would provide free medical and legal aid (thus cheering up the Minister of Health, and protecting the girls from the police exploitation which Mr. Butler denies), it would release the police for directing the traffic (to the great relief of the Minister of Transport), and it would serve as a bureau for alternative employment, a focus for welfare work, and could operate a pension fund. This is the libertarian alternative, and if you think that it is merely flippant, just wait and see if the policemen and the moralists can produce any suggestions as sensible. C.W.

Prostitution and American Business

NEW YORK, JANUARY 20.

Mr. Robert Wagner, Mayor of New York, said to-day that he would ask police to investigate charges made in a broadcast last night that American business men were employing prostitutes to promote business deals. A spokesman for the Mayor said: "If there is any truth in the reports... the police will crack down fast. We will not tolerate such scandal and vice in the city."

A Columbia Broadcasting System official said they would try to co-operate as far as possible, but people taking part in the programme had been promised that their identities would not be disclosed.

The programme, narrated by Mr. Ed Murrow, sought to show how prostitution had become part of the American business way of life and included recorded interviews with "call girls", who were described as "the aristocrats of the prostitute world". Mr. Murrow said it was estimated that each could average a yearly income of \$10,000 to \$25,000 (about £3,500 to £8,900) or more.

"In some cases," Mr. Murrow said "top executives are directly involved—giving instructions as to the type and extent of the entertainment their company will provide." Some companies maintained one or two of the women on the payroll as part of their public relations staff.

One business man said: "This is the fastest way I know of to have an intimate relationship established with a buyer. The point is that I know that the buyer has spent the night with a prostitute I have provided. In the second place, in most cases the buyers are married, with families. It sort of gives me a slight edge: well, we will not call it exactly blackmail, but it is a subconscious edge over the buyer. It is a weapon I hold, and I could discreetly drop it any time when the (buyer's) wife is present..."

An unidentified man said that "a very famous madam" in New York would make a flat fee of \$3,000 to \$5,000 (about £980 to £1,700) when big corporations had a party. "Send them a book and they'll pick out the girls—there's no guesswork here. And she deals with the largest corporations in the United States."

Spokesmen for two Chambers of Commerce discounted any suggestion that they might protest officially but one said individual members might protest on their own behalf. The spokesman for the American Chamber of Commerce added: "If that sort of thing does take place, I doubt whether it takes place to the extent made out. It is more restricted than the way they describe it. Even if it does occur, it is not in very good taste to handle it as they did." (Our italics).

Reuter.

I WANTED TO FIGHT IN THE SPANISH CIVIL WAR....



ANYWAY, IT WAS RATHER MESSY...



OF COURSE BASICALLY THE SPANISH ARE ABOUT AS AUTHORITARIAN AS YOU CAN GET...



....AND THEY PROBABLY ALL REALLY LIKE FRANCO....



NOW THAT WE ARE ALLIES, THINGS ARE NOT TOO BAD....



...BUT MOTHER WOULD HAVE BEEN SO UPSET.

...AND WITH ALL THOSE FACTIONS YOU DIDN'T KNOW WHO WAS WHO.

....DEEP DOWN, THAT IS.

...ESPECIALLY WHEN YOU THINK HOW MANY PESETAS WE GET TO THE POUND!

