
Declare Independence

Posted by scunnert - 2008/07/10 03:34

{youtube}igOWR_-BXJU{/youtube}

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/10 13:38

This is a copy of a reply to a blog on independence I knew I had taken a copy but could not find it but here it is see what you think.

The Act of Union included the right of the Scottish Legal system and Constitution to remain applicable to Scotland. The reality of the Act of Union was and is that only the people of Scotland as Sovereign can empower any act of a servant Scottish government.

This was never done, and legally Scotland was never part of the Union, because the signatories were never authorised to commit to the dissolution of the Scottish Parliament.

The Scottish and English Parliaments were never ever dissolved, that is a matter of public record. The Westminster Parliament was empowered whilst two parliaments were fully operational.

It is a matter of legal right that the Scottish People can resume the Scottish Parliament at anytime.

It is also a fact that the Westminster Parliament cannot overrule the Scottish courts or Constitution, which are based on the Sovereignty of the People versus the Sovereignty of a later Parliament that had a partner who wasn't authorised to sign for Scotland.

Check the timing and terms of the Scottish Constitution to check the facts. There is no record of the Scottish People agreeing in any form of plebiscite that decided the transfer of the Countries government to London.

There is the rights of the Scottish Legal System which was based on the Scottish Constitution, in the Act of Union.

I cannot go into a bank and sign a cheque for my wife's account no matter what. The members of the Scottish Parliament were never empowered to sign the Union Cheque that cost Scots so much. Only the Sovereign could do that and in that case they did not.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acts_of_Union_1707

<http://personal.pitnet.net/primarysources/act.html>

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by scunnert - 2008/07/11 07:28

R.D.Laing:

" Our mutually shared hallucinations are what we call reality, and our collusive madness - sanity."

I may have paraphrased - it's been a long time - 'The Politics of Experience'.

Point is reality is whatever we say it is. So why aren't we challenging the union more aggressively?

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/11 16:50

scunnert wrote:

R.D.Laing:

" Our mutually shared hallucinations are what we call reality, and our collusive madness - sanity."

I may have paraphrased - it's been a long time - 'The Politics of Experience'.

Point is reality is whatever we say it is. So why aren't we challenging the union more aggressively?

We probably need a leader who will

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by dws - 2008/07/11 17:28

LYDIA REID wrote:

scunnert wrote:

R.D.Laing:

" Our mutually shared hallucinations are what we call reality, and our collusive madness - sanity."

I may have paraphrased - it's been a long time - 'The Politics of Experience'.

Point is reality is whatever we say it is. So why aren't we challenging the union more aggressively?

We probably need a leader who will

I thought we had one....dry:

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/11 17:38

dws wrote:

LYDIA REID wrote:

scunnert wrote:

R.D.Laing:

" Our mutually shared hallucinations are what we call reality, and our collusive madness - sanity."

I may have paraphrased - it's been a long time - 'The Politics of Experience'.

Point is reality is whatever we say it is. So why aren't we challenging the union more aggressively?

We probably need a leader who will

I thought we had one....dry:

I think so but maybe we are all feeling a little impatient, maybe he has a lot more to give, how do we know.

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by dws - 2008/07/11 20:09

LYDIA REID wrote:

I think so but maybe we are all feeling a little impatient, maybe he has a lot more to give, how do we know.

Look at the mountain he has to climb!

He's probably displaying more fortitude than I would, if I was being honest. He's only human, he'll make mistakes, but I believe he actually cares about Scotland's people.

I hope I'm right.

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/11 21:20

dws wrote:

LYDIA REID wrote:

I think so but maybe we are all feeling a little impatient, maybe he has a lot more to give, how do we know.

Look at the mountain he has to climb!

He's probably displaying more fortitude than I would, if I was being honest. He's only human, he'll make mistakes, but I believe he actually cares about Scotland's people.

I hope I'm right.

That much I am absolutely sure of he does care but we are all subject to the decisions we make in life and I hope he is wise enough to do enough right. Already it will be difficult for him to keep all the promises he made and felt sure he could keep. He simply does not have the money due to the Barnett settlement and now the rumblings are that they will find a way to reduce even that by changing the format.

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by Clare - 2008/07/12 14:30

I think the blog piece is interesting Lydia but I think most of it is irrelevant to where we are right now. All this "The Scottish people....." stuff is certainly aggressive and passionate and patriotic but in reality it means nothing politically. We are part of the UK right now and in due course hopefully that will change but right now we can't simply use a hopelessly romantic blog to justify declaring ourselves independent.

Salmond in my view is an excellent Leader and is very gifted in many ways. At times however, in Glasgow East last week for example, I felt disappointed in him. Declaring that an "earthquake" was about to take place politically there was silly I think. I think the SNP could take it, don't get me wrong, but talk like that is foolish. The SNP candidate has so far disappointed also. Why on earth did he have a go at Curran for considering drawing two salaries when Salmond is already doing that? I don't have a problem with Salmond doing that so why is a Nationalist having a go at Curran about it? Why isn't he talking on real issues?

Like a government currently sitting back ignoring the full-scale recession that has arrived? They could have done more, they still could. Why is he not talking about that? The construction industry is now in meltdown fast on the heels of the mortgage industry. The banks are doing nothing! The economy could be stabilised and Brown knows how to do that. Why isn't Mason asking Brown why he isn't doing it in order to limit the damage? Why isn't he talking about fuel? So the postponement of the 2p increase in October, we need action now on fuel: the crisis is here already on fuel. Yet Mason can only taunt Curran about having two salaries. And what about Marshall, the current Labour MP? What about his half a million claimed to run his office and pay TWO staff?

This by-election could be won by the SNP if they do it properly. Rising to Curran's way of playing will win them nothing. She's an old hand and she will wipe the floor with Mason if he doesn't wise up.

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/12 16:58

Clare wrote:

I think the blog piece is interesting Lydia but I think most of it is irrelevant to where we are right now. All this "The Scottish people....." stuff is certainly aggressive and passionate and patriotic but in reality it means nothing politically. We are part of the UK right now and in due course hopefully that will change but right now we can't simply use a hopelessly romantic blog to justify declaring ourselves independent.

Salmond in my view is an excellent Leader and is very gifted in many ways. At times however, in Glasgow East last week for example, I felt disappointed in him. Declaring that an "earthquake" was about to take place politically there was

silly I think. I think the SNP could take it, don't get me wrong, but talk like that is foolish. The SNP candidate has so far disappointed also. Why on earth did he have a go at Curran for considering drawing two salaries when Salmond is already doing that? I don't have a problem with Salmond doing that so why is a Nationalist having a go at Curran about it? Why isn't he talking on real issues?

Like a government currently sitting back ignoring the full-scale recession that has arrived? They could have done more, they still could. Why is he not talking about that? The construction industry is now in meltdown fast on the heels of the mortgage industry. The banks are doing nothing! The economy could be stabilised and Brown knows how to do that. Why isn't Mason asking Brown why he isn't doing it in order to limit the damage? Why isn't he talking about fuel? Sod the postponement of the 2p increase in October, we need action now on fuel: the crisis is here already on fuel. Yet Mason can only taunt Curran about having two salaries. And what about Marshall, the current Labour MP? What about his half a million claimed to run his office and pay TWO staff?

This by-election could be won by the SNP if they do it properly. Rising to Curran's way of playing will win them nothing. She's an old hand and she will wipe the floor with Mason if he doesn't wise up.

Romantic it may be but if this is true then the Scottish Government need only hold a successful referendum and then simply declare independence with no agreement from Westminster.

My Scottish history is not good enough to state whether or not this is true. If it is would publication of these facts make a difference to elections, referendum, the whole attitude of the Scottish people.

It would also make an enormous difference when asking for the return of what is ours.

Considering the flack Alex Salmond took over the fact that he wanted to wait before resigning as an MP I think he deserves a little retaliation. I think you will find he only actually takes one salary.

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/scotland/6271072.stm>

In this by-election I believe he is being careful what he promises because as much as SNP want to win he cannot promise anything will happen in Westminster because of the work of the SNP.

I agree he could criticize more. There is a lot to say in that area.

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by Clare - 2008/07/12 20:18

Lydia

I'm not having a go at Salmond on the salary issue. Actually I think if he's doing two jobs he's worth both salaries personally. I also know his voting record at Westminster is better than many of Labour's finest. What I'm saying is that if the two-salary issue was the best Mason could come up with against Curran then the SNP lack imagination and courage because he could bury her on many other more relevant topics.

A referendum? That's a different scenario altogether. That route is the one which recognises we ARE currently part of the UK: the blog earlier denied that by stating the "Scottish people" hadn't signed up to the Union and questioned the existence of the Union all this time. That was what I termed romantic nonsense and regardless of who signed what it simply wastes time. Its been 300 years for God's sake, we can hardly say now we didn't authorise it or that we aren't currently a part of it. We are. We need to focus on the way out of it provided that is what the majority of people in Scotland want.

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/12 22:15

Clare wrote:
Lydia

I'm not having a go at Salmond on the salary issue. Actually I think if he's doing two jobs he's worth both salaries personally. I also know his voting record at Westminster is better than many of Labour's finest. What I'm saying is that if the two-salary issue was the best Mason could come up with against Curran then the SNP lack imagination and courage because he could bury her on many other more relevant topics.

A referendum? That's a different scenario altogether. That route is the one which recognises we ARE currently part of the UK: the blog earlier denied that by stating the "Scottish people" hadn't signed up to the Union and questioned the existence of the Union all this time. That was what I termed romantic nonsense and regardless of who signed what it simply wastes time. Its been 300 years for God's sake, we can hardly say now we didn't authorise it or that we aren't currently a part of it. We are. We need to focus on the way out of it provided that is what the majority of people in Scotland want.

Hi Claire

of course focusing on a way out is important. But if this is all true then this may be the legal way out and to take back what is ours. I am sure if this is all true better minds than mine will find the right way to use it and the right time.

My hope is Mason will simply bury Curran's mouth.

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by scunnert - 2008/07/13 03:57

dws wrote:

LYDIA REID wrote:

I think so but maybe we are all feeling a little impatient, maybe he has a lot more to give, how do we know.

Look at the mountain he has to climb!

He's probably displaying more fortitude than I would, if I was being honest. He's only human, he'll make mistakes, but I believe he actually cares about Scotland's people.

I hope I'm right.

I believe you are dws - I'd be totally useless as a politician - I'd have an amygdala moment the minute those wee feckers opened their mouths to spout their lies. I suspect Alex is exercising a lot of discipline to hold his tongue. I respect Alex Salmond, but I am no sycophant. Perhaps that's the difference between nationalists and unionists - we hold our leaders to account.

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by Clare - 2008/07/13 21:02

"My hope is Mason will simply bury Curran's mouth."

You think there is a crater big enough to hold it on this planet?:S

=====

Re:Declare Independence

Posted by LYDIA REID - 2008/07/13 21:20

Clare wrote:

"My hope is Mason will simply bury Curran's mouth."

You think there is a crater big enough to hold it on this planet?:S

Naaaaaaaa I was exaggerating sorry

=====

