

TIMES

1.7.85

23p

Thatcher incensed by EEC vote

From Ian Murray

Milan

An extremely bad-tempered EEC summit ended here on Saturday with the Community in serious disarray, after Britain, Greece and Denmark had been outmanoeuvred in a divisive vote called in the name of European union.

To the undisguised fury of Mrs Thatcher there is to be a special "intergovernmental conference" to discuss changes to the Treaty of Rome; changes which Britain and Denmark have already said they will never accept.

President Mitterrand, one of the seven to vote for the conference, said the summit had sorted out "those in favour of a strong, united Europe from those who are hanging back". He expected this to be finally cleared up at the next summit in Luxembourg at the end of the year.

His comments have re-kindled speculation about a two-tier Europe, with the original six members plus Ireland on one level and Britain and the dissident Greeks and Danes on another.

The furious argument inside the meeting overshadowed other agreements reached, to press ahead with tearing down the internal frontiers of the Community, to create a new-technology Europe, and to set up a 500,000 tonne cereal store to fight famine in Africa. But these points were scarcely noticed.

The debate also put an end to the real progress being made towards co-ordinating community foreign policy along lines suggested by Britain, France and West Germany. That subject is now to go to the intergovernmental conference as well.

Mrs Thatcher had gone to Milan seeking a kind of gentleman's agreement to accept more majority voting, while protecting but limiting the right of veto. Signor Bettino Craxi, the Italian Prime Minister chairing the summit, insisted that the only way to streamline decision-making was through treaty amendments doing away with the veto in certain areas. An intergovernmental conference was needed for this, he argued, and when Mrs Thatcher refused to accept it, he called a vote for the first time at a summit. An amazed Mrs Thatcher was defeated.

Afterwards she said the coming conference was just an excuse for not taking decisions. "I am not particularly irritated. It was just a lost opportunity."

But Mr Bernard Ingham, her spokesman, had another version of her mood. "She has but one emotion - fury", he said. "The Richter scale ceases to operate when it applies to her. It is not irritation to the Prime Minister. It is total volcanic eruption. Krakatoa has nothing on it."

Summit dissent, page 6

Leading article, page 13



P.O. Box 7, 200 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8EZ. Telephone: 01-837 1234

MUDDLE IN MILAN

The European Community, it seems, can make progress only in an atmosphere of crisis and bitterness. Its leaders can solve a problem only at the third or fourth attempt, when all agree that the solution is long overdue and that the present meeting offers positively the last chance to avoid catastrophe. That was the case at Fontainebleau a year ago. By contrast a meeting which everyone approaches with high hopes, proclaiming that immediate crises are now solved and there is a golden chance to make constructive plans for the future, is *ipso facto* doomed to end in disappointment and recrimination.

So it was in Milan this weekend. Beforehand it looked very promising because everyone agreed on the need to improve and speed up the Community's decision-making procedures. The French, for whose benefit the so-called "Luxembourg compromise" was invented in 1965, had joined the camp of those advocating greater use of majority voting and an end to the abuse of invoking "vital national interests" whenever a state is confronted with proposals it does not like. Even the British, Danes and Greeks, though anxious that this veto right should be clearly reaffirmed, had accepted proposals aimed at limiting its use in practice to bona fide cases.

The British had actually taken the initiative in putting forward proposals not only for streamlining the Community within its existing fields of competence but also for strengthening political co-operation - even to the extent of agreeing to vote always as a block in the UN - and for extending it formally to the "security" (i.e. defence) field.

These last proposals would probably have fallen foul of Danish, Greek and Irish opposition but they were an earnest of Britain's new found European zeal.

In exchange, British officials believed they had convinced their French and West German counterparts of the futility of insisting on a new treaty or on formal amendment of the existing one, given the difficulties and delays of drafting and parliamentary ratification that this would involve; from which it followed that to convene an intergovernmental conference for the purpose of drafting a treaty or treaties would be a waste of time. Indeed Britain's very unwillingness to contemplate a new treaty was assumed in Whitehall to rule out this procedure, since there would be no point in drafting a treaty unless all member states were prepared to sign it.

Such impeccable logic, had it originated in another European capital, might be dubbed Cartesian. But, as so often, it left crucial political considerations out of account. M Mitterrand, whose domestic political standing is low, had promised his people "a surprise" on the European front. Chancellor Kohl, anxious to repair the Franco-German relationship after the damage it suffered at the Bonn economic summit, and to restore his country's European credentials after the inglorious attempt by his agriculture minister to veto the farm price implications of that "budgetary discipline" which Germany herself is most anxious to achieve, was happy to go along with whatever, within reason, his French colleague might propose. What both hit on was to spring

on their partners at the very last moment a text labelled "treaty of European union" which in fact was no more than a compendium of already well known proposals, some of them lifted word for word from the British paper - and not its most audacious passages at that.

Signor Craxi, in the chair, was for his part engaged in a contest with his own foreign minister to see who could get most domestic credit for the conduct of the Italian presidency, and had staked his prestige on the proposed intergovernmental conference. Since everyone claimed to be in favour of majority voting, he had the ungentlemanly idea of putting the proposal to the vote. That, of course, is not how Italian leaders are expected to behave. But Signor Craxi has made his reputation by breaking with the postwar Italian tradition of compromise and consensus. He must have thought that the same approach would work in European affairs.

Yet it is hard to see how it can, given that the Community is still an association of sovereign states which have every intention of remaining such. Mrs Thatcher's anger and frustration showed through in her radio interview on Saturday night, but they are understandable. It would be wrong, however, for her to let her prediction that the intergovernmental conference will fail harden into a determination to see that it does. It may not be the quickest way of securing the improvements in the Community that we all want. But it is a way, and it would be better to make use of it than to goad our partners into signing some new treaty which would leave us out.

THE MAN MOST LIKELY TO

The high-level party and government meetings taking place in Moscow this week will indicate how far Mr Gorbachov has succeeded in consolidating his position. In April 1984 he proposed the ailing Konstantin Chernenko as president, saying that it was in the "highest interests of the state and society" that the party General Secretary should concurrently hold the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the formal title of the head of state. It would be a public setback for Mr Gorbachov if he did not himself achieve this status, having now headed the party for almost four months. But he has already shown great skill in manipulating the Soviet system, helped by the fact that it is unencumbered by democratic restraints.

He is replacing many local party officials, industrial ministers and high-ranking administrators - partly because it gives teeth to his demands for greater efficiency, but mainly because it allows him to strengthen his support in the Central Committee before the 27th Congress next February. Every Soviet leader begins his rule with energetic efforts to improve economic performance; first, to raise the USSR's position relative to the capitalist West, and second, of much less importance, to raise the living standard of the population as some justification for the party's exclusive control. Yet even this objective gives little in the way of legitimacy to a system in

which each new leader criticizes his predecessor for the mess in which he left the economy without offering either fundamental reforms or genuine elections to choose an alternative government.

Mr Gorbachov has certainly spoken at great length about the USSR's economic problems, but it is significant that he should choose to do so in Leningrad, the base of his rival Grigory Romanov, and, most recently, in Dnepropetrovsk, from which both Brezhnev and Chernenko drew their support. He appears to be concentrating on eliminating potential opposition rather than setting out to eliminate the major difficulties, domestic and foreign, with which he should be coping. While attacking the shortcomings of his predecessors, whose supporters still remain in the Politburo and Central Committee, he recently used peak television viewing time to underline to all that his patron, President Andropov, was an honourable exception, simultaneously paying tribute to the vital role of the state security organization on which he too relies to maintain his position.

The present KGB chief, Viktor Chebrikov, gained full membership of the ruling Politburo last April, along with two other evident Gorbachov supporters, Nikolai Ryzhkov, the secretary responsible for industry, and Egor Ligachev, the secretary now regarded as the chief ideologist and the party leader's right-hand man. Mr

Romanov, the fourth man in the exclusive group who are members of both Politburo and Secretariat, is now strangely absent from public occasions. The Gorbachov clique is in the ascendant.

By replacing men in certain key posts Mr Gorbachov is not just encouraging the others. Over 60 per cent of the Central Committee hold high positions in government or regional party administration, and appointment to these posts ensures a seat in the top party body. Military chiefs, ambassadors, police, media and cultural leaders account for most of the remaining places, with only a sprinkling of workers, peasants, and women for the sake of appearances.

It is widely accepted that the Supreme Soviet is little more than a rubber stamp for the Politburo's decisions, but less widely realized how thoroughly the party Central Committee is dominated by the ruling handful of leaders. According to party rules, some five thousand delegates to the CPSU Congress, which meets every five years, are supposed to name the new Central Committee members, but in practice they are presented with a list and do not appear even to exercise the right of scoring off names. The advice and expertise of Central Committee members is welcome, but what Mr Gorbachov wants now is loyalty. He can think about new policies at home and abroad later.

THE OLD COVENANT AND THE NEW

The Vatican and the Jews appear to have misunderstood each other again. More than once in the past some act by the Pope or some curial department meant to be warm and conciliatory, has been received on the Jewish side with irritation or worse. In the latest case, the Vatican sought to amplify, mainly for the benefit of teachers of religion, a 1974 document which was itself a commentary upon the famous 1965 decree of the Second Vatican Council called *Nostra Aetate*. The Vatican presumes that teachers are familiar with those earlier landmarks in Christian-Jewish relations, and therefore found it unnecessary to repeat all the earlier ground covered in them; Jewish scrutineers of the text rather inevitably find the 1985 document inadequate and incomplete. In the version for British consumption, at least, 1985 appears with 1974 as an appendix; it would have been better still had 1965 appeared as a second appendix, to emphasize that all three should be read together, and they should not be regarded as supplanting each other. They are, in any case, in diminishing order of authority. "Notes for teachers" cannot be equated to a solemn declaration by the council.

That the relationship is accident-prone is not surprising, and the remedy is very much in the

Vatican's hands. There would be far less reason for Jews in Israel and elsewhere to study the nuances of Vatican documents on Christian-Jewish relations for signs of some advance or retreat if the real bone of contention, recognition of the state of Israel, was removed from the arena. As it is, Jewish commentators have seized upon the latest Vatican utterance to complain that it does not put the question of Israel's existence in a religious context, but describes it as a matter of international law. So it is; and in accordance with international law the Holy See ought to exchange ambassadors with Israel forthwith. The reason usually given for not so doing, that Israel's frontiers are not yet guaranteed by international treaty, is to make its status (in the eyes of the Holy See) hostage to the political interests of Israel's enemies. That is extraordinary and scandalous. It is not to be wondered at if Vatican statements which touch on the matter are read without much goodwill or benefit of the doubt.

In fact both *Nostra Aetate* and this latest essay contain a most positive sentiment towards the Jews, whose far-reaching significance has hardly yet been grasped on either side. It is the doctrine, based on Romans II vv28, 29, that the Covenant between God and the Jews has

not been abrogated by the Incarnation but still applies.

The latest document recalls the words of the present Pope in 1980: "... the people of God of the Old Covenant, which has never been revoked...". Cardinal Johannes Willebrands, head of the Vatican section concerned with the Jews, said in a remarkable lecture in Britain earlier this year that theologians must urgently explore what this doctrine meant. Though he did not spell it out, what is to be explored is this: if the concept of the "Chosen People" is still valid, in Catholic teaching, why not also the concept of the "Promised Land"?

As it was Cardinal Willebrands' section which also issued the document now at issue, it has to be assumed that what distinguishes the two approaches is their context. One is unfinished business for theological speculation to digest; the other is for teachers to pass on in the classroom, and therefore limited to what is settled and established. It is in accordance with what is settled and established that the Holy See should recognize Israel; indeed it is difficult to see how the other more theoretical question can be fairly examined in an open-minded way if political and diplomatic factors are allowed to complicate it.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Control of purse strings in sport

From Mr Christopher Thorneycroft-Smith

Sir, I read with interest the letter from Mr Alan Minter (June 12) on violence at sporting occasions. We obviously endorse Mr Minter's comments on the need to take positive action and applaud his offer to assist in an advisory capacity.

For a number of years we have been closely involved with sports sponsorship and indeed were the main sponsors on the night of the Alan Minter/Marvin Hagler fight referred to in Mr Minter's letter.

However, this latest swing to violence has led us to re-think our strategy for the coming season. As a responsible company, we have to ask ourselves how long we can risk losing the confidence of customers, shareholders, staff and, indeed members of the public.

Millions of pounds are spent each year on sports sponsorship. Without it, many sports would be unable to remain solvent. Britain would undoubtedly lose its "driving force" in many of the sports where it has justifiably become famous on the international sports scene. The majority of our great individual "stars" would be robbed of many of the facilities needed to remain competitive.

We would rather contribute for the next 12 months money to put British sport back on its feet than continue to spend money on what can only be considered extremely bad image projection.

If other companies were to do likewise, surely it would be possible for the Government/Sports Council to form a committee which would be able to implement ideas rather than continually debate a problem which has been with us for far too long.

Yours faithfully
C. THORNEYCROFT-SMITH,
Marketing Director,
DAF Trucks (GB) Limited,
Thames Industrial Estate,
Marlow,
Buckinghamshire.
June 26.

Future of Lyceum

From Sir John Gielgud, CH and others

Sir, Forty-six years ago, on July 1, 1939, we, as members of the *Hamlet* company, bade a sad farewell to the Lyceum Theatre. However, demolition and its proposed translation into a traffic roundabout were averted by the outbreak of war.

Today the same owner, the GLC, is deliberating whether to perpetuate the 200-year-old Lyceum's temporary post-war service as a ballroom or to encourage its restoration, at the expense of others, to full theatrical use.

Some talk of how the Lyceum could link Covent Garden to the South Bank, others of the commercial seating capacity, larger than either the Palladium or Drury Lane. As actors, we recall simply the powerful associations of what you yourself described then as "an intensely theatrical theatre" and its remarkable intimacy.

The transfer of the National Theatre's brilliant promenade *Mysteries* has successfully rekindled the flame. We welcome another generation's rediscovery of this great theatre and echo the last words spoken from that stage in 1939: "Long live the Lyceum! Long live Ellen Terry! Long live Henry Irving!" A theatre with such resonance of the past and such promise for the future cannot be allowed to perish.

We remain, Sir, your obedient servants.
JOHN GIELGUD,
HARRY ANDREWS,
ANDREW CRICKSHANK,
MARIUS GORING,
Garrick Club,
Garrick Street, WC2.

Objecting to jurors

From Mr Michael Sherrard, QC

Sir, My learned friend, Mr Roger Gray, QC (June 20) paints with too broad a brush. The result is a picture of the fairness of which is, to put it at its lowest, questionable.

There are many cases, particularly complex frauds, where the ability of jurors to understand the evidence on more than a very superficial level is essential to the defence as well as to the prosecution. I do not believe counsel should be criticised for seeking to eliminate those who may appear not to be likely to understand the evidence or who may be swept along adversely to the accused because of the large sums of money involved in the accusation.

I agree with your leader (June 13) that intelligence judged on sight may be something of a hit and miss affair. As things are we have little alternative.

If the Roskill committee does not recommend the abolition of juries for fraud cases it may be that some better and more reliable yardsticks than mere appearances will be suggested as substitutes for pre-emptory challenges. Let us hope so.

Yours faithfully,
MICHAEL SHERRARD,
2 Crown Office Row,
Temple, EC4.
June 20.

Base attitude

From Mr R. J. Routh

Sir, Mr J. S. Abbot (June 25) finds your headline, "The Tory faces at risk", curious because it is their seats that are at risk.

Does he imply that parliamentary prestige has so diminished that the loss of a seat by a sitting member now carries with it no loss of face as well?

Yours faithfully,
R. J. ROUTH,
Egton Cottage,
Clun,
Craven Arms,
Shropshire.
June 25.

Wrong-footing the Inland Revenue

From the General Secretary of the Inland Revenue Staff Federation

Sir, The juxtaposition (June 26) of Mr David West's "an insider's view of Civil Service overstaffing" and Miles Kingston's enjoyable "Watch out for this tennis racket" ensured that I kept a sense of humour. There was, as you, Sir, must have recognised, propinquity.

Mr West was much more successful than he supposes - at least in the Inland Revenue to which he referred. Revenue staff have gone down 15,000 since 1979; a further reduction of 7,000 is planned by 1988. The department plans to close 164 income tax, 121 collector of taxes' and 44 valuation offices. There is, of course, lots more, all taking us Westward.

My worry is the results. In April, 1979, the total arrears of post was 1.9 million items; in April, 1985, it was 4.8 million items - a rise of 142 per cent. In April, 1979, 26,000 of these letters had remained unanswered for two months or longer; in April, 1985, the corresponding figure was 176,000 - a rise of 577 per cent.

It is hardly surprising, perhaps, that we are investigating stress and its consequences.

Collectors of taxes have, currently, £1.2 billions of PAYE tax and National Insurance contributions deducted from pay packets by employers but still overdue and unpaid for a month or more.

This is far from all of the story, though perhaps I should add that the contribution which the Revenue is making supplying able, trained people for the so much better paid private sector is on such a scale that it will be years before, for example, the inspectorate recovers from the 139 resignations in 1984 and the even higher outflow expected this year.

If where we are today in the Inland Revenue is the result of the attention of Mr West and others of similar views, it is at least some

relief that he is no longer "an insider". But, then, he never truly was.

Yours sincerely,
TONY CHRISTOPHER,
General Secretary,
Inland Revenue Staff Federation,
Douglas Houghton House,
231 Vauxhall Bridge Road, SW1.
June 27.

From Mr C. N. Beattie, QC
Sir, I agree with everything which Mr Christopher McCall has said in his letter to you (June 25), in particular his approval of the new approach of the courts to tax avoidance whereby artificial schemes will often now be defeated. It should, however, be borne in mind that antagonism between taxpayers and the Inland Revenue grew up in years when rates of tax were confiscatory, eg. income tax at 98 per cent on top incomes. But there is also antagonism between those, such as employers, who are made to do the Inland Revenue's work by collecting tax due from others.

Mr McCall says that there are many things wrong with our tax system, as indeed there are. I wish to mention one kind of thing only, and that is the enacting of legislation, promoted by the Inland Revenue, which is slanted unfairly against the taxpayer. I will give one example only, though many more could be found.

There is exemption from tax on capital gains arising on the disposal of a debt, not being a debt on a security, by the original creditor. Why? Because such debts are likely to produce capital losses, not capital gains, and relief for those genuine capital losses can then be refused.

The Burmah Oil Company sought to overcome this injustice by an artificial scheme, but fell victim to the courts' new approach to such schemes.

Yours faithfully,
C. N. BEATTIE,
24 Old Buildings,
Lincoln's Inn, WC2.
June 26.

Behind the terrorist

From Mr Adam Roberts

Sir, Your leader, "Behind the terrorist" (June 24) makes several sweeping assertions about the ideological underpinning of the current plague of terrorism. One target of your editorial criticism is the International Committee of the Red Cross, of which you state:

Regrettably, in 1967 [actually, 1977] a committee of the International Red Cross at Geneva met to update the 1949 texts on the treatment of prisoners of war and voted to extend prisoner of war status, protection and privileges to terrorists... We have been paying for it ever since.

It is not clear from your account to what particular negotiations you refer. However, if one takes the whole round of deliberations over a decade which led to the adoption by states of 1977 Geneva Protocol I (on international armed conflicts) and Protocol II (on civil wars) it is very hard to justify your sweeping conclusion.

It is 1977 Geneva Protocol I which might appear at first sight to contain provisions that could support your assertions. Article I does say, in language which has been heavily criticised, that the Geneva Conventions apply to "armed conflicts in which peoples are fighting against colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist regimes in the exercise of their right of self-determination..."

Furthermore, articles 43 and 44 do somewhat extend earlier and more restrictive definitions of the

terms "armed forces" and "combatants" to make greater provision in respect of certain guerrilla fighters.

The 1977 Protocol I does thus provide a legal framework regarding guerrilla fighters aiming at legitimate targets in the context of an international conflict. But this is not the same thing as extending privileges to terrorists. On the contrary:

1. The protocol is widely and properly viewed by states as only applying to armed conflicts which are not merely international in character but are also marked by military operations of a substantial level of intensity.

2. The protocol has not been viewed as applicable to recent cases of terrorism, whether of the IRA in the UK or of other groups connected with the Middle East or the Indian sub-continent.

3. The protocol obliges combatants to comply with the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict and

4. The protocol contains numerous provisions prohibiting attacks on the civilian population as such.

The 1977 Geneva Protocol I is open to several objections, some of them serious. But it does not "extend prisoner of war status, protection and privileges to terrorists" in the way that you imply.

Yours faithfully,
ADAM ROBERTS,
St Antony's College,
Oxford.
June 25.

North and South

From Professor Miles Irving

Sir, The decisions reached last night (June 17) by Parliament over Britain's international airports will be viewed in the North as further evidence of the withdrawal of our Government from its "one nation" tradition.

This trend of ignoring the needs of the North whilst continuing to develop the South is apparent in every walk of life, from education to opera. Nowhere are differences more blatant than in my own profession of medicine.

Some weeks ago you rightly gave prominence to the 150th anniversary of London's St Mark's Hospital. The celebrations were an enormous success, supported by royalty, the presence of a Government minister and a three-page supplement in your paper (May 28). In this supplement I was delighted to read that the hospital had been given regional speciality status, thereby ensuring its future and allowing one of its closed wards to reopen.

Those of us in Manchester with identical interests to the work carried out at St Mark's are attempting to provide a similar standard of specialist services to a much larger number of patients than are ever seen at that hospital. The people of the North-west deserve specialist services of a quality equivalent to those available in London. We, however, lack the support and resources available to the teaching hospitals and special health authorities of the South-east.

In the last 12 months my own hospital has had one surgical ward completely closed and the phase II provision of a new block postponed indefinitely. We are threatened with even further reductions in the number of beds available for surgical cases and similar cuts are planned at the University Hospital of South Manchester.

One cannot blame the regional health authority for making these cuts, for they have to provide basic health services to all the people in a region which has been neglected for decades. Despite a remedial building programme funded, as the minister will remind us, by an increased grant for capital development not one new

hospital has been completed in our region since the end of World War II.

The divisions between the South and the North of this country must be healed if we are to have a peaceful and prosperous nation. As a national newspaper at least part of the remedy lies in your own hands.

Yours faithfully,
MILES IRVING,
University of Manchester,
Department of Surgery,
Clinical Sciences Building,
Hope Hospital,
Eccles Old Road,
Salford, Lancashire.
June 18.

Protecting golden eagle

From Mr Anthony Whyatt

Sir, Direct personal experience supports Lord Burton's view (June 22) that golden eagles kill lambs, against the doubts of Mr Hamilton, of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (June 15).

On August 20, 1983, two golden eagles started suddenly from the hillside in front of me as I traversed Ben Odhar Bheag at about 2,000 feet, on the saddle dividing Loch Eilt and Loch Shiell in western Inverness-shire. We ran the intervening

Beating off bees

From Mr M. G. H. Rogers

Sir, I am sorry to see that the correspondence about wild bees has descended into frivolity as a friend of mine was stung to death by a swarm in Northern Nigeria.

When I was in Nigeria I always advised a newcomer, if he were to be attacked by a swarm of wild bees, to lie down on the ground on his stomach and to cover his face and neck with his shirt. These are the most vulnerable parts of the body since bees go for the moisture surrounding the mouth.

Yours faithfully,
M. G. H. ROGERS,
Croftside,
Harrow Road,
Dorking,
Surrey.
June 24.

ON THIS DAY

JULY 1 1980

The expulsion of the Jesuits was part of the anti-clerical campaign of the Third Republic, in particular of Jules Ferry (1832-93), the Minister of Public Instruction, an austere Protestant. In March he had ordered the expulsion of religious congregations; in July a law was enacted suppressing the obligation of Sunday rest; and in 1881 Ferry pushed through an education Bill to laicise the schools.

FRANCE.

PARIS WEDNESDAY JUNE 30. 9.30P.M.

The Jesuit establishments throughout France, with the exception of their colleges for lay pupils, which have another month's grace, were closed today. Shortly after 4 a.m. M. Clément, a judicial functionary, and M. Dulac, police commissary, presented themselves at the gate of the establishment in the Rue de Sévres, outside which a large number of Catholics, &c., had collected. Claiming admission in the name of the law, they passed into the court and knocked at an inner door, when the Superior, Father Pitot, answered the summons, MM. Chesnelong and de Ravignan, Senators being behind him...

M. Clément said he was only performing his duty, and asked where he could find the Jesuits whom he had to expel. After a fresh protest, M. de Ravignan said that, as the violation of domicile had been consummated, it was useless to make them lose time; he would guide them. M. Dulac was then conducted upstairs, entered the first cell, and found Father Marin reading at a table. "Monsieur, I am ordered to turn you out." "By what right?" "By a mandate which I have read to your Superior." "The mandate is illegal, and I refuse to obey it." "In that case, I must resort to force." "Do so." Two policemen put their hands on the Jesuit's shoulder, and he said, "Very good; I yield to force." M. de Ravignan pushed forward and claimed the honour of escorting him. The second cell was locked, and the commissary went on to Father Pitot's door. The Father urged that he had a proprietary right, which even the decree of expulsion recognized, and M. Chesnelong, after some parleying, obtained leave for the Superior to remain for the present. Each of the other inmates had the secret of some Deputy or Senator. M. Chesnelong accompanying Father Matignon to the Foreign Mission House, amid cries of "Vivent les Jésuites!" - and many of the spectators, kneeling for the blessing of the expelled...

The number of the expelled is 13; one of them being an Englishman named Forbes and another a Russian. A considerable crowd has occupied the street all day, but no ingress into the premises has been allowed, and since the departure of the Jesuits there have been no demonstrations on either side.

Telegrams have been received from Lyons, Marseilles, Lille, Bordeaux, Rouen, Laval, Avignon, Amiens, Besançon, Limoges, Douai, Clermont-Ferrand, Le Puy, Troyes, Nantes, Bourges, and Versailles describing the expulsion of the Jesuits from their establishments. Only at Bordeaux and Lille has there been any kind of public disturbance, and those preceded and did not accompany the execution of the decrees. At Bordeaux a crowd, which had collected yesterday before the Jesuit institution, was suddenly, according to the *Union*, charged by the police with drawn sabres, the result being a scuffle, in which a few accidents occurred...

Such are the victories achieved by the Republic to-day - victories over unarmed and, in many cases, aged men and even the Ultra-Radicals will scarcely boast of them. No doubt allowance must be made for the obligation resting on the Government to enforce the decrees it has issued, while its opponents have caught at the chance of turning all Catholic and moderate minds against it. The Government, however, should never have put itself in this position. It should never have proposed a clause the rejection of which incited the Chamber to demand an equivalent, and it should never have received musty enactments out of harmony with the spirit of the age. It should never have belied its professions of liberty by applying obsolete laws to communities powerless to defend themselves, except by invoking the public opinion. The dispersion of the Jesuits is an act of despotism, and if the Republic reviews laws violating personal liberty it is only the substitution of the tyranny of the multitude for the tyranny of an individual. If it can only pacify the mob by indulging its animosities, nobody is safe. To dig up obsolete enactments for the purpose of oppressing inoffensive citizens is worse than passing new laws, and the aim is even worse than the means. Why are the Jesuits being expelled? Because their teaching is contrary to the present system of government. Such a theory is monstrous. It is more than the confiscation of a liberty, it is the confiscation of the most prized of liberties - liberty of conscience...

seventy yards to discover what had preoccupied the birds since my companion, who had supervised, a golden eagle sanctuary, felt sure they had been feeding.

As the eagles soared in the strong westerly wind we came upon their prey, a deer calf which had just been killed, its throat and belly torn open, tufts of hair scattered on the hillside above and a trio of anxious hinds a hundred feet below. While we examined the calf its eyes started to glaze, showing how recently it had been killed.

By late August a deer calf is a good size, and bigger than a contemporary highland lamb: there is no question but that this calf had been killed by the two eagles. There is equally no doubt in my mind that these vast and magnificent birds despatch lambs in the same way.

Yours faithfully,
ANTHONY WHYATT,
8 Campden Hill Square,
Kensington, W8.
June 26.

Deus ex machina?

From Mr Gerald Priestland

Sir, Winifredon struck by lightning (report, June 25): I feel we might make a significant advance in theology if it could be confirmed that the Bishop of Durham has tickets for the tournament.

Sincerely,
GERALD PRIESTLAND,
4 Temple Fortune Lane, NW11.
June 28.