

THE RIGHT OF
BRITTANY
WALES AND
SCOTLAND

TO SELF-DETERMINATION AND
INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION

A MEMORANDUM
presented
to the

UNITED **N**ATIONS **O**RGANISATION

by the
CELTIC LEAGUE
9 Br. Cnoc Sion
Baile Atha Cliath 9
Eire

Brittany's Right to International Protection and to Self-Determination

BRITTANY is a nation. As such, she has a right to self-determination. But in view of the ruthless policy of assimilation pursued against her by the French State, she stands in need of international protection as envisaged in certain resolutions of the United Nations. We refer to :
1. Resolution 217 (III) C of the Third Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations which considers that "the United Nations cannot remain indifferent to the fate of minorities", and calls for a thorough study of the problem of minorities in order "that the United Nations may be able to take effective measures for the protection of racial, national, religious or linguistic minorities."

II. Resolution C of the Fifth Session of the Commission of Human Rights which recognises the importance and urgency of the question of the rights of groups and organisations to petition in the case of violation of human rights. (We draw attention to the proposals by the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of minorities concerning measures of implementation, especially that the right to petition the United Nations should be granted to both individuals and groups as a means of initiating procedure for the enforcement of Human Rights; also to the opinion of the Sub-Commission that, in the special case of minorities, a decision to confine the right of initiating proceedings to contracting States presents the grave drawback that, by impelling a dissatisfied minority to seek the support of a foreign State, it increases the risk to which attention is drawn in par. 3 (c) of the Definition of minorities.*)

III. The First Resolution of the Third Session of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, which considered the need for thorough and precise information on efforts being made to prevent discrimination (see UNYBHR Vol. 1950, p. 489), and Resolution C, adopted at the same session, defining minorities for the purpose of United Nations protection, the relevant passages of which we quote (UNYBHR Vol. 1950, p. 490) :

"The Subcommission . . .

1) *recognizing* that there are among the nationals of many States distinctive population groups, usually known as minorities, possessing ethnic, religious or linguistic traditions or characteristics different from those of the rest of the population, and that among these are groups that need to be protected by special measures, national or internat-

* See United Nations Year Book of Human Rights 1950, p. 492).

tional, so that they can preserve and develop these traditions and characteristics in question” ;

4) “*resolved* that from the standpoint of such measures of protection of minorities as the United Nations may wish to take

a) the term ‘minority’ includes only those non-dominant groups in a population which possess and wish to preserve stable ethnic, religious or linguistic traditions or characteristics markedly different from those of the rest of the population ;

b) such minorities should properly include a number of persons sufficient by themselves to preserve such characteristics ; and

c) such minorities must be loyal to the State of which they are nationals.”

At the same session, the Sub-Commission recommended that, as an interim means of protecting minorities, the General Assembly adopt, and so place the full weight of its authority behind, the draft resolution on facilities to be provided for minorities recommended by the Sub-Commission at its Second Session (E. CN 4/351, annex Resol. V)2:

“The General Assembly, considering that a discriminating treatment of minorities has been and could be a major cause of international tension leading to war, considering at the same time that rights accorded minorities entail a corresponding obligation on their part towards the larger society in which they live and must not therefore be used to threaten or undermine the unity and security of States, recommends that in the interest of enabling recognised minority groups to maintain their cultural heritage when they desire to do so, member governments should provide as a minimum adequate facilities, in regions where they represent a considerable proportion of the population, for

- 1) the use before the courts of languages of such groups in those cases where the member of the minority group does not speak or understand the language ordinarily used in the courts ;

- 2) the teaching in State-supported schools of languages of such groups (with due regard to educational efficiency), provided that such groups request it and that the request in reality expresses the spontaneous desire of such groups (see UNYBHR 1950(p. 492. except for the words preceding the mark +, for which see UNYBHR Vol. 1951, p. 566).

IV. Resolution 532 (VI) B of the Sixth Session of the U.N. General Assembly recalling that one of the functions of the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities was to submit recommendations to the Commission on Human Rights relating to the prevention of discrimination of any kind incompatible with human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to the protec-

tion of national or linguistic minorities, *emphasizing* that the full application and implementation of the principle of non-discrimination recommended in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are matters of supreme importance, *considering* that the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities are two of the most important branches of the positive work undertaken by the United Nations ;

5. Resolution 545 of the Sixth Session of the General Assembly, which decided to include in the Covenant on Human Rights an article on the rights of peoples to self-determination ;

6. Article 1 of the Draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, adopted at the Eighth Session of the Commission on Human Rights, stating that :

“All peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination, namely the right freely to determine their political, social and cultural status. All States, including those controlling in whatsoever manner the exercise of that right by another people, shall promote the realisation of that right in all their territories.”

Also the section of the draft recommending that the States recognise the right to a fair wage and equal remuneration for work of equal value, and the right to social security.

7. Article 5 of the Convention against Discrimination in the Field of Education, adopted by the General Assembly of U.N.E.S.C.O. on December 15, 1960, requesting member-states to take all the measures necessary to enable their national minorities to carry out their own educational activities, including the management of schools and the use or the teaching of their own language.

We submit herewith :

1. Evidence that Brittany is a nation, which, as such, has a right to self-determination ; and that she answers the criteria of the definition of minorities as set out by the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities for the purpose of United Nations protection.

2. Thorough and precise information about the harmful neglect and purposeful violation of Brittany's rights by the French State. We take this step in view of the following facts: 1) that the efforts, supported by the great majority of the Breton people, to obtain recognition of their rights in whatever form during the past 40 to 60 years have met only with inoperative measures, refusal or repression ; 2) that this policy continues unchanged in spite of France's membership of the United Nations ; and 3) that a comprehensive and satisfactory solution of the Breton problem

can clearly no longer be expected from a recourse to the French government.

We are aware of the obstacles to the presentation of this memorandum to the United Nations but we deem it important to testify to the Breton people's desire for a peaceful solution of their problem, as well as to inform all responsible national and international bodies of the situation which exists in our country.

BRITTANY IS AN OPPRESSED NATION

The three million inhabitants of Brittany constitute a nation which, since being deprived of its political freedom by force of arms, has had to submit to French rule up to the present day.

Brittany has never surrendered her right to exist as a nation and to self-determination. But, since the suppression of her autonomy in 1788, it has been the aim of all French governments to destroy her national characteristics.

The French State has carried out this policy on two levels :

1) through its control of the Breton economy, it has weakened the Breton national cohesion and induced emigration of Bretons on a large scale ;

2) through its control of education and media of mass communication, it has hindered their development as a Celtic people and relentlessly sought to eradicate the Breton language.

Thus the Bretons' awareness of their distinct nationality has been undermined and their resources diverted, to their own prejudice, into the service of another nation.

The attempts to obtain a revision of this policy of integration have been consistently opposed, sometimes covertly, sometimes ruthlessly, under every French regime. Such a disregard for the rights of a small nation is catastrophic in an age when the power of the State penetrates all aspects of the life of the community. The physical and cultural threat to Brittany makes it imperative therefore that effective means of international protection be extended to the Bretons forthwith and that they regain their national freedom without delay.

HISTORICAL AND JURIDICAL BASIS OF BRITTANY'S RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

The Breton nation began between the fifth and the seventh century when immigrants from Britain settled in Armorica, a peninsula on the West coast of Europe. They established a kingdom whose limits have remained unchanged since the tenth century. They upheld their indepen-

dence against the pretensions of powerful neighbours, submitting at times to superior forces but reasserting their country's sovereignty as soon as circumstances would permit. Yet, in consequence of the crushing defeat of St-Aubin du Cormier (1488), Brittany was forced to accept union with France. Her political autonomy was however guaranteed by the Treaty of 1532.

The rights recognised by this treaty derived from the fact of a Breton national community attested internally and at an international level.

At international level, from 848 onwards, Brittany constituted indisputably an independent State, with its own army and navy, its own diplomacy and monetary currency, its own customs and taxation system, all serving the permanent aims of Brittany and no other State.

In Brittany, the French king's subjects were termed "aubains non régnicoles", i.e. they were aliens, as were the subjects of any other foreign prince. They needed the same kind of protection as was accorded to foreigners in order to enjoy civil rights.

Taking into account the principles of the feudal system which prevailed in Europe during the Middle Ages, it can be stated with certainty that a Breton entity was recognised at international level from 848 to 1532, and that it exerted the full prerogatives pertaining to that rank. This is attested by the numerous international agreements made by Brittany with other States during that period of her history.

Internally, the Breton State was a monarchy mingled with aristocracy and democracy. Very early, the Assembly of the States-General, composed of representatives of the nobility, the clergy and the bourgeoisie, were associated with its government, they met at least once a year and no important decision, even in foreign affairs, could be taken by the rulers without their consent or advice. They represented the *nation* as distinct from the State which the Duke represented. This liberal conception anticipated the principles of government which the most progressive countries have adopted in recent times ; it was essentially different from that of France, according to which the King personified the State and created The Nation, and which has engendered the present intolerance of France of alien minorities such as the Bretons, the Basques and the Alsacians.

Brittany was not an appanage of the French kingdom. She emerged from feudalism well before most of the other Western countries, in particular more than a century before France. Her State persisted because it grew out of her people.

Two facts exemplify the reality of the Breton State and the cohesion of the Breton nation.

Following the annexion of Brittany by France, a conflict arose because of the difference in the legal system of the two countries, a conflict that would not have occurred had the one system been subordinate to the other. To resolve the conflict, new arrangements were necessary. The promoter of international law was in fact the jurist Bertrand d'Argentré who led the Breton resistance to French encroachments in the sixteenth century.

The second fact testifies to the value which the Bretons attached to the independence of their country. At the battle of Saint-Aubin (1488) which determined the fate of Brittany, 4000 of them gave their lives rather than flee or surrender and open the way to the French conquest. This stand is in striking contrast to the feudal and dynastic wars of the time, when soldiers, mercenaries and condottieri, fought without enthusiasm or ideals, were always ready to change sides for higher pay, and to desert and compromise rather than kill one another. A resistance such as that offered at St-Aubin had not been witnessed for centuries, nor did it happen again in Europe before the end of the 18th century.

The Treaty of Union.

On August 4, 1532, Brittany was compelled to accept the principle of a perpetual union with the kingdom of France. The treaty was negotiated between the Breton National Assembly and representatives of the French State. The principle was accepted on the following conditions :

1. Breton laws would continue to apply in Brittany ;
2. the territorial integrity of Brittany was respected ;
3. no taxes would be levied without the consent of the Breton Assembly ;
4. the Breton Supreme Court was to exert control over the application of the French laws so as to ensure that they would conform with the Charter of Union ;
5. the Bretons could not be mobilised and drafted into the King's armies except for the defence of Brittany ;
6. any act contrary to these guarantees would be void.

Thus a complete administrative and juridical autonomy was maintained. Only the external prerogatives of an independent State had been renounced. It was understood that the Breton nation would continue to exist *within* the French State as it had existed *within* its own State.

Violation of the Treaty by France.

These guarantees of Breton freedom—opposed as they were to its ideas and its plans to integrate the small nations on its periphery, were accepted unwillingly by the French

State. However, numerous as the encroachments and transgressions were, they did not affect the fundamental relationship between the two countries. The initiative for the abolition of the treaty came only from Louis XVI and his minister de Colonne in May 1788, when they tried to suppress the Breton "Parlement" or Supreme Court. A revolt in Rennes thwarted them but on February 1, 1789, the King's troops forced the Assembly of the States-General to separate and adjourn *sine die*.

The Bretons had been in the vanguard in the fight against the absolute monarchy. When the Revolution started, they expressed in nearly all their Cahiers de Doléances (Lists of Grievances) their concern for the safeguard of their national rights. In the elections for a French Assembly of States-General, the Breton Assembly took its stand upon the Charter of Union according to which it alone could represent the Breton people. When this was overruled by the French government, the Assembly appealed to the Breton *Parlement* which, in March 1789, pronounced the elections invalid in Brittany. But confusion and the pressure of an occupation army made it possible to carry them out. Those Breton deputies who took part in the Versailles Assembly of the French States-General had thus no authority to speak for Brittany. They admitted this fact implicitly : when, in August 1789, they abandoned the rights guaranteed by the 1532 treaty, they specified that their vote would have to be ratified by the Breton Assembly.

The latter could not be re-convened and could thus not decide the issue. But its spokesman, the Attorney-General Count Botherel, proclaimed that the Breton rights could not be considered cancelled. As far as Brittany was concerned, he declared, all the acts of the French National Assembly were void (February 1791). This was the last official Breton act.

The Chouan guerilla war which lasted from 1793 to about 1803 was originally a national rising in defence of Breton freedom.

The abolition of the 1532 Treaty was an act of violation committed freely by the French king without even the excuse of an emergency, since the Revolution started only about a year later. As an act unilaterally undertaken, it freed the Breton people from the obligations of the treaty.

Present Juridical Situation.

In law, we consider Brittany to be in the same situation as after the military defeat in 1488. *De facto*, there is a state of integration which can be denounced at any time : no tacit acquiescence by any generation can base it in law.

Moreover, according to the modern view, the rights of a nation are imprescriptible and inalienable. This view is represented in particular by the well-known specialist in international law, Professor Louis Le Fur, who spoke of Brittany in 1937 in the following terms (see "L'Abbé F. M. Perrot", by Abbé H. Poisson, p. 184-85, Plon, Rennes, 1955) :

"When can one speak of a national minority or of a separate minority? The Treaties of Minorities recognise three types: the racial, the linguistic and the religious minorities. We leave aside the first type. There remain language and religion. They are the main causes of distinctiveness. We could add others: geographical conditions, history, economic interests, which together create common traditions, a common way of life and common customs, and above all the will to live as a collectivity which is the essential characteristic of nationality.

All these things are characteristic of Brittany, and from them she has derived her strong individuality and her consciousness of being different, one of the essential elements in the collective will to live as a community. Brittany's national rights will remain as long as the Breton people, who are entitled to assert them at all times in order to rebuild their own State.

The foregoing statement of the historical and juridical basis of this claim is all the more relevant as the resurgence of the Breton community spirit has developed simultaneously with the threat to the Breton national characteristics. The Breton struggle in all its forms, and Breton nationalism in particular, are only the defensive reactions, conscious or unconscious, of an organism which is in danger of death.

THE CULTURAL ASPECT OF THE BRETON PROBLEM

During the past 170 years, the French State has pursued in Brittany a policy of cultural assimilation, in face of which the Bretons are practically defenceless as a result of the abolition of their institutions. It was only after 1880, when schooling through French was generalised, that this policy could be effectively carried out. Since the official doctrine is that France is one and indivisible, the Breton people have been kept in ignorance of their own history, and the Breton language, the irrefutable characteristic of their nationality, has been refused all recognition. At the same time they have been constantly indoctrinated with the universal value of French culture and the glory of French history, neither of which is theirs. The traditional attitude of the French State in education is dominated by political and not by educational considerations.

When a delegation of Breton teachers visited the French minister of Education to request the right to teach Breton, he reminded them that their task, in the Breton-speaking area, like that of their colleagues in Algeria, was at all costs to "assimilate" the population (see Report of the Welsh Delegation in Brittany 1947). Philosophic and political preoccupations thus take precedence over the needs of education proper. The result is that a large number of Bretons are uprooted, disorientated, ignorant of their own past, of their literature and of the culture from which they have sprung and which gives meaning to their life. They are unable to adapt themselves to the French cultural norms; they are ill-equipped to stand up for their own national interests, but they are made to serve the interests of the French nation.

The Breton Language.

The Breton language is spoken in the Western half of Brittany by about one million people. It belongs to the Celtic group like Welsh and Irish; it is as different from French as Italian is from German. It is the only Celtic language spoken on the continent.

It is in Breton and/or in Welsh — at the time they differed little — that the Arthurian romances were composed. Later on, Middle Breton was the medium of a spiritually inspiring and technically elaborate literature.

Nowadays, far from being an uncultivated patois as a hostile propaganda describes it Breton has been developed into a language capable of expressing technical and scientific knowledge, and all the needs of communication of a modern community. The literary revival in the language which started with the Romantic movement led to the production in this century of many works which stand comparison with those of other small countries. Thanks to dedicated linguists like Vallée, Mordiern, Ernault, Hemon, Kervella, Breton has become a refined and well integrated medium which is used — unofficially — in interpreting the most diversified aspects of modern life. Textbooks, dictionaries, a unified spelling and modern methods are at hand awaiting the right to teach it in the schools of Brittany.

The blossoming of Breton literature around the magazine GWALARN before and during the Second World War continued, after the repression of 1944-46, around the bi-monthly AL LIAMM. Many other periodicals were founded during the past 10 years, some of them specialist and thus increasing the flexibility and widening the scope of the language.

The current publication of such works as a Compre-

hensive History of the Celtic Languages (600 pages) and a Historical Dictionary of the Breton Language (about 3000 pages) gives it in certain respects a prominent position among the Celtic Languages.

FRENCH POLICY REGARDING THE BRETON LANGUAGE

The French State has brought pressure to bear on the Bretons to abandon their language, in particular during the last four generations. France recognises only one language on her territory. For the sake of the official theories of unity and equality, the other languages, Breton, Basque, German in Alsace-Lorraine, Flemish in the North, Catalan, Occitan and Italian in the South, must be eradicated, whatever the sacrifices thereby imposed on their speakers. This doctrine has been expressed more than once by French officials. It was stated most bluntly by the Minister of Education de Monzie in 1925: "For the sake of French unity, the Breton language must disappear."

To achieve this result it is not enough to impress the Breton-speakers with the merits of the French language and culture. They are constantly told that Breton is but a patois or a dialect devoid of cultural or practical value. In public services, it is treated as if it did not exist: there has never been any census to establish how many people speak it; no official business can be conducted through it: it is ostracised in the schools for, as we shall show, the Deixonne law (1951) which tolerates its teaching under restrictions is inoperative.

Deixonne Law

This law was passed by the French Parliament shortly after the adoption by the United Nations' Commission on Human Rights of the Draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It was a move to conform externally with the requirements of UNESCO membership.

Under this law, primary school teachers could devote one hour a week of the time reserved for extra-curricular activities to the teaching of rudiments of the language of their area. But this was optional for both teachers and pupils; permission to teach a "regional language" must be sought from the Education authorities in each individual case, and would be withheld if there were not enough children willing to attend. There was no provision for including the language in examinations, for the preparation and printing of textbooks, for the training of teachers except that optional courses might be opened for the last-year students in training colleges if professors

were available to give them.

Similar restrictions were put in the way of secondary school teachers and pupils who might have wanted to avail themselves of the Deixonne-law. The time-tables made it difficult to attend classes regularly. Its optional inclusion in some examinations was permitted in 1954, but the marks were of no value for success in the examination: they could only help the candidates who were successful in the regular subjects to get honours. Few pupils would consider this advantage worthwhile in view of the entailed reduction of time for the regular subjects.

There are 92 chairs of Celtic throughout the world, but only one has been created in French territory — at Rennes University. France considers herself a Latin country. Rennes students have not been taught to read Breton, so that very few take Celtic as a subject. More attention is given to Breton at Aberystwyth (Wales) than at Rennes (Brittany).

It was left to the Educational Authorities to issue instructions for the application of the Deixonne law. The latter was contrary to the traditions of the French State and was bitterly opposed by the Conseil Supérieur de L'Education. A 1960 regulation excluded the regional language test from examination for the Brevet d'Etudes Primaires Complémentaires.

In 1958 and again in 1960, the French Minister for Education attempted in spite of the law to remove the Breton test and the trifling advantage associated with it from the Secondary Schools' Leaving Certificate examination. He desisted only because of widespread opposition in Brittany and in the South of France.

Doubts are fostered in the minds of pupils and teachers concerning the availability of the tests. In March, 1961, for instance, it was stated officially that it was not desirable for candidates to the Leaving Certificates (Baccalauréat) to enter for it. In the summer of 1961, the Minister of Education, replying to Breton students, reminded them that the law did not permit a methodical teaching of "local dialects".

Unchanged Policy

In fact, while the French State may no longer openly proclaim that its aim is to eradicate the Breton language, it continues stubbornly to obstruct all efforts to obtain recognition for it. Thus, the French Government does not dispute the legitimacy of the claim to have it taught in schools, but it takes refuge behind technical and procedural details in order to avoid all discussions. The following facts show conclusively that its aim is to hold

out until the number of Breton speakers has dwindled to a point of no return.

A bill proposing to make the teaching of regional languages more effective than was possible under the Deixonne law was tabled in May, 1960, by Breton, Basque and Occitan Members of Parliament and placed in July before the Parliamentary Commission for Cultural Matters. The latter rejected the recommendation that these languages be admitted as second living languages, side by side with Laotian, Amharic and 30 others, more or less numerically-important than they, to the oral part of the Leaving Certificate examination. The report prepared by the Commission contained proposals for a modest improvement in the existing situation. It was circulated in May, 1961, to all the members of the French Parliament.

It stated that seven years of experience had shown that a coherent and effective teaching of the languages concerned had been impossible because of the restrictions imposed on the application of the Deixonne law. Requests by cultural organisations for different regulations had been refused on the ground that *the existing law* did not permit any improvement of the teaching conditions. Bretons, Basques and Occitans had therefore directed their efforts towards obtaining a *new law*. The bill represented the conclusion of two years study.

Its promoters found no opposition in the parliamentary process. It was expected to go on the agenda of the Assembly before the Summer. It had the support of all the Breton, Basque and Occitan deputies. At that point the government intervened. On July 8, 1961, the Prime Minister announced that the tabling of the bill was anti-constitutional; the teaching of regional languages was *a matter for the administration only*, in which the Assembly had no competence. This was the end of the bill. A new law could not be obtained.

In March, 1963, a Breton deputy asked the Minister of Education what he proposed to do in order to meet the popular demand for a regular teaching of Breton. The reply was evasive.

During the past two years, joint efforts have been made to prepare new bills in favour of the regional languages, but the present French constitution can again be invoked against them, or if they succeed in becoming law, that law can be made inoperative. We cannot escape the conclusion that the Deixonne law was intended to fail. In 1961, two training colleges out of six in the Breton-speaking area taught Breton to their last year students: 20-30 hours in all. Two or three dozens primary schools out of a total of over 1000 had occasional lessons devoted to the reading of easy texts. No such classes existed in any of

the 110 colleges of General Education. In the secondary schools, a dozen classes were attended by 300-400 students in spite of great difficulties such as the scarcity of competent teachers — a number of these have been transferred outside the Breton-speaking area after they had started Breton classes. That was the balance-sheet ten years after the adoption of the Deixonne law. These figures have hardly been improved in the past three years.

The Breton people are attached to their language

There is no doubt about the pupils' and students' interest in the study of Breton. Once they have discovered that they had been misled about its nature and qualities, they learn it enthusiastically. But school time-tables leave them little time to devote to it.

In the summer of 1959, two demonstrations, in each of which 2500-3000 young people participated, took place in Brest and Kemper in protest against the decision to cancel the Breton test in the Leaving Certificate examination. In January, 1961, 1000 students from 4 secondary schools asked the Minister of Education for a regular teaching of the language. In 1963 this request was repeated by 1500 secondary school students.

The attachment of the common people to their language is also evidenced by their contribution to the annual collections in its favour on the public roads, and by the increasing success of the stage performances in Breton which have been carried out over the past 7-8 years in rural districts. They throng to these shows, "for the pleasure of hearing their language on the stage, as if hungry," to use the words of a witness.

Their elected representatives have intervened on countless occasions to demand its official recognition. Petitions for instruction in it in State schools were submitted through parliamentary channels to the French Government in 1903, 1907, 1909, 1919, 1921, 1925, etc. The petition organised by AR BREZONEG ER SKOL in the years 1935-39 was signed by a majority of the municipal councils in the Breton-speaking area. In 1939, Breton deputies introduced a bill in favour of bilingualism. It was also on the initiative of Breton deputies that parliamentary action was resumed after the war, eventually leading to the adoption of the Deixonne law in 1951. In 1959, all the 31 Breton deputies to the French National Assembly tabled a bill for the teaching of Breton during regular hours. They renewed the attempt in July, 1960, only to be thwarted by the French Prime Minister in July, 1961. A more elaborate bill was prepared with their support during the years 1961-62.

These efforts at government level have been backed by other representative bodies. In January, 1961, the General Councils of the 3 Breton-speaking départements, elected by universal suffrage, repeated the demand which they had made many times previously that Breton be taught as a regular subject in these départements. In June, 1962, the General Assembly of the Committee for the Study and Co-ordination of the Breton Interests (CELIB), at a meeting which was attended by 1200 representatives of all sections of the Breton population (farmers' unions, trade unions, professional organisations, cultural associations, members of parliament and mayors), the French Government was asked to revoke its hostile attitude to our language. The Bill for a Breton Programme of Development prepared by CELIB with the co-operation of the aforementioned organisations included proposals for the safeguard of the Breton language and culture. In July, 1961, a demonstration which brought together members of all Breton organisations took place in front of the Kemper "préfecture" in protest against the government's refusal to discuss a new bill in favour of the "regional languages".

Psychological effects

The French policy of assimilation has had other effects, however, than to generate protests. Submitted to a powerful and ceaseless propaganda, a large percentage of the Breton-speakers in each generation has been brought to admit that their language, deprived as it was of all recognition, was a hindrance to them in life. It is true that Breton, since it is not taught, nor used by the leading class, degenerates in the homes into subdialects. This has made it possible to discredit it further in the minds of its speakers and to equate it with backwardness. The fact that it is a Celtic language and not a French dialect, that it has a remarkable literature and a unified standard, that it is possible to use it for all the needs of modern life, has been assiduously concealed from the people. Those who spoke it have been mocked at and despised. The school children who could not play in French were punished for speaking Breton in the playground and were made to inform on their comrades.

These and similar practices have had widespread inhibiting effects. The complete disregard for the mother-tongue in teaching has had the result that most children in the rural areas have acquired hardly any knowledge at school. Although it has been proved recently that the intelligence level in the Breton-speaking area is higher than the French average, there is a considerable lag in education. The lack of an adequate means of expression

has contributed, together with the anti-Breton propaganda, to the development of an inferiority complex which has handicapped tens of thousands for life. A large number of people have been ashamed to admit that they knew Breton, to acknowledge their Breton origin. The transmission of the ancestral wisdom and traditions has been suddenly interrupted in families where it became accepted as natural for grandparents and grandchildren not to understand one another.

This process of assimilation is educationally unsound. It disregards the principle, adopted by UNESCO, that education be based on the mother tongue. Under the pretext of "civilising" those subject to it, it degrades them. It leads, as research has shown (Dr. L. de Guiliant, *Le Concours Medical*, 1960, pp. 3429-3440; Dr. N. Bothorel, *Ar Vro* No. 24, Brest) to the degeneration of the individual and the disintegration of the community.

Although the concept of "cultural genocide" is not accepted in law, we draw attention to the correlation which these workers have established between cultural uprooting on the one hand, and on the other social maladjustment, social disintegration, alcoholism, anxiety and mental diseases among the Bretons. Our case is that the destruction of Breton culture has harmful repercussions on the material life of the Breton people, and that this harm is criminal.

Positive measures have been taken by Bretons to teach their language to adults and children outside the official school system. Correspondence courses and summer schools have been established as early as 1930 and function regularly. A Centre for Secondary School Education by correspondence set up two years ago teaches 8 subjects, including physics and chemistry. But the tight control of education by the French State makes it impossible to open schools for the children on a regular basis. The school set up at Plestin during the war was closed in 1944 and its headmaster, an experienced teacher, debarred from teaching in public schools. The Plouezeg bilingual school which managed to teach 4-6 hours a week for a time had finally to conform to State-prescribed time-tables. Dr. Etienne who undertook to teach two of his children at home in conformity with UNESCO principles was subjected to pressure by the Educational Authorities and deprived of family allowances for his wife and five children: it was pointed out that the French State reserves all the rights in matters of education and that all the subjects must be taught in French from the first school year: that *France did not have to take into account the UNESCO Convention of December 15, 1960, which she had signed and ratified, on the Prevention of Discrimination in*

the field of Education.

A last example concerns a secondary school teacher who had organised Breton classes in two Kemper schools in 1961. As he could admit only about 1/5 of the 250-300 students who wished to attend, he requested the Minister of Education to release him for 4 hours a week from his regular teaching so as to satisfy all applicants. The resulting gap would be filled by other members of the school staff. The Minister's reply, which came after months of delay, gave him no satisfaction.

The treatment given by the French authorities to the repeated demands that the Breton language be allowed a place in Radio and Television broadcasts commensurate with the number of its speakers has also been characterised by evasions, dilatory and defective measures, lack of credits and facilities. The enormous disproportion between the times allotted to the Breton and the French programmes remains one of the factors in the destruction of the Breton culture.

THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF THE BRETON PROBLEM

Brittany is a predominantly agricultural country. Her economy bears the characteristics of colonial exploitation: poor equipment, under-industrialisation, stagnation or decline of the existing activities, under-employment, emigration. The efforts of the Breton collectivity to redress the situation have failed because the French Government has persistently refused to take the major decisions necessary to back them.

The Breton *agricultural production* is enormous and varied. Its value amounts to 10% of the French total although in area the proportion is only 6.2%. In 1960, 4 of the 5 Breton départements produced 8% of the French meat, 11% of the milk, 15% of the horses, 7% of the wheat, 19% of the potatoes, 40% of the apples; percentages for 8 common types of vegetables varied from 14% to 51%. Their egg and chicken production exceeded that of all French regions put together. The quality of these products was high in many respects (seed potatoes, onions, horses, hens, etc. ...)

The Breton fishermen extend their activities all over the Atlantic, and their catch represents in weight about 33% of the French total. Tourism, another important factor in the Breton economy, attracts yearly 600,000 visitors.

Under-industrialisation

Only 20% of the active population is employed in industry as against 36% in France. There has been a decline under French rule: if building is excluded and

the Nantes-St. Nazaire area is left out, it is estimated that the number of industrial workers fell from 201,000 in 1896 to 139,000 in 1954.

To-day the principal concerns are stagnant or are threatening to close: there is redundancy at the St. Nazaire shipyards, the Henbont foundries are to be dismantled, the Brest and Lorient naval dockyards are expected to cease their activity. As regards the fish and vegetable canning factories along the South coast, they give only seasonal employment, and their owners are setting up rival branches near Paris and in Morocco.

Lack of industrial developments is related to the cost of power, the neglect of the under-structure of industry, the outlook of the capital owners, the unavailability of State credits.

Energy Price Policy

Brittany could import coal more cheaply by sea from Wales, the U.S.A., Poland, than by rail from the French mines. American coal could be brought to Brest at a cost of 0.86 Fr. kilocalory instead of French coal at 1.32-1.56 Fr.kcal. But in order to protect her own industry, France imposes 25%-40% tariffs on imports. With additional transport costs, Brittany pays for coal 25% more than Paris.

In 1959 only 15% of the Breton needs in electrical power were covered by the home stations. The tariffs imposed for the sake of solidarity with the French coal miners made it impossible to produce electricity from coal at competitive prices, but this sacrifice is not compensated by an even sharing of the cost per kilowatt which in Brittany is higher than anywhere in France. The 570 kwh. per year to be generated by the Rance tidal station, on Breton soil, are not likely to affect prices.

Power accounts for 15%-30% of production costs in many industries (e.g. kaolin, milk powder, apple juice, metallurgy). Its price is a decisive factor in the choice of districts for new factories. Since it is controlled by the French Government, the latter bears a direct responsibility for the reluctance of industrialists to set up branches in Brittany.

Transport

Credit has been readily available in France for the equipment and modernisation of the under-structure of industry, but this has not been shared by Brittany. As a result, the many defects of the Breton railway system continue and are reflected in the average speed of trains on the main Breton lines, which is only 80 km per hour as compared to 120 km per hour on the main French

lines. This slowness, as well as delays caused by changes from narrow gauge to normal gauge lines at many junctions, has also adversely affected industrialisation.

Of the 5,500 km of highways which are in the care of the State, only about 40% are in good condition. The most neglected is the East-West highway through Central Brittany.

The State has given no encouragement to Breton efforts to establish air services — the only existing routes are operated by English and Irish companies — ; it has withheld credits for the maintenance of existing harbours and waterways, and for the building of a motorway.

Colonial exploitation

Until 1789, the Breton economy was characterised by a good balance between agricultural and industrial activities. Following the loss of autonomy, and as a result of the Napoleonic wars which destroyed her flourishing sea trade, Brittany became orientated towards the continent and more and more dependent on French sources of power and markets. All the important industries, commercial exchanges, and banks passed between 1870 and 1925 into the hands of foreign companies whose main interests are outside Brittany: almost all their profits leave the country instead of being used to develop it. 40% of the land in Eastern and Central Brittany belongs today to a gentry which mostly lives outside the country, or which serves French centralism. The Frenchified upper middle-class owns the three dailies published in Brittany, in partnership with non-Breton elements: they conceal from the people the systematic neglect of their collective interests.

Thus, the Breton workers are dependent upon individuals or companies which seek immediate profits and, in their indifference to the welfare of the country, take advantage of the under-employment and pay the lowest wages possible. The majority of the industrial concerns of Brittany give wages which are inferior by up to 50% to those paid in France for the same kind of work. In Western Brittany, the mean annual salary in 1962 was 5,670 fr. whereas in Paris it was 10,277 and in France 7,700 fr.

The average income of the Breton farmers is only 60% of that of an agricultural worker in the region around Paris. It is lower than anywhere in France, and it is estimated that 50%-60% of them earn less, in spite of their hard work from dawn to dusk, than the "minimum inter-professional salary" guaranteed by the State to industrial workers. To some extent, this is due to the speculative

character of their production (weather risks, abundance alternating with poor crops) or to marketing conditions and fluctuations outside their control. Like many fishermen, they are in debt. Breton economic activities are unprofitable, mainly because goods produced in Brittany have to be sold at low prices for processing abroad while finished articles have to be imported at high cost. This also is characteristic of a colonial economy.

Emigration

Underemployment resulting from the lack of industrial development and the realisation that the standard of living is well below the French average leads the most active elements of the population to migrate.

In the last 60 years, Brittany has lost about one million people through emigration. Since 1945, its annual rate has been 20,000-25,000. 60% of the young people go away. The 1962 census showed a decrease of 82,000 in the active population of 4 Breton départements over the previous 8 years. The majority of the people in large areas of Central Brittany are over 30 years old. For many of the young who stay, there is no prospect of marriage. Until recently a demographic balance was ensured, but this is no longer the case. Unless radical measures are taken during the next 4-8 years to provide work for those who were born after the war, the population of Brittany will decline at an increasing rate.

The Bretons are emigrating through economic necessity. They would prefer to live in their country. The emigrants hope soon to earn enough and return. When vacancies in Brittany are advertised, numerous applications are received from these exiles (a striking example was offered by the Brest municipality in 1961 when it advertised technical posts).

So long as the demographic level remained steady, the people were not alarmed. But nowadays, emigration affects all sections of the population. Not only in the rural areas but also in the towns, business and professional people see their incomes dwindle through loss of customers, and they in turn must think of leaving. It is this threat to the livelihood of the entire population which has quickened the Bretons' awareness of a community of interests during the past 3 or 4 years. In mass demonstrations, farmers, workers, teachers, tradesmen, have been demanding work for their daughters and sons in Brittany and refusing *economic deportation*. This was also the theme of big public meetings during the winter 1963-64.

It is hinted, however, that the French Government favours the elimination of the small farms which form

the great majority of the Breton holdings. A quarter or a third of the Bretons would then have to "re-adapt" themselves, i.e. in the absence of industrialisation, to emigrate. "Brittany should be decongested, and Central France repopulated," stated Prime Minister Debré in 1960. Yet our country has only 84 inhabitants per km. But France favours only such regional schemes as could boost up her international position. It is thus planned to build up Paris into an agglomeration of 11-15 millions within the next 10-15 years, a development which will call for a massive Breton contribution, no matter how much stress and misery the problems of re-adaptation to a culturally foreign environment will bring to the hundreds of thousands. The connection between exile and cultural uprooting on the one hand, and such social ills as alcoholism, tuberculosis, homesickness and mental diseases on the other hand has been established in the case of the Bretons by, among others, Abbé E. Gauthier and Dr. N. Bothorel. The former concluded that few emigrants succeed in rising above the lower social classes, while the latter ascertained a casual relation between the process of Frenchification and those evils.

We should point out that the upbringing and education of the future emigrants costs the Breton people about £120 millions a year. This heavy tribute is, however, of secondary importance compared with the vital loss of the country's youth.

THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE — THE FIRST BRETON PLAN

It was shown in the Breton publications of the last 40 years that Brittany's economy was declining under French rule. The neglects and tendencies which are detailed in R. Pleven's book "L'Avenir de la Bretagne" (1961) were already exposed by M. Duhamel in "La Question Bretonne dans son Cadre Européen" (1928).

In 1951, a Committee for the Study and Co-ordination of the Breton Interests (C.E.L.I.B.) was created to work at a non-political level for the recognition of our needs, particularly in the economic field. It united the great majority of Brittany's elected representatives, and was supported by economic bodies, farmers unions, cultural associations. In 1953, its dynamic Commission for Regional Expansion presented a comprehensive Plan of Development which had been prepared in consultation with competent members of these organisations, and which was conceived in such a way as to fit in with the Second French Plan of Modernisation and Equipment.

It was accepted with some important modifications by

the French Government in 1956. But it was not put into application. Incentives for the establishment of new industries in a few critical districts were provided for, but the State made no financial credits especially available for the purpose. On the contrary, the 4 départements of "Region Brittany" were allotted only 3.1% of the investments to be provided under the French Plan, although on a population basis they would have been entitled to 5.3%. And every year this area has seen its promised share further reduced, whether in respect of power, transports, recalcification, rural electrification, piped water supply, or agricultural and technical education. Ministerial responsibility for the execution of the Plan has not been defined. Although the Government has admitted the need to make available 10,000-12,000 new employments a year between 1954 and 1961 only 10,000 in all were created.

Everything that depended on Breton efforts was speedily accomplished. The town councils entered enthusiastically the competition to attract, and prepare the basis for, industries. The initial capital required by law to create a "Society for the Development of Brittany" was subscribed by 1,400 small shareholders and the subventions needed to create a "Society for the Equipment of Brittany" were provided by the Breton General Councils. But restrictions introduced by the State in the charters of these societies prevented them from being used appropriately.

A law adopted in 1959 set aside 1,327 billion fr. for the general equipment of France and her dependencies. When the 2 billions initially allotted to "Region Brittany" were "frozen", the great majority of the Bretons recognised that their country was being systematically neglected. It marked the beginning of a series of mass protests which have extended over the past 5 years and at times brought Brittany to the verge of revolt.

MASS DEMONSTRATIONS

In October and December, 1959, and again in April, 1960, about 70,000 people demonstrated in several places in order to draw attention to the French Government's disregard for agricultural interests and the need for investments suited to the special character of the Breton economy. From May 25 to June 22, 1961, numerous acts of sabotage, clashes with the police, tractor demonstrations, spread over all of Brittany and, culminating in the temporary seizure of the Montroulez (Morlaix) "sous-préfecture", were caused by disastrous conditions on the potato market and government failure to fulfil a promise of reforms.

In September, 1962, 15,000 people demonstrated in 6 towns and railway barricades were set up at 5 level crossings when the Government decided to increase transport tariffs by 2%-5% in Brittany while decreasing them by 10%-20% in the other areas. This time all sectors of the population protested as they realised they were to be penalised on account of defects for which the State alone bore responsibility.

In October, 1963, 20,000 workers, farmers and tradesmen demonstrated in different towns against the State's decision to close the Henbont foundries, the only heavy industry in Brittany. In January, 1964, at St-Nazaire, 25,000 men from various professions opposed the dismissal of 1,500 shipyard workers; and 14,000 farmers gathered at the 5 Breton administrative centres to demand agricultural planning on a regional basis and social equality. At Nantes in February, 1964, 70,000 people from all professions proclaimed their right to stable employment in their home country, a fair salary and equality of educational opportunities. Other demonstrations at Brest, St-Brieg, Gwengamp and St-Nazaire in February and March stressed the demand for the regional planning of production and investment, the solidarity of all sections of the population in the defence of their interests, the will to safeguard Brittany's future, the refusal of economic deportation, the need to apply the Second Breton Plan of Development.

During the past 3 years, tons of potatoes, cauliflowers, artichokes, fish, were dumped in streets on many occasions, when sale prices fell below production costs.

THE SECOND ECONOMIC PLAN

In August, 1961, at the General Assembly of C.E.L.I.B., 1,500 elected representatives and delegates of the farmers' and workers' unions and of professional and cultural organisations, demanded the adoption of a special emergency law to solve the Breton crisis, in particular to endow Brittany with modern means of communication, power stations, facilities for the storage and transformation of agricultural products, i.e. an adequate understructure for industrialisation. Such a law would put the State under obligations regarding investments, means of implementation, time schedules.

The Government's reply in October, 1961, being unsatisfactory, C.E.L.I.B. decided to prepare itself a Second Plan for the Development of Brittany. From October, 1961, to June, 1962, detailed estimates of the needs of the various sectors, based on a forecast of population movements during the 4 years ahead, were computed by the

Commission for Economic Expansion. The 50-page draft, containing arguments and proposals under the various headings of transport, agriculture, industry, social and cultural equipment, teaching of Breton, etc., was adopted in June, 1962, by the General Assembly of C.E.L.I.B., attended by 1,200 people. Estimates of the required investments were indicated for each section. In order to enable the Government to integrate this plan in the 4th French Plan of Development, the C.E.L.I.B. proposals applied only to "Region Brittany", but they included the demand that its application be entrusted in an assembly of elected representatives assisted by specialised bodies and empowered to take decisions without constant reference to Paris.

The bill received the support of the 5 Breton General Councils, the 5 Breton Agricultural Chambers, 7 Chambers of Commerce, and about 1,100 town councils representing over 20% of the population of the 4 "départements".

Faced with this undeniably democratic expression of Brittany's will to survive, the French Government undertook *by law* to adopt a programme for all under-developed areas in the French territory before the end of 1963. But again, this pledge, given on the eve of a presidential referendum and of parliamentary elections, was not honoured. After repeatedly postponing a decision, the Government made it clear that they had in this case no intention of abiding by their own law. The 1964 budget, instead of providing supplementary credits, attributed to Brittany much less than the share to which she was entitled on a population basis: discrimination was particularly marked in respect of education, transport, housing, technical and agricultural training. As regards the 1965 budget, it is now known that it will earmark for Education 33%, for Housing 40%, and for Agriculture 20% less than the 1964 budget.

Apart from comprehensive plans of development, there are many examples of particular efforts to solve the Breton problems within the framework of French laws: 600 co-operatives of 3-6 small farms, pooling their machines, exist in Brittany as compared with 900 in France; studies have been made of the minimum conditions under which farms could provide a reasonable standard of living to 2 workers each; C.E.L.I.B. organises Breton participation at international fairs (7 in 1962) and is taking steps to promote trade arrangements between Brittany and Great Britain: farmers in the more productive areas have set up model co-operatives: in 1960, "Region Brittany" had 120 Centres for Agricultural Technical Study (compared to 880 in the rest of the French territory), and 79 of them were organised by the farmers

themselves ; foreign methods and experiments are closely watched ; Breton language and cultural centres are open in the main towns ; 5 correspondence schools and other classes teach Breton free of charges ; secondary school students have formed a federation to study the Breton social and economic problems ; eagerness to learn is shown by the high percentage of school pupils of the age group 15-19 years : it is 37.3% in Brittany (47% in Finistère), 35.4% in "all of France".

NO FRENCH SOLUTION OF THE BRETON PROBLEM

It has been shown that all the French Governments have opposed the demands, however moderate, of the majority of the Breton people in respect of their economy as well as of their language during the past 25-30 years. There are many other indications of the French State's *antagonism* to Breton interests, such as the administrative separation of the industrialised Loire-Atlantique from the other 4 Breton départements, and the refusal to allow a Breton application for credits to the European Investments Bank ; the tearing-down by official orders of posters urging people to "buy Breton in order to save Brittany" and to say "No to Deportation" ; the exclusion of independent bodies and personalities from an official advisory commission on economic development in Brittany ; the French refusal to ratify the Protocol of the Council of Europe's Convention for the Protection of Human Rights ; French opposition to any mention of Breton in the minutes of the UNESCO Congress on bilingualism in Cardiff, 1960 ; the official black-out on news of meetings which show the existence of a collective Breton will, as at the General Assembly of C.E.L.I.B. in August, 1961. Furthermore, by excluding Great Britain from the European Economic Community, France puts Brittany in a position removed from important commercial exchanges. Her prestige and military expenditures are equally detrimental to our country in that they are an excuse for refusing credits for its development. Finally, the multiplication of military bases on our soil confirms our conviction that Brittany is destined by France to remain, as in the past, a reserve of cheap labour, soldiers and minor civil servants. (The percentage of Bretons killed in the 1914-18 war was 7.1% whereas for France it was 3.5% of the total population ; Breton regiments were in the most exposed sectors in 1939-40 ; and they were the first to be sent to Algiers in 1954.)

NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

Brittany, it has been shown, has the characteristics of a nation : ethnologically homogeneous, she has a

historical claim to self-determination, she has a language of her own, and her people have the will to live together and collectively defend their interests.

The Breton struggle is the struggle for survival of an oppressed nation.

Before and during World War II, a minority of Bretons asserted their country's claim to political freedom, but this movement was repressed in blood in 1944-46. The delegation of the Council of the National Eisteddfod of Wales, which inquired, at the invitation of the French Government, into the situation in Brittany immediately after World War II, came to the conclusion that simply to have indulged in Breton activity, whatever its nature, was for the French Government reason enough for persecution. Some 2,000 Breton patriots were arrested, more than a thousand of whom were sent to concentration camps. (For details of the severity of this persecution, see "Breton Nationalism", published by the Welsh Nationalist Party, Cardiff, 1947.)

Since 1946, almost every organised attempt to defend the Breton interests has avoided challenging France's claim to the Breton's loyalty, so that a threat to her security cannot be alleged as an excuse for her negative policy.

It is clear that France continues to consider the existence of the Breton nation as contrary to her own aims. Conversely, a vitally endangered Brittany can no longer leave the control of her destiny to a hostile State : in order to counter-act effectively the powerful forces which seek her total annihilation as a nation, she must regain her political freedom.

Need it be stressed that this aim implies no animosity towards the French people, that Brittany claims no other rights than those enjoyed by every free nation, that she, like other small European nations, will best be able to serve peace when she will be free, and that the advocates of her freedom strongly support the establishment of a Federation of the European Peoples ?

REQUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION

In conclusion, we submit that :

- (1) The right of self-determination stated in Art. 1 of the Draft Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights applies to Brittany ; the behaviour of the French State is contrary to the promotion of that right, and does not recognise the right to a fair wage and equal remuneration for work of equal value and to social security in Brittany ;

(2) the Breton people possess ethnic, linguistic and even religious traditions markedly different from those of the rest of the population in the French State ; they need to be protected by special international measures, since otherwise they cannot preserve and develop their traditions and characteristics unless and until they obtain self-government ;

(3) the Breton people constitute a non-dominant group who not only possess, but also wish to preserve, those traditions and characteristics ; they seek equality, but not identity of treatment, with other citizens of the State ; they include a number of persons sufficient by themselves to develop such characteristics ; therefore, the term *minority* as defined by the Subcommittee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities applies to them, notwithstanding France's refusal to grant this recognition ;

(4) the Breton people, who represent 1/15 of the population of the French State and have spontaneously expressed their desire to maintain their cultural heritage, are denied the minimum *adequate* facilities for that purpose, including the use of their own language in all administrative offices and its teaching in State-supported schools.

(5) although the French State has ratified the UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in the Field of Education, it does not fulfil Article 5 of this Convention, which would oblige it, if it recognised the Bretons as a national minority, to take all the measures necessary to enable them to carry out their own educational activities, including the management of schools and the teaching of the Breton language ;

(6) finally, the French State has violated the law binding it to adopt, before the end of 1963, a law-programme for underdeveloped areas, among which Brittany ranks as the worst. This violation is particularly harmful to the Breton people. Apart from the unilateral violation of the Treaty of 1932, the French State, by its disregard for the rights of the Bretons and its mismanagement of their interests, has forfeited its claim to their loyalty. By continuously thwarting their efforts to secure their future in their home country and to save their cultural heritage by peaceful means, it will leave them no alternative but to pursue their struggle by other means.

This grievous harm done by the French State to Brittany cannot be allowed to continue. A way must be found to afford protection, possibly by the United Nations, to this peace-loving nation.

The Welsh Case

INTRODUCTION

WALES — CYMRU in the Welsh language — is a country of roughly 8,000 sq. miles. On three sides it is bordered by the sea. Its fourth side forms a border with England. Much of the country is composed of mountainous terrain broken by deep valleys, except in central Wales where there is extensive lowland and the southern part where flat agricultural land is fringed by a series of heavily-industrialised valleys which lead up to moorland.

Today, the population is scattered unevenly. The southern extremity, especially the eastern end of it, is heavily populated, central Wales is sparsely populated and northern Wales only slightly more so, apart from the north-eastern area where industry has attracted a concentration of population.

The people who inhabit this country are called the **WELSH**. For eight centuries — some scholars would say fifteen — the Welsh have thought of themselves as a nation distinct from their neighbours, having a common cultural tradition, a distinct language and a social identity. In spite of insistent pressure from outsiders and constant defections amongst the Welsh themselves, they have succeeded in maintaining their sense of nationhood. By today its content has become so attenuated that urgent action must be taken to secure the future of the nation.

No small nation can hope to survive either as a cultural or social organism in the modern world unless it is given the means to defend and enrich and strengthen its own life. And amongst those means none is more essential than a government of its own. The achievement of self-government by so many small nations in all parts of the world and the manifest advantage that they have enjoyed by acquiring this status, inspires us to bring the plight of Wales to the notice of the several delegations to the United Nations Assembly by means of this document.

A NATION'S STORY

The Emergence of Wales

When the Roman Empire began to disintegrate at the close of the fourth century, one of the several peoples that emerged out of its ruins was the Welsh people. Although their country had been formally subjugated to Rome, there had been no thorough process of absorption of the kind that happened in Spain or in Gaul. One proof of this was the continued use of a Celtic language by these people. They certainly adopted many Latin loan-words but the

language remained substantially different from the Romance languages. It was closely related to those branches of the Celtic languages that are still spoken in Scotland and Ireland.

As in other European countries the incursions of tribes from Eastern Europe in the fourth and fifth centuries brought about chaos and destruction and the consequent upheaval is reflected in the heated arguments of modern historians about the correct way to interpret the tantalisingly small body of surviving evidence. That there was a long period of intense struggle between the semi-Romanised Celts and their brethren who had come under the military suzerainty of the Northern invaders is admitted and later on, this traumatic epoch was to leave its impress upon the cycle of Arthurian legends which have played so romantic and creative a role in world culture. Even as early as this the Celts (whom we can now call 'the Welsh') were conscious of the similarity that united them together as well as of the dissimilarity between their fellow-Welshmen and their English neighbours. And this consciousness of difference is reflected in the name they gave themselves, — Cymry, "fellow countrymen" and in the unreadiness of Welsh Christians to adopt various religious practices that the English had already adopted. It was not until 768 that the Welsh Church abandoned its isolation by adopting the dating of Easter that was common to the Western Church. From then until the end of the Middle Ages Wales was loyal to Rome in religious matters.

By the eighth century, Wales had developed many of the characteristics that it was to retain for centuries. At the close of that century the limits of English expansion into Wales were defined by Offa's Dyke, the traditional eastern frontier between the two countries built by the Mercian king of that name. The language had taken a fixed form and had begun its career as a literary medium. The scattered Scandinavian attacks along the coastline served only to draw the people closer together and under Rhodri the Great (d. 878) and his descendants, the Welsh achieved a large measure of political unity. The most distinguished of this family was Hywel the Good (d. 950). King of All Wales, and the reputed systematizer and codifier of the numerous local systems of law. The "law of Hywel" became the standard of justice to all Welsh lawyers until the indigenous national law of Wales was ousted by that of England.

On the eve of the Norman invasion, Wales enjoyed a widespread political revival under the leadership of Gruffydd ap Llywelyn. Until his overthrow in 1063 he had not only brought Wales generally under his sway, and made its name a terror to Englishmen, but also he roused

his people to a new sense of destiny. His inspiration helps to explain their strenuous resistance to the Normans when they came and their pertinacious struggle for two centuries to preserve their independence.

The Norman invaders were far from successful in Wales. They fared best in the southern part of the country where political control passed into the hands of Norman barons. In mid-Wales, however, the kingdom of Powys was little affected while up north Gruffydd ap Cynan, thanks to his own perseverance and the mountains of Snowdonia, succeeded in consolidating the strength of his principality of Gwynedd, right under the noses of the Norman intruders.

Welsh mediaeval society was at the same time hierarchical and cohesive. Life for the slave and the serf was hard and poor. Nor was it very luxurious for the upper classes from which the princes, their courtiers and armies were recruited. Every prince had his own band of soldiers as well as a carefully organised court in which the duties of each official was clearly defined. There was constant friction between these princes but the disorder which followed was a familiar aspect of European life generally.

But when a strong prince emerged who was able to secure the support and loyalty of lesser princes, peace and order reigned also. In the twelfth century, the Welsh princes were able, by presenting a united front, to overwhelm the English King Henry II's invasion at the memorable battle of the Berwyn in 1165. At last Wales was left alone and a period of consolidation followed. The age of Rhys ap Gruffydd, the Lord Rhys, is vividly reflected in the pages of Giraldus Cambrensis. At this time, the focus of power was in southern Wales but with the emergence of Llywelyn ab Iorwerth, it moved north to Gwynedd. Llywelyn, who married Joan, daughter of the English King John, was the most powerful of the mediaeval Welsh princes, and is deservedly called the Great. He extended his power over most of Wales and unseated the Normans from several of their strongholds. Under his enlightened rule the country prospered and the rule of law strengthened; he patronised bards and religious houses. His death at Aberconway in 1240 marked the end of an epoch. For Llywelyn had not succeeded in creating those institutions which would preserve and perpetuate that unity which he had built and which rested so largely on his personal abilities. For a brief period Llywelyn, grandson of Llywelyn the Great, succeeded in repeating his grandfather's achievement by uniting virtually the whole of Wales under his own rule and the new title "Prince of Wales" which he assumed was meant to reflect this unity.

But England, too, was achieving a new unity under the powerful King Edward I, whose ambitions soon brought the two countries into conflict in the war of 1277. Llywelyn lost much of his authority and was finally killed on 11th December, 1282.

Loss of Independence

The fall of the house of Gwynedd made it possible for the English King to accelerate the process of bringing Wales within the orbit of English administration. By the Statute of Rhuddlan (1284) the counties of Anglesey, Caernarvon and Merioneth were created, as well as the county of Flint. But much of the country apart from Gwynedd was left under the control of local lords and in possession of ancient rights. But the provisions of the Statute of Rhuddlan were modified in a significant way by the decision, taken in 1301, to create the King's eldest son Prince of Wales. Once again, Wales was admitted to be a distinct entity and was given an independent status.

National feeling continued to simmer. Although the years that followed were generally peaceful ones, disturbed only by local outbreaks of violence, it only needed a small spark to ignite a national conflagration. This spark was struck in 1400 when Owen Glyn Dwr, the Lord of Glyn-dyfrdwy, raised the banner of revolt. A feud between Owen and one of his neighbours soon developed into a national struggle between Wales and England. It soon became evident that Glyn Dwr was a leader of uncommon calibre. As a general he was skilful in strategy, as a diplomat he perceived the advantage of securing foreign help from France and Scotland. And as a national statesman he saw clearly that Welsh unity needed to be fortified by the creation of national institutions — universities, an independent Welsh church, and a parliament. His hopes were not realised and although he continued to fight with dauntless courage, none of his plans bore fruit. But the impression he made was profound. As the historian, Sir John Edward Lloyd put it, "*the revolt gave a new strength and cohesion to Welsh national feeling*". The Welsh came to regard themselves more clearly than ever before as a nation rather than as a group of clans, and as a nation marked off from the English by the use of a different language and the possession of a different culture. It was under the impact of this vision that literature flourished in fifteenth century Wales as it had never done before.

Effects of Tudor Rule

The accession of Henry VII to the English throne in 1485 was a significant event in the history of Wales as it

was in that of England. But its significance for the two nations was not the same. For England it meant the triumph of the house of Lancaster and the end of years of internecine strife. For Wales it meant that a Welshman at last occupied the throne. Henry was the representative of an old Welsh noble line, he had been reared in a Welsh atmosphere and probably spoke Welsh. The victory of Bosworth was felt to be a fitting vengeance for the ills the Welsh had suffered at the hands of the English for many generations.

But the significance which late fifteenth century Welshmen divined in the accession of the Tudors that the power of England over Wales was broken was hardly justified by later history. Welshmen began to flock into England and so begin the long and tragic story of emigration. In particular, the gentry and the Welsh aristocracy found a new focus for their social life and political ambitions in the royal court at London. Gradually, they became anglicized and a growing gulf separated them from their Welsh tenants and kinsfolk. The constitutional expression of this development was the Act of Union, passed in 1536 and confirmed in 1542. Its main purport was to bring Wales into the English constitutional system. New counties were created and they, like the old, together with the boroughs, would now be represented in the House of Commons in London. In order to facilitate the fusion of the two countries, the Welsh language was treated as an anomaly and proscribed in a clause that has never been repealed.

Gradually, the natural leaders of Welsh life lost their sense of solidarity with their fellow-countrymen. By the middle of the eighteenth century hardly any of them could speak Welsh and their interest in Wales had long ceased to be informed by any sense of a historic past, or of an ancient culture. It had declined into an anxiety about collecting inadequate rents from an uncouth (but amusing) peasantry.

Peasant Custodians

Things were happening to the peasantry too. They felt that their landlords were becoming alien. And the landlord was closely linked in their minds with the parish priest. In Elizabethan times, the great Reformation figures, Richard Davies, Bishop of St. Davids, William Morgan and William Salesbury, translators of the Scripture and of the Book of Common Prayer, had given the Church of England (as it was called, even in Wales) a Welsh aura. It was not impossible to think of it as a revival of the ancient British Church. At long last, the Welsh people could listen to divine service in their own tongue. And this loyalty

to the new established church continued. It was finally undermined by tragedy within the church and revival without. After 1660 the Church became increasingly the happy hunting ground for English prelates on the way to better things and bigger emoluments. The Church as a consequence soon lost that Welsh atmosphere which characterised it in the past. Meanwhile, profound religious disturbances were leading the people to forsake their allegiance to the Church and to organise movements of great spiritual force which were controlled by the peasantry itself. First of all came the Puritan movement in the middle years of the seventeenth century. Although strongly coloured by the English majors and merchants that came into power in the Cromwellian era, it soon developed into a Welsh Non-conformist movement. In consequence, it began (under the inspiration of Stephen Hughes, a Carmarthenshire minister, and his friends) to publish religious books in the Welsh language. This had the very significant consequence of triggering off that process which was to make the peasantry — the ordinary people — the new custodians of the language in place of the defaulting gentry.

The work begun in the seventeenth century by the Puritans was continued by the much more powerful Methodist Revival of the eighteenth. This affected all the existing sects and brought two new Methodist sects into existence. Its effect on the peasantry was revolutionary. Hardly an aspect of national life escaped its impact. And its effect continued as a creative force into the middle of the following century. First of all, it created an articulate and a literate nation. Secondly, its medium of communication was the Welsh language. Thousands of people were drilled in the Sunday Schools, by listening to sermons, by participating in the government of their churches, by reading papers and attending debates in literary societies, to express themselves lucidly, delicately, and with subtlety in Welsh. Moreover, by making people articulate, the Evangelical Revival disciplined them in the principles of democracy. They learnt how to conduct public business in a tidy and formal way. And by teaching them to read, the Revival opened their minds to new ideas — some of them very dynamic ideas — about the nature of human society and the rights of man.

Social Discontent

This process was very rapidly modified by great economic changes. The Industrial Revolution struck Wales slightly later than England. But early in the nineteenth century, Merthyr Tydfil and the valleys of Monmouthshire were becoming centres of modern heavy

industry. People were flocking into the valleys from rural areas to seek work. Conditions were harsh and vile as the industrial villages mushroomed up. Sanitation was non-existent, housing was deplorable, conditions of work abominable. In such conditions people were compelled in the name of their common humanity to fight back. And now the social fury of the oppressed industrial worker, disciplined by the literary and cultural training received in the chapels, began to express itself in organised labour movements such as trade unions and the dramatic (but rather pathetic) Chartist Movement. Even more important, the working people began to see, especially after the failure of Chartism, that their best hope for ameliorating their social condition was by political action. And so began the alliance between the workers and the Liberal Party in the second half of the nineteenth century.

A similar transformation happened in the rural areas. Chartism had its parallel there in the Rebecca Riots, very serious and effective expressions of the countryman's frustration, despite the somewhat theatrical atmosphere of Rebecca's midnight attacks on toll-gates, the burning of toll-booths, and the disappearance of the attackers, disguised in female clothing, into the night. Here again, exasperation gave way to the conviction that patient political agitation was the most effective weapon for redressing wrongs.

Education

No nation, however, could redress its wrongs, it was felt, without adequate education. The syllabuses of the Sunday Schools were too restricted. Before any positive steps could be taken to provide better education, it was necessary to discover what things were like in the existing schools. The Government's attempt to collect the facts in the Royal Commission's 1847 Report, released a tornado of suppressed national feeling. The three Commissioners were able, well-intentioned young Englishmen, whose main qualification to undertake the enquiry was their total ignorance of Wales and their inability to speak Welsh. Much of what their Report has to say throws a valuable light on the condition of Welsh education at the time. It throws even more fascinating light on the condition of English administrative thought at the time. In impeccable Whitehall prose, the Commissioners dilated upon the immorality of Welshwomen (and, by implication, of Welshmen), upon their astounding ignorance and their improbable stupidity. And derived these qualities from the Welsh language and Welsh Nonconformity. The Report immediately brought Welshmen to realise that

there was a clamant need for a better system of education. But it did more than that. It roused their national feelings but in a confused and somewhat sentimental way. Instead of compelling them to insist that their historic language be given its legitimate place in the public life of the nation and particularly in its schools, it provoked them into showing that they could master the intricacies of English as effectively as any Englishman. The consequence was that the new system of education that was finally evolved was an entirely English one.

Even so, the various streams of social discontent, industrial unrest, religious nonconformity and educational ambition were eventually channelled into the Liberal Party which won its first great campaign during the election of 1868 and within a generation became the political instrument supported by the vast majority of the Welsh people.

Growth of Nationalism

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century the Liberal Party's programme began to include policies that reflected the growth of nationalism in Wales. This nationalism had emerged under the influence of Continental movements such as those in Hungary and in Italy. But it fanned into flame the much older nationalism of Wales itself. It had a strong cultural element and this found expression in the demand for a national university, and in a magnificent literary revival pioneered by the scholarly and creative work of men like Sir John Morris-Jones, the grammarian, and Sir John Edward Lloyd, the historian, and others. Later still, other national institutions such as a National Library and a National Museum were created.

Meanwhile, this cultural nationalism was fused with political nationalism in the thought of men like Michael Daniel Jones, Thomas Gee and Emrys ap Iwan. Between them, they brought to Welsh political thinking a new breadth of vision and a new realism. *They argued that the nation should have its own organs of government if it was to preserve its nationhood.* These themes were taken up by some of the new Liberal leaders such as David Lloyd George and Thomas Edward Ellis. But not with any profound seriousness. They preferred to fight for lesser objectives that were dear to the Welsh mind at the time, and above all the disestablishing of the Church of England in Wales — an objective that was finally reached in 1914. As Liberal politicians became absorbed ever more deeply in the machinations of their English political colleagues, the talk about self-government for Wales became increasingly romantic and unreal.

And while the Liberals were enjoying the fruits of

power another political party emerged. This was the Labour Party. During its early years it, too, was attracted by the need to give Wales a generous measure of political devolution and this conviction never had a more eloquent exponent than the pioneer socialist agitator Keir Hardie. And his socialistic exposition of nationalism was endorsed by many of his Welsh followers. Gradually the Labour Party increased its influence in Wales and from 1923 it was the majority party.

In a way reminiscent of the history of the Liberal Party a generation previously, the Labour Party's zeal for Welsh self-government seemed to decline in direct proportion to the support it gained in Wales. Its inability to see the national predicament of the nation seemed to increase precisely as crises developed into tragedy.

For during the twentieth century this small nation has been subjected to intolerable strains. It had the incubus of an educational system that only gradually and most reluctantly allowed any place to the national language and the national history. It had to suffer economic disaster on a vast scale in the period between the two wars. In those years, unemployment laid waste the industrial life of the country and something like one-fifth of the population had to leave Wales in search of work. And there was nothing the Welsh people could do to shield themselves from the worst effects of the storm. *It was a vivid and frightening proof of the helplessness of a nation without a government of its own.*

WALES TODAY

Why should anyone feel anxious about the future of this small nation? Are there firm grounds for anxiety? Are the Welsh people themselves eager to see a radical change in the political and social organisation of their nation? The answers lie in a study of the Wales that exists in 1965.

The first relevant truth is that the Welsh nation exists. It is conscious of itself as a nation. And its sense of nationhood is expressed in many ways, in its literature and in its art, in its competitive gatherings (its *eisteddfodau*) and its international rugby matches. Moreover, its nationhood is recognised by those who are not Welsh people. This has been revealed clearly by the appointment recently of a Secretary of State for Wales by the new Labour Government, by the locating of the Welsh Office at Cardiff and by the plans to treat Wales as an entity for the purposes of economic planning in the future. The only reason why Wales should be treated in this way is because its nationhood is recognised as a factor that must be respected in political and economic life.

Then again Welshmen have desired some measure of political devolution that will allow them to organise their national life in its manifold aspects in a way pleasing to them. This demand is most clearly proclaimed by Plaid Cymru [The Welsh Party, or (more correctly) Wales' Party]. It was formed in 1925 with the aim of securing for Wales the status of a self-governing country within the British Commonwealth. In spite of disappointments at the polls in successive elections its influence has been far greater than the votes cast for it would suggest. It has secured the allegiance of some of the ablest men and women in Wales during the last forty years and the intellectual calibre of its leaders and candidates has been outstanding. Its criticism of the older and larger parties has been apposite and able and they have not been unaware of the intellectual and moral weight behind those criticisms. It has drawn attention time and again to issues that the other parties would have been glad to gloss over. And the result is that the cause of Welsh self-government, and the problems of the Welsh nation, have received far more serious attention, thanks to the intervention of this party, than they would ever have had in its absence. It is no exaggeration to say the "problem of Wales" would have been quietly and finally shelved were it not for the tenaciousness and liveliness of Plaid Cymru.

Economic and Cultural Decay

And a glance at the nation's conditions reveals the need for such agitation. Precisely because it has no government with a vested interest in its development and prosperity, the tendency has been throughout the years for Welsh life to suffer by default. Emigration on a substantial scale has continued ever since the tragic years of depression. One of the best indications of successful government is increase in population. In Wales, it has been far otherwise. Whereas the population of England has increased by 26.9% since 1921, that of Switzerland by 39.9%, that of Denmark by 69.1% and that of the Netherlands by 69.1%, the population of Wales has remained stationary. And the sad story continues. In the period between 1957 and 1962 nine Welsh counties (out of thirteen) suffered a diminution in population. In England during the same period, only two of its 48 administrative counties suffered any decrease. The result, quite apart from the human unhappiness that cannot be calculated, is that many areas in Wales, especially in the central part of the country, are becoming empty and derelict. Elsewhere and on a vast scale, social life is disintegrating, together with its attend-

ant culture. Those forms of social expression represented by choirs, bands, voluntary literary societies, churches and competitive meetings are unable to carry on because the population is insufficient to support them.

Behind this decline hides the spectre of economic maladministration. The attempts of the government in London to face the challenges of this crisis have been perfunctory and half-hearted. They would not let the Welsh people work out their own social salvation nor would they do it themselves. Protests against official dilatoriness were met by planting a factory here and there. Some of them were indeed major contributions to the economy, particularly such installations as the Abbey Steel works of the Steel Company of Wales. But even these substantial contributions were not part of a carefully constructed plan. The result was that the economic unbalance of Welsh life continued, in many ways it has been made even more pronounced. And there has been no realistic attempt to come to grips with the crisis in Welsh rural life. In spite of such palliatives as the 1947 Agriculture Act, which did much to raise the standard of living of the small Welsh farmer, it provided no developing future for the Welsh countryside. *In short, the fatal flaw in all these activities is the refusal of the various London governments to see the problems of Wales as a nation's problems.* They have continually been considered as provincial English problems, which assume a purely incidental character when viewed in the bright sunshine of English economic expansion. When reduced to digits in the overall statistics of the United Kingdom, Wales ceases to have any significance.

The helplessness of a Wales that is considered as but a poorer province within a larger and more flourishing whole, can be vividly illustrated by reference to two topics: its lack of control over its own resources and its inability to secure for itself the kind of transport system that would enable it to convey its resources easily and rapidly from one point to another.

Resources

First of all, its resources. Wales is far from being a poor country. It produces twice the milk it needs and three quarters of the meat. It produces 98% of British tin, 89% of its tinsplate, 40% of its aluminium and 29% of its raw steel — and yet only 5% of the population of the United Kingdom lives in Wales. It exports vast quantities of electricity (759,000,000 kilowatts in 1961) and of water, gas and coal. *And yet Wales is unable to deploy this great wealth in a way which can*

be of benefit to its national life. The wealth is manipulated by the government of the United Kingdom and by the complicated network of powers and agencies which together form the industrial and business empire of England. At no point can Wales decide to vary the pattern of distribution, or change the destination of its products or substitute new customers for old. Indeed, there is no body in Wales which has the power of acting on behalf of the nation. It is a country without a government. Considerations of business, or of convenience, or of finance, or of party politics can certainly modify the pattern at sundry points. Considerations of Welsh national well-being cannot.

Purloining of Welsh Water Resources

This inability to decide was starkly revealed in the Tryweryn episode. The Tryweryn Valley is in Merionethshire. The City of Liverpool in its search for a new source of water supply decided to impound the waters of the River Tryweryn and convey the water via the River Dee to Liverpool. This proposal involved drowning a valley and submerging the hamlet of Capel Celyn. Liverpool had prepared the way by a clever piece of bluff. They announced in the summer of 1955 that they were considering submerging Dolanog, the home of the greatest of our women hymnwriters. Immediately, patriots posted their furious protests to Liverpool. Liverpool graciously withdrew. Wales was overjoyed and grateful. Psychologically, the way was open for Liverpool to take what it wanted. It was a year and a half later that the truth emerged. Liverpool had never intended to drown Dolanog. In spite of this preliminary ruse, there was immediate opposition to the Tryweryn plan published in December 1955. The plan was published without previous warning to the inhabitants, without previous consultation with the local or county authorities. It was a choice example of the confident discourtesy of a big city that cared less than two hoots for human or national considerations. The inhabitants formed their Defence Committee and besought the permission of Liverpool City Council to send a deputation to discuss the matter. The City Council refused. It refused twice. Only when the whole population of Tryweryn paraded the streets of Liverpool on 21 November, 1956, did the people of Liverpool generally realise the extent and the seriousness of the opposition. Soon there was no doubt whatsoever that the vast majority of the people of Wales were prepared to stand by the people of Tryweryn in their fight for their homes. The majority of the local authorities (125 of them), almost all the churches, trade unions, cultural and

industrial bodies, all joined in the protest. Liverpool tried a little subterfuge once again. It was claimed that Tryweryn water was needed for human consumption — over a million people were in need of drinking water. But it was soon shown by reference to the minutes of Liverpool's own Water Committee that she was already receiving from her other Welsh reservoir at Lake Vyrnwy more than twice the amount of water necessary for drinking. It was clear that the water was needed not for human consumption but for industrial expansion. So serious and so effective was the opposition that the City Council after listening to Plaid Cymru's President, Mr. Gwynfor Evans, outlining the case against the plan, could only muster 90 votes out of a possible 160 in support of it. And when a public City Meeting was held to endorse the plan, it was discovered three quarters of an hour before its commencement that opponents of the Tryweryn Plan outnumbered the supporters. The day was saved by marching a sufficient number of the City's employees from their offices to the chamber.

What about the Welsh Members of Parliament? The part they played is instructive to the student of democratic politics. The first obvious fact is that they were not in the vanguard of the attack upon Liverpool. The majority of them were not vitally interested in the matter. The two Liberal M.P.'s opposed the measure when it came before Parliament and one of them spoke. That was the limit of their vivacity. One Conservative M.P. was thoroughly consistent and strong in his opposition, two of his colleagues voted for the measure. The Labor Party, which held more than three-quarters of the Welsh seats, was peculiarly supine. Merionethshire's own M.P. was prepared to accept whatever guidance the County Council might choose to give him.

It was only after the most insistent pressure from interested bodies that these representatives of the Welsh people decided to act as representatives of the powerful Welsh opinion that objected to the whole Tryweryn project.

And never was such a significant Welsh battle fought by so inept an army. Some of the most distinguished names amongst Welsh M.P.'s were silent or absent; others were hopelessly inefficient in their conduct of the parliamentary campaign; the remainder were as stubble before the wind. The Bill passed. Tryweryn was submerged.

This episode provides an alarming example of how the will of the majority within a subjugated nation can be overruled by the mere exercise of democratic processes. By the mere fact that it is a small nation, long subdued to foreign government, Wales can produce large numbers of public servants who revel in delivering their country and its wealth into the hands of the exploiter. This is not

surprising. It is an example of the psychological effect produced by subjection to foreign rule. The M.P.'s — some of them very able and well-known men — were servile and shy when it became a matter of representing their nation. Even more surprising, they were servile and shy when it was a matter of representing what was the majority view of the Welsh people. Tryweryn showed with admirable clarity that *even the full use of all the available democratic processes was insufficient to give forceful expression to the majority view of Welshmen at that time.*

And the question, after all, was concerned with the deployment of an important natural resource. The water was to go free to Liverpool. The city would merely make a token payment in the form of compensation to the people whose wealth it was purloining — and purloining with the blessing of a democratic parliament where those people were represented by 36 half-hearted M.P.s in a House of 630 members.

Transport in Wales

A similar tale can be told in relation to our transport system. One of the essentials of effective economic planning is a good and modern transport system. For a generation, Wales has been offered a main road to connect the northern part of the country with the southern part, but nothing has come of the suggestion. The road and rail systems have been designed to bring Wales closer to London. They flow West to East. It was never their purpose to bind Wales in a closer unity.

Central government has been niggardly in its grants to the Welsh road system. Wales possesses one-sixth of the road-mileage which England has. Yet it receives no more than one-twelfth of the grants. That is, for ordinary trunk roads. What about the new motorways? Belgium has over 1,000 miles of them. Wales has not a single mile nor are there any provisions for it to have any.

Since Wales suffers from the lack of good modern roads, the railways are all the more important. Here again, *the inability of a nation without a government to secure justice is obvious to all.* It has been shown by reference to figures which British Railways has not disputed that the railways in Wales, taken as a whole, are making a profit. And no mean profit at that. But Wales is not considered as any kind of entity in railway administration. Consequently, its railways are considered piecemeal. The result is that railway lines are being closed and dismantled quite ruthlessly in all parts of Wales, with the result that when the process is completed the country will have two main lines only, one running along the

northern seaboard and the other along its southern counterpart. *Yet the profit known to have been made annually on Welsh railways is of such an order as to make possible a thorough modernisation of the whole system on a scale that would make it yet more profitable to run.*

The consequences of having an inefficient road system and no railways and no air service within the country are serious. In spite of optimistic talk of economic planning, the difficulties are multiplying rather than diminishing as government succeeds government.

The Cultural Realm

And a parallel story can be told in the cultural realm. Wales has its educational system. That system now has sufficient autonomy to decide to some extent its own policies and its own future. But control of the purse-strings by the government in London and its refusal to recognise the full implications for Welsh education of the existence of the Welsh language are an effective deterrent to the growth of a system of education properly adapted to the needs of Wales. But in other spheres, there is much less freedom of action for Welsh people. Government support for cultural institutions in Wales is ludicrously small when compared with the lavish support given to similar institutions in England.

Of all the modern media of communication none are more powerful in their effects than radio and television. And yet in this vitally important field the leading strings are jealously kept in London hands. It was so from the beginning. Broadcasting was made into a State Monopoly and vested in the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC). This made it also an English monopoly. No provision was made for Welsh broadcasting; still less for any Welsh control over the medium. Only after prolonged agitation and patient rebutting of silly statements put out by the BBC to explain the insurmountable "technical" difficulties that made Welsh broadcasting impossible, was a Welsh region created. But only a region. It was still very much under the London thumb. Welshmen might run their own churches or their own university or their own National Library but certainly not their own broadcasting service.

When the television service was begun, it was necessary to go through the same charade again. Welsh-language programmes were obviously an intrusion, if not an impertinence. And whereas the control of all television transmitting in Wales should be in the hands of Welshmen or their nominees, it was felt necessary to arrange the whole system in such a way as to make this difficult. In

spite of a very powerful body of opinion in favour of creating a Welsh Broadcasting Corporation, the suggestion has found no favour in London. *The nation without a government cannot defend itself against indoctrination.*

The Ban on Party Political Broadcasting

Not even when it gives massive support to a democratic political party, if the main strength of that party is in another country. The Labour Party, for which the vast majority of Welshmen vote, has (in concert with the Conservative and Liberal Parties) been responsible for promoting a ban on party political broadcasting by any but the 'big' parties. The ban was first imposed in 1955. The General Elections of 1959 and 1964 were almost entirely fought on television, yet minority parties were excluded. In Wales both the Communist Party and the Welsh Party participated in the election but were not allowed broadcasting time. This flagrant abuse of power has had as a consequence the muzzling of discussion on specifically Welsh topics. Any party which takes Wales seriously enough to confine its political activities to the country is not allowed to share political broadcasting time. And to make the matter still more ludicrous, the 'ban' has now been lifted to the extent of allowing five minutes per annum of broadcasting time to Plaid Cymru. This astonishing figure was attained by allotting time in proportion to the number of votes received at the last election. The farcical nature of this concession becomes even clearer when we compare it with the treatment meted out to the Liberals in Wales. At the recent election Plaid Cymru received 5% of the votes cast, the Liberals 7%; *yet the Liberal Party has been allotted four times as much party political broadcasting time as Plaid Cymru.* Furthermore, they are allowed to broadcast on all channels, Plaid Cymru on BBC Wales only. The effect of this will be apparent when we realise that large numbers of television sets in Wales are still not converted to enable them to receive BBC Wales. This limitation, therefore, will exclude Plaid Cymru from reaching an appreciable percentage of Welsh viewers. And so from ridiculous joke to another a nation is stripped of its dignity and its most elementary rights and democracy of its reality.

FIGHT FOR A TONGUE

No nation possesses anything of more value than its language. A language is the product of many centuries of history. It is one of those unique human achievements which, once it disappears, cannot be revived.

The Welsh language is of interest in world culture not only for its own sake but as a member of a small linguistic family of languages. If it ceases to be spoken, something irretrievable will be lost. One would have thought that any government which bore responsibility for Wales would be most anxious to use its good offices in every possible way to secure the well-being of this unique tongue. But it is not so. This is partly due to the psychological accident that the vast majority of Englishmen are utterly philistine in their attitude to any tongue but their own. Not to speak English is, for them, to be a barbarian. It is unfortunate that this parochial attitude is adopted by some *déraciné* Welshmen when they lose their mother tongue. Another reason is that for centuries England has pursued the political policy of seeking to destroy Welsh. Ever since the Act of Union, the Welsh language has been considered a political matter. To use it and to speak it carry undertones of treason. And so England has deliberately used every political weapon under its control to uproot Welsh. It was banished from its law-courts and civil service, from its government publications and its Houses of Parliament. Only recently has there been the slightest possible modification of this aspect of Renaissance power-politics. But the outcome is that the London Government spends more on preserving castles than on promoting the Welsh language.

No political party, up to the formation of Plaid Cymru in 1925, had even sought to give the language its rightful place in the public life of the country. Notwithstanding, a national petition was promoted in 1939 which had as its aim to give the language parity with English in the law-courts. The petition was signed by 500,000 people, both Welsh and non-Welsh speakers, and revealed a widespread desire for justice to be done in this matter. The result, however, was disappointing. Its net result was to give Welsh parity with foreign languages such as Chinese or Arabic in the law-courts of Wales. But there has been a slight improvement in recent years. The Welsh Department of the Ministry of Education has been solicitous for the language in the schools and has been responsible for some notable developments, though its position in our system of education is still very precarious and unsatisfactory. But the language is still in a very inferior position. One can spend many hours in a Welsh-speaking town without seeing any evidence apart from people's conversation that the language exists. Public notices and signs on the streets do not use it; the police, local government bodies, shops, cinemas and offices make virtually no use of it. Much of the blame for this must rest at the door of the Welsh people themselves. Much of

the blame for fostering this state of mind amongst Welsh people must be attributed to the London Government's adamant refusal to accord the language its rightful dignity in the country where it is spoken.

Cultural Institutions

Even so, the Welsh people themselves have made valiant efforts to preserve their language. The churches have always used it in their public services and in their literature. Cultural movements such as the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion have nurtured and patronised it with great fidelity for many years. Amongst the best-known of the voluntary cultural agencies is the *eisteddfod*. This institution consists of a series of competitions in the various arts. A printed programme is published giving details of the competitions and the prizes beforehand and naming the adjudicators who will decide on the winning entrants in each competition. The National Eisteddfod is held annually and moves its provenance from year to year. It is a remarkable social institution. Thousands of Welsh people from home and overseas look forward avidly to it. And a whole week is spent listening to choirs and elocutionists; in contemplating the paintings and carvings and photographs of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition; in debating Literary and Cultural issues; in listening to detailed adjudications of poems, novels, plays, short stories and musical compositions. The evenings are devoted to the watching of plays or listening to concerts where the finest orchestras and soloists of Europe perform. Anything up to 100,000 people will visit the 'National' in the course of the week. But the Royal National Eisteddfod is not the only one of its kind. The country is littered with smaller versions of the same thing — there are county eisteddfodau, town eisteddfodau, church eisteddfodau, shop eisteddfodau, youth eisteddfodau and workers' eisteddfodau. These institutions reveal better than perhaps anything else how creative and lively Welsh culture is.

Then there are the small folk gatherings called the "Noson Lawen" — the Social Evening. This is a community concert. The conductor of the evening who acts as compere is a central figure upon whom much of the success of the evening depends. He calls on various members of the audience to contribute to the evening's entertainment, either by singing or playing a musical instrument or reciting a piece of poetry or recounting some humorous yarn.

Not less popular is the Gymanfa Ganu — the Singing Festival. This is a highly organised form of community

singing which originated in the last century in the non-conformist chapels. Normally, the festival is preceded by a long period of rehearsing from a published programme of hymns to be sung. Then on the great day a guest conductor appears to put the singers through their paces.

Of the organised movements to foster enthusiasm for the language and the culture of Wales, none has made a more remarkable contribution than the Welsh League of Youth (*Urdd Gobaith Cymru*). It was founded in 1922 by Sir Ifan ab Owen Edwards whose father, Sir O. M. Edwards had been a pioneer in the field of making Welsh history attractive to children of all ages. The *Urdd* has obvious affinities with the Boy Scout and similar movements in that it is concerned mainly with character-building. It is a youth movement organised in branches scattered all over Wales. One of its great contributions is its annual national *eisteddfod* which is remarkable for the very high standard of its winning performers. The reason for this is that every performer has to graduate from a local to a county *eisteddfod* and thence to the national. So that the final entrants are the cream of Welsh youth. In addition, the movement organises annual camps for the juniors in Cardiganshire and for the seniors on the banks of Bala Lake. And in its outdoor activities it follows the pattern of youth movements everywhere.

Finally, the liveliness of the language is shown in its printed literature. Books are published on a generous scale and they are now assisted by a modest government grant. There is no daily paper published in Welsh but there are several weeklies, some published by the various churches, other by printing houses. There are several monthly papers and magazines, both secular and religious, and two or three quarterlies.

All that Welsh speakers ask is that the language be given fair play. They ask no favour. If it be given the conditions which any language has a right to expect in its own land, there is no reason whatsoever why it should not become more creative than it has ever been in the past and why Welshmen ignorant of their own language should become a thing of the past. One indication of the way in which the language releases spiritual energy once it is given its rightful dignity is the success of the so-called "Welsh Schools". These are schools in anglicised areas where Welsh is used as the medium of instruction. The first of them was opened at Aberystwyth in 1942 and since then several dozen of them have been opened in various parts of the country. And in all of them there is a happy, vivacious atmosphere which suggests that to accord the language its proper function is at the same time to fulfil profound human needs.

The Land of Wales

Wales is a country as well as a nation. It has occupied a tract of land in Western Europe for more generations than one cares to count. And land is as necessary to man as the air he breathes. He cannot last many seconds without either of them. Moreover, the land where a nation lives becomes subtly entwined in its cultural and spiritual life. A farm is not always a farm, it is sometimes the home of some poet whose lines have long outlived the lips that first sang them. A field is not just a collection of square yards, it may well be the spot where a prince fell in battle. A town is not just a huddle of stones piled on one another, it may well be the place where a social agitator burning with righteousness was clapped in prison for shaking the foundations. Land is never land for a nation; it is always home. It follows that no nation can willingly let its land be filched from it.

Again and again the land of Wales has been threatened by people who cared nothing for it. One tragic example has already been mentioned — Tryweryn. But there have been others. One frequent offender has been the War Office. During 1939 to 1940, it was decided to convert the Epynt area in Breconshire into a military zone. This involved displacing a whole community of people, Welsh-speaking. And it was done despite protests. In Pembrokeshire, the opposition was more successful, as it was in Rhandir-mwyn in Carmarthenshire against the State Forestry Commission, another frequent offender. A proposal to extend the area already occupied by the military forces in Trawsfynydd in Merionethshire was met with passive resistance. For a whole day on two occasions protesters in the name of the Welsh people sat on all the roads leading to the camp and blocked them. That protest too was successful. But the most spectacular defence of Welsh land happened in 1936. The offender this time was not the War Office but the Royal Air Force. It decided to set up a bombing school in the Llyn Peninsula with its headquarters at Pen-y-berth, just outside Pwllheli. National opposition was universal and intense. Never before had Wales been so unanimous in its opposition to encroachment upon Welsh land. When all democratic means of protest had been exploited and had failed, three nationalist leaders, Mr. Saunders Lewis, Mr. D. J. Williams and the Rev. L. E. Valentine, resolved to set fire to the new camp buildings. After they had done this, they gave themselves up to the police. They were first tried at the Assizes at Caernarfon and there the jury failed to agree. It was a thrilling moment in modern Welsh history. And then came the unexpected insult. A jury of Welshmen

could not be trusted to try three patriotic Welshmen. The case was transferred to the Old Bailey in London to be tried by "unprejudiced" Englishmen. The three, of course, were found guilty and given the savage sentence of nine months' imprisonment.

CONCLUSION

Wales is a small nation and it has fought long and hard to preserve its identity. It has had to fight not only against the supercilious carelessness, the downright callousness and the deliberately hostile acts of a foreign government, but also against those tragic complexes of character which prolonged subjugation creates in people's personalities. It has had to fight with very slim resources against one of the greatest political and military powers that modern Europe has known. *And England still preserves many of its imperial attributes when dealing with Wales.* It is not over-much concerned about the truth. English political parties rely quite as much on false propaganda and half-truths in arguing against Welsh self-government as they do upon reliable facts.

But for Wales the time for decision is fast running out. The national spirit, hampered as it has been at every turn, has yet much to be proud of. It has forced concessions again and again from the Government: since 1945, a Council for Wales, a Welsh Day in Parliament, a Minister for Welsh Affairs, a Welsh Grand Committee, a Secretary for Wales with attendant ministers, a planning authority for Wales. They may not add up to all that national dignity demands and deserves, they add up to very little in terms of a nation's needs if it is to remain alive. But they are very clear indications that there is energy yet in our national life. After all, a dead nation would need none of these things.

The attainment of national freedom is an ideal which is sweeping over our world with increasing force. Not a year passes but we hear of new nations emerging and taking upon themselves the responsibilities of full nationhood. Some of them are much smaller than Wales in population; others occupy much smaller countries; many of them are far poorer in resources than Wales is: not a few of them have to struggle valiantly with the tremendous problems of illiteracy and lack of educational facilities, things that are unknown in Wales.

If Wales is to survive and develop and flourish, it too must have the opportunity to bear responsibility as a nation amongst the nations of the world. Responsibility is a right that the very fact of nationhood confers upon a

community. Without it the nation will ultimately perish. This is a fate that few Welshmen are prepared to accept for Wales. The nation must *live*. In the modern world in order to live a nation must be *free*.

Scotland's Case

INTRODUCTION

THE importance and value of nationality can only be dismissed with the gravest consequences for the nation and often with far-reaching and disastrous results for other nations also. The right of nations to govern themselves is one of the accepted human rights and the national community has proved time and again to be a defence of the liberty of the individual as well as the community. To deny the right of self-government to Scotland implies a denial of the whole principal of the right of nations to run their own affairs. This is not an assertion of the principle of absolute sovereignty as against any future developments of a federal type in Europe or elsewhere, but the nation must be a free participator in such arrangements.

Scotland has been a nation, in the modern sense of the term, for the past thousand years. She has developed over that time, and from roots stretching into the further past, her own institutions, legal, educational, religious and of course social, in her own way, but with open doors to influences from other societies in Europe and elsewhere.

Recently, since the first world war, Scotland has become more of a backwater than during most periods of her existence; contributing less to others and, at the same time, developing less on her own. This has coincided with the great extension of political and economic power in the hands of the English Government during those years.

In spite of the existence of an incorporating political union since 1707 the national institutions were strong enough to withstand the worst of the attempted subversions of Scottish society until recently. Initiative remained possible in most matters. The increasing canalisation of all activities through government agencies has shown up the terrible consequences which can result when the government is not one responsible to the national community which it governs.

Scotland did not develop as a Dynastic State but as a Popular State. The maintenance of her independence depended on the people and their free assertion of it, and not on the nobility — indeed very often in spite of the efforts of the nobility . . . That is why Scotland is often called the "First Nation in Europe".

After the end of the terrible and devastating war of independence the King who had led the people in the last battles said "Had not the old Scots love of liberty inspired

me, I could not have tholed those evils for all the world's empire." A few years later, in 1320, the Parliament of Scotland in a message to Pope John enunciated, among many other matters of importance and significance even to this day, the sovereignty of the people of Scotland in the following immortal words "should he (King Robert) forsake the cause he has so nobly upheld and consent to yield our Kingdom . . . we shall cast him forth as our enemy and as the subverter of his own and our rights and we will make another King, who will defend our Liberties, for so long as one hundred of us remain alive we shall not submit to the domination of the English. For it is not for glory, nor for riches, nor for honour that we fight but for liberty alone which no good man giveth up save with his life."

The Early Nation

While there is some evidence that the earliest settlement of Scotland was made not through what is now England but by direct landings from the sea, and that even in those days there were differences in the racial make-up of North and South Britain, the Roman invasion caused a historical cleavage. South Britain, or what is now England, was conquered and occupied by the Romans for four centuries; Alba, the Roman Caledonia, maintained an invincible resistance which gave to the country a national tradition and unity, out of which came historic Scotland.

South of the wall which marked the limit of the Roman Empire, the Celtic people were Latinised and partly mongrelised by large Roman colonies of many races. North of the wall the Celtic stock, culture and law were successfully maintained and strengthened by the addition of Scots from Ireland and those elements from Roman Britain which refused to accept the imperial yoke.

The collapse of the Roman Empire brought the Angles, Saxons and other Low German tribes into South Britain, which they largely conquered and in part re-peopled. In the territory now Scotland, these invaders secured a foothold only on the eastern fringe of the depopulated No Man's Land just north of the Roman Wall. Their efforts to extend their sway over Alba collapsed in 585 with a catastrophic defeat at Dunnichen in Angus, and from that date the Angles were on the defensive, and recoiling.

Subsequently England (particularly the northern parts) was conquered and in part re-peopled by the Danes who on the other hand met with no tangible success in Scotland. At Carham in 1018 the last hold of the Anglo-Danes on the Scottish south-east plain was shattered and the territorial boundaries of Scotland in the south were established at approximately their present limits.

The Norman Conquest of England in 1066 brought new overlords and new racial elements into England but all attempts to extend it to Scotland failed. These efforts reached their greatest intensity under the Plantagenets and for three centuries Scotland was the victim of constant English aggression. The names of Wallace and Bruce and the victories of Stirling, Bannockburn and Ancrum Moor are the highlights of this glorious and successful defence of Freedom against an unscrupulous and barbarous Imperialism.

Thus both the racial stocks and the histories of Scotland and England are markedly differentiated and have produced two separate nations whose internal organisation, outlook, aspirations and culture are so divergent as to be antipathetic.

The Union with England

In 1603 the Scottish King fell heir to the English Throne and brought the two countries into a regnal union which, however, went no further in law than a king in common. In fact, the Royal Family became completely Anglicised and attempted to use the Royal Prerogative and influence to shape Scottish policies to conform with England's interests. The result was a century of strife, including the Wars of the Covenant in defence of the Scottish Constitution and the deposition of James VII and II for "having invaded the fundamentall Constitution of the Kingdom and altered it from a legall limited monarchy to one arbitrary despotic power". The regnal union was continued, however, by the choice of William and Mary as joint monarchs of both countries. The constitutional strife persisted and the regnal union was in serious danger of being abrogated when in the early 18th century the Crown and its English advisers decided to manoeuvre an incorporating union of the two countries with one Parliament. This was achieved in 1707 by a mixture of corruption, blackmail and violation of the Scottish Constitution which recalls Hitler's Anschluss of Austria and which was clearly against the will of the Scottish people as admitted by all historians.

Home Rule Movements

During the two centuries of incorporation in England the Scottish people have never lost their belief in the necessity for self-government. This has been evidenced in many ways, even to the inclusion of Scottish Home Rule in the programmes of the Liberal and Labour Parties when campaigning in Scotland.

Since 1889 various Home Rule Bills have been presented to the House of Commons. On all occasions, except the first in 1889, the result of the voting showed a majority of Scottish representatives in favour of the Bills. All plebiscites of whatever kind have shown a definite majority of the Scottish people in favour of some form of self-government.

It was a realisation that Scottish self-government could not be won through the English parties which brought into existence in 1928 an independent Scottish party, now the Scottish National Party.

SEPARATE INSTITUTIONS

Education

There is but little resemblance between the educational systems of the two nations. Fundamentally, Scotland's system is a development of that instituted in the 16th century. It is a classless system, fundamentally democratic, and, until modern times, highly efficient, emphasising how to think and not what to think. The legislation passed by the Westminster Parliament has, in fact, tended to harm rather than help it and to narrow the gap between Scottish and English results by holding back Scotland.

Scotland had a national system of schooling long before compulsory education was introduced into both countries in 1870 and 1872. At that time Scotland had 5/6ths of her children regularly attending school. Her enrolment in post-primary schools was 1 per 140 of the population compared with England's 1 per 1,300. Her Universities had one student per 1,000 of the population compared with England's 1 in 5,800. These comparisons are no longer as favourable but we still have in Scotland a different attitude to education and a very different educational machine.

Church

The Church of Scotland is Presbyterian and the State Church in England Episcopalian. In Scotland the church is fundamentally a democratic organisation, with the individual minister and congregation governing it. In England the State Church is aristocratic in its organisation and the individual cleric, and still less the layman, has very little say in its government or the selection of its leaders. The monarch, an Episcopalian in England, becomes a Presbyterian when he or she enters Scotland!

Legal System

The legal system in Scotland is quite distinct from that of England and is quite distinctive. It developed separ-

ately and continued to do so after both the regnal union of 1603 and the parliamentary union of 1707. It is based on different principles and in the view of many international jurists it is better and fairer than the English system. To keep it up to date without a legislative assembly in the country has recently been a great struggle and it is only after a lot of pressure and agitation by the legal profession and others that time is reluctantly and often very belatedly given in the U.K. Parliament for the necessary legislation.

Economics, Culture, etc.

The ownership and major control of Scottish industry is now (as a result of recent mergers and other financial manipulation) in the hands of great interests centred in England and many of the Scottish trades unions have lost their identity and freedom of action by merging with English unions. Yet Scottish workers are in many industries still in independent Scottish trades unions and there is a Scottish Trades Union Congress. Professional societies have in many cases maintained their separate Scottish organisations. In cultural matters the cleavage is even greater, for the two countries have a very different background and outlook. Even in sport the two countries are generally organised on a separate national basis.

Administrative

Scotland is now recognised to a large extent as a separate administrative unit. The Secretary of State for Scotland is in large measure the Scottish Executive (but without legislative powers) and the functions of many departments represented for England by Ministries are in Scotland separately exercised by Departments under the Scottish Office.

The Machinery but not the Power

It is obvious, therefore, that Scotland has all the machinery of a separate State but not the power. She has already all the essentials to function as a separate State but not the legislature or control over policies and finance. These she has been demanding for many years and she is now approaching the stage where she will no longer accept frustration.

EVILS OF THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENT

Legislation

The Westminster Parliament is the legislature not only

of the four nations of the United Kingdom but also of the remains of the British Empire.

In these circumstances it is not surprising that Scotland's needs are grossly neglected and inefficiently handled. The time allotted to Scottish affairs in any session is only a few hours, and the natural result is that Scottish legislation is many years in arrears and too often is passed without due consideration and with many defects. On December 13, 1938, Mr. Tom Johnston summed up the situation in speaking of land drainage: "It has taken me from 1922 to 1938 to get something done upon which everyone . . . is agreed and which will bring thousands of acres into cultivation!" On a later occasion (March 30, 1939), Mr. Johnston said: "The Secretary for State for Scotland has a whole tin trunk full of Bills all drafted and ready, awaiting a chance of promoting. I understand there are about 50 of these hapless documents. Only two or three of them every year have a chance of seeing the Statute Book".

Financial & Economic

Until comparatively recently, the Scottish financial system was largely independent. Subjection to English institutions began with the attempt to withdraw the rights of Scottish banks to issue their own banknotes, an attempt which was nominally repulsed by Scottish public opinion but which in fact succeeded since the Scottish fiduciary issue was eventually frozen at a low figure and new money can be issued now only with the backing of Bank of England notes.

A very high proportion of the money raised in Scotland by government taxation is spent outside the country, mostly in England where it boosts the English economy and increases jobs which are not needed while the unemployment figure in Scotland remains consistently higher than in England. At the present time this amounts to at least £150 million per annum, or about a quarter of Scotland's annual revenue.

In the ten years between 1952 and 1963 the number of male jobs in Scotland actually decreased by 39,000 while the number rose in England by 868,000.

Scotland has a relatively high export trade and does not have a balance of payments deficit on her own account. In fact one third of the total U.K. dollar exports are from Scotland. Nevertheless Scotland has to suffer from the deflationary measures adopted from time to time to suit conditions in England. This is the worst possible thing from the point of view of Scotland's economy which has not been inflationary at all the last fifty years.

The economic policies imposed on Scotland during the whole period since government commenced to control and direct economic affairs have been based on the requirements of England and not on Scottish conditions even where the correct policies to meet Scottish conditions would also have resulted in benefit to England.

Before the intervention of government in economic affairs, in recent years, Scotland's industrial, financial, and trading concerns and activities were independent. In this state they were able to face the world on an equal footing and were noted for their initiative and stability. The development of Scottish industry during this period provided what is still the basis of Scotland's economy. Since the period of government intervention the newer industries of various types which have developed in England and many other countries, have not been able to maintain themselves in Scotland. This is not a criticism of the principle of government intervention as such, but is a statement of the fact that such intervention has, in general, not been favourable to Scotland.

It is now generally accepted that where there exists government guidance in economic affairs the nation's economy and livelihood will be protected by government action. The United Kingdom Government has failed in this function in relation to Scotland in a way in which it has not failed in relation to England.

It is notorious that the spending departments of the government, particularly the Defence Departments, incur an undue proportion of their expenditure in England. In fact, whether in the sphere of placing contracts or maintaining establishments, expenditure in Scotland usually occurs when there is absolutely no alternative, notwithstanding equality in taxation for these purposes.

Overseas Trade Representatives of the United Kingdom have failed to promote Scottish trading.

The government-financed "British" Tourist Board has been so completely concerned with English tourism that a voluntary Tourist Board has had to be set up in Scotland. This consequence is equivalent to double taxation in Scotland for a necessary service.

Government Acts in relation to the development areas failed to take into account the differing relationship between "depressed" and "over-populated" areas in Scotland and in England. The result was the inhibition of development in certain Scottish areas which were not well populated, e.g., the North East.

The post-war economic policy which has concentrated on the expansion of the export trade has not resulted in Scotland receiving the equivalent benefit to her economy from her exertions. The cut in Capital Investment in

Scotland has unfairly handicapped her present economic state and will seriously impair her future productivity. In both these matters Scotland has suffered from her own natural disadvantages, but has been prevented from reaping the benefit of her natural advantages as a traditional exporting country.

The present trend is towards closer association of individual industrial and trading interests between various countries. Economic pressure, in some cases, may tend towards the creation of larger industrial groups with research facilities, etc., and also towards the finding of larger markets for mass-produced products. Scottish production, however, has always maintained an emphasis on quality — hence the disproportionate value of Scottish exports to the United Kingdom's economy. We must emphasize that this trend may sometimes require to be controlled by the Government. It is also obvious that the existence of National Government, in the Scandinavian countries for example, has in no way prevented advantageous industrial and trading developments within these countries and in relation to world markets.

There has been total failure of government to deal with the special problems of rural economy which exist in Scotland. This failure is notable in regard to land settlement and the comparison with other similar countries is invariably unfavourable to Scotland. Rural depopulation is more advanced in Scotland than in any other country in Western Europe.

One of the grave consequences of the lack of proper government initiative and responsibility to maintain a balanced economic structure in Scotland has been the undue number of emigrants. The proportion of 18 to 1 of Scottish to English emigrants is clearly due to some serious social and economic malady.

There is an unnatural rate of emigration from Scotland of about 30,000 every year (from a total population of five million).

There has been failure to set up an autonomous Transport Authority in Scotland. The Government has failed to maintain modern transport facilities throughout the whole of Scotland. This covers rail, road, air, and coastwise shipping facilities. There has been no attempt at co-ordination of these facilities to meet the special conditions in the various areas of Scotland.

The Government has hindered the natural economic development of international air services to, from and through Scotland. In consequence, the aircraft industry has failed to expand as would naturally have been the case.

Various government departments have encouraged the

by-passing of Scottish ports by shipping importers, with incidental increase in cost of railway freightage to the consumer.

Education

Education in Scotland is not effectively under a Chief Minister. Scottish education is being made to conform with education in England. "Scottish education is being brought into line with the system in England and Wales, under the Education (Scotland) Act, 1945." Such policies unavoidably involve the destruction of the Scottish way of life and of its natural future development.

Oxford and Cambridge are now used as the finishing departments of the Scottish, as well as the English, Universities. There has been failure to maintain equivalent educational facilities in Scotland in spite of the existence of an adequate basis for such development.

The policy of recruitment to the Civil Service demands conformity to English educational values on the part of candidates.

The undue predominance of the Church of England in all matters connected with the United Kingdom State, notwithstanding that there is little disparity in the absolute numbers of membership between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England is not accidental.

Radio and T.V.

The failure to provide an autonomous broadcasting service in Scotland is noted. The basis of all programmes is English, and Scottish programmes are so parochial that they cannot meet the requirements of the country. Party political broadcasts during Elections are on the basis of the proportion of seats contested in the United Kingdom and not in Scotland, thus excluding the political voice of the Scottish nation.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

(a) Relative Constitutions

Out of the very divergent historical development of Scotland and England developed constitutional systems of a very different type. The doctrine of the omnipotence of Parliament is the whole basis of English constitutional law. It is the reason, in fact, why England does not have a written constitution. It is the true English constitution and such statutes as Habeas Corpus are not in truth modifications of it. They merely guarantee certain legal

rights so long as Parliament does not will to the contrary. The individual in England has no constitutional rights. He is completely at the disposal of the Parliamentary majority.

This is a historic consequence of the Norman Conquest by which a "Frenchman", with the support of a new military caste, made himself master of England. The whole country and its inhabitants became his absolute property in law — the King, at first as an individual and now in Parliament, became omnipotent.

In Scotland there has never been a military conquest. No King and no upper class established themselves as owners and masters of Scotland and the Scottish people. It was late in our history that the Kingship ceased to be elective and the Royal title was King of the Scots, not King of Scotland. The powers of both King and Parliament were *surrendered* powers, freely given up by the people, and they were limited. In Scotland even the King was subject to the Law and could be (and was) haled into the Courts by individuals when he overstepped his rights. Neither King nor Parliament was omnipotent. Thus, in 1320 the nation solemnly reserved to itself in the Declaration of Arbroath the right to depose and replace the King if he failed in his duties. In 1689, the Stuarts were deposed on the basis that James VII of Scotland and II of England had "invaded the fundamental Constitution of the Kingdom and altered it from a legal limited monarchy to one arbitrary despotick power".

(b) Treaty of Union

Thus, the Union of Parliaments brought together two constitutions of a diametrically opposed nature. It resulted from an international treaty between two equal and sovereign nations, both of which solemnly ratified it. It put an end to the separate status of Scotland and England and erected a new State, the United Kingdom of Great Britain. The Treaty which created this new State was thus its fundamental Constitution. That Treaty established certain limitations on the powers of the new Parliament over Scotland and certain protections for vital reserved rights of the People of Scotland.

(c) Usurpations and Protests

This new Constitution has not been observed by the united Parliament and the rights expressly protected have not been respected. Despite repeated protests every protecting clause has been violated many times. The ills from which Scotland is suffering today and most of the unhappy

events of the last two centuries can be properly ascribed to these usurpations of power. The defence made is that the Westminster Parliament is not bound by the Treaty of Union, that it has the historic omnipotence of the English Parliament, that it is the English Parliament.

We have thus a situation in which Scotland, which entered into an international agreement in good faith and has loyally sought to keep it, is faced with the claim that that agreement is binding only at the discretion of the English majority and therefore only when it is to their interest.

SUMMARY

It is obvious from the foregoing that Scotland's history as a separate nation is vastly longer than her incorporation with England and that her right to sovereign status is indisputable. It is equally clear that that right has been steadily asserted and that its recognition and implementation are now and have been for years the desire of the Scottish people. It is also a fact that in Scotland we are administratively already a separate nation, with all the institutions necessary except a Scottish legislature and an executive responsible to the Scottish people. It is further evident that under the present system of government by an English majority, Scotland has suffered and is suffering great hardships and national injuries which, if much longer continued, may destroy our ancient nation or will lead to violent reactions. It is also indisputable that Scotland's constitutional rights have been violated, that the lawful basis of her Union with England has been destroyed, and that she is entitled to resume her independent status on this basis, too.

We do not desire to revive ancient enmities with England which were solely the result of imperialist aggression by England. Scotland is prepared to go as far as any other nation in the equal surrender of any sovereign rights which endanger international co-operation and the maintenance of peace.

*Printed at Westport, Co. Mayo, Ireland, by
Foilseacháin Náisiúnta Teoranta.*