

CAMERA SCRIPT (Amended to include new introduction, recorded 11.9.70)

00520/1202

Studio A AP
Friday, 19th June 1970

Final Duration: 24'11"

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THE

S O C I A L S C I E N C E

U n i t 2

Men and Government

EXECUTIVE PRODUCER.....	ALAN HANCOCK
DIRECTOR.....	MICHAEL PHILPS
PRODUCER'S ASSISTANT.....	HELEN BRAMLEY
FLOOR MANAGER.....	MICHAEL DONALDSON
DESIGNER.....	PAUL MUNTING
GRAPHICS DESIGNER.....	JOHN ASTON
T.M.....	PETER MURRAY
SOUND SUPERVISOR.....	JERRY LAWRENCE
VISION MIXER.....	ROGER SUTTON
SENIOR CAMERAMAN.....	GORDON BLOCKLEY

SCHEDULE

11.00 - 13.00.....	Camera Rehearsal (2 TKs from 11.00)
13.00 - 14.00.....	Lunch
14.00 - 15.00.....	Camera Rehearsal
15.00 - 15.15.....	Tea
15.15 - 16.00.....	Camera Rehearsal
16.00 - 16.30.....	Sound and Vision Line-Up

V.T.R.
16.30 - 17.15.....VTM/6LT/OU.10032

BLOCK PRESENTER: Professor Michael Drake
UNIT PRESENTER: Dr. James Barber

Camera 1 - Turret (Autocue) Camera 3 - Zoom
Camera 2 - Zoom

(New recording of introduction:
Camera 1 - Zoom Camera 2 - Turret (Autocue))

Men and Government

F/U

VTR CLOCK

T/J (1)
UNDERSTANDING SOCIETY
A FOUNDATION COURSE

T/J (2)
UNIT 2
MEN AND GOVERNMENT

Remake starts here

1. 2 A / PROF. MICHAEL DRAKE: Another way
MS Block Presenter of putting the question "Why do
men live in societies?" is to ask
- S/I
2. 1 A "What advantages do men gain from
Prof. Michael Drake living in societies?" And one
Dean of the Faculty of advantage often assumed by
Social Sciences political philosophers is that of
(Caption 1) living under government.
- T/O

A central problem of government, however, has always been the conflict that exists between maintaining social order, and yet providing for individual liberty. We're going to look at

(2-1)

this problem now, using a case study approach.

The aim is to examine some of the general propositions and ideas to which you have been introduced in your reading by applying them in a particular case or situation.

Dr. James Barber, a Reader in Government at the Open University, takes the situation in Northern Ireland in the late 1960s and examines it against such general propositions as Hobbes' insistence that the first job of government is to provide security and order.

DR. JAMES BARBER: Security and order - these are advantages which not only Hobbes here but other philosophers have said that we stand to gain by living under government. If this was the only criterion for judging government we'd have a relatively easy task. But, of course, there are many other advantages which it's said we can gain by living under government. For example, in your reading this week/ you have been introduced to the

Remake ends here

2. 1 A
Presenter and BP (1):
Hobbes

3. S/I
3 A
Dr. James Barber
(Caption 1a)

T/O

4. 2 A
Title page of book (photo)
(Caption 2)

CHANGE BP

(1 NEXT)

(2-4)

ideas of John Stuart Mill. Mill was a great advocate of individual liberty.

5. 1 A
Presenter and EP (2):
John Stuart Mill

He didn't deny that government should provide an order, but for Mill it was order with a purpose - to establish the conditions in which individual liberty could flourish. If

(Continued)

(3 NEXT)

(1-5)

securing order implied using devices like a secret police, ~~or imprisoning people without trial~~ or placing bugging devices in rooms to record private conversations, Mill would have been appalled. He'd probably have said that preserving order just wasn't worth that sort of price, that in such cases government had abandoned what it should have been doing and had become mere tyranny. There are dangers, as Mill and others see it, either in government seizing excessive powers for itself, or in us becoming too apathetic and accepting a particular order simply because it's imposed by the government. Albert Camus, / the French writer, said: "Whoever blindly entrusts the government with the care of freedom has no right to be surprised when freedom is immediately dishonoured." / We could develop this further and even stand Hobbes on his head by arguing that it's not only in situations

TRACK IN to
MCS Presenter

6. 3 A
Albert Camus (photo)
(Caption 3)

7. 1 A
MCS Presenter

(1-7)

of chaos that people live in fear and that social, economic and cultural life suffers, but also when government imposes too harsh an order - when it imprisons its opponents, for example, or imposes a tight censorship, or generally suppresses individual initiative.

We can keep this in mind as we take up the question of individual liberty. Not all governments respect even the idea of individual liberty, but in this country we say we do. We claim it as an advantage of living under our system of government. But what happens if there's a conflict between liberty and order? What if the two can't be reconciled? Today we're going to examine this dilemma by looking at Northern Ireland in the late 1960s. Let me emphasise that the intention is not to give an account of current developments in Northern Ireland. Instead we're trying to

(TK NEXT)

(1-7)

S/B TK

make a general point by looking at a particular situation at a particular time. We've broken up the programme into three parts. First, we shall give a brief historical outline of events in Ulster. Second, we'll hear the views of participants in events of the late 1960s, and finally we'll ask Peter Laslett, of Trinity College, Cambridge, to examine and clarify some of the issues which have been raised.

RUN TK

First then, let's outline the situation.

8. TK (Dur.: 4'02")
Seq. 2

s.o.f.

Memories or perhaps prejudices die hard in Ireland. The divisions between Roman Catholics and Protestants which broke out into civil conflict in the late 1960s have their roots in the 17th century. Many of today's symbols, like the pictures of William III, King Billy, who secured the Protestant succession, or the march of the Apprentice Boys of Londonderry - are symbols drawn from the late 17th century but are still very much alive today. The enmity between the two Christian sects led to a constitutional division of Ireland in 1921 leaving the North a province of the United Kingdom - the province of Northern Ireland - and a republican and mainly Catholic south. Within the

(1 NEXT)

province there's a Protestant majority, but also a substantial Roman Catholic minority which tends to be concentrated in particular areas, so that there are parts of towns like Londonderry which are almost entirely Roman Catholic. Roman Catholic urban areas identify themselves by their religion and view the other Christian sect with hostility.

"That's what we want - the people of Northern Ireland, the Protestant people - wants to remain British, the Roman Catholics do not want to remain British, they want to come under the Republic of Ireland."

"Well, as far as I can see, it's been coming on for months, as soon as Mr. Paisley came into the picture. He has stirred the Protestants up against the Catholics. For years they lived in peace, but he couldn't have that, no he wouldn't have that, and he stirred the Catholic - the Protestant people, up against the Catholics."

Such a situation is ripe for misunderstanding and suspicion, especially as the Roman Catholic group claims that the government in Northern Ireland, which handles most of the province's internal affairs, is Protestant dominated. The Roman Catholics complain that because of this they are denied equal rights and liberties. In 1968 the Civil Rights Movement took up their cause.

"We are deprived of one man one vote, and we are deprived of majority rule in cities like Derry, where the majority is anti-Unionist."

The leaders of the Civil Rights Movement, not all of whom were Roman Catholics, organized protest marches and demonstrations. These met with opposition from militant Protestants, who among other things, feared that an attempt might be made to break down the constitutional division of Ireland and incorporate

the North into the Republic.
They also feared that the Government
would be too weak with the Civil
Rights followers.

"The whole Civil Rights Association
is a front movement for the
destruction of the Constitution
of Northern Ireland."

The Northern Ireland Government
intervened, to keep the peace
according to the government, but
unfairly said the Civil Rights
leaders by stopping their marches

(TK)

and demonstrations. From then onwards there was a return to the ugly history of conflict and fighting between the opposing factions, with the government caught somewhere inbetween. There were, however, continual complaints from the Roman Catholics against the government, and in particular complaints against the 'B' specials, a reserve police force, which was accused of acting as an armed unit for the extreme Protestant groups. Despite appeals for tolerance and peace the disorders grew so intense, the effects of the violence so disruptive that the United Kingdom Government was called upon to help restore order. Troops were called in to separate the warring factions. To regain order many liberties were withdrawn - curfews were imposed, people were not allowed into certain areas of the towns and cities, pubs were closed early, processions were banned, and so on. In other words, to restore order a price was paid in individual liberties./

9. 1 A
MCS Presenter

In a minute we're going to hear the views of people who were deeply involved in these events. Although they're striking personalities, try to consider what they say from the standpoint of the role each of them was playing; as a government minister, for example, or as the leader of a particular group, rather than seeing them as individual characters. I interviewed three people - the

S/B TK

(TK NEXT)

leader of the Civil Rights Movement, a leader of the militant Protestants, and finally the Minister of Home Affairs. I was trying to discover what each of them meant by liberty in the context of Northern Ireland, and what relationship they saw between liberty and order.

RUN TK

First I asked what liberties had been challenged in Northern Ireland and what liberties they were out to defend. The Civil Rights leader speaks first.

10. TK (Dur.: 4'48") s.o.f.
Seq. 3

S/I

T/J (3)

John Hume M.P.
Civil Rights Leader

F/O

The individual liberties that have been threatened in Northern Ireland are fundamental liberties, such as the right to freedom of speech and freedom of procession. For example, we have political newspapers banned here, we have marches and protests banned here that were in opposition to the government party's point of view and we had of course the liberty of the abuse rather of the right to vote.

S/I

T/J (4)

The Rev. Ian Paisley M.P.
A Protestant Leader

F/O

As a Protestant I don't believe that any man has the right to come between another man and his maker. And leading on from what I would call spiritualist liberty, which is seen and manifested in the religious sphere, there are those liberties which I believe are the fruits of this spiritual liberty. For instance, the right of the individual to express himself within the law. Now Captain O'Neill and the present government have sought to take this right away from Protestants.

(TK)

S/I

T/J (5)

The Rt. Hon. Robert
Porter M.P.
Minister of Home Affairs

F/O

Well, I think individual liberties have been threatened but it is necessary in the Northern Ireland context to consider it from two points of view. There has first of all been the fundamental threat which has been with us throughout our existence and to the liberty of the right or majority to preserve Northern Ireland as an integral part of the United Kingdom. This threat has come from terrorist groups principally the I.R.A. who from time to time have attempted to force their political solution by violent means and this of course has been a threat to the liberty of the majority and in a democratic society this type of terrorist activity is very difficult to deal with, and we have been forced here to assume powers which have not been necessary in peace time in the rest of the United Kingdom. They do not in fact contravene or upset the right of people to pursue their legitimate constitutional aims but in fact exist to preserve the liberties of the majority and indeed of the State as a whole.

I asked whether seeking liberty implied challenging the existing order.

Well, the only way that we could was to challenge the government on its whole position and indeed to challenge the government's attitude to law and order itself because law and order itself was a very partial and one-sided force here. It was a force that represented the government party's thinking rather than what should have been a completely impartial force that would be unchangeable irrespective of the party in power.

I believe the government ought to govern, but I also believe that they ought to govern not only with firmness but with fairness and

(1 NEXT)

(TK)

justice should be seen to be done to all sections of the community. If a Protestant does wrong he should be punished, if a Roman Catholic does wrong he should be punished, and the sentences should be seen to be fair, but at the moment the Protestants are receiving hard sentences and the Roman Catholics are receiving sometimes no sentence at all.

Isn't it necessary for the government to impose order to ensure conditions in which individual liberty flourish?

I think there is no such thing in an ordered society as absolute individual liberty. It must be recognised that there must be restrictions and in the last analysis, an order imposed by the government depends on the consent of the community to accept restrictions if they are to live in harmony together.

I don't think that order should be imposed by the government, I think order should derive from an attitude to fundamental democracy and human rights, and that it should not be necessary in society to have a government impose these things. These things should derive from the very nature of society itself. But what is lacking in Northern Ireland and what is affecting the whole law and order position is the lack of tolerance to other people's points of view and the attitude of some people, particularly those in power, that the only way that they can maintain their point of view is to suppress the expression of another point of view.

I believe that individual liberty must be within the law and whether we like the law or not, I feel that the rule of law must prevail. Our argument is that the government is not imposing law and order.

11. 1 A
MCS Presenter

S/B TK

Although the Minister confirmed

(TK NEXT)

(1-11)

that the Government had seen itself as something of a referee between extreme groups, neither the Protestant nor the Civil Rights leader saw the Government as a referee, certainly not as an impartial one.

RUN TK

12. TK (Dur.: 56")
Seq. 4

s.o.f.

I suppose that as long as the government is in this role and is trying to resolve the problems peculiar to this community that it should be looked upon as a referee.

PRESENTER TO POS. B

No Civil Rights person under the troubles that were in Armagh were sent to prison. I was sent to prison.

1 to B

Their attitude towards order was a party attitude and they have done so for a long time by use of special powers act here which for example really hits at liberty in that people can be arrested without a warrant and imprisoned without trial.

Well, I think the government is going to be unpopular whatever it does, but the government ought to govern and I think that they should not be particularly concerned about any section of the community they should do what is right and this government refuses to do what is right.

13. 1 B
MCS Presenter (Pos. B)

We're now coming to the third stage of our analysis, but before we hear Peter Laslett there are some threads we can draw together. First, important issues are raised by

(AS DIRECTED NEXT)

(1-13)

looking at the sequence of developments in the late 1960s. One view would see the sequence starting when the Civil Rights Movement decided to challenge the existing order by adopting tactics, which in conditions like Northern Ireland, carried a high risk of retaliation from other groups and therefore a high risk of civil disorder. As we've heard from Mr. Hume, the only way they saw of achieving the liberties they were seeking was to challenge the government and the social and political order it upheld. Mr. Hume's statement raises such important questions as "Have individuals or groups the right to challenge the existing order, and if so, in what circumstances, and using what methods?"

As the disorders grew, so the government imposed restrictions to try to regain order and we have also heard Mr. Porter say that the government had no choice but

(AS DIRECTED NEXT)

(1-13)

to do this. Equally, the government's action raises other important questions, but this time they are a direct counter to those of Mr. Hume's. Now we have to ask such questions as "Is the government justified in restricting individual liberties, and if so, what liberties and under what circumstances?" The answers given to these questions in part depend upon the perception of the people who are making the judgement. We'll try to visualise this by building up a simple model on a magnetic board. Let's start by trying to imagine the situation as the Government might see it. Well, perhaps they'd see it like this. The Civil Rights Movement here starts to exert pressure on the Government there. As a counter to the Civil Rights demands, the Protestants also start to exert pressure on the Government. And so the Government's left here in the middle of the situation, trying to retain order and also trying to

TRACK OUT to 2-SHOT
Presenter and Mag.
Board

14. AS DIRECTED
- | | | |
|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 2 | B | CS of Mag. Board |
| 1 | B | 2-Shot Presenter
and Mag. Board |

(TK NEXT)

(AS DIRECTED)

keep the two groups apart. But if this is the perception of the Government, it certainly wouldn't reflect the perception of either of the opposing groups. Let's try to imagine how the Civil Rights leaders might see it. They'd see an alliance between a Protestant dominated Government here and the Protestant groups. Remember Mr. Hume has said that the Protestants do dominate the Government. And they'd see this alliance putting pressure on the sort of people the Civil Rights movement is out to defend. Well, if this is the Civil Rights perception, it certainly wouldn't be shared by the militant Protestants. Let's try to imagine how they might see it. Perhaps they'd see it starting with the Civil Rights Movement exerting pressure on the Government there, but the Government's weak. In fact, we've heard Dr. Paisley say that the Government is too weak standing against these pressures. So the pressures go through onto the Protestants there. And in this

(TK NEXT)

(AS DIRECTED)

S/E TK

TRACK IN to MCS
Presenter

situation it's the position of the Protestants that has to be defended. Well understanding the different perceptions may help us to understand the situation in Northern Ireland. But do the ideas of political philosophers also help us? Peter Laslett studied all the material you've been given for this unit, and then he wrote out

(Continued)

(AS DIRECTED)

RUN TK

his comments on questions I asked him. First I had asked whether Hobbes' ideas had any relevance to the situation in Northern Ireland. He said that they did have some relevance and started by quoting the famous passage.

BRING TK IN EARLY AND HOLD UNDER SPEECH

15. TK (Dur.: 5'06")
Seq. 5

s.o.f.

S/I
T/J (6)
Peter Laslett
Trinity College, Cambridge

"... which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short."

F/O
PRESENTER TO POS. A

Now this obviously isn't the description of what's been happening in Northern Ireland, but might certainly be called a description of what might have happened if some power hadn't intervered to keep everyone in awe. What we have here in fact is the threat of anarchy of the Hobbesian kind, on the one side by the people who want to change things, and the threat of the same anarchy on the other side by the dominant majority who are afraid themselves that it might happen, but may also want to frighten others with it, so that change will be prevented.

1 to A

Nevertheless, I wouldn't like our students to read Hobbes literally into Ulster events. I don't believe that anarchy of the Hobbesian kind could ever happen in Northern Ireland if our troops withdrew. Institutions are matters of habits, and political habits would remain. Anarchy in fact is extremely rare in politics, and it's wrong to argue from it, though it may occasionally happen as for example in the Congo. I believe as a political scientist that we're

(1 NEXT)

(TK)

slightly fanatical about the absence of violence all the time, we feel it as a psychic threat and easily deceive ourselves into supposing that anarchy is imminent - in the universities as well as in Ireland.

What our students should bear in mind, I think, is the political scientists' concept of consensus. You can only operate a system of government like ours, by consent, representation, rule of law, if there is widespread consensus that these things themselves should be maintained at all costs. In England we have been very fortunate about this. For two hundred years we have had such consensus, though with occasional interruptions which we forget too easily, like the General Strike of 1926.

It seems clear that there is no such consensus in Northern Ireland, not now anyway. And without consensus you cannot expect to live in conditions of undisturbed law and order. It may follow from this, as Mr. Porter says, that for that reason political rights should be suspended for a time. But it may also follow that people should learn to live with some degree of disorder for a time, in order to arrive at a situation where a new consensus can be brought about. If this is accepted, then people do have the right to threaten the existing order, which they believe lacks consensus because it is unjust to them. A Hobbesian would deny this, but as I have already said, I don't think Hobbes should be taken as a final authority of this kind.

J.B. For most people there is this dilemma of trying to balance order on one side against individual liberty on the other. It is certainly something that comes up again and again in Northern Ireland, and it is something that political philosophers have dealt with. For example, would you say that Locke would have challenged Hobbes on this particular point?

Let us agree that there is a problem of reconciling these two. Certainly most political thinkers in the Western tradition do assert that the

(1 NEXT)

(TK)

rule of law is an essential condition of liberty. John Locke, whose portrait you see up there, himself said "where there is no law there is no freedom". He evidently thought that consensus could break down, without necessarily threatening law and order, but let us fervently hope that he was right in this.

But we must always remember how easy it is for those in power to interpret the absolute security of their power, their rights and their property, as essential to the preservation of civil peace. Other and more recent political thinkers with great influence in the contemporary world, like the social revolutionaries Marx or Lenin, would deny this completely and insist that those in control of Northern Ireland were merely mistaking their own class interest with conditions of a fair consensus in that country.

Here we reach the final issue for us political scientists on the question of law and order, for speaking as a political scientist, it does seem to me that we ought in England to be prepared to accept less than absolute tranquillity in the political sphere. We tolerate a breach of order in the economic sphere by allowing strikes. We permit men to defy military rule on grounds of conscientious objection. Perhaps we ought now to recognize that breaches of regularity in the political sphere are to be tolerated, even if they occasionally infringe our liberties, like, for instance, the liberty of a lecturer to address his students without interruption. We may, I think, confidently hope that our political genius will allow such actions taking place without actually approaching anything like a breakdown in the political system.

16. 1 A
MS Presenter

In this programme, we've tried to show that questions raised by political philosophers have a continuing relevance today.

(3 NEXT)

(1-16)

Certainly, a situation like Northern Ireland has raised enormously difficult questions about the right to challenge existing order, and the right of governments to impose order even if this means restricting some liberties. Problems like these are faced by all societies as they try to balance order and liberty.

17, 3 A
OU symbol (Caption 4)

S/I
T/J (7)
The speakers were
PROF. MICHAEL DRAKE
DR. JAMES BARBER

S/I
T/J (8)
Guest speakers
PETER LASLETT
Trinity College, Cambridge

S/I
T/J (9)
The Rt. Hon. ROBERT PORTER M.P.
Minister of Home Affairs
JOHN HUME M.P.
Civil Rights Leader
The Reverend IAN PAISLEY M.P.

S/I
T/J (10)
FILM EDITOR MICHAEL FREEMAN
GRAPHIC DESIGN JOHN ASTON
FILM DIRECTOR PETER RAMSDEN

S/I
T/J (11)
PRODUCTION BY MICHAEL PHILIPS
EXECUTIVE PRODUCER ALAN HANCOCK

T/J (12)
A PRODUCTION FOR THE
OPEN UNIVERSITY