The Scotland-UN Committee

PETITION TO THE QUEEN

By 1986 the Scotland-UN Committee had amassed a substantial amount of experience of presenting Scotland´s case for self-determination to the international community. Action had been taken within the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the Council of Europe, the UN Secretariat, the UN Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation, and the Assembly of the European Communities, amongst others. A Scotland-UN delegation of three members had addressed a United Nations conference in Geneva for a week on the Scottish situation. And every national government in the world had been given a comprehensive statement, with special attention being paid to the President of the United States of America.

Scotland-UN, by this time an object of some interest to the diplomatic and security services, was about to target the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which in 1975 had adopted the Principles of Helsinki, including the right of all identifiable peoples to self-determination without external interference. The CSCE's Third Follow-Up Conference was due to be held in Vienna, and was an obvious subject for the Scotland-UN Committee´s attention.

The case that was being presented at international level was becoming more and more refined, if at times necessarily somewhat repetitious. However, one loophole had to be closed. Experience had shown that it was necessary to prove that all possibility of obtaining redress at domestic level had been exhausted before taking the case to the international authorities. But what was one supposed to do under circumstances where the national government blandly refused to observe the democratic standards that are the international norm? When even Scottish judges could manoeuvre an incontrovertible constitutional case out of court by claiming that they had no power to decide it? The answer was to take the matter to the second-top constitutional level, to the Head of State, the Queen. After that there could be no argument that all the possibilities had not been tried.

The Petition to the Queen, using the traditional Scottish form of address ("Majesty" is a purely English usage introduced by Henry VIII), and with the wording making it perfectly clear that the Head of State is subordinate to the people, placed the onus squarely on the Queen to rectify the unconstitutional actions of the government she had installed in office - a duty of any head of state anywhere in the world. The case presented repeated many of the arguments used in other Scotland-UN documents before and since, but it is no less watertight for that.

It also pointed out that, since this was a complaint against 10 Downing Street, it would be highly improper for the Head of State to pass such a communication on to the Prime Minister. The Petition - barefaced but fully justified - was then sent by registered post to Buckingham Palace.

No reply was ever received by the Scotland-UN Committee from Buckingham Palace. It can be assumed that the document was forwarded directly to 10 Downing Street, despite the warning it contained against passing the complaint over to the very people who were being accused of acting unconstitutionally. Accordingly, as had been made clear in the Petition itself, copies were distributed to the delegations attending the CSCE Third Follow-Up Meeting in Vienna as Appendix C of the Scotland-UN submission. It was the best possible demonstration of the perfidious nature of the British state that the international diplomatic community could have had, as well as positive proof that the UK has no built-in safeguards against constitutional crimes and the abuse of political power.

A PETITION

TO HER GRACE QUEEN ELIZABETH

CONCERNING THE PRESENT STATE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF SCOTLAND

Presented by

The Scotland-UN Committee

Madam,

The Scotland-UN Committee, in the name of approximately one third of a million Scots who have signed a petition requesting it to take diplomatic action on their behalf, has the honour to address this petition to you as Head of State subordinate to the people, with the request that you exercise the powers vested in you by virtue of your office to rectify the unconstitutional and unjust state of affairs presently prevailing in respect of the government of Scotland.

As you are aware, the Scottish people have been attempting for well over one hundred years to obtain the recall of their ancient national Parliament to deal with Scottish affairs. Among the evidence that could be quoted we would cite the following readily verifiable facts:

A1. Since the middle of the 19th century there has been constant popular demand for the restoration of Scottish legislative facilities. To take only one of many examples, in 1853 the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights was formed, with cross-party support and the affiliation of many local authorities and the Convention of Royal Burghs. A meeting held that year in Glasgow, attended by five thousand people, asked for a separate Scottish Assembly for the direction of those matters that are exclusively Scottish. In 1886 the Scottish Home Rule Association was founded. There are many similar examples that prove that for the past hundred years there has been constant and increasing demand for the restoration of Scottish legislative facilities.

A2. In the past century there have been no fewer than 32 formal attempts in the Westminster Parliament to have the Scottish legislature recalled to deal with Scottish affairs - a simple and reasonable proposal which would arouse no controversy in any European state where federal government and divided sovereignty are known and understood concepts. These measures were supported by the Scottish Members of Parliament (excluding those not permitted to vote on private members' bills on account of holding parliamentary office), with the single exception of the 1889 measure, which was opposed by the Scottish members by a majority of 22 to 19. The 20th-century Scottish self-government proposals that actually came to a vote were supported by the Scottish MPs, over 80 per cent, and often over 90 per cent, of whom voted in favour. Despite this, every one of these was either talked out by filibuster tactics, killed by procedural chicanery, or in the last analysis simply voted down by the huge English majority at Westminster in an atmosphere of jeers, contempt and derision for Scotland and all things Scottish. This is described as "democracy". It would be more accurate to describe it as blatant political repression on racist lines.

A3. These parliamentary attempts only reflected the feeling in the country as a whole. In the early 1930s a whole series of surveys carried out by two popular newspapers revealed a 23 to 1 majority of Scots in favour of recalling the Scottish Parliament. This pattern has never varied right up to the present day, the most recent opinion polls indicating that over 80 per cent of Scottish residents are in favour of having their own legislature once again, the younger generation in particular being solidly for it.

A4. In many countries action must be taken by the governments on presentation of petitions signed by twenty or thirty thousand electors. In 1950-51 a National Covenant requesting the setting up of a domestic legislature for Scotland was signed by almost two and a half million Scottish electors - an enormous majority of those entitled to vote. The petition was taken to London by a delegation of prominent Scots, but the government of the day refused to accept the signature sheets, with a complete disregard of standards of common courtesy let alone democratic sense. The Covenant and its signature sheets exist to this day, still undelivered, and a standing affront to democracy and the hard-won norms of human rights.

On 1st March 1979 a national referendum was held in Scotland to allow the constitutionally supreme Scottish people to decide whether the Scotland Act of 1978 was to be implemented. Although this measure by no means satisfied the aspirations of the Scottish people as regards their right to self-government, it was adopted for

implementation by a clear and adequate majority of those voting, in full accordance with every known constitutional principle and precedent.

This formal decision by the country's supreme constitutional authority thereupon became the law of the land, and was thereby placed beyond the possibility of reversal by any subordinate authority such as Government, Parliament or Head of State.

Despite being constitutionally bound by this decision taken by the higher authority, however, the incoming Conservative Government forced through a so-called "repeal" of the Scotland Act in June 1979. The ostensible ground for this action - which was of course totally unconstitutional, null and void - was that an allegedly insufficient proportion of the electorate had voted in favour of the implementation of the Scotland Act. The genuine reason for the "repeal" charade was purely political, but it was at least formally based on the stipulation that if less than 40 per cent of the electorate voted for the measure it was to be returned to Parliament for reconsideration. It is therefore essential to examine the constitutional basis for this procedure:

B1. If a subordinate authority remits a matter to a higher authority for decision, it cannot be a logical conclusion that the subordinate authority that remitted the matter retains the power to overturn such a decision if it happens to dislike it. Unlike the position in other countries with written constitutions approved by the people, there are no provisions in either Scots or English law that delegate any such power to a legislature. Neither generally nor specifically has the Scottish electorate delegated any such power to its servants. Since it cannot be the natural assumption that a subordinate authority possesses overriding powers in respect of the decisions of its constitutional superior, the absence of any such formal provisions means that a democratic decision by the people is untouchable by the state authorities. Anyone who wishes to deny this would do well to consider the implications thereof.

B2. A general percentage rule applicable to all referendums on constitutional matters would, if approved by the people, be fair and acceptable. But any such rule would have to be laid down well in advance of any particular referendum in order to avoid a charge of discrimination. This was not done in the case of the Scotland Act, and the stipulation therefore falls down on this account.

B3. The 40 per cent rule itself represented a constitutional change of a quite unprecedented nature. It was nevertheless pushed through the House of Commons on the strength of a tiny majority vote, supported by a mere 27 per cent of all Members of Parliament, almost exclusively English, and against the opposition of the Scottish elected representatives. This, by the way, in the matter of an exclusively Scottish measure. By its own standard, that was a totally insufficient degree of support to justify such a radical constitutional innovation, therefore this piece of racist discrimination was to all intents and purposes destroyed right from the beginning by the inconsistency of its own status.

B4. The anomalies that it raised in regard to the present system of registering voters made a farce out of the stipulation. These ranged from dead men being counted as voting against the Scotland Act to double-registered voters having either two No

votes, or one Yes and one No vote, to say nothing of the criminal falsification of the register by a Conservative Party office-bearer, and a host of other factors.

B5. Then there is the matter of precedent. No such rule was laid down for the referendums on the Northern Ireland constitution, or on membership of the European Communities. Indeed, neither before nor since, in the whole course of Scottish, English and British constitutional history, has there been such a rule applied even to the most far-reaching constitutional alteration, which re-emphasises the discriminatory and racist nature of the stipulation.

In the case of the 1975 referendum, a constitutional change of staggering proportions was considered to have been approved when a simple majority consisting of 35 per cent of the electorate voted in favour of subordinating the Scottish Act of Union and the whole body of Scots Law to the Treaty of Rome and to EEC directives made in accordance with the latter's provisions.

It cannot be advanced as an argument that the EEC referendum was conducted on an all-United Kingdom basis, unless one can explain how matters fundamentally affecting the indigenous law of Scotland could be decided by an electorate resident under and subject to a totally different legal jurisdiction in what, for legal purposes, is as much of a foreign country as China. Furthermore, the country's membership of the EEC was unconstitutional and invalid, or at best provisional, up to the time when it was legitimised by the supreme authority in the 1975 referendum.

In 1979 a clear and adequate majority consisting of 33 per cent of the electorate decided in favour of the implementation of the Scotland Act, a measure of much less consequence involving no transfer of sovereignty whatever, and no fundamental constitutional change. In the light of the unassailable and binding precedent of the EEC referendum, therefore, no 40 per cent barrier clause could have had any constitutional validity whatever.

B6. The 40 per cent clause was not a barrier clause at all, although it was exploited as if it had been. All that the stipulation did was to refer the Act to Parliament for reconsideration - which could just as well have entailed amendments to its provisions, or its replacement by a more suitable piece of legislation. The rule laid no obligation on anyone to repeal the Act, as its sponsors repeatedly emphasised in the course of the referendum campaign. The "repeal" of the Act was carried through, not because an insufficient proportion of the electorate had voted for it, but because it was returned to Westminster after a general election, to a House of Commons with a completely different political composition, with a majority who were totally opposed to the slightest degree of autonomy for Scotland.

B7. The English majority at Westminster carried the so-called “repeal”. The Scottish elected representatives, however, voted for the implementation of the Scotland Act by an overwhelming majority of more than two thirds, which was the final word on the matter. The Scotland Act is therefore in force, and remains so.

The question therefore arises: by virtue of what constitutional authority did the Westminster Parliament set out to overturn the democratically expressed will of its

constitutional superior? The answer is, of course: none whatever. The Westminster Parliament could not repeal the Scotland Act, because by that time it no longer possessed the requisite power to do so, the highest authority in the land having already decided otherwise.
The "repeal" of the Scotland Act was therefore pure bluff, a mere form of words with neither constitutional nor any other form of validity. It was an act of pure anarchy that not only undermined the rule of law with devastating force, but also in effect destroyed Britain's unwritten constitution with a single hammer blow. It is a matter of elementary logic, confirmed by world-wide judicial practice, that no such decision can have any constitutional legitimacy, that it remains null and void without limit of time.

We will refrain from commenting on the methods which were used during the referendum campaign in order to reduce the level of support for the Scotland Act, save to comment that that orgy of corruption and malpractices by the opponents of self-determination for the Scottish people proves conclusively that in any procedures laid down from London there is no chance of their being allowed to determine their political status "freely" in terms of the International Bill of Human Rights - i.e. in freedom from procedural and other chicanery, London-based media hostility, manipulation of financing, publicity, electoral registers, voting figures, etc., for the purpose of sabotaging the object of the exercise, namely a balanced decision by the Scottish people regarding their own future.

We do, however, wish to bring to your notice the following constitutional points, which have a direct bearing on the subject of this petition:

C1. The Scots are without the slightest doubt a distinct and distinctive "people" within the meaning of the United Nations definition of the term as an entity entitled under international law to exercise and enjoy the right of self-determination. This right is guaranteed by the Charter of the United Nations Organisation, and confirmed and enshrined in numerous later enactments and pronouncements by the international authority. We would mention in particular Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which is identical with Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, both of which have the status of international law binding on the United Kingdom. The text reads:

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.

The United Kingdom Government are also signatories to various EEC declarations guaranteeing these rights within the European Communities.

C2. The "sovereignty of Parliament" may conceivably be defined as meaning that parliamentary decisions override those of all other lawmaking bodies and institutions of state. But, however it may be defined, it cannot be taken to mean or imply that Parliament exercises sovereignty over the people, from whom its entire authority to legislate is derived. Until recently, no legislative decisions were taken by any higher constitutional authority than Parliament, and therefore parliamentary decisions could

be taken to have overriding force in our courts of law and elsewhere. The introduction of the referendum changed this system entirely.

Since decisions are now being made directly by a higher constitutional authority than Parliament, it follows that it is the will of the superior authority that must be implemented in the event of a clash with that of a subordinate authority. There is not an international court or authority of any description which either could or would entertain the proposition that a legislature exercises sovereignty over the people who elect it - an illogical and lethally dangerous notion, the political implications of which are horrifying in the extreme.

C3. The principle of popular sovereignty has been established for centuries under Scottish constitutional law. The declaration of Arbroath of the year 1320, issued in the name of the barons, freeholders, and "the whole community of the realm of Scotland", established the principle that the Head of State and Executive was subject to the will of the people, and could be deposed for failure to abide by it. Among other constitutional writers who have confirmed the establishment of the principle, the celebrated 16th-century scholar George Buchanan, in his "De jure Regni apud Scotos", stated that the monarch's right to rule derived from the people, and that to them the rulers were responsible. The Claim of Right of the year 1689 stated unequivocally that King James VII had forfeited the right to the Crown on account of his breach of the fundamental Constitution of Scotland. This by now entrenched principle remains part of the Scottish Constitution to this day, translated into terms of the modern Executive.

C4. The concept that Monarch or Parliament exercise "unrestricted sovereignty" never existed in pre-Union Scotland. There is ample evidence that both institutions of state were held to be subordinate to the Constitution and the law. Therefore, since the Scottish Parliament could not transfer to the newly-created United Kingdom Parliament any more power than it itself could legitimately exercise ("Nemo plus juris ad alium transferre potest, quam ipse habet", a principle of all Western legal systems), the United Kingdom Parliament could not exercise unrestricted sovereignty within Scotland, nor, in view of the entrenched nature of the union agreement to which it owes its entire existence to this day, could it possibly acquire such supremacy within Scotland in the course of time - this irrespective of the constitutional situation in England.

C5. The Scottish and English Monarchies were combined under the terms of the Acts of Union in 1707 (and not in 1603, as is commonly but erroneously believed). Leaving aside the by now academic question of whether the Scottish Parliament had the legitimate authority to do any such thing, it should be noted that the new joint United Kingdom Parliament was set up under the terms of a non-entrenched clause which could be altered at any time. It should be noted further that the Acts of Union make no provision for the abolition of either the Scottish or English Parliaments, which were not combined into the entirely new UK Parliament, but went into abeyance. The Scottish Parliament could be recalled to deal with Scottish affairs without one word of alteration to the union agreement.

C6. The constitutional norm throughout the entire civilised world, specifically laid down in many state constitutions, is that the people are sovereign over the institutions of state, and that every nation, land, province, region, town and district is governed by a directly-elected legislature which is sovereign under the people and the law within its range of competence.

There is also such a thing as differential federalism, which permits different degrees of decision-making powers in different parts of a single state. This applies even to the Soviet Union, nine of whose fifteen constituent republics have smaller populations than Scotland, and yet all have their sovereign powers laid down in their own constitutions. Other examples from Europe, America and elsewhere are too numerous to mention.

C7. The acceptance of the constitutional sovereignty of the people, represented by a qualified and registered electorate, implies an acceptance of the constitutional supremacy of any part of that people and electorate in matters that concern that part alone. This must be particularly the case when, as in this instance, the "part" is in fact an integral whole, a distinct legal and constitutional entity in its own right, for the identity of the Scottish constitutional unit was not extinguished in 1707, as the most superficial knowledge of the Acts of Union makes clear. If the above were not the case, it would theoretically be possible for the result of any local government or parliamentary by-election to be overturned at the arbitrary whim of the Westminster administration for the time being. That is only one illustration, and it is obvious that to concede any vestige of such powers would be totally subversive of democracy.

C8. If it be argued that the people, although constitutionally supreme, delegate their sovereignty and decision-making powers absolutely to their elected representatives between elections, it must be pointed out, firstly, that this cannot be the natural assumption in the absence of a formal constitutional statute to this effect which has been approved by the people.

Secondly, it is impossible to argue that there has been a long tradition of constitutional practice in this respect even if it has not been formally sanctioned by statute. The fact is that, leaving aside the Northern Ireland referendum, there have been only two occasions when the people have had the opportunity to make direct decisions, namely in 1975 and 1979.

On the first of these occasions, the EEC referendum of 1975, the decision of the superior authority was not challenged by the subordinate authority, so that no constitutional controversy arose then, in contrast to what happened with the Scottish national referendum in 1979.

One can agree that in the normal course of events Members of Parliament are elected to use their individual judgement on the issues of the day, but immediately any matter is referred back to the electorate, to the source of parliamentary authority, for a decision, the elected representatives are no longer free to overturn any such decision at will. To conclude thus would be to set the servant over the master, to assert that men and women acting by virtue of granted powers may do not only what these powers do not authorise, but what they expressly forbid.

C9. Arising from the above, it must be pointed out that this matter represents a constitutional crossroads, and that the issues are not confined to Scotland's right to self-determination. What happened in 1979 was nothing less than a confrontation between the people and the state to decide which is in possession of sovereignty - i.e. which is the ultimate resting-place of legitimate authority.

Under no circumstances can we permit the state to retain its usurpation of 1979, for to do so would nullify everything for which Western society stands. Why do we have a defence budget if it is not just to prevent such a situation from being forced upon us?

C10. It is obvious from the foregoing that for a subordinate authority to refer to a decision by its constitutional superior as "consultative" is quite simply nonsensical.

There can be no question but that the recall of the Scottish national legislature is now a matter of the utmost necessity, for a number of well-established reasons:

D1. Scotland is a distinct geographical, economic, ethnic, social, historical and cultural entity, the needs and problems of which differ considerably from those of England, and require different treatment and different solutions.

D2. Scotland is the only country in the world with its own distinctive legal system and no legislature.

D3. The functions of government have vastly expanded over the years. This is not peculiar to the United Kingdom, but since geographical conditions and the prior existence of distinctive Scottish institutions have always precluded any unified administration from London, it has been necessary to develop a complete Scottish state administrative apparatus. There now exists a whole tier of government in Scotland that is subject to no effective democratic supervision and control. In addition to a bureaucracy of around 11,000 civil servants, there are hundreds of non-accountable organisations exercising official functions, and the number of patronage appointments made by the Secretary of State for Scotland runs into thousands.

D4. The Westminster Parliament is so overloaded with work that Scottish affairs are either ignored completely or are given wholly inadequate attention. Scottish questions are handled only once a month in the House of Commons, and the Scottish committees there are completely incapable of keeping the Scottish state apparatus under adequate supervision, due both to distance and lack of time. The infrequent cosmetic sittings of the Scottish Select Committee in Edinburgh for harmless discussions with no powers of decision have not altered the situation in the slightest. Furthermore, the Scottish local authorities have been deprived of virtually their last genuine powers of decision, and reduced to administrative arms of the central authority.

D5. The Scottish political structure and voting patterns are so radically different from those of England that a separate legislature would be justified for this reason alone. The present system, under which the country is run by a Secretary of State with the

powers of a colonial governor-general, whose authority is based on a party majority in another country, who need pay no attention to the Scottish elected representatives, and who has no democratic mandate to administer the country against the wishes of the people, is the absolute negation of democracy and justice.

D6. The continuation of the present legislative structure represents a denial of the sovereign will of the Scottish people - which in itself is the only reason that need be advanced for recalling the Scottish Parliament.

The case for setting up the Scottish national legislature immediately is therefore incontrovertibly proven. There has existed a lengthy historical demand, which remains as strong today as it has for the past century or more. The political and administrative necessity becomes more obvious with every year that passes. The Scottish people have a clear and undeniable right to decide their own political status, which they have done in a form that leaves no further discretion open to the institutions of state. The prevarication that has nevertheless been demonstrated is therefore a clear and deliberate breach of the Constitution of our land.

There is no room for doubt that this situation represents a flagrant attack on the people's rights, and that the present position in Scotland, if not actually criminal, is nevertheless wholly unconstitutional. This throws into question every governmental action in Scotland since 1979, every piece of legislation, every appointment, and much more besides. Clearly, it is not a situation that should be allowed to continue.

Nowhere is it laid down that a legitimate and democratic decision by the people must be implemented exclusively by the government of the day and by no one else. And failing appropriate action by the Head of State, there is certainly no question of illegality attaching to a direct initiative by the people of Scotland to implement their own democratic decision to restore legislative facilities to their country.

It is, however, unquestionably the duty of the Head of State to defend the Constitution against a flagrant breach such as occurred in 1979 - a clear case of the usurpation and abuse of power through the manipulation of a managed Parliament which was firmly under the control of the Executive, and consequently of the power groups which stand behind the latter.

We put it to you that it is your plain duty, as the guardian of the Constitution on behalf of the people, to override the actions of the subordinate authorities, and enforce the will of the constitutionally supreme people by recalling the Scottish legislature forthwith.

The Government at Westminster have no further powers to act in this matter, other than to implement the will of their constitutional superior. And it is precisely because they have been guilty of dereliction of duty in this respect that this petition is being presented to you. For this reason, it would be improper in the extreme for you to follow the usual course of passing such a petition over to the Government of the day. We consider it to be your bounden duty to protect the rights of the people even against their own Government, in the event of such a patent abuse of political power.

We therefore call upon you as Head of State, as the guardian of the people's rights, and the protector of the Constitution of Scotland, to implement the clearly expressed will of the Scottish people in this matter. We put it to you that the obligations laid upon you by your office leave you with no option but to take action along the following lines:

E1. To issue an order implementing the provisions of the Scotland Act 1978, which the Scottish people and their elected representatives have adopted for implementation, by calling a general election in Scotland to elect the Scottish Assembly that was specified in that Act.

E2. To instruct the Westminster Government to implement the decision of their constitutional superiors by introducing as a matter of the utmost priority a Government of Scotland Bill setting up the national legislature and executive which the Scottish people have already decided are to be established, but with a more appropriate and comprehensive list of powers.

E3. To recall the Scottish Parliament, which has been in abeyance since 1707, although it has never been abolished. This could be accomplished by holding an initial election on the basis of the present parliamentary constituencies.

E4. To convene without delay a representative Scottish Constitutional Convention charged with the duty of drawing up a scheme of government for Scotland based on a directly elected legislature and executive in accordance with the clearly-expressed wishes of the Scottish people. This step would obviate the need for direct action along these lines by the Scottish people themselves.

The Scottish judges – erroneously, in our opinion – have already declined to deliver a judgement in this matter. If you, as the immediate superior of the Scottish judiciary, decide that you also have no power to act, then there clearly exists a power vacuum bordering on anarchy in respect of enforcing the observance of the Constitution and checking abuses of political power. In that case there are obviously no further steps that the Scottish people can take at the level of the British Union, and the way will then be open for them to initiate direct action to set up their national legislature under international supervision without further reference to London.

The Scotland-UN Committee will, in pursuance of its basic function, be forwarding copies of this petition to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, the institutions of the European Communities and other international organisations, as well as transcripts of your reply. Copies are also being made available to the media and public bodies. The Committee will also be informing all other state governments of the progress of the matter, since it concerns fundamental principles of democracy and human rights, the upholding of which is a matter that transcends international frontiers.

We confidently expect, however, that you will take urgent steps to right the wrong that has been done, and restore Scotland to a state of constitutional law and order with the least possible delay. Time is not on our side, for the practical extinction of local democracy within Scotland is only one symptom of how the authoritarian frontiers of

the state are presently being assiduously rolled forward. If we are not to lose all the hard-won democratic freedoms our forefathers gained for us at the cost of so much bloodshed, then a stand has to be made here and now against this cancer of absolutism in democratic camouflage. We, the people of Scotland, have made our choice, and we demand that it be implemented. For in the final analysis the only justification we require for assuming the powers of self-government is that we are the Scots - and Scotland is our land.

We respectfully submit this petition to you, and formally request that you take action to remedy the present state of the government of Scotland in accordance with the wishes of the Scottish people.

In the name of the Scotland-UN Committee,

John McGill,
Secretary,
66 Irvine Road
Kilmarnock. KA1 2JS
Tel. (0563) 28505
March 1986