

THE SEMINAR ON THE MULTI-NATIONAL SOCIETY LJUBLJANA 1965

BY GEORGE THOMPSON

*Published by the Celtic League,
9, Bothar Cnoc Sion,
Droimchonnach,
Baile Atha Cliath 9,
Eire.*

THE SEMINAR ON THE MULTI-NATIONAL SOCIETY LJUBLJANA 1965

By George Thompson

THIS Seminar* was organized by the United Nations to consider certain problems of human rights connected with minority groups, whether these groups were ethnic, religious, linguistic or national. It was the first Seminar ever to deal with this topic on a global basis.

Participants and Agenda

The list of participants is instructive, both by reason of the countries which were there and by reason of those which were not. Present were twenty-seven countries—from all the continents except Australasia. The European countries represented were Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Norway, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and Yugoslavia itself. France was not among those present. It is, of course, impossible to say whether this was because she would not accept an invitation, since no explanation is given of the choice of participants. In any case, we know that France has always evaded any serious consideration of her minority problems by simply pretending that they do not exist. The United Kingdom was present but the Seminar Report does not reveal whether she was present as having group problems within her own boundaries or as still possessing colonies where these problems exist.

The Report does not name the delegates when reporting their contributions to the discussion. It contents itself with recording that certain people thought this, while some said that, and others emphasized something else. For any reader with time on his hands it would provide a fascinating piece of detective work to identify the various anonymous contributors to the deliberations. However, our intention is not to indulge in an investigation of the provenance of the material, but rather to consider the discussions as a whole in their particular relevance to the Celtic world.

It will be as well at this point to run over the agenda as it is printed in the Report. It reads as follows:

“1. Measures which should be taken to ensure the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all without discrimination.

**Seminar on the Multi-National Society*, United Nations, New York, 1965.

2. Measures which should be taken to ensure the realization by ethnic, religious, linguistic or national groups, of the special rights necessary to enable them to preserve their traditions, characteristics, or national consciousness, such as:

- (a) The right to use their own language in everyday life, in courts of law, and in public or assembly;
- (b) The right of association;
- (c) The right to establish autonomous educational institutions;
- (d) The right to develop their own traditions and characteristics autonomously;
- (e) Equal treatment of economic regions within a country."

Terminology

The problem of terminology naturally raised its head. You will note that the Seminar was on the "multi-national society." It is evident that the word "state" was deliberately avoided, which necessarily means that the distinction between state and society could have been blurred. On the other hand, the word "society" allows a broader discussion than would have been possible if attention had been concentrated solely on society as organized for political and legal purposes, that is, on the state. Besides which, minority group problems affect society as well as the state, and this was emphasized several times during the course of the Seminar.

The term "minority" is usually employed only where the group is to be contrasted with a "majority"—otherwise the word "group" is used. This avoids the sort of altercation that took place at the AR VRO Summer School at Menez Kamm in Brittany two years ago, where the discussion showed that people with a Romance linguistic background tended to attach to the term—and, as I believe, quite erroneously—the legal connotation of the word, taking "minority" to mean that the group in question has not yet quite grown up culturally or politically. I have adopted the terminology of the Seminar in this respect, making it clear that I take the word "minority" to have only a numerical significance.

The word "multi-national" deserves special consideration, because it recognizes the possibility of a society, really a state, having several nations within its boundaries. There is no evidence that any participant objected to this concept. The equation of "nation" and "state" is, I suppose, derived from France, where the two ideas are normally confused. Some of the states participating in the Seminar, like India, the Soviet Union or the United Kingdom, are living proofs that the "multi-national society" does exist. During the discussions a distinction was drawn between "multi-national" and—hideous Greco-Latin hybrid!—"multi-ethnic". This latter

term applies to those states like the United States of America, where many non-indigenous elements have been fused into one state, these elements having lost their truly national status by having emigrated piecemeal to a new country. It is clear from these distinctions that France requires to recognize that she is a "multi-national" state, since the Basques are truly indigenous and the Bretons so long established and so long separated from their original ethnic centre in Britain that they merit the qualification "national" and not simply that of "ethnic." The Flemish, German and Catalan groups in France are, of course, "ethnic" and not "national" according to this terminology

The participants distinguished also between "nationalities" and "minorities" which are groups of a certain national origin separated from the main section of their nationality by a frontier, and united in a state with some other nationality or nationalities, which are the majority in that state. Thus, I take it that the Six Counties constitute *de facto* an Irish minority in the multi-national United Kingdom, composed itself of the English, Welsh and Scottish nations.

Ideas and Ideals

From the discussions certain ideas and ideals keep on cropping up. For instance, the value of a federal solution to the constitutional difficulties of guaranteeing rights to nations and minorities in a multi-national society is frequently mentioned. This is not surprising considering, for example, Yugoslavian experience in this field. The idea is, of course, familiar to the Bretons and other nationalities and groups inside the French Hexagon, though it by no means commends itself to the Jacobin traditions of post-Revolutionary France. Certainly a Scot would recognize that the 1707 Union of the Parliaments of England and Scotland would have been much less harmful, if a federal solution had been adopted instead of the incorporating union that was eventually accepted.

Again, speakers constantly emphasized that the root problem was to ensure real tolerance between one group and another. To this the Celtic peoples can only echo a heartfelt amen. The travail that Ireland went through in her emergence as a state provides a tragic example of how intolerance can blind an imperialist power to every human value, which in other circumstances and outside its own sphere of power it would recognize and praise. If there ever was a country whose history is a monument of "man's inhumanity to man," that country is Ireland. Had there existed between Ireland and England that "mutual trust and respect" that the Seminar believes to be the only basis for a solution of

problems between nationalities, then history would have been different. However, it is not my business to conduct a meditation on the might-have-beens of history, a fascinating pastime to which too many of my own countrymen devote time that they might spend to better purpose.

Individual Rights and Group Rights

Another problem raised in the discussion of the first part of the agenda was whether the rights which most needed protection were vested in the group rather than in the individuals composing it. It has often been pointed out how the revolutionary theory of France professes to be democratic—for example, in its Declaration of the Rights of Man—but is in fact a theory which recognizes the State as the one organization and the only organizer of society, the Declaration being a mere catalogue of cases where the absolute State graciously abstains from intervening. Moreover these exceptions are in favour of individuals, never of groups. These pre-suppositions readily account for the way that the French State has steadfastly refused to make exceptions in favour of its minorities, maintaining that they have exactly the same rights as everybody else in France, and blinding itself to the fact that this very equality of treatment is, in reality, grievously discriminatory. Take an example. Every child in France is to be educated in French, therefore they are all equal. Yet this reasoning is completely false, because some children in France do not have French as their native language, while others do. It may also be, though here I would not wish to appear dogmatic, that the French passion for abstract thought and clarity at all costs likewise contributes to French inability to see the individual in all his uniqueness as a person. It is always much easier to manipulate concepts than to deal with people.

Some speakers held that political rights could only be vested in the individual and that the political rights of a group could not exceed the total of the rights enjoyed by the individual members of it. But there was some agreement that groups had interests which were not always identical with those of the individual members of the group. Hence special rights could be envisaged in the linguistic, cultural and religious fields.

I have noted how difficult the French revolutionary theory finds the acknowledgement of group rights. It has to be said for the English that they find it less difficult to allow for group rights even in the political field. Neither the Scottish National Party nor Plaid Cymru have ever been considered illegal bodies on the grounds that they advocate political action to dissolve the United

Kingdom into its constituent parts. The French have never been so tender to Breton or Basque aspirations. On the other hand, it might be argued that the English learned sense from the American War of Independence and from the protracted struggle in Ireland. I myself believe that the English tradition is more humane because it is less doctrinaire than the French.

Linguistic Rights

Turning to a more detailed consideration of the discussions on the second part of the agenda, we cannot do better than follow the order of the Report itself in treating the various questions that arose.

The first point dealt with was "the right to use the language of the group in everyday life, in courts of law, and in public or assembly." Delegates believed that it was necessary to find out whether the group did, in fact, wish to use its own language. Some said that it was discriminatory to force a group to maintain its own tongue if the group really wished to integrate with the majority. Nobody seems to have raised the very pertinent question: How are we to know what the group's wishes are? Clearly an unscrupulous majority could brainwash a minority into believing that its own language was totally and inherently inferior to that spoken by the majority. As a result of this induced feeling of inferiority, it would be easy to obtain the alleged proof that the minority wanted linguistic assimilation. I am thinking now of many ordinary Breton folk whom I have met who are deeply ashamed to admit that their native language is not French, because they fear that the stranger would laugh at them as rustics, if they were known to speak Breton. The skilful use of the words "patois" and "parler" instead of "langue" in referring to Breton does untold damage to children's attitudes to their mother tongue. A further consideration that is relevant here is whether any one generation has the right to accept linguistic assimilation, an assimilation which is going to bind all future generations and separate them totally from their cultural patrimony. How many Scots nowadays bitterly regret that their Gaelic speaking grandparents abandoned the language which their grandchildren would have been proud to speak, but which they are now obliged to learn with great toil and in which it is unlikely that they will ever be completely proficient.

One delegate pointed out that governmental action cannot eradicate a language, if the group that speaks it is determined to maintain it in existence. This is too sweeping a statement, because clearly a group which consists largely, let us say, of peasants may not be able to maintain its language, if the middle classes of the

group have already abandoned it. Unless all the social classes in the group use the language habitually, the language will scarcely be able to resist governmental action in the schools, since children will look on it as the badge of their social inferiority. Where the natural leaders of a group have already deserted their native language, there is much less chance that the language will be able to hold its own, since the esteem in which the language is held is bound to react on the speakers' attitudes to it. Breton is here a case in point. Indeed all the Celtic languages are.

Certain speakers rightly pointed out that the suppression of a language is a clear case of cultural genocide. It is remarkable in our day and age that physical violence employed against a minority is almost invariably condemned by world opinion, whereas those who employ psychological violence in the cultural field in order to promote what the perpetrators are pleased to call "the interests of national unity" scarcely provoke even a mild protest. It is easy to feel revulsion at physical cruelty, which is visible, while ignoring cruelty exercised on the mind. One thinks of the use of the "sabot" in the schools of Brittany or of the "tessera" in the schools of the Scottish Gaidhealtachd as a means of detecting and punishing children who spoke their native language in school, and this with the approval of the inspectorate and other educationists. This system no longer obtains in either country, so far as I know. But as a young Breton friend once remarked to me, "There is no need for the sabot now. Every child knows before he goes to school that it is a disgrace to speak Breton outside his home."

Delegates agreed that an alien tongue should not be imposed on a group whose own tongue is not sufficiently developed to express modern concepts. The proper solution was to aid the group to develop the potential inherent in the minority language until it was able to serve as an all-purpose medium among the group. All of us here recognize the justice and the truth of this, and it is only fair to pay tribute to those who have striven to make the Celtic languages capable of expressing all the thoughts that twentieth-century man has in a world of rapid technological change. But how much aid has the state given to these efforts outside of Ireland?

The need for some form of *lingua franca* in the multi-national state was recognized by the Seminar. The problems of, say, India or Ghana were clearly being considered here. Delegates believed that historical minorities as well as immigrant groups had the obligation to learn the majority language—indeed economic necessity often acts as the surest spur to this end—but they emphasized that,

in return, the majority ought to subsidize the minority language. To a limited degree this is done in Wales by the subsidy to Welsh publishers, but it is notorious that a recent Secretary of State for Scotland refused to make a grant towards a Gaelic dictionary. It would have been instructive to know what sort of subsidies are given in states which do exercise this care for their minorities. One sure thing is that the Westminster Government is by no means enlightened in its approach to the Welsh or the Gaels. Whether we could force it into feeling shame by showing it what other states do in this field, I do not know. I rather doubt it.

The Seminar agreed that members of a minority group are entitled to use their own language in the courts, and it was pointed out that modern techniques make this quite feasible. They did not express any opinion as to whether justice did not require that the judge appointed to a minority area should speak the minority language. In Scotland it is not unknown to have the ludicrous situation where sheriff, solicitors, accused and witnesses are all Gaelic speakers but where court proceedings have to be conducted in English. In April, 1966, the Secretary of State for Scotland declared that Gaelic could not be used in the courts unless hardship could be proved. The Seminar Report is clearly not obligatory reading in St. Andrew's House.

Consideration was also given to the right of using the minority language in public and in assemblies. Practice seems to be very variable. In Ireland Irish may be used in parliamentary debates. In Wales I understand that Welsh is often the language of the debates and minutes of county and other councils. In Scotland and Brittany this is almost unknown, though candidates for Parliament find it useful to be able to address election meetings in the local language, even though they may not do very much to help the language once they are elected.

It is evident from what I have outlined that the approach of most delegates to this subject was liberal and sensible. We would not wish to question much of what was said, though I have pointed out one or two places where the participants appear not to have thought a problem through to its conclusion. At all events, it is quite clear that the British and French Governments could draw many lessons from this section of the Report.

Right of Association

Passing now to the second item on this part of the agenda, the right of association, we find delegates divided as to the sort of purposes for which this right can be invoked. They agreed that this is a general human right, and not merely one which applied to

minorities, and that it could be exercised for any lawful cultural, religious or economic purpose. Some delegates denied that it could be exercised for a political purpose, though others held that it could be so used. In any case, all maintained that the exercise of this right had to be in accordance with the constitution of the state and with the law concerning breach of the peace. Clearly para-military and conspiratorial organizations could not be allowed. Here, of course, we have to remember that we are dealing with the deliberations of people who are government servants and, therefore, to that extent apologists of the states they represented at the Seminar. To us it is evident that the provisions of a constitution could themselves be discriminatory, in which case the state becomes an unjust aggressor and the minority discriminated against would have to consider what action was required to remove the wrong they were suffering. In extreme cases a minority might have no alternative but conspiracy or armed rebellion to bring the state to its senses.

This might be the place to consider whether there exists a right of secession and of self-determination for a minority. The Seminar discussed the question but no firm conclusion could be drawn. Some upheld this right, while others claimed that a minority could not expect favoured treatment unless the state could be certain of its loyalty. Yet others pointed out that there is no right of secession recognized in international or constitutional law or practice. In present circumstances it is clear that might alone is right. If a group secede successfully from a state, they will almost certainly gain international recognition as a state. If they are unsuccessful, they will be very lucky if their case ever reaches the floor of the United Nations. Here again it seems to me that no right of secession will ever be universally recognized until there is some form of world government to allay each nation's fear of other nations and to allow a climate of international opinion where frontiers may safely be dismantled.

Another problem raised was whether minorities had the right to associate across frontiers. Delegates thought that this was often an essential right, because it enabled a minority to maintain its identity through contact with its ethnic centre. It is notorious, though no doubt delegates had to avoid mentioning it, that many frontiers are purely the results of history—royal marriages, the accidents of war, a line drawn on the map by imperialist powers with no regard for linguistic, ethnic, or even, at times, geographic reality. The Irish are well enough aware of this! Delegates agreed that open frontiers were an aid to this form of association, but most agreed that such association should be non-political. The main con-

clusion of this item of the discussion was that there was much need to conduct more research into these matters.

Appreciation of Diversity

One notable remark occurs in the summary at the end of this subsection of the Report, where it says: "The resulting duty of governments was not merely to protect special groups but also to instil into all citizens an appreciation of diversity." This is a very wise remark, especially in view of the fact that most of us are only too prone to demand that others should share our outlook, because it is ours. Inter-group hostility has reached a peak in this century, when it became possible for a civilized nation to send six million Jews to the gas-chamber solely because they were different and thus readily turned into scapegoats by those who were unwilling or unable to recognize or master their hostility to diversity. Thanks to the mass media and universal education, modern man possesses increasingly the power to destroy diversity in the world and to impose a flat uniformity. Whether mankind does set out on this self-destructive course, we cannot tell, but there are certainly voices raised to applaud the prospect.

The Report frequently mentions that diversity, so far from being a menace to the state, is in fact one of its greatest riches, since it provides for a necessary cross-fertilization in the field of culture. We in the Celtic League are naturally well aware of this fact, but the correspondence columns of *The Scotsman* have shown quite recently that there are still many in Scotland who do not appreciate the value of Scots Gaelic language and culture even under this secondary aspect. I recall that the last time I was in Ireland certain citizens of Dublin were showing the same lack of appreciation in debating in the columns of *The Irish Times*, the merits or otherwise of the Irish revival.

The task of making the Galla, the Lowland Scot, the Scot of English tongue, aware of the Gaelic heritage of Scotland has never been tackled in the schools. From my own experience I can testify that I learned more in a few days from one or two little books I picked up in Dublin three years ago, than I did in thirteen years in Scottish schools. The history taught in the schools of Scotland, when it is Scottish history at all, is always Lowland history and the picture of Gaelic civilization is based on a few lurid details about the Massacre of Glencoe and the Battle of Culloden. Clearly the Scottish Education Department has much need to study this part of the Seminar Report and even more need to act upon it.

There was also some discussion about whether an individual could become a subject of international law, where a state had

infringed his right to associate freely with his own group. Some countries provided for this, some did not. The vexed question of surrendering sovereignty arises here, and we know well that many states refuse to abandon an inch of what they consider their rights, even where a citizen has clearly had *his* rights trampled upon. In this respect we might well think of the case of the Etienne family in Brittany, which the League has taken up before.

Educational Rights

This brings us directly to the next subsection of the Report—the right to establish autonomous educational institutions. The Seminar agreed that there were three basic principles to be considered here—firstly, the child's right to education; secondly, society's responsibility to teach the child, which will usually mean the government's responsibility; and thirdly, the group's right to transmit its unique cultural heritage. Obviously it is the third statement that must attract our attention at once. In the eyes of the delegates the minority group has a *right* to transmit its heritage. It is precisely this right that has been contested in all the Celtic countries at one time or another. In Brittany the right has never been recognized. There is only one heritage that requires transmission to future generations in France, so far as Paris is concerned. It is, of course, well known to all observers of France that the French have a vastly exaggerated notion of the importance of French culture. To many, "French" and "culture" seem synonymous. In this way they are blinded to the value of the other indigenous cultures of France and from this blindness flows that moral blindness which leads to the attempts—and quite successful attempts!—to destroy everything in France that is not French, regardless of the harm that may be done to French culture in the process by depriving it of the possibility of fertilization by the non-French elements in the country.

In Wales, as the result of a long drawn out struggle which does great honour to the Welshmen who have led and supported it, Welsh schools have been set up, thus securing the transmission of the Welsh heritage to future generations. No doubt, more remains to be done, but it is already certain that a decisive step forward has been made. The problem of the University of Wales remains to be tackled, as it appears to have become in part, at least, a hotbed of anglicization, probably under the guise of being international, since learning and science know no frontiers. The English are past masters in these propaganda techniques, thanks to their long experience in the field! However, it would be quite surprising if Welsh tenacity did not win the day here in the course of time.

In Scotland two counties have now begun to tackle timidly the need to provide education through the medium of Gaelic, at least to the extent of ensuring that the Gael becomes literate in his own tongue. It is now recognized that this has beneficial effects on the pupils as well as on the future of the language. This is what should have been done in the 17th century when the erection of a school in every parish was prescribed, or at the very least, after the 1918 Education Act. The new approach runs the risk of giving a little much too late. The provision of Gaelic as a modern language option in the secondary schools of the Galltachd, the English speaking area of Scotland, is only slight. Much more could be done, if sufficient parents cared enough to campaign for an extension of these facilities. This would have the good result of making Gaelic pay. An influx of students asking for Gaelic as part of the M.A. Degree in Modern Languages, would help to sweep away the cobwebs at present found in Celtic Departments, where the study of the language is geared to research and archaeologizing and where it is treated like the classical languages rather than like French or German.

I suppose that the language problem in the schools has been best solved in Ireland by making every child learn the language. However, I am only being honest if I record my disappointment at hearing so little Irish spoken in the street and on public transport, when I was last in Ireland. This suggests that too little research has been done in applying modern linguistic methods to the teaching of Irish as the all-purpose medium of everyday life.

Right to Maintain Traditions

We can now turn to the fourth subsection of this part of the Seminar agenda which deals with groups' rights to develop their own traditions and characteristics autonomously. Delegates agreed that this aspect of minority rights was the surest means for a minority to preserve its collective identity. Most thought that the state should, as a matter of course, offer incentives to groups to maintain their traditions. Once more, the variety of groups in a multi-national state was noted to be of great value to all the citizens, contributing a richness and diversity to the life of the whole.

It has to be remembered in the case of the Celtic peoples that it is not always the state that has been the enemy of their cultural traditions. The Church has often interfered and destroyed valuable elements of culture in the alleged interests of getting rid of superstition. I think particularly of the baneful effects of the evangelical element in Scottish presbyterianism which was instrumental in stopping traditional dancing and sports and in suppressing the telling of tales. The introduction to Carmichael's *Carmina*

Gadelica contains sufficient damning evidence of the disastrous effects on Gaelic oral culture of a type of evangelicalism which refuses to recognize any value in secular culture.

There is also the temptation for governments to foster folk traditions in the interests of tourism. We are then faced with a prostitution of the national heritage—or at least there is a danger of this. On the other hand, folk dancing groups are sometimes the means of arousing in the participants a new and vital appreciation of their heritage. Each case here will have to be judged on its merits.

Economic Rights

We now come to the final subsection of the agenda which has to do with the "equal treatment of economic regions within a country." This was, in the view of many participants in the Seminar, of quite special importance, because economic freedom is the key to all the other rights that have been discussed. The Report rightly remarks that suppression of various groups is often accompanied by economic depression of the groups. A Scot has no need to look further than the Highlands and Islands of Scotland to be made aware of this truth. The results of the economic and social policies followed after the 1745 Rebellion in the north of Scotland are with us yet, and it remains to be seen whether the measures introduced by the Labour Government will be able to halt the economic decline of the North and to reverse it. Unfortunately a change in economic trends will not bring Gaelic or Gaelic culture back to the mainland areas where the language has already died or is in its death throes. A Welshman will naturally think of the enforced emigration from Wales in the 1920's. In fact, all the Celtic countries have suffered the same wrongs in this matter.

The Report also says that "the deliberate diversion of assets from any given region would constitute oppression." It is not quite clear what the Report envisages under the term "assets" but I would take it to include such things as taxation revenue, savings, raw materials taken without payment or compensation, and probably also the most precious asset of all—people. If we consider the French record in Brittany or the English record in Wales or Scotland, we can have little doubt that we are in the presence of the oppression of which the Report speaks.

The remedies that the Report mentions are the ones that we constantly hear in our own national contexts—financial investment in the region, development of the economic infra-structure, industrialization, scientific development, economic diversification, decentralization, regional planning. There they all are—the cures that we know from the textbooks but which are rarely put into practice. So far

as Scotland is concerned we shall now have four years or so to see whether Labour is really determined to tackle our problems, to see whether some genuine form of regionalism can replace the centralized structure which has been in the past so dear to the "unionist" parties in the United Kingdom.

The Seminar Report underlines the role that government now plays in planning and developing the economy in general and in minority and underdeveloped areas in particular. However, it very properly stresses that the central government must take care not to stifle regional initiative through a too rigid and too paternal interference from the centre. The principle of subsidiarity is not mentioned but it is clearly at the back of the mind of those who framed the Report. That is to say, that the central government should tackle only those matters which cannot readily be dealt with in the region and those matters which involve several regions at the same time and which cannot be dealt with by inter-regional authorities.

The state today tends to make a great parade of what it does for under-developed regions, as though it were being exceptionally generous, whereas, in fact, it is very often only making belated amends for evils committed by governments in the past. It makes one think of the distorted ideas that Chancellors of the Exchequer seem to have these days, that what they allow us to keep out of our hard earned income is a sort of gift on their part, since they assume that our income is entirely and properly their possession, if the state sees fit to take it. Similarly we are invited to admire what Labour or the Tories have done for Scotland, as though they did it out of their generous and noble hearts, instead of, as usual, in an effort to gain votes. Looking more closely at the problem of the Scottish Highlands, we will be bound to say that anything Westminster does will be but a minor act of reparation for wrong-doing on a vast scale in the past, whether by direct government action or by *laissez faire* policies which allowed land-owners to treat their tenantry with complete barbarity and to exploit natural resources without any regard for human values or even for sound ecology.

The idea of cultural, linguistic and economic reparations certainly requires development by international jurists, though there would, of course, still exist the problem of bringing the matter home to the perpetrators of injustice. Meantime, the victims of imperialism in all its forms will have to fight on for economic and social justice in the hope that one day a reconstruction of their particular part of the world may allow them those freedoms which they are presently denied.

Safeguards for Rights

Finally, I should like to turn back to the first part of the Report and to deal briefly with the various suggestions put forward for safeguarding minorities and their rights. Needless to say, the ombudsman made his appearance among the various suggestions, under the guise of a United Nations Commissioner of Human Rights. Others preferred some form of tribunal. Either of these ideas runs up against the usual difficulty that states will consider such institutions as potential invaders of their sovereignty or else suspect their impartiality. There was the further fear that the major powers might be tempted to introduce a political flavour into the judicial process. In other words we are back again at the root problem, the problem of persuading states to limit their own claims to absolute sovereignty in the interests of mankind. The outlook for minorities is bleak until such times as world government in some form or other is accepted, thus freeing states of their suspicion of their neighbours. And when the dawn of this millennium will break is anybody's guess! When we reflect on the difficulty there has been in getting states to ratify various conventions which would help materially to protect group rights, we may well be sceptical of ever seeing a Human Rights Commissioner or Tribunal.

Does this mean that the Seminar was a great waste of time? By no means. We find set out in the Report a body of international opinion on the question of group rights. It is the sort of document upon which we can found in preparing memoranda and other approaches to governments in order to obtain justice for the Celtic peoples. It is encouraging to know that we are not struggling alone. It is heartening to realize that many of the things we are fighting for are recognized by many states in the present day world as objects worthy of pursuit. The Ljubljana Seminar deserves our gratitude for producing a report which underlines the justice of our cause in our search for freedom. The fact that the participants asked the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organization to organize further seminars to explore more deeply the various problems touched upon at Ljubljana stimulates the hope that these problems will be kept constantly before the minds of Governments and that further discussion will eventually bring home to the British and French Governments that they are guilty of discrimination against national and ethnic groups within their boundaries. The Seminar could not reasonably be expected to devise machinery to compel states to behave justly towards minority groups. But it must surely be expected that it will help to create a new outlook on the problems it discussed. If it does that much, the Celtic peoples will have reason to be thankful to the Ljubljana Seminar.

