







guest-ssasmeJul 12th 2014 0:26 GMT

Well that's a great stereotype in your picture! Thanks for assisting the YES campaign.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-slnoeimJul 11th 2014 19:43 GMT

duplicate post pls delete thx

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-slnoeimJul 11th 2014 19:41 GMT

The article neglects to account for the fact that Scotland was deprived of her independence by Cromwell on the battlefield at Dunbar. Since that time, Scottish national pride has taken additional blows from London, the Jacobite wars, Highland Removal Act, and Thatcherism being the most notorious. Like the Irish, they see themselves as a conquered people. That this current generation sees itself as Scottish and not British can be blamed almost exclusively on Thatch.

Independence might allow the Scots to put subjugation in their past.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

VLCCin reply to guest-slnoeimJul 11th 2014 22:19 GMT

--

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

VLCCin reply to guest-slnoeimJul 11th 2014 22:19 GMT

The idea that the Union is a consequence of an English takeover is Mel Gibsonian and SNP fake believe. The conflicts in the 17th century across the British Isles were broadly along pro vs anti-Royalist and Protestant vs Catholic lines - and not nationalistic lines. Cromwell was fighting the pro-royalists in Scotland who were supporting a deeply unpopular King in England (Chales II) - not against Scotland per se.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-sealisein reply to guest-slnoeimJul 12th 2014 2:25 GMT

"Like the Irish, they see themselves as a conquered people"

Absolute nonsense

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-sinlsiiJul 11th 2014 18:39 GMT

You do realize that pretty much all of your arguments apply to the UK-Europe situation? So what are you waiting for to join (or write an editorial about joining) the Euro Zone and the Schengen space? What's holding you back? Why are so many English, Briton, whatever you want to call them, so opposed to Europe?

Because the English want to control their destiny. They want their own country. Why wouldn't the Scots? Or the Catalans? Or the Quebeckers? Or the Tibetans? Or the Palestinians?

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

VLCCin reply to guest-sinlsiiJul 11th 2014 22:24 GMT

No they don't. The EU and UK do not have remotely the same level of shared history, culture and peoples as do England and Scotland.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssasnjin reply to VLCCJul 12th 2014 0:13 GMT

Oh, I think if you check your history you'll find there are very close ties across the European nations. Just have gander at Queenies relatives for starters. And it goes deeper than that.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

Lubumbashiin reply to VLCCJul 12th 2014 0:14 GMT

...or England and Ireland, for that matter.

Your point is a non-sequitur.

If anything, it is the shared history that is the motivation to break-up.

The UK-in Europe debate is more similar than unionists would like to admit. The strongest opposition to Europe is driven by UK nationalism. This doesn't mean the debates should have the same answer, of course.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssasaonJul 11th 2014 17:29 GMT

Many Catalans that also think the same about Spain and Catalonia we would like The Economist also had this same sensitivity towards us. The Catalans that do not want the division, also because we think will be bad for everyone, we would like to see articles like this in your magazine, not usually advocate a break with the Spanish state.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

Rob\_VancouverJul 11th 2014 15:42 GMT

I think the only thing that will stop the discussion is for England's bullying to stop. England bullies Scotland and it now also tries to bully all other countries in the EU. Demanding special treatment or else... Or else what?

It is the "my way or the highway" approach that England seems to always go to that is pissing everyone off. In a current world where England is but a small country among many that behaviour is not effective anymore. Therefore England has more to lose than Scotland as

Scotland gives it more clout than it would have without it. If England does not change its tune, I can see Wales and Cornwall going the same route as Scotland.

Recommend

4

Report

Permalink

reply

Corinthianin reply to Rob\_VancouverJul 11th 2014 20:08 GMT

There is no "bullying". That's all in your head.

Please, prove me wrong by providing concrete examples of this alleged bullying of Scotland by England.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

VLCCin reply to CorinthianJul 11th 2014 22:28 GMT

He probably thought Braveheart was a documentary.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

SavannaPandain reply to CorinthianJul 12th 2014 4:53 GMT

It is not per se bullying, it is a condescending attitude of "we know best". Scotland is now graciously being afforded more devolved powers if they vote no. However, there is no mention of the strings attached, there is no question as to whether this is really what the people in Scotland want. DevoMax was categorically removed from the ballot only to be replaced by something more amenable to Westminster under the same name.

Worst of all, there are the Scottish stereotype of a hairy, wild porridge-eating northern tribe, good at rebellion but incapable of self-governance. Look no further than the cover of this magazine for an example of this.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

kpxJE4WvWEJul 11th 2014 15:29 GMT

The Scottish vote; It has all gone very quite on the issue of legality. I still fail to see how it can be legal to limit the vote to current residents of Scotland. What about the born and bred Scots now living abroad and those that are working abroad with every intent of returning. Are they to be denied their birthrights? Reducing the voting age to 16 also smacks of intent to rig the vote.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssalolJul 11th 2014 15:16 GMT

I consider The United Kingdom to be the Globally Inter-dependent Backbone of Britain. If Scotland severs that Backbone in favour of Independence, and the entire Infrastructure of United Kingdom Britain ends up in chaos and collapses - who will be left to pick up the shattered pieces and pay the unimaginable Cost?

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

the clapham omnibus passengerJul 11th 2014 14:53 GMT

Good article. Wrong conclusion.

Nice to see some true statements for once:

Scottish whingeing and free loading - bang on

English complacency - that recognises one real change of the debate. The Scots used to complain ad nauseum about English arrogance. They've changed their tune now they have finally learnt that England never gave two hoots about Scotland.

As an Englishman who was educated from primary to university in Scotland my message to Scotland is clear:

Go Scotland go! We are not complacent any more. We are heartily sick of you. And make Mel Gibson your patron saint.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

Ministry for Popular Enlightenment and PropagandaJul 11th 2014 14:43 GMT

If much less than one million Scottish voters change their current opinion, change will occur. The World needs change to help it evolve, and give ideas to peoples who are not yet able to vote for anything, let alone change.

Your impassioned article has failed to answer the title's subsequent question, why not?

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

Polar ResidentJul 11th 2014 14:26 GMT

The question is once you vote for seperation how do you unvote it the next time ? or can you ? All this reminds me of Quebec where the separatists had two referendums and lost. Canadains cared then but now English Canada says don't let the door slam on your way out with your

share of the national debt. Scotland like Quebec has been pampered and catered to for far too long. So let them go and see if they can do better themselves.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

Rob\_Vancouverin reply to Polar ResidentJul 11th 2014 15:48 GMT

Well, I think it would be a great loss for Canada, and most people I know in BC would agree with me. For me, the vote in Scotland reminds me more of the UK and its discussions of a referendum on the EU. The UK has behaved far more as a bully, demanding everything and giving nothing in return, than Quebec ever has. By now most other EU citizens would love for England to leave (Scotland is welcome to join). Let them go and see if they can do better by themselves.

Recommend

3

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssalwlwJul 11th 2014 12:44 GMT

Good read but that photo was a truly awful decision.

Recommend

3

Report

Permalink

reply

Peter Piper 2in reply to guest-ssalwlwJul 11th 2014 14:14 GMT

The Economist is no stranger to awful photos.

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

Kim77in reply to guest-ssalwlwJul 11th 2014 14:46 GMT

The Economist is incredibly tone deaf, I'm not sure where that comes from.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

wd3vvfKU6LJul 11th 2014 12:24 GMT

"only a strong vote for the union will bury this issue"

Ummm, so a strong vote for independence would not bury it, then?

Recommend

3

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssaleisJul 11th 2014 12:04 GMT

"The United Kingdom embodies the belief that people with distinct histories and identities can live together, and that their diversity makes their culture, their economy and their polity stronger." No. The existence of the UK owes more to dynastic politics in 1603 and bribing in 1707 than any such belief. And diversity is not even the result; it is not actually encouraged. Assimilation is the result.

Recommend

5

Report

Permalink

reply

Felipe Coelho reply to guest-ssaleisJul 11th 2014 13:25 GMT

The UK and Spain are the two surviving dynastic unions, a sort of successful Austro-Hungary or Poland-Lithuania. They lasted so many centuries because they were not so oppressive and so unreasonable as other unions, and all regions profitted from the overall prosperity. But all that is the glorious past and the question to the Scottish voters (as it is for the Basque, the Catalanian, the Welsh, the Northern Italian, the Breton, and the Corsiccan voters) is the future. Will they be better off if they go alone?

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

Rob\_Vancouverin reply to guest-ssaleisJul 11th 2014 15:51 GMT

Clearly the writer has mixed up the UK and the EU. I agree with you that the UK is a product of dynastic policy. It is the EU embodies the believe that people with distinct histories and cultures can live together and be stronger for it.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

SavannaPandain reply to Felipe CoelhoJul 12th 2014 4:59 GMT

With "better off", I assume you would be more holistic than econometric calculations. To that the answer would in many cases be "Yes".

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssaleisJul 11th 2014 11:57 GMT

"Tellingly, most members of ethnic minorities describe themselves as British rather than English or Scottish" No. Most members of ethnic minorities in England call themselves 'British' and not 'English' because they perceive 'English' as being something specifically white. In Scotland, members of ethnic minorities call themselves 'Scottish' more than 'British'.

Recommend

5

Report

Permalink

reply

willmill82Jul 11th 2014 11:28 GMT

Brilliant article. I am not a big fan of the "regions" - England has long operated on a system of counties and unitary authorities - and I would fully support devolution to these authorities, including a similar amount of fiscal variation powers that Holyrood enjoys and the Senedd should be also given, to encourage big business to be more evenly spread throughout a truly United Kingdom.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

Carl1965Jul 11th 2014 10:16 GMT

One of the best articles I read about this topic. I am a passionate advocate of a unified Europe build up by regions not nations. The retrograde idea of nations is most of the time a hindering aspect in terms of development. The south-west of Germany and the north of Italy have much more in common than the north and the south of Italy. This is true with lots of regions. So we must support the regions individually and give them much more autonomy without neglecting the European idea.

guest-ssalaa5 mins ago

Oh my God, I thought this was the Daily Mash or some other satirical piece when I saw this picture. This is up there with Spike Milligan's Pakistani character, Jim Davidson's Chalky character and is like a national version of Love Thy Neighbour, none of which belong in the 21st century.

Absolutely foul piece of gutter level journalism, and perfectly illustrates why Scotland no longer wants to be in this so-called "union"

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

yoowin23 mins ago

Disappointed to see phrases such as "Scottish whingeing and freeloading" in an article in the Economist. No hint of a 'perceived' beforehand: either sloppy writing or you believe it. Either

way, this is an example of why so many in Scotland feel they would be better off on their own - responsible for their own successes and failures without the sneering of our so called 'partners'. If your wife or husband has such a low opinion of you the marriage would be on the rocks: do you perhaps get it now?

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-smnjnemin reply to yoowin20 mins ago

I admit the Scots profited mightily from the Empire and it is hypocritical of them now to lumber the responsibility of it wholly on the English.

Here is the Scot song of our epoch

"No man knoweth how I loved England once !

Alas, alack, I love it no longer

It hath denied me - ah, vile old bones !

The currency deal for which I hunger

'twas the aristocracy did the fell deed

No Scot e'er belonged to this vile breed

Our oppressed clansmen, huddled o'er the peat fire

Knew no profit of the grim English Empire

No miserable native caused we the smallest tear

But under the English eye they shivered in fear

We gained no penny in the English tyrant's reign

And ever sighed to return to our thatch huts again

Give us but oats and a barrel o' whisky

And a currency union, and we'd be frisky! "

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssaljel43 mins ago

The choice of accompanying photograph says it all - ill informed mocking of Scotland - which make a hat-trick now if we add this latest Economist effort with the Drowning in Oil and Skintland attempts. We are moving on to a Scandinavian style socio-economic future while rUK is heading to the EU exit door and the introspection of the UKIP camp.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-smnjnemin reply to guest-ssaljel18 mins ago

Here is the Scot song of our epoch:

"No man knoweth how I loved England once !  
Alas, alack, I love it no longer  
It hath denied me - ah, vile old bones !  
The currency deal for which I hunger  
'twas the aristocracy did the fell deed  
No Scot e'er belonged to this vile breed  
Our oppressed clansmen, huddled o'er the peat fire  
Knew no profit of the grim English Empire  
No miserable native caused we the smallest tear  
But under the English eye they shivered in fear  
We gained no penny in the English tyrant's reign  
And ever sighed to return to our thatch huts again  
Give us but oats and a barrel o' whisky  
And a currency union, and we'd be frisky! "

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-smjnem51 mins ago

We did not leave you. You left us by voting again and again and again for Thatcher and then insisting that Labour could only be elected to office if it abandoned its socialist principles and became more Thatcherite than the Thatcherites so as to give you the luxury of having an alternative Thatcherite party to vote for if the original one made a mess.  
Sorry your sweet deal has turned sour.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-smjnem57 mins ago

"Don't leave us this way."

Why did you, the English middle and upper classes, then leave us with three successive terms of Thatcher who destroyed Scottish industry and lives and used Scottish oil to fund a brutal and cynical experiment in funding the unemployment of the British working class?

WHY?

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

sarri11 hour 13 mins ago

The option Scots have to decide their own future is, without any doubt, a lesson for the so called "democratic" Europe, mainly the UE countries, and a clear example of the far superior

democratic qualities inherent to the prevailing system in the UK. Any doubter can always ask or investigate what is going on with Basques, Catalans or Corsicans, to name a few, and specially how are their Spanish and French masters dealing with their appetite to decide for themselves. UK foremost in democracy!!

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

Bhuchal1 hour 30 mins ago

Re: "much of humanity still looking up to Britain", I can only say Ha-Ha!

Britain has collected more sins than even Nazi Germany. It is only the Anglo-American grip on the world media and their power to corrupt the leadership of the rest of the world, that has saved Britain the volley of rotten eggs. But the time nears when there would be nothing more pathetic than being British or rather English.

The Scots do not need to share in the sins of the English committed onto humanity!

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssainja1 hour 50 mins ago

Point 1:

The cover page is racist and stupid. It is akin, when writing about France, to putting a Frenchman with big moustache in striped T-shirt on a bicycle wearing a berry, selling onions, shouting 'oh ho he hon, monsieur!'. Grow up, FFS.

Point 2:

The issue of Scotland restoring her independence and proper democracy would not even be discussed, if this so-called 'most successful union in the world' really worked. The problem is, it only works for England. Westminster has had over three hundred years to sort things out, yet with true arrogance has consistently buried its head in the sand, and responded to Scotland with utter contempt - a contempt exemplified by the attitudes behind the cover picture.

The people of Scotland NEVER voted for the Union, the Scots Parliament in 1707, was wholly undemocratic. Our nation was signed away by what Burns accurately described as a 'parcel of rogues', bribed as they really were by London's money, and an implicit threat of invasion, with England's army stationed on the border. Contrary to popular unionist myth, Scotland itself was not bankrupt in 1707, but many large landowners (due to Darien) were. It was THOSE people who took the bribes, and forced the union.

It is very much a one-sided union, with Scots only having a 9% of votes in Westminster. A shoddy state of affairs and wholly undemocratic, something only the restoration of independence can resolve.

That is why I will vote YES in September. It cannot come soon enough.

Recommend

4

Report

Permalink

reply

exiled again1 hour 55 mins ago

Splitting up a country can be done completely peacefully as Czechs and Slovaks demonstrated so impressively. Both countries are doing rather well compared to others further East and there is no reason to believe that Scotland would not be capable of succeeding on its own.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

PPVP2 hours 21 mins ago

To quote from the article "Yet a 307-year-old union, which once ruled a third of humanity and still serves as a role-model to many..."

I am sorry but please enlighten us as which part of the world still looks upto UK as a role model!

Recommend

3

Report

Permalink

reply

Ben\_Hain reply to PPVP1 hour 28 mins ago

I lived in Malaysia for a year recently. Several Malaysians I spoke to admired the UK and told me they were glad that their institutions were based on the UK's. So there's one!

Recommend

1

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-ssainjain reply to Ben\_Ha50 mins ago

An interesting wee anecdote. Any hard facts?

Here's my wee anecdote.

I lived in Canada for a year. Several Canadians I spoke to admired Scottish independence, as they themselves enjoyed being independent from their much larger neighbour, the USA.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

ZA Observer2 hours 54 mins ago

Fear, inertia and the sheepish nature of humanity incline more Scots to apathy (not voting) or voting for the status quo, but that does not disguise the growing and justifiable concerns of

citizens about archaic forms of Westminster and other majoritarian "democracies" where the winner takes all.

At its root, the problem of squashing Scottish spirit is constitutional - unlike the US and most federal systems, Scotland is allowed very little federal state identity and power: the English do with it largely as and when they please. Another reader crystallised resentment to this as "The Yes/No vote is as much about Culture and suppressed identity as economics. Scotland has never been a Region but a Nation"

The US outdated system is as fractured and falling apart in the centre with decade after decade of "lame duck" presidencies falling victim to a system that rewards politicians for bickering for control and point scoring rather than working together.

There are alternative, consociational forms of democracy that thrive and work in Europe such as Sweden, Switzerland. The pervasive internet and smart phones make devolution of power and referendum to the people eminently feasible, but that does not suit politicians who profit from their relative "untouchability" and distance of a 5 year office term.

A "Yes" vote for Scottish independence, unlikely as that may be, would force unionists to reformulate their view of what a federal "United Kingdom" should be, and certainly counter balances the anti-EU fanaticism of England.

Scots should not under estimate their own capacity to make money (or babies for that matter): economics and demographics can be changed, and there is no reason why Scotland "must" have a military force. Tax incentives could just as easily pull foreign investors into Scotland as push industrialists south - that is a challenge which Scots should be allowed to take responsibility for, themselves.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

sarasky3 hours 0 mins ago

please don't leave the uk. otherwise we have to apply for one more visa to visit scotland. (me saying this on behalf of people out of the uk) xxxxx

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-simesns3 hours 12 mins ago

You have not included any benefits that might accrue to the 'rest of the UK', if Scotland devolves. Smaller agile countries will provide the opportunity for England to reinvent itself, with pace.

Recommend

3

Report

Permalink

reply

lao shiin reply to guest-simesns48 mins ago

Indeed! If Scotland votes to stay, should England and Wales start a campaign to expel Scotland? The grounds would be that Westminster would more fairly represent England and Wales, and that this subsidy of £1200 per per person per year that is paid to the Scots by the English would no longer be a drain on English taxpayers. The English are not too pleased to send £1200 a year to each Scot so that they can have benefits (free university, more generous elderly care) that the English don't have.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

HP703 hours 52 mins ago

The same arguments could be made on Belgium, and yet:

<http://www.economist.com/node/9767681>

Consistency doesn't seem to be the Economist's strong suit...

Recommend

5

Report

Permalink

reply

Jaga the Wisein reply to HP702 hours 30 mins ago

Thanks for reposting this, especially since TE's column of 2007 on Belgium splitting up is so wrong and ill informed. There's specifically one glaring omission in the Belgian op-ed that features prominently in the Scottish piece: the economics of splitting up.

TE argues Belgium should split because the two communities live parallel lives. This is true (even more so for Belgium than for the UK due to language differences), but it completely ignores the Brussels question (which Scotland luckily doesn't have to deal with). According to data from Eurostat, Brussels is the third richest region in the EU measured on the basis of the wealth it generates (after the City of London and Luxemburg). This is because, as EU capital, it draws in many multinationals, lobbyists, lawyers, services, etc. Brussels is also blighted by poverty, with 40% of its population living below the poverty line.

However, whenever the Flemish quote economic statistics supporting Flemish independence (such as that Flanders is responsible for 80% of Belgian GDP), they conveniently include numbers from Brussels (responsible for 35%), since it is nominally the capital of Flanders, but they fail to realise that no Flemish live in Brussels and the Bruxellois would never agree to joining an independent Flanders. They also continuously complain about having to pay €500 million a year to support Brussels (which is far less per capita than Antwerp btw), while the city generates €3 billion in GDP a year for the Belgian economy.

In short, the Flemish have been free riding off Brussels for years without realising it. Half a million Flemish commute to work in Brussels every day but pay taxes where they live in Flanders. If Belgium were to split they'd continue to benefit from jobs in Brussels but not have to pay anything to the city in return. That the TE failed to highlight this aspect in 2007 when

arguing for Flemish independence makes me seriously doubt how well reasoned their arguments are for arguing against Scottish independence.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

bharati kJul 11th, 05:25

'Once ruled a third of humanity. Glad' UK knows it had to cruelly, horrifically loot and enslave so many to become rich and avoid Dickensian poverty. Could also mention it trafficked drugs and deliberately created addicts. Remember this when you see stately homes and institutions. Or when the Queen flaunts her ill gotten robbery.

Recommend

4

Report

Permalink

reply

Mayes and MayesJul 11th, 04:54

"As a permanent member of the UN Security Council and a big noise in the IMF, the G7 and the European Union, Britain can make itself heard in support of values such as human rights, democracy, freedom of speech, the rule of law and clean government that are threatened by the rise of states and ideologies that do not share them."

Those institutions wouldn't necessarily lose such a member. The only thing we can say with certainty is that the EU and the UN general assembly would gain a member with that outlook.

Recommend

4

Report

Permalink

reply

drewxxxxJul 11th, 04:47

Good Pub Quiz Question:

Name five Scottish footballers who currently play in the Premier League (they don't even have to be good).

In the 70's, 80' and perhaps the 90's Scottish footballers were giants in English football. Where have they all gone?

Have to agree, this weeks magazine cover is absolutely disgraceful. What point is the Economist trying to make? because the image usually is trying to make point.

Recommend

2

Report

Permalink

reply

shaun39Jul 11th, 03:36

"The United Kingdom embodies the belief that people with distinct histories and identities can live together, and that their diversity makes their culture"

Nonsense. Ever heard of Theresa May? Ever had a friend having to deal with the UK visa system? Even Americans & Australians can't get through. Ever listened to the Little England rhetoric? Listen to a progressive and inclusive view of what Scotland should be (what the UK is not):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a3AsXCo7Ks0>

And to reaffirm this (yes, attitudes in Scotland are more liberal, open, liberal and pro-European than the UK), see Farage getting the treatment he deserves (disgrace that he isn't harangued like this outside Scotland too):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q1tWGh5HrRY&list=PLw1R8Bv9IGSjkH0hzJcx8R...>

"A democratic, peaceful, well-governed nation state is a blessing which should not be casually thrown away."

Is that a bad joke?

- "Democratic"? - how many Etonians are there on the Cabinet again? How accountable does this government feel? Why is economic policy so bad, and why are social outcomes so much worse than anywhere else in Northern Europe?

- "Peaceful"? Why is there a fleet of submarines just within walking distance downstream from my current locations - powered by nuclear reactors (yes - there have been leaks of waste into the Clyde. Yes - there is a risk of meltdown & severe nuclear incidents). Why another generation of nuclear armed submarines (making Glasgow a first-strike nuclear target, at outrageous waste of taxpayer money)? What about Iraq? Why is 2.5% of GDP being blown on guns & toys (why not R&D, education or better infrastructure).

- "well-governed". Westminster is corrupt to the core. This isn't Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland or the Netherlands. This is the worst-governed state in Northern Europe, and Scotland can surely do better (it can't do worse).

Recommend

8

Report

Permalink

reply

drewxxxxin reply to shaun39Jul 11th, 05:07

'Little England' and 'Wee Scotland' were made for each other.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

Moshe DayanJul 11th, 03:30

I can't help but think that if Mel Gibson didn't make Braveheart there would be no referendum.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-smnjnemin reply to Moshe Dayan45 mins ago

No. It was the cynical and gloating shift of the English middle and upper classes to the heartless, rob-as-rob-can capitalism of Margaret Thatcher that destroyed affection for England among Scots. Thatcher used Scottish oil to pay for mass unemployment resulting from her destruction of British industry so as to cripple the working class once and for all.

Recommend

0

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-lnwnjsiJul 11th, 02:53

Scotland, if it votes for independence, will shortly learn the truth of Mrs. Thatcher's saying: the problem with socialism is that sooner or later you run out of other people's money.

Recommend

5

Report

Permalink

reply

guest-Innmownin reply to guest-lnwnjsi3 hours 23 mins ago

Or alternatively a distinct centre right party shorn of ties to Westminster will come to the fore and implement different policies.