

Europe Renaissance

Nation state, new nationalism,
separatism and the future of EU

Marine Bluchet-Brousso

Álvaro Boyero

Ania Kulakowska

Mercedes Taús

Eliza Vas



2014

Index

The separatism in Scotland	3
Historical Reason.....	3
Cultural and political differences	3
“Should Scotland be an independent country?” – A short analysis over the referendum	5
ARGUMENTS FOR SCOTLAND TO VOTE “YES” OR “NO” IN THE REFERENDUM	8
Reasons to vote YES in referendum:.....	8
Reasons to vote NO in the referendum:.....	8
Consequences of Scottish independence.	10
Regarding Europe:.....	10
Economic Consequences.	11
Political consequences.....	13
Other minor consequences.....	15
Reference sources:.....	16

Working on a project about the development and the future of Europe we choose to study the case of Scotland a Nation which represent well the Nationalism and separatism in Europe. I will sum up the Historical part of this Country which is an explanation of this independent movement, but not the only reason.

The separatism in Scotland

Historical Reason

Since a lot of Centuries Scotland had to face wars and invasion like a lot of country in Europe but especially with England.

I will Start in 1296 when Edward the 1st the king of England at that time start lot of time to conquer Scotland.

In 1603 after the death of Elisabeth the Queen of England who had no one to replace her, Jack VI, king of Scotland took her place in England.

From 1625 to 1649 William the 1st is the king of England and became king of Scotland in 1633.

In 1650 Oliver Cromwell occupied Scotland after a battler in Dunbar.

For more than 50 years battle and wars continued in Scotland

The 1st Mai 1707 is a really important day, the union of the two Parliaments from England and Scotland: The United Kingdom of Great Britain.

But this didn't avoid the conflicts between the two the **Highlands Clearances** (Farmers has to leave their place and to immigrate to Africa) was horrible for Scottish people.

Fortunately in **1886 the Crofters Act** is signed and protected the farmers from this movement.

In 1999 Scotland has again his own Parliament and the collaboration with England is better and better.

All those Historical fight, Battle and war dug a gap between Scotland and England and created as well cultural differences, which is a part of the explanation of this nationalism movement.

Cultural and political differences

First of all we can speak about the cultural differences **through the religion, Schottische are Presbyterian and Englishmen are Anglicans.**

The language is also a bit different. The Scottish accent and dialect is different from the English one, and Scottish people do their Best to keep it and differentials themselves.

Today, the Right Political Part is almost absent in Scotland while it is in England the most popular one. When we observe the results of the European election and how much UKIP (English political party against really conservative) group won votes, we can say that the contrast is more and more present.

Scotland is a nation really attached to his social right, and this since the end of the war, to his middle class and right, contrasting to England and the rest of the United Kingdom.

As example they want a better social health protection system, and are proud that their University are free while in England Students as to pay more than 11 000 euros per year.

Conclusion:

The desire of to be independent in Scotland is not only historical and cultural but more and more political and economic, even if the story play a role, it is a minority.

“Should Scotland be an independent country?” – A short analysis over the referendum

The political arena of United Kingdom had to deal in 2014 with the feeling of uncertainty in regards to Scotland, after the entering into force of the *Scottish Independence Referendum Act 2013*¹. This paper was meant to establish the legal framework for organising a referendum, where voters could express their opinion on the following question: *Should Scotland be an independent country?*. The Bill that represented the first step of adopting the Referendum Act was introduced in the Government by Nicola Sturgeon MSP (member of Scottish National Party) on 11 March 2013, later on debated by the Parliament and passed on 27 June 2013. On 7 August 2013 the Bill received the Royal Assent and on 7 February 2014, a volume was published with all the information regarding the passage of the Bill.

As for the contents of the Scottish Independence Referendum Act, we can mention here the followings: information regarding those who are entitled to vote, provision about voting, campaign rules, referendum agents, observers, information for voters, advice and encouraging participation, estimates of expenditure, offences and legal proceedings. It is interesting to know, that besides those who are eligible to vote for elections to the Scottish Parliament and local authorities, for this referendum there was an addition of 16 and 17 year olds voters. Given the fact that the voters had to register before participating at the elections, the conditions they had to comply with were: British citizens resident in Scotland; qualifying Commonwealth citizens resident in Scotland; citizens of the Republic of Ireland and other EU countries resident in Scotland; members of the House of Lords resident in Scotland; Service/Crown personnel serving in the UK or overseas in the Armed Forces or with Her Majesty's Government who are registered to vote in Scotland.

The date established for the referendum was 18th of September 2014. At that point, 84.6 per cent² of the eligible voters participated at the elections, marking in this way one of the highest turnout rate. On this day, 1,617,989 voters chose to be in favour of independence, establishing a percent of 44.5. The opponents won the elections, by establishing a percent of 55.5, gathering in this way 2,001,926 of “No” votes. According to “The Economist” magazine³, the cities and regions that had the highest rate for a “Yes” vote were: Dundee City (57.4 per cent), West Dunbartonshire (54 per cent), Glasgow City (53.5 per cent) and North Lanarkshire (51.1 per cent). Even though the turnout rate for Dundee City was only 79% compared to the overall turnout rate, the town of Alex Salmond was considered to be the “Yes City”.

The small difference between the votes may be explained by the massive campaigns managed both by the Scottish Government and David Cameron's staff. From one point, we were witnesses of “**Yes Scotland**” and from another point we looked up at the messages sent by “**Better Together**” representatives. The first one explained to the local public and international arena that Scotland would be better off standing outside of United Kingdom and being able to decide for its own future.

¹ Scottish Independence Referendum Act 2013, 2013 asp 14, online edition, http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2013/13/pdfs/asp_20130013_en.pdf, checked on October 18th 2014;

² Official result of the Scottish Independence Referendum, online edition, <https://www.scotreferendum.com/information/>, checked on October 22nd 2014;

³ Britain survives, The Economist, online edition, September 19th 2014, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/blightly/2014/09/scotlands-referendum>, checked on October 20th 2014;

On the other side, “Better Together” was the flag-campaign of the unionists who agreed that a country such as Scotland should not leave the United Kingdom. In regards to the channels used by the two major campaigns, both of them had messages for online readers, but also events in the offline area.

The website of “**Yes Scotland**” was continuously updated with information from all areas of the public life and with multimedia content, showing in this way that the materials were meant to cover a wide range of audience. People who accessed the website were invited to take action through the followings: put questions and have them answered by the organisers of the campaign (meaning here the Scottish Government), attend a local event, sign the “Yes Declaration” and donate in the favour of the cause. Viewers could also buy different branded products from the online store available on the website.

The **Better Together** campaign was chaired by MP Alistair Darling and it represented a cross-party group that convinced people that is better for Scotland to be part of UK. The main message sent by the organisers was “We are united” and other slogan used in the campaign was “Love Scotland, Vote No”. The “No” message was endorsed by more than 20 newspapers from UK, businesses such as British Petroleum, trade unions, non-governmental organisations, politicians within UK and all over the world such as Tony Abbot (PM of Australia, Carl Bildt (Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden), Hillary Clinton (former Secretary of State of the United States), Barack Obama, (President of the United States), Mariano Rajoy (Prime Minister of Spain), actors, musicians, sportspeople, public figures and writers together with academics.

Also, the HM Government⁴ opened a website similar to the one used by those in favour of independence, where it explained the benefits of remaining in the Union. It was divided on three parts: home, family and work. For each section, there were presented information in such manner that the readers could get to the point that is better to not choose the independence. Also, for each example explained there were brought arguments of what might happen with the benefits if Scotland would not be part of UK anymore. Called “You Decide”⁵, the website wanted to be promoted as a channel of spreading information for those entitled to vote.

In regards to the declarations that followed the output of the elections, the First Minister of Scotland – Alex Salmond⁶ said the followings: “*Today of all days as we bring Scotland together let us not dwell on the distance we have fallen short. Let us dwell on the distance we have travelled and have confidence that the movement is so broad in Scotland that it will take this nation forward and we shall go forward as one nation. Thank you very much.*” His words echoed in the hearts and minds of other endorsers of the independence and the results of these elections prove that there’s no way back for giving up at being an independent country.

On the other hand, the Prime Minister of United Kingdom – David Cameron⁷ affirmed: *It would have broken my heart to see United Kingdom coming to an end. And I know that sentiment*

⁴ Her Majesty's Government

⁵ <https://www.youdecide2014.uk/>

⁶ First Minister on Referendum Outcome, <https://www.scotreferendum.com/2014/09/first-minister-on-referendum-outcome/>, checked on October 25th 2014;

⁷Raw Video: David Cameron on Scotland independence vote, FOX 10 Phoenix, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kvr_SbDgpAo, checked on October 24th 2014;

would be shared by shared by people not just across our country, but also around the world, because of what we have achieved together in the past and about we can do together in the future. So, now it is time for our United Kingdom to come together and to move forward. A vital part of that will be a balanced settlement for the people in Scotland and important for everyone in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as well."

In conclusion, in the upcoming future the relations between Scottish authorities and UK Government seem to be full of negotiations, as one part will further on promote the fact that Scotland is better out of the Union and the other part will try to convince everybody involved that Scotland is better off in the UK. For the moment, the "Better Together" campaign has won, but "Yes for Scotland" campaign is not going to cry uncle.

ARGUMENTS FOR SCOTLAND TO VOTE “YES” OR “NO” IN THE REFERENDUM

Reasons to vote YES in referendum:

1. **Taking responsibility by moving all governing powers to Scotland.** Meaning: make Scotland fairer and more democratic country. No more accepting the fate that Westminster choose for Scotland.
2. **Get the government Scottish people choose.** The majority Scots voted for different political party, that is in power in the government. If Scotland was independent and have its own government, there wouldn't be nothing more important than Scotland for them.
3. **No more building nuclear weapon.** Scots are against building nuclear weapon, because it is unethical and morally wrong. Scotland is a supporter of peace, and building mass destruction weapons doesn't suits this policy.
4. **Securing oil funds in North Sea.** Most of United Kingdoms reserves of oil is located in Scotland. Most of revenue and tax form oil goes to London. If Scotland was independent, whole income would stay in. Scotland could even become one of the wealthiest countries in Europe.
5. **Scotland has resources an finances to become an independent country.** Even the Unionists believe, that Scotland is ready and has all it takes to be independent.
6. **Believing in creation of more jobs.** Scotland has possibilities for improving as a leader in energy supply. There are many sources of natural energy, which is not used yet, so this is area to create new jobs. Also, if Scotland becomes independent, institutions like Tax Office would have to be opened. This is another opportunity to create new jobs. That would be beneficial for both economy and citizens.
7. **Believing in the benefits for Scotland as individual.** Future Scottish government already has plans how to improve healthcare, situation of Pensioners and parents.
8. **Believing in a more equal wages.** The supporters of independent Scotland believe, that the difference between poor and rich people is too big. Their goal is to equalize as much as possible the wages.
9. **Believing that Scotland and England have opposite political and social views.** if two countries have different opinions in such important matters, they should go in their own directions and still respect each other. This is opinion of supporters of independent Scotland.
10. **Understanding that NO might lead to changes for worse.** Staying in United Kingdom means, that the most important decisions would still be made in Westminster. This means, that this decisions not always would be best for Scotland.

Reasons to vote NO in the referendum:

1. **Believing that England and Scotland are better off together.** United Kingdom with Scotland in it is much more powerful, than it would be as two different countries.

2. **Unsure about the future after independence.** Many people are afraid of how their life in independent Scotland would look like. They also are afraid of changes, and this might be reason for them to vote NO – being unsure about what would happen after secession.
3. **Doubtful about benefits for Scots as individuals.** Basically, the opponents of independent Scotland doubt if the supports would be able to implement their plans.
4. **Doubtful about supporting the European Union.** The truth is, UK pays more to the UE than it gets back. This is main reason, why opponents of Scottish independence doesn't want secession – they're afraid Scotland would become too depend to UE. But Europeans Union point of view is different: Scotland as a new country would have to go all the way to become a member of UE. Question is, would they want to be one?
5. **Thinking that Scotland cannot make it alone.** The issue in this point is that Scotland has not enough citizens comparing to its surface.
6. **Leaving responsibility at Westminster.** Scotland might get more independence from London in future. Maybe the risk of being independent country is too big?
7. **Happy with choices of government in Westminster.** In Scotland lives quite big group of people, who think that decisions made in past by London were in their interest, and they don't think that Scottish independence is needed to make the country to function better.
8. **Scotland costs more than it generates.** This is an argument of UKs government. It's not convincing, because if Scotland costs so much, why they don't want its independence?
9. **Sharing Scottish oil resources benefits whole United Kingdom.** The revenue from oil reserves can be too big to spend for so small country as Scotland, and would be enough for whole United Kingdom.
10. **Believing in building nuclear weapon.** Opponents of independence think, that country which possesses a nuclear weapon is safer. It makes country able to protect itself in case of danger.

CONCLUSION:

There are many reasons for Scotland to stay in United Kingdom, and to choose independence. In the referendum Scots decided to stay. This means they still believe that United Kingdom is stronger together. Not insignificant is a fact that the British Prime Minister, David Cameron, promised to Scots more independence, if they chose to stay in United Kingdom. That might be the most convincing argument for those, who did not know what to vote for – kind of a compromise.

Consequences of Scottish independence.

Taking into account that the Scottish independence wouldn't be effective until March 2016, 17 months from the actual referendum, we would need to consider some ongoing consequences, for Europe, the United Kingdom and Scotland.

Regarding Europe:

The main consequence for the European Union would be the "domino effect". Scottish independence would give a boost to nationalist areas that exist within the EU; it would set an example of feasibility and could also show what the effects are, for both the remaining country and the new one on its own and out of the EU.

The president of Eurasia Group, Ian Bremmer, expressed in an interview with Business Insider that he does not expect Scotland to vote for independence but if they did this effect would spread out in other European nationalisms: "If this happens, the risk of contagion in Europe is very real."⁸

Scotland leaving the EU:

Scotland would have to leave the EU in case they decide to leave the United Kingdom; this means Scotland would no longer be a member of the European Union. They would have to renegotiate their EU membership if it became independent in March 2016.

José Manuel Barroso, President of the European Commission, sent a letter to the House of Lords, in which he warned that "if a territory of a Member State ceases to be part of this, because it has become independent, it would leave the applicable treaties"⁹. It was stipulated by the European Commission in 2004, that a new independent nation "becomes a third country with respect to the Union."¹⁰

If Scotland voted for independence, it would become a third state to the EU, and for re-joining the Union it would have to get a unanimous vote from all the current members. The risk is that countries that are facing problems with nationalism within their territories would probably vote "no" to Scotland's membership.

⁸Si Escocia vota por la independencia, el "efecto contagio" arrasará por Europa, http://lacartadelabolsa.com/leer/articulo/si_escocia_vota_por_la_independencia_el_efecto_contagio_arrasar_a_por_europa

⁹Barroso afirma que una Escocia soberana quedaría fuera de la UE, <http://www.elperiodico.com/es/noticias/internacional/barroso-afirma-que-una-escocia-soberana-queraria-fuera-2267946>

¹⁰Una Escocia independiente saldría de la UE, según Barroso, http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2012/12/06/actualidad/1354816300_973474.html

Eurasia Group President, Ian Bremmer, said "that would be incredibly difficult, precisely because countries like Spain and Belgium have an incentive to prevent attachment of Scotland given their own situation."¹¹

The most immediate consequence would be demographic. Absence from the EU would mean that Scottish citizens would not be allowed to move freely around Europe without a passport or visa etc. Similarly, European citizens would not be able to freely enter Scotland.

As for the economic impact: the economic consequences of leaving the EU would be the most important. The departure of Scotland from the EU would affect the commercial treaties, agreements, laws and tariffs with the EU. "The Royal Bank of Scotland (RBS) and Lloyds have warned that if independence is granted, their headquarters would relocate to London."¹²

It would also affect the foreign investment for new companies that wish to install in Scotland.

Economic Consequences.

First of all, currency. So far the currency used in Scotland is the British Pound, but it stands to reason that if they were to become independent this would change.

Scotland could consider 3 different scenarios,

the first option would be keeping the pound; although it is the most convenient and logical choice, Scotland would lose power over decision-making in areas such as interest rates, inflation or exchange rate. These issues would become only matter of the Bank of England. The Scottish Government would want to reach an agreement with the British Government by which the Bank of Scotland could coordinate with the Bank of England monetary policies. It would be a "monetary union" that would allow the Bank of Scotland to review and participate in decisions that directly affect its interests. The main problem with this plan is that the 3 main parties in Westminster have already said they are opposed to this union. In the case of Scotland deciding to maintain the pound, it would be out of a "monetary union" which could reduce financial security.

The second option would be to join the €, but this solution could not be feasible until Scotland is accepted in the European Union, which would not occur until 2018. If this was the case, Scotland would lose the competitiveness that the British Pound offers.

¹¹Si Escocia vota por la independencia, el "efecto contagio" arrasará por Europa
http://lacartadelabolsa.com/imprimir/articulo/si_escocia_vota_por_la_independencia_el_efecto_contagio_ar_rasara_por_europa

¹² RBS y Lloyds se trasladarán a Londres si gana la independencia
http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/09/11/mercados/1410420906_026949.html

Finally, creating its own currency. The disadvantage in this case is that for a long period of time interest would be extremely high until it's credibility is proven. Who is going to suffer the most if this happens? Companies and businesses that would have to pay more in order to protect themselves from exchange rate fluctuations.

Another major economic uncertainty would be the British debt, which is guaranteed by the Treasury in London. If the debt was to be divided in relation to the population, Scotland would get 1/12 of the British national debt.

Scotland would have two options;

to accept the debt. Scotland would start its life as an independent country with a large expensive debt. The interest payable would be higher than one originally paid by England and the Treasury in London would now be both the creditor and debtor. This increase should be compensated somehow by tax increases or cuts in public spending. Also, Scotland should ensure a solid source of income to meet the debt; in this case it would be oil, but relying on a single source is not the smartest thing, considering that it is limited and prices fluctuate easily.

The second option for Scotland would be to ignore the debt. This option would allow the new country to start from scratch, with no debt or deficit. Even though it would be the most practical alternative it would also have some negative consequences. Scotland would give an unstable image causing mistrust of potential investors. This would mean having problems in the future when it comes to funding and would face possible retaliatory measures adopted by the UK.

Another important issue to address about the economic consequences is oil, since 90% of British oil is obtained from the Scottish coast.

In 2012, 67% of the oil and 53% of gas demand in the UK was covered with oil from the British oil fields. Although in recent years the production has declined, the North Sea will generate about 54,000 million pounds of revenue in the next five years. It is a very powerful source of income that causes neither party is planning to waive those sites.

Scotland would claim 90% of the sites maintaining that they are in Scottish territory, but still Scotland would ask the UK for assistance to remove 300 platforms. Likewise Scotland says to tackle price fluctuations creating two funds, one in the short-term for price variants and another to ensure the maintenance of long-term deposits.

The UK also has its own plans for these oil wells, first to maximize the extraction of crude oil, allowing private sector cooperation. In this sense the UK would be more capable than an independent Scotland, to address both investment and market fluctuations.

Since the central government is supporting the Scottish public spending, both taxes and benefits and social support are a relevant point.

Public spending per person in Scotland is higher than the average in the rest of the UK. If separation occurs, Scotland would have to take care of this public spending. In 2016 the new tax policy would be decided with the new Scottish government. Since the UK would not be liable for the tax benefits received we can not predict with certainty what will be the policy of taxes, benefits or social assistance.

Political consequences.

If Scotland was to be independent it would have several policy implications both for Scotland and for the UK.

Prime Minister, David Cameron, has been one of the major players in the Scottish independence, since it was he who allowed the referendum. This is the reason for doubts about its continuation in government if Scotland had voted "yes". He said he would not resign his post, however, this would not have been prevented if both his party and the opposition had launched a parliamentary censure vote, due to both Labour and Conservative acting under the "British Union" philosophy.

Also, the next general elections would be held before Scotland had obtained full independence. Elections can't be postponed by 10 months, therefore Scots would take part in the vote and their elected representatives would have to leave Westminster on the day of independence (March 16, 2016)

One of the most controversial issues is the nuclear fleet. In this case the injured part would be the UK. The Royal Navy nuclear submarines are based in the deep water port of Faslane, West of Glasgow.

Scotland has announced that they want to be a nuclear free country, so in the case of becoming independent, Scotland would require the UK to remove from Scottish waters four nuclear submarines by 2020.

This transfer would be possible since there are several options for changing the location of the submarines. Potential new locations would be Milford Haven in Wales or Plymouth. The problem would lie in close proximity to urban centers that can complicate the transfer of nuclear material. Another alternative could be sharing basis with an allied country, the more likely being the basis of King's Bay, Georgia (USA). Although the options are manifold the transfer would be very expensive and would delay or nullify strategic projects in defense and also take more time than the Scottish parliament has estimated. Therefore the transfer may be effective by year 2028 if there were no mishaps.

Apart from the harbor, the Trident missiles are kept in a separate tank, in Coulport. This tank was created for the sole purpose of storing those missiles in concrete structures, so the tank has very specific characteristics and is equipped especially for storage missiles and warheads.

In addition to economic and political issues, another aspect must be taken into account; national defense.

The budget for the new Scotland would be € 2.5 billion and the army would be composed of an air force of 12 Typhoon aircraft, six transports Hercules and a helicopter squadron, with 2,000 troops plus 3,500 soldiers. Currently these soldiers serve in the British army, so the Scottish soldiers would be given the option to join the Scottish army or remain with the British Royal Navy.

Although Scotland wants to remain part of NATO, their stay would not be insured in the event of independence. Scotland should apply for the membership and member states would have to unanimously accept. It is thought that Scotland would struggle to get the unilateral vote, due to their plans to move from its shores the nuclear material currently stored there. Des Browne, former Secretary of State and Defense, says "a vote to leave the United Kingdom is a vote to leave NATO, the defense and security alliance most successful in the world."¹³

Ultimately Scottish independence would undermine both politically and economically, as well as the defense of the Union. The value of the pound decreased days before the referendum, and it is estimated that British growth would be one percent lower if Scotland left the Union. Also, debt and oil issues are still unsolved, which would mean a loss of revenue for England if Scotland kept the oil and turned down their share of the debt.

For Scotland it would not be easy either since its future would be uncertain and would depend on many factors. Large companies in the oil industry as well as major banks would abandon Scotland to relocate in London; some others would reduce their investment in the new country. Scotland would have to bear the consequences of either accepting or not accepting the debt, which in both cases would be negative and as a result would lead to a big problem with both currency and EU membership.

If everything is favorable for Scotland it could end up becoming an even more powerful country than the UK. *Robert Rowthorn, professor emeritus of economics at the University of Cambridge, thinks Scotland could end up ahead. If they refuse to pay debt and oil revenues stay high, he says, the long-term outlook could be quite good. But the initial transitional period, he predicts, will be tough. "They're spending money on this and that. Where are they going to get it from?" Rowthorn said. "They will just have to tighten their belts for a decade."*¹⁴

¹³ What Happens if Scotland Votes for Independence?
<http://time.com/3318806/scotland-independence-guide/>

¹⁴ What's the Worst That Could Happen if Scotland Leaves the U.K.?
<http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/what-s-the-worst-that-could-happen-if-scotland-leaves-the-u-k-20140917>

Other minor consequences.

The queen: Scotland wants to become a free state but want to continue to keep Queen Elizabeth II as the state's queen.

Stated by Salomon on September the 9th; "I want the Queen as head of state, including Queen of Scots in an independent Scotland" but added, "and, of course, one of the things that polls have shown this weekend, apart from a breakthrough campaign for the "yes" is the enthusiasm of the people of Scotland to have Her Majesty the Queen of Scots."¹⁵

Furthermore Queen Elizabeth II said:

"You have a very important vote on Thursday. I hope everyone thinks very carefully about the referendum"¹⁶ Implying that she supported the "no" campaign.

Sports: In terms of football nothing would change because Scotland has its own league and Federation. It would change at the Olympic level, whereby the athletes would begin to compete as an independent country.

National Anthem: Currently Scotland uses the "God Save the Queen" anthem but if they became independent they would chose another anthem by ballot.

¹⁵ Salmond dice que Isabel II estaría "orgullosa" de ser Reina de Escocia
<http://ecodiario.eleconomista.es/politica/noticias/6064499/09/14/Salmond-dice-que-Isabel-II-estaria-orgullosa-de-ser-Reina-de-Escocia.html#.Kku86wAPrOf1YNv>

¹⁶<http://www.abc.es/internacional/20140914/abci-queen-england-scotland-201409141854.html>

Reference sources:

- History of Scotland
 - <http://lewebpedagogique.com/.../ecosse-vs-angleterre-les.../>
 - <http://www.lexpress.fr/.../ecossais-vs-anglais-le-jeu-des...>
 - <http://www.scotland.org/about-scotland/scottish-history/>
- Reasons for Scotland to vote Yes Vs No
 - www.independentscotland.org
 - <http://www.stefczyk.info/wiadomosci/raporty-stefczyk-info/szkocja-decyduje-o-niepodleglosci-nasz-raport,11710714055>
 - <http://www.tvn24.pl/szkocja-referendum,3913,t>
- Should Scotland be an independent country ?
 - http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2013/13/pdfs/asp_20130013_en.pdf, checked on October 18th 2014;
 - <https://www.scotreferendum.com/information/>, checked on October 22nd 2014;
 - <http://www.economist.com/blogs/blighty/2014/09/scotlands-referendum>, checked on October 20th 2014;
 - Her Majesty's Government
 - <https://www.youdecide2014.uk/>
 - <https://www.scotreferendum.com/2014/09/first-minister-on-referendum-outcome/>, checked on October 25th 2014;
 - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Kvr_SbDgpAo, checked on October 24th 2014;
- Consequences of the Scotland's independence
 - <http://www.alumnigs.com/>
 - <http://www.lucidez.pe/noticias/si-hubiera-ganado-el-si-escoces>
 - <http://www.dailysabah.com/opinion/2014/09/17/the-consequences-of-scottish-dependence>
 - <http://www.nationaljournal.com/politics/what-s-the-worst-that-could-happen-if-scotland-leaves-the-u-k-20140917>
 - <http://time.com/3318806/scotland-independence-guide/>
 - <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/scotland-independence-vote-everything-you-ever-wanted-to-know-about-life-after-this-weeks-result-9731654.html>
 - <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/?fa=54458>
 - <http://www.abc.es/internacional/20140912/abci-sacar-flota-nuclear-escocia-201409112040.html>
 - <http://www.fundspeople.com/noticias/consecuencias-de-la-independencia-de-escocia-analisis-en-profundidad-de-las-implicaciones-para-la-economia-y-los-mercados-151678>
 - http://www.elconfidencial.com/mundo/2014-09-16/el-mundo-empresarial-escoces-dividido-sobre-las-consecuencias-de-la-independencia_197410/
 - http://www.elconfidencial.com/mundo/2014-09-16/escocia-y-la-crucial-papeleta-del-oro-negro_196741/
 - <http://www.portafolio.co/internacional/consecuencias-independencia-escocia-septiembre-2014>
 - http://elpais.com/elpais/2013/11/19/opinion/1384866108_814238.html
 - http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/09/17/mercados/1410975980_165827.html
 - http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/09/11/mercados/1410420906_026949.html

- http://cincodias.com/cincodias/2014/09/09/mercados/1410270421_345074.html
- http://internacional.elpais.com/internacional/2012/12/06/actualidad/1354816300_973474.html
- <http://www.elperiodico.com/es/noticias/internacional/barroso-afirma-que-una-escocia-soberana-que-daria-fuera-2267946>
- <http://www.vozbcn.com/2012/12/07/136257/bruselas-escocia-fuera-unione/>
- <http://www.vozbcn.com/2012/10/30/132726/ue-privado-secesion-unilateral/>