

Happy New Year to all our distributors and readers

In the past the London government used the bayonet and the point of a gun to keep the Scottish people under their heel and to do their bidding. These days we Scots are not subjected to the same level of barbarity that our ancestors suffered but we are still kept under the hegemony of the British establishment by other means. These days they use slick propaganda to generate fear in the Scottish people. Media manipulation is the alternative to the militarism of the past, but it has achieved the same result with great success. It was Vladimir Lenin who said Freedom was a precious commodity that must be rationed, and governments the world over have agreed with him. The British government has always applied that mantra to Scotland to maintain their control over our land and seas and to diminish the very idea of Scottish nationalism and ridicule our culture.

This issue looks at the lies and false propaganda propagated by Westminster to spread fear and self doubt in the minds of Scots throughout the referendum campaign. They were desperate to hold onto Scotland, not because of any love for the Scots like they pretended, but because of what Scotland represents to the British economy. Westminster needs to control Scotland assets and the surplus they harvest from us every year. They lied before, and they will lie again. That is the only thing we can rely on from Westminster with regard to Scotland. Read on and see why.

It was all about the oil, or that's what Labour, Lib-Dems, Tories and our Media would want you to believe. During the Independence referendum the YES campaign and the SNP continually stated that Scotland's oil was not a burden, it was a bonus, only a bonus. However, the Better Together campaign continually brought oil into the debate and took pride in playing down the importance of it to the UK economy and what little help it would have on Scotland. We now know that oil plays a huge role in the UK economy and has for a long time now, why else would they have covered up the McCrone report in 1975, move the Scottish maritime border in 1997 claiming 7 oil fields for England, have Ian Woods contradict his own finding and lie to Scotland about remaining oil and hide the Clair Ridge oil discovery until after the referendum vote on September 18th last year. We know that Scotland's oil is used as security for the National debt and losing this resource would have interest payment soar above the current 2%, a rise to 4% would see the UK instantly Bankrupt. So yes Scotland's oil is important, but more so to Westminster, remember it would be just a bonus to an Independent Scotland.

In September 2014 the real price of oil per barrel was \$90.45, in December it was \$53.27 per barrel a drop of 42%. Now the unionist parties and the media are jumping all over this stating that an Independent Scotland reliant on oil would've seen a huge deficit in the budget as a result, forgetting to point out that Scotland would not have been an Independent country until March 2016. However, there is another side to this story one this writer believes coincides with the confirmation of Jim Murphy on 13 December. Oil prices started to fall in October 2014 when the US and Saudi governments started to artificially lower the price of oil in an attempt to squeeze the economy of Russia, in this futile attempt prices have continued to fall with no direct effect to the Russian economy worth speaking of. The UK press never covered the topic of the falling oil prices until the Monday following the election of Jim Murphy as leader of Labours Scotland Branch, why?

There has been a huge surge in support for the SNP following the Independence Referendum, rising by nearly 70,000 members to 93,000 at the last official announcement. The polls show that Labour Scotland is heading for near wipe out in Mays General Election with the SNP predicted to take 50 or more of the available 59 seats. Labour desperately need to attack the SNP and rubbish them in any way possible, so attacking oil is the way they have chosen, stating that had a YES victory been returned Scotland would be facing economic collapse based on the current oil price. Scotland would not be facing economic collapse as Scotland would not have been Independent until 2016 making this statement another blatant Labour Lie.

Scotland has a thriving economy and oil is but a small part of it, £17b Construction, £9b Tourism, £13b food & drink. £4.3b Whisky export industries to name a few, more than enough to make Scotland economically viable without oil. An Independent Scotland would rank 8th out of 34 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development member countries on GDP per head. All along the YES campaign and the SNP told Scotland the facts about our economy and that oil would be a bonus not a burden as Better Together claimed, this bonus would have been used to create an oil fund similar to Norway's who have amassed a £483b fund, enough to make every Norwegian a Kroner Millionaire.

So in conclusion, it is always wise to think why are these things being reported as they are, what is the truth behind the facts? Why did they hide the McCrone report, why did they appropriate Scottish Waters into England's, why did they get Ian Woods to lie and why wait until after Murphy was confirmed? Lies, fear and deceit all manufactured to keep Scotland in the dark and its peoples subservient to Westminster, that's why.

The furore surrounding an SNP candidate interview has made headlines; with Labour twisting facts to suit their own agenda. The scenario put to the candidate (Craig Murray) concerned one of the current austerity measures (bedroom tax); which he advised he wouldn't vote in favour of. Other candidates answered likewise on similar questions and passed, whilst unfortunately Craig did not. It is a matter for him now to be given the necessary feedback on why he did not progress through selection process. Judging by the (mis)information put out by Labour following on from Craig Murray's unsuccessful interview there is a clear attempt to misdirect any un-informed voters who may be tempted to vote SNP, since Labour rushed out a release to followers to 'spread the word' that the SNP must be preparing for a Tory coalition (a rather outlandish and quite frankly ridiculous claim). A conclusion jumped to because one of the questions put to one of the candidates in one of the interviews related to a Tory policy. This is all despite Craig Murray's subsequent clarification that the SNP interview question related to a hypothetical situation questioning if support would be given to a Labour government opting to keep the controversial policy in place; and at no time advocated an SNP/Tory pact. However (surprisingly enough) Labour were not so quick to issue anything out to clear up this misunderstanding.

Now you could perhaps argue that at this stage in the run-up to an election those who don't play their cards face up might be best able to play politics; however where the Tories are concerned the First Minister has already declared her intentions upfront to all. Nicola Sturgeon (herself a child of the Thatcher years) has ruled out only two things; the first being that SNP will never ever help the Tories into power. The second being that although they could work with Labour (on an issue by issue basis to pass laws for the benefit of Scotland) they could not extend support to extortionate sums of money being spent on the nuclear weapons programme (Trident; nor is it likely SNP would extend support to Scotland continually being used as the dumping ground for nuclear waste).

Meanwhile the Guardian reports a Tory / Labour unity coalition might be the only solution; something which Labour have yet to rule out. This may seem ridiculous; since the last time these two parties held joint office was back in the 1930s; however with public services spending levels currently also taking us back to the 30s, perhaps the Guardian have hit on something here. Could they be right in asserting that these (formerly) polar opposite parties now have more in common with each other than with outsider parties? How will this sit with their supporters? Whilst it could hardly be argued the Tories have become Labour, it seems the opposite is true. In their bid for the hearts, minds and most importantly the votes of Middle England, Labour have become just another brand of Tory. So as electioneering steps up the gears, and with big two seemingly having more in common than we are encouraged by them to believe: How will Scotland vote - More of the same please, or time to try something different?

As 2014 drew to a close the former First Minister Alex Salmond celebrated his 60th birthday on Hogmanay. Whether or not you share his Independence vision, it is difficult to dispute his passion for Scotland; and his bolshie exterior likely results (at least partially) from having to shout to have Scotland's voice heard. Whilst politicians change course frequently just to win votes, he remained true to his belief that the people of Scotland deserved a chance to vote on Independence; despite serious opposition from the main Westminster parties all along. He may not have won on the night, but by giving people a say he can take credit for not only politically energising Scotland, but also for securing just under 45% of the vote (an increase of 50% in support for Independence).

Salmond has since been criticised as a 'sower of discord' however it is unlikely the 1.6 million YES voters would agree that their opinion on the matter should not even have been asked. The truth is that there have pretty much always been divisions in Scotland. Historically battle lines would have been drawn up between Clans; whilst more recent disputes were more likely to be Sectarian in nature resulting from religion and / or football; and although some differences of opinion have now formed on Independence, it seems that the Sectarian divide has perhaps narrowed as a direct consequence. Some examples of this include: invitations from the Orange Order to the Catholic Church to attend marches; and the social networking of football fans on both sides of the 'Old Firm' divide unified in support of Independence.

Sectarianism hasn't gone away, but perhaps people have started to see it as it should be seen – an unnecessary barrier to civilised society. If political debates have started to edge out this blight this should be welcomed; and furthermore such debates are what we need to keep politicians on their toes. Surely most would prefer divisions based on how you would like to be governed rather than what colour of football top you wear on a Saturday?

The next edition of "Freedom of Information" is 21 Jan 2015

Access links to these articles on the FOI page at www.trueScotnews.net

If you would like future bulletins electronically please email us to at; FOInews@virginmedia.com