



Spring 2015

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Past and Present Conflict for Scottish Independence

Avery N. Fox '16, Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship

 Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#), and the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Fox, Avery N., "A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Past and Present Conflict for Scottish Independence" (2015). *Student Publications*. 323.

http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/323

This is the author's version of the work. This publication appears in Gettysburg College's institutional repository by permission of the copyright owner for personal use, not for redistribution. Cupola permanent link: http://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/323

This open access student research paper is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Past and Present Conflict for Scottish Independence

Abstract

A study of the language and word patterns used in the past and present conflict over Scottish Independence.

Keywords

Scotland, Independence

Disciplines

Anthropology | English Language and Literature | Social and Cultural Anthropology

Comments

This paper was written for Professor Amy Evrard's course, *ANTH 304: Anthropology of Violence and Conflict*, Spring 2015.

A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Past and Present Conflict for Scottish Independence

Avery Fox
Anthropology of Violence and Conflict
Professor Evrard
5/8/2015

The conflict for Scottish independence from the United Kingdom is not a new phenomenon that sparked with a referendum in 2014, but has been a centuries long debate and controversy. Beginning in 1707, Scotland and England, in the midst of dissenters and supporters, joined together under mutual Parliaments and monarchs. Since this moment, those seeking to renew the independent Scottish nation had attempted to yet again separate Scotland from England's clutches. This argument has again culminated more recently in 2014 with the Scottish Independence Referendum, providing the Scottish people a chance to choose if they wanted independence or to remain within the United Kingdom. Leading up to this Referendum, voices from both sides fought to be heard. The opposing groups utilized multiple forms of media and propaganda including written and verbal language to share their cause with the Scottish public. In analyzing the language and word choice of both sides, it is clear that both sides carefully chose their words to highlight their point of view and word patterns could be seen in both arguments. Even with the defeat of the referendum, both sides continued to spread their rhetoric to the public. A Critical Discourse Analysis on the language of both parties in the fight for Scottish independence emphasizes the historical precedents set by past arguments and the way in which they are placed in a modern context.

The conflict over Scottish independence began in the medieval histories of Scotland and England. The monarchies of the Scots and the English, ranging from the fourteenth and early eighteenth centuries continually fought over rights to power and territory within the Scottish Isle. Due to their close proximity to Scotland and their imperial motives, the English attempted on multiple occasions to forcefully take the Scottish Isle. A battle that took place during one such English attack in 1314 was the Battle of Bannockburns, a decisive battle in the First War for Scottish Independence. At this battle, the English, under Edward III, were defeated in their

attempts to overtake the Scottish Isle by the outnumbered Scottish force.¹ This event went down in Scottish mythology as a pinnacle moment emphasizing the resilience and strength of the Scots and their nation. Despite this victory in the medieval times, the conflict between the Scots and English continued centuries more. However, it was in the early eighteenth century that the diplomats of England and Scotland chose to meet together, away from the battlefield, to discuss a peaceful union between the nations.

Both Scots and English supported the union. Scotland was a weaker power in military force, wealth, and land holdings thus such a jointure would benefit Scotland. On the English side, they feared that Scotland would ally with other powers to challenge the power of their empire. The English wanted to beat any other nation to the punch and desired to have Scotland in their nation. Also, there had also been precedent for having British rule in Scotland for James VI ruled both England and Scotland in the late seventeenth century, however, the Parliaments and legislative bodies of the two nations were separate.² The language and arguments for and against the union could be found in a variety of printed pamphlets from noblemen as well as those in the Scottish Parliament that were circulated to the literate population of Scotland. In defense of the union, a Scotsman, George McKenzie, stated that a union with England would lead to an “increase of strength, honour, riches, peace, security; and in one word increase of warlick, industrious inhabitants, useful in peace, by sea and land; in war for offence or defense.”³ As this language demonstrates some Scots felt that by aligning with an expansive and powerful nation, they too could take part in the benefits. This language not only expresses the economical and

¹ Robert Crawford. *Bannockburns: Scottish Independence and Literary Imagination 1324-2014*(Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2014):1-10.

² Murray G.H. Pittock. *Scottish Nationality*(New York: Palgrave, 2001):51.

³ Sir George Mackenzie. “Friendly Response to a Letter concerning Sir George Mackenzie's and Sir John Nisbet's Observations and Response on the Matter of the Union,” National Library of Scotland, 1706.

power benefits that Scotland would gain, but also the sense of protection and security they would receive. The words, security, riches, and peace, plead to the inner desires of the Scottish public, for those who want wealth, power, as well as representation and protection from foreign enemies. Another Scotsman, Sir John Clerk uses a plea to the Scottish mythology to defend the logicity of the union. He states, “Neither our sovereignty nor our antiquity are lost in incorporating union with England.”⁴ These words are aimed at assuring the Scottish citizens that an alliance with England would not threaten Scotland and its pride but would only strengthen it as a nation and people. This statement seemed reassuring yet poignant in its language, defending that Scottish history and identity would not be lost. The word choices in both of these arguments assert the inferiority of Scotland in comparison to England and that it was their fate to become part of something larger than themselves if they wanted to improve their place in the international theater. The language of those supporting the union in this early stage emphasizes the weakness of Scotland that could be saved with the security and prosperity that would come with joining a mighty world power like England.

One the other side of the conflict, the language of those against the union denied the lowliness and inadequacy of Scotland and supported their opinions with the pride and historical identity of the Scottish nation. Similarly to their opposition, those rejecting the union looked back to the mythology of the Scottish people to defend their cause. The arguments with mythology in this party, however, argued that the age old pride and strength of Scotland had to be preserved and that this could only be done with an independent Scotland. This group feared

⁴ Sir John Clerk. “A history of the making of the union by a supporter of union,” *History of the Union of Scotland and England*, trans. and ed. Douglas Duncan, (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1993).

that with the jointure with England they would lose their historical pride and would have to assume oppression that would come with the rule of England. One loyal Scotsman, Scotland William Forbes, argued “England boldly tells you that you’ve no right to choose a successor to her present Majesty; nor the liberty to make good laws for the security of your most valuable interests.”⁵ The words “no right” or “nor the liberty” highlighted the degradation that would overwhelm Scotland with the English rule and showed how “valuable interests” would be taken away. These Scotsmen foresaw the depletion of their nation’s power and wealth with a union with England. Robert Wylie continues this opinion asserting “the Parliament of Scotland comes to be totally annulled and the Parliament of England to continue just as it is, and always was, with some very inconsiderable accession of a few Scotsmen.”⁶ With the union, the Scottish nationalist believed that they would lose any representation in the government and their interests would not be cared for. They felt that England’s intention was to make them a branch economy that would only benefit England in wealth, but repress their voices and success. Besides Scots, there were also some Englishmen who were weary of the union. They viewed such an alliance as an “unequal union” with the inferior Scotland and this could, in turn, hurt England financially.⁷ It can be shown with these arguments that both Scots and Englishmen supported both sides, and that the opposing groups firmly stressed their arguments and opinions on the proposed union.

Despite the arguments against the union the Treaty of the Unions of the Parliaments was passed in 1707. This treaty combined the two Parliaments of the nations and united them under the same monarch. Early on in the jointure, the Scots retained their domestic control but as time

⁵ William Forbes, “A Pil for Pork Eaters; or a Scot’s Lancet for an English Shilling.” *The National Library of Scotland*, 1705.

⁶ Robert Wylie. “Opinions on the Union of Scotland and England,” *The National Library of Scotland*, 1706.

⁷ “Documenting the Union of Parliaments.” *The National Library of Scotland*, 2012.

continued into the nineteenth century, England began to step on the toes of Scotland.⁸ It is this point in history that the Scottish independence supporters looked again to the historical root of their conflict with England to derive an opposing rhetoric for their oppression. With the defense of their heritage Scotland again raised the battle flag in the fight for Scottish independence in the decades to come. This conflict was not violent as it had been in the past, but through social movements and legislation Scotland again tried to redeem their independence. This historic battle reached into recent years in 2014, with a new Scottish Independence Referendum that was established to again reconsider the fate of the Scottish nation.

The 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum culminated a historical conflict between Scotland and England and placed the historical arguments into a modern frame. To put this vote into context, in 2013 a Scottish Independence Referendum Bill was passed in an agreement between Scottish and British members of Parliament. This bill allowed for Scottish public to vote in 2014 for or against Scottish Independence in November of 2014. With a majority Yes vote, Scotland would assume independence, with a majority no vote, the union would be preserved.⁹ From the onset of this referendum campaign, the two sides picked their places; the Yes vote supporting Scottish independence, and the No vote supporting the preservation of the union. Rhetoric and propaganda for both sides erupted for the consumption of the Scottish people with the intention to sway their opinions to one side or the other. The language used by the opposing campaigns addressed the sympathies, frustrations, and interests of the Scottish public and also tied back into similar arguments from past rhetoric of the conflict, as earlier mentioned. Both groups utilized a variety of mediums for their persuasive language and with a close analysis of

⁸ John MacKenzie and T.M Devine, ed. *Scotland and the British Empire*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011):14-18.

⁹ "Scottish Independence Referendum Act 2013," Scottish Parliament, 2013.

the pattern and intention of language and word choice a more complex understanding of the conflict and its participants can be gleaned.

To look first at the Yes vote party, their use of language focused on pulling at the pride and strength of the Scottish people and the promise of a brighter future for the nation separate from England. The language used in this particular campaign could be found in books, online sources, as well as videos that will be discussed later. Two sources that can be scrutinized for an understanding of the Yes vote campaign are *Yes* a book written by James Foley and Pete Ramand as well as online propaganda from the Scottish government's entitled "Scotland's Future is in Your Hands."¹⁰ From the analysis of these materials a set pattern of words and phrases can be easily denoted. Optimistic terms such as "potential," "stronger," "better," "equality" are a group of words that are used in and around the topic of an independent Scotland in these two sources as well as others.¹¹ With these words, the authors highlighted the optimistic view of what an independent Scotland would be in its future apart from England. The words of potential and better, indicated a feeling of future progress that Scotland would have if it would gain independence. The words strength and potential also argue for a global presence of Scotland how they can be a major player in the global theater. England, in their view, kept them from the global atmosphere and took away their individual identity. These groupings of words highlighted the positive and optimistic fate that Scotland would gain with the separation from England.

¹⁰ "Scotland's Future: It's in Your Hands". *Scotreferendum*. Scottish Government, Web. June 2014. www.scotreferendum.com and Foley, James and Pete Ramand. *Yes: The Radical Case for Scottish Independence*(London: Pluto Press, 2014), 78-118.

¹¹ "Scotland's Future: It's in Your Hands". *Scotreferendum*. Scottish Government, Web. June 2014. www.scotreferendum.com and Foley, James and Pete Ramand. *Yes: The Radical Case for Scottish Independence*(London: Pluto Press, 2014),78-118.

Among these positive terms was the word independence that was repeated and used in a variety of contexts. This word in itself can be viewed in a historical framework such as the war for American independence or other such conflicts that were fought to relieve a nation of oppression. Scotland, like America, was trying to separate from a nation they felt was repressing them and were using legislative means to win the war of independence that they desired.

With the Yes vote campaign, another pattern of words were clear in their rhetoric this time aimed at England. The terms that were aligned with discussions of England emphasized the frustration and unfairness that stemmed from the relationship from the two nations, in the eyes of the Yes vote campaigners. The blatantly negative terms, “inequality”, “poverty”, “failure”, and “unfair” encompassed the discussions about England and the continuance of the alliance between the two countries.¹² These words exemplified a system that was failing at the expense of the Scottish nation. The materials analyzed went into explicit detail over the financial, economic, political, and social inequalities that were experienced by the Scottish people at the hands of the English. With this evidence of word pattern and language that the words describing the Yes and No vote campaign were chosen carefully to emphasis the strengths or the weakness of the other to stir distrust in the English and confidence in an independent Scotland.

As with the Yes vote supporters, the No vote campaign in the face of the Independent Referendum used their own language and propaganda to persuade the voters to preserve the jointure of the nations. The language of this campaign, like their opponents, was carried over from the original union conflict in the early eighteenth century. This group also utilized written

¹² Scotland’s Future: It’s in Your Hands”. *Scotreferendum*. Scottish Government, Web. June 2014. www.scotreferendum.com and Foley, James and Pete Ramand. *Yes: The Radical Case for Scottish Independence*(London: Pluto Press, 2014), 78-118.

and verbal arguments in all mediums, some in periodicals and even visuals. From these examples of rhetoric, words such as “strength”, “posterity”, and “security” were commonly found interwoven within the arguments in support of the union.¹³ This language built a strong pedestal for England, emphasizing the safety and promise that the continuance of the union would bring about in the future. The word choice could also indirectly serve as a warning to the Scottish people. One phrase used widely was “better together” and this phrase along with a somewhat threatening or warning tone seemed to allude to a jeopardized Scottish future without England by their side.¹⁴ With a disjuncture from England, the security provided for Scotland on the international stage would disappear and the Scots, who had not experienced independence for centuries, would have to defend themselves militarily, fiscally, and politically. The everyday safe haven and happiness that the Scots experienced would dissipate and the security blanket would be ripped off exposing a naïve and inexperienced nation. The terms when used in their context even accused the Scottish people for shaking the status quo of the more powerful nation and such disturbances would not go unchecked.

As in the past, those supporting the union also implied the inferiority and weakness of Scotland even in current times. Though the language was not blatant, the implications of the chosen language and word choice doubted the readiness of Scotland to be on its own. It was argued that the Scots “were not ready” for independence and that they needed the English support and without their big brother, the Scottish nation would be thrown into confusion and

¹³ Iain McLean, Jim Gallagher, and Guy Lodge. *Scotland's Choices: The Referendum and What Happens Afterward*(Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), 190-205 and Murray G.H. Pittock, Murray G.H. *Scottish Nationality*(New York: Palgrave, 2001), 1-15.

¹⁴ Iain McLean, Jim Gallagher, and Guy Lodge. *Scotland's Choices: The Referendum and What Happens Afterward*(Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013, 190-205) and Murray G.H. Pittock, Murray G.H. *Scottish Nationality*(New York: Palgrave, 2001), 1-15.

degradation.¹⁵ This language asserted an inferiority complex upon the Scottish identity and assumed the superiority of a U.K. identity. The No vote campaign mainly focused on an agenda of worrying the Scottish of the unknown without the English by their side. For centuries the Scots have been part of the U.K. and had not known different so how were they ever prepared to go out on their own? One such opinion can be found in a Spectator article which uses arguments to show that the Scots do rely on the English in profit and economic growth and that English companies are the main drivers of their economy.¹⁶ Thus, with the removal of the English businesses from Scotland, the economy would plummet. The arguments of an inferior Scotland and strength and security of a partnership with England was at the center of the No vote campaign that supported the preservation of the Scottish and English union drawing from their historical rhetoric.

Looking past the rhetoric pre-vote, the post referendum language holds some of the most interesting points in my opinion. The results of the vote on the Referendum went in favor of the No vote. About 84% of the Scottish population voted, a large amount even commended by Prime Minister David Cameron, that showed the “power of their ancient democracy.”¹⁷ The Yes vote pulled out a 44.7% trailing behind a 55.3% given to the No vote.¹⁸ With the Independence Referendum defeated, both the victorious and losing sides continued to discuss the topics of Scottish independence and to continue to fight for their causes. Press releases were significant in

¹⁵ Iain McLean, Jim Gallagher, and Guy Lodge. *Scotland's Choices: The Referendum and What Happens Afterward*(Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013): 190-205.

¹⁶ Iain McLean and Jim Gallagher, and Guy Lodge. *Scotland's Choices: The Referendum and What Happens Afterward*, 169-190.

¹⁷ Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's Office Press Release. September 19, 2014.

¹⁸“Scottish independence referendum: final results in full”. *The Guardian*, Thursday 18 September 2014.

this phase of the campaign for the leaders of each side, Prime Minister Cameron, and Nicola Sturgeon, leader of the Scottish National Party, who later became the First Minister of Scotland. The language used in these press releases after the defeat of the referendum was similar to the words used during the campaign but they added new fervor because of the results of the vote.

In his first press release after the vote, Cameron fashionably relished in the preservation of the union and fell back on the common language that was used earlier in the campaign, however, in the wake of the victory he gave them new meaning.¹⁹ The phrase of “better together” popped up multiple times throughout his short speech, as it had in earlier propaganda, commenting on the strength of the United Kingdom as one unit.²⁰ He continued to refer to those in Scotland as “the people of Scotland” and told them “we hear you.”²¹ It is with these few phrases that Cameron solidly creates his stance. By isolating the Scottish citizens, he first identified them as the instigators of the conflict, but he also pointed their uniqueness from the rest of the United Kingdom. This phrase demonstrated that even with their union with England, they were still their own people. He also acknowledged that the Scottish people were sending a message to his Parliament. Without admitting wrong, Cameron promised that Scotland would receive more equal treatment and representation in the future with the overarching guidance of England. When discussing the rights and demands of the Scottish people, Cameron turned his speech to look to the other parts of the United Kingdom such as Wales, Northern Ireland, and England. He noted that all of the U.K. must have rights and a voice to be heard, like Scotland and that they too would have their rights observed. He goes one by one, mentioning the conflicts and issues with the segments of the U.K. and assures that the concerns of each nation would be

¹⁹ Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister, September 19, 2014.

²⁰ Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister, September 19, 2014.

²¹ Ibid.

observed. Lastly he turned to England, which he stated, “is also part of the United Kingdom not yet mentioned” and he notes that there are voters and people in England that need to have their voices and opinions heard.²²

This use of language was fascinating and sly, for Cameron took the narrower issue of Scottish independence and broadened it to the issues that were had throughout the United Kingdom. To the listener it may seem that he was taking the Scottish independence into further context to show that the issues had in Scotland could be compared to others and that he and his Parliament would work towards correcting the issues had elsewhere. However, with a closer look into his address, it seems as though he is taking the credit away from the Scottish referendum fight and leaving it behind to highlight national problems. He states that the issues with Scotland were no different to the issues had around the U.K. and that Scotland’s perils are just a drop in the bucket for the grander scheme of things. When looking at the language of his speech overall a pattern in the use of “our” is easily noticeable. “Our United Kingdom”, “our democracy” flooded the sentences within Cameron’s speech to figuratively bring the separate people together.²³ By using this particular word Cameron is asserting the preservation of the union, and to somewhat rub salt into the wound for those in the Yes campaign. It becomes clear that the “we-ness” with England was important to the majority of Scottish individuals and he would make that clear to his audience. The use of “our” also seems to bring some equality to the two parties which contradict some of the early language used by the No vote party, because the language was used to inherently bestow inferiority to Scotland. However, in this case, Cameron brought equivalence to the two groups and defined the we-ness of the United Nations. With this word, Cameron highlights how the present and future of Scotland, England, as well as the rest of

²² Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister, September 19, 2014.

²³ Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister, September 19, 2014.

the United Kingdom were aligned and that their nations, “our democracy” would prove for future success and the better understanding of the wants of the people of the United Kingdom. Cameron in his speech emphasized the want for a “better and brighter future,” however; the futures that he and Sturgeon were seeking were quite different.²⁴

Nichola Sturgeon also fed back into the language and arguments that were used by her party in their Independence Referendum campaign. From a video that interviewed Sturgeon soon before the referendum vote, in response to the polls on Yahoo U.K. predicting that the Yes vote would lose the referendum, Sturgeon continued even in the face of defeat to fight on for her cause. Though her disappointment was clear, Sturgeon kept up the fight, noting how an exceedingly large population of Scotland still voted for independence. She was sure to mention that Glasgow, the biggest city in Scotland, voted for independence.²⁵ The word “change” again weaved its way into Surgeon’s speech climaxing at her statement “there is still an appetite for change in Scotland.”²⁶ Sturgeon’s speech never gave an air of defeat, even with a loss in votes because the Yes vote’s message was made clear. “An appetite for change” lends the hint that even though the votes didn’t go in their favor, those seeking Scottish independence still had expectations from England.²⁷ To push her point further, Sturgeon clearly articulated her disappointment with England and to state the need for change. She stated that “there was no endorsement for the status quo” and that these wrongs had to be righted. These words placed England in the enemy position, making them the oppressor. Hence, even after the loss in votes, England was still painted as an enemy force that was repressing the Scottish nation. With the continued presence of the so called enemy, Sturgeon with her use of language illustrated that the

²⁴ Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister, September 19, 2014.

²⁵ Scottish independence: Sturgeon 'deeply disappointed' by poll. *BBC News*, 19 September 2014.

²⁶ Scottish independence: Sturgeon 'deeply disappointed' by poll, 19 September 2014.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

fight was not made in vain and that England should hear the voices of the Scottish people and to prove the Scots would not passively accept defeat. In a sense, her word usage still invoked the threat that the fight for Scottish independence was not over.

Other than desiring a change, Sturgeon emphasized that Scotland had been altered by the Referendum campaign, and that the response they had received from the Scottish nation showed promise. She backed up this statement with the fact that “millions” of Scottish citizens had voted for independence and that England did not have full sway over the minds of the Scottish people.²⁸ Cameron never looked to the numerical results in his address, as if to avoid a concession that millions of Scots did in fact want independence. Sturgeon’s use of the cold hard numbers asserted her cause to show that a change was needed if the England wanted to preserve the union. By including the numbers, it almost appeared that Sturgeon was trying to show that the results had potential for change in the years to come based on the high voter turnout for Scottish independence. Despite defeat, Sturgeon was effective in her verbal language to place England in the wrong and to show that this conflict was not yet over.

What can be taken away from the past and present arguments over Scottish independence and the more recent Referendum? Those for and against Scottish independence developed effective and thought provoking arguments that generated a large following behind each group. First looking at the No vote, the victorious group, the language used in the past and present highlighted the strength in union and asserted Scottish inferiority. The past and present discourses had several parallels but after close examination some variances can be seen. In the past the discussions more blatantly stated the weakness and inferiority of Scotland and

²⁸ Scottish independence: Sturgeon 'deeply disappointed' by poll, 19 September 2014.

heightened the strength and might of the British Empire. This cannot be seen in the present arguments, for the No vote campaign used more hidden language to denote the Scottish inferiority. Though the words such as union, strength, and security were similar terms, the words took on new meaning in the present. With the current Referendum, England was fighting to hold onto their way of life that had incorporated Scotland into their economic and financial systems. The tone of the language became more hidden in their criticism of the amateur Scottish nation and more centered on the preservation of the English way of life. The language was attempting to protect the British strength and desirability to not allow people to leave or to be discontent with their policies. Thus, the past arguments and language were utilized by those for the union while incorporating them into a modern context.

Those supporting Scottish independence also developed an effective argument that shook the traditionalist beliefs in their nation as well as in England. Again, this side also used the same language in their rhetoric, however, unlike their opponents, the tone remained the similar in the past and present. The Scots seeking independence, as with their forefathers, were aggressive and assertive in their views that Scotland would thrive as an independent nation and that they did not need England to hold their hand any longer. This preservation of tone and desire added strength to the arguments and language of the independence seekers. The language tying back to the past showed the historical battle that the Scots had been fighting for centuries and how they wanted their long wanted independence. The context of the language was in a modern context but the want for change tied back to the centuries old battle for the freedom of Scotland. Their want of identity of their own was a huge point of sympathy that would have pulled at the heartstrings of their audience.

The strength in the Yes vote arguments can also be demonstrated in their ability to cause change in the United Kingdom despite their loss in the polls. As mentioned in Prime Minister Cameron's address after the No vote victory, he promised to create change in the system that would give more representation to the Scottish people. It was this recognition of the need for change that highlighted the dramatic impact that the referendum had on the British government. They would not allow themselves to be overlooked and they created rhetoric that was too strong to be ignored. The Yes vote party appeared to have used their ancient rhetoric and language more effectively than their counterparts despite their defeat. Their movement had generated change and forced England as well as the international audience to notice the plights of the Scottish people. It is with this competent rhetoric and language that with some fostering and growth may one day break the ceiling on Scottish independence from England.

When performing a Critical Discourse Analysis on the past and present Scottish independence conflict an interesting story of rhetoric and passion can be revealed. In the beginning of the conflict in 1707, those seeking a union with the English world power spread the values of strength and security that would come with such as jointure. The opposing side rebuked by asserting the freedom and loyalty that they had to their Scottish nation and how there were no positives to joining England. Once this union was made, the conflict over renewed Scottish independence carried through the years up until 2014 when a new Referendum for Scottish Independence was sparked. Both sides utilized the same rhetoric that was used in the past but formatted it to fit into the modern context. After the defeat of the Referendum, rhetoric on both sides continued their fight of discourse. Both sides mightily utilized the precedents in language set by their forefathers. However, when analyzing the effectiveness of the language and cause for Scottish independence it can be seen that they made a larger impact on their opposition. A

Critical Discourse Analysis of the Scottish independence conflict unveils language and rhetoric that originated from past struggles that were placed into the modern context for the nation's independence.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Clerk, Sir John. "A history of the making of the union by a supporter of union," *History of the Union of Scotland and England*, trans. and ed. Douglas Duncan, (Edinburgh: Scottish History Society, 1993).

"Documenting the Union of Parliaments." *The National Library of Scotland*, 2012.

Forbes, William, "A Pil for Pork Eaters; or a Scot's Lancet for an English Shilling." *The National Library of Scotland*, 1706.

Massie, Alex. "10 Pretty Unpersuasive Reasons for Scottish Independence." *The Spectator*. May 22, 2012. <http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/alex-massie/2012/05/10-pretty-unpersuasive-reasons-for-scottish-independence/>

Mackenzies, Sir George. "Friendly Response to a Letter concerning Sir George Mackenzie's and Sir John Nisbet's Observations and Response on the Matter of the Union," *National Library of Scotland*, 1706.

"Scotland's Future: It's in Your Hands". *Scotreferendum*. Scottish Government, Web. June 2014. www.scotreferendum.com.

"Scottish Independence Referendum Act 2013," Scottish Parliament, 2013.

Scottish Independence Referendum: Statement by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's Office Press Release. September 19, 2014.

Scottish independence: Sturgeon 'deeply disappointed' by poll. *BBC News*, 19 September 2014.

"Scotland's Future: What Independence Means to You". *Scotreferendum*. Scottish Government, Web. August, 2014. www.scotreferendum.com.

"Union with England Act 1707," The Kingdom of Scotland, The Kingdom of England, 1707.

Wylie, Robert. "Opinions on the Union of Scotland and England," *The National Library of Scotland*, 1706.

Secondary Sources

Crawford, Robert. *Bannockburns: Scottish Independence and Literary Imagination 1324-2014*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014.

Foley, James and Pete Ramand. *Yes: The Radical Case for Scottish Independence*. London: Pluto Press, 2014.

MacKenzie, John M. and T.M Devine, ed. *Scotland and the British Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

McLean, Iain, Jim Gallagher, and Guy Lodge. *Scotland's Choices: The Referendum and What Happens Afterward*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

Pittock, Murray G.H. *Scottish Nationality*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.

“Scottish independence referendum: final results in full”. The Guardian, Thursday 18 September 2014.