



Fraser Prize essay 2014

Is the Referendum question a theological question?

Margaret A. K. Whyte



Introduction

Growing up in the north of Scotland in the 1970s and 1980s where the speaking of the Gaelic language was not encouraged, where landscapes were dotted with ruined buildings as poignant reminders of the Highland clearances and political decisions affecting our lives were determined in faraway London, it was hard not to feel an underlying sense of injustice about Westminster rule in Scotland. Indeed, there has been a growing resurgence of Scottish national identity which until recently has been quiet, reserved and under the surface. More recently however, the voices of disquiet have become louder with the rise of the SNP and the consequent Referendum question of September 2014 which asks all those resident in Scotland above the age of 16, ‘Should Scotland be an independent country? Yes/No’.¹ It could be argued that there is a wound in Scottish identity yet to be healed after centuries of union. Asking the Referendum question may help Scotland to heal that loss of language, culture and independent nationhood that has occurred over the last three hundred years, and in the words of the unofficial Scottish national anthem “O Flower of Scotland”, give Scotland the opportunity to rise and be a nation again.²

However, now that Scotland is allowed to have a voice about its own future, there has been a great deal of rhetoric exchanged in the media between the nationalistic pro-Independence ‘Yes’ side and the Better Together pro-Union ‘No’ position. Yet, there is little being said regarding the theological implications of the Referendum question. There is perhaps an underlying consensus among Christians

in Scotland that the vote is a matter of personal conscience and not a question of how theology impacts the decision. The Church of Scotland has maintained a position of neutrality, whilst considering both sides of the equation at their May 2014 General Assembly.³ In addition, the Free Church of Scotland commissioned four papers on the possible implications and ramifications of the decision for their May 2014 Assembly.⁴ Indeed, perhaps the Referendum question does have significance for those who believe in Christian values and doctrines and should be carefully examined for theological components. This paper will explore some of the possible theological considerations in several areas such as: nationhood and biblical theology, social welfare and justice, the status of the church and belief in an independent Scotland and lastly, prayer and the Referendum. The conclusion will then examine whether the Scottish Referendum question is indeed a theological question.



Nationhood and biblical theology

The Referendum question could be considered a theological question since it encourages us to think about issues of nationhood – a biblical meta-narrative. Viewing the big picture of meta-narratives through the perspective of biblical theology synthesises biblical materials from both testaments in a canonical way and identifies overarching themes.⁵ One such theme or meta-narrative relevant to our study of the Referendum is the concept of nationhood and the *missio Dei*, the mission of God to the nations from Genesis to Revelation. At first glance, there does not appear to be a unifying concept of nationhood in both testaments. It seems like the Old Testament is largely concerned with the small, insular, inward looking nation of Israel whilst the New Testament is more global in outlook with mission, inclusion and universalism on the agenda.⁶ However, digging deeper and considering the testaments together there may be more unity to the meta-narrative than meets the eye. Thus, turning to the book of Genesis we find Adam was commissioned to fill the earth and this hints at expansion (Gen 1:28) and the inclusion of others in the kingdom of God.⁷ It could be argued that this applied to the ideal pre-Fall united world. After the Fall and the flood, however, mankind had proliferated yet became unified in

their defiance against God (Gen 10:5–32, 11:1). As a result of this united arrogance, judgement lay in their being scattered and divided, with disintegration into national separate identities over the whole earth (Gen 11:9) to follow. Thus, humanity was dispersed into nations, and the misunderstandings and conflicts that then resulted ‘mirrors the brokenness of humanity as a whole’.⁸ The relationship between nations was broken and in this context, Yahweh commissioned Abraham to be a blessing to the nations (Gen 12:1–3). The implicit Adamic hint at inclusion becomes more explicit with this Abrahamic covenant.⁹

There is, however, an ongoing tension between Israel’s role as a separate holy nation and its role as blessing the nations, over against the fact that the other nations were regarded in a negative light. On the one hand, Israel was meant to overthrow and cast out other nations (Exod 34:24). The nations were presented as in ‘opposition to the universal rule of God’ or, theologically, the ‘mass of humanity which is in rebellion to God’.¹⁰ Israel was to avoid contact with foreign nations except for warfare, and the pagan idolatry of other countries was an ongoing hazard for those in covenant with Yahweh (Deut 12:29–31 and 18:9–13).¹¹ Yet, despite this, Israel was ordained to be a nation of priests and intermediaries offering intercession on behalf of the nations (Exod 19:5–6) in their role as a treasured possession but still a ‘kingdom of priests’ for the other nations.¹² They were intended to be a witness to the other nations through their worship of Yahweh (Deut 4:5–8). They were also intended to treat non-Israelites in need of help justly – such as the resident alien who was given protection in the Mosaic legislation (Exod 22:21, Lev 19:33). On occasion, foreigners were incorporated into the people, with a ‘mixed multitude’ coming out of Egypt with Israel (Exod 12:38), the inclusion of the family of Rahab (Josh 6:25) and others into the kingdom of David (2 Sam 11:3, 15:19–23).¹³ In addition, there was also a vision of the ingathering of all nations (Isa 2:2–3, Mic 4:1–2), the eschatological hope that all nations would join Israel in the worship of Yahweh (Ps 22:27, Isa 56:6–7), and the salvation of all nations (Isa 45:22–23, Zech 2:11).¹⁴ It is clear that God has a concern for the nations beyond the borders of Israel.

The election of Israel, however, should not have been in conflict with their mission to the nations. They were a small nation, chosen in

love (Deut 7:6–9) for the purpose of drawing all nations to God (Isa 66:18–20). They were meant to shine as a light in the darkness and, centripetally, to attract the nations to Yahweh (Isa 60:3, Mic 7:12).¹⁵ Their worship and standards of social justice, however, did not shine as light or as a witness to the larger world and they became too insular (Ezek 20, 36). In exile, therefore, they were invited to consider a new way (Isa 43:19, 48:6), a new song (Ps 96:1) and a new covenant (Jer 31:31–34) which would extend to the ends of the earth (Isa 42:10). The New Testament further re-iterates the inclusion of all nations invited to join the kingdom of God through the Incarnation, the Great Commission (Matt 28:18–20) and the apostolic expansion (Acts 1:8) which culminates in the Book of Revelation with all nations united in worship of a holy God (Rev 6:9). The unifying meta-narrative of Old and New Testaments regarding the nations is, therefore, one that moves from the particular to the inclusive, not unity to separation.¹⁶

Reflecting on the insularity of Israel, it might be the case that if Scotland were to become more isolated and separate from England, there would be wider implications for gospel work, mission and evangelism. The biblical narrative seems to point to the removal of the barriers of race, nationality and culture for the purpose of expansion of the kingdom of God.¹⁷ However, there is an important distinction to be made between the political and the Christian community.¹⁸ Scottish departure from the Union is not about a withdrawal from the eschatological ingathering pointed to in the Psalms, Isaiah and Revelation. Equally, in terms of independence, being part of the Union is not being equated with being more part of the kingdom of God. However, the insular attitude of independence and the cultural arrogance of supremacy might well ring alarm bells for an outward-looking church.¹⁹ Like a divorce, there would be bad feeling between the separated countries and this could impact missional work. In addition, there is a suggestion that too much nationalism would be not helpful for the spread of the gospel among other nationalities. National identity, although valued by God, is of secondary importance to the unity of the people of God in their mission of spreading the gospel to the world (Rev 5:9–10).²⁰ The *missio Dei*, the message of salvation from God to the world transcends national boundaries.



Social welfare and justice

The Referendum question, in addition, could also be considered a theological question because it encourages the church in Scotland to think about social welfare from the holistic perspective of biblical theology. In Christian circles, even if individual Christians wished to speak out about the Referendum, there are not specific Bible verses that give direct and explicit guidance on the Scottish Referendum vote. Perhaps a ‘solemn silence’ on the topic could be considered the biblical point of view.²¹ However, there are biblical passages that speak about suffering and injustice. In the Old Testament, Israel had shut her ears to the suffering and injustice of those around them (Ezek 18:8, 12). Caring for the most vulnerable of society, including the foreigner, the fatherless and the widow, was essential to true religion and the role Yahweh intended for Israel (Ezek 22:7). Indeed, Jesus’ message of salvation was to the poor (Isa 61:1, Luke 4:18) and his disciples were commissioned to care for those in need (Matt 25:31–46, Luke 10:25–38, 16:19–31).²² The New Testament also reiterates the fact that true religion consists in caring for widows and orphans (James 1:27). Spirituality, as part of theology and religion, was intended by God to include social justice – consideration for the suffering, the poor, and the oppressed. True religion, then, considers the social welfare implications of political policy.

As Christians we may tend to think that finance and social welfare are not theological topics. Many people believe that politics and religion should not mix, that politics is for this world and religion for the next, with faith, theology and religion being largely outdated, irrelevant or even dangerous.²³ However, from a theological point of view, it is a false dichotomy to think that theology is only about spirituality and not the physical aspects of life. This perception is based on a Greek dualism which viewed spirituality as good and physicality as bad, and this has shaped our thinking on faith and theology today.²⁴ Instead, the perspective of biblical theology is one that believes the message of Christianity to be holistic, involving body, mind and spirit.²⁵ The gospel message is not simply spiritual, seeking transformation through a proclamation which leads to conversion and personal faith. Nor is it solely a social message that seeks to care for

the physical welfare of a person.²⁶ Instead, in a holistic theology the proclamation and demonstration of the gospel are more than simply alongside each other – they are integrated together, for ‘justice and justification by faith, worship and political action, the spiritual and the material, personal change and structural change belong together’.²⁷ So, as part of our Christian belief system it seems properly theological to consider political contexts and their impact on social welfare.

The Lausanne Covenant in 1974, in fact, made it acceptable and even compulsory for evangelicals to consider the social aspect of the gospel as part of their responsibility in Christian mission to the world.²⁸ It affirmed that ‘evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty’ adding that ‘faith without works is dead’.²⁹ Those who drew up the Covenant were not the first to advocate that involvement in social justice through politics was integral to Christian faith. In the fourth and fifth centuries the theologian Augustine of Hippo advocated a non-violent reform of political society in order to oppose injustice.³⁰ More recently, advocates of liberation theology such as the Peruvian priest Gustavo Gutierrez have sought to bring matters of poverty to the fore by questioning structures of oppression in twentieth-century South America.³¹ He believed it was the churches’ responsibility to give a message of liberation, both physically and spiritually in the context of the poverty and oppression of the favelas of Lima.³² Although liberation theology has been criticised for being more concerned with politics than salvation, it does make the important distinction that if a church is ‘apolitical’ then by doing nothing it gives support to the *status quo*.³³ By saying little about the implications for social justice of the Referendum, the church in Scotland may well be supporting the *status quo* and, possibly, social injustice in the nation.

Therefore, despite the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ camps paying little attention to such theological aspects they do highlight the financial implications and, thus, the pros and cons for welfare and social justice. So, this brings us to the question of whether Scotland is suffering and would be better off away from the Union. It is not a Third World country where there is mass poverty or vast political corruption that is detrimentally affecting the people. However, it is simply a fact the Glasgow is one of the most deprived cities in the UK with the lowest life expectancy in Britain.³⁴ The last few hundred years of Union have not treated

Glasgow well. There are also broader welfare needs in Scotland as a whole – such as an aging population, high suicide rates and the fall-out from recession. Yet, Alex Salmond states, ‘Scotland is one of the wealthiest countries in the world, more prosperous per head than the UK, France and Japan, but’, he continues, ‘we need the powers of independence to ensure that that wealth properly benefits everyone in our society’.³⁵ Perhaps an independent Scotland could address the social welfare needs of the country in a more focused way. On the other hand, however, if the cost of setting up independence runs into the billions it may be that this sum could be better used for social welfare, communities, education and the elderly in Scotland.³⁶ There is also the worry regarding the ability of an independent Scotland to provide for an increasingly aging population should oil revenues dry up. In addition, as both sides of the debate argue that Scotland will be better off, the actual asking of the question seems to imply that either way the people of Scotland will benefit.³⁷ The asking of the question also addresses the historical social injustices of the past, allowing the nation a voice about the three hundred years of rule from Westminster. Scotland at times does seem to have a wound in her national psyche since the Union of 1707. The right to vote on self-determination and express an opinion on this issue, whether the nation decides it is better together with rUK or as an independent nation, does seek to repair some of that perceived past hurt and injustice. Going forward then, the church should see the Referendum question as a type of healing of the past, at the same time as a calling-to-account of both sides to consider the implications for the most vulnerable in the future.



The church

The Referendum question could also be considered a theological question since the outcome of the Referendum may have far-reaching consequences for faith and ecclesiology in Scotland. The establishment principle in Scotland means that the church and state recognise each other as institutions under God’s authority and ‘owe each other due recognition, support and respect’.³⁸ This is based on the doctrine of the headship of Christ found in the New Testament (Eph 1:2 and Col 1:16–18) as well as in Chapter 23 of the Westminster Confession of

Faith, defended by Samuel Rutherford in the seventeenth century as a social covenant between church and state.³⁹ At the Union of 1707 the Presbyterian government of the Church of Scotland was recognised in the British constitution.⁴⁰ The establishment of the Church of Scotland was affirmed and later clarified in the Churches (Scotland) Act of 1905 and the Church of Scotland Act 1921.⁴¹ To this end then, establishment meant recognition with an element of support.⁴² In an independent Scotland there may be some ambiguity as to what would happen to the established church, since the spiritual independence of the Church of Scotland was guaranteed constitutionally at Westminster. The Church of Scotland may not necessarily be recognised as the established national church although the SNP has stated ‘we propose no change to the legal status of any religion or of Scotland’s churches’.⁴³ In the 650-page document issued by the Scottish government detailing proposals for an independent Scotland, moreover, there is minimal mention of anything other than the above proposal.⁴⁴ In the context of an inclusivist arrangement where all religions, or none, are valued, any priority given to Christianity or the national established church is conspicuous by its absence.

Secondly, there is already a move towards a multi-faith status in the Scottish Parliament. The Scottish Government is committed to neutrality in matters of religion and a ‘pluralist, open, and democratic society’ that protects ‘freedom of religion and freedom from discrimination’ in accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights.⁴⁵ While this may protect Christianity to some extent, there is no guarantee further down the line that legislation may not be put in place towards the institution of a more secular state. The proposal and draft constitutions do not refer to policies on secularism.⁴⁶ However, there has been a process of increasing secularisation of policies under the devolved Scottish government, which has led to the dilution of traditional Christian values. Examples include Sunday trading legislation, the stance on same-sex marriages, creationist teaching being discouraged in schools, and prayer prohibited in hospitals by chaplains.⁴⁷ This secularisation is also seen in practice if not policy, by the fact that the Scottish Parliament since its founding in 1999 has given no special place to Christian prayer and scriptural reflection. Instead, equality with other religions and any group that

wishes to contribute to ‘time for reflection’ is recognised.⁴⁸ There is also an argument, however, that the loss of the Church of Scotland as the established church may not unduly impact the spread of the gospel and the role of religion in the nation either since, in any case, the UK as a whole is moving towards secularisation. Some argue that the non-established and disestablished churches have been shown to be more effective in gospel-mission in Scotland, being less distracted by the differences between liberal and traditional groups that the established church has to contend with.⁴⁹ A ‘Yes’ vote, in fact, may well result in a more vibrant Scottish church in the face of the potential challenges ahead.⁵⁰

Thirdly, in the UK, religion and monarchy are closely linked and currently the state still abides by a Protestant Hanoverian model.⁵¹ The Act of Union in 1707 requires an oath by a new monarch to swear ‘to inviolably maintain the true Protestant religion and Presbyterian church government in Scotland’.⁵² Despite this Scottish Oath being part of Westminster UK legislation, in 1999 the Scottish Parliament passed a motion to ‘remove religious discrimination from the Act of Settlement and Succession to the Scottish throne’.⁵³ So, whilst the SNP intend to keep the monarchy, in an independent Scotland there would be a change in the relationship as there would be no established church.⁵⁴ In an independent Scotland it is quite possible that the monarch would not need to be Protestant. A reigning monarch could be also be non-Christian or of no faith at all. This could have wide reaching implications for the country. This year, the Queen re-iterated the importance of the links between church and state in Scotland as they currently stand, in a letter to this year’s General Assembly. She said, ‘We recognise that contained within the Articles Declaratory of the Church of Scotland, church and state hold mutual duties towards one another.’⁵⁵ Currently, with a monarch professing Christian faith, there is some recognition of Christian belief and the church in an era of increasing secularisation.



Prayer

Lastly, the Referendum is a theological question since the outcome of the vote should be a matter of prayer for all Christians in Scotland.

The Queen also said in her letter to the General Assembly this year, ‘In this important year of Referendum we pray that whatever the outcome, people of faith and people of goodwill will work together for the social good of Scotland.’⁵⁶ Prayer about the Referendum, is important. God is not just a transcendent absent deity, He is also immanent and interested in the day-to-day life of His people, the church and the nations. The issues of the nations are of a concern to God and should be brought before Him in prayer, to align the outcome with His will. The priestly function of the church is to intercede for those in authority over them (1 Tim 2:1–2).⁵⁷ John Ross, in his paper for the Free Church Assembly, points out that this verse refers to prayer that is to be made ‘*for* (n.b. not, *against*) kings and all who are in high positions’ giving thanks for the benefits of the services we enjoy and interceding for those experiencing the demands of public office.⁵⁸ Thus, as a church we should continue to pray for the Queen, for politicians in both Westminster and Holyrood, and for the people of Scotland as they vote.



Conclusion

It may not seem at first glance that the Referendum question is a theological question, with the majority of churches staying silent or maintaining a position of neutrality. However, firstly, within biblical theology there is a clear move from the particular to the universal. Separatism could be viewed as anti-biblical and anti-missional. Secondly, from the perspective of an holistic biblical theology, social justice is a theological issue. Indeed, the very asking of the Referendum question seeks to address and heal some of the historical social injustices from the past. Going forward it does look like the nation of Scotland will be more prosperous either way the vote goes, according to both sides. Consequently, from the perspective of social welfare provision, the poor and needy in Scotland may well be better off regardless of the outcome. Thirdly, as has been noted, there could be far-reaching consequences with regard to the status of the church should Scotland become independent. The Church of Scotland, challenged by concurrent issues of secularisation, multi-faith and diversity which marginalise Christianity, would no longer be protected

by Westminster. Conversely, the UK is becoming an increasingly secular nation, and it may make little difference to the status of belief in the long run if we remain in the Union. Fourthly, the Referendum question is a theological question as it is a matter of solemn prayer for all Christians, churches and denominations. God is concerned for all nations and this includes Scotland. My challenge to all those reading this paper, whether ‘Yes’, ‘No’ or indifferent, is to make this a matter of personal and corporate prayer. In the face of media rhetoric, let us consider the theological implications prayerfully. The Referendum is a theological question because we need to intercede for the nation of Scotland through prayer regarding the question, the vote, the answer and the implications that will arise after September 2014. Let us pray to God with the words of the psalmist, ‘Our times are in your hands’ (based on Ps 31:15).

Notes

- ¹ “Scotland’s Referendum”, The Scottish Government, accessed 21 May 2014, <http://www.scotreferendum.com/information/>
- ² Roy Williamson, “O Flower of Scotland”, accessed 21 May 2014, <http://www.flowerofscotland.org/>
- ³ “Church to Run Independence Debates Across Scotland”, Church of Scotland, accessed 3 June 2014, http://www.churchofscotland.org.uk/news_and_events/news/2014/general-assembly-to-debate-independence-referendum
- ⁴ “2014 General Assembly Reports”, Free Church of Scotland, accessed 3 June 2014, http://www.freechurch.org/index.php/scotland/news_events_item/2014_general_assembly_reports/
- ⁵ Charles H. H. Scobie, “Israel and the Nations: An Essay in Biblical Theology”, *Tyndale Bulletin* 43 (1992): 283f.
- ⁶ Scobie, “Israel and the Nations”, 284.
- ⁷ Jamie A. Grant, “A Biblical Theology of Nationhood: Some Light on the Scottish Independence Question”, *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 31 (2013): 117.

- ⁸ Christopher J. H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Nottingham: IVP, 2006), 454.
- ⁹ Grant, "A Biblical Theology of Nationhood", 117.
- ¹⁰ Graeme L. Goldsworthy, "The Great Indicative: An Aspect of a Biblical Theology of Mission", *Reformed Theological Review* 55 (1996): 5.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Grant, "A Biblical Theology of Nationhood", 118.
- ¹³ Scobie, "Israel and the Nations", 286f.
- ¹⁴ Ibid., 290f.
- ¹⁵ Ibid., 292; Wright, *The Mission of God*, 264.
- ¹⁶ Grant, "A Biblical Theology of Nationhood", 117.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., 120.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., 123.
- ¹⁹ Ibid., 123f.
- ²⁰ Ibid., 126.
- ²¹ Ibid., 115.
- ²² Brian E. Woolnough and Wonsuk Ma, *Holistic Mission: God's Plan for God's People* (Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2010), 1. The poor here are not solely the spiritually poor but physically poor also.
- ²³ Nigel W. Oakley, *Engaging Politics?: The Tensions of Christian Political Involvement* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2007), ix.
- ²⁴ Woolnough and Ma, *Holistic Mission*, 5.
- ²⁵ Ibid., 4.
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Ibid., 5.
- ²⁸ Ibid.
- ²⁹ Ibid.
- ³⁰ Oakley, *Engaging Politics*, 9.
- ³¹ Ibid., 20.
- ³² Ibid., 21.
- ³³ Ibid., 20.
- ³⁴ "Why is Glasgow the UK's Sickest City?", BBC News, accessed 14 June 2014, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-27309446>
- ³⁵ "Both Sides Claim Scots Will Be Thousands of Pounds Richer After Referendum", *The Telegraph*, accessed 14 June 2014, <http://www>.

- telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/10860791/Both-sides-claim-Scots-will-be-thousands-of-pounds-richer-after-referendum.html
- ³⁶ The Westminster Treasury have estimated that setting up independence in Scotland could cost £1.5 billion. In addition, independent cross-party analysis from the IfG and the LSE have calculated the cost of setting up one new policy department at £15 million. Therefore the cost of setting up the 180 or so policy departments required to run an independent Scotland could rise to £2.7 billion. Mr Salmond and the SNP dispute these findings. See “Scottish Independence Referendum: Cost of Setting Up Independent Scotland Could Be £1.5bn, Claims Treasury”, *The Independent*, accessed 19 July 2014, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/scottish-independence-referendum-cost-of-setting-up-independent-scotland-could-be-15bn-claims-treasury-9434222.html>
- ³⁷ “Both Sides Claim Scots Will Be Thousands of Pounds Richer After Referendum”.
- ³⁸ John S. Ross, “Church Establishment in an Independent Scotland”, accessed 3 June 2014, http://www.freechurch.org/2011uploadirectory/Independence_referendum_paper_one_-_John_Ross.pdf
- ³⁹ Ibid., 1f.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid., 3.
- ⁴¹ Ibid.
- ⁴² Ibid.
- ⁴³ “What Will Be the Position Of Churches and Religion in an Independent Scotland?”, The Scottish Government, accessed 3 June 2014, <http://www.scotreferendum.com/questions/what-will-be-the-position-of-churches-and-religion-in-an-independent-scotland/>
- ⁴⁴ Ross surveyed the 10-chapter, 650-page and 170,000-word, *Scotland’s Future: Your Guide to an Independent Scotland* (Edinburgh: The Scottish Government, 2013) and found the word ‘church’ occurring only five times, three being irrelevant to the discussion. Ross, “Church Establishment in an Independent Scotland”, 6, n. 19.
- ⁴⁵ Ross, “Church Establishment in an Independent Scotland”, 7.

- ⁴⁶ W. Elliot Bulmer, “Religion and State in a Scottish Constitution: Secularism, Pluralism and Neutrality” (2010), accessed 3 June 2014, <http://constitutionalcommission.org.blog/?p=185>
- ⁴⁷ Donald Macleod, “The Independence Referendum: The implications for Scotland’s established religion”, accessed 3 June 2014, http://www.freechurch.org/2011uploadirectory/Independence_referendum_paper_two_-_Donald_Macleod.pdf
- ⁴⁸ Gordon Matheson, “The Free Church of Scotland and the Referendum on Scottish Independence”, accessed 3 June 2014, http://www.freechurch.org/2011uploadirectory/Independence_referendum_paper_three_-_Gordon_Matheson.pdf
- ⁴⁹ Matheson, “The Free Church of Scotland and the Referendum on Independence”, 10.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ Bulmer, “Religion and State in a Scottish Constitution”.
- ⁵² Norman Bonney, *Monarchy, Religion and the State: Civil Religion in the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and the Commonwealth* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2013), 48.
- ⁵³ Ibid., 49.
- ⁵⁴ Bulmer, “Religion and State in a Scottish Constitution”.
- ⁵⁵ “Kirk Responds To Queen’s Call for People of Faith to Work Together After Independence Referendum”, *The Telegraph*, accessed 19 June 2014, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/scotland/10841388/Kirk-responds-to-Queens-call-for-people-of-faith-to-work-together-after-independence-referendum.html>
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Ross, “Church Establishment in an Independent Scotland”, 9.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.