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## List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA</td>
<td>Euskadi Ta Askatasuna: Basque separatist organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT</td>
<td>General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Great Britain: England, Scotland and Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCPR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICJ</td>
<td>International Court of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Member of Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Partido Popular: People’s Party of Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSOE</td>
<td>Partido Socialista Obrero Español: Spanish Socialist Workers’ Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Scottish National Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPO</td>
<td>Unrepresented Nations &amp; Peoples Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>confer/conferatur: compare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>edition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>exempli gratia: for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>et cetera: and the rest, and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.</td>
<td>page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

I have always had a special passion for maps. Huge pieces of land, mountains and rivers interrupted by random lines. These lines have been drawn throughout history by people, their wars and conquests, their will to protect their land or to expand their territory. Beyond the maps and their blurred boundaries lie the story of the people, a dilemma between protecting the past and constructing the future. In the legend of most maps, you will only find 193 states, those who are part of the "United Nations" and have the right to call themselves "states". What about the rest? What stories do people across the dotted lines of our world map have to tell? I started to wonder. What are obviously geopolitical conflicts affect millions of people around the world. Why do they not have the right to be a state? Who dictates the rules? Who can change the situation? Most importantly, what is it that people want that they do not have the feeling they can get in their current situation?

I started to focus my attention on entities that are not part of the United Nations, want to separate from their current state and establish a new one. From a high number of separatist groups around the world, I chose to concentrate on the most advanced cases. After due research and consideration, I chose to compare the cases of Catalonia and Scotland, two European entities that had been independent in the past and have shown much dissatisfaction with their current autonomy. My research is based on primary and secondary literature, international law texts, textbooks, newspaper articles, statistics and databases, which provide for the theoretical point of view. In order to better understand
the issue from a practical point of view as well, I conducted 6 qualitative, semi-structured interviews with three people from each entity.

My goal through this thesis is to understand and try to propose an explanation on why people whose fundamental human rights are respected and who have a certain quality of life in a Western Democracy still strive for more self-determination than the autonomy that they have already been granted and what they hope to achieve through a new independent state. In order to do so, my leading questions are:

1.2 Research Questions

1. How did the current discrepancies regarding the legitimacy of states come to place?
2. What are the options available to people who strive for self-determination beyond autonomy?
3. Why do certain ethnic groups want independence and what do they want to achieve through it?

1. How did the current discrepancies regarding the legitimacy of states come to place?
This chapter depicts how it came about that our world currently revolves around so called nation-states, and therefore work on the definition of different terms (2.1): "state" (2.1.1), "nation" (2.1.2), and the peoples who do not have their own nation-state: "ethnic groups" and "minorities" (2.1.3). Because one way to regulate inter-ethnic relationships is through the use of international law (2.2), the basic principles of international law and who it applies to will be presented (2.2.1), as well as special conditions offered to people who do not possess their own nation-state (2.2.2). After having approached one particular aspect of inter-ethnic relationships in the form of ethnic conflict (2.3.1), separatist movements around the world (2.3.2) who are not satisfied with their current situation will be introduced, concentrating on Catalonia and Scotland and explaining the selection process of these two entities (2.3.3). Subsequently,
I will apply these theoretical components to the cases of Catalonia and Scotland (2.4).

2. What are the options available to peoples who strive for self-determination?

In this Chapter, I will discuss the concept of self-determination through its definition (3.1), the aspects that cause people to claim it (3.2), and how it has been interpreted throughout history (3.3). I will look at different authors and whether they consider that secession can be a last resort and in which conditions (3.4), and present different alternatives to secession (3.5).

3. Why do certain ethnic groups want independence and what do they want to achieve through it?

After having described the current world order and the self-determination discourse, I will proceed with the interview analysis. I will present a summary of each interview (4.2), and later compile the most relevant information gathered according to topics (4.3) in order to determine similarities and differences and be able to draw conclusions regarding the reasons and conditions behind the minorities secessionist claims.

* 

You can find the full transcription of the interviews in Appendices A and B. The electronic version of this work contains clickable links, which appear in a red colour. The bibliography, as well as the list of tables and figures, can be found at the very end of the document.
Chapter 2

The Current World Order

Our international system is based on the existence and legitimacy of “nation-states”, a concept which legal basis originated from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. From then on, the principles of sovereignty, territoriality and autonomy have been forming the basis of the international legal system. Some groups of people "won the historical lottery of the Westphalian system"\(^1\) and the right to govern their own sovereign state. Most of the sovereign states are now members of the United Nations, some enjoy their independence outside this system. Those who were neither lucky nor powerful enough to gain control of their territory and establish their authority and legitimacy internationally remain "stateless nations", also known as "national minorities".\(^2\) There are far more national minorities in the world than there are states, and separatist movements seeking territoriality and thus possible statehood keep challenging our current world structure.

In this chapter, we will define (2.1) the terminology necessary to understand the discourse around secessionist claims, such as following terms: "state" (2.1.1), "nation" (2.1.2), and "minorities" (2.1.3). We will then look at fundamental aspects of International Law (2.2), who it applies to, and which rights and duties it confers to states, non-state actors (2.2.1), and minorities (2.2.2). Finally, we will have a look at how ethnic conflicts arise (2.3.1) and how they can sometimes turn into separatist movements (2.3.2), some example of which I will present before explaining my choice of Catalonia and Scotland (2.3.3).

\(^1\) Chouinard, 2016, 54.
\(^2\) cf. Chouinard, 2016, 73.
2.1 Differentiation of terms

Is Scotland a country, a state? Are Catalans a nation, an ethnic group, a minority? In everyday language, the words "state", "country", "nation" are being used interchangeably. Words like "ethnicity", "ethnic group", national or ethnic "minority" are often used as synonyms. In order to offer clarity, I intent to illustrate how these words are employed in international law and by academic authors in comparison with colloquial use. Table 2.1 contains definitions selected out of the Oxford dictionary for British English and Merriam-Webster dictionary for American English. While studying these words, one realizes that in everyday language, many of the definitions intertwine with each other, that one word is often used to define another, and it is difficult to find a clear definition to differentiate each term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Oxford</th>
<th>Merriam-Webster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>• a nation with its own government, occupying a particular territory&lt;br&gt;• the people of a nation</td>
<td>• the land of a person’s birth, residence, or citizenship&lt;br&gt;• the people of a state or district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>• a nation or territory considered as an organized political community under one government&lt;br&gt;• the civil government of a country</td>
<td>• a politically organized body of people usually occupying a definite territory; especially: one that is sovereign&lt;br&gt;• the political organization of such a body of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation</td>
<td>• a large body of people united by common descent, history, culture, or language, inhabiting a particular state or territory&lt;br&gt;• a North American Indian people or confederation of peoples</td>
<td>• a) a politically organized nationality.&lt;br&gt;b) a community of people composed of one or more nationalities and possessing a more or less defined territory and government&lt;br&gt;c) a territorial division containing a body of people of one or more nationalities and usually characterized by relatively large size and independent status&lt;br&gt;• a tribe or federation of tribes (as of American Indians)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1. Differentiation of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nation-state</td>
<td>- a sovereign state of which most of the citizens or subjects are united also by factors which define a nation, such as language or common descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- a form of political organization under which a relatively homogeneous people inhabits a sovereign state; especially: a state containing one as opposed to several nationalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| nationality | - the status of belonging to a particular nation  
| | - an ethnic group forming a part of one or more political nations |
| | - a) National status; specifically: a legal relationship involving allegiance on the part of an individual and usually protection on the part of the state nationality bestowed by birth  
| | b) Membership in a particular nation |
| citizenship | - the position or status of being a citizen of a particular country |
| | - a) a member of a state  
| | b) A native or naturalized person who owes allegiance to a government and is entitled to protection from it |
| stateless | - (of a person) not recognized as a citizen of any country |
| | - having no state  
| | - lacking the status of a national |
| minority | - a small group of people within a community or country, differing from the main population in race, religion, language, or political persuasion |
| | - a part of a population differing from others in some characteristics and often subjected to differential treatment: the country’s ethnic minorities |
| ethnicity | - the fact or state of belonging to a social group that has a common national or cultural tradition |
| | - a particular ethnic affiliation or group |
| ethnic minority | - a group within a community which has different national or cultural traditions from the main population |
| | - people who belong to an ethnic group that is a relatively small part of a population |

A **country** can define where a person was born or lives, it can mean a **nation** or the people of this nation or of a **state**, and should have its own **government** on a particular **territory**. A **state**, in colloquial use, is not very different. It describes a **nation** or politically organized community whose government’s power spreads over a specific **territory**. While territory and government play a role in
all three terms of country, state and nation, aspects such as culture, history, language only comes in play when talking about a nation. According to Merriam-Webster, a nation can include more nationalities, is usually quite large and has an independent status. As of nation-state, a concept uniting two different terms, we can find keywords such as sovereignty, language or common descent, homogeneity and one nation rather than several. One can express the state they officially belong to through their citizenship, or nationality. According to Merriam-Webster, both nationality and citizenship can mean membership to a state. This dictionary points out a sort of allegiance-protection relationship between the person and the state, while Oxford differentiates nationality as being part of a nation while citizenship is being part of a country.

The definitions of the word stateless illustrates very well how the terms are being used in an interchangeable way. Being stateless involves, for Oxford, not being a citizen of any country, and for Merriam-Webster, not having a state or national status.

It is important to keep in mind that:

* Countries and states are used as synonyms, but in international law, they are referred to as "states".
* There are many more nations than there are states, therefore, not all nations have their own state.
* Nationality and citizenship being an official status, not all nations have their own nationality or citizenship. (eg. Kurds in Iraq have Iraqi citizenship, people born in Northern Ireland are entitled to both UK and Irish citizenship and nationality.) Many people live in a country whose nationality or citizenship they don’t have.
* Not all people from the same "race" or "ethnic group" build the same nation.
* A state can be home to more than one nation. (eg. Russia)
* No existing state is comprised of only one nation, as illustrated by ethnonation fractionalization indexes, which range from 1 (maximum fractionalization) to 0 (no fractionalization). The least fractionalized states, where the most people are from the same ethnic group, is currently North Korea.\(^3\)

\(^3\) We will go deeper into fractionalization in section 2.3.1.
2.1. Differentiation of terms

* One nation can be split between several states. (eg. Roma, Kurds)
* All states can be called countries but not all countries are states. (eg. The UK has four home nations, or constituent countries: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. They form the British nation.)

Now that we have seen how the terms are commonly used in everyday language, we will proceed with academic definitions, starting with the concept of "state".

### 2.1.1 What is a state?

In the eyes of international law, to be recognized as such, a "state" must prove its sovereignty to other existing states by showing the following characteristics, also known as Georg Jellinek’s 3 Elements:

- a defined territory
- a permanent population, whereby language, ethnicity, religion and cultural homogeneity are irrelevant, unlike a certain sense of belonging to a particular state
- a state authority that must prove its efficiency rather than its legitimacy, in the sense that a government can be in power without having been selected in a democratic way\(^4\)

The "Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States" of 1933 added a fourth Element to the already existing ones:

- the ability to build relationships with other states

The effect of recognizing states have been prone to debate. The earlier paradigm required a state to be accepted by a majority for its recognition to have "constitutive" effect. It has been replaced by the general opinion that the effect should be declaratory, meaning that the existence of a state does not depend on its acceptance by other states.\(^5\)

Nevertheless if a state wants to act on the international scene, it cannot just declare its existence and ignore other states’ reaction. The reason why states act according to international law is explained by the principle of reciprocity.

---


Only by following the agreed upon rules can a state expect the same from others, and not complying could lead to reprisal. For this reason, many states chose to internalize international law in their own constitution and laws.

States can recognize others *expressly* (by issuing a statement) or by *implication* (by establishing diplomatic relations or signing treaties). When an already existing state decides to recognize a newly created one, they can include demands regarding minority rights or democratic structures in a bilateral recognition agreement. Herdegen, director of the institute of international law and institute for public law at the University of Bonn, reminds that the international community tries to avoid the recognition of new states born out of wars and sets criteria such as compliance to the UN Charter and the guarantee of minority rights.6

### 2.1.2 What is a nation?

The word nation and the idea behind it have developed much throughout history, through their discussion by many authors and international lawyers. In this section, we will see how the concept developed since the middle of the 19th century up to now.

**Nation by Henry Wheaton (1864)**

The words nation, state and country have been used interchangeably for centuries. Already in the 19th century, people such as United States lawyer and diplomat Henry Wheaton found this use "incorrect" and tried to offer clear distinctions of the concepts in his 1864 Elements of International Law. A “nation,” in Wheaton’s view, implies “a community of race, which is generally shown by community of language, manners and customs”, whereas a country or state already included the aspect of a fixed territory under one central authority. A state “may be composed of different races of men, all subject to the same supreme authority” while a nation or people “may be subject to several states.” Wheaton noted that in ancient Rome, the philosopher and orator

---

Cicero defined a state as “a body politic, or society of men, united together for the purpose of promoting their mutual safety and advantage by their combined strength.”

**Ernest Renan’s Nation as a Spiritual Principle (1882)**

One of the most extensive definition of nation was provided by civilization expert, philosopher and historian Ernest Renan in his 1882 lecture at the Sorbonne. It shows the immense meaning behind one sole word and the difficulty to find one universal way to describe a concept. In his lecture, Renan suggested the analysis of an idea which appears clear but gives rise to "the most serious of misunderstandings"; the nation.

Since the fall of Charlemagne’s Empire and the Treaty of Verdun (843), which set the first boundaries of nowadays nation-states such as France, Germany, Italy or Spain, Western Europe has been divided into nations. During the 18th century and after centuries of "lowering", humankind finally returned to the antique spirit, to self-respect, and to the idea of rights. People were ready to acknowledged the existence of a national right. On which criteria shall national right be founded? From which principle shall it be derived? Renan considered following criteria to define a nation:

**Race** - Many people of the time suggested that one criteria be “race”, for it was considered "not artificial" and "fixed". For Renan, there are no true race and discussions about races are never-ending. As an example, the “Germanic family” was, at the time of the Scythes, mixed with the Slavs. There should be no concept of race in politics.

**Language** - Language invites unification, but does not force it. For Renan, there is something stronger than language: the will to be united. Switzerland does not need one language to build a state and Spain and Spanish speaking South America do not build a state for the sole reason of speaking the same

---

8 “Je me propose d’analyser avec vous une idée, claire en apparence, mais qui prête aux plus graves malentendus.” Renan, 1882, 1.
language. “Can we not have the same feelings and the same thoughts, love
the same things in different languages?”

**Religion** - For Renan, religion does not offer a sufficient basis for establishing
modern nationality. At its origin, religion was bound to families who practiced
it to reflect their belonging to a social group, to a city. Renan qualifies persecu-
tions by for example the Roman Empire to maintain a so called state religion
as a mistake, a crime, a true absurdity. Everyone should be able to follow their
conscience and chose a religion or none.

**Community of interests** - For Renan, interests should be reflected in trade
agreements and do not suffice to build a nation.

**Geography** - Natural boundaries play a significant role in dividing nations.
Rivers favored historical movements while mountains hindered them. When
are rivers and mountains separating or uniting? Can a nation demand passage
to a mountain or a river? According to Renan, this would be arbitrary and jus-
tify violence. Geography, like race, does not make a nation. Man is responsible
in the formation of a people, he is the soul out of which a nation, a spiritual
family, is born.

Nation, if not a race, not a language, not a community of interest, not a reli-
gion, not geographically bound, is, Renan argues, a **spiritual principle**, a soul.
What constitutes it lies in the past and the present. It is the common possession
of a large bunch of **memories** combined with consent and the **desire to live to-
gether**, to keep the common **heritage** alive. Nation, just like the individual, is
the result of a long past of efforts, sacrifices and devotion. Worshiping ances-
tors who have made us who we are, a **heroic past**, great personalities, glory, are
the bases of a national idea. **Common hopes**, regrets, joys and sufferings, for
suffering unites more than joy. When the existence of a nation is doubted, one
should ask its population. Man, his desires, his needs. What people want can
change, nations were born and will die. The highest ideal reality is humanity,
and each nation, through their various abilities, brings their part to it.

---

9 Renan, 1882
10 cf. Renan, 1882.
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Anderson’s Imagined Communities (1982)

Political scientist and historian Benedict Anderson, in "Imagined Communities", refers to nationalities as cultural artefacts. In order to understand these, it is important to look into how their meanings have developed throughout history and how they have been conferred such "emotional legitimacy". For Anderson, a nation is "an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign." Why imagined? Because even though no one in the world can pretend to know all the other members of the nation they belong to, an image of community exists in their mind. "In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined." Nations are imagined as limited because all of them have boundaries, across which live other nations. Due to the fact that the concept of nation rose in a time where divine, hierarchical dynastic realms were being destroyed by the Enlightenment, the communities are imagined as sovereign. Lastly, what is imagined is a community, a horizontal fraternity for which one is ready to sacrifice oneself. "Nations dream of being free"\textsuperscript{11}, and the sovereign state represents the highest freedom.

"If nation-states are widely conceded to be 'new' and 'historical', the nations to which they give political expression always loom out of an immemorial past, and, still more important, glide into a limitless future. It is the magic of nationalism to turn chance into destiny"\textsuperscript{12}

The propagation of printed materials in different European languages contributed heavily to the decline of the imagined community of Christendom and its main language Latin. Printing in vernacular languages, the language spoken in each respective country or region, allowed people to become aware of thousands or even million of other speakers of in their language-field and gave them the feeling of belonging together, or even that only these -never seen or thought of before- persons belonged to their community. This set the base for national consciousness.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} Anderson, 1983, 51.
Kai Nielsen’s Civic Nationalism (1999)

Nielsen, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Calgary, approaches the concept of cultural nationalism, and points out the fact that not all forms of nationalism are negative, but all seek to defend the cultural and material interests of a common nationality. National identity is very important for many people to determine a meaning to their lives and have a sense of security and belonging. Yet, Nielsen points out national identity should not be people’s deepest loyalty. Ethnic nationalism considers that you can only be part of the nation by inheritance and excludes anyone for whom it is not the case. Civic nationalism, on the other hand, create a nation that is theoretically open to anyone. In Nielsen’s definition, a nation must "be in aspiration (if not yet in fact) a political community. It must aspire to self-government, to in some way control "a chunk of the earth’s surface". In that way a nation is very different from something that is merely an ethnic group. "In some way" means that independence is not necessarily required, but at least a kind of self-governance.

Nation & Ethnicity by Lagerspetz (2004)

A nation, in today’s sense, is defined by its culture and political life and not by law. It is not a legal person, unlike the state. It is nevertheless the nation and the community behind it that gives the state the sovereignty it needs to be legitimate. This concept laid the basis for the creation of the modern state. Like Anderson, Olli Lagerspetz, senior lecturer of Philosophy at Åbo Akademi University, describes a nation as a horizontal community, where people are united by culture and politics. "The main function of a nation (...) is to provide a shared space for political and cultural life". Symbolic places (such as the Statue of Liberty for US-Americans, Kosovo Polje for Serbs) were created to address members of a nation and give them a tangible place to identify themselves, and their belonging to the nation, with. Lagerspetz warns we should be skeptical with such cultural engineering, because in their process of unifying

2.1. Differentiation of terms

certain people, they separate them from others. Yet it is inevitable for mem-
ers of imagined communities to see these points of reference as part of their heritage.

Commenting on Renan’s consideration of criteria for defining a nation, Lagerspetz’s impression is that Renan rejects ethnographic categories as a le-
gitimate reason to create a nation due to the fact that he (like many other aca-
demics of his time) "assumes that ethnic groups are something like racial cate-
gories. "Having dismissed race as a classifying principle, Renan argues in the
following section for the irrelevance of language- because language does not co-
incide with race. This puzzling argument is, perhaps, a symptom of the hold
that ideas of race had on academics at the time.""16

In Lagerspetz’ opinion, the relevance of attributes (descent, language, re-
ligion) is only valid if the individuals concerned think it should be. Quoting
Renan’s final words "man, his wishes, his needs", Lagerspetz stresses out that
people should be asked what is important to them, and we cannot know in
advance which characteristic it will be.

Ethnicity is, in Lagerspetz’ words, "an umbrella term for cultural features
and patterns of association that in fact establish social affiliations and divi-
sions."17 Ethnicity shows how human groups are organized socially. Because
people tend to associate with others who show similarities, what started as
cultural groups can become political. The difference between social classes
or castes and ethnic groups, is that the latter represents a group who might
develop into a whole society, for example a minority or nation. Up until the
twentieth century, ethnicity would imply "objective" criteria, attributes of peo-
ple that were easily recognizable (race, language, religion) and into which they
were born. Nowadays, ethnicity involves cultural aspects, which, as the name
implies, need to be cultivated by the individuals and in community and are
not necessarily innate.18

---

2.1.3 What is a minority?

There is an estimate of between 3000 to 6000 nations in the world, according to Stéphanie Chouinard, assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Royal Military College of Canada,\(^ {19}\) which means there are far more nations than states in the world. Despite various past efforts to make them so, states are rarely homogeneous, or home to one sole nation. Even through drastic measures such as forced assimilation or exclusion of minority groups, it is impossible to create a state with only one nation and one language. “Minorities are too numerous, and too politically conscious of their rights, to simply disappear,” claims Will Kymlicka, professor of philosophy at Queen’s University of Kingston, Canada.\(^ {20}\)

Etymologically speaking, a “minority” describes less than half of a whole, or a smaller number. When applied to people, a universally accepted and agreed upon definition of the concept minority does not exist.

"The term minority cannot for practical purposes be defined simply by interpreting the word in its literal sense. If this were the case, nearly all the communities existing within the state would be styled minorities, including families, social classes, cultural groups, speakers of dialects, etc. Such a definition would be useless."\(^ {21}\)

The term "minority" as been used to define cultural groups since its inclusion in peace treaties at the wake of the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. It referred to **numerically inferior groups of persons belonging "to racial, religious or linguistic minorities."

While the League of Nations confined minorities to a fixed geographical location, the United Nations has been tending to work towards a universal application of the concept.\(^ {22}\) To do so, there are different criteria which apply to minorities:

\(^{19}\) cf. Chouinard, 2016, 55.
\(^{21}\) United Nations Economic and Social Council, Definition and Classification of Minorities, Memorandum Submitted by the Secretary-General, E/CN.4/Sub.2/85, 37. 27 December 1949.
2.1. Differentiation of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. objective criteria</th>
<th>2. subjective criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• race</td>
<td>• group self-identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another essential aspect of minorities is whether they want to be considered as such. This can be split into two aspects:

- **minorities by force** (groups who would want to be integrated into the dominant culture and are denied assimilation), and
- **minorities by choice** (groups who are forced into assimilation even though they would want to preserve their distinctive characteristics.)

The former needs anti-discrimination and equal rights laws while the latter requires more freedom and special cultural, linguistic and education rights.\(^{23}\)

There are different types of stateless nations/national minorities.

- **‘internal’** nations, living on a defined territory within a nation-state where they constitute a minorities (eg. Québécois, Welsh, Catalans, Scots)
- **‘dispersed’** nations, with a population dispersed throughout different states (eg. Kurds in Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Syria or Roma)
- **‘border’** minority, living on the border of the country neighbouring their homeland. (eg. German minority in Denmark or Danish minority in Germany)\(^{24}\)

It is worth noting that refugees, migrant workers and stateless persons (not to be confused with stateless nations as mentioned above) are excluded from the definitions of minorities; their rights are mentioned in other texts of international law. Indigenous people also hold a special position within international law.

\(^{24}\) cf. Chouinard, 2016, 55.
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The term minority can carry a negative connotation to some people, and in some case it might be preferable to refer to them as "nationality", "community", "nation", "language group" or "cultural group".  

"Immigrant groups in society into which they immigrate form ethnic groups as distinct from nations. (...) An ethnic group is distinguished from a nation, including an ethnic nation, by being a group with a common culture that does not seek to be a political community, does not seek self-governance, and certainly does not seek to constitute themselves into a state. There is no issue of secession with them. For them a crucial issue is how to integrate successfully into their adopted homeland while still preserving something of their ethnic identity."  

In the late 1970s, Francesco Capotorti, then Special Rapporteur to the United Nations, produced what is considered to be one of the most comprehensive and concise (yet not binding) definition of a minority, to be used in consideration with Article 27 of the Covenant:

"a group numerically inferior to the rest of the population of a state, in a non-dominant position, whose members -being nationals of the state- possess ethnic, religious, or linguistic characteristics differing from those of the rest of the population and show, if only implicitly, a sense of solidarity, directed towards preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language."  

Brunner & Küpper suggest that every state should create their own definition of a minority according to their situation, and this definition should include all groups that "can justifiably be considered as national or ethnic minorities" and exclude those who are not.  

In her 1998 "National Minorities and the European Nation-States System", Jennifer Jackson-Preece, Associate Professor of Nationalism at the London School of Economics and Political Science, includes further aspects to complete Capotorti’s definition, such as the cultural characteristic (in addition to ethnic, religious or linguistic), the willingness of a minority to maintain and develop its own distinct identity and the fact that minorities should be "well defined and historically established on the territory of that state".  

---

26 Nielsen, 1996, 123.  
27 Capotorti, 1979, Art. 568.  
"Minorities are none other than ethno-nations who have failed to secure the ultimate goal of ethnic nationalism -independence in their own nation-state- and consequently exist within the political boundaries of some other nation’s state; their very existence is an uncomfortable reminder of the ‘national self-determination fudge’ in international society -i.e. the fact that the practice of state sovereignty does not necessarily conform to the principle which legitimizes it when this is understood in ethnic terms. In short, the problem of minorities only arises within the context of the nation-states system and is in fact a direct result of anomalies and inconsistencies in it."

Because they possess nationhood, one of the criteria for political independence required by our modern nation-states system, minorities do get the attention of political actors.

In the next section, we will how minorities are treated in the context of international law, and how some of them evolve into separatist movements.

2.2 International Law and its Subjects

2.2.1 Legal Personality in International Law

Through a long history of treaties and agreements, the international community has established a series of basic principles upon which modern international law rests: sovereign equality (every sovereign state possesses the same rights), territorial integrity (prohibition of the use of force on other states), the independence of states (autonomy in the state’s affairs), elementary human rights, self-determination, and the protection and conservation of natural resources.

International law applies to entities who possess a “legal personality”, meaning the ability to hold rights and obligations under international law. To have legal personality entails the capacity of being part of the development and production of international law. International law was born out of the need to regulate relationships between states, consequently, states are the main international legal subjects. Despite their influence on the international scene,

---

Non-Governmental Organizations and multinationals are not considered as legal personalities. In contrast, International Organizations such as the European Union, the World Bank or NATO can only fulfill their mission by being holders of rights and obligations and are therefore subjects of international law. Other subjects of international law (without statehood) are the Holy See, the Order of Malta and the Red Cross. Individuals are not per se subjects of international law but they do hold rights and obligations and can be held personally accountable for war crimes, genocides and crimes against humanity.\textsuperscript{33}

The highest binding fundamental norms of international law, also known as \textit{jus cogens} ("compelling law"), must be followed disregarding states’ or people’s opinions about it. These include the prohibition of torture, slavery, genocide or racial discrimination. Violations can lead the perpetrators to the International Court of Justice.\textsuperscript{34}

Rights can be classified in different categories:

\begin{table}[h!]
\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Type of Rights by Gurr}\textsuperscript{35} & \textbf{Includes the rights to...} \\
\hline
\textbf{civil} & "life, security, physical movement, equality before the law, due process, and avoidance of cruel and unusual punishment." \\
\hline
\textbf{political} & "free speech, assembly and association, unrestricted voting, and political candidacy." \\
\hline
\textbf{cultural} & "educational opportunity, religious freedom, family life, and respect for cultural diversity" \\
\hline
\textbf{economic} & "essential means of subsistence such as adequate food, shelter, health care, and minimum level of income" \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{34} cf. Herdegen, 2010, Chapter 1, §3.
\textsuperscript{35} Gurr and Scarritt, 1989, 378.
### Table 2.4: Different Types of Rights by Howard and Donnelly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Rights by Howard &amp; Donnelly</th>
<th>Includes the rights to...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>survival</td>
<td>&quot;life, food, and healthcare&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>membership</td>
<td>&quot;family and nondiscrimination&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td>&quot;habeas corpus and an independent judiciary&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment</td>
<td>&quot;education, a free press, and freedom of association&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International law offers a great basis for the coexistence and cooperation of states, but it would be utopic to think that everyone follows it. In general, "almost all nations observe almost all principles of international law and almost all of their obligations almost all the time."\footnote{Gurr and Scarritt, 1989, 379.}

We will now address special rights granted to protect particular characteristics that people are willing to preserve: minority rights.

#### 2.2.2 Minority Rights

The existence of a minority relies on the awareness that it possesses distinctive characteristics which make them different from the majority. Both the minority and the majority should acknowledge this fact for co-habitation to be possible.\footnote{Louis Henkin, How Nations Behave: Law and Foreign Policy, 2. ed. 1979, 47. in: Herdegen, 2010, Chapter 1, §1.} After this first prerequisite has been fulfilled, minority rights can be created with the stabilization of the minority and the preservation of their differences at stake.

Minority rights encompass different scales of rights that can be organized into a hierarchy. At the top of the scale, one can find the "autonomy", the highest legal status possible within a state, in the middle, special rights such as affirmative action, and at the bottom there are the minimum rights granted to members of a minority: non-discrimination and equal rights.

\footnote{cf. Brunner and Küpper, 2002, 13.}
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The Principle of non-discrimination serves the purpose that being a member of a minority should not entail any negative consequences and that all citizens should have the same rights. The principle of equal rights or equality is different in a sense that some rights should be granted to minorities in order to give them equal chances compared to the rest of the population. (e.g. the right to receive education in one’s mother tongue.) To alleviate the pressure put by the majority culture onto minorities, special rights can act as a defense mechanism. Special rights are individual rights conferred to members of a minority, including for example the use of a native language in all aspects of private and professional life, the right to assemble with other minority members or the freedom of religion.

Individual rights fail to consider that minority identity is lived and preserved in a community, which is why many minorities demand collective rights who address their particularity as a group. In this case, the legal subject becomes the minority itself or the legal entity representing it. Collective rights become an autonomy when they relate to "essential self-determination", such as politics or culture. With affirmative action, a state "actively feels responsible" for a minority and its well-being. In this case, members of minorities might be entitled to more rights than other citizens.39

A number of legal texts have been produced in order to ensure the protection and respect of minorities, as well as the promotion of their distinct identity and their participation in political life, including:40

- 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)
- 1966 International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR)
- 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities -United Nations

• 1994 European Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities - Council of Europe
• 2001 Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity - UNESCO

Problematic is the fact that these have not been signed or ratified by the whole international community, rendering them less efficient that they had been intended to be. The right to a distinct identity is recognized in Article 27 of the above mentioned ICCPR.

"In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language."  

The wording of Article 27 refers to "persons belonging" to minorities, rather than minorities. This is due to the fact that a minority is not a subject of international law, but a private person - a member of a minority - is. Minority rights thus concern persons who belong to minorities rather than the minority itself. Article 27 contains rights which are considered a mix between individual and collective rights, seeing that the right of a person to practice their culture, religion and language can hardly be exercised alone, but in a community.  

While assimilation can be seen as an inevitable process in history, it can be controlled in a way that members of cultural group have a say in how their culture adapt to other dominant ones, as states by Patrick Thornberry, Emeritus Professor of International Law at Keele University.

Considering the fact that many minorities do not have the political means to defend their own rights, it is within the scope of international law to support them in this matter. Despite the objective and subjective criteria used to define affiliation to a minority, it is sometimes difficult to determine who belongs to a particular minority. There are many discussions about whether people should be able to determine this

41 Resolution 2200A: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
by themselves, as an act of free consent, or if they should even be able to re-nounce membership?\textsuperscript{44}

When minorities are not satisfied with the arrangements within the state they live in, they demands for more rights and liberties. If these are not granted, conflicts can evolve into separatist movements.

\section*{2.3 Ethnic Conflicts & Separatist Movements}

\subsection*{2.3.1 Ethnic Conflicts}

For Ramsbotham, Miall and Woodhouse, authors of "Contemporary Conflict Resolution", conflicts are not necessarily negative and can even be beneficial to the development of society and human rights. The goal and responsibility of the international community is not to avoid disagreements or discussions, but to make sure it does not turn into violence. The authors are confident the international community (including the OSCE and the UN) is aware of the importance of preventing violent conflicts, they know it can save a lot of lives and a lot of money otherwise needed for reconstruction. In their experience, violent conflicts usually end up in a lose-lose situation for all belligerents. In order to prevent violence, conditions, structures and relations should be optimized so people can expect a peaceful change, thus reducing the likelihood of resorting to violence. First, the two parties should define their goals and structures should be in place to facilitate communication between them.

"If the goals \{of people or ethnic groups\} are incompatible with those of other groups, a conflict forms. If the incompatibility is so severe that the parties' relationship is broken and the structure of institutions and the context in which they live cannot contain the conflict, violence becomes possible."\textsuperscript{45}

The strategies and behaviour adopted by parties, and whether they decide to implicate other parties, can determine how a conflict will develop. The main

\textsuperscript{44} cf. Thornberry, 1991, 175.
\textsuperscript{45} Ramsbotham, Miall, and Woodhouse, 2011, 126.
method for peaceful conflict resolution is negotiations. Part of conflict prevention policy is also the promotion of democracy, which tends to decrease the amount of wars, but, when used as a financial incentive, can be exploited by one-party rulers or largest ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{46}

Ashutosh Varshney, Professor of International Studies and the Social Sciences and Professor of Political Science at Brown University, suggests, like Lagerspetz (see 2.1.2), a difference between ethnic group and nation: an ethnic group may do without a state of its own; a nation implies bringing ethnicity and statehood together." Territoriality is a very important factor in the development of an ethnic group into a nation.

"Since the number of territorially based ethnic groups is currently larger than the number of nation-states, the existing nation-state system must be considered \textit{vulnerable}. Some ethnic conflicts may not remain simply ethnic; they may eventually take steps towards separatist nationalism."\textsuperscript{47}

Varshney points out that conflict does not necessarily mean violence, and that in an ethnically plural society where freedom of expression is endorsed, conflicts are to be expected. When people exercise their freedom of expression in parliament or through non-violent demonstrations, this is not considered as a violent conflict. Varshney warns that emotions have been neglected in the social science discourse about ethnic conflict and that these tend to explode when institutions fail to function well.

Ethnic fractionalization is considered to have implications on economic development and has therefore been an area of interest for political scientists. In generally accepted terms, ethnonational fractionalization equals “one minus the sum of the squared proportionate shares of each ethnonational group”, and index which ranges from close to one (maximum fractionalization) to zero (inexistent fractionalization). With the help of these indexes, one calculates linguistic, ethnic, religious, cultural, or even political fragmentation. According to the data provided by Alberto Alesina \textit{et. al} (2003), the lowest ethnic and linguistic fractionalization can be found in North Korea and the highest in Uganda. The UK has a very low ethnic and linguistic fractionalization, and an

\textsuperscript{46} cf. Ramsbotham, Miall, and Woodhouse, 2011, 123-130.
\textsuperscript{47} Varshney, 2007, 277-278.
above average religious fractionalization. Spain has a similar fractionalization in all aspects.

TABLE 2.5: Fractionalization Index by Alesina et. al

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fractionalization by State</th>
<th>Ethnic</th>
<th>Linguistic</th>
<th>Religious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>0.6604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0.1211</td>
<td>0.0532</td>
<td>0.6944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.4165</td>
<td>0.4132</td>
<td>0.4514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.9302</td>
<td>0.9227</td>
<td>0.6332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnic divisions do not necessarily have a political significance, but they can.\textsuperscript{48} When ethnonational consciousness is used as a political means and destabilizes democracy, the so-called outbidding effect occurs. People are usually born in several ethnic categories, and can more or less choose which one or which ones to identify with. Ethnic parties try to appeal to people according to their identity, and claim to represent and defend the interests of this given group through the exclusion of other groups. According to Kanchan Chandra, Professor of Politics at NYU, most people see ethnic outbidding with pessimism and fear about its influence over democracy. She argues that in a context where institutions promote multiple dimensions of ethnic identity, ethnic parties can sustain democracy.\textsuperscript{49}

Inter-cultural relationships are influenced by socioeconomic factors such as structural advantage (protecting privileges) or disadvantage, which can lead to a sense of injustice. Geographical factors (territorial concentration, dispersion) also play a role for political mobilization and can drive collective action.\textsuperscript{50} As John Coakley -Emeritus Professor in the School of Politics & International Relations at the University College Dublin- explains, ethnonational conflict usually have their roots in pressure put on marginalized groups and their exclusion from political life. Leaders of minority groups may demand additional rights,

\textsuperscript{49} cf. Chandra, 2005, 2356-236.
\textsuperscript{50} cf. Coakley, 2009, 274.
collective rather than individual, such as the formal recognition of their group identity, either through cultural or linguistic reform, or through political autonomy.\textsuperscript{51}

Although diversity in itself is unproblematic in most societies, where different groups can coexist in a peaceful manner, “the mere existence of an ethnic group that exceeds a certain critical mass in respect of population, especially if it reaches a modest level of territorial concentration, may result in an enhanced sense of identity, an escalation of calls for political change, and a cycle of demands, concessions, and refusals in its relationship with the state. Ethnic mobilization may confine itself to conventional activities and may operate within the limits of the constitution; but it may also take the form of armed rebellion and direct action against the state.”\textsuperscript{52}

The "Minorities At Risk" (MAR) project documents over 300 groups across the world, sorted out in different categories:

- **Ethnonationalist groups**: large groups mobilizing for political autonomy.
  
  *Examples*: Québécois in Canada, Tibetans in China, Abkhazians and South Ossetians in Georgia, Kurds in Iran, Iraq, Syria and Turkey, Scots in the UK, Palestinians in Israel, Jordan and Lebanon

- **Indigenous peoples**: “economically and politically marginalized groups descended from the original population”
  
  *Examples*: Rohingya in Myanmar, Maori in New Zealand, Tuareg in Niger, Berbers in Algeria and Morocco)

- **Ethnoclasses**: “ethnically or culturally distinct peoples, usually descended from slaves or immigrants”.
  
  *Examples*: Roma in 12 european countries, Turks in Germany, non-citizen Muslims in France, foreign workers in Switzerland

- **Communal contenders**: culturally distinct peoples who hold or seek political participation.
  
  *Examples*: Hazara in Afghanistan, Pashtuns in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Maronite Christians in Lebanon, Zulus in South Africa

\textsuperscript{51} cf. Coakley, 2009, 268.

\textsuperscript{52} Coakley, 2009, 276.
• **Religious sects**: group with different religious beliefs and cultural practices with a political status centered on defending their beliefs.

*Examples*: Copts in Egypt, Baha’is in Iran

• **National minorities**: part of the population who holds a history of political autonomy, now constituting a minority in the state they live in.

*Examples*: Gagauz and Slavs in Moldova, South Tyroleans in Italy, Catalans in Spain

These groups appear on the Minorities At Risk list because of they achieved a significant political mobilization and because they demonstrate the will to collectively promote and defend their self-defined interests and identities.

### 2.3.2 Separatist Movements Around the World

After the Second World War, nation-states who considered themselves and each other independent and equal have gathered into the United Nations Organization, with the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations with each other and solving issues by cooperation. Membership of the United Nations is "open to all peace-loving states that accept the obligations contained in the United Nations Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able to carry out these obligations". Only states can become members of the United Nations, invoke the UN-Security Council or be a party at the International Court of Justice. Non-UN states can, under conditions, be part of diverse specialized agencies and can thus represent their own interests and draw some benefits. The agencies include eg. the International Monetary Fund, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or the WTO World Trade Organization.

The principle of self-determination and the politics of decolonization, which we will discuss in detail in Chapter 3, have brought many new members to the

---

53 United Nations: About UN Membership.
54 cf. UN-Charter, Art. 3 & Art. 4.
55 cf. UN-Charter, Art. 35.
56 cf. ICJ Statutes, Art. 34.
organization, which are now considered independent and sovereign. Originally comprising 51 members, the United Nations has grown to 193, yet not all of them acknowledge each other’s independence. 187 members tolerate and do not deny each other’s existence, while 6 only obtained only partial recognition (Armenia, China, Cyprus, Israel, North Korea and South Korea).

As we speak, there are around 70 separatist movements around the world, less than half are really active, at least 7 of them are qualified as violent. They represent a worldwide phenomenon: “the almost inevitable conflict caused when a group of people want to separate themselves from a state that refuses to let them go. Despite today’s oft-heard mantra that mankind is living in a global community where borders no longer matter, having a homeland of one’s own clearly remains a dream for millions”, journalist and writer Brian Beary reminds.\(^{57}\) Many countries, regions or territories have claimed their right to self-determination, declared their independence, but have not received the international acknowledgment they have hoped for.

There are many national minorities claiming self-determination:

- Entities that have come very far and are recognized by a majority of UN members, such as Kosovo and Palestine - the latter holds an observer status at the general assembly alongside with the Holy See.
- Entities that have some international recognition: Taiwan, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic and Northern Cyprus.
- Entities that are de facto separated but are only recognized by non UN-members (Artsakh, Transnistria) or by no entity at all (Somaliland)
- Members of the Unrepresented Nations & Peoples Organization (44 members)
- Some of the 17 "Non-Self-Governing Territories" as defined by the UN Charter
- Entities which were already granted autonomy but seek independence (eg. Catalonia, Scotland, Corsica, Tibet, Kashmir, Aceh, Kurdistan)

**Status Quo:** Through the granting of a certain extend of self-rule, violence

was prevented in many cases, such as in Québec, Flanders, Wales and Scotland. A democratic system which functions and allows people to send elected representatives reduces the chances of violent breakouts.\(^{58}\) The international community reacts to self-determination claims in various ways. It accepts Taiwan as a trading partner, still offers financial support to Timor-Leste (which gained independence in 2002 but relies on it for its survival) but set an embargo against Northern Cyprus. It turns a blind eye on what is happening in Tibet, and in Xinjiang, where the Muslim minority "Uyghur" people faces "re-education" camps comparable to concentration camps\(^{59}\), and ignore the existence of the de facto state Somaliland. Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Artsakh and Transnistria are de facto states und continue to "exist" due to the lack of military strength to get them back.\(^{60}\)

### 2.3.3 Case Selection

Over the years, I have created my own database which includes over 500 entities (states, regions, dependencies). For the purpose of this work, I have added a list of autonomous regions, as well as separatist groups and minorities (specifically the Minorities At Risk list). To guide me in my choice of case study, I filtered the entities who have claimed self-determination and already acquired an autonomy status, reducing the list to 70. I decided to narrow it down to those who were able to pursue their quest through "democratic means" and have succeeded in holding a referendum, regardless whether it was allowed by their respective state. The list came down to 13, and, after crossing it with the minorities from the MAR project, the final entities to select from are 8, shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table includes the list of entities I have created, which have claimed their right to self-determination, have a certain degree of autonomy, have held a referendum and appear in the MAR project. Column 1 shows which ethnic

---


\(^{59}\) cf. Uyghur Human Rights Project.

\(^{60}\) cf. Beary, 2008, 47.
group from the MAR list intends on creating which state. Column 2 specifies the group they belong to according to the MAR project. Column 3 depicts which state the proposed state belongs to, and which status it holds within this state. Column 4 shows the year or years a referendum about independence was held, as well as its outcome. If the cell is green, the referendum was recognized by the current state, if it is red, it was deemed illegal.\footnote{Column “Year & Outcome of Referendum” extracted from wikipedia.org.}

**Table 2.6: Case Selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group in Proposed State</th>
<th>Group Type</th>
<th>Current State &amp; Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papuans &gt; West Papua</td>
<td>indigenous</td>
<td>Indonesia-special autonomous region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians &gt; Artsakh/ Nagorno-Karabakh</td>
<td>national minority</td>
<td>Azerbaijan-autonomous territorial unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scots &gt; Scotland</td>
<td>ethno nationalist</td>
<td>United Kingdom-constituent country with devolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bougainvilleans &gt; Bougainville</td>
<td>ethno nationalist</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea-indigenous territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics &gt; Puerto Rico</td>
<td>ethno nationalist</td>
<td>United States of America-commonwealth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavs (Russians &amp; Ukrainians) &gt; Transnistria/ Pridnestrovian Moldavian Republic</td>
<td>national minority</td>
<td>Moldova-autonomous territorial unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ossetians &gt; South Ossetia</td>
<td>ethno nationalist</td>
<td>Georgia-autonomous republic/provisional administrative entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalans &gt; Catalonia</td>
<td>national minority</td>
<td>Spain-autonomous community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61 Column “Year & Outcome of Referendum” extracted from wikipedia.org.
Looking at these 8 entities, my decision was guided by the following reflection:

- I decided to exclude West Papua, because the referendum was held almost 50 years ago and Papuans are classified as indigenous, which is not the focus of this work.

- Seeing Puerto Rico has voted 5 times to stay part of the United States of America, I chose not to concentrate on it.

- Due to practical reasons, the likelihood of finding interview partners from Bougainville seemed very low to me.

- I could see two choices: building my work around former Soviet break-away states who have already established de facto sovereignty and live in frozen conflicts, or addressing two west-european entities who have been claiming independence for a very long time and have not manage to establish it. My thoughts were that my language abilities in English and Spanish would be of advantage for getting in contact with interview partners and offering them the chance to discuss in their mother tongue. Also, I personally liked the prospect of working with more recent and dynamic events. Consequently, I chose to dedicate my work to Catalonia and Scotland. The two entities show many similarities, which we will investigate in Chapter 4.

### 2.4 Catalonia & Scotland in the Current World Order

#### Catalonia & Scotland as a State

When talking about their entity, my interview partners mostly used the word "state" for the United Kingdom and Spain. Scotland was referred to as a "country" and Catalonia as a "community", one of the 17 autonomous communities of Spain.

Both Catalonia and Scotland would have the required characteristics to build a state according to international law’s criteria. They have a territory that has been defined for centuries, a permanent population, a parliament and
executive. Foreign affairs are matters reserved to the nation-states of Spain and the UK, yet there is no doubt that Catalonia and Scotland would establish their own foreign relations if they were to become independent states.

Catalonia declared independence on 27 October 2017, after a referendum considered illegal by Spain. No state recognized this declaration of independence. Most states considered this to be an internal Spanish matter and defended the principle of territorial integrity. Only Abkhazia and South Ossetia, who both seceded unilaterally from Georgia in the 1990s and are mostly unrecognized states, stated they would recognize the entity if requested by the Catalan government. Recent events show the possibility of Israel recognizing Catalonia if Spain recognized Palestine.62 Scotland issued an official statement, pointing out that the people of Catalonia must be able to determine their own future, encouraging a process of dialogue and stressing out the EU’s responsibility to support this dialogue in order to resolve the situation in a peaceful and democratic way.63

In the case of Scotland, a referendum was held in 2014 after the Prime Minister of the UK David Cameron and First Minister of Scotland Alex Salmond reached an agreement. The United Kingdom would have recognized the independence of Scotland if such had been the will of the people. We will continue discuss Catalonia’s and Scotland’s structures and claims to independence in Chapter 4.

**Catalonia & Scotland as a Nation**

Both Catalonia and Scotland have been considered as nations for very long time, and even at the time of Henry Wheaton in the 19th century, they built their own community of *language, manners and customs on a fixed territory*. They are a spiritual principle like Ernest Renan portrayed, with a common heritage and memories, full of heroic moments, sufferings (eg. Jacobite Rising, Highland Clearances) and hopes (eg. rejoin the European Union, build a more social state inspired by Scandinavia) as mentioned by my interview partners. Their
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63 Scotland’s statement on Catalonia’s declaration of independence [27.10.2017][01.10.2018].
history has provided them with emotional legitimacy, which created a "horizontal fraternity for which one is ready to sacrifice oneself", as put by Benedict Anderson. To illustrate this with the examples of my interview partners, Ana María declared that "if we are independent I think the Catalans would be willing to tighten our belts for a time so that it gets better." Gary mentioned the trend that people would be ready to pay more taxes "to see our country do well and our people do well."

Catalonia’s and Scotland’s nationalisms seem to be more civic than ethnic. All interview partners I’ve asked said you did not need to be born in Catalonia or Scotland to be a Catalan or a Scot, but that anyone who wanted to or identified with it, could become it. Both entities want to "defend the cultural and material interests of a common nationality" as explained by Nielsen.

Catalonia and Scotland value community a lot, and it is this sense of community, which, according to Lagerspetz, gives a state the sovereignty it need to be legitimate. If ethnicity is a pattern of association established by common cultural features and traditions which define social affiliations and divisions, both Catalonia and Scotland qualify as ethnicities. Catalonia and Scotland developed into ethnicities that evolved into nations which relevant attribute should be determined by themselves.

**Catalonia & Scotland as a Minority**

Following the **objective criteria** for being a minority, both Catalonia and Scotland are home to people from various origins, and race does not play a significant role in their political lives. Neither Catalonia nor Scotland justify their claim to independence on religious grounds. Most Catalans are Catholic, the main religion of Spain, and in the UK, Catholics (about 16% of the population) seem to cohabit with the Protestant majority without considerable issues. All my Catalan interview partners speak Catalan and see their language as a major part of their life, while none of the Scots I interviewed speak either Gaelic or Scots and don’t consider speaking Gaelic or Scot as a prerequisite to

---

65 Scottish Government Website. Summary: Religion Demographics.
be part of the nation.

The **subjective criteria** of belonging to a minority is more difficult to define. When considered as a minority, people in Catalonia and Scotland would be a "minority by choice", seeing they are integrated in the larger society and show their own desire to maintain distinctive characteristics. They both construct their identity through their respective history, culture and traditions. Catalonia cultivates its differences with Spain, and Scotland defines itself also through its difference with the rest of the UK, and even if they feel similarities with Northern Ireland and Wales, the contrast with England is often pointed out.

One important aspect of "minorities" is whether people identify themselves as such:

- Only one person, Ana María, identified herself as a member of a minority (linguistically and culturally), none of the others had ever seen it that way or thought about it that way.
- For Arnau, a minority is "part of the population that doesn’t have enough people or influence to be able to decide.” Catalans are not a minority because everyone is different, some are independentists and some are not. Arnau pointed out that the word minority can be somewhat depreciating.
- In Angela’s view, being Catalan is a way to refer where she is from, and the word has no connotations with minority.
- Henry sees a minority as being "a group that is smaller than the largest group." For Henry, Scots are not a minority because they don’t have any disadvantages compared to other people. There are only a few extreme situations in Scotland where someone with an Irish-sounding name would find it difficult to find a job, but it is very rare.
- Gary does not feel like a minority, and thinks the Scots don’t see themselves as a minority in their own country. For them, they are a country within a country. To a certain extent, Scots are perhaps a political minority.
- Evelyn never thought of herself as a minority, even though Scots don’t have
the voice or the numbers. Feeling Scottish is not assimilated to being a minority.

Catalans and Scots fulfill the international law’s criteria to be a minority. Their societies are in numerical inferiority, in a non-dominant position, and they possess either an ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristic different from the rest of the population, furthermore, they show interest in preserving their culture, traditions, religion or language. Catalans and Scots appear on many registers about minorities, for example Minority Rights Group International and the Minorities At Risk project. According to Ted Robert Gurr, who initiated the project, all minorities that "actively seek greater autonomy belong on the list of minorities at risk". In Western Europe, historically-autonomous people such as the Scots, Catalans, Bretons and Sicilians qualify in the sense that they demand more autonomy from centralized states and that this shows they are not satisfied by current political arrangements.

Even though their ethnic group are largely recognized as minorities, most of my interview partners identified more as a nation, than as a minority. In everyday use, the word "minority" seems not to be a synonym to a nation without a state and has quite a negative feeling behind it.

International Law & Human Rights within Catalonia & Scotland

Catalonia and Scotland, because they are not "states", cannot participate in the production of international law and cannot participate on the global scene. Gary thinks "it is a tragedy that Scotland’s progressive values and its cultural values are not being properly part of the global discussion, how we take things forward as a world." Human Rights in Spain and the United Kingdom are generally considered to be respected. The Freedom in the World index from Freedom House takes political rights, civil liberties and freedom rating into consideration. With a score of 94/100 in Spain, Freedom House reports corruption cases involving politicians, businessmen and members of the royal
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family. It states that that the Catalan referendum was flawed, "held in defiance of court orders under conditions that did not guarantee a free and fair vote". The United Kingdom also has a score of 94/100. Freedom House points out the rise of crimes against immigrants, partly linked to terrorist strikes and rhetoric regarding migrants and refugees. It also mentions fake information spread to convince people to vote in favour of Brexit.  

According to Amnesty International, "the rights to freedom of expression and peaceful assembly of Catalan independence supporters were disproportionately restricted." Furthermore, excessive force was used by law enforcement against peaceful demonstrators which opposed the High Court of Justice’s ruling against the Catalan independence referendum. Many people who participated in the referendum at a higher level were charged with sedition, and later rebellion.

---

Chapter 3

Self-Determination

As we have just seen throughout Chapter 2, many peoples do not have their own nation-states and constitute minorities within different states. Sometimes conflicts develop and escalate up to a self-determination claim.\(^1\) Some independence movements are using democratic ways to come to their ends, others are under the impression that the only way of being heard is by using violence and thus putting peace in peril.\(^2\) The international community’s highest desire is to maintain peace, sometimes to the detriment of human rights. It seems international law supports the idea of a minority either gaining independence or assimilating into its current state.\(^3\)

Though a dream for many, the utopia of a united community with one language, one nation and one state, is unrealistic. The earlier assumption that minorities and indigenous people would disappear over time and assimilate with the larger population group has proven out to be false. Minorities are here to stay, they are aware of their rights and are not willing to keep living under old hierarchical systems: they demand equality.\(^4\)

The international community, among which the United Nations, have been defending both concepts of the nation-state and its *territorial integrity* as well as the principle of *self-determination*. The former, as a means to secure stability and due to the inviolability of borders, which for some people is merely an

---

\(^1\) cf. Carley, 1996, 1.
\(^3\) cf. Carley, 1996, VI.
excuse to protect an unjust system. The latter is subject to different interpretation and is not applied in a consistent manner.\textsuperscript{5}

The concept of self-determination has been, since its creation in the aftermath of World War I, one of the most complex issues for the international community.\textsuperscript{6} “The discourse of national self-determination contains little that is self-evident or on which everyone can agree.”\textsuperscript{7} In this section, we will try and define the concept of self-determination as set in texts of international law. We will discuss the main causes that lead to self-determination claims, and find out how the concept has evolved through history. Finally, we will follow two different lines of thoughts, one in which secession can never be justified by claiming the right to self-determination, the other being that secession can be, under some circumstances, used as a last resort.

### 3.1 Definition of Self-Determination

Even though it is engraved in texts of international law, the notion of self-determination lacks of a universally agreed upon definition of the term itself, of what rights are conferred by it, and of who it is directed to.

The right to self-determination is laid down in Article 1 of the ICCPR (International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights) and the ICESCR (International Covenant Economic, Social and Cultural Rights), as such:

1. "All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

2. "All peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources without prejudice to any obligations arising out of international economic co-operation, based upon the principle of mutual benefit, and international law. In no case may people be deprived of their own means of subsistence."

\textsuperscript{5} cf. Carley, 1996, 1.
\textsuperscript{6} cf. Carley, 1996, V.
\textsuperscript{7} Koskenniemi, 1994, 244.
3.1. Definition of Self-Determination

Considering the growing number of self-determination claims, it is necessary to come to a clear definition. This task is not an easy one, and no definition can pretend to be unequivocal. Patricia Carley, from the United States Institute of Peace, put together a roundtable in order to discuss the issue of self-determination, sovereignty, territorial integrity and the right to secession. In her view, any new definition of the concept of self-determination should include customary human right standards and a body responsible of enforcing these standards.\(^8\)

3.1.1 Two Models of Self-Determination: Classical vs. Secessionist

One thing that justifies our state-centred international order is indeed the belief that people are able to freely determine their political status and future development.\(^9\) Existing nation-states are believed to be the fruit of self-determination, which legitimizes their existence. If self-determination is now enshrined in many texts of international law and gave life to many new states, its interpretation has developed through time. Whether it ever has been or still is synonym with the right to secession has been prone to passionate debate. This discourse is not made easier by the fact that secession rights depend on the domestic jurisdiction of the state in question.

International lawyer and diplomat Martti Koskenniemi asks himself whether one can "support particular liberation struggles that seem just (...) by a legal principle of self-determination?"\(^10\) What is "just" depends on political priorities on the part of the international community, for example in the 1960s focus was laid on decolonizing the world, rather than defending European imperiums.\(^11\) As the notion of self-determination was born in the Enlightenment and was meant to be universal, Koskenniemi finds limiting self-determination to the context of decolonization "somehow arbitrary"\(^12\) Koskenniemi differentiates

\(^8\) cf. Carley, 1996, V-VI.
\(^9\) Koskenniemi, 1994, 245.
\(^10\) Koskenniemi, 1994, 244.
between two models of self-determination, the classical and the secessionist models. In the classical model, nations are artificial communities where a collection of individuals decide to form a state together. In this case, self-determination follows procedures determined by government institutions. The classical view gives advantage to the statehood of already existing states and defends the equality and political participation of minorities over their entitlement to create a new state.\footnote{cf. Koskenniemi, 1994, 249ff.}

In the secessionist model, a nation is something authentic and more fundamental than government institutions and decision-processes. If these institutions exercise a popular will that goes against part of its population, the oppressed "nation" has, according to Koskenniemi, the right to rebel and create their own institutions of government. In a liberal state, where relationships between the state and the individual are predominantly legal, there is a need for a deeper connection, a sense of belonging and nationhood.\footnote{cf. Koskenniemi, 1994, 258.} The challenge is not to let this "authenticity" be emphasised to such an extreme that other identities are excluded. The will to enjoy self-determination is not a "sufficient condition for its application".\footnote{cf. Koskenniemi, 1994, 263.} Self-determination law is an alternative, softer approach to international conflict which provides procedural and material guidelines in order to regulate the conflict in a pragmatic way.\footnote{cf. Koskenniemi, 1994, 266.} The right to self-determination does not ensure the creation of new boundaries without all parties agreeing.\footnote{Koskenniemi, 1994, 267.}

### 3.2 Causes for Self-Determination

Many groups considering themselves as minorities have been invoking the right to self-determination in order to legitimize their demand for more rights, autonomy, or independence. Self-determination claims may have different roots, and we will present the following ones:
3.2. Causes for Self-Determination

• Historical Territorial Disputes
• Violations or Denial of Minority Rights
• Growing awareness of the right to self-determination
• National Aspirations

• Historical Territorial Disputes
The boundaries of internationally recognized nation-states have been drawn in a way that can be seen as "artificial, arbitrary and accidental"\(^\text{18}\), forcing different peoples to share the same territory against their will. Through its history, the “West” has developed a special understanding of sovereignty and statehood, seeing borders as being inviolable; a way to see things which other parts of the world are not familiar with and which is not necessarily permanent.\(^\text{19}\)

For Horowitz, Professor of Law and Political Science at Duke Law School and Duke University, the drawing of boundaries was not as disrespectful and arbitrary as we often hear. Due to the fact that there are no true natural land boundaries and that the way peoples are settled would make any boundary seem arbitrary, secession is not a way to correct them.\(^\text{20}\)

Partitioning a state along ethnic lines almost always leads to long-term conflict. Violence can be avoided if wise leadership is exerted.\(^\text{21}\)

• Minority right violations or denial
"Throughout history separatism has manifested itself in various forms as groups grew dissatisfied with their government."\(^\text{22}\) “The concept was developed that a people might have the right to secede when the state they belonged to did not respect their fundamental rights"\(^\text{23}\)

Some reasons involve a will to end repression and human right violations.\(^\text{24}\)
"People who are denied basic cultural, linguistic, and political rights by their rulers are more likely to resort to violence than those who have been given

\(^{19}\) cf. Carley, 1996, V.
\(^{22}\) Beary, 2008, 39.
\(^{23}\) Beary, 2008, 41.
\(^{24}\) cf. Carley, 1996, VII.
a large measure of local autonomy.” When minorities feel they have been repressed for too long, a point of no return is crossed and their only goal remains to become independent. If issues are taken seriously early enough, some minorities can be satisfied with a local autonomy deal.25

When people feel left out by their state, they look for other sources of identities (ethnicity, religion) which can be used as political instruments.26

“If the voice of some group in society is systematically silenced, then that group will in certain ways cease to be part of the society.”27 This may happen in at least two ways. Perhaps a group or a region financially receives less than its fair share of the common resources. Or perhaps political debate on the whole tends to look at things from the other point of view of just one group or region while the experiences of others are marginalized.

**Lack of recognition of people’s identity**

Emeritus Professor and philosopher Charles Taylor suggests a close connection between identity and recognition. His concept of recognition is different from the international recognition of an entity as a state we have mentioned so far: it is not about the acknowledgement of someone else’s existence, but rather the attitude and willingness of a person to accept someone else for who they are or want to be. Taylor presents a new concept of recognition and points out the importance of it for the construction of people’s identity and their well being. The discourse of recognition is split into two spheres: the intimate and the public sphere.

The **intimate sphere** of recognition: Our own understanding of who we are and how we define ourselves as human beings is our identity. This image is constructed throughout life, both based on a personal connection with oneself and through relationships with others and in accordance to the way they see us. Our identity is thus shaped by interactions with others, and their acceptance and recognition or lack thereof have a big influence on our lives.

"Non-recognition or mis-recognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being." \(^{28}\)

Non-recognition can lead to feeling of inferiority and self-hatred, which is why recognition is considered by Taylor to be a vital human need. This need for recognition can be a driver for nationalist movements.

The public sphere of recognition is itself split into two different concepts: the Politics of Equal Dignity or Politics of Universalism and the Politics of Differences, which should complete each other. In the Politics of Equal Dignity (or Universalism), equal recognition and the concept of dignity are seen as essential to a democratic society. Social hierarchies and the concept of honor, or being a preferred or distinguished person, has been replaced by dignity, a status that can be equally shared by everyone. For example, everyone can be called Mr. or Ms. instead of just a few being able to be called Lord or Lady.

Another important aspect is that of originality, something special and unique which people get to discover and define for themselves. This Politics of Differences can be applied not only to "the individual person among other persons, but also to the culture-bearing people among other peoples. Just like individuals, a Volk should be true to itself, that is, its own culture." Peoples should get the chance to "be themselves unimpeded", with all their similarities as well as differences. "The idea is that it is precisely this distinctness that has been ignored, glossed over, assimilated to a dominant or majority identity." \(^{29}\)

For Taylor the need for recognition is one of the driving forces behind nationalist movements. People’s identity and their understanding of who they are is strongly linked with external recognition or lack thereof. Non-recognition can be harmful and considered as oppression. \(^{30}\)

- **Growing awareness of the right to self-determination**

Graham Fuller, former CIA agent and member of the RAND Corporation\(^ {31}\), taking part in Carley’s roundtable about self-determination, pointed out that

\(^{28}\) Taylor, 1994, 25.  
\(^{29}\) Taylor, 1994, 38.  
\(^{30}\) Taylor, 1994, p.24-25.  
\(^{31}\) Research AND Development Corporation: an international non-profit think tank.
while many of the world’s newest states derive from the breakup of the Soviet Union and the Yugoslav Republic, the issue of self-determination is not a regional one and happens throughout the world. People are becoming more aware of the fact that they can change the course of history.\textsuperscript{32} There are irruptions of nationalism all across the world, and in Carley’s view, the question whether they are legal is irrelevant, much more important is the fact that they are taking place and cannot be stopped.\textsuperscript{33} Many realities of today’s world can’t be ignored and the world should be understood "not the way it ought to be, but the way it is."\textsuperscript{34} Just stating legal principles isn’t of any help for people fighting for their existence. The current international legal system make minority groups believe they can rightfully claim independence.\textsuperscript{35} Desires of self-determination are often a gradual process which seems very sudden to the international community, due to a lack of attention paid to movements before a conflict breaks out.\textsuperscript{36} This leads to the feeling that violence is the only solution.

Ethnic self-awareness is encouraged by people’s attraction to democratic values and spread by mass communication. Democracy, human rights, individual fulfillment, freedom of speech, assembly and the press are concepts that might originate from the West, but these are principles that people in other part of the world want to embrace. These values can act as an incubator for minority group’s demands for autonomy or independence.\textsuperscript{37}

\textbullet National Aspirations

According to Fuller’s theory of cycle of ethnicity, the peoples of the world can be divided into two categories. Those whose identity is fulfilled enough so that they are ready to give away some degrees of sovereignty and live in a multi-ethnic state, even if this means not being part of a majority. The other group -much larger- have not reached the necessary fulfillment of their identities to be able to accept living in a multi-ethnic state, which they see as a threat to

\textsuperscript{32} cf. Graham Fuller in: Carley, 1996, 5.
\textsuperscript{33} cf. Carley, 1996, VI.
\textsuperscript{34} cf. Graham Fuller in: Carley, 1996, 5.
\textsuperscript{35} cf. Carley, 1996, 12.
\textsuperscript{36} cf. Carley, 1996, VII.
\textsuperscript{37} cf. Graham Fuller in: Carley, 1996, 5.
their own culture. These peoples want the right to build their own national project and some see assimilation as a cultural suicide.38

“Countries that can foster sufficient social cohesion and a common identity while minimizing horizontal inequities are the most likely to stay whole,” according to Kaplan. “Those that cannot do so and have obvious identity cleavages are likely to ignite secessionist movements.”39 Combined with the belief that it would bring an economic or political advantage, national aspirations often lead to secessionist movements.

3.3 Interpretation of the Principle of Self-Determination throughout History

3.3.1 The Three Eras of Self-Determination

The history of self-determination can be split in three eras:

First Era
During the first era of self-determination, from the 19th century to 1945, the first connection was made between language, culture and ethnicity, on the one hand, and statehood on the other. Many nationalist movements of the time were inspired by this idea and wanted to use it to unify nations such as the Germans and the Italians. Following the disintegration of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires, nationalist groups expressed their desire to divide larger territories into smaller, nation-based ones. At this time, the concept of self-determination was purely political and described autonomy rather than statehood. Prerequisite for statehood included political and economic requirements, such as viability and geographic size.40 Before World War I, already existing states would recognize the existence of a new one after a national movement had secured their authority and independence. In the eye of international

law, self-determination only became a guiding principle during the drawing of new boundaries along national lines at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference. Internationally supervised plebiscites first appeared to settle the dispute over Upper Silesia and Schweswig in 1921, whereas autonomy was granted for the Åland islands in the same year as a result of the reports of Commissions appointed by the League of Nations. Woodrow Wilson is described by many authors as being one of the persons who identified the most with the principle of self-determination. Even he, as a fierce defender of the idea, did not consider self-determination to be an absolute right, but rather a relative one. He split the term into internal (peoples should have the right to choose their form of government) and external (the establishment of a new state). Wilson concentrated his effort on the internal aspect of the concept, with the goal of protecting the cultural and linguistic rights of minorities. Wilson failed to have the principle written into the League of Nation’s Covenant, due to mostly European Power’s skepticism.42

Second Era
The second era in the history of self-determination starts in 1945 with the creation of the United Nations and the mention of self-determination in its Charter, evolving it from a principle to a right. Still, it referred to states and not to peoples. Later, following the 1960 United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Peoples, self-determination was used as a synonym for decolonization and the concept elevated to an absolute right for colonial peoples to become independent. In the wake of this Declaration, people in “non self-governing territories” had the following choices: the creation of a new sovereign independent state, the free association with another independent state or the integration with an already existing independent state.43

Third Era
The late 1970s and the end of decolonization mark the beginning of the third
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era of self-determination which lasts until now. It attempts to combine both first eras and merge the ethnic and cultural rights of minorities with the territorial absolutism, creating the popular idea that "every distinctive ethnic or national group has a right to independence", which has not been acknowledged by international law. How is the "right" to self-determination perceived nowadays? In the mainly accepted definition, the right to self-determination does not confer the right to secede or create a new state. Self-determination can be seen as as being part of the "right of people to choose their own political regime and to be free of authoritarian oppression." For some international lawyers, it is synonym of the right of living under a democratic regime. However, there is a discussion whether certain conditions of human rights violation could lead to a last-resort right to secession.

3.4 Secession as a last resort?

- The international community’s response to self-determination claims

Responses of the international community have been guided by some principles which have been evolving with time. Self-government, as a guiding principle, has become relevant, but is far from being the most valued. International security, stability, territorial integrity have long been a focus of international law and keep their importance up to today. The international community, in its effort to support democracy, has been favouring plebiscite -asking the inhabitants of the territory in question- as an exceptional way to solve territorial claims in a democratic way.

Outside the context of decolonization used in combination with the 1960 Declaration, the international community’s view on separatist claims has been unfavourable. Wondering if recent successes such as the new states who emerged from the Soviet Union and former Yugoslavia, as well as Timor-Leste and

---

45 cf. Carley, 1996, VI.
46 Horowitz, 2003, 52.
South Sudan show a possibility of a change of paradigm regarding how secession is treated in international law. Orentlicher, Professor of International Law at American University, points out that each case and the mediation effort that go with it are reshaping international law.\(^{48}\) The international community considered the creation of new states originating from the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia as being caused by their disintegration, rather than by the secession of their constituent countries.\(^{49}\)

For Orentlicher, self-determination claims have a human right problem at their root,\(^{50}\) and territorial integrity should not be used as a justification for repression or genocide.\(^{51}\) Condemning human rights violations could justify the desire of a minority to secede. However, the international community seems unwilling to make such a decision.\(^{52}\)

When faced with oppressive governments, the only way to them to comply with human rights regulations might be to threaten them with outside military forces. The United State’s view on the matter is that you can’t force an oppressive government’s behaviour towards its minorities unless you are ready to use your military force against them. Already in 1996, Gidon Gottlieb of the University of Chicago, present at Carley’s roundtable, recommended the United States should perhaps concentrate on waves of migration to Europe, "which are pushing the continent’s politics in the direction of political extremism" instead of becoming party to other disputes. It should also care about self-determination issues, as these could influence its neighbours a lot, as well as asserting their values in order to keep support from its citizens.

The Western point of view regarding human rights is based on western values and mostly individual rights. Advocating for human rights in other parts of the world might be, sometimes deliberately, misinterpreted as backing up a minority group’s claim for independence.\(^{53}\)

\(^{49}\) cf. Beary, 2008, 34.  
\(^{50}\) cf. Carley, 1996, 9.  
\(^{51}\) cf. Carley, 1996, VII.  
\(^{52}\) cf. Carley, 1996, VI.  
According to Beary, instead of taking measures of prevention, the United Nations’ strategy is to wait for a conflict to break out and then send a peacekeeping mission.\textsuperscript{54} The United Nation’s approach is, in Carley’s opinion, a zero-sum game. Its Security Council is, according to International Law, the only body allowed "to take military action against an aggressor." In the case of the China-Taiwan conflict, for example, only one state could have a seat at the UN and Taiwan’s was replaced by China’s. Other international bodies use another approach where reality (e.g. economic reality) precedes formal notions of nation-states. If a country can prove its functioning economic autonomy, it can be part of some international organization. (WTO members, Hong Kong and Macao, Taiwan in Asian Development Bank). Some sub-state entities enjoy the right of establishing foreign relations. In this sense, UN members could also open dialogue with sub-national groups. "Minority groups need an international forum to express their desires, and a variety of regional organizations could offer them such an arena."\textsuperscript{55} Such Forum exists in the Form of the Unrepresented Nations and Peoples Organization (UNPO), which should be given more attention according to Carley. It must be noted that 90% of UNPO’s members are not looking for independence\textsuperscript{56} Offering UNPO a space at the UN or in Trade Organizations might raise false hope and encourage new minority groups to ask for more, according to Hannum. Gottlieb agrees that providing a space at the UN would be destabilizing, but that some topics such as the environment should not be reserved to states. Minimizing and devaluing the “aura surrounding statehood” might be a solution.\textsuperscript{57}

- **The discourse around secession as self-determination**

Back in the 1920s, the two commissions appointed by the League of Nation regarding the Åland Islands case both came to the conclusion that “international law did not recognize a right of national self-determination.” Nevertheless, Orentlicher argues that according to her interpretation, the Commission

\textsuperscript{54} cf. Beary, 2008, 34.
\textsuperscript{55} Carley, 1996, 14-15.
\textsuperscript{56}cf. Beary, 2008, 35.
\textsuperscript{57} cf. Carley, 1996, 15.
of Rapporteurs hinted that possible exceptions could be made in form of a remedial right to secede, and secession could be a "last resort when the State lacks either the will or the power to enact and apply just and effective guarantees of minority rights."\(^{58}\)

Horowitz strongly objects, citing another statement by the Rapporteurs:

"To concede to minorities, either of language or religion, or to any fraction of a population the right of withdrawing from a community to which they belong, because it is their wish or their good pleasure, would be to destroy order and stability within States and to inaugurate anarchy in international life; it would be to uphold a theory incompatible with the very idea of the State as a territorial and political unity."\(^{59}\)

After self-determination had been enshrined in the 1960 Declaration, the term became a legal right synonym to the free determination of colonized peoples over their political status. The question arose whether this right to self-determination also applied to context other than decolonization, for example the persistent denial of "meaningful participation in national political processes".\(^{60}\)

According to Orentlicher, the Declaration on Friendly Relations of 1970 stated that the right to territorial integrity would be held by established states outside the special context of colonization.\(^{61}\) This right, however, "might be forfeited if a state’s government did not represent "the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction of any kind".\(^{62}\)

- The argument for secession as a last resort

Orentlicher considers that "a general right to democratic governance carries

\(^{60}\) cf. Orentlicher, 2003, 22.
\(^{61}\) The Declaration on Friendly Relations of 1970 grants the right of territorial integrity to states whose government represents "the whole people belonging to the territory without distinction as to race, creed, or colour". This would imply that racial and religious group would be entitled to this right, provided that they are denied participation in the political decision-making process, but linguistic and national groups would not. The UN Declaration of 1990s rectified this to "people belonging to the territory without distinction of any kind." cf. Orentlicher, 2003, 23.
with it the right of a national subgroup to secede if this is the only means available to secure its members’ right to self-government. In this view, secession is not a general entitlement for any particular type of collectivity but rather an **extraordinary exception** to the universal right of self-government."\(^{63}\)

For Orentlicher, even though international law tries to avoid separatist claims, its "core commitment to basic human rights and democratic principles (implies the) recognition of a last-resort, remedial right for a subnational group to secede when these rights are denied its members." The question remains which inequality and with which degree of persistence would justify secession as a remedial right.\(^{64}\)

Carley regrets that secession is not recognized as an international right. "Secession can be a legitimate aim of some self-determination movements, particularly in response to gross and systematic violations of human rights and when the entity is potentially politically and economically viable."\(^{65}\) A right to secede would signify a reinterpretation of the right of self-determination, to be held by ethnic groups. Secession can be seen, in some case, as a solution to end ethnic conflict and violence.\(^{66}\) If secession is the only means for minorities "to secure its members’ right to self-government", it can be interpreted by some as an exceptional right.

For Kaplan, the only legitimate reason to secede is when people are "deprived of the right to participate in government, and there are serious violations of human rights, such as genocide." "It is only when other forms of self-determination - like local autonomy - are blocked that secession becomes inevitable."\(^{67}\)

---

**The argument against secession as a last resort**

\(^{63}\) Orentlicher, 2003, 25.
\(^{64}\) Orentlicher, 2003, 24-25.
\(^{65}\) Carley, 1996, VII.
\(^{67}\) cf. Beary, 2008, 35.
Even though Orentlicher advocates for a remedial right to secession, she admits that one risk of recognizing a right to independence is that minorities could use it as a leverage to go against the will of the majority, which is against democratic principles.68

For Horowitz, secession tends to worsen problems and cannot promise the creation of a new homogeneous successor state people would expect. He argues that the establishment of a new state does not put an end to conflicts, violence and minority oppression and that the new entity is not likely to be able to guarantee more minority protection. A right to secede would not encourage people to seek coexistence and accommodation within an already existing state, it would rather create new fruitless secessionist movements who do not have the means for a successful outcome. With the help of institutions, minorities should be encouraged to seek satisfying outcomes while remaining in the same nation-state.69

According to Horowitz, just a few international lawyers advocate for the right to secede. By studying ethnic politics, people become, in his opinion, less enthusiastic about secession. Horowitz presents some assumptions about positive aspects of secession in order to counters them. According to him, people argue that secession could pave the way for the creation of an homogeneous successor state. It would guarantee minority protection in case a state remains heterogeneous, and would diminish conflict at the root of the secessionist movement.70

In his point of view, if it were so easy to make minority rights be respected, why do we even get to the point that a minority wants to secede because their rights are being denied? Furthermore, new minorities would be created in the newly founded state, and they might be victim of years of accumulated grudges. Secession if likely to exacerbate the situation, create new conflicts and turn domestic issues into international ones. Therefore, Prudent, consensual partition does not require the creation of new rights.71

Additionally, a right to secession could motivate irredentist claims, disrupt ethnic balance in a region and lead remaining ethnic groups to also wonder whether they want to leave the state. Secession gives an advantage to militant groups instead of encouraging mediation. If secession is seen as a legitimate last resort for extreme conditions, there is a risk that some people are willing to create these situations on purpose. Nation-states fear that devolving powers to minorities could lead to secession claims.\footnote{Horowitz, 2003, 54-59.}

Horowitz strongly disagrees with Orentlicher’s statement that international law implicitly reserves an exception to grant secession as a last resort, even when human rights and democratic principles are being denied.\footnote{Horowitz, 2003, 59.}

- **Self-determination as the right to democracy**

  In "The Emerging Right to Democratic Governance", Thomas M. Franck explained that Democracy has become a major way to validate governance and be seen as a legitimate entity within the international community. A government’s responsibility is to secure the "unalienable rights" of the citizens. Its powers are legitimate when it can demonstrate the consent of the people. How rules are made and respected within a country is used to measure legitimacy as well.\footnote{Franck, 1992.}

  The principle of democratic entitlement has established itself, evolving from a right to free expression to a right to free and fair election processes. The principles of democratic governance implies that democracy should be a global entitlement, "promoted and protected by collective international processes".\footnote{Franck, 1992, 90.}

  Horowitz points out that secessionist movements are often created by the undemocratic way minorities are being dealt with by regional majorities. In his views, however, minorities are entitled to meaningful political participation, which by no means is synonym to independence.\footnote{Horowitz, 2003, 54.}

  In Orentlicher’s view, everyone should be entitled to political participation...
on a basis of full equality. No state is willing to disavow such a statement, but at the same time very few are willing to back up claims outside the context of decolonization.\textsuperscript{77}

We have established that scholars’ interpretation of self-determination differ and may or may not include secession. However, the right to democracy and political participation seems to be a point where most agree. In the next section, we will go through alternatives to secession, different accommodation agreements which balance relationships within a state provide minorities with more rights and delegated powers.

### 3.5 Alternatives to Secession

Thomas Benedikter, economist and social researcher in Bozen, describes most states as being dominated by a "titular nation" which exerts cultural hegemony. Many minority ethnic groups are thus structurally disadvantaged and do not have access to power. When attempting to re-balance the relationships between majorities and minorities, a few legal options are available.\textsuperscript{78}

Options for preventing and managing conflicts include "minority rights, autonomy, voting systems and legislative assemblies that give incentives to ethnic groups to work together, to various types of power-sharing and consociational systems, to confederal and federal systems."\textsuperscript{79} The redistribution of resources, the reformation of state structure, the recognition of minority rights and the empowerment of peoples to participate in political and and represent their community help avoid secession.\textsuperscript{80} A state can share or devolve different powers with a smaller entity that belongs to it, who then exercises some self-governance. There are different types of decentralization:\textsuperscript{81}

- Policy decentralization: decision-making on polity issues

\textsuperscript{77} cf. Orentlicher, 2003, 23.
\textsuperscript{78} cf. Benedikter, 2009, 5.
\textsuperscript{79} cf. Ramsbotham, Miall, and Woodhouse, 2011, 127.
\textsuperscript{80} cf. Benedikter, 2009, 6.
\textsuperscript{81} cf. Colomb, Bakke, and Tomaney, 2014, 2.
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- Fiscal decentralization: decision-making on taxation or division of tax revenues
- Political decentralization: election of regional government officials by popular vote

As we mentioned earlier, we should take into consideration that minority rights are not only individual rights due to the fact that some rights can only be exercised as a group. (see 2.2.2)

Many different power sharing arrangements have been made around the world, ranging from federalism, to different levels of autonomy or other forms of self-governance, as you can see in Table 3.1. In federalism, all constituent territorial units have equal powers and have the same relationship with a central government. Federalism has been known as a good accommodation for ethnic diversity in states such as Switzerland and Canada, but in some cases, particular arrangement to protect minorities are more necessary in some entities of the state than in others. (eg. Åland Islands, Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland, South Tyrol, Sicily, etc.) The main difference between autonomy and federalism is that in a federation, all regions are involved in policy making at the central level, whereas autonomous entities govern themselves and have no additional rights towards the central power. If there is the necessity of treating one entity of a state differently, political autonomy might be the most appropriate solution. With "political" autonomy, the goal is to retain the territorial integrity of a state while protecting minority rights by delegating self-government to a region. "Cultural", or "personal" autonomy grants rights to people not according to a territory, but to members of a specific group. Autonomy is a form of internal self-determination, which allows minorities to determine aspects of their lives while still belonging to a larger state. In a real autonomy, the entity should have the right to set out own laws which do not have to be passed by the state parliament. It requires its own parliament and locally elected members of parliament as well as elected executives. Kymlicka introduces the concept of multicultural federalism, the creation of

---

a federal-like structure where a majority forms a local majority, can exercise self-government, and usually have their language recognized officially.\textsuperscript{83}

In the next Chapter, we will concentrate on the reasons for Catalonia’s and Scotland’s claim to independence, including the historical background and the results of the interviews.

\textsuperscript{83} cf. Kymlicka, 2002, 4.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government arrangement</th>
<th>Description of the arrangement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associated state</td>
<td>A federal (treaty) relationship wherein the smaller polity is linked to a larger state. It has substantial authority over its own affairs, but very little influence on those of the larger state. Usually either party may dissolve the relationship at any time.</td>
<td>Cook Islands, San Marino, Micronesia, Holy See.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominium</td>
<td>A polity is jointly ruled by two authorities in a way that permits substantial self-rule.</td>
<td>Andorra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation</td>
<td>A loose, but institutionalized cooperation of two or more independent states without federal constraints</td>
<td>CIS, EU, Serbia-Montenegro (until 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservation</td>
<td>A form of self-governance of a smaller people on a given territory, with separate “citizenship” as legal members of the titular ethnic group of the reservation, almost no participation to general affairs of the state.</td>
<td>Navajo, Sioux, Hopi (the United States), Yanomami (Brazil) etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation</td>
<td>Two or more constituent entities enter into a constitutional framework with common institutions. Each member state retains certain delegated powers and the central government also retains powers over the member states.</td>
<td>Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, USA, India, Russia, Brazil, Canada etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent territory</td>
<td>A political dependency, as defined under Article 73 of the UN Charter, is not considered to be part of the motherland or mainland of the governing state.</td>
<td>Gibraltar, Virgin Islands, Tokelau etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial autonomy</td>
<td>Integral parts of a political sovereign state that have legislative and executive powers entrenched by law. Specific solutions for one or more units of a state, but not for the whole territorial state structure.</td>
<td>Aland Islands, Gagauzia, Aceh, Greenland, Muslim Mindanao etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Power sharing arrangements. Table extracted from Benedikter, 2009, 10.
Chapter 4

Scotland’s & Catalonia’s Independence Claim

4.1 Qualitative Interviews

Six interviews were conducted for the purpose of this work, three for each entity. Gender and age were mixed in order to account for diversity. Because "a democratic future requires a past, in which not only the top people are being heard,“¹ I decided to interview people who are not necessarily involved with the independence cause on a higher level. I found my interview partners through acquaintances and tried to create a pleasant atmosphere where people would trust me and share information freely. The following booklet (4.1.1) was sent to the interview partners in advance, and following the model of an open, "semi-structured" interview, a dialogue should be established where there is no strict order regarding which questions should be answered first, allowing partners to mention aspects I wouldn’t have thought of, and allowing me to react to the interview partner by asking additional questions. This way, reality is constructed through the eye of interview partner. An open interview gives one the chance to find out about things one would not have asked on their own, because they are beyond its own horizon.²

² “Ein offenes Interview bietet die Chance, Dinge zu erfahren, nach denen man nicht gefragt hätte, weil sie jenseits des eigenen Horizontes liegen”. Schlehe, 2008, 121.
Chapter 4. Scotland’s & Catalonia’s Independence Claim

Each interview has been summarized individually according to the categories in the interview booklet (4.2). Later on, the most relevant information of each interviews will be compiled together in order to allow for a comparison between the Catalan and Scottish Claim to self-determination. The names of the interview partners were changed apart from Gary P. and Henry B. who accepted to appear with their real name.

4.1.1 Interview Booklet

A. Catalonia & Spain | Scotland & The UK

A.1. How do you feel in terms of identity? (one or more answers)
   - Catalan | Scottish
   - Spanish | British
   - European
   - World Citizen
   - Other identity

A.2. What do you love most about:
   - Catalonia | Scotland?
   - Spain | the UK?

A.3. What would you improve in Catalan | Scottish society?

A.4. What are the main similarities between the communities of Spain | the United Kingdom?

A.5. If all Catalan | Scottish people had something in common, what would it be? What makes the Catalan | Scottish nation...
   - unique in the world?
   - distinct from other Spanish communities | UK countries?

B. History

B.1. Which historical events most influenced Catalonia | Scotland and which role do they have in Catalonia’s | Scotland’s collective memory?

B.2. How was history taught in school? What was the main focus?

B.3. What is, for you, the Catalan | Scottish culture?

B.4. What is your relationship to Catalan and Castilian? | Scottish Gaelic, Scots,
C. Minority Rights

C.1. What is your understanding of a “minority”? Do you consider Catalans or Scots to be a minority? -ethnic, cultural, linguistic, religious?

C.2. What measures are being taken in Spain or the UK for the protection and development of minorities and aspect of their lives such as culture and language?

C.3. If Catalonia or Scotland needs additional rights, which should these be?

C.4. Do you believe people should be able to create new states or that we should try to fix internal problems, or something in the middle?

C.5. How would you like the international community to respond to a Catalan or Scottish declaration of independence?

D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences

D.1. What would be the benefits of an independent Catalonia or Scotland?

D.2. What would be the disadvantages of an independent Catalonia or Scotland?

D.3. What do people want to change by being independent?

D.4. What do you think is the reason for people in Catalonia or Scotland wanting to be independent?

D.5. What do you think would happen if Catalonia or Scotland became independent?

D.6. Which place should Catalonia or Scotland have within Spain or the UK, within Europe, within the World?

E. A Good Life

E.1. What is your definition of a good life?

E.2. What’s the most important to you in life?

E.3. What needs to be provided by the government and society for you to live a good life?

E.4. To which extend do you feel the parliaments and governments of Catalonia and Spain or Scotland and the UK represent your interest?
Optional question (only if comfortable sharing political views): Where would you situate yourself on this Political Compass?

The left right axis is the economic scale, or how much you think the government should intervene in the economy.

The top bottom axis is the social scale, or how much you think the government should be involved in guaranteeing collectivism.

(Top, government very much involved, bottom, people should do it on a voluntary basis.)

4.2 Summaries of interviews

4.2.1 Ana María T.L.

Originally from a small Catalan village, Ana María T.L., 62, lives near Barcelona and owns a pharmacy where she works with her daughter. Her son Joan lives and studies in Graz, and when I heard his mother was coming to visit, I asked if I could interview her in order to get the point of view about Catalan independence. The interview took place at a typical Buschenschank restaurant near Graz, a quiet enough environment so that we could record our conversation while Ana María could discover a new aspect of Austrian culture during her visit. The interview was conducted in Spanish and Joan only intervened a few times to share some thoughts and help me clarify some questions. I directly transcribed the Spanish audio file into English and Joan, who speaks both languages fluently, proofread and confirmed it. See translation of interview: A.1.

A. Catalonia & Spain - Ana María showed no hesitation when asked about her identity, she feels Catalan 100%. She appreciates the general feeling of Catalonia, with their own culture and their own language. Traditions are lived in community: "Another thing about tradition is that when your environment, the people around you, your relatives are from the same region and have the same lifestyle, then the circle of people you know enables the culture to thrive."
Within her family, everyone speaks Catalan together, even the members of the family who are originally Castilians. When she was a kid, under Franco, Catalan was prohibited and she learned how to write it later, when she voluntarily enrolled into classes. Ana María thinks and does everything in Catalan, even though she admits having more vocabulary in Castilian because she studied in that language. Ana María’s son, Joan, learned Catalan at school, and she explains that Catalans fought to obtain the right to be educated in their language.

There are many things to improve in Catalan society, mainly education and health services. Large companies should contribute more by sharing a part of their profit to benefit society. Ana María would like to see a more social and egalitarian society.

Because every region is distinct and everyone has a different lifestyle, Ana María can’t find similarities between Catalans and Spaniards. "Everyone is allowed to think how they want and should respect each other and our differences".

What is distinct about the Catalans is their more open-minded and European mentality. Catalans have their proper history, their own language and way of thinking. According to Ana María, Catalans are more structured. "We have our schedules and working hours, how things should work and we stick to it. We don’t spend all our time at the bar, we work, we have holidays and free time but otherwise we work. We work hard and we contribute to the other communities. A lot of other communities get their things because we contribute so much."

**B. History** - As main historical events, Ana María mentions the civil war and the Franco dictatorship. "I think it changed the Catalan society a lot because we lost everything, all our rights, everything." Ana María’s son added before the civil war, Spain was very advanced in terms of human rights and that the country went backwards on many level. Now the country is very centralized and regions with their own cultures are overwhelmed by the centralized regime. In her time, only Spanish history was taught in school. "I studied
the whole Franco regime. You know, who wins get to tell the story. The winner writes the history and the loser, well, doesn’t have a say.”

**C. Minority Rights** - In Ana María’s view, Catalans are a minority within Spain, culturally and linguistically. For her, Spain does not do much to protect minorities. In her opinion, Catalans have to fight to have new rights, as they did to get the right to have their language at school. Regarding the autonomy of Catalonia, Ana María calls it "coffee for all". "As the country was entering a democracy, they thought, "What are we going to do?", see, Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country, we have our own languages, and in principle they should be the three autonomous countries that should exist. But in order not to give us such power, they made this coffee for all, all regions got the same. We give a lot to autonomy to everybody so the important ones lose power.”

Ana María’s opinion is that Catalans need more liberties and self-determination. Seeing Catalan politicians put in jail after last October’s referendum was a step back. People were put in jail in Madrid, away from their family. The new socialist government allowed them to be incarcerated in Catalonia, and the next step Ana María hopes for is their release. She gets the feeling she should be careful what she says to people, especially at work, because if the government does not like what you say, they can just put you in jail.

Ana María advocates for the right of people to vote and if they decide to have a new state through a referendum, they should be allowed to create one. She participated in the October referendum and regrets that it was deemed illegal by the Spanish government. She could vote peacefully but denounces the violence with which some some people were treated the the Civil Guard, "Franco’s police."

**D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences** - Ana María does not know whether the government represents her interests, but "wants to think so". According to Ana María’s explanations, the main benefit for Catalonia as an independent state would be economic. The new state would have more money to spend on what people decide on. If it were up to her, she would invest
more in education, health and social assistance. A problem would be that this would mean leaving the European Union, and she thinks the Catalans "would be willing to tighten our belts for a time so that it gets better".

"We want to be independent because we are tired of not of getting answers from the Spanish state, for nothing. It’s been two years, and Rajoy does not want to listen or grant anything. It should be a social concert, where people communicate. If you don’t get any answers of any kind, then there’s a moment where you look for your solutions elsewhere. We want to find solutions for the problems in Catalan society. Then you feel abandoned." Seeing Catalonia becoming independent would be a dream of Ana María’s youth.

E. A good life - For Ana María, a good life is synonym with having a good work where people earn enough to have a lot of free time and enjoy a little more. She would use her time to travel more and maybe start a hobby. Ana María said she can’t complain because at least she has a job and can survive with it, whereas so many people work hard a earn a minimum salary of €700. To enable a better life for the community, the government should raise the minimum salary and create more job offers for young people. The most important in Ana María’s life is her family, including the extended one with all cousins, uncles and aunts.

4.2.2 Arnau C.V.

Arnau, born in Barcelona, grew up in a town 10 km away from the capital city of Catalonia. He has relatives in different parts of Spain, such as Madrid and Málaga. During his studies of Business Administration & Marketing, he has spent a semester in the Netherlands through the Erasmus programme and is doing a professional internship in Graz during the summer semester 2018. Upon hearing Arnau was from Catalonia, a friend of mine put us in contact. Arnau accepted to have an interview with me and said he would be more comfortable in Spanish, because he felt he could much better describe the situation
and his opinion in Spanish than in English. I translated the interview myself and Arnau confirmed it. See translation of interview: A.2.

A. Catalonia & Spain - Due to his stay in the Netherlands as a student and London when he was smaller, Arnau feels European first. He also feels Catalan and identifies much with the culture of the region, and feels Spanish as well. His identity derives from his family, from the culture, and the territory. Arnau feels like home in Europe, yet he would like to get out of his comfort zone and visit many more places in the world, before he can say he feels like a world citizen.

In Catalonia, Arnau loves above all the people. He enjoys the culture, the common stream of thought and the philosophy of life. People in Catalonia are said to be very hard working and tend to save money to ensure a stability of life, partly due to the hard times they have had under the Franco dictatorship. Sharing is an important value for Arnau, and he enjoys sharing time and meals with family and friends.

There are many things Arnau loves about Spain, especially about the southern most part of the country, Andalusia. Over there, people are very emotionally open. In the south, people live according to the motto "carpe diem", "live in the moment". He would wish for Catalonia to live more in the moment and less in the future or in the past, and for Andalusia to think more about the future, to find the right balance.

For Arnau, culture is a feeling of community. Food is what unites Spanish people the most, what you can share with everyone.

B. History - As historical major events, Arnau mentioned the Muslim conquest of Spain followed by the Reconquista, the rural flights of the caziques, the two World Wars, and the Franco dictatorship. Many of the nowadays inequalities have their roots in the Franco era, because rich people were supported because they were raising the GDP of Spain, and the gap between rich and poor got bigger. Franco also banned the use of the Catalan language, which was seen as a huge attack on Catalan culture. Nowadays, people are taught
Catalan at school and Arnau is completely bilingual, a "native bilingual", as he defines himself, with the ability of combining both Spanish and Catalan perfectly.

The way history is taught depends much on the professor. Arnau was lucky to have a very good professor who tried to remain neutral. Arnau was taught international history, Catalan history as well as Spanish history.

Catalonia emerged as a industrial power, the strongest in Spain along with the Basque Country. Many people moved from the countryside into the city and worked in the industry, contributing to making the area strong. One big problem is that seeing Catalonia does not have fiscal autonomy, the money generated by the region is put into the hands of the government and redistributed throughout Spain. The redistribution is seen as unfair in Catalonia, and the region can’t invest in health care and education as much as it would like to.

Regarding politics, the main parties in Spain are the PP and the PSOE. In Arnau’s view, the PP "has always been characterized by corruption".

**C. Minority Rights** - A minority, in Arnau’s understanding, is "simply a part of the population that doesn’t have enough people or influence to be able to decide". He does not consider Catalans to be a minority, because also within Catalonia people are very different. For Arnau, "minority" is more used to depreciate people.

Governance in Spain has been rotating between the PP and the PSOE. The PP, in power until recently, has not taken a lot of measures to protect minorities or smaller communities. There hasn’t been bilateral communication, and Arnau thinks it’s mainly the responsibility of the government to establish communication, for they are the ones who are able to take decisions and they should thus live with the consequences. The PP is a conservative party, and for Arnau, "the fact of wanting to conserves hinders acceptance towards other cultures". Rajoy, the former president, resigned due to corruption. Under his rule, people involved in the referendum of 2017 were imprisoned and Arnau
considers them as political prisoners. Arnau finds it not right that while thousands of other corruption cases have been dropped, these people are imprisoned and others, like Puigdemont, who defended their ideology, cannot get back to their home country at the risk of being arrested. "I’m not a partisan of Puigdemont, but I’m not a partisan of what is happening with this situation either." Nonetheless, Arnau is optimistic that the situation will improve with the new government in power.

Arnau isn’t of the opinion that Catalans need more rights, because they have the same rights as any other European or Spanish citizens. However, they do need more liberties, above all, the right to express their opinion and decide, which is for him a fundamental right of people. Due to a lack of bilateral communication, "people didn’t have the adequate means to express their opinion". In order to give more liberties to the people, a government should be more open-minded and ready for dialogue. Both Spanish and Catalan governments should be more open-minded and work towards finding a middle point.

Despite obvious cultural differences, which Arnau respects and understands, he thinks the world is a "unique society and everyone should help everyone else". Arnau does not advocate for the creation of new states, because he thinks there are other solutions. As an analogy, he gives an example of someone living in a shared flat. You can either move out and be on your own, which is your right, or you can talk to you flatmate and find a solution, a set of rules that fits both. He mentions the strange simultaneous development of a world fragmentation at the level of the states, and the unification of technology, communication and transportation at the global level. "We have a very rapid international development and on the other side you have many barriers, legal ones, political ones." "I don’t want to build new barriers, but to open doors."

**D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences** - Arnau would have expected more reaction from the international community regarding the Catalan declaration of independence. He would have appreciated more mediation from the member states of the EU, which could have helped.
If Catalonia were to become independent, Arnau predicts the social and cultural level would not change much, but that it would benefit the economy. There are many factors that would influence Catalonia’s fate, such as whether they would become members of the European Union. Right now, what is generated by Catalonia does not benefit the region, but is split between all the regions of Spain. By being independent, Catalonia could keep the money and chose how to invest it. Catalans value their community and make effort to improve it and make it grow, one problem being that “we want to grow with our community, not with the others.” At the current state, Catalonia can’t invest in health and education as much as people would want to. As an example, Arnau explains the time he went on Erasmus and got a scholarship of €300 per month, while people from Andalusia would get €500 because Andalusia can invest more in education. He also pays €2000 a year for his university, while a Andalusian student only pays €500. Arnau finds this differences within Spain unequal, and finds that the government spends the money in a wrong way. ”They’ve built airports that go nowhere, highways that go nowhere, they speculated on real estate, they’ve subsidized companies that have been committing fraud, in the end it doesn’t work correctly”. Arnau would wish for Catalonia to have economic and fiscal autonomy, rather than being independent. He reiterates the economic factor, ”and if it weren’t a benefit, at least we would have the possibility to decide what to do with our money. So I’m in favour to regulate a fiscal autonomy or additional regulations so that we can operate with our own money.”

As disadvantages of independence, Arnau would predict a loss of the Spanish cultural identity in Catalonia. The connection between Spain and Catalonia would be lost. At the economic level, international trade agreements would not be valid for Catalonia anymore”. "I also have to say I think Spain would end up more harmed than Catalonia."

**E. A good life** - A good life, for Arnau, is synonym with being happy. Being happy means being satisfied with oneself, being good with his family and friends, and live a healthy life in economic stability. To do so, one needs to earn
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enough money to sustain oneself according to the standards of living where one resides. The part of the government is to offer open communication and to listen to the population. Arnau would like to live in an egalitarian society where everybody has the same conditions of life.

4.2.3 Angela M.L.

Angela, 23, just finished her business study and is preparing to travel around the world for the next year. She currently lives in Barcelona, where she was brought up. Her mother is from Colombia and father from Catalonia. I met Angela through her boyfriend Enrique, who comes from Sevilla and did an Erasmus in Graz a few years ago and is mentioned a few times in the interview. The interview was conducted in English over Skype and its transcription was confirmed by Angela. Find it here: A.3.

A. Catalonia & Spain - Angela speaks both Catalan and Spanish equally well. "Everybody in Catalonia speaks both, Catalan and Spanish completely bilingual." Angela can switch very easily between Catalan and Spanish. She speaks Catalan with her father who is from the region, and Spanish with her mother who is from Colombia, as well as with her brother. Angela’s grandmother speaks Catalan but never learned how to write it due to the prohibition of the language under Franco. The younger generation speaks and writes it properly. Angela visited the French high school in Barcelona and had equal amount of Spanish and Catalan classes.

When studying in Catalonia, all students have to speak Catalan. Some written exams can be taken in Spanish too, but all classes are taught in Catalan. She appreciates it much when she sees foreign people making the effort of learning the language. "It’s more than enough for us to see that other people make an effort to understand."

Angela feels that the culture in Catalonia and in other northern regions of Spain is not as specific as in the south. To explain her thought, she says
that if you ask a foreigner about Spanish culture, they would come up with things that are typically from the south, particularly Andalusia. "If you’re asking someone who’s not from Spain they will automatically tell you something from Andalusia, and think the rest of Spain is the same. "The rest of the world gets the impression that the whole of Spain is like Andalusia." She admits her family does not live traditions such as other families, which might explain why she feels culture is not as strong as in other regions of Spain. Regarding her identity, Angela does not feel the need to express it with percentages or numbers, she feels equally Catalan, Spanish and European.

Catalonia, in Angela’s opinion, has been much more progressive and open-minded than the rest of Spain in many aspects. "I really like how open-minded we are, how people, generally speaking, do accept differences, or are very progressive in a lot of senses, for example LGBT rights, Catalonia: no problem. Or environmental-wise, or feminism-wise."

What she appreciates most in Spain are the differences and various characteristics of different regions, such as languages, traditions, climates and landscapes.

B. History - She points out that Catalonia became so industrially powerful because of its geographic location and because the Spanish government of Spain also supported in the past. "The fact that Catalonia has been able to go this far because we had the government supporting us in the past, we have been given the means to build our infrastructure, we have big factories, not because we’ve already had it from scratch, you know, but because the government has also been working on giving us these things and for example we’re very lucky that Barcelona is completely open to the Mediterranean, if we were a region in the centre of Spain, what would we have you know, it’s like lottery, you’re born where you’re born and we’re also lucky to be next to France and we’re well connected."

Angela shares that it hurts to see her home divided. She understand people who are in favour of independence might be frustrated or angry about the current situation but thinks it did not start the right way, because she senses
a political manipulation behind it. One big problem in Catalan society is that people have not been heard enough and that political parties are unwilling to reach agreements that make everybody happy.

C. Minority Rights - In Angela’s eyes, Catalans are not a minority. The terms is for her a way to refer to where she is from, to one of her nationalities.

D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences - The main reason why Angela does not want Catalonia to become independent is because "there is absolutely no plan". "We’re all theorizing about many things and nobody has sat down to write a plan, we don’t know if we would keep the Euro, everybody is talking about being independent but we don’t even know if we would have the same money, the same currency. What would we trade with the rest of Europe? If I have double nationality, Colombian and Spanish, do I have to choose between Catalan and Spanish, do I have to give up Colombian? Do I just say no to Spanish nationality and stay Catalan and Colombian? We don’t know. Pensions? Retirement, how does that work? Does the Catalan government have enough for the all retirement plan? Are we trading with Spain? Will they start a commercial war with us? Do I need a visa to go to Spain?"

Angela did not take part in the 2017 referendum because she was working in Germany, and even if she had been there, she would not have gone due to the fact that voting at this event would give importance and credibility to something illegal and which has no meaning for her. She would go and express her opinion if the referendum were legal, like in Scotland.

It was very unexpected and shocking for Angela to see so many people sent to prison in the aftermath of the referendum. These were, in her words, not big politicians, but just normal people from whom she would know family members due to the small size of the region. Across Barcelona and the rest of Catalonia, you can see yellow ribbons supposed to show support to the political prisoners. Although Angela feels solidarity for the prisoners, she would not wear a yellow ribbon, because people would immediately assume she is pro-independence.
Angela does not feel represented by the parliaments and governments of Catalonia and Spain and considers that they have created a "battleground", blaming each other and not creating a consensus. She would like to see kindness in politics.

E. A good life - For Angela, a good life would be "worrying less about things that could be automatically done for you." She mentions the lower levels of Maslow’s pyramid, which shows that you can only concentrate on yourself and your self-fulfillment if some basic needs are taken care of, such as physiological needs and safety. Health care and education are for her the most important pillars. Angela strives to be happy with several aspects of her life - personal and professional - and wants to be able to focus on what she loves because what she would be otherwise worried about is already covered. "Being able to develop positive aspects of my life rather than worrying about the negative ones." When asked if she could lead this fulfilling life in Spain, she answered that the independence matter had "taken a toll on a lot of us." If Catalonia became independent, it would be a good reason for her to leave the country due to the uncertainty it would unleash.

4.2.4 Henry B.

Henry was my English teacher when I was a teenager, and I was eager to hear more of his story and opinion on Scottish independence. He has been living in Graz for many years, where he is an English teacher in several institutions, including the University. I remembered Henry mentioning his mother was German, and during the interview I found out that his father is English and that the family moved to Scotland when Henry was very small. Our interview took place at the linguistic institute of the university of Graz, a perfect location to have a recorded conversation. After adding a small disclaimer, Henry confirmed my transcription, which you can find here: B.1.
A. Scotland & the UK - Identity for Henry has always been a difficult question. Having been brought up in Scotland, Henry considers this country as his closest sense of roots and this is where he says he is from. He strongly associate himself with British and European identity equally, then Scottish and world citizen on a secondary level.

Scotland, for Henry, is home, more than anywhere else. "It’s home. More than anywhere else. The landscape is beautiful, the people are friendly, and nice, and you can have a good time in Scotland, it’s a good place for families, to grow up, the same can be said about the UK. It’s home. It’s why I love it. There’s this thing about British culture that I really love, that you can talk to random people and just chat, you know this sort of friendliness. Austria is a bit more of a closed society in that sense."

What he would improve in Scottish society is the tendency to see things in a negative way, to complain and think some things can’t be managed. Another problem is the constant comparison to England. Henry sees England as a more competitive individualist society, while Scotland (and Wales) are more social and think about the community. There is the same difference within England, where the north is much more similar to Scotland in that regard. What is similar within the UK is a culture of friendliness and politeness, people like joking about things and not taking them too seriously, except in London where people are very focused about the money and do not really have time to build proper friendships.

B. History - Events which influenced Scotland in Henry’s memory include the Lockerbie bombing, Bannockburn, King Edward I and II, the Jacobites... More recently, the Second World War and the decline of manufacturing and ship building and coal mining hit Scotland very hard. The strategies of many Empires such as France and Britain were to buy raw material from somewhere, ship it back to your homeland, add value to it by processing it and sell it back to the colonies which had to buy it because the tariffs for foods from other countries were much to high and made it impossible to purchase. The coffee industry is still using this strategy up to today. Since the wave of independence in
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the 1960s, former colonies could not be forced to buy the products anymore. In addition to this, German and Japanese industries, which had been completely destroyed during the war, were rebuilt and included brand new technologies, so no one would buy Scottish ships anymore when they could get much better, cheaper ones from elsewhere. Margaret Thatcher is remembered as a prime minister Scotland did not vote for.

History, Henry remembers, was badly taught and made no sense. "The main focus was that there wasn’t any focus, except for Nazis." Henry thinks Germany has a good system for de-nazification, but in the UK, crimes committed in the past are not studied in order in a way not to repeat history.

Regarding Gaelic, Henry has almost no connection with it. He remembers having to study poems in the Scots language, and does not keep a very good memory of it.

C. Minority Rights - Henry’s definition of a minority is "a group that’s smaller than the largest group, I suppose". A group that is somehow seen as weaker or a victim and does not have the same status as other groups. Henry does not see Scots as a minority and does not think they have any disadvantages. Henry was shocked to see the Scots appearing on the Minority at Risk project. Scots do have their own culture, but in Henry’s eyes, they do not count as an ethnic or linguistic minority.

Henry cannot think of additional rights Scots would need, they should be entitled to rights that should be universal, such as having a roof over your head and not being hungry.

Henry believes people should be able to create new states, for a number of reasons. A strong one would be if they are being mistreated and if the government supposed to be representing them does not protect them and "actually actively tries to hurt them", like in the case of the Kurds, or if the borders were drawn in a "ridiculous way", such as between Pakistan and India.

D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences - Henry was allowed to vote at both Brexit and Scottish independence referenda. He shared the fact that
Brexit hurt a lot and challenged his identity. For him, nothing good with come from the UK leaving the European Union. "It’s a disaster. I don’t see what problem it’s supposed to solve." Henry wonders what problems Brits have to which Brexit is the answer. Admitting there are many problems in Britain, Henry points out that this is the case in many other countries. He mentions differences between rich and poor, the decline or industry, and people worried about migration.

"There were a number of reasons why people voted for Brexit, and I don’t believe this idea that everybody who voted for Brexit was an idiot or a racist.” Henry explained different reasons that lead to the Brexit referendum and its result. Lies spread in the media, people blaming the European Union for diverse problems, immigration issues, the fact that the UK is the second largest contributor to the EU, the decline of the UK as a world power, to name a few. "I can imagine, if you live in a poor city, in Britain somewhere and you have a miserable life and you see someone coming from Poland who doesn’t even speak English, but gets up at 5 o’clock in the morning to pick fruit and then starting to get themselves a nice house, a nice car, and within a year, they have a nicer life than you, I can imagine it being easy to say they must have cheated somehow. Right? Rather than taking responsibility for their own life.”

For Henry, the main difference between leave voters and remain voters is ideological: the former about competition and hard capitalism, the latter for cooperation and working together.

One reason why Scotland mainly voted remain, in contract to England, is that Scotland is a much more social democratic country and that they want the European Union to implement social reforms that a conservative government would not. "There’s just more of a cohesive feeling within Scotland, more of a feeling of working together within Scottish culture, England is more of an individualistic culture." Like the French, many people in Britain are still convinced that their country is much powerful than it actually is.

Henry does recognize that there are problems within the European Union and this needs to be acknowledged by people as well.

People who voted remain enjoy different cultures want to keep many things
such as freedom of movement, the ability to travel, the trade links, according to Henry. They also cherish Europe as a source of peace. Another reason to vote remain was if people identify more with the liberal laws set in Brussels rather than the British conservative government. Scotland happens so be a much more social democratic country than England. People there have a more cohesive, collaborative feeling. The SNP looks at Scandinavian countries for inspiration.

Within Scotland, the SNP is very strong and its government has a lot of power within what is devolved to them. Scotland can’t have their own representation abroad, no embassies, no military, but they have their own legal, educational, health care and justice system.

At one particular occasion, Scotland demonstrated its jurisdiction over its own territory. End of the 90s, a plane traveling from Frankfurt to New York crashed on Scottish territory. The person responsible spent many years in prison, and despite London’s objections, he was then released on compassionate grounds so he could die with his family.

Henry can recognize with a high degree of certainty whether someone is Catholic or Protestant by their name. Henry points out that it’s a massive generalization, but if someone has the name of a Saint, they are very likely to be Catholic. If someone has the name of an English King, they are likely to be Protestants. In Scotland, the ratio would be about 90% Protestants and 10% Catholics. At a football match in Glasgow for example, one can see which religion people have by observing which team they cheer for. Protestants from Glasgow Rangers wear orange and wave the Union Jack, while Catholic Glasgow Celtic fans wear green and carry Scottish flags. "But you know, what’s really funny is that people who fight each other on religious basis if you ask them to explain what the theological difference is, between catholicism and protestantism, they would not know. They just know that my dad hated your dad, that’s where the conflicts come from. It’s so idiotic, it makes you want to cry."

Henry finds the royal family nice enough people, but they portray an anti-meritocratic symbol. If your values are to better and improve yourself, "having
a queen says you can’t go beyond a certain point in life." On the other end, hav-
ing a decent monarch can provide stability in times of crisis and serve as a neu-
tral head of state. Henry does not think much of Prime Minister Theresa May, 
although, to be fair to her, he says that she has an impossible job. May cam-
paigned for remain and "knows Brexit is a mistake because she campaigned 
against it", but because she wants to be prime minister and keep her powers, 
she goes on with it. "Anyone who actually wants to be the leader, shouldn’t 
be allowed to be", Henry says smilingly, quoting the Hitchhiker’s Guide to the 
Galaxy.

If Scotland became independent, Henry thinks the country could follow 
their social-democratic path better and could eventually apply for European 
Union membership. Scotland could also benefit from their oil, though not 
much of it is left. Scotland would also move away from "a kind of scary re-
vival of English nationalism".

When ask if the Scots would hate the English less if they were independent, 
Henry says this hate is a bit of a myth. He compares it to Austrian-German 
rivalry, where people like to joke about each other. As a matter of fact, Scottish 
people "don’t really care about the English". "Everyone has their own little life 
in their own little town, you know how it is, you get into your own routine and 
you got your job and your family and you don’t really think about England 
very much, because you’re busy doing you own thing."

Back in 2014, Henry voted against independence because he thought the 
world had enough walls as it is, and he did not see what problems Scotland 
had to which the answer was independence particularly. Henry thought there 
would not be much difference and wanted to stay in the European Union, be-
cause people had been told they would have to reapply for membership if the 
country left the UK. The fear of leaving the EU was one of his reasons to vote to 
stay in the UK. For Henry, Scotland could surely survive on its own a a country. 
Their population is the same as Norway, and there are countries much smaller 
than Scotland that are very successful.

The advantages of independent Scotland would be not to have a conserva-
tive government that Scots did not vote for, and the ability to run things on a
small scale. Also, a potential rapid readmission to the EU would be beneficial. If Croatia and Slovenia managed to avoid vetoes, then why couldn’t Scotland do the same.

Henry is convinced the UK will eventually break up, and thinks Ireland will be reunited. He foresees another referendum in Scotland in the next 10 to 15 years. The border issue within Ireland is a very problematic. Referring to the West Lothian question, Henry thinks that moving towards a more federal system within the UK could be a way to avoid this break up, but fears it’s too late for this. One fundamental legal difference between the UK and most other European countries is the concept that unless specified otherwise, everything is legal. This is why it is especially difficult for the UK to implement EU laws, because the European Union states what is legal, and the UK needs to adapt it to determine what is not. Henry sees this as a fundamental incompatibility and understand some might find it a valid reason to vote to leave the EU.

Things to improve in the UK is to impair the media and politicians from lying without consequences. For Henry, the purpose of fake news is often misunderstood. "It’s not to make you believe something that’s wrong, it’s to make you doubt the truth." What would need to be introduced is awareness and knowledge of critical reasoning and education, and moving from a competitive spirit to a cooperative one. Also, the difference between patriotism and natinalism needs to be clarified. "It’s ok to love your country, that’s patriotism. But nationalism is to say that you’re better than everyone else and that’s a fundamental thing that people don’t really get." The economic consequences of the credit crisis should also be addressed. Henry deplores the fact that we have a global system of finance and a global system of business, but no global system of government or set of global rules, and this lack of cooperation allows large corporations to do what they want.

If Scotland were to vote in favour of independence, England would not try and stop the process, they would accept it.

**E. A good life** - To have a good life, all Henry needs is a "happy, healthy family", and to know when you have enough. Henry very much likes a quote
by Kurt Vonnegut, an American writer who was invited to a billionaire’s house party, and while talking to someone else who asked if he liked the house, he said "yes, but I have something this guy doesn’t. I’ve got enough.” Henry is happy here in Graz with his family, he can afford to pay for food and rent, to go on holiday with them and to provide for their needs. The government needs to provide security so that people can have a good life without fear of someone threatening it. This includes police, military, infrastructure, education, health care, and universal services, as well as regulating big businesses.

Henry does not feel represented by Westminster at all, and portrays the institution in quite a negative way. "They are just scheming with each other, they’re deliberately hurting our country and economy, they’re lying, they’re making it acceptable to lie, they’ve helped the politicians to lie, they’re making it acceptable to doubt truth and reality, they’re making it acceptable to talk openly about politicians they disagree with being treasonous, they’re making it acceptable for the media to influence people the way they have, it’s a disaster."

4.2.5 Evelyn J.M.

Evelyn, a former ward nurse, recently moved from Glasgow to Nigg, in the Highlands, to find a quiet peaceful place. Evelyn loves the Highlands and enjoys her life surrounded by nature. She was introduced to me by a common friend and accepted to share her vision of Scotland and the world with me. We had a Skype interview and made the best out of the unfortunate very low quality of the call, which was interrupted several times and made the recording difficult to transcribe. For the sake of legibility, I decided to relate our conversation in indirect speech, instead of translating word by word like in the other interviews. Evelyn confirmed the report and we had a second Skype call to clarify some points. You can find the interview here: B.3.
A. Scotland & the UK - Two years ago, Evelyn moved from Glasgow to Nigg, in the Highlands, to enjoy her retirement in a beautiful and quiet environment. Her father worked in the industrial city of Coatbridge as a kid, and due to the pollution, he had never seen the sky before he came to the region. Evelyn loves the Highlands and feels Highlander first, Scottish second, and European third. What Evelyn loves about Scotland is how people deal with poverty and the lack of possession. People work very hard, both in their professional lives and at home. Evelyn describes the innovative spirit of the Scots and the many inventions that were triggered by it, such as the telephone, the radio, television, as "creative suffering". Furthermore, the Scots are a quite tolerant nation, and do not demonstrate anger towards immigrants. There are many English living in the region due to lower housing prices, and because they are looking for a better quality of life.

There are numerous differences between Scotland and England, and Evelyn finds the English do not appreciate them and she feels patronized by them.

B. History - Evelyn is part of the Clan Robertson of Struan, and declared jokingly that it is better than her husband’s clan. At primary school, Evelyn only learned Scottish history. She only started learning about general history, mainly European, in secondary school.

Nigg was the second place St. Columba, who introduced Christianity to Scotland, visited. The town is very famous for its ancient abbey which hosts a Pictish Stone from 600 A.D. When you have that kind of history, Evelyn points out, you deserve to keep it. The historical events Evelyn mentioned include the killing of Mary, Queen of Scots, and the Anglicization of her son James (VI of Scotland and I of England), who was brought up protestant and did not know Scotland. The Jacobite Rising of 1746 is a very crucial event for Scotland. After this, Scots were banned from wearing traditional clothing such as the kilt and speaking their own language. A law was enforced, prohibiting Catholics or people married to one to access the throne. The Highland Clearances led 450

3James introduced the "Union of the Crowns" and was the first monarch to rule over Scotland, England and Ireland.
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000 people to leave their home and land and settle in other regions or even other countries of continents. Gaelic has lost many speakers through the years and Evelyn does not speak it. The only people who speak it really fluently are on the Islands of Skye, and Lewis and Harris. Evelyn can witness an attempt to revive Gaelic through TV programmes and school.

In every Scottish village, one can find a memorials for the Second World War. They are not here to celebrate victory, but rather show the "tremendous outpouring of grief regarding the thousands of people sent to war." Many villages saw all their young people sent to war, never to return, and people think much more Scots were sent away than English people.

C. Minority Rights - Evelyn had never thought of herself as a minority, yet she thinks Scots do not have either a voice nor the numbers within the UK. There are many Scots around the world, and feeling like a Scot is not linked with belonging to a minority.

D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences - Evelyn thinks that there is a lack of active listening in the political environment. Many people in Scotland are annoyed and feel powerless towards not being able to decide about the future of their country, because the English hold the strings and do not let Scotland decide on their own budget and other important matters.

Evelyn has nothing against the English people as such, it is the form of government, the country of England, which she does not feel positive about. She defines Westminster as the English government, and deplores the fact that Scotland is underrepresented regarding their number of MPs. It is difficult to get their voice heard.

Many Scots are of the opinion that Scotland could not survive without the Barnett formula. According to Evelyn, even the person who came up with the formula "things it was a terrible mistake".

Regarding the Scottish parliament and government, Evelyn thinks it tries very hard to engage the people. Most of Scots voted to stay in the European Union and the result of the Brexit referendum are very disappointing. "We
don’t have a say, we have to go with England and that annoys the Scots intensely.” Evelyn supports Nicola Sturgeon and especially liked her when she was at her best, a few years ago. She now finds that Sturgeon’s confidence has been shaken and she does not have the same drive as she once had. It is especially difficult for Sturgeon, because "you can’t run a country on a housekeeping budget” and you can’t raise the taxes because the money would go to England.

A referendum was held in 1979 and the majority of voters were in favour of independence. Upon seeing the result, the English imposed a 60% quote retrospectively. For the 2017 referendum, Evelyn finds that many politicians made empty promises in order for people to vote to remain in the UK, and the promises weren’t kept. What is problematic is that many of the issues handled by the EU will be handed back to Westminster, and not to Scotland, who might lose some of the powers they hold now. Evelyn would wish for the matters of health and people with disability to be cared for by Scotland.

Scotland is a big nation with skilled people who could for sure build a successful independent state. Bureaucracy is a big problem, it keeps people from doing there work while burying them in paperwork and leads to huge waste of money and resources. As an example, many people can’t go to a doctor anymore because the general practitioners spend most of their time filling out paper for the government. If Scotland were independent, general practitioners, and other professions, could make a better case and be heard more.

Evelyn clearly would not see any disadvantages of leaving the UK. Scotland would be better off it it were independent, and Evelyn illustrates her opinion with a few examples. One main advantage of independence is the ability to decide on your own budget. Roads in Scotland tend to be worse than in England because Scotland does not get to decide how much to invest in it. The North Coast 500 needs a lot of maintenance for all people, including tourists, who come with different transportation means such as motorbikes, cars and caravans. Salmon fishing is also a hot topic, with many families not allowed by Westminster to engage in their activities, while French are.
E. A good life - What is most important to Evelyn, is the quality of life and the environment around her. She enjoys living in the Highlands very much and since she has settled there, she does not need the internet quite as often. She keeps busy with taking care of her house, including storing wood in the garden for when the winter comes.

What the government should do to ensure her good quality of life is to "stand back", because people are able to make their own quality of life without too much government interference. The more government interference, the worse it can get. Evelyn would rather pay for education and health care instead of having it all free and of bad quality. The health service they have now, is not a service, according to her and her years of experience in the profession. Evelyn loved her job but became annoyed and frustrated when she constantly had to justify her decisions with people who do not know what she was talking about, just to save money.

People in Scotland, according the Evelyn, "detest the Conservatives". She remembers when Margaret Thatcher introduced the poll tax and made so many people lose their house.

4.2.6 Gary P.

Gary, 28, is a young Scottish activist, passionate about politics and equality. Gary comes from Dundee and what he calls a disadvantaged background and communities. Gary and I met in 2016 while he was visiting Austria for the occasion of the European Forum organized by the Young European Federalists. Gary is quite active on social media and I occasionally get to see some of his pro-independence posts. A former president of the student union of his university, Gary is now working for a member of the Scottish Parliament. He describes himself as a political animal who always wants to ring about change. Our interview was held on Skype, and Gary was kind enough to send me many further information about Scotland and its independence cause. The
interview transcription can be found in Appendix B.2.

**A. Scotland & the UK** - Gary feels Scottish, European and regards himself as an internationalist. He does not speak Scots or Gaelic but sees a tendency of young people learning it at school.

What Gary loves the most about Scotland is the attitude of the Scots to the world, the way they are a positive, welcoming and progressive country with compassionate people focused on living a happy life. When thinking of the UK, Gary admits he sees rather negative things such as the past 10 years with a conservative government and Brexit. He feels this entity does not represent the values he stands for. Gary’s generation has always known Scotland as being with devolved powers and its own parliament, where people are involved in political life and can contribute to the change.

There are many things uniting the Scottish people, they are, in Gary’s words, an ancient nation united by history, geography, politics, and more. For Gary, it is not important to show your nation is unique to have your own country. Scotland has many things in common with other peoples, especially in Europe. What makes them a country is that they are an active society and political sphere, within which the decisions should be made. Nevertheless, there are many aspects of Scotland that are worth pointing out, such as the contribution to science, education and the economy throughout history.

Talking about sports, you can only participate in the Olympics if you are an independent nation, no the Scots are playing under the "Great Britain" team. People support individual athletes rather than the team GB itself. There is no British football team, and when former prime minister Gordon Brown tried to create one, people reacted strongly against it. "I think when it comes to sport people really do take pride in the national teams for rugby, for football and in other things, and then support athletes playing for team GB." Scots take part in an additional competition, the Commonwealth Games, where they are represented as a nation.
B. History - History provides a context to explain people’s claim for independence but is not the only aspect that should be based on. Independence is engraved in the people of Scotland because they did not vote for the union. Many educational, religious and governmental institutions have been conserved and contributed to the state identity. Most people in Scotland are in favour of the European Union. Before the EU, the UK was seen as a supranational identity you could have in addition to being a Scot, but this has been slowly replaced by the European identity. Scotland would have more sovereignty within the EU than it ever had in the UK.

When discussing why England does not have a parliament of their own while Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales do, Gary says he has the impression that the English nation is well represented by the British parliament and that would explain why they do not feel the need to have their own parliament or a federal system. The British Parliament allocate seats according to the population share, and Scotland, with about 5% of the population of the UK, holds about 50 seats.

Partly because he works for a member of parliament and because he supports the SNP, Gary feels very represented by the Scottish government and parliament. He finds the way the Scottish Parliament more fair than Westminster, because it gives smaller parties more representation and the system is more open, allowing people to submit petitions and proposals.

C. Minority Rights - On the one hand, Gary would say that Scotland is perhaps a political minority, seeing the feeling of people that they do not get what they vote for in the UK. On the other hand, Gary does not often think of himself in the UK context. He spends more time in the rest of Europe than in the UK and the rest of the time, he is in Scotland, in his "country". In Scotland, minority is more used to define "gender, ethnicity or underrepresented group". Gary does not think people would regard themselves as a minority. People in Scotland do not ask themselves whether they should be country, they consider Scotland to be "a country within a country", and the question is more whether their country should be independent outside the UK.
"I think there’s always been this idea of that Scotland is a European nation and that we want to be part of something bigger." Earlier, people could feel part of the UK as an empire, and now their attention has been directed more towards Europe and a new internationalist identity.

**D. Independence, Reasons & Consequences** - Gary sees the principle of self-determination as a human right and thinks people who are able to demonstrate they fulfill the requirement for a nation-state should be able to become independent. "Effectively, countries are more ideas than anything that’s physical or real, and apart from the fences around them, they’re effectively just lines on a map. So what is it that creates these fences as counties, it’s the notion of a group of people that have a shared belief that they are a country, that they have an identity and that they want to be a nation".

There would be quite some benefits in an independent Scotland. For Gary, the independence claim portrays how Scots want more matters being held at the Scottish levels. If it were the case, Gary would make the immigration policy more progressive in order to tackle the de-population problem Scotland is facing. He would make investments to stimulate economic activity and improve infrastructure. Gary finds it regrettable that Scotland is not able to borrow money to invest, and give as an example that the country has been saving for the past 10 years to build the Queensferry bridge, whereas other projects have been funded in the UK. The most important for Gary is that the change should be directed towards serving the needs of the people. Gary mentions that if Scotland had become independent in the 70s when the oil was found, the situation would have been different and the country could have developed in a similar way than Norway. The Nordic countries are a major source of inspiration for Scotland. Gary would like for Scotland’s progressive values to be part of the global discussion. What is important to Gary is the have more control over how society develops, to have the power to do what the people think is right. As of disadvantages, Gary compares it with someone leaving their house for the first time to live on their own. It is a time full of opportunities, excitement, but and challenges and difficult times. Leaving the UK
would not solve all the problems and there surely would be other ones, but at least the people would be able to decide in which direction to go. "For me that’s most important thing about independence, it’s not that everything is going to be perfect, but it’s that we will decide the outcomes and that we will shape the country to reflect our needs and to respond to the challenges in the way that we see fit, and then politically at the moment within the UK we’re not in a position to do that just now." In contrast with Catalonia, who have not been fortunate enough to get in a position where they can negotiate independence as a process where it is internationally recognized, Scotland is entitled to the "claim of right", the right to determine their form of government. If another referendum were held and Scotland voted to leave the UK, their decision would be respected by the international community and the UK itself. Before another referendum can take place, Gary would wait until the Brexit situation and what it entails has been clarified. In the meantime, the Scottish government will, where possible, remain align to EU laws in case they want to join the union later. Gary has observed voting turnout have increased much since the 2014 referendum. Before, people did not feel they had the power to make the difference, but now, more people feel empowered.

One major problem with Brexit is where the powers held by the EU would return to. According to the Act of Scotland, all matters not specifically held in London are automatically devolved, yet the British government wants to recuperate most of the powers the EU possesses right now so they can for example negotiate new trade deals. Scotland is worried about safety standards and the protected status of trade items like Scotch whisky. As the UK does not have a written constitution, all it would take to take devolution away is to amend the act. However, this is very unlikely due to the risks it would create a political crisis.

E. A good life - For Gary, a good life is synonym with having opportunity, a high level of happiness, life satisfaction, and living in a community with people who are experiencing the same opportunities, well-being and integration.

Due to his past and the disadvantaged background he comes from, what
makes Gary happy is contributing to reducing social inequality, which is what he does through his work, his studies and his activism. Through the policy called "widening access" and other policies such as free education, Gary could enroll in university.

The government can intervene in order to "level the playing field" and make sure everyone is included in the development of a country. If all policies are "universal" - directed to everyone - then even wealthy people are not against them, because they and their family also benefit from it, so they do not seem unfair even though they are funded by raising tax money.

4.3 Comparison of Catalonia’s & Scotland’s Claim to Independence

In both Catalonia and Scotland, we can find a regionally-concentrated group that considers itself as a nation within a larger state, and attempts to achieve recognition of its nationhood (in forms of either independence or more territorial autonomy) by mobilizing behind nationalist, yet social-democratic political parties. In the past, both the UK and Spain have tried to suppress these substate nationalisms, because they were seen as threat to the state. Strategies in the past have included minority language restrictions, abolition of regional self-government, resettlement of majority members in the minority territory etc.4

4.3.1 Catalonia’s & Scotland’s culture and identity

In Catalonia, 38% of the population feels both Spanish and Catalan, 26% only Catalan, 23% more Catalan than Spanish, 3% more Spanish than Catalan and 5% Spanish only. (In these statistics, 5% is not accounted for.) 5

---

5 El portal de estadísticas - Statistics Portal.
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The Scotland’s census of 2011 shows that our of 5,3 million people, 62% feel Scottish only, 8% British only, 18% Scottish and British, 2% English only (the rest being a combination of UK identities, or other identities).

All my interview partners see the European Union as positive. Their sense of identity varied along a broad spectrum. Ana María is 100% Catalan, Arnau feels European first, then Catalan and Spanish. Angela doesn’t see her various identities as competing with each other, she is equally Catalan, Spanish and Colombian (from her mother’s side). Henry feels like Scotland is home, he feels British and European first (his father is English and mother German), then Scottish and World Citizen on a secondary level. Gary is a Scottish, European internationalist. Evelyn is a Highlander, Scottish and European.

The Catalans I interviewed were are bilingual Catalan-Spanish. They seem to cherish the Catalan language very much and all mentioned its prohibition under Franco to be of high significance. None of the Scots from the interview speak Gaelic or Scots. They see a resurgence of these languages through television and school, and find it positive, yet the language is not a significant issue for them. What Catalans would improve is that they want to invest more in health care and education to promote a more egalitarian society. One thing in common in the people of Catalonia is their open-mindedness and progressive attitude.

Also in Scotland you can find a feeling of community, people are very social-democratic. Scots have notably contributed to science, through what Evelyn called “creative suffering”. Evelyn finds that if you have a culture and history that old, you should have the right to keep it. Gary defines the Scots an ancient nation, united by history (social and political), and geography. The Scots "are a nation and we have always been so, there is a Scottish perspective and a Scottish idea, a Scottish identity." According to Scottish author Ertl, the term nation "denotes people, that, generally speaking, create a community, sharing certain commonalities such as culture, ethnicity, language, religion, descent and above all, history. As such, the term applies to a broad group of

---

6 Scotland Census 2011, topic "Ethnicity, Identity, Language and Religion", table "national identity by sex and age".
people that have at least, when nothing else, the feeling of being together.”

Different parts of culture are important to the people I interviewed:
- intangible cultural heritage: eg. traditions, festivities, food, languages
- geography: nature and landscapes,
- people: their way to share and interact, their open-mindedness, mindset and creativity, the stream of thoughts and philosophy of life.

### 4.3.2 Catalonia’s & Scotland’s historical background

History classes, in Catalonia and in Scotland, left a quite neutral to negative memory. Arnau remembers only one good teacher he was lucky to have. Ana María learned only Spanish history and regretted that the winner gets to write the history while the loser doesn’t have a say. For Henry, history class was badly taught and made no sense, and "the main focus was that there wasn’t any focus".

The person that most influenced Catalonia was Francisco Franco, according to the interview answers.

In Scotland, all my interview partners mentioned Margaret Thatcher and how unpopular conservatism is in Scotland.

All 6 interview partners hope their entity would join the European Union if they became independent. It is very frustrating for the Scots to have to leave the EU through Brexit.

- **Catalonia** - From the end of the Civil War (1936-1939) to 1975, Spain was ruled by General Franco. Franco declared Castilian as the only official language of Spain, and prohibited the public use of other languages. King Juan Carlos succeeded to him and established democracy. The Constitution, approved in 1978, declares the "indissoluble unity of the Spanish nation", while guaranteeing the autonomy of nationalities and regions comprised in it, which should be solidary with one another. Both Spanish and Catalan languages have equal status and can be used in the administration and all aspects of life.

---

7 Ertl, 2013, 61.
8 Spanish Constitution.
Catalonia and the Basque Country became industrial centres during the 19th century, while the rest of Spain did not develop as much. Interview partner Angela is the only one who sees a correlation between the Spanish government’s support, the geographic location of Catalonia, and the emergence of a strong industry in the region. These two provinces, as well as Galicia, had the status of "historic nationalities" and could attain autonomy more quickly. Catalonia produced their statutes in 1979.\textsuperscript{9} Since 1983, Spain is divided into 17 autonomous communities, each of them having different statutes of autonomy. Spain has granted autonomy to the regions as such, not only to "nationalities". Under Spanish law, the autonomous communities are more strongly considered as territorial bodies than as national autonomies. The constitution and statutes of the respective communities define the devolved powers. All powers not explicitly kept by Spain are assumed by the autonomies.\textsuperscript{10} Ana María thinks that Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country, because they have their own language, should be the only three autonomies in Spain. She disagrees with the "coffee for all" policies that gave more autonomy to all regions, thus undermining Catalonia’s autonomy. Only the Basque Country and Navarre have fiscal autonomy, and Catalonia strives to have it too. In 2006, Catalonia was granted the status of nation by the Cortes Generales, which consists of two chambers: the Congress of Deputies and the Senate.\textsuperscript{11} The Congress of Deputies counts 350 members who are not proportionally distributed per region, but per parties. The Spanish government has jurisdiction on matters such as domestic and foreign policy, including defense and the economy.\textsuperscript{12} The Catalan Parliament is formed by 136 deputies. Arnau and Angela do not feel represented by either the Spanish nor the Catalan governments and parliaments, and Ana María is not sure but "would like to think so".

- **Scotland** - The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary democracy. The UK does not

\textsuperscript{9} Statutes of Autonomy of Catalonia.
\textsuperscript{11} Spanish Constitution, Art. 2.
\textsuperscript{12} Encyclopedia Britannica: Spain.
have a written constitution; changes occur through Acts of Parliament. It is comprised of four constituent units - Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland - each of which has certain devolved powers, and England. England does not have its own parliament and is subject to Westminster decisions, where deputies from other constituent countries are also present. This brought the West Lothian question, regarding whether Welsh, Northern Irish and Scot Members of Parliament should be able to vote on matters concerning England only.

England and Scotland have been under common rule since the Union of the Crowns in 1603, when King James (VI of Scotland and I of England) inherited the English throne. James’s great grandmother was Margaret Tudor, sister of King Henry VIII, who famously introduced Protestantism to England after the Pope’s refusal annul his first marriage. At that time, however, both entities remained separate. The Scottish and English parliaments were united into the Parliament of Great Britain under the Acts of Union in 1707, which was unpopular in Scotland.

The Jacobite rising of 1745, initiated to put Catholic "Bonnie Prince Charlie" on the throne, is seen as one of the most significant events in Scottish history. After the English victory at the Battle of Culloden, the Act of Proscription came into effect in 1746 (repelled in 1782) with the purpose of abolishing the Clan system and restricting Scottish culture (eg. prohibition of the Bagpipe). The Dress Act proscribed the wearing of the Highland Dress, such as tartans and kilts. People who would not abide to the Acts could be sent to jail or to plantations on other continents. In the 18th and 19th centuries, many inhabitants were forced to leave the region during what is called the Highland Clearances, also contributing in the weakening of the Clan system and other aspects of Scottish culture.

Following the Scotland Act in 1998, the Scottish Parliament was reestablished. The British Parliament, commonly referred to as Westminster, (in which Scotland holds 59 out of 650 seats at the House of Commons) still decides on areas such as defense, foreign trade, foreign affairs, economic and monetary policy, employment, social security, energy regulation, aspects of taxation and
transport. The Scottish Parliament has powers over health, education, housing, regional transport, the environment and agriculture.

The Scotland Act states which powers are reserved to Westminster. Powers over matters that are not reserved under the Act are granted to the Scottish Parliament. Devolution also brought the Scottish Executive, including a First Minister, ministers and Law Officers, compelled to implement European Union and UK laws.

None of my Scottish interview partners feel that Westminster is properly representing their interests, whereas the parliament of Scotland seems to make a lot of efforts to represent the population. Gary wants more decision powers to be held in Scotland, because he believes the parliament does a good job at representing people’s interests. Also Evelyn sees that the Scottish parliament makes a lot of effort to engage with the people. Evelyn would also want the budget to be decided by Scotland.

### 4.3.3 Minority Rights in Catalonia & Scotland

Now that Spain has gotten back the rights they had lost under Franco, both Ana María and Arnau think Catalans need more liberties, more freedom, and to be able to decide and vote on different matters, especially how to invest the money and where. Ana María wants to decide where Catalan money goes, so that it can be invested in health care and education in order to build a more egalitarian society. Arnau also wants to invest more in these area.

The Scots called for universal rights to be granted. Henry considers that apart from extreme cases, the Scots are not discriminated against in the UK, so he doesn’t feel the need for additional right, but rather universal rights such as having accommodation and no hunger. Like in Taylor’s Politics of Universalism, Gary dreams of a society where everybody’s dignity is respected, where all people have equal opportunities and well-being and the same integration to society and wants to dedicate his life to politics in order to bring about change.

---

13 Encyclopedia Britannica: Scotland.
15 see 3.2
Evelyn would like to see the quality of public services improve, she would be willing to pay to have a better health care, especially since she knows how thing are working because she worked in the field.

All interview partners mentioned that they are in favour of a right to chose, a right to decide. For Ana María, "if people want to have a new state, they should have the right to vote for it", through a referendum. Arnau is not for the independence of Catalonia but advocates for the right to decide and to vote whether people want a new country. Angela is against independence and would not participate in the referendum in 2017 because it was illegal. Henry sees the right to vote as a universal one and thinks that people should be able to create new states is the government that is suppose to represent them fails and actually tries to hurt them. Henry voted against Scottish independence, the main reason being to stay in the EU. Furthermore, his opinion is that "here are enough borders and walls and fences already and we need to move away from that and cooperate with each other and work together (...)". Gary and Evelyn are strongly in favour of Scottish Independence.

### 4.3.4 The Political Compass

Regarding the question about their political view, it is worth noting that none of my interview partners placed themselves on the right side of the Political Compass (see 4.1). Arnau positions himself right in the centre of both axis, Evelyn and Gary on the upper left corner very close to the centre of the chart (as the SNP would be), and Ana María, Angela and Henry are in the lower left corner, also close to the centre.

### 4.3.5 Reasons & Consequences for Independence

Both Catalonia and Scotland have been granted a certain amount of autonomy, they have their own parliament and government. They now demand constitutional changes in order to be able to take more decisions and implement them regarding the development of their own region. In Scotland and
Catalonia, people have come to question the fiscal redistribution and power allocation within their nation-state. Arnau was directly affected by policies which made him pay more for his Erasmus semester and university tuition than young people in other Spanish communities. Ana María has the impression Catalans work harder and contribute more than other communities. Ana María is scared to speak freely to people in Catalonia, because she has heard of people who were put in jail for criticizing the government. Arnau also sees Catalans are hard-workers who tend to save money for the future.

While Catalonia has been complaining of unfair redistribution of the amount of money they give to Madrid, Scotland wants to manage its own budget. Many people in Scotland believe the country still profits from the Barnett Formula. The Barnett Formula calculates the additional amount of money that devolved governments should get if England gets extra funding. As Evelyn mentioned, Joel Barnett, Chief Secretary to the Treasury at the time, came up with the formula in 1978 and has since declared he intended it as a temporary solution.

\[^{16}\text{cf. Colomb, Bakke, and Tomaney, 2014, 1.}\]
measure and that continuing to use it was a "terrible mistake".\textsuperscript{17}

Both entities would want more control over the way they transform and develop their territory, the so-called spatial planning. The problem emerges when the central state’s and the devolved entity’s vision of the development of the region diverge much, as is the case for Catalonia and Scotland.\textsuperscript{18}

- **Catalonia** - After the amendment of the Catalan statutes in 2006, the Constitutional Court of Spain "culled significant parts of the text"\textsuperscript{19}, which led to massive public protests and the beginning of advocating for "the right to decide" of the Catalans. In 2017, the Catalan parliament passed the "Law on the Referendum on Self-Determination of Catalonia", which was later suspended by the Spanish Constitutional Court. The referendum was held despite being deemed unconstitutional by the Spanish state. The turnout is said to be 43.03\%, and over 92\% voted for independence. However, the head of the International Election Observation Mission in Catalonia concluded that the vote did not meet international standards.\textsuperscript{20} United Nations rights experts have warned that regardless whether the referendum is legal or not, Spanish authorities must respect fundamental rights such as freedom of expression, assembly and association, and public participation, and avoid violence.\textsuperscript{21} Amnesty International found the use of police force to be excessive and disproportionate, even though the police have been obstructed in the exercise of their duties. Human Rights Watch also observed the use of an excessive and unjustified police force.\textsuperscript{22} The Spanish government threatened to invoke Article 155, which would impose direct rule on Catalonia. Catalonia declared independence on 27 October 2017. On 28 October, Mariano Rajoy dissolved the Catalan Parliament and called for a snap election, where pro-independence Quim

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{17} "My funding formula for Scotland is a ‘terrible mistake’, Lord Barnett admits", The Telegraph. [16.09.2014][01.10.2018].
  \item \textsuperscript{18} cf. Colomb, Bakke, and Tomaney, 2014, 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{19} Colomb, Bakke, and Tomaney, 2014, 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{20} "Independent observers: No proper referendum took place in Catalonia", www.euroactiv.com [18.10.2017][01.10.2018].
  \item \textsuperscript{21} “Spain must respect fundamental rights in response to Catalan referendum, UN rights experts”, United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner.
  \item \textsuperscript{22} “Spain: Police Used Excessive Force in Catalonia”, Human Rights Watch.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Torra became the new president of Catalonia. In May 2018, following a no-confidence motion, Mariano Rajoy was replaced by Pedro Sánchez from the PSOE as Prime Minister of Spain.

People involved in the organization of the referendum and the declaration of independence, including former president of Catalonia Carles Puigdemont, along with 13 former Catalan ministers and several members of the Catalan Parliament’s Bureau have been charged with rebellion, sedition and improper use of funds. All three Catalans I interviewed refer to the people arrested following the referendum and declaration of independence as "political prisoners". They are shocked to have "political prisoners" in their country and sympathize much with them, especially because they are seen as normal people from the region, who could be anyone they know. Amnesty International avoids the use of "political prisoner", due to the lack of accepted definition. The organization considers that Catalan ministers and parliamentarians "may have committed a legitimately prosecutable offence", yet demands prosecutorial powers not to be exercised arbitrarily or unreasonably. Amnesty International believes the charges of rebellion are unjustified, because they would require the use of violence to declare independence, which has not been proven. The pre-trial detentions is questionable in the eyes of international law, because it should only be used when no alternative can be taken. Amnesty International demands the release of Jordi Cuixart and Jordi Sanchez, and their charges of sedition to be dropped.23

The one year anniversary of the referendum, on October 1st, 2018, was marked with violent demonstrations. Sánchez’ reaction was to ask for Catalan politics to return to the parliament, reminding President Torra to “fulfil his responsibilities and not jeopardize political normalization by encouraging radicals to besiege the institutions that represent all Catalans”.24

It would be Ana María’s dream to see Catalonia be an independent state. Arnau would prefer to have fiscal autonomy, he does "not want to build new barriers, but to open doors". Ana María and Arnau both stress the economic

---

23 Amnesty International Public Statement, [17.11.2017][01.10.2018].
advantage the new state would have, and that independence would hurt Spain more than it would Catalonia. Angela is hurt to see her home divided, she finds there is political manipulation behind the claim to self-determination, and the lack of a proper plan makes her feel insecure to a point she considers to leave the country if Catalonia became independent.

Arnau would have expected the international community, especially the EU, to react more to the declaration of independence and try and mediate. Ana María also would have wished for a more "clear position". It must be noted that many countries and international organizations did have an official, clear, negative position on the subject.

- **Scotland** - On 18 September 2014, a referendum was held to decide whether Scotland would become independent, without notable incidents. The referendum happened legally, and 55.30% of the people voted against the proposal.

  The United Kingdom European Union membership "Brexit" referendum took place in 2016, and in all regions of Scotland, the majority voted to remain in the EU (62% overall).

  First Minister Nicola Sturgeon from the Scottish National Party plans to hold a second referendum after the Brexit negotiations are over.

  Henry, Evelyn and Gary have no doubt Scotland could survive as an independent country. There are many other smaller countries that proved to be successful and they believe in the same future for Scotland.

### 4.3.6 A Good Life

Everyone has a different concept of a good life, and cited criteria include family, friends, health, education, happiness, economic stability, security, fundamental needs, reasonable salary, professional occupation, opportunity, community, integration, and to know when you have enough. It would appear that a good life as described by my interview partners is only possible once
the two lowest stages of Maslow’s pyramid are attained. (see Figure 4.2.) Only then can one concentrate on self-fulfillment and relationships.

**Figure 4.2: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Source: Wikimedia Commons**
Chapter 5

Conclusion

1. How did the current discrepancies regarding the legitimacy of states come to place?
As we have seen in Chapter 2, our international system relies on the existence and to a certain extent reciprocal recognition of so called nation-states, originating in the power allocated to certain national groups to control the territory they had been living in. This model, although initially European, has become the highest ideal throughout the world and laid the basis for the creation of international law which should serve as a framework for international cooperation and peace. The current world order is challenged by the fact that there are far more nations than there are states, which can lead to conflicts that have significance for the entire world and influence long-term peace. The creation of new states is not in the interest of the international community and only supported by international law in specific contexts. Whether a spiritual principle or an imagined community, a nation is characterized by a common past and the willingness to create the future as a community of people you feel related to. Minorities, who also bear the feelings of a nation, have not disappeared despite past attempts of assimilation or destruction. Some demand more rights, liberties and freedom and are determined to make claim right to self-determination if they are not satisfied with their current situation. When not given attention and the possibility to be part of a dialogue, minorities might resort to different ways of reaching their goals, creating conflicts that go beyond boundaries.
2. What are the options available to peoples who strive for self-determination?
Throughout Chapter 3, we have witnessed a heated debate regarding whether self-determination includes a remedial right to secede in certain circumstances. The term "self-determination" is known by some people, but its ambiguity is not. Most people still interpret self-determination as the right to secede from your current state and create a new one. Despite the strong argument of human right violation, the generally accepted use of self-determination includes no right to secession, but it does entail a right to democratic participation. Independence is not always the best solution for minorities, seeing the difficulty of creating a new state that is not doomed to fail. Other solutions can create a consensus based, win-win situation for both nation-states and minorities. Therefore, alternative solutions range from granting more collective rights to minorities to offering them self-government. The highest and most longed-for kind of accommodation is autonomy and the devolution of powers to a parliament and executive of an entity.

3. Why do certain ethnic groups want independence and what do they want to achieve through it?
The different sorts of autonomy are not always considered by all to be a satisfying solution. Causes to keep exercising a right to self-determination beyond its generally agreed upon use and demand independence are various. They can include unsettled territorial disputes, violations or denial or minority rights, lack of identity recognition, and, combined with a growing awareness of human rights and national aspirations, they account for claims for more autonomy or independence. My interview partners did not all agree on the independence issue, some were highly in favour of it, some against, and some wanted greater autonomy, particularly fiscal. One aspect they were unanimous about was the impression that the government of the sovereign state did represent them or have an open ear towards the smaller entity. Furthermore, all interview partners would like to have a say on how to invest public money. They stress out a right to vote and decide upon the fate of their entity. What they
all have in mind is to create a better, more social, egalitarian and just society. However, there are is no consensus regarding the way to make this endeavour come true.

It seems both claims of independence in Catalonia and Scotland have at their root a sense of frustration from not being heard, and that the voice of the specific entity is not strong enough at the state-level. One can feel a historic wound coming from past-wrongdoings, such as the period when the Catalan language was forbidden or when traditional aspects like kilts and bagpipes were proscribed.

In addition to this, Catalonia’s claim seems to be based mostly on an economic criteria. Catalonia strives for a redistribution of the financial resources so that the money it generates benefits the region more. The region is very social-democratic, yet it seems that many people would prefer to concentrate on Catalonia’s well-being rather than contributing to Spain as a whole. As the oil resources in Scotland are getting scarce, this argument is not as strong as it once was. Regarding finances, Scots want the right to decide about their own budget. In the case of Scotland, there is a feeling that Scottish progressive vision cannot flourish under the current circumstances.

One main common aspect is everyone’s wish to be part of the European Union. This illustrates that the intention is not to build a new nationalist state, but to get away from an existing one. A common goal one can derive from the interviews is to create a better, more progressive and social democratic state in order to foster an environment where people can strive and have a good life. This can be interpreted as a self-interested attempt to improve one’s own quality of life, yet all my interview partners mentioned family, friends and community as important components of their own well-being.

To conclude, if what people want is for their voice to be heard, the right to self-determination as the right to democratic participation reflects this trend well. What international law lacks to take into account is people’s reaction when they do participate in democracy, but their proportional presence within nation-states is so small that it seems insignificant to them, leading to self-determination claims.
Appendix A

Interview Transcripts Catalonia

A.1 Ana María T.L.

13 June 2018, Graz. Interview held in Spanish. Transcribed and translated by myself, sent to review and confirmed by Ana María’s son Joan who was present at the interview.

CC: Hello Ana María! Welcome to the interview, thank you very much for participating!
AMTL: Hello Carolina!
CC: The first question would be, how do you feel, in terms of identity?
AMTL: Catalan 100%.
CC: What do you love most about most Catalonia?
AMTL: The general feeling, for example we have our own culture and our own language.
CC: What is special about Catalan culture? What is unique about it?
AMTL: Well, we have our own traditions, our own things we identify with. For example we have a typical dance called "Sardana", we have the "Castell", they’re human towers, Castells, with a lot of people and they build different levels, ever seen one?
CC: Oh yes, I have. Very impressive!
AMTL: We also have the Haveneras, it’s a type of music, not only Catalan but also Catalan.
CC: Have you ever participated in Castells?
AMTL: No, it’s from another region in Catalonia but we identify with it a lot too because they’re present in foreign countries as well and they make a good impression. Another thing about tradition is that when your environment, the people around you, your relatives are from the same region and have the same lifestyle, then the circle of people you know enables the culture to thrive.
CC: And about the language, what do you speak at home with your family?
AMTL: Catalan, the whole family speaks Catalan. We are a Catalan family, we have some members of the family who are Castilians but they also speak Catalan.
CC: Do people learn Catalan at school as well as Castilian?
**AMTL:** Yes, now yes. Now Catalan is taught as school too, in my days it wasn’t the case. In my days, under Franco, Catalan was prohibited. School was only in Castilian. I learned to write Catalan later, because I visited classes when I was older. But school was only in Castilian because times were like this. My son learned Catalan at school too. We fought to obtain these rights, so that a part of education would be in Catalan. For my son, it was 50% Castilian, 50% Catalan.

**CC:** In which language do you think?

**AMTL:** I think in Catalan. I do everything in Catalan. I was taught by nuns, I went to religious school and I learned French there, the rest was in Castilian. I have nothing against Castilian, I have more vocabulary than in Catalan because at the end of the day I studied in Castilian, but I just want to say, I have my own language, it’s Catalan. You get me?

**CC:** Yes I do! I get it. So you feel very Catalan, what would you improve in Catalan society?

**AMTL:** Many things. There are different things that can be improved. Education can be improved, health services can be improved, social assistance can be improved, and well, my point of view is that big companies and banks who have a big annual percentage of profit, they should give a part to benefit society. It’s just a personal point of view, it’s personal. I would like a society which is more social and egalitarian, and just. At least that the middle class gets back what they have lost. With the crisis, the middle class lost a lot of purchasing power.

**CC:** What are the main similarities between the regions of Spain.

**AMTL:** Hard question. What’s the question?

**CC:** What is the same in the whole of Spain, are there things in common?

**AMTL:** There are some similarities I guess. I’m not sure.

**CC:** Do you have Spanish friends?

**AMTL:** Yes

**CC:** What do you have in common with them?

**AMTL:** I don’t know. Nothing.

**CC:** Alright!

**AMTL:** I have Spanish friends, well, they feel Spanish, and this doesn’t imply that we can’t have a nice relationship with them. Everyone should be able to think what they want. I think some people have different lifestyles, every region has different things. There are some similarities but I find that everyone is different, every region is distinct. But I have different friends, and unionist friends and we never have a problem because everyone is allowed to think how they want and we should respect each other and our differences. For people who want to be independent we think this process is worth it because we want to obtain much more.

**CC:** If all Catalans had something in common, what would it be?

**AMTL:** The Catalan nation. We are different from other regions. We have a different mentality than the Spanish. I think we have a more open mentality and more European. I think the Spanish have a mentality much more closed.

**CC:** What is the Catalan mentality?
AMTL: Well, what we have in common, what unites us, is our culture. The Catalan culture is not like the Spanish one. We have our proper history, the history of our country, distinct from Spanish history. That’s where we start. We have the language too, our way of thinking, I find we are more structured. We have our schedules and working hours, how things should work and we stick to it. We don’t spend all our time at the bar, we work, we have holidays and free time but otherwise we work. We work hard and we contribute to the other communities. A lot of other communities get their things because we contribute so much.

CC: Which historical events most influenced Catalonia?

AMTL: Historical events... I think we could mention the civil war, 1936 to 1939. The civil war was the most influential, that is where we lost everything. Under Franco, the dictatorship. I think it changed the Catalan society a lot because we lost everything, all our rights, everything.

PTB: Before the war we had a republican Spain, very advanced, we had women rights, Catalonia was a pioneer in this, we had freedom of speech, freedom of thought. After this, during the dictatorship, they created a centralized Spain, one unique Spain, unique thinking, other cultures, other languages, all the rest was destroyed. Catalan was prohibited for example, and also the women rights, on many levels it went backwards.

CC: Did the rights come back?

PTB: Now we have democracy, we have left parties and right parties. The left parties are trying to be more open but in general I think the country is closed, very centralized. There is no conception of pluricultural Spain, so the minority cultures or the regions with their own cultures are overwhelmed by this centralized regime.

CC: How was history taught in school?

AMTL: History was Spanish history. Only. Now, in the schools there is Catalan and they tell you about Catalan history but in my time, only Spanish history. I studied the whole Franco regime. You know, who wins get to tell the story. The winner writes the history and the loser, well, doesn’t have a say.

CC: What’s your relationship with Catalan language?

AMTL: Well perfect. As I said I have more vocabulary in Castilian because I’ve always studied it, I would love to know other languages but you know, in a country that poor. The Spanish think they are the whole world but in reality we are in the "tail" of the European Union. Spanish think they’re the best of the "worldly world". But we’re really behind. Just with Portugal and Greece, us three we are behind.

CC: What does the word minority mean to you? Do you think the Catalans are a minority?

AMTL: In relation to Spain, yes.

CC: In which sense? Ethnically, culturally, linguistically, religiously?

AMTL: I think culturally and linguistically. Ethnically, no. And religion, the country has the Catholic religion. The majority is Catholic. We have other religions like Islam but the majority, we are Catholic. Things have changed a lot. Earlier, you had to accomplish everything because they presented God as more castigator, now it has evolved and people say "oh, don’t explain me
stories like this", now the religion of the country is like this, you don’t live with the pressure I lived with when I was young. Now what is important is the community.

CC: What measures do Spain take to protect the minorities?

AMTL: Well, not much. If we could start having Catalan in school it’s because we started demanding it. Not because it came from the Spanish government, a proposal, "do you want to study Catalan" so we’ll put it in school. No. We had to fight for it. Without a fight, there is no progress. If you don’t fight to get rights, you’re not gonna get them. For everything. For women rights, for everything. People in general put pressure. And little by little, we got some things. In 1976, Spain did give us autonomy. "Coffee for all". As the country was entering a democracy, they thought, "What are we going to do?", see, Catalonia, Galicia and the Basque Country, we have our own languages, and in principle they should be the three autonomous countries that should exist. But in order not to give us such power, they made this coffee for all, all regions got the same. We give a lot to autonomy to everybody so the important ones lose power. You know. And they did it that way. Some won a lot and some less. So now if we need our money, no, because we need to help the others who have less. And that’s how it is. If the government made the coffee for all, it’s because instead of giving power to three, they gave the same to everybody.

CC: If you consider Catalans should get more rights, which should they be?

AMTL: Now, the Catalans need more liberties. We need self-determination. Yes. You know what happened with our votes in October. They put people in jail, all our politicians in jail. It was a step back. Now, if they don’t like what you say, they can just put you in jail. I work at a pharmacy, I’m talking to a lot of people, and I have to be careful with whom I say what. I don’t feel I can talk freely to everybody. They also accused a lot of school teachers to make the case for Catalanism in schools and they were denouncing them and there was a legal action against them.

CC: What happened with the members of the Catalan government like Puigdemont?

AMTL: Well, Puigdemont is in Germany, they told him for the process of rebellion they’re not gonna give him to the Spanish authorities, but they could do it because of misuse of money, for the referendum. The referendum of October, the Catalans voted if we wanted independence. And they put all politicians in jail. We voted. 2 million people voted. The majority, we voted yes. So, we wanted to declare independence unilaterally and they put the politicians in jail. Some fled to Belgium and Scotland, and Germany. They caught some, Interpol gave a warrant order.

CC: The people who stayed, they’re still in jail?

AMTL: Yes. They were in jail in Madrid. The families had to visit them in Madrid. Now, there’s a new socialist government, they put them in jails in Catalonia. At least for the families. And now the next step is to ask to release them. The Spanish jail they originate from the problems with ETA, this military organization they had in Basque country. They were made to separate the
people from ETA from their families and their contacts. Now they used the same law to send the Catalan politicians to Madrid jails and separate them.

CC: What is the name of the new president?

AMTL: Quim Torra.

CC: Did Rajoy want to be president again or not?

AMTL: No, Rajoy was a disastrous president, I think for Catalonia and the Spanish state. Bad for both. He was terrible for Spain too. He spent much money in pension funds. A disaster. Since two years he didn’t want to have any dialogue with people from the Catalan government. Nothing. Now, there’s the motion of censure. But Pedro Sanchez just started, he’s the Spanish president now. He’s a socialist. Sanchez agreed to send people back to Catalonia. Rajoy would never have accepted. Rajoy, with him, the judicial power and the politics were intertwined.

CC: Do you think people should have the right to create new states?

AMTL: Oh yes!

CC: Or shall we try to fix the internal problems or something in the middle?

AMTL: No, no no no no. I think today the referendums serve something. Yes, if people want to have a new state, they should have the right to vote for it. We’re in the 21st century, we should be able to vote. We have the right to vote.

CC: How would you like the international community to respond to the Catalan declaration of independence?

AMTL: I expected another international response, especially from the European Union. Yes, at least from the European Union, a more clear position.

CC: Which benefits would an independent Catalonia bring?

AMTL: The main benefit would be economic. We would have more money. Everything we are paying to other communities, we are subsidizing other communities, we would have that money for ourselves. We could decide where our money goes. And then democratic benefits, more freedom, a more just society as I said earlier.

CC: Which disadvantages would independent Catalonia have?

AMTL: Well, we would be gone from the European Union. We would then see how to solve this problem. There would be other problems, I guess, but if we are independent I think the Catalans would be willing to tighten our belts for a time so that it gets better.

CC: What do people want to change through independence?

AMTL: As I said earlier, we want to change... With more money we could invest in health, in education, in social assistance which is very bad right now.

CC: What is the reason why Catalans want to be independent?

AMTL: We want to be independent because we are tired of not getting answers from the Spanish state, for nothing. It’s been two years, and Rajoy doesn’t want to listen or grant anything. It should be a social concert, where people communicate. If you don’t get any answers of any kind, then there’s a moment where you look for your solutions elsewhere. We want to find solutions for the problems in Catalan society. Then you feel abandoned.

CC: What do you think would happen in Catalonia were independent?

AMTL: I don’t know what would happen but for me it would be a dream from my youth. I think that the Catalans are a hard-working society, and even
if there are problems, of course, we would advance. It seems the whole world doesn’t want Catalonia to be independent because so much money goes out of Catalonia for Spain.

CC: There was a unilateral declaration of independence, right? What is going to happen now with the new governments?

AMTL: Well the unilateral declaration didn’t proceed. We voted without the permission of Spain, they consider the vote to be illegal. You know, they sent the police. The Civil Guard, Franco’s police. In the school I went to vote, luckily, the police didn’t do anything. We didn’t have any incident. We could vote in peace. But in many schools there were many incidents. They were hitting people. I think they didn’t continue in the afternoon because they say Merkel, I don’t know if it’s true, they say Merkel called Rajoy and told him to stop the police from hitting people. So we voted on the first of October, but we couldn’t really declare independence. Spain said the vote was illegal because the Spanish constitution doesn’t allow to have votes for things. So we were out of legality, and we’re illegal. The constitution decides.

CC: Would it be possible to change the constitution?

AMTL: No. They’re not gonna change the constitution for this.

CC: Will there be another referendum?

AMTL: Yes, but not in the near future. I don’t think so. Not now.

CC: What place should have Catalonia in Spain, Europe, the world?

AMTL: If there is something that would benefit to Catalonia, I think, they wouldn’t be OK with it. We have a good access to the Mediterranean Sea, we have great access to France. What place I would like Catalonia to have, I don’t know. The nation has 7 million people, we are what we are. But Spain would lose a lot.

CC: Alright! No more politics, but what is for you a good life? A beautiful life?

AMTL: A good life! Would be, well, have a good work where you earn enough to have a lot of free time and enjoy a little more. More free time. I can’t complain because I earn money. But if we could arrange schedules in another way, we could enjoy free time more, have more quality of life. It’s a little difficult.

CC: What would you do with more free time?

AMTL: I would travel more, I would go to France more for example, more holidays, I could have a hobby. I would like to try swimming, or do things I like. But that’s how it is. I really can’t complain. So many people work and earn almost nothing. The minimum salary is €700. Now you explain me what you can pay with that. What can you pay? You have a flat in Barcelona and it’s all gone.

CC: What is the most important in your life?

AMTL: My family. Family is very important for us. Our family, look, we are very united, with all the cousins, and their children, the uncles and aunts. Family. The main core is with your children, and we are also united with the rest.

CC: What should the government and society do so that you can have a good life.

AMTL: Raise the minimum salary. That can’t be. €700 can’t be. At least €1200 so you can live. There should be more work, more offers of work for young
people. But the minimum salary is very important. If you don’t have money... You need it to live.

CC: In which extend do you think the government represents your interests?
AMTL: I don’t know. I don’t know what to answer here. I like to think so. I want to think that they do.
CC: Last, optional question, the political compass. [explaining the political compass with the help of Joan]
JTM: Bottom left corner. Mom, you’re a social democrat!
AMTL: Yes, that’s right!

A.2 Arnau C.V.

24 July 2018, Graz. Interview held in Spanish. Transcribed and translated by myself, sent to review and confirmed by Arnau.

CC: Hello Arnau! I would first ask you where you’re from, what your story is?
ACV: I’m from Catalonia, from a place near Barcelona, around 10 km away. I was born in Barcelona, I also have relatives in Madrid too, and in Malaga. I currently reside in Cabrils, and I’m studying in Mataró, which is also nearby.
CC: What do you study?
ACV: A joint degree of business administration and marketing in the fourth year, I still have a year left and then I can apply for Masters.
CC: How do you feel in terms of identity?
ACV: I should answer that I feel European first, because I also had an Erasmus in the Netherlands, I was living in London when I was a kid. I forgot how to speak English properly but well. I must say that I feel of course Catalan, because I’m identifying with Catalan culture for the most part, and I feel Spanish too. Due to my family, because of traditions, because of the territory, it’s a bit of everything but I can’t really say that I feel like a world citizen because there are so many places I haven’t been yet. I’d like to get out of my comfort zone. My comfort zone right now is Europe, Spain and Catalonia.
CC: What do you prefer in Catalonia and Spain?
ACV: I can’t say that I prefer Catalonia or Spain...
CC: Oh, not if you prefer Catalonia or Spain, but what is your favourite thing in Catalonia, and what is your favourite thing in Spain?
ACV: Oh! I get it. In Catalonia, above all the people. I identify a lot with the culture, with the stream of thought, with the philosophy. Catalonia is, to use a stereotype which I can’t tell is true or not, but so you can understand the situation, there are people who are very hard-working and living off the minimum, with the help of their parents or grandparents. Earlier during the war under Franco, it was a very difficult time in Catalonia, and now they value a lot what they have, and they value sharing it with other people, to share meals together, with your family and friends. It’s a little “sharing economy”, regarding food, situations, and emotions too. Obviously, we love eating and spending time together in Catalonia. I love Catalan food, and the beach of course. Now if I have to tell you what I love most about Spain, it would be an incomplete
answer because there are many things I love, especially in Andalusia, in the south of Spain. Malaga, Sevilla, Cadiz, Granada, all these areas I love them a lot, also because of the people, they are very open people, emotionally speaking, and the food is great as well. But it’s very different, in Catalonia it’s true we’re very hard working, very focussed on what needs to be done to subsist, to have money and stability, to feed the children and have a good life. In the south, it’s more “live in the moment”, “carpe diem”, live your life and let it flow. There are a lot of areas in Spain that I haven’t visited so I can’t tell if I like them or not, but more or less, in general, I really like Spain.

CC: What would you improve in Catalan society?
ACV: I think what I would improve above all is not to think so much in the future but live more in the present. What they’re missing in Andalusia is to think more about the future, so it’s the other way around. I think that would be a solution. And not to think about the past so much, the hard times Spain had, especially the grand-parents. It’s a culture of saving, making sure nothing is missing, so saving a lot time after time to have enough stability, economic stability at every moment. But, sometimes, we cross the line, we only think about savings and in the end we don’t have a life. I think that sums it up.

CC: What are the main similarities between the regions of Spain?
ACV: As I said earlier, it’s a culture quite open but I’m not sure it’s the same in all the regions. It’s hard to generalize on that topic, what identifies and unites us the most is the food. It’s the thing you can share with everyone else. Generalizing is not right, there are many different qualities in each region, so it’s hard to find a point in common so I would say the food.

CC: If every Catalan had something in common, what would that be?
ACV: What we have in common is nationalism, we’ve seen that in the news, we’ve seen that in the communication media, we have a very rooted, strong culture. It can be both positive and negative, of course. So it’s true I’m more concentrating on the positive side, we are one, we share everything with all, and we have the same stream of thought, the same cultural similarities like the values, we identify a lot with the values.

CC: Which values?
ACV: To grow in community but the problem is that we want to grow with our community, not with the others. There are a lot of factors intervening in this moment, but it is surely good also. To see how everyone shares the community values, live together and grow together. There is also a bad part.

CC: And which community do you talk about, which you’re part of?
ACV: The Catalan community. I refer to the Catalans, to their culture and the fact we are very similar in many aspects but here is where I disagree, there are some Catalans who think we are very similar to each other but very different from the rest of Spain, I don’t think so, that’s just my point of view.

CC: And the Catalans, are they the people who live in Catalonia or the people who were born there?
ACV: The concept of Catalans for me, they are people who live in the region of Catalonia. We have similarities with the community of Valencia too, for example, but some aspects are only valid for Catalonia. For example the Castellers,
it’s a typical popular celebration of Catalonia. The people build these live towers.

CC: Have you ever been part of one?

ACV: Oh no.

CC: About history...

ACV: I can tell you I’m not an expert in history. The trajectory, we’re starting with the fact that the major part of Spain was conquered by the Muslims, Al Andalus, that’s where the name comes from. So we were conquered, so we have a lot of traits coming from Muslim culture, for example Spanish guitar, or mathematics. A big part of musical influence comes from Arabic influence. That is a particularity regarding food, culture. Well, then over time we had the Reconquista, with Catholicism coming to the region, if we go straight to the important part, from which most problems emerged - well first there was the Crown of Aragón, with arranged marriage, the first discrepancies at the level of regions like Aragón and Madrid - but the important thing was when departivism, separatism started, when Castroism started, a lot of regions had "caziques", who were in high positions, very rich, a lot were part of nobility and some not, but that is how exploitation started, and rural flight too. It’s a complex topic, but this determined a lot for the future, the parties started to become a bit more extreme, doesn’t matter if they were left like right, people couldn’t meet in the middle to negotiate. We have also World War I, World War II, it’s in common with other countries of course, Pinochet, Mussolini, we had Franco. Franco was a major point in the topic. Franco was the person who introduced autarky, who generated a lot of inequalities, you had the rich who got richer and the poor who got poorer. The black market emerged, the Estraperlo too. Our grand-parents were hungry, it was a very difficult period for them, and now we have this culture of saving and saving, so that tomorrow nothing is missing. That’s how various discrepancies started, the Popular Front of Catalonia, the fight they had. Franco came into power with a coup, he wasn’t elected, he just took power, and the war started. The red against the blue.

CC: Who were the red?

ACV: The red were more the left parties. They were completely against the politics of Franco that were completely restrictive. During the autarky, it wasn’t allowed, well it was allowed but it was very regulated, to import and export food. So we had to grow everything ourselves in the country. It was a big problem, some speak of the Golden Franco Times, a lot of people were for him, in favour of him and his ideology and his stream of thought. It depends how you look at it, but with everything that was bad, I prefer to keep an image of his ideology that is a bad image. During the war, Franco forced many people to fight for his side, to march out of the country, a lot of thinkers were assassinated, politicians too. So, if you look at it from the historical context, I’ll concentrate more on Catalonia. Catalonia has always had its own stream of thought, from one part coming from Catholics kings, and from the other part from France. In some aspects, we identify more with the culture of France than that of Spain. Not me, but if I may generalize the concept a little.

CC: In which aspects?
ACV: Primarily economically. I think there are 3 typologies. Economic, political and cultural aspects. Regarding economic aspects, Catalonia resurfaced from the economic crisis. People used to work more in the countryside but with the industry the relocation of Catalonia was very important and now we have industry, we’ve very industrial, a lot of companies settled in Catalonia and in the Basque country, in Navarra and in Madrid of course. So, we started to notice differences regarding the economy within the country. For example, the more disorganized regions, remember when I was mentioning the rural flight, many people who were working the land, they were called “payeses”, people who were working in the countryside, they left to work in the city, in the industry. Catalonia started winning a lot of prestige and economic power. That’s a point in favour for Catalonia. The problem is the following: a lot of inequalities were created at the regional level, and these inequalities created... - Catalonia didn’t have fiscal autonomy - everything goes into the Spanish government’s hands. The Basque Country has fiscal autonomy, but Catalonia doesn’t. These are economic nuances in Spain. I think we’re going into details, what more? Politics. Politics in Spain has always been corrupted. Principally governed by the PP [Partido Popular] and the PSOE [Partido Socialista Obrero Español], now we have the PSOE in the government but before we had the PP, and the PP has always been characterized by corruption. It has always been a corrupt party, yes they’ve been elected by most of Spain, by the ”peperos” like they’re called, because they want to profit from the economic benefits. Like with Franco, what happened, he subsidized and supported the rich people, because they could raise the GDP into Spanish society, but didn’t support other people, so inequalities were created. And then comes the other extreme, extreme right or extreme left. Like I said, in politics in Spain, you have two completely different parties, there’s a discrepancy at the level of the system, at the political level, and we have inequalities, also at the level of ideology, economy and others. Now we’re missing the culture. I think it’s sure that we have our proper culture, we have our own language too, and for years, starting with Franco, it was forbidden to educate people in our own language, we couldn’t speak Catalan. It was like, to generalize a little, to speak ”spanishism” so that everyone would feel Spanish, so that everyone speaks Spanish. Some people were bilingual, because you could speak English for example, but it was forbidden for people to be trilingual. So in Catalonia the education we have is, we have classes in English, we have classes in Catalan, we have classes in Castilian, and sometimes in French or Italian. When Franco said we can’t speak Catalan, he was suppressing a very important part of Catalan culture. So I think there is a big discrepancy between the groups, between Catalan nationalists and Spanish.

CC: In which language do you think?
ACV: At home I speak Catalan, I think Catalan too but when I have to speak Spanish I speak Spanish, in class, with my classmates who are from Spain I speak Spanish. I can combine both perfectly. I’m a native bilingual.

CC: How was history taught as school?
ACV: It’s quite important. It depends so much on the professor. Fortunately, I got a very good professor, and others ones who weren’t as good. The very
good professor always kept himself from saying if he was for independence or not, for example. He always said, here is the information, the conclusions are yours. I think that’s the best. So that you yourself can decide what you really want, what your point of view is. On the other side, I had other history teachers who weren’t as good, they tried to teach their ideology and they were spreading information that was not neutral. But it depends, history, generally, they teach us history from a neutral point of view, you can find schools that teach like this, or more pro Catalan, or more independentists. So it’s complicated, there are a lot of factors in the game, we have to know how to differentiate. It is like with the communication media, we know how it works, in the end, you transmit what you want to transmit for your own benefit and interest. That’s a problem that has always existed and will always exist.

CC: Who decides about the history programme in Catalonia?
ACV: We have different programmes. We have history on the international level, so we know what’s happened in the world, how it developed from the beginning, World War I, World War II, to understand the global international context. Then we have history more focussed on Spain, no only Catalonia. It’s a globalized concept to explain a bit of everything. In the end you want pupils to know what happened, you don’t want to be demagogic. It’s a bit generalized, but so you see the point, it depends on the school, on the teachers, on many things. There is international history, national history, usually the same amount of each.

CC: What does Catalan culture mean to you?
ACV: For me, it’s a feeling of community. For me, to be a Catalan, I identify myself with the Catalans because of what I mentioned earlier, the similar culture, similar thoughts and values, that’s for me Catalan culture.

CC: How do you interpret the word “minority”? Do you consider Catalans to be a minority?
ACV: Well that’s a good question. For me a minority is simply a part of the population that doesn’t have enough people or influence to be able to decide, that would be it for me. I don’t know if it’s the accepted definition, probably not, but well. I don’t consider Catalans to be a minority, firstly because there are many types of Catalans, there are independentists, there are non-independentists, and none of them is a minority. Sometimes we use the term minority to depreciate part of the people. I don’t think it should be like this, you can be a minority and accepted socially by the other people. I don’t think Catalonia is a minority, and I don’t think independentism is a minority, no, in truth it’s not. I guess it depends on how you use the term.

CC: What does Spain do to protect other minorities?
ACV: When you say Spain, you refer to the government?
CC: Yes.
ACV: Depends on the government, we had the PP, the PP didn’t take a lot of measures and we’ve seen that with all the demonstrations there were, about the right to vote. It could not be done, they didn’t have enough means, there wasn’t any support. Sometimes it’s important to defend minorities and make corrections in the social system but PP is very conservative. On the other side we now have the PSOE, it’s the socialist party. Let’s see. I guess it always ends
up being quite the same. PP, PSOE, PP, PSOE. We have never left this circle. Well, I think there was no protection. In terms of minority, if you want to call Catalans that way, even though I don’t think it is...

CC: We can call it community

ACV: Exactly. I don’t think there was any protection, and I don’t think there was any bilateral communication. For the main part I think it’s the fault of the government, because the decisions are theirs and they should live with the consequences. It’s a hard question. Parts of the government followed an "educational, moral and social" path, very rooted/settled, a bit like extreme right, so the extreme right, they’re very conservative. The fact of wanting to "conserve" hinders acceptance towards other cultures. When it comes to conserve and support the Catalan culture, I haven’t seen that intervention from the government. Now I don’t know what will happen. It appears the situation is improving, between the groups. I’m optimistic.

CC: Since when?

ACV: We changed government, Mariano Rajoy resigned due to corruption, the lack of support, and other things. And now we’ll see, but I think it will get better.

CC: Do you think Puigdemont will come back?

ACV: He can’t. Due to international differences in law, in various countries such as the Netherlands, Switzerland, Puigdemont is not guilty of these charges, at the international level he can move in peace, without any problem, the problem is the Spanish law, if he comes back to Spain, he’s going to prison. We see that at the international level, Puigdemont is absolutely free of charge and he can live his life normally, but in Spain we say that "no, he committed a crime". The thing is so many people in the government have committed crimes and nothing happened, we have thousands of corruption cases that didn’t end up anywhere and were dropped but about Puigdemont and the case for independence, to defend an ideology, well they put you in prison. I’m not a partisan of Puigdemont, but I’m not a partisan of what is happening with this situation either.

CC: Do you consider Catalans need more rights?

ACV: I don’t know if we need more rights. More liberties. I consider we need more liberties and the main one that I as a Catalan ask for, as a Catalan and a Spaniard, is the right to decide. Or at least the right right to vote, and express your opinion. It’s a fundamental right of people. It wasn’t the case lately, people didn’t have the adequate means to express their opinion, there wasn’t bilateral communication. I don’t think we need more rights, because we have the same rights as any other European citizens or Spanish citizens. But more liberties, and to have liberties I think the government should be open-minded, a government with a closed mind and not ready to dialogue, is a government that will not give many liberties. For the same reason I would say we need the same from the Catalan government, it also has to be more open-minded and know how to deal with a situation and find a neutral point where people can talk, have a dialogue, and decide.

CC: Do you think people should be able to create new states or they should try to keep living together under the current state?
ACV: There is only one world, there is a unique society and everyone should help everyone else. Of course you have cultural differences, I respect it and understand it, there are a lot of differences, there are social differences too and I think we should resolve this, the economy, the free market and other things. The topic is, I’m not for creating new states, of course if you look at the course of history, there are always new states being created, and the world has been fragmented more, at the level of states, and has been unifying more at the level of technology, communication, transportation and other things. It’s strange. I think we should diversify the cultural heritage, we came to a point where cultures have been developing into something very complex to analyze, more so than earlier, now we can communicate with anyone. At the European level, at the economic level, with America. We have a very rapid international development and on the other side you have many barriers, legal ones, political ones. So, there is the right to create new states, but I think there are other solutions, that would be my conclusion. I don’t want to build new barriers, but to open doors. But this right exists, if you want to identify yourself with other people, you have all the right in the world to live without them, it’s like sharing your flat. You can share your flat with another person, if you are paying for the flat, at any time you have the right to say, I don’t want to pay anymore for this flat, I’ll go and live in another one on my own. This right exists. Now, to continue with this analogy, you can talk to the other person, you can create a road-map, discuss norms and rules, and arrive at a situation where, even if people don’t respect each other, at least they can live together. That would be the conclusion I want to come to.

CC: How would you want the international community to respond to the Catalan declaration of independence?

ACV: I would like them to respond more. That was a problem we’ve been through, both Spanish and Catalan societies, more mediation from the member states of the European Union, and other states. I think it would have helped the situation.

CC: What benefits would you see in independence?

ACV: At the economic level, you can’t know. There are many factors, for example whether Catalonia becomes a member of the European Union or the economic community to keep the free trade. Cultural benefits, I don’t think many. We would be the same, because we already have the culture. At the social level... I think the main point is the economic level. In my point of view, I think the situation in Catalonia would improve regarding economy. Because it’s sure that we, the GDP we create in Catalonia, in the end, all the benefits go to the government and then it is shared between all the communities and regions. The problem is how it is distributed, if you have a conservative right-wing government that is anti-independence and everything, well you don’t have objectivity regarding the distribution of benefits. That’s the problem we’ve been confronted with, we are right now one of the richest regions, with the Basque Country, and Valencia and Madrid would be one of the richest too. So principally we can compare ourselves with the Basque Country and Madrid, economically. We have a big part of Spanish industry, with the Basque Country, and the problem is, what we generate, it doesn’t go to us.
Every time we go to the Spanish government so that they distribute it another way, they never change what we expect. So that’s a problem. Obviously, you can’t develop health, the education system. I’ll tell you an easy example. I was doing an Erasmus in the Netherlands. I got a scholarship for Erasmus, a financial help, €300 per month, in Andalusia, the Erasmus scholarship, there is one which actually depends on the European Union, and one which depends on the Spanish government. The scholarship over there is €500. What they invest in Catalonia for education is much inferior to what they invest in Andalusia, for example. For me, to be able to go to public university, I pay €2000 a year, to study. In Andalusia, €500 per year. There are inequalities. At the level of transportation, I pay from Barcelona to Girona, another city in Catalonia, I pay a rate for transportation, €10-15, and this tax goes to the government. At the end, what I’m saying, we’re paying a lot of taxes, we don’t have fiscal autonomy like the Basque Country does, and the distribution is not correct, in terms of health, education, I think that’s a very important point. And if we invest so much money and don’t get the same, then we can’t invest in health, in infrastructure or anything else. The problem is how the government manages the money they have. They’ve built airports that go nowhere, highways that go nowhere, they speculated on real estate, they’ve subsidized companies that have been committing fraud, in the end it doesn’t work correctly. But yes, on the economic level, it would be beneficial for Catalonia to be independent. And if it weren’t a benefit, at least we would have the possibility to decide what to do with our money. So I’m in favour to regulate a fiscal autonomy or additional regulations so that we can operate with our own money.

CC: What about disadvantages?
ACV: Disadvantages. For example transportation to go to other places in Spain. At the cultural level we would lose a lot that I identify with for example there are many aspects of Andalusian culture that I share with them, like the food, the music, and the relationships, and we would lose that. We would make the connection more difficult. At the economic level too, we would lose the international trade agreements, the trade routes could be affected. There are many things, you can speculate a lot, but no one can know for sure. Things would change of course, but I think people exaggerate, especially the Catalan independentists. Everyone just defends their part. What I think would happen if Catalonia were independent. I simply don’t know. I don’t think we would benefit in general, just at the economic level, I don’t think it would benefit neither to Catalonia nor to Spain. I also have to say I think Spain would end up more harmed than Catalonia.

CC: Really?
ACV: I think Spain would be more harmed, it would be worse for Spain that for Catalonia. It’s just a guess, I don’t know either. Plus I’m not an independentist, so...

CC: What position should Catalonia have in Spain, Europe and the world?
ACV: Well just a position like any other country. A egalitarian society, with the same conditions of life. I respect and believe in equality, of genders, of ethnies, I respect this. And I think Catalonia should have a normal position, not privileged or anything, just equal to any other community. I’m not an
independentist, I don’t want independence. But, I do want economic and fiscal autonomy. No political or economic independence, but autonomy. At least to do what people decide to do. There is a great variety of opinions, and everyone is free to think what they want. No one can say, no you can’t think that. That’s a big problem we have today.

CC: After the referendum, a lot of people were sent to jail, right? What’s happening now?

ACV: They’re still in prison.

CC: Did you vote?

ACV: No, I couldn’t. I was in the Netherlands, on Erasmus. All my family was there, but the situation, excuse the word, is "shit". You can’t just imprison people, you can’t have political prisoners at this level. That was at Franco’s time. Nowadays, you can’t have political prisoners. People who have their own ideology and culture, their stream of thought and are just expressing their ideas, you can’t put them in jail. You don’t put people who are embezzling million of euros in jail but you put people in jail who are just defending their own ideals. I think this is incorrect. I don’t think that’s the solution. And we’ve seen this is not the solution, neither is violence on the streets and none of this.

CC: What is for you the most important in life?

ACV: Be happy. That’s the most important.

CC: What’s happiness for you?

ACV: For me happiness is being good with your relatives and friends, be healthy, economic stability of course. Well stability is relative, we don’t have the same stability here [in Austria] than in Spain, at the economic level. Here I couldn’t be happy without let’s say €900 a month, principally because the standards of life is higher here. The prices are higher, the level of life is about the same but the prices are higher. If here I can’t subsist, I can’t be happy. In Spain, that would a different economic reality. For me, being happy is being satisfied with yourself first, being healthy and get along with other people, with your family, your friends, your acquaintances, that’s being happy for me. And to have a good life, the government should offer communication, and listen. Because sometimes we have communication but people formulate their response badly. It’s not communication if you have to ask to be listened to. Many times, that’s what happens. What you want in the end, is that two people, the two presidents, sit at the same table, the same day, and talk about things correctly, I think that would be a solution for what regrettably happened.

CC: Do you think the new governments will do it?

ACV: I’m an optimist, so yes. I don’t know if they’ll get to the point of solving everything, but I hope they’ll improve the situation at least a bit.

CC: You have a parliament and government in Catalonia, and also in Spain. Do you think the people in the parliament and government represent what you want for your life?

ACV: Right now the truth is that neither the parliament nor the government are representing my interests. But, they should. They should, yes. Many people think so. Many people think that the Catalan parliament is doing the things right. I, right now, think that it isn’t the case.
CC: And the European parliament?
ACV: In some aspects yes, there is a European Community, it seems like a great idea, and I agree with it, what I want is not only in Catalonia or Spain, I want to expand my knowledge, get to know other cultures, other cities, other places, so I think so, to generalize a bit, because there are always bad things too, yes, I can say yes.
CC: So I’ll explain you the next question in English if it’s alright? [explaining the political compass]
ACV: I think in this compass I would put myself in the centre. Exactly in the centre, because in the end if you advocate for a thing more than another, it benefits more to one than another. I think in the end you want to be exactly in the centre, that’s utopic, but you need utopia to keep advancing, so I think the middle point is the correct point. No more no less, just here. If the government were completely liberal, you could talk about anarchism. That wouldn’t be good either. The government just needs to set measures to control the country, set norms just like in a family, other that would be negative for all the people. But you need to listen and know how to change and adapt to the new environment, the technological changes and political changes, system changes, etc. Adapting is super important for me.

### A.3 Angela M.L.

27 August 2018. Skype interview held in English. Transcribed by myself, send to review and confirmed by Angela.

CC: Thank you very much for accepting to help me for my thesis about Scottish and Catalan self-determination claim!
AML: We don’t really know how to approach it because the topic is so sentimental for a lot of people. I can understand that elderly people for example when Franco lived, Catalan language was completely banned so it was complicated for them to still communicate in their language while it was prohibited. So for example my grandma doesn’t know how to write it, she makes very basic grammar mistakes because she never learned it properly, while at least us, the younger generation, we are able to write it properly.
CC: You had Catalan at school?
AML: Well, actually, I studied in a French school, in the "lycée français".
CC: Oh really!?
AML: Yes!
CC: Why?
AML: Because my mom went to the French school of Bogotá.
CC: Your mom’s from Colombia?
AML: Yes.
CC: Oh, how interesting! So in French school, you had Catalan and Spanish?
AML: Yes, we had mainly two hours of Catalan per week and two hours of Spanish per week. Like you guys learn German or any other language, for us it was learning Catalan and Spanish. And then for example in history I personally did one or two hours of Spanish history per week, so it wasn’t a lot. And
after Spanish history we had French history too. It wasn't a subject that a lot of people took seriously or studied for it much, it was easy, they didn't put a lot of emphasis on that subject. And for French people it was literature. Everybody in Catalonia speaks both, Catalan and Spanish completely bilingual.

CC: In what language do you think?

AML: Hmmm... I would say Spanish but it's completely the same for me, 100% the same, I can switch between both very flexibly. My dad is a Catalan speaker and my mom is obviously a Spanish speaker and for example when I'm speaking to my dad I speak in Catalan then I change to my brother who I speak Spanish with, then for friends for example if you meet them then somehow you start speaking Catalan but if someone doesn't speak Catalan I automatically would speak Spanish.

CC: With your family, when your mom and dad are together, what do you speak?

AML: They're divorced, but when we meet with people non Catalan speakers we usually speak in Spanish or the persons who speak Catalan communicates in Spanish with them and when they speak to us and we speak Catalan they change to Catalan. But we try to make it so everybody understands. They're not super different languages, even Enrique knows how to speak a bit of Catalan. [laughing]

CC: [laughing]

AML: You can catch a few words here and then, if you speak Spanish, you just need to use your imagination a bit.

CC: Did your mom learn Catalan when she came?

AML: She does speak Catalan but it's like a very forced Catalan, it doesn't sound natural. It's easier for her to speak Spanish.

CC: What does the Catalan culture mean to you? What are important aspects of it?

AML: So, I think Catalonia as a region I wouldn't say, compared to other countries, it doesn't have that much of its culture I would say. The north of Spain in general we don't have that many traditions, the feeling I get. Yes of course we have several Catalan typical days or some traditions but I wouldn't say... for example if I'm thinking of a region in Spain that has its own very own culture I would say Andalusia.

CC: What's special about them?

AML: About them. I say they have more traditional festivities, as for us it's just one or two days a year and that's pretty much it. I don't know, I think the rest of Spain also sees them more... No I wouldn't say that because actually the rest of Spain also sees us Catalans as different. How do I explain... If I think about Madrid, I don't think about typical things they have as much as when I think about Andalusia, I could tell you "oh, they have this, and that, that's very traditional". When you think of Spanish festivities, if you're asking someone who's not from Spain they will automatically tell you something from Andalusia, and think the rest of Spain is the same. The rest of the world gets the impression that the whole of Spain is like Andalusia.

CC: I see!
AML: For Catalonia for example, it’s maybe just me, but in my family we don’t live traditions as much as in other families, I would say that in general all of Catalan speakers we do value our language and we do think it’s a separate language, it’s something we treasure a lot, in part because it was banned in the past, so we try and maintain it as much as possible. Then, half of my family is Catalan so for me, I do identify myself as both Catalan and Spanish, and European, and also citizen of the world as you mentioned. For me it’s not like from 1 to 10 you can only chose for example 4 Spanish and 6 Catalan but you can have 10 Catalan, 10 Spanish and 10 European, you know. They’re not competing against each other. People who write that, are pro-independence. They would be 80% Catalan 20% Spanish, for example. They don’t see both cultures as going hand in hand but rather, Spain tried to kill our culture in the past years so now we want to take over. I think it’s also more a way for Catalan people to try and self-govern. For a lot of things, Catalonia has been much more progressive than the rest of Spain. That’s something I’m very proud of, it’s very rare to see discrimination in Catalonia, as you would see in other regions. I don’t want to point out which regions, because I don’t think it’s one region more than the others, but for some laws Catalonia has been very progressive and open-minded than other regions in Spain. I think that’s something that people are taking, saying so if Catalonia was independent, we would be much more advanced region because we have been trying to progress more than the others in the past century. It’s more like the feeling that they want to have complete control about the measures they’re passing. Honestly, I don’t think it would be that wonderful.

CC: How do you think it would be?

AML: It’s always like pointing the other as being wrong. I don’t think it is like that. The fact that Catalonia has been able to go this far because we had the government supporting us in the past, we have been given the means to build our infrastructure, we have big factories, not because we’ve already had it from scratch, you know, but because the government has also been working on giving us these things and for example we’re very lucky that Barcelona is completely open to the Mediterranean, if we were a region in the centre of Spain, what would we have you know, it’s like lottery, you’re born where you’re born and we’re also lucky to be next to France and we’re well connected.

CC: Do you think it would work out if you had another referendum and people decided to be an independent country, how do you think life would be?

AML: I want to be somehow optimistic because I think it’s actually a possible scenario that might happen, and now it’s surely 50-50% of the population, 50% of us don’t want to be independent and 50% of us want to be independent. So it’s very tight and it’s not only one generation that is affected but it’s 50-50 everywhere I would say.

CC: And why do you not want to be independent?

AML: Personally, I don’t think economically we would be... No, first of all, because there is absolutely no plan, and everybody is talking about independence and how independence would bring wonderful things to everyone. I’ve heard so much bullshit on the radio, like "oh, yeah, if we were independent, we would have better healthcare, and then we would live more", literally this.
Then everybody is talking a lot about great things independence would bring us but nobody has a solid plan. We’re all theorizing about many things and nobody has sat down to write a plan, we don’t know if we would keep the Euro, everybody is talking about being independent but we don’t even know if we would have the same money, the same currency. What would we trade with the rest of Europe? If I have double nationality, Colombian and Spanish, do I have to choose between Catalan and Spanish, do I have to give up Colombian? Do I just say no to Spanish nationality and stay Catalan and Colombian? We don’t know. Pensions. Retirement, how does that work? Does the Catalan government have enough for the all retirement plan? Are we trading with Spain? Will they start a commercial war with us? Do I need a visa to go to Spain?

CC: So many questions...
AML: Nobody is giving answers, everybody is just, I’m feeling very optimistic today, let’s be independent. There’s no plan at all. Actually now when you’re voting in the elections for the Catalan government you’re just voting against or pro independence. Everybody forgot about other things that are none of those options.
CC: Did you vote at the independence referendum?
AML: No, because I was working in Germany.
CC: Would you have gone if you had been in Barcelona?
AML: The one in October? No I think I wouldn’t. Because I don’t want to give credibility to something for me that has no meaning. I would only go to a referendum if it was a legal one, like in Scotland. Otherwise I think I wouldn’t go. Of course, I go and vote when it’s something legal and that has consequences, I’m the first one to vote. But if it’s something just promoted by a pro-independence party I’m just not going to participate. So of course they get numbers of about 90% of pro-independence because it’s only been promoted by independence parties. No, I wouldn’t go.
CC: The new government is now pro-independence?
AML: Yes, in Catalonia you mean?
CC: Yes.
AML: Yes. I suppose you’ve heard about these political prisoners.
CC: Yes, I have.
AML: For us, it was something pretty unexpected. My point of view, I am against independence but it was weird to see some of our governors in prison. They’re not like big politicians, like Trump, it’s just some guy from a small town in Catalonia who suddenly is going to prison. Catalonia is such a small region that everybody knows his aunt, or the cousin, you know. It’s just very weird, for me it was putting more pressure.
CC: So they’re still in prison, and Puigdemont is still in Belgium? And he can never come back?
AML: Yes, they’re still in prison and he can never come back. It’s very weird, it has been over dimensioned. The more they talk about it, the more Europe is going to have opinions that are distorted by media, you know. It’s so weird, they could be my uncle, you know.
CC: Is the independence party using their stories to their ends?
AML: Of course, if you walk around Barcelona you see hundreds of yellow ribbons which is showing support to the political prisoners. I wouldn’t mind them coming out of prison, I wouldn’t wear the yellow ribbon because you automatically assume that I would be pro-independence. They were in Madrid before and with the change of government we had now they’re bringing them to Catalonia.

CC: When do you think it’s ok for a people to declare independence or create their own country?

AML: Honestly, if I had the answer to that... Honestly I don’t know. I did try to empathize with them and I understand that some people might really get frustrated or angry about the situation because it’s the same for me. It also hurts me to see my home divided and I imagine for them it’s the same. Feeling that Spain going against them or whatever. Of course I do think there’s many ways to get your voice across but I don’t think they’re doing it the right way and I don’t think it started the right way. They started with the crisis, they took all the economic discomfort and it was for me purely political manipulation. The party who was in charge in 2007 for example they were not even for independence, they started with demonstrations, catalyzing all the discomfort into independence, first they started, we want more economic liberties, then they just went to we want independence, around 2009-2010 and now exploding.

CC: What would you improve in Catalan society without needing independence?

AML: The government we had before, PP, I think they did the worse terrible job someone could do when it comes to pacifying the problem and at least the government now even if they’re not truly wanting to talk to Catalan leaders, at least they’re making the effort to make us believe they want to, you know? Honestly, I don’t know what is the solution to all of this. I think the problem became that big because we Catalans were not heard enough, the problem escalated quickly and nobody thought it could become this big and then it just blew up in their faces. So maybe try and meet some middle ground but the problem is independent people they don’t want any other solution that independence. It’s very difficult to reach an agreement that makes everybody happy. So I don’t know, I really cannot answer that.

CC: Do you yourself, or do you think other people feel that Catalonia is a minority?

AML: No. For me it’s just a way to refer to one of my nationalities or at least I do feel that I am Catalan and it’s just one way to refer to a territorial aspect of Spain but I don’t feel as a minority. I wouldn’t feel more of a minority than Enrique would feel Andalusian. For me it’s just a way to refer to where I’m from.

CC: You were mentioning the Catalan language earlier.

AML: Yes, education is in Catalan for example, at universities they’re also teaching in Catalan.

CC: Is it mandatory, does everyone has to learn it?

AML: Yes, kind of. I don’t actually know if it’s mandatory. Yes, Enrique says it’s mandatory, so I trust him in that.
CC: How do you become Catalan? If you move there, if you were born there? Can everyone become Catalan?
AML: Yes, pretty much. I don’t think we have any discrimination around that. If you say you’re Catalan, you’re Catalan. I’ve never seen anyone being bullied because they’re not Catalan. Usually, people learn the language pretty quick, they make efforts to learn it. For example, in my university degree, in my class, a lot of us were Catalans, but we also had many people from the rest of Spain, so of course like the first exam for them was... not the exam because you can take it in Spanish, so you can chose in what language to answer the exam. But for the classes, the first ones they tried to make the efforts to understand what’s going on. For a lot of people that’s difficult at first because the classes are taught in Catalan. It’s more than enough for us to see that other people make an effort to understand.
CC: At university too, when foreign people come they have to learn Catalan too?
AML: Yes.
CC: What is the thing you prefer about Catalonia?
AML: My favourite thing... [smiling and looking up] I really like how open-minded we are, how people generally speaking do accept differences, or are very progressive in a lot of senses, for example LGBT rights, Catalonia no problem or environmental-wise, or feminism-wise. It would be weird for me to find someone that is not pro LGBT. It would just be very weird. I really like that youth here is also traveling a lot, I don’t want to generalize either, but I do think it’s one of the most open regions form Spain, even with the whole independence thing going on, I do think we’re more progressive than the rest of Spain.
CC: What about your favourite thing about Spain?
AML: Many things. [smiling] I really really like how many differences there are inside of Spain, for example we have Gallego, Aragonese, what else do we have, Basque, we have many languages, we’re very culturally diverse, many different traditions, the climate is different from one side of Spain to the other, you have the beach, you have woods, you have mountains, and the people are nice too.
CC: Coming to your conception of a good life, what do you think is a good life?
AML: For me, it would be worrying less about things that could be automatically done for you. Not having to worry about, you know the Maslow’s pyramid, you physiological needs, for sure not worrying about that, economically being at ease, being happy with what you’re doing, being somewhere that you feel comfortable in. I don’t know if the question is more oriented about the country?
CC: Generally, you, what you think is a good life, what you need to have a good life?
AML: Honestly, I’m just expecting to be happy with several aspects of my life. Like both personally, professionally, focussing on what I love because what I would be worrying about is already covered. Being able to develop positive aspects of my life rather than worrying about the negative ones, you know.
CC: Do you think right now you have the possibility to have the best life in Spain/Catalonia?
AML: Honestly, the independence thing has taken a toll on a lot of us. It’s something that is very emotional for everyone. I was talking to Enrique recently, and saying that I don’t know if I see myself living in Barcelona if Catalonia becomes independent. For me, it would be more than enough reason to leave Catalonia.
CC: You would rather live somewhere else than in independent Catalonia. Why?
AML: The first years would be pretty difficult in many senses and I don’t see myself buying a house somewhere where the prices might just crash, or the value that I would have invested wouldn’t be the same after independence. It’s just too much uncertainty. And as long as things are not crystal clear I wouldn’t see myself going back to an independent Catalonia.
CC: What do you think the government needs to do for you to have the best life possible? Both governments, the Spanish and the Catalan one?
AML: Keep investing in health care first of all, in education. And as soon as this areas are covered I would say the other ones can come along. These two are for me the most important pillars when I consider which party to vote for.
CC: How is health care right now?
AML: Yes, right now in Spain we do have a really great health care system, and I hope it stays that way.
CC: Is it free and is it also good?
AML: Yes, both of them. Everybody can have access to health care, it’s easy to have access to great professionals, and I’m very happy.
CC: How do you feel represented by the parliaments and governments?
AML: Very unrepresented, in many ways. At the end, they were both trying to win their own votes and the people that are voting for them that trying to reach a common ground, I don’t think they are creating a dialogue that goes further than their parties’ ideologies. I just think they’re creating now a battleground, "oh, you did this, that was worse than what I did", there’s not a lot of consensus. I would like to see more... a kinder political system, a more empathetic political system. I would like to see kindness inside politics, not because they want to win votes, but because they want to reach a nice agreement.
CC: What about the EU parliament?
AML: The EU... Honestly I haven’t read a lot about the EU parliament so I can’t tell you much.
CC: Have you ever voted for the EU parliament?
AML: No.
CC: At last, an optional question with the political compass. Have you ever heard of it?
AML: Wait, let me just open it.
CC: [explaining the political compass] So if you would like to share your view with me?
AML: I would say that I am more of a left but still pretty centered, you can imagine the line, and then I do believe that the government has to intervene but still leaving a margin for the people to work a bit for their future.

CC: So you think people should work for future?

AML: Of course, I think the government should put the basis, I do believe taxes are useful, I don’t mind paying taxes as long as I see the government is having a positive impact on society. I want to trust the government and I do think people studied for that because hopefully in the future they will be able to lead the country, and I want to give them this vote of confidence, but I do believe there is a limit and the government should not intervene in private decisions, or still give us the chance for us to decide where we want to invest our money or make individual choices and not everything decided by the government.
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CC: Hello Henry!
HB: Hello Caroline!
CC: Thank you for being my first interview partner for my thesis!
HB: You’re welcome!
CC: So, I sent you questionnaire and as I said I would rather have nice discussion instead of following the questions strictly.
HB: Okay perfect.
CC: So, what is your story?
HB: My story? So I was born in Birmingham in 1979, my father was English, my mother was German but we moved to Scotland when I was four years old so I grew up in Scotland, so my closest sense of roots, if someone asks me when I’m from, I would say Scotland because I was four years old when I moved there so I don’t really know anything else from my childhood.
CC: If you could give percent, how would you say you feel, Scottish, British, European, world citizen, or other?
HB: In terms of my identity, this has always been difficult question for me to answer easily, so I would say probably my strongest association is either British or European, and also maybe Scottish and world citizen on a secondary level, but I do generally feel European and British so that’s maybe why Brexit hurts so much because it challenged my identity.
CC: Were you allowed to vote for Brexit?
HB: Yes, well I was allowed to vote against Brexit [laughing].
CC: Really? So it was not only for people living in the UK?
HB: No, I was allowed to vote in the Scottish referendum as well because my last registered address is in Scotland.
CC: So you were allowed to vote for both.
HB: That’s it. But now I’m not allowed to vote in Britain anymore because my last registration was 2002 and you’re only allowed to vote for 15 years if you leave the country. I don’t know if France has a similar rule or not but in Britain
if you’re outside Britain for more than 15 years you’re no longer allowed to
vote so the Brexit referendum, actually the general election in 2017 was my
last vote, unless I move back to Britain of course.
CC: Ok! And in Austria, are you allowed to vote?
HB: No I don’t have Austrian citizenship so I’m not allowed to vote in Austria
either, I’m completely disenfranchised [laughing] but what can you do? The
conservative government in Britain has promised to remove this rule - this 15
year rule - but as with many other promises they haven’t fulfilled it yet.
CC: What do you think will happen with Brexit?
HB: Nothing good. Nothing good. It’s a disaster. I don’t see what problem
it’s supposed to solve. That’s my fundamental issue. What problem do we
have to which Brexit is the answer? I don’t know. Of course, there are many
problems in Britain as in France and Austria and many other countries, we
have a big difference between rich and poor, we have some cities that are very
wealthy and some that are almost forgotten I’m sure it’s the same in France,
the decline of industry and people worried about migration and so on. There
are legitimate problems and I think what has happened is that a lot of the
conservative side of politics have successfully managed to find a scapegoat.
So in the past they said “oh you know we have to implement this unpopular
rule because it’s Brussels, they are forcing us to do it”, or, “well, you would
have a job if it weren’t for all these Polish people coming. And so on. It’s very
easy to blame other people for problems and say “oh you know everything
would be wonderful if we didn’t have Brussels or Polish people or whatever.
So I think finally this came back to bite us, this right wing lies that were in
the media resulted in the Brexit referendum and now we have 8 months to go,
the British government still doesn’t know what it wants to achieve with Brexit
which makes it hard for the European Union to negotiate.
CC: Didn’t the Brexit minister quit last week?
HB: Yes, David Davis resigned, Boris Johnson resigned, the reason they did
that is not out of any sense of honour, but because they wanted to keep their
hands clean. They know Brexit is going to be a mess and they wanted to be
able to say “well it’s only a mess because these people ruined it. I tried but
they wouldn’t let me” and so they want to come back in a couple years time.
There’s nothing honourable about their resignation.
CC: How is Boris Johnson seen by the public? Because he started all of this
didn’t he?
HB: He was popular, originally. When he was mayor of London. He was
always in the conservative party, and then he became quite famous as a jour-
nalist already, he was a journalist and he’s actually a respected academic as
well, he wrote a number of books about Rome, Ancient Rome and so on so he
was always quite respected, then he started coming on TV more and more and
people started to quite like him. He was actually quite funny, amusing. Then
he ran for mayor of London and everyone laughed because he was seen as a
joke candidate but he started becoming quite popular and actually as mayor
he was seen as popular, he did some good things, he took credit for things and
he was seen as competent at least. This was what gave him the platform to
really jump and become a much more prominent politician on a national level.
Before the referendum 2014 or so he was actually a very popular politician - I didn’t like him, just to put that there [laughing]. I don’t want my name associated with him. But he is seen - he was seen - as very popular and now his reputation... he’s seen as an opportunist who will happily stab you in the back to further his career. He’s seen as someone who puts his career ahead of his party and his party is put ahead of the country, so he’s seen as... a joke, basically.

CC: Which problems did he... pretend to want to solve? And which problems did the people who voted for Brexit think would be solved by leaving the European Union.

HB: There were a number of reasons why people voted for Brexit, and I don’t believe this idea that everybody who voted for Brexit was an idiot or a racist. I’m sure there were some, of course, but I think there were legitimate reasons for it. I already mentioned immigration, taking on low paid jobs and people seen as... I can imagine, if you live in a poor city, in Britain somewhere and you have a miserable life and you see someone coming from Poland who doesn’t even speak English, but gets up at 5 o’clock in the morning to pick fruit and then starting to get themselves a nice house, a nice car, and within a year, they have a nicer life than you, I can imagine it being easy to say they must have cheated somehow. Right? Rather than taking responsibility for their own life. So, immigration of course, there are some talks about sovereignty, about why is it that Brussels is imposing rules on us, why are there some laws, and I think that’s to some extent reasonable. Issues about as well the financial crisis of 2008. The repercussion of the Euro seen as being very weak, or problems in Greece, Italy, Portugal and so on. Some of these European countries that have financial issues as well. And talks about sending lots of money from rich countries to poorer countries like Greece [...] and people were worried that Britain would also be asked to pay money towards this. Britain is also the second largest contributor to the European Union budget, behind Germany, and this was seen as... a lot of people were saying why are we sending money there when we have enough problems at home, you know. there were a number of reasons, I think. Also, historical reasons, Britain used to be like France, very powerful country and now we’re sort of a medium ranked country, I think this is psychologically difficult for some of the older people to deal with, that we’re just a normal country now. And also, this sort of pride, even with the language, English has now become this global language and we think that’s because of our current influence, not because of the influence from 200 years ago you know [laughing].

CC: [laughing]

HB: I think there’s a bit of a misunderstanding there. There are many people in Britain who feel that Britain is a much more powerful country than it actually is, and I think this idea that we need to work together with Europeans is difficult and also there’s a lot of older people who remember Margaret Thatcher, she had a famous quote, she said that in her “lifetime, all the good things for Britain came from across the Atlantic and all the bad things came from across the channel.”

CC: Ooh!?
HB: She was born in 1925 and remembered the war and so on, the problems after the Second World War, not able to compete with Germany for example, economically, they had this new industry that was built up, we couldn’t compete, and so I think there are a number of people who would share her sentiment. So, to say that vote leave was all about racism and ignorance I think would be unfair, I think there are reasonable arguments, and you know there are problems within the European Union and there are things that need to be change. I think that does need to be recognized.

CC: The people who voted to remain, what do they want to keep?

HB: Now? Hmm, it depends, I think there are a number of people who understand the importance of trade and business and the European Union will always be our largest trading partner, just because it’s close to us. And I think they want to keep easy trade links, they want to maintain the freedom of movement and the ability to travel, they like having different cultures coming to Britain, there are a number of reasons, I mean they/I actually quite like the European Union as a source of peace in Europe, this is the first time since ever, that there hasn’t been a conflict in Europe, right. We’ve been fighting each other since the Stone Age, and now we have peace, and so may NATO is partly this, but also increased trade and interdependence is a big part of this. Just, this idea of working together, and I think this is a fundamental ideological difference, where the right wing leave vote are much more about competition and hard capitalism [...] and competing with each other and the people on the remain side are more about cooperation and working together and I think you know there are strong arguments to be made for either. There are other reasons to vote for remain if people didn’t like the conservative government for example, if people consider themselves more social democratic, that Brussels has implemented a number of labour reforms, the maximum number of hours you can work a week, environmental regulations, all sorts of regulations to make the life of normal people better, and this is something that a conservative government would never have done by itself. And I think this is coming up to a later question, a large reason why Scotland voted remain and England didn’t. Scotland is a much more social democratic country.

CC: How did they become that way?

HB: There’s just more of a cohesive feeling within Scotland, more of a feeling of working together within Scottish culture, England is more of an individualistic culture. Like, the SNP, they see themselves as potentially a Scandinavian country. They look to Norway and Sweden and these countries for inspiration.

CC: When you hear "national" party, you would expect something different.

HB: No, no, the Scottish National Party are centre-left, are a reasonable respected force in politics. They’re not some right-wing nationalist party that you think of. They used to be, that’s where the name came from, they used to be radical anti English, but now they’re much more about cooperation, I’d like to say this kind of Scandinavian-German model of social democracy.

CC: They’re the third party in the UK and the first in Scotland, right?

HB: Yes, they’re massive. They’re a very powerful party.

CC: Do they have the power to do what they want?
HB: Yes, Scotland has a lot of independent power, Scotland cannot, doesn’t represent itself abroad, they can’t go against the UK government law, in terms of trade and external representation, but within the union, Scotland has a lot of power.
CC: So they’re not allowed to be part of any UN agencies on their own?
HB: No, they can’t have embassies or things like this, they can’t have their own military of course, but they have their own legal system, education system, health system, we have our own justice system, we have all sorts of different systems.
CC: Did this come with the devolution or was it earlier already?
HB: Yes, with devolution, 1997.
CC: That’s pretty recent.
HB: Oh yes, Tony Blair made this happen, this was a campaign promise in 1997. And that’s been a cause of conflict many times, there was the case in 1998, there was an airline that was bombed, that was flying from Frankfurt to New York, and it blew up in the sky and it happened to be over Scotland, and the plane crash took place in Scotland territory, turns out it was a Libyan agent called Abdel Basset Ali al-Megrahi who was responsible for this and he was extradited to Scotland and had to spend time in a Scottish prison. He was then, after many many years, dying of cancer and the Scottish government decided to release him to Libya on compassionate grounds so that he could die with his family. And London tried to block this, but couldn’t. This is seen as a key moment in Scottish history where Scotland asserts itself, and says no we don’t care what you say we have decided to this - rightly or wrongly - but they were able to make this happen despite London trying everything to stop it.
CC: Do Wales and Northern Ireland have the same power?
HB: No, Wales has similar powers but not as extensive and so does London, London has devolved powers as well.
CC: The city of London?
HB: No, the whole of London, the 8-9 million people that consider themselves Londoners. There’s a London parliament for example, London has a lot of independent powers as well, its own various fire-services, emergency services, police and so on, separate system. Wales has some similar powers but not quite as extensive and Northern Ireland is a ... very complicated story. [laughing]
CC: [laughing] Let’s not get into it today, we could write a whole Master thesis about it.
HB: Yes, [laughing] but they have some powers but it has to be done in cooperation with you know, across the Protestant-Catholic divide, it gets quite complex very quickly.
CC: Is Scotland mainly Catholic?
HB: No, it’s mainly Protestant but there are Catholic towns in the west coast, places like Coatbridge, outside Glasgow, would be majority Catholic. You can tell from someone’s name whether they’re Catholic or Protestant quite easily.
CC: How?
HB: If they’re Protestant, they’re more likely to have an English name, if they’re Catholic they’ll have an Irish sounding name. Not always, but 99%. I can
tell with a high degree of certainty if someone’s Protestant or Catholic just by looking at their name.

CC: It’s hard for me to know if a name is English or Irish, unless there is a O’ in front of it.

HB: Right, that’s a giveaway but names associated with Catholic Saints, Patrick for example, there is almost no Protestant called Patrick.

CC: First Name or Last Name?

HB: Could be either, if there’s a king of England who has that name, they’re likely to be Protestant, so my name for example. It’s generally fairly clear but the differences in Northern Ireland is about 55% Protestant and 45% Catholic whereas in Scotland it’s like 90 to 10. I would have to check the exact numbers, but it’s a much higher ratio.

CC: Do Scots feel close to the royal family?

HB: Some do. Especially the older people I suppose... “Jain”... Some do, some don’t. Catholic definitely don’t. It’s a massive generalization, I’m sure there are some Catholics who are monarchist and some Protestants who are republican. Generally speaking, Catholics are Scottish first and British second, and the Protestants are British first and Scottish second. You can see it at a football match for example, when Glasgow Rangers, the Protestant club plays Glasgow Celtic, they’re Catholic, at the ranger’s end the fans have the Union Jack, and at the Catholic end they have the Scottish flag. And they have colours as well, if someone wears an orange t-shirt or has orange on them they’re Protestant, no Catholic would wear that. And Catholics have the colour of green. So you can tell from that form of allegiance.

HB: But you know, what’s really funny is that people who fight each other on religious basis if you ask them to explain what the theological difference is, between catholicism and protestantism, they wouldn’t know. They just know that my dad hated your dad, that’s where the conflicts come from. It’s so idiotic, it makes you want to cry.

CC: That’s very sad, indeed. how do you personally feel about the royal family?

HB: I think they’re nice enough people. I don’t need them. I don’t that they are an anti-meritocratic symbol. In America they say, and of course it’s not true, but they say "anyone could become president", and I suppose theoretically it’s possible. In France as well, anyone can become president, right?

CC: Right.

HB: Not anyone can become King or Queen. I think this is fundamentally against our values, that are about bettering yourself, improving yourself, and what bigger message than having a queen is there that says you can’t go beyond a certain point in life. I think it’s very anti-meritocratic, on the other hand if you have a decent queen or king, they can provide stability during times of constitutional crisis, its good to have a president or head of state who is not invested in one political party or another, it’s quite good to have a neutral head of state who can be above the politics of fighting and chaos in government. So there are strong arguments on both sides and honestly I don’t really know if I’m a monarchist or not, I suspect I’m a republican, but that’s something I

---
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would need to think about a lot more. But I don’t really think about the queen very much.

CC: What does she represent for the people?

HB: I don’t think people think about her as much...

CC: As much as foreigners do [laughing]

HB: Yes, I mean some people are strongly monarchist, some people are strongly against, most people don’t really care either way, that’s how I see it. I don’t have a very strong opinion about it.

CC: And what about May?

HB: Oh... she’s an idiot. But I think to be fair to her I’m gonna try and be charitable. I think she has an impossible job. She has a very weak government that only has a majority of a couple of MPs and helped by some Northern Ireland MPs, so she has an almost impossible position, she has a party that is openly at war with itself, I think it would be impossible to be a prime minister in her position. So, that said, I think she is weak. She campaigned for remain. Not very passionately, she wanted to keep her hands clean, the good conservative that she is, you know. And she knows that Brexit is a mistake because she campaigned against it. I’m sure she’s seen all the government reports talk about Brexit is gonna be a disaster, they know this is a mess.

CC: Why doesn’t she decide to cancel Brexit?

HB: Because she wants to be prime minister. She doesn’t care about that, she wants power. Maybe you know Douglas Adams, he wrote the Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy, he has a famous quote, he said "anyone who actually wants to be the leader, shouldn’t be allowed to be."

CC: [laughing] We could also learn something from Ancient Athens where they treated politics and governing as a sort of jury service that you were pulled at random to be involved in government for a year, which I think has some merit to it perhaps.

CC: I think we covered the Brexit referendum part. What do you think would happen if Scotland were independent?

HB: Well, like I said earlier, Scotland is more of a social-democratic country, I think if Scotland became independent they could pursue that more forcefully, they could apply for European Union membership, which I think most people in Scotland would want, there’s the matter of oil in the North Sea, at the moment it’s British oil, and Scotland wants it to be Scottish oil, it’s not as much oil left as there was, other benefits of independence, there seems to be a kind of scary revival of English nationalism, and I think it might not be a bad thing to move away from that.

CC: If Scotland were its own country, there would be less hate towards the English?

HB: You know, this is a bit of a myth, that Scotland hates the English. It’s more like the Austria Germany rivalry. We like to tell jokes about each other, to say they hate the English is a bit strong. Generally speaking, Scottish people don’t really care about the English. Everyone has their own little life in their own little town, you know how it is, you get into your own routine and you got your job and your family and you don’t really think about England
very much, because you’re busy doing your own thing. So I think in terms of independence, I actually voted against independence, back in 2014 because I thought the world has enough walls as it is. There are enough borders and walls and fences already and we need to move away from that and cooperate with each other and work together and perhaps it’s part of the identity as well because my father was English like I said, I do feel British more than Scottish but fundamentally it was the same with why I voted remain I didn’t see what problems we had to which the answer was independence particularly. There would still be poverty in Scotland, there would still be problems, social issues, good things and bad things going on, and I don’t think it would make that much difference, it wouldn’t be worth it, and I thought if we’re all in the European Union anyway, who cares. And actually, a major reason why I voted against independence was because we were told that Scotland would be outside the European Union and would have to reapply for membership. Actually, fear of leaving the European Union was one of my reasons to vote for staying together, and we all know how that worked out.

CC: Would Scotland survive on its own as a country?

HB: Yes, sure why not. We have the same population as Norway. Why not.

CC: How about the economy?

HB: Sure, I think so, I don’t see any reason why not. There are good and bad things, there are poor regions and rich regions in Scotland I don’t see why it shouldn’t work. There are countries much smaller than Scotland who are very successful. I don’t see why not.

CC: What would be advantages of an independent Scotland?

HB: Seeing Scotland is more of social democratic countries, the advantage would be that we don’t have a conservative government that we didn’t vote for. England is a much more conservative society in terms of politics and Scotland has often had a London government that they would never have voted for. That’s a potential benefit, other potential benefits would be rapid readmission to the European Union potentially.

CC: Wouldn’t Spain and other countries be against it?

HB: Possibly. France as well said they weren’t too keen because of Corsica. And there are some other countries I suspect. But you know, if Slovenia and Croatia have managed to avoid vetoes, then why couldn’t Scotland, I think there would be some negotiations, I don’t think it would be particularly easy but I don’t think it would be impossible either. I just don’t know. That might be one benefit, other benefits would be just that it’s easier to run things on a smaller scale, maybe. There aren’t that many strong reasons apart from this deliberate separation from conservative English politics in London that we don’t really agree with.

CC: What do you think would need to change in the UK so that people don’t want to secede anymore?

HB: I think the UK will break up. I think that’s inevitable. I think the Brexit will be impossible without a united Ireland, I see that coming. I see a second vote coming for Scotland within the next 10-15 years. And a big problem in the Brexit negotiation is that we don’t want a border between the north and the south of Ireland, but the European Union does want a border. Of course,
it’s an external frontier of the European Union. But we also don’t want a border between northern Ireland and the rest of the UK. How do you solve this, you can’t, it’s impossible. And there’s actually a lot of the unionists in Northern Ireland who are pro UK are starting to move towards accepting a united Ireland because of this. So it’s not just catholic vs. Protestants, its because of the border. The troubles are historical primarily, it’s not really an issue the way it was 30 years ago. What would have to change within the UK? We would have to get our media under control, we have this wild media that are happy lying, there’s no consequences for politicians who’ve been caught lying, so if a politician lies, like Boris Johnson has demonstrably lied many times, and what we do now at the moment is we just shrug and say hey, all politicians are like that, and that is very dangerous. We have this climate of fake news, which I’m sure we have in other countries as well, and the purpose of fake news is often misunderstood. It’s not to make you believe something that’s wrong, it’s to make you doubt the truth. If you look at North Korea for example, they have most extreme propaganda. It’s obviously crazy when you look at it, this propaganda that they have. And I’m sure their people know that its nonsense, but the problem is the point of it is not to have people believe this nonsense, it’s to make them doubt it when they see the truth, so no one knows what’s actually happening, that’s the purpose of fake news. It’s exactly the same reason why these oil companies have green logos. No one believes that BP is an environmentally friendly company, but that’s not the point, the point is to make it look like all companies are bad. And I think there’s some sort of awareness some sort, knowledge of critical reasoning, education, moving towards a more co-operative spirit rather than this competitive spirit, that would have to change, I think we would have to deal with some of this nationalism and racism that’s coming out, people need to understand the difference between patriotism and nationalism. It’s ok to love your country, that’s patriotism. But nationalism is to say that you’re better than everyone else and that’s a fundamental thing that people don’t really get. So I think education would have to change, some of these economic consequences of the credit crisis need to be addresses, I think we can see how this was started with the credit crunch in 2008, it lead to all of this nonsense, it’s where it all started.

CC: Do people blame globalization?
HB: Well yes, but also it’s this finance, what we have at the moment is this global system of finance, this global system of business but we don’t have a global system of government. This means that these large corporations can do what they want because there is no global government. I’m not saying we need a global government necessarily, I’m just saying if we have global business and global finance, we need some sort of global rule to say it’s not OK for Google to […] to make no profit in Europe or amazon to make all this profit in Luxembourg, it’s obviously nonsense. And I think a lot people are angry about this, quite rightly too. This tax avoidance by large corporations. This frustration, this crazy laissez-faire capitalism, this disconnect between company and country where it’s supposed to be from is very dangerous, would need to be looked at as well.
CC: We covered the independence part! let’s go on with Scotland itself, what do you love most about Scotland?
HB: It’s home. More than anywhere else. The landscape is beautiful, the people are friendly, and nice, and you can have a good time in Scotland, it’s a good place for families, to grow up, the same can be said about the UK. It’s home. It’s why I love it. There’s this thing about British culture that I really love, that you can talk to random people and just chat, you know this sort of friendliness. Austria is a bit more of a closed society in that sense.
CC: What would you improve in Scottish society?
HB: Scottish society is a bit insular, inward looking. there’s a lot of negativity, we’ll never manage or we can’t do this, or complaining. That’s something I would certainly try and improve and I think there’s a bit of a problem how we define ourselves against the measuring stick that is England. That’s something perhaps to look at.
CC: What is the main difference between Scotland and the UK.
HB: The more social aspect of Scotland, more social democratic. Wales as well. England is more of a competitive individualistic society, I’d say is the main difference. I would also say that the difference between the north of England and the south is as big. The north of England is much more like Scotland in that social sense. The people themselves, if you go to London, maybe it’s just because it’s a big city, maybe it’s the same in Paris compared to the rest of France, they have this busy busy busy money money money things to do people to see they don’t really have proper friendships, they don’t have time for this you know. It’s all about money and work and I don’t like that. There’s more to life than that.
CC: And the main similarities?
HB: I would say this sort of culture of friendliness and politeness and having a joke and not taking things too seriously all the time - except in London.
CC: If all Scottish people had something in common, what would it be?
HB: The sense of community, perhaps, that they belong to a larger community. I don’t know if it’s unique in the world particularly.
CC: Both Catholic and Protestant in that case?
HB: Maybe... I’m not part of the Catholic community so I don’t want to speak for them, I don’t know, but my experience in Scotland was that people feel Scottish. I don’t think that’s particularly unique in the world but perhaps it’s slightly distinct from other UK countries. And again coming back to this English nationalism, there are some roots in this English nationalism, I think you can look up on Wikipedia if you wish, the West Lothian question. This was where a labour MP called Tam Dalyell, he said why is it that Scottish MPs in Westminster can decide things that happen in England but English MPs cannot decide what happens in Scotland? And so people in England started to think, well that is ridiculous, Scotland has self-determination, Wales, Northern Ireland, London even has some self-determination, why don’t the rest of England have self-determination. And this could have been one possible path to avoiding this break-up that I predict, a move towards a more federal system within the UK but I think we missed that boat.
CC: London has MPs but England doesn’t?
HB: England is only represented by the UK government in Westminster. There’s no federal system in the UK. This is a fundamental issue as well, where there’s a difference between the UK and the rest of the European Union. Most European Union countries, maybe even all of them - just trying to think of an exception - maybe one of two exceptions, are federal. And we don’t really have a system of federal government. Another fundamental difference between UK and Europe is the legal system. In the UK everything is legal by default, except if it’s specifically forbidden. As long as it’s not actually against the law, it’s assumed to be legal. Same in America. In the European Union, in Austria and France as well, and all the other countries, it’s specifically legal, otherwise it’s illegal. That’s a completely opposite ways of looking at the law. This was making it very difficult in the United Kingdom to implement European Union regulation. Because European Union regulation said this is legal, whereas in the UK we need to say this is illegal.

CC: You have to turn everything around every time.

HB: Yes, it gets very complicated. This is another example of a fundamental difference between the UK system and the EU system and I would say also a valid reason for voting leave, this fundamental incompatibility there.

CC: Did many people have that at their criteria?

HB: [laughing]

CC: [laughing]

CC: Which historical events most influenced Scotland?

HB: Ok, well, I talked about the Lockerbie bombing, with the Libyan guy, other events... You can talk about the old history, Bannockburn 1314, you can talk about Edward II, Edward I even, the hammer of the Scots, you can talk about the Jacobites, all this is more ancient history, more recent history since the Second World War would be the decline of manufacturing and ship building, we had a system with the Empire, France had the same system, where the way you make money out of an Empire isn’t to hit people on the head and take their money, that’s what the Spanish tried in South America and it works for some time, until it doesn’t, until there’s no money left, right. So, what Britain did and France did as well, is what we’re doing actually, is you buy a raw material from somewhere, you cart it back to France, to Britain, process it, add value to it, and then sell it back to the colony. Cotton for example. Raw cotton grown in the American colonies brought back to Britain, processed, turned into textile, turned into shirts and trousers etc, and then sold back to the colony and they had to buy it from us because the tariff for non British good was 300\% \textsuperscript{2}, that made it impossible to buy. We still do this today, look at coffee today for example. You have some African farmer growing coffee, he gets 10 cents a kilogram maybe if he’s lucky, he’s allowed to export raw coffee to Europe and then it’s all processed and refined and roasted and marketed and everything and it costs €10 in the shop. €9,90 of the €10 of value stays in Europe. If he tries to roast it himself in Africa, suddenly we have an import tariff. So there’s no import tariff on raw material, but there’s an import tariff on processed goods. This is how were making a little bit of money, and this is why Britain and

\textsuperscript{2}Disclaimer, Henry notified in the reviewing email that he wasn’t sure about the exact number.
France, exact same story in France, were so successful with their empires. We forced them to buy our products. Ships, for example, from Scotland, we made ships, they weren’t very good, they were expensive, but they had to buy them. Because that was the Empire. Suddenly in the 1950s, 1960s, exactly the same happened in France, these colonies became independent and we couldn’t force them to buy our products anymore. And not only that but the German and the Japanese industry had been completely destroyed during the war and were rebuilt. They had brand new factories up against our inefficient ones that were 30 years older. And so suddenly no one wanted to buy Scottish ships, why would they if there’s one from South Korea that’s half the price and twice as good.

The decline of manufacture and the decline of coal mining would be huge historical events, the minor strikes in 85-86 were very important as well, Margaret Thatcher, this experience of having a prime minister that we didn’t vote for, very important in Scottish history I would say.

CC: People didn’t vote for her?
HB: Scotland didn’t, no. I was too young. She was imposed on us by England. England is 90% of the UK population.
CC: How was history taught in school?
HB: Badly. It was taught, it made no sense. One month we were talking about this, and then another month we were talking about something 500 years in the future and then we go back another 1000 years and then we spend 2 years talking about Nazis. Completely idiotic. So the main focus was that there wasn’t a focus, except maybe for Nazis. Pretty useless. No talking really about empire. Which I think is crazy. If you look at Germany for example they have a very good system of de-nazification. Looking at crimes committed in the past. I don’t know how it is in France, do they look at this in school in France? Bad things the French did in their empire?
CC: The first part until high school you just learn chronologically what happened, and then in high school - I haven’t been in high school in France but this is what my friends told me - in high school you re-do the same why trying to think about it for yourself.
HB: That seems quite good.
HB: Because in Britain we don’t have that at all, we don’t talk about the empire other than that it’s a thing that happened, and that it’s basically quite good, no sense of shame or horrible things that we’ve done. Horrible, horrible things.
CC: What I remember from class is that we weren’t criticizing a lot while we were kids, it was more about how great the empire was, of course little negative things, but then again we brought civilization.
HB: Right, that’s basically the attitude in Britain. Maybe it’s changed, since I was in school, I left school in the 90s.
CC: Yes, I hope it did too. What is for you Scottish culture?
HB: Very difficult question to answer for any country isn’t it. Don’t know. Rain. [laughing]
CC: [laughing] What is your relationship to other languages such as Scottish Gaelic, Scots and Scottish English?
HB: Scottish Gaelic, almost zero, Scots, having to read poetry when I was in school, Scottish English, it’s just what we speak, I guess so.
CC: Do you know people who speak Gaelic or Scots?
HB: Hmm... I know someone who came from the north-west of Scotland.
CC: I didn’t know there was a difference, I thought it was a synonym.
HB: - Gaelic is the Celtic language, and Scots is an old form of Scottish English, like what Robert Burns would write. We had to read that at school. I hated it.
CC: What is your understanding of a minority?
HB: A minority is a group that’s smaller than the largest group, I suppose. Right? If you think of it. But I suppose the cultural aspect is a group that is somehow seen as weaker or is a victim or somehow doesn’t have the same status as another group.
CC: Do you consider Scots to be a minority?
HB: No, I don’t think Scots are a minority particularly. I don’t think they have any disadvantages. If you’re a Scottish guy trying to get a job in London I don’t think you would be discriminated against, I really don’t.
CC: Do you consider Scots to be an ethnicity?
HB: No.
CC: A culture?
HB: Maybe, yes, it as its own culture, sure.
CC: Linguistic minority?
HB: No, not really, [...] CC: What if I told you Scotland appears on the Minority at Risk project [looking for minority at risk website to show Henry].
HB: If Scotland decided to be independent, England wouldn’t try and stop it.
CC: No?
HB: No, if the referendum had gone the other way, England would have said fair enough.
CC: May won’t allow another referendum though?
HB: No, she won’t. but Scotland could have a referendum anyway. I don’t think she could stop it if the SNP went through with it.
CC: So she’s not gonna send the police like they did in Catalonia.
HB: No absolutely not, that was quite shocking what happened in Barcelona.
CC: [showing website]
HB: I can’t believe we’re on that list! Fine, I guess I’m a minority! [laughing] The Scottish Catholic maybe, sometimes if you have a very Irish-sounding name you might find it hard to get a job in certain places. Otherwise... Wales is a very good example, the Welsh language almost dies, and they started having welsh TV programmes and Welsh cartoons to teach welsh to kids, because kids learn languages more easily, right. They started doing it in school, I think the UK is quite good at this actually.
CC: If Scotland needed additional rights, which should they be?
HB: Additional rights... I mean there are some additional rights that could be for anyone not just for Scotland, a right to have a roof over your head, right not to be hungry.
CC: Universal rights?
HB: Universal rights like this perhaps, nothing specific for Scotland.
CC: Do you believe people should be able to create new states, or should we try to fix internal problems or something in the middle?
HB: If people want to create new states, sure. Of course we should try and fix problems. Something in the middle, probably.
CC: What would be criteria for you to allow new states to be created?
HB: Generally, if there’s a minority like for example the Kurds, it would be entirely reasonable for them to have a state. If people need to be protected, if they’re being mistreated. If the government that should be representing them doesn’t, and actually actively tries to hurt them. That would be a reasonable criteria for a state. If the border was drawn in a ridiculous way, like when the Empire was divided up, this war of partition between Pakistan and India, all because the border was drawn in the wrong place and Kashmir was in the middle. There’s a number of reasons for new states to be created.
CC: You think more of the survival aspect, right?
HB: Yes, basically, if you’re government is not only not representing you but also actively trying to hurt you then you have a strong case to no longer accept that government.
CC: How would you like the international community to respond to an independence declaration of Scotland?
HB: Just accept it, if that’s the will if the Scottish people and it’s done peacefully and fairly, then I don’t see why it would be a big problem in particular.
CC: What’s your definition of a good life?
HB: A happy, healthy family. A happy healthy family. [Smiling] and to know when you have enough. Do you know Kurt Vonnegut, he’s an American writer. He wrote very interesting things, he was at a party outside New York at some billionaire’s house, it was this amazing house with helicopters and swimming pool and so on, and someone came up to him at the party and said, ”what do you think of the house, it’s pretty cool right?” And he said ”yes, but I have something this guy doesn’t. I’ve got enough.” And he said "yes, but I have something this guy doesn’t. I’ve got enough.
CC: Ooh!
HB: Yes, I like that quote, you know, it’s a very good quote. I’ve got something he doesn’t, I’ve got enough.” And I have enough as well. I’m not the richest guy in Graz, probably not even the richest guy in the house I live in, I don’t care. I have enough. I have a happy healthy family, I can afford to easily pay for food and rent, and I can go in holiday when I want to, and if I need something I can just buy it without worrying about it. So I’d say that’s the definition of a good life. Good relationships, good people, the most important in life.
CC: What needs to be provided by the government and society for you to have a good life?
HB: The government needs to provide security. So that I can live my good life without fearing someone’s gonna hit me on the head and take it. So security, police, military I suppose, in a wider sense. A good infrastructure, education, health care, universal services like that, and some regulation to protect me from big business that are trying to exploit and so on. Mainly, I would say the ability to live what I think is a good life. This is what the government should provide.
CC: Could you be living an as good of a life in Scotland right now?
HB: I think so, sure.
CC: To which extend do you feel the parliament and government of Scotland and the UK represent your interests?
HB: The government of the UK does not represent my interests at all. I hate them. [laughing]
CC: [laughing] You mean Westminster?
HB: Westminster yes. They are just scheming with each other, they’re deliberately hurting our country and economy, they’re lying, they’re making it acceptable to lie, they’ve helped the politicians to lie, they’re making it acceptable to doubt truth and reality, they’re making it acceptable to talk openly about politicians they disagree with being treasonous, they’re making it acceptable for the media to influence people the way they have, it’s a disaster.
CC: optional question. [showing the question on paper]
HB: I am a left libertarian. I’ve done this political compass a few times.
CC: Oh, you know it?
HB: Yes, I’m here somewhere. [pointing the bottom left corner] I found myself getting more left wing as I get older. You’re supposed to be more right wing when you get older, but I’m getting more left wing, I think so. I’m definitely down there somewhere.
CC: I like this compass, because only a right-left axis is not enough.
HB: Yes, right.
CC: I think the SNP is around here [showing on the political compass]
HB: Yes, it’s a bit more authoritarian. Jeremy Corbyn of the Labour Party is almost exactly where I am, and I would happily vote for him if he were in favour of the European Union but I think he’s also a Brexit guy. He’s not opposing.
CC: Who’s the party in favour of the European Union in the UK?
HB: The liberal democrats, they’re the ones I would vote for, if I could still vote.
CC: Ok.
HB: I voted for them many times in the past. I voted labour and I voted liberal democrats in the past. So when it was Tony Blair I voted for him and then the Iraq war, then I regretted that vote. Then I voted liberal democrat and then they enabled the coalition with the government so you know the problem when you go to vote is you need to figure out who on the list you despise the least. Who do you hate the least, you know. [laughing]
CC: [laughing]
HB: So you have to vote for them, it’s not a very positive experience of democracy unfortunately. I’m sure that’s true in many countries as well.
CC: Alright, thank you very much!
HB: Was there anything that we missed?
CC: I don’t think so, I think we covered everything! Thank you very much for your time and sharing your experience with me!
HB: No problem!
CC: I will transcribe it and you said I can use your name?
HB: Of course you can, yes absolutely.
CC: And when I’m finished I’ll send you a copy of my work!
HB: Please do!
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23 July 2018. Skype interview held in English. Transcribed by myself.

CC: The first question would be, how do you feel regarding your identity? Where were you born, what’s your story?

GP: Identity for me... I would say I regard myself as a Scottish, I regard myself as a European, and I would regard myself as an internationalist as well. I have a strong feeling of my national identity, balanced with a strong internationalist feeling as well, particularly with European citizenship, I feel very strongly about being an EU citizen.

CC: If I were asking you if you felt British, what would you say?

GP: I’d say not at all, 0%.

CC: Not at all, ok! Very interesting. What is the thing you love the most about Scotland?

GP: I think probably our attitude to the world. We want to be a welcoming and progressive country and we want to be seen as a country which is kind of compassionate, which is focused on living a happy life, I suppose a lot of the Scottish identity and modern identity can be discussed in contract because we feel that our nation-state that we live in, which is the UK, does not reflect what many people see as our values, to some extent there is an element of our values and impressions of Scotland to be in contrast with something that exists but doesn’t represent us. The thing I most appreciate about Scotland is that kind of general attitude which I think is positive.

CC: The attitude of the people, the government?

GP: Yes, of the people.

CC: How do you describe the UK? When you hear UK, what comes to your mind?

GP: I tend to think of a lot of the negative. The negative things we have to deal with. I tend to think of the UK as a problem rather than something positive. As soon as I think of or hear the word UK, the first thing I think of: the challenges of the UK that don’t represent us.

CC: Has it always been like this for you?

GP: There’s been a development of consciousness in Scotland where we can do things in our own way, in my lifetime that has happened from an early age, that changes in Scotland have occurred, so my generation really doesn’t know any different way than it is at the moment and to have a very active Scottish identity and polity, that’s not been the case for previous generations, it’s only for our generation that it’s always been that way for us and I think that’s reflected in the polling, in the voting when it comes to independence.

CC: Is there a different between generation for voting?

GP: Yes, massively. I can send you some information later if you want but there’s a breakdown if you look at most polling, it does break down by age, and under the age of 55, it’s a majority "yes". It gets bigger as the age group gets younger.

CC: Yes to leave the UK?

GP: Yes, it’s at its highest from 16 to 18, it’s still a sizable majority from 18 to 25, 25 to 35 it’s still a majority, 35 to 45 is where it starts to level out and then
above 55 is where the highest support for the Union is. So you can argue that that’s one of to things. You could say that young people want to change the system more and I would actually proposition that polling change also occurs alongside the generational changes that I’m talking about, that we’ve always grown up with a Scottish Parliament, which was reconvened in 1999. We’ve always grown up in this Scottish political landscape and social landscape which developed in the last 20 years and so for people of the younger generations like myself, we don’t really have much positive relationships with the UK, we only see the negatives of the last 10 years of conservative government that we don’t support and then we have Brexit as well which is going to completely reshape the relationships of the nations of the UK.

CC: Do you come from a background that is for independence, for example your family, or is it something you discovered for yourself?

GP: I come from a socially disadvantaged background and communities, so growing up, there was never any sense of a British identity or any support for the UK but equally I don’t think there was a strong idea of independence growing up in the 90s and early 2000s. I think if you actually look at the polling as well, it was pretty low when the referendum was first announced, the call for independence, because we never really had that conversation about whether or not this is an option that we can have but since you introduce a Scottish devolution at the end of the 20th century, then you’ve got 20 years in which this political scene has emerged, and it’s also happened at the same time that there’s been a growing development in Scotland socially as well. It wasn’t necessarily something that was introduced to me growing up but something that I came to support as I grew older.

CC: You talked about the devolution, do you feel that people wouldn’t strive for independence if they had more other rights within the UK?

GP: Potentially, I suppose the question is, whenever you talk about this debate, is it kind of binary: people either want independence or they don’t, or is it like a freeway option that people either want independence, they don’t want devolution, or they want more devolution. I think it’s not any of those things, I think it’s more of a journey, so for example if you count me amongst the people that would be supportive of having more devolution, more rights within the UK, that doesn’t mean I still wouldn’t want independence overall. There’s definitely a vast majority of people that want more issues to be held at the Scottish level. If you look at social attitude survey, which is released every year, the 9th edition just came out, it has a breakdown of the question “what powers should be decided at Scottish level” and about 50% think that what we have at the moment isn’t right. I wouldn’t quote me entirely on these breakdowns, you’d be best checking them out but just generally, and then there’s about 30% who think we should have more. There’s only less than 20% that believe that we should have power over everything apart from foreign affairs and some economic cooperation. Generally, a vast majority, roughly about 70% in social attitude survey over the last few years has indicated that people believe that most of the powers relating to the state should be dealt with at Scottish level.

CC: If everything were dealt at Scottish level, what would you improve in the Scottish society?
GP: I would change the immigration policy, I would make it more progressive. We have de-population issues in Scotland, our population is not growing at the rate that it needs to sustain the economy and the country. That will become more of a challenge for an aging society, and young people are less likely to have kids. I would change a lot of the macroeconomic management of the UK, which is very right wing in operation, I would utilize the power of the state to stimulate economic activity. The government is very limited in what it can do, because we don’t have power to make massive investments that are required in a country. It’s not just necessarily the state providing support to grown companies or establishing companies, it’s also the things that a country needs to work, like infrastructure, for example, the government got a [...] so we can’t borrow money, so we can’t borrow to invest, it’s a lot harder to develop our state infrastructure for example we spent the last 10 years putting money aside to build the Queensferry crossing which is a new bridge. Within that timeframe there’s been a vast amount of infrastructure development across the rest of the UK and across Europe. There are so many aspects of the country that I would change but it’s not really just down to what I as an individual think, the most crucial part is that, for our democracy and for our economy to serve the needs of the people, it’s important that it’s responsive to those needs and my view is that the power over our country should be decided by the polity which is Scotland.

CC: The Scottish people, if they had something in common, what would that be? What makes you guys united or unique?

GP: Well, we’re an ancient nation so we are united by history, predominantly, and geography. We have a social history as well, a political history, even just the fact that we are a nation and we have always been so, there is a Scottish perspective and a Scottish idea, a Scottish identity.

CC: What makes this identity unique? What is specific about it, that no one else has?

GP: Something specific that no one else has... To be honest I don’t know if it’s important if we have something that no one else has, because I think we have a lot in common with people outside of Scotland, particularly in Europe and so to me, the whole point of the nation-state, it’s not necessarily that you have to be entirely unique in order to have your own country, I don’t think many people take this perspective that we’re ethnically or culturally superior or inferior to anyone else. What makes us a country is that we have an active society and polity, and political sphere where decisions should be made within that polity. But you know, we do have our characteristic and culture I actually think is recognised as being quite unique. And this notion of wanting to seek out and have connections in the world, this idea of wanting to strive and contribute I think you see that in historical figures that contributed to science and education and the economy, and I think there’s a cultural pride in our contributions, but it’s not an arrogant pride because it’s quite obvious that part of our modern history is that we had a lot of challenges and opportunity too [...] we look towards other countries that do, like the UK, we kind of look on that with some degree of embarrassment and I think that makes us less inclined to try and take their side, this kind or arrogant approach to promotion, we like
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promoting ourselves in the world, as more collegial and about relationships.

CC: You were talking earlier about history and the ancient nation, which would you say are historical events that really influenced Scotland?

GP: Just the idea that we have a nation that has developed historically, we didn’t develop as one united kingdom historically, we developed as separate countries, with separate monarchies and governments, parliaments, you know until that was brought together and even the Roman conquest of the UK if we go back that far, it didn’t connect to Scotland so from our very foundations we shifted a different way, but I think all lot of the modern underrepresentation and one of the main issues that people have and why they have this idea of independence is not necessarily based on just history, though it does provide some context, we’ve always had an element of independence because the people didn’t vote for the union. We’ve retained a lot of our own institutions within that, so we’ve got our education system as always been separate, our church etc. and we had strong local government and didn’t necessarily have national representation until the devolution. So the state identity I suppose to some extent is shaped by history, but I think people are quite historically been comfortable with having [...] identity and I think that’s still the case because the support for being in the European Union for example is significantly high in Scotland in comparison with the rest of the UK, and that would suggest to me, I’m very comfortable for example with having [...] identity, I don’t see myself as just Scottish I see myself as European as well, I think that’s the biggest challenge for the UK actually is that the UK tries to present itself as like a kind of supranational identity that you can have in addition to your own, and that’s always in the last 40 years, been compromised by the European identity. You never had to choose between a British European identity and I think now for those of us in Scotland that want the Scottish state to develop and maybe as part of another entity, there’s now a choice between UK and the EU and with the latter point we have sovereignty within the EU in a way that we’ve never had within the UK. So it’s clear to me which relationship is more based on respect and which one is more based on empowerment. This unitary approach that we have in the UK.

CC: As far as I understand, Scotland has their own parliament, Northern Ireland and Wales also have one, then London is also as the city represented, but England is not?

GP: Yes, that’s the system that they proposed because we needed a parliament in Scotland, we’ve been waiting for a long time, so they couldn’t deny us that and they needed one in Northern Ireland because of the peace process and they had historically another parliament in Northern Ireland as well, they had one back before the troubles, and then if you’re gonna give one to Scotland and Northern Ireland, then Wales should get one as well. They have an independent movement but I don’t think they’re so scared of the Welsh independence movement because I don’t think it’s that powerful yet. It was a time where there was a growing demand for a three layered EU governance system, which is like local/regional government and national government and European. So they did attempts to introduce a similar concepts into England but there was no interest from the English to create a parliament or assemblies, they didn’t
seem to be bothered about that and I think that’s mostly because the UK as a unitary state does very good job at representing the English voters. So they don’t really see the need to create another parliament because they are very well served by the British parliament, there are disagreements on the government that may get elected if it’s left or right, but there is a general feeling that there is an English nation and that they vote for Labour and Tory, and generally they feel that they get they’re voting for, whereas we don’t feel that same way. So there’s not been a push for any sort of federalism in the UK, we’d want to create a federal system, because that would then start to involve even more power away from the centre even where we have devolution there’s still a lot of power that’s centralised and for example our budget is tied to the budget at the UK level. So what they decide to spend on education in England, we get a percentage of that to spend in our different devolved parliaments. If you were to move to a federal model, then there would be a need for our own constitution, first of all which the UK is supposed to and it would mean four different parts of the UK to have a role perhaps in areas, not just what powers have been voluntarily given by London, but to be able to have a say overall in other areas as well.

CC: When you say the UK or London, who or what are you referring to exactly? Is it Downing Street, is it Westminster, or something else?

GP: Well the parliament and government, yes. That’s where it’s based, it’s London.

CC: Are the number of seats balanced between all the UK countries?

GP: No, and they don’t intend to because they say that it’s balanced by population so the population share of Scotland is 5% or less. We have about 50 MPs for Scotland, and the rest of the UK, there are 700 overall. The UK as a political construct is a unitary state, so again, you could have the political discussions about maybe we could have federalism or a different political system. Unfortunately that’s been attempted, and that there is no appetite from the government in London and generally from the population across the UK, then not interested in creating federalism, because it’s not a problem for them, they don’t see what we have to go through, with a country that only represents one major interest.

CC: How was it when ministers, Prime Ministers were Scots? Tony Blair for example?

GP: It’s funny, because I don’t think a lot of people would regard Tony Blair as a Scottish, as from Scotland. I think he lived in Scotland for a couple of years, in childhood, I don’t think he’s regarded as Scottish, I mean I’ve actually got a book as well that talked about Scots that went to America and they sense we’ve included Tony Blair in this even though he’s not Scottish, but he was born in Scotland. No I don’t think Tony Blair has ever been regarded as Scottish, certainly not in the mainstream.

CC: And Gordon Brown?

GP: I mean he has come at the end of very turbulent Labour government, so technically like the war in Iraq was very much not supported in Scotland so I think his time in government is seen as not having been a very successful time as Prime Minister. He certainly was regarded as Scottish by people here but
I don’t really... There’s support for him amongst the Labour and supporting population in Scotland but I don’t think he’s particularly thought of in that high way as a Scottish Prime Minister.

CC: Would you say there has been any benefit or inconvenience for all these four constituent countries joining the UK, building the UK?

GP: Is there any benefit to it?

CC: Has there been, or is there still a benefit of staying together?

GP: It’s kind of going into history, I’m not sure, because I haven’t been around in all the time that Scotland was part of the UK so it’s hard to say how it would have developed if we weren’t part of the UK, I certainly think that if we were independent 40-50 years ago in the 70s when we found all the oil, that would have been different, because you can see with Norway, they follow a different economic model, we probably wouldn’t have had a lot of the economic shocks that we’ve had. Some would argue that it would give more stability to Scotland [...?], I’m not entirely convinced by that argument. Again, for me it’s not really about history so much, it’s about here and now. And we can see that in the last 20 years we’ve been very much underrepresented in the UK and you could argue for the last 40 or 50 years that’s been the case, so the system as currently constituted is not working towards what many people would like to see and as a result, perhaps slightly less people would like to see a complete change in where Scotland fits within the world.

CC: How do you feel about the EU? When you see a lot countries now moving towards wanting to leave the European Union, so not only Brexit, but you have a lot of right-wing parties who want to leave the EU. In Austria, in France for example. On the one side you have so many countries who are in the EU and want to leave and then you have Scotland and Catalonia who would love to join it.

GP: I think it’s interesting because if you look for example, we’ve got a government in [...] which professes to be anti-EU, but they haven’t announced whether they’re going to do anything about that at the moment. Undoubtedly they’re a rising populism across Europe and I think that’s dissatisfaction with the current political standards in the Western world actually because it’s happening in the US as well and I think it’s not entirely down to a preference on the EU than it’s down to people being dissatisfied with the political outcomes and the lack of [...] modality on the left to provide answers, so I don’t think people in Scotland think that the EU is necessarily going to go away at any point, I think Brexit is probably giving an example of what happens when you actually don’t have something like the EU to be a partner in, so I can’t speak for Catalonia but I think there’s always been this idea of that Scotland is a European nation and that we want to be part of something bigger, and I think for those who supported joining the UK, historically it might have been an element of that we were joining this Empire and that we were part of something bigger in the world. But certainly today I think a lot of people have a strong idea that we want to be part of Europe and that is something that’s connected to their identity as internationalists, as well as Scottish.

CC: Is Brexit gonna go through?
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GP: I don’t really have any reason to doubt that if won’t go through. I think they’ve put it to such a position, if anything’s gonna change it may be [...] slightly but I think it will go through now yes.

CC: What has been happening, what have you heard? Because from here, from Austria, where I am, you saw that Johnson, Boris Johnson started it, then he quit, then he became minister for foreign affairs, then he quit, then May came, well, she came before that, she’s representing an idea she actually campaigned against, and then David Davis quit, so, why, what’s happening?

GP: They’ve promised something they can’t deliver. They want to have a single market, without adhering to all the regulations, though they would be prepared to set up some sort of arbitration so that they can try to maintain some form of regulatory alignment, the main second point is they’re not prepared to accept free movement of people, they only want free movement of goods and they’ve been told that it’s impossible to separate those two, but they keep trying to negotiate and to have free movement of goods, and not free movement of people, they’ve boxed themselves into a difficult corner, and they don’t really know what to do so at the moment it’s uncertain what the outcome will be.

CC: I wanted to ask you a bit more about the Scottish culture. What is your relationship to the Scottish languages? You have Gaelic, and Scots, Scottish English and British English. How is your relationship to the languages of Scotland?

GP: I only speak English, although I do come from a part of the country where’s that’s not unusual, there’s the Scots language as well, which is probably the one which really would have been there historically in that part of the country. Gaelic as well, but likely, the uptake [...] on Gaelic, we’ve never got taught that in school, so if you look at the differences between Ireland and Scotland, you’ll see that there’s a lot more promotion of their cultural history and their language and than what has been historically in Scotland. I think that it’s changing and particularly if you look at the schools that are set up for Gaelic, these schools tend to be full to capacity and they are continuing to open more, so there is a demand for it and I don’t think anyone is suggesting that we’re going to move to a system where that becomes the primary language, but I think there are few who would like to see that language maintained and if more people want to study it, that’s great.

CC: Where are you from originally?

GP: I’m originally from Dundee.

CC: Okay! Within the UK, do you consider the Scots to be a minority?

GP: It’s a funny question, in a way, about whether or not I consider us to be a minority. I think perhaps we’re a political minority to some extent, and just because the decision of the UK to constitute it that way. But if we had a scenario, like in Germany, for example, where there is a federal system, each of the countries have their say, and within the political process in the UK, then perhaps we wouldn’t see ourselves as such because we would be able to contribute to the UK’s outcomes and because that’s not the case, that’s how many of us feel, then yes there is like a feeling that we don’t get what we vote for in the UK. I don’t know how I would describe us, in terms of like minorities.
CC: What is for you a minority?
GP: The thing is, I don’t really think of myself in a UK context so much anyway. And that’s not because of politics or anything, that’s because if I visit England, that might be once or twice a year, I travel to Europe more often than I travel to London. So, you know, I don’t think of myself in the UK context, because I’m not often in the rest of the UK, and that will be the case for many people here, that people live their life in their country and they don’t think of themselves as a minority in their own country.
CC: How do you become a Scot? Is you were born there, or from your bloodline, or you can become one?
GP: I think it is a mix of many things, if you think of the new Scots, I think there’s a kind of pride in the fact that we’re a tolerant and welcoming nation, by large in the most part. We’re proud of the different groups of people that have come throughout the decades that have contributed to our country and have become Scottish themselves and so these idea of the new Scots is something as quite, quite prevalent in the political sphere at least. I think generally anybody that wants to call Scotland their home and to contribute to Scotland, they’re welcome to be a part of it.
CC: I’m gonna leave out some of the minority questions as you’re not considering yourself in the UK context as a minority as you said.
GP: Yes, it’s a funny question, because it’s not something that I hear very often here, I don’t think people talk about themselves as a minority. On the political side, maybe on the economic side. I think that, to talk about minorities in Scotland, we would talk about ethnic minorities, we would talk about people with different characteristics like gender, [..?], ethnicity, any underrepresented groups. I don’t know if people would regard themselves as a minority, as a country.
CC: In international law you have this right to self-determination for minorities, or for nations, so there is no real universally recognised definition of either a nation or a state or a minority.
GP: I think a lot of people still, we already think of ourselves as a country anyway, so for us it’s like, “should our country be independent?” not “should we be a country?” Scotland is a country within the UK and the question is “should we be a country outside of the UK?”
CC: Do you have any different definition of country and state or are they synonyms?
GP: I mean, that is kind of funny because people would say that the UK is a country but they would also say that Scotland is a country as well. It’s a country within a country. For example the first international football game was in Glasgow, and it was Scotland vs. England. So, that’s not just like a modern concept that Scotland is a country within a country, that’s a concept that’s been there since we became part of the UK. The first international football match was in the 1800s, late 1800s. It was not far from where I live.
CC: Was that you that posted [on facebook] that if football came home it wouldn’t be to England but to Scotland?
GP: [laughing] Yeah
CC: [laughing]
GP: Yes, because actually the game of football that was invented in England was a lot more like rugby and the game was kind of amended in Scotland, and the modern game was created, and it's completely a different game, the best way that we summarise, we say, the rules of passing a ball from player to player and attempting to kick it into your opponent's net, that game was invented in Scotland.

CC: Was that Gaelic football?

GP: No, no, that's another game, actually Gaelic football is an Irish thing, and it's actually more similar to the original football that was invented in England. That involved picking up the ball and then throwing it onto your foot and then kicking it and playing like rugby. You can run with the ball in your hands, you can throw the ball around, you can kick the ball, you have these elongated goal posts, you have a goal that you can kick into but you also have posts above the goal that you can throw into the like rugby, so it's a completely different game. You do have Gaelic football in Scotland but it's something that's come across to Scotland from Ireland.

CC: If you watch the Olympic Games for example, you have team GB, right? Who do you cheer for?

GP: It tends to be for individual athletes and because actually that's the Olympics, that focuses quite a lot on individual athletes anyway and I don't know if you know this but there isn't a British football team in the Olympics. When it comes to the World Cup football matches there is no British team, because we don't have a British football team. So we don't compete in that. It just is the way of the Olympics, you can only be a participant if you're an independent nation. So as we are as a country within a country, we can only be part of team GB. Politically, they've tried, Gordon Brown attempted to create a joint British National team for the football and to get rid of the Scottish football league, and people would not accept it, they don't want anything to do with it, so basically, I think when it comes to sport people really do take pride in the national teams for rugby, for football and in other things, and then support athletes playing for team GB. There will be some people generally in the population that don't really care. We have the, I actually have my t-shirt for it right now, we have the Commonwealth Games as well and Scotland competes as an independent team in that game, so all the Commonwealth members have their own team for that.

CC: Ok! Did you play any sport?

GP: Did I play sports? I went to some of the stuff but I don't really play sports, but I go to football and stuff like that.

CC: Nice! So my next question would be: do you believe people should be able to create new states?

GP: To create what?

CC: New internationally recognised states.

GP: Oh, new states. Yes, of course, I believe in the principle of determination, I think that's a human right, so if there is a group of people and they want to be in independent state, then they should have that right. Actually, you know, it's funny because I've spoken to opponents of this notion of self-determination, movements in Scotland or Catalonia for example, should they
be independent. I’ve spoken to people who are against these propositions and against the notion of self-determination and they always pose this questions to me, with their smug smile on their face, expecting to know the answers, and they say, “what would you do if Orkney or Shetland wanted to become independent?” and my answer, and I think a lot of people have answered similarly, is quite simply: “well if they want to do that then that’s their choice” and they get surprised by that because they expect us to behave in the same way that they behave. And I don’t think we’re ready to have [...] but maybe that would change if we did become a state of our own, but certainly my viewpoint is that if anyone wants to become independent, and maybe it’s fair enough that you have to demonstrate that you have a polity, and that you have certain things that are required to be a nation-state. But people shouldn’t be stopped from enacting a democratic will.

CC: And for example, ISIS declared themselves a state.

GP: I think that that’s just them trying to build a base, basically, there’s no such thing as an ISIS culture, or history or a polity, so I don’t really think that it’s a compatible case because they don’t have any of the hallmarks of a nation, maybe they’ve tried to create that but almost no different to other groups like the Taliban which have held control of certain areas I think it’s just them trying to build themselves up and no doubt that they would like - the people that run it - would like to get themselves in a position where they could create a state so that they can mobilise themselves. But it’s not, there’s nothing that unifies their country. It’s not a country. So I don’t think it’s a compatible case to any of our notion of self-determination, I mean the people involved under occupation, they say they didn’t vote for these people, they didn’t even ask them to come. So it’s not a composition of people that have an idea, a shared identity or any desire, really, to be independent. It’s just people living under brutal occupation from a terrorist organization.

CC: So you would put democracy as a criteria for becoming independent?

GP: I mean, there have been countries that have become part of other countries, without democracy, you think of like the USSR and then there are... When it comes to the creation of the state, I think it’s generally accepted that the composition should be like people that if not broadly, at least in the majority, agree that they should be a country. If that’s not the case, then how in any ways is it a state? What unifies them? Effectively, countries are more ideas than anything that’s physical or real, and apart from the fences around them, they’re effectively just lines on a map. So what is it that creates these fences as counties, it’s the notion of a group of people that have a shared belief that they are a country, that they have an identity and that they want to be a nation.

CC: If Scotland were to declare itself independent, how would you like the international community, everyone around to respond?

GP: Well, I think I wouldn’t expect them to respond in a different way to how they said they would respond in 2014 which was the EU, the US, and other countries in the world, they said that if Scotland voted for independence they would recognize Scotland so I wouldn’t expect it to end any differently. Things in Catalonia are more unfortunate because they can’t seem to get a position where they can negotiate independence as a process where it is internationally
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recognised. I think one thing to be clear about in terms of Scotland as part of the UK, was that we actually, the UK Parliament a debate recently on what we call the claim of right and this is a statement that says that the Scottish people have the right to determine their form of government, be that independence of through the UK. We are an ancient nation that has a parliament and its own country, and we've decided to be part of the UK, but if we're allowed to withdraw from that, then it's up to the Scottish people to determine. That motion that went to UK Parliament was not opposed by the British government which I think is quite telling. And it does clearly detail constitutionally that Scotland is not just some region of the UK, but that we have a nation within the UK and I think we're recognised internationally as a country, be it a non-independent one, so, so long that we can demonstrate in a referendum that is clear and fair that the outcome is what the people want, then that would be recognized I have no doubt about that. What was said by some countries like the US and [..?] as well, they said that if Scottish people choose independence that they would recognise it, so it's never been a concern or a worry, the debate as to whether or not we would be recognised. I think even the UK said it would recognise it.

CC: Is there any other referendum planned after Brexit?

GP: Well, the government that’s in power in Scotland said that if Brexit happened and Scotland voted to stay in the EU, and we were taken out against our will, then there would be a referendum to determine whether or not Scotland wants to go down this path with Brexit or if we want something else so it’s hard to say when that could happen and I think it’s probably appropriate that we don’t have a referendum until it’s clear what Brexit actually is because people would be voting for something that they don’t know about. So we’ll need to see what happens with Brexit first and then once people know what that actually means then they can compare it with the argument for independence, so I think that within my lifetime definitely I would be willing to bet everything on the fact that there will be another referendum within my lifetime, whether or not that happens in the next few years. I don’t think that anybody knows just yet.

CC: Is there any way that... You know, when the USSR broke down, then Russia took over their spot in United Nations for example, is there any way that Scotland could do that with the EU?

GP: We can’t ask the EU because we’re not a country, so only the UK can ask that question for us. It looks unlikely anyway because I believe that we will come out of the EU with the UK and then if we were to get independence I believe that that would happen after we’ve been already out of the EU, so we would effectively return to the EU but I think the EU is mostly about political expediency so I believe that if we were to apply, we already meet all the criteria as a country which has adhered to EU law over the like 40 years, and in Scotland as well the government have said that they would continue where possible to remain aligned to EU rules and laws were we ever to make that decision. We are European citizen that have had to leave but if we decided to change our view, then we could come back into the EU. If you look at what some EU figures have said, [..?] who said that if Scotland wanted to stay in
Europe that they would find a way to make that possible, but at the moment it looks like we’re not in a position to have a referendum and decide an outcome before Brexit because Brexit is still undefined itself.

CC: How do people cope with that uncertainty?

GP: People are not very happy about it but we don’t have any power over the process, so we just have to watch it unfold and try to do the best we can with our representation in London, with our government in Edinburgh to try and put forward Scottish prospective, that’s happened, but it’s not been taken on board.

CC: You also posted something about the UK wanting to take the devolution away for some years.

GP: Yes, because under the devolution settlement, particularly for Scotland, there’s a almost quite unusual, but there’s a principle that anything that is not specifically held in London is automatically devolved so they never thought that we would ever be leaving the EU. No one ever thought this would happen, so some of the areas are not reserved around agriculture, for example, and these are powers that actually devolved to Scotland under the act, but the powers are held in Brussels, so the UK wants to bring those powers to London rather than bringing them to Scotland, so that they can make their own trade deals with other countries and we have high concerns about what would happen to the safety standards, for example, what would happen to the protections around Scottish trade items like whisky, which has protected status, you can’t call whiskey “Scotch whisky” unless it is, but if the UK wants to change that then they can make deals with countries and they can say you can make whiskey and call it “Scotch whisky”, but under the EU you can’t do that at the moment. So there’s a lot of concern.

CC: Can they change these devolution powers without Scotland wanting it?

GP: The whole thing with devolution is that we don’t own those powers, the powers are given to us by London and they’re set constitutionally in the UK because we don’t have a written constitution, they’re set in an act in the British Parliament, so they could just amend that and they could close the whole thing down if they want to. They would just need to get rid of the act. That’s very unlikely that there would close it all down, because that would create a political crisis for the UK. They could amend things and they could take powers away – and they’re thinking of doing that at the moment.

CC: Do we know what the Queen thinks about the situation?

GP: She doesn’t have a public opinion on anything. Her rule is just functionary. She doesn’t play a role in the political developments in the country.

CC: Do you feel represented by Royal family?

GP: No, not at all. Both because of my personal view and just generally because the Royal family is not a representative institution, I suppose you might feel represented by her if you feel British, because that’s a British institution, I don’t think it attempts to represent people.

CC: What would be, in your opinion, benefits if Scotland were independent?

GP: I kind of answered that a way around, I talked about how we could change our socio-economic circumstances and model, that would be the top priority, that we can reshape our economy, we could develop our infrastructure,
to meet not just the needs that we have at present, but to be very ambitious for our country and to start really seeing major positive changes in Scotland very much akin to developments that are happening in Iceland, Ireland and the Nordic countries, and these are all, we look to these countries for ideas of what we do here, but we don’t have the powers to do all these things and is not just about the number of powers you have but it’s about what economic mobility you have as a state, as a region of the UK, even though we’re a nation, just effectively constituted as a region of the UK, and we are very limited in what we can do to raise capital, to act. We are country that can’t behave like a country, that’s the main issue.

CC: What would be disadvantages?

GP: Disadvantages, well the same as any other country in the world. When you leave the house, when you leave your home for the first time, you set up your own home, there’s a lot of opportunities, there’s lots of excitement, you get to decide what you want to do, but also it’s challenging as well, you know, I don’t think we should ever make the argument that independence is going to create a utopia in Scotland so I think things would be better, we would have more control over how society develops and we’ll have the responsibility that every other country in the world has as well, and you know we have these responsibilities in the UK as a country of within the UK, we still have the same responsibilities, but we don’t have the power to change how we respond to those challenges that any other country in the world would face, so what we’ll have with independence is that yes, the challenges that countries have to live with, we will have to still live with those challenges, but we’ll have the power to do what we think is right, to vote for the government and vote for the policies we think will improve our country, so for me that’s most important thing about independence, it’s not that everything is going to be perfect, but it’s that we will decide the outcomes and that we will shape the country to reflect our needs and to respond to the challenges in the way that we see fit, and then politically at the moment within the UK we’re not in a position to do that just now.

CC: So you said you didn’t want to create a utopia, what would...

GP: Oh no, I didn’t say that I didn’t want to create a utopia, I think everybody would want to, but what I’m saying is that to suggest that independence is going to result in living in a country where there are no problems at all is ludicrous. And I think there is an element of the opposition to independence where people do try to say, "you know, when there’s not gonna be this problem there will be that problem", there are already problems beyond the UK [...] we just need to fix, that’s one of the big problems. So it’s not to say that that would never be problems in a country or never be challenges, that’s just a ludicrous thing to suggest, what independence is about is saying there’s opportunities to develop ourselves in the way that we want, which we can’t do at moment because we don’t have the power and then where there are challenges we can respond to those challenges in a way that we see fit. The best example would be, look at Iceland how they responded to their global financial crash. They responded in a way that the citizens decided how they wanted to respond and the outcome was much better than any other European country because they
make sure that that people had their say. The opposite happened in the UK and we’re still struggling with it.

CC: What is for you the definition of a good life. As still part of the UK or not. What is for you, regardless of politics, a good life?

GP: I understand. I think to live a good life is one where you have opportunity, where you have relatively high level of happiness, life satisfaction, I think it is when you live in a community and a country in which everyone around you is also experiencing those same opportunities, that same well-being, that same integration to society, so for a positive outcome, regardless of what kind of country you live in, that to me is what a good life looks like, that you have opportunity to grow and to be happy and satisfied and to me I’ve concluded a long time ago that... I’ve come to it through my personal background which is from a socially disadvantaged community which is not been served well by the political construct, to become relevant, and the highest support really for independence within Scotland are in these high urban areas where there is a lot of working class people who feel dissatisfied by the political system, that indicates to me that this idea that we want to have a happier and better life, we’re not achieving in the UK. We need to bring the tools closer to the people so that we can change that.

CC: What makes you personally happy?

GP: It really is because my personal background is so deeply connected to social inequality that for me being happy is reducing that, and that’s what I do in my work, my academia and my activism, and then I pass on, I try to be happier, to get myself opportunities, or seek out opportunities, try to develop my life as well as my opportunities, the two are very closely connected.

CC: What is the most important to you in your life?

GP: The most important what?

CC: The most important value, what wouldn’t you give up for anything?

GP: The most important value for me is inclusion. It’s about me being included, people around me being included, to fight against inequalities. I would, if I had the opportunity of a well-paying job, I’d be prepared to give up a portion of my income so that we can help improve the chances for people that have come from the backgrounds I’ve come from, so that’s something, that’s a trend that is quite quite popular in Scotland, I can send you some stats around that, but a lot of people tend to say that they would be prepared to pay more tax for example in Scotland because they would want to see the unequal society - which is quite significant in Scotland, particularly in the West Coast of Scotland, where I’m living - we want to see that develop and change, we want to see our country do well and our people do well.

CC: You were mentioning your background several times. How did you get out of this disadvantaged background?

GP: Because of the policies we call widening access, improving access to opportunity such as university for the most deprived backgrounds in the country. Policies that mandate universities to get more people from disadvantaged backgrounds so they have to undertake actions and programmes to try to reach out to these folks, and because of policies like free education, it doesn’t cost me
money to go to university, policies like funding for people who come from underrepresented backgrounds so they have a grant, so these are all policies that have supported me through, supported to think about wanting education because it was possible for this to do it.

CC: What does the government needs to provide for people and you to have a happy, included life?

GP: More or less it needs to undertake activities like I just described, they need to level the playing field and it needs to ensure that when we are talking about economic development that we’re talking about it in a way that is inclusive to everyone, that is not just focused on one area but it’s actually focused across society geographically and socially. And that’s the hallmark of how our economic agenda is created, economic development that is based on inclusion and equal development.

CC: People who come from advantaged backgrounds, wealthy backgrounds, how do they react to these policies in Scotland?

GP: They’re not really against them, particularly because they’re done in a fashion which we call universal, universalism, so free education is done for everybody, it’s not just for poor people, that also takes a stigma out of it because it’s not charity, it’s what your entitled to. This is the thing about creating a level playing field and giving everybody equal opportunity regardless of their background and that’s a way that basically takes the politics out of it. There has been studies on stuff like this before, I can’t think of them on the top of my head, but I’ve seen them in the past. Like programmes where the upper class are paying more tax and they’re not getting the same access to these programmes then they’re less likely to support, for example, if our healthcare service was not universal then you would have people that have more influence in society because they have more money and they have more ability than you to speak out and they may be more inclined to want to see this programmes removed hoping that would reduce their tax burden, and because they’re not part of that system, so for me this is not just a Scottish thing but the concept of universalism within the NHS was created by a Welshman, and it’s crucial to the success of creating activities within a country and programmes which will be supported by all, as of they’re open to all. And the other will be certain programmes that are specifically targeted to people that are from underrepresented groups. I think if our public services are for everyone, our education system is universal, healthcare is universal and we all put money into the pot and we can all take out of it, I think that that’s the best way to operate.

CC: All this is free in Scotland?

GP: Well it’s free in the sense that there’s no cost at the point of delivery, but we all pay tax.

CC: How do you feel represented by the parliament and government of Scotland?

GP: Well, I’m a member of the party that is in government, so of course I feel very satisfied, but again if you want to look at the statistics from the Scottish social attitude survey, you will find that there is a higher satisfaction rate with the government than there is voters of the party of government. They break it down by party as well so you can actually see that, people who don’t even
vote for the SNP, people that are against independence and they’re a high portion of them that are generally satisfied, maybe not entirely, and obviously the highest amount of satisfaction at the moment is amongst those that are very much in favour of what the government is doing. But I think by large the Scottish parliament as an institution does very well to represent Scotland and its interests. This whole system is very different to the Westminster system. It’s proportional, its format, so we have a proportional electoral system, which means that smaller parties - like the Green party and actually the Conservative party has historically been a smaller party - the smaller parties have more representation than they would, the system’s designed so that parties that can’t form governments have strong numbers of MPs in opposition and the system as well is very open, in terms of being able to submit petitions and proposals, and through the committees which have the power to submit legislation as well, so the Parliament as an institution is quite fascinating, it’s worth looking into if you’re interested in politics and modern political history and by its formation, its format and its whole operations, it is very reflective of Scottish society. And I think that’s why people would like to see the Parliament deal with more issues and why a not insignificant amount of us would like to see the Parliament deal with all issues, because as an institution and as a political body in Scottish politic, we’re a small country and our parliament is that of the small country, so it reflects closely the will of the people.

CC: Did you say you were a member of parliament or working at the parliament?

GP: No, I’m not a member of parliament! [laughing] I work for a member of parliament.

CC: Would you like to be a member of parliament?

GP: Well, it’s not for me to say just now but who knows what the future holds. I don’t know. It’s something I would be interested in but it’s not something that I’m going to do anytime soon.

CC: Where do you see yourself going professionally?

GP: It’s always going to be something political because I’m a political animal, I always want to change stuff, so even if everything that we’ve talked about today had been resolved then I would still find other things to focus on, I’m passionate about inequalities, passionate about climate change, passionate about science and passionate about how we develop as a world, as people, and because we live in a democracy, it’s politics that determines all these things, so I will always be political, even if I lived in a country that wasn’t as problematic just now as it is. That’s not the only reason why I’m involved in politics, I believe that the political system is how you make change. As I’ve said before, if you don’t do politics, politics don’t do you.

CC: What would you say to someone that doubts the system, who doesn’t trust politicians, who doesn’t want to exercise their right to vote?

GP: Well, this is an interesting one, because many years ago, that used to be the problem, the case in Scotland, a lot of people I would speak to would say that they don’t think the system represents them and that they don’t have a say in it. Since 2014, we had the referendum, it has changed a lot, voting turnout in Scotland is very high, political discussion is still very high, and why I think it’s
important, maybe not so much to put the [...] on the voter, for example across the
UK and US people are complaining and saying why do people not vote, when actually it is because the system is not enforcing what these people want. That’s why people are not voting, because they don’t feel that they have power to make a difference. And for a long time in Scotland, that’s been case, but then you empower people, you give them the chance to change things, give them real power and then they will vote. But if don’t give people power over their country, if you don’t give them democracy, real genuine vocal democracy, then of course they don’t see the outcomes they want from the system, so that’s the reason why people don’t vote, it’s because the country itself is failing them, so I really believe that we need to have very active and strong polities which are close to the people. In a country like Scotland where we have 5 million people, it’s absolutely feasible, we can create an economy and a democracy, which is really determined by the people and if we’re independent then I fundamentally believe that we would have a more reflective democracy, because we’re a smaller country. We need to find a way beyond just Scotland to reshape the common thinking on democracy and the economy and to make it more reflective and responsive to people’s needs and I fundamentally believe that that means that you have to bring power closer to the people and give them real control over it.

CC: Who do you think would be you main partners, economic partners, if you became independent?

GP: Of course the rest of the UK would always be a major partner, so England, Wales and Ireland, I think Europe in general is as a major export market for Scotland and the Nordic countries like Sweden, Denmark, Norway, these would be partners for us as well and internationally, Scottish exports like whisky, travel the world as well, so we have strong partnerships, in like the Scottish diaspora in America and we have strong economic links with countries in Asia so I think Scotland would really like internationally to be out there as much as possible, like trying to make as many partnerships as possible. Certainly I think we work towards other small countries as a model for success economically and also diplomatically as well, looking at the countries like Sweden and Iceland and Ireland and to see how these utilize cultural diplomacy and progressive diplomacy to promote themselves and to bring about positive in the world. We don’t have any capacity within the UK to influence the foreign policy, so there is the Scottish idea, the Scotland values that are not been projected in the world because we don’t have a seat at the table at the EU or at the UN or within the international fields, we have to use our soft diplomacy as much as possible because we don’t actually have access through the UK’s foreign policy. The UK’s foreign policy is completely alien to Scotland’s, and I think it’s one of those areas that we don’t talk about so much as a nation because most people aren’t that interested in how foreign policy works but for those of us that are interested in politics, we can see that the activities of the United Kingdom’s foreign policy does not even attempt to represent the UK or represent Scotland. So I think it is a tragedy that Scotland’s progressive values and its cultural values are not being properly part of the global discussion, how we take things forward as a world.
CC: Why you think the majority of people in Scotland voted to remain in the UK?

GP: I think it’s about the EU. [...] It was yes or no, and I think for many people from the older generation they’ve grown up and the UK is the only thing they know UK, and I think for many people, they feel it would be safer to be part of a bigger country within Europe, so obviously now with Brexit that changes things, and then I think, I do believe that there is a great deal of people, if you look at social attitude survey, it shows that people would want to have more control over everything or there’s a majority that says that the Scottish Parliament should deal with all issues which otherwise is called independence but when you call it independence, then it becomes another debate in a way, and so I think there’ll be a great deal of people that - I’ve seen it from the referendum - that were saying no to independence just now, because we’re not ready, and when we’re ready, then we should go for it.

CC: I also saw a post of yours, a campaign about Scotland being not too small for independence...

GP: Yes, big enough. Smart enough. This is all means that were created by activists, because there are these arguments that some people say like we’re too small to be a country like we don’t have a big enough economy to be a country and then this one is that they’ve built together examples of countries that are smaller and have less size economies than we do. Of the EU’s 28 member states, about 12 to 14 of them are actually the same size or smaller than Scotland. So in terms of size, in terms of economy we would have one of the most, we would have a strong and advanced Western European economy and that would only continue to go grow, when we start utilizing our tools to create an even better and stronger economy than we can at present in the UK.

CC: Last question! An optional one, as you’re working for a member of parliament and you like politics, maybe you would like to answer it? Have you seen the political compass? If you would like to share with me where you would position yourself on that compass?

GP: Yes. I don’t often think in terms of authoritarianism. I’ve only ever landed on this compass when I’ve answered one of these surveys, and they put you somewhere as a way to determine whether you’re a libertarian or authoritarian. I don’t really consider myself in those terms but I would say that I’m on the left of the economic scale and I wouldn’t describe myself as libertarian so I suppose you would put me and in the middle to two thirds on the left scale and around about just in the middle in terms of social side. I think the government should be guaranteeing, as you’ve put it down here, should the government be involved in guaranteeing collectivism, yes, I do think that that should happen so but I don’t necessarily regard that as authoritarianism myself. I think it’s probably just a more involved government and a less involved government and I would say that I really believe that we should have a social democratic country and that we should have an active government that secures rates and ensures that the country runs towards improving outcomes for everyone in it, and so definitely the opposite of libertarianism.

CC: Do you have any questions?
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GP: I would say as well, if it’s of interest to you, that viewpoint that I’ve got fits quite well with the overall political viewpoint in Scotland. It’s very much where people would see themselves, on the left in Scotland and that’s the majority because I think a lot of the social economic challenges that we’ve had with the industrialization high levels of poverty, that means that people are more likely to want to have a left-wing society and left-wing management of the economy and so that everyone develops and everyone has opportunities.

CC: The majority of the people is for the national party SNP right?

GP: The SNP are like left-centre. There are different ideas about what that means, but generally if you get the votes for the elections, you find that the highest percentage of votes will go to parties that regard themselves as on the left.

CC: So I will try and transcribe the interview as precisely as I can and I will send it to you so you can see if I didn’t make any mistake.

GP: Ok!

CC: I’d like to thank you very very much for you time and sharing your view with me!

GP: Happy to help! Cheers, take care, bye!

B.3 Evelyn J. M.

10 August 2018. Skype interview. Transcribed by myself in indirect speech to due the bad quality of the internet connection and resulting bad quality recording. Interview interrupted and resumed three times. Confirmed by Evelyn after second Skype call to clarify some details.

Evelyn and I started by introducing each other, we talked a little about the surroundings and she showed me the beautiful view from her window. The landscape is very green, with the sea in the background. Sheep are being sheared and the noise will still last for a few days.

Evelyn’s father was brought up in the region in the 1920s during the Great Depression and brought the family there on several occasions. He used to live right around the corner from her current house. Evelyn moved from Glasgow two years ago after construction works on several motorways around her house became too inconvenient. She now enjoys the nature and quiet of the Highlands. Regarding the climate, Evelyn finds it quite pleasant. The weather is not cold, the bottom of Scotland is quite mild, the middle is very cold and the top is quite mild as well, it is not what people think it is. It is very windy, but people get used to it. Some people do even go into the sea, which is fabulous.

Her father came up here from Coatbridge when he was 12, in Coatbridge, at the height of its industrial power, due to the steam of the over 200 factories, he had never seen the sky during the day, he then came here and thought he had landed on another planet. All these fields, animals, the sea, sand, the sky, which he’d never seen, and he was astonished, because there are no street lights here, and everything is very bright in the sky. He said to Evelyn, it’s a very strange thing Evelyn, when I came up here there was no more money, but
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all the poverty is gone. He wasn’t rich, but it’s how Scots deal with poverty, or the lack of possession. It’s how they deal with that that makes them slightly different from others. Up here, people work incredibly hard, all the time, in the gardens, growing vegetables and fruit, and they have their job too. They’re outside all the time, working. Since she came up here the internet has played a much less important part in her life than when she was in the city. There is something about poverty that has hardened people and something about creative suffering. An Austrian author wrote this, creative suffering, based on a paper about leading the world, a research into the fact that every major leader, apart from Bismarck and De Gaulle, by the time of writing, have known poverty in childhood. If you build resilience in a child early, you get a leader. Paul Tournier was his name. “I’m not saying there isn’t poverty in England”, but Austria and Scotland have been slightly different. Her favourite thing about Scotland is how the people are, how they became through adversity, pioneers who invent many things like television, radio, telephone, creative people who are not wealthy but find creative ways to survive.

Regarding her identity, Evelyn feels Scottish. She thinks the French have a strong regional feeling, a friend of hers would state Normandy first, then France, then Europe. So for her it’s Highland first, Scotland second, and Europe third. Evelyn is part of the Clan Robertson of Struan, and declares jokingly that it is better than her husband’s clan.

What she likes about Scotland is that she thinks they are a “quite tolerant nation”. A friend of hers who is English and often goes down to England told her the amount of anger and bordering violence towards immigrant is very high, and she is glad it is not the case in Scotland, that this feeling is not present and that there is no anger towards immigrants. There are less immigrants in Scotland, apart from Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Evelyn can only think of two people of colour in the area where she lives, apart from the English who make up around 50% of the population in her region. The English who come up there are looking for a better life, a better quality of life, and partly because the property price is much lower than in England. In fact, all the people she talked to say they would never want to return to England. Evelyn talks about a very friendly way of life in the Highlands, a society which includes and develops people. Evelyn is very happy around here and avoids going to bigger cities, including Inverness, only 30 minutes away.

The differences between Scotland and England are very numerous. She feels patronized by England and finds the English do not appreciate the cultural differences there are between the two countries. The English hold the strings and don’t let Scotland decide on their own budget. Many people are annoyed by it and feel powerless. Evelyn tries to avoid driving through England. As an example, when she visited France with the motorbike, she drove through Ireland instead to avoid England. Evelyn doesn’t mind the English people as such, which she likes as her neighbours, but the English form of government, the country of England. Even though Westminster is composed of all the constituent countries, Evelyn refers to it as the English government, due to the fact that she thinks Scotland is underrepresented with far fewer MPs than the rest of the UK and what they get is not what they vote for. Scotland, with
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A population of about 5 million, is even smaller than the city of London. It is difficult to get your voice heard. Evelyn mentions the Barnett formula, which was started as a temporary measure in 1978 before devolution took place but according to her, even the person who started it think it was a terrible mistake. Many Scots think Scotland couldn’t survive without the Barnett formula. It is worth looking into this because of the important role it plays not only in Scotland but also in Wales and Northern Ireland.

At primary school, Evelyn was only taught Scottish history. Starting secondary school, she began to learn about general history, mainly European. She had never thought of herself as a minority, but concedes that Scots don’t have the voice, the numbers, but there are a lot of Scots around the world, but feeling Scottish is not a minority. When Christianity was brought to Scotland it came first to Iona with St. Columba, then he went from Iona to Nigg, where Evelyn resides, and it was the second place he stopped. Iona is very famous in Scotland for their huge ancient abbey, very popular for retreats. In Nigg, there is a very old church with Pictish Stones from 600 A.D. in them, a beautifully restored church, opened to the public. When talking about whether people should be able to create new states, Evelyn referred to this old church and says that when you have that kind of history, you deserve to keep it.

As historical facts, Evelyn mentioned the English killed Mary, Queen of Scots, who was a Catholic. Her son, James VI of Scotland and I of England, wasn’t raised by his mother and was thus brought up a protestant and didn’t know Scotland. Another crucial event was the Jacobite rising of 1746, after which Scotland was banned from wearing traditional clothing such as the kilt, and speaking their own language at the risk of being put in prison. A new law was enforced, prohibiting Catholics or people married to a Roman Catholic to access the throne. There is still a little place on the isle of Seil, where Princess Diana’s mother came from, called the house of the Trousers, where you would change out of your kilts into trousers before you went to mainland. This law managed to overweight Gaelic and the kilt is not worn as it once was. One man locally wears it all year round, but it’s not normal anymore. During the Highland clearances, 450,000 had to leave their home.

What caused a lot of grief in the Scottish memory are the young people sent to the Second World War. In each town, there is a war memorial for the Second World war, which for Evelyn doesn’t signify victory but rather the tremendous outpouring of grief regarding the thousands of people sent to war. A generation was decimated. Many villages were emptied of young people, and many more Scots were sent to war than English people.

Evelyn doesn’t speak Gaelic, the only people who speak it really fluently are on the Islands like Skye, Lewis & Harris, they almost have the Gaelic because islands kept it. Some people can speak it but can’t read or write it. It is a very complex language, very difficult to learn. Some people have it at school now, higher Gaelic. Some TV programmes try to promote it as well.

Evelyn thinks the Scottish parliament tries very hard to engage with the people and all Scotland voted to stay in Europe and is very disappointed with Brexit. “We don’t have a say, we have to go with England and that annoys the Scots intensely”.
Evelyn did like what Sturgeon wanted to achieve and thinks her confidence has been shaken and she doesn’t have the same drive in Scotland as she once had. When she was at her best she was very good and she could have made a difference if she had been voted in. “You can’t run a country on a housekeeping budget.” They can’t raise taxes because England takes the money. It’s difficult for Sturgeon and it’s difficult for the people.

Evelyn doesn’t know if there will be another referendum. She mentions the vote in 1979 where a majority voted in favour of the Scottish devolution, but after the vote took place, the English raised imposed a 60% quote retrospectively. Depending on what happens after Brexit, people should be asked about their opinion. Before the Brexit referendum, many politicians vowed to give people more powers and this might be a reason why people voted to remain in the UK. However, the promises weren’t kept. Many of the matters handled by the EU will be handed back to Westminster and not to Scotland, and Scotland might lose other devolved powers. One power Evelyn would like to have back is health and particularly people with disability.

When asked if she was for independence, Evelyn said that Scotland is a big nation, with skilled people, and they can have proper independence by themselves.

Evelyn was very interested for a long time in community and how it worked. At university, a reader named Routledge answered her question ”what role does the government have in community” with ”none”. In healthcare for example, before the government became involved, it actually functionned not too badly. Alex Ferguson, who was present at the university that day, told Linda a story to illustrate bureaucracy taking over. As he ran Manchester United for years, he had to make up his mind on who would be playing all the games, and he made his decision every time the previous day before by 9 o’clock in the evening, once he made up his mind it was cast in stone, nobody could change his mind. A chief executive of the NHS, also present at the event, told Evelyn he remembered when he could assess the situation, tell what was required and act on that immediately. He couldn’t do it anymore because he always had to write it all down, explain his decision making process and then wait for weeks for a reply, which completely changes the scenario. Everything became very slow and he was treated as a schoolboy because can’t make the decisions he was hired to make.

Evelyn thinks there is a huge waste of money and resources because ”people need to please their political masters”. Now all General practitioners (GPs) work a four day week, and most of these four days are used to fill out paperwork for the government, so the GPs can no longer take care of the patients, who now directly go to the hospital, because they can’t see a doctor anymore. It has nothing to do with the doctor not being available, but with the weight of paper for every patient. When asked if there would be less paperwork if Scotland were independent, Evelyn answered she of course can’t tell, but the doctors could probable make a better case and be heard more. The health service in Scotland is independent and what the doctors could do is build a stronger case to self govern. It’s been so long since they did it that she doesn’t know if they would be able to adapt back, because they’ve been told what to
Other benefits of self-governance would be to be able to make their own budget and decide where the money goes to. For example, the roads in Scotland are much worse than the English ones because they get a specific amount of money for it. It might be because most of the English perceive Scotland as a "wee bump" and don’t see how large it actually is, and the vast wilderness it covers. The North Coast 500 is bringing a lot of tourist and many go with motorbikes, caravan, motorhome and there is not much money to take care of the road.

When ask if she would see any disadvantages of leaving the UK, Evelyn thought for a few seconds and expressed a clear "no", before laughing. Back in 1707, people were very angry that Scotland gave up its independence, there were many battle fought and Evelyn thinks eventually, Scotland will become independent again. She has no doubt that Scotland would be better off with independence, one advantage she states is salmon fishing, many families have been fishing for over 100 years and this year they are not allowed to do so because the Westminster government is not allowing it, while the French are. If nobody was doing it it would be fine, but a foreign country coming and taking the fishes make these families very upset. It’s these very many everyday things that are problematic.

Evelyn has been involved with the Scottish parliament and government work and tried her best to show there are other ways to do things but didn’t feel she was being heard. Active hearing is what is missing right now and people chose not to see the problems.

The most important to her in life is the quality of her life, influenced by factors such as her environment. She loved her current environment and has in her house a wood burning stoves and 23 tons of wood in the back of the garden. It’s a learning thing to be able to use it and there is always something to do.

What the government should do to ensure her good quality of life is to stand back [laughing], because people are able to make their own quality of life without too much government interference. The more government interference, the worse it can get.

About free education and free health care, she would rather pay a little subsidy towards some of these things instead of having them all free because in the end what they have now in the health service is not a service. If anybody offered her that and asked her to pay for it she wouldn’t. She is trained in it and passionately against what happened in it, she was a ward sister, orthopedics. She loved her job but became annoyed when some topics came up, such as when she had to argue for a certain dressing for patients, or more expensive than ordinary gauze, she had to argue because it was better, less time consuming and it would heal the patient more quickly. Arguing with people who don’t know what you’re talking about is just nonsense, from BNA or Marks & Spencers. They don’t know what you’re talking about and they’re managing your money for your ward.

On the political compass, Evelyn is quite happy with support but not with intervention. Some people see the SNP as very far left, but Evelyn doesn’t
agree. She’s certainly not right-wing, at the moment she would support the SNP over any other party in Scotland, there a very few other parties. People in Scotland detest the Conservatives. Margaret Thatcher did that dreadful thing and put the poll tax on us which changed the way that houses were paid for, you pay your rate for your house to the government, and she changed it, so that every single person in the house needed to pay, and it didn’t matter if you were employed or unemployed or disabled. It cost a lot of money and she ran the pilot in Scotland only, people were infuriated. Many had to get out of their houses, some refused to pay, but it wasn’t until it hit England the following year that they realized it. They didn’t listen to us for about one year. May’s days are numbered as Prime Minister.

At the end of the interview, Evelyn and I chatted a little about my thesis and she sent me a few pictures from Scotland.
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