THE THISTLE

A SCOTTISH PATRIOTIC MAGAZINE

VOLUME TWO

1910

Edinburgh

Printed by J. & J. Gray & Co., St James Place,
and Published on the First of every Month
by "The Thistle," 8 North Bridge

NOTE.—Where the same person or subject is referred to throughout an article, reference is given only to the page on which that person or subject is first mentioned in the article.

ERRATUM.

Page 61, Column 2, Line 14, for "BRITISH," *read* "ENGLISH."

INDEX

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 18. January 1910 Price 1d

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 18. JANUARY 1910. MONTHLY 1D.

TO OUR READERS

WITH this issue begins the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is 1d., post free 1½d.; outside British Isles, post free, 2d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 North Bridge Edinburgh.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 54

THE BUDGET AND THE MUTINY OF THE LORDS

EVERY true Scot must hail the present political crisis with the utmost satisfaction. It opens up to him a fair prospect in the not distant future of obtaining for his beloved country the inestimable privilege of self-government for purely Scottish affairs. The great obstacle to this reform in British legislation hitherto has been the House of Lords and the selfishness of the English Liberal party. It is possible to shame the latter into doing justice to Scotland, but to get the House of Lords to consent to a measure of "Home Rule All Round" has long been past praying for. And yet, if the Tory party could only take the hint from the reason given by English Liberal leaders for their refusal to give Home Rule to Scotland, viz., that if that were granted, then the Tories would be able to govern England, it would long ere this have tried "to dish the Liberals" by granting that which the Liberals so much feared

to give. But the stupidity of the Tories is proverbial. And consequently Scotland has long suffered, and for a time will still continue to suffer from the denial of legislation in many matters most essential to the comfort and well-being of her people.

But Tory stupidity has assumed a new phase. Its chief feature hitherto has been inertness, and an incapacity to see what it was necessary and prudent for it to concede to popular demands in the way of reform. Now it has become aggressive, and seeks to dictate to the British people, a policy which emanates, not from the House of Commons—the legislative chamber which has the people behind it—but from the House of Lords, which represents only the privileged classes. It has, by rejecting the Budget, made a bold bid for power; for the complete control of British policy. It is the old contest between the earthen pot and the iron one, and the Tory party has at last in its stupidity committed political suicide. Had the leaders of that party only a very limited knowledge of what shape democracy has taken in Australia, in New Zealand and in Canada, they never would have dared to provoke a contest which must end in their utter destruction. For that must be the end of the present struggle, so rashly begun by the thoughtless and selfish members of the House of Lords. Their veto, not merely in money matters, but in general politics, must now be utterly swept away, and that without compunction and without reservation. It may be said that this will be the establishment of government by a single chamber. Quite true; but we hold that this is an evil which must be faced. This is no time to begin, or to take in hand the policy of reconstructing a second chamber of legislation. If we enter upon such a question at the present crisis we shall be met with all sorts of obstacles and all kinds of propositions of reform, with the result that the popular feeling and enthusiasm for a radical change will be dissipated into an ineffective, misty, political atmosphere, so to speak, and we shall not get a clear and solid foundation on which to build a Liberal and permanent reform. The position taken up by Mr Asquith is the correct one, and no compromise should now be entered upon or allowed. When the reforms that have been mangled or rejected during the present Parliament have all been pushed through the next one, and have become law by hook or by crook; then, after that, but not before, the question of the best form of a second chamber may be entered upon and duly discussed and carried out. But not till then.

QUESTION OF THE MUTINY

For the position is briefly this. The Lords, as officers of the State, have mutinied, and have seized the Citadel—the Treasury—which has been held by the active army—the Commons—for three hundred years. They—the Lords—hoist their flag and say, "We will hold the Citadel in future against you until we are assured by the rank and file that you are their chosen leaders. The Commons reply, "We are the leaders

of the army of the Commonwealth —duly appointed. It is we who have the control of the Treasure chest, not you, and your action is a mutiny against the State. We will hold no discussion with you, but will appeal for conformation of our position. And when that is affirmed we will degrade you from your rank and from such power as you have hitherto been allowed to exercise, and we will take the field without you. In future, when we find it desirable to have an Army Council to help us in the discharge of our duty as representing the British nation, we shall take care that it is chosen on account of ability and of merit, not by the accident of birth or wealth.

This is the true Liberal reply to the action of the Lords. This is not the time for their reform, but for their dismissal from power as a mutinous and impossible member of the governing body of the State. When a revival of their function is desirable or necessary, the good sense of the British people will revive it in another and workable form. That is a task not beyond British intelligence and British common sense.

———o———

No. 55

DENIAL OF HOME RULE TO SCOTLAND AND WALES

"BOMBS" AND THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION

SECOND only to the Budget in importance at the present crisis is the question of "Home Rule All Round," and we regret to say that the position taken up by Mr Asquith, as representing the Cabinet toward this question, is most unsatisfactory and deeply to be regretted. Evidently the matter has been discussed by the Ministry, and the decision arrived at is that Home Rule is to be given to Ireland, but is to be denied to Scotland and to Wales. This is the old dirty and shameful policy, born of selfishness and national bigotry, which has been the policy of the English Liberals for the last thirty or forty years. Scotland and Wales are to be treated as a part of England, with the result that all their national peculiarities are to be levelled down to the English hum-drum standard, and their national interests are to be made subservient to those of England. And why are Scotland and Wales in this matter to be treated differently from Ireland? It certainly is not that these two nationalities are unfitted for self-government. On the contrary they are more fit for it than either England or Ireland. No. It is because of their complete fitness for self-government; because of their orderliness, their high intelligence, and their indisposition to resort to violence, that their claim for the management of their own national affairs is denied to them. They don't throw bombs, they don't shoot the officers of the law, they don't resort to bribery and corruption in their electoral and other business, and hence, according to the policy of the brutal English majority—Liberal and Tory alike—they must be denied the blessings of Home Rule, and be treated as tributary and conquered peoples. That is, and has been, the policy alike of the Radical Lord

Morley, and of the Tory Lord Salisbury, and their followers for the last thirty years. Ah well, that policy may be carried on too long, and if national and rational liberty is only to be gained by violent methods, even these may be possible to the Welsh and Scottish peoples if they are driven to extremity.

But what a disgraceful position for the English people to take up towards their fellow-citizens in Scotland and Wales. To the violence of Ireland they yield and say—you shall have what you demand, because we fear you and cannot do without your vote in Parliament. To the orderliness and law-abidingness of the Scots and the Welsh they refuse their desire for international justice, and say, you always vote "Liberal," and we can't do without your vote in Parliament; you are Liberals, and were it not for your vote the Tories would control English legislation. This is the selfish position taken up by the English Liberals. The Tories, on the other hand, refuse any concession to the Scots and the Welsh, partly from their innate conservative stupidity, partly from national bigotry and their determination to Anglicise Scotland and Wales. Their policy is to grant no concessions to the reasonable and just demands of the three countries—Scotland, Ireland and Wales—for the management of their own affairs, unless these demands are accompanied by continuous defiance of the law, and by social violence and social outrage. It was only by such action that in the "eighties" of last century the Highland crofters gained a very moderate measure of relief, and we need not elaborate the case of Ireland. Any concessions she has obtained in the way of amelioration of the lot of her oppressed people has been "by battle, murder and sudden death." That seems to be the only argument that can now obtain international justice from that Parliament in Westminster which is controlled by English votes.

The practical result, then, of this selfish action on the part of the English Liberals, and of the stupid and bigoted action of the English Tories, is that another policy—the policy of violence and of law-breaking—has now become the most potent factor in the working of the British constitution. The brutal English majority refuse to yield to international arguments on the part of the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales for a fair and reasonable amount of Home Rule, for power to manage and control their own purely Scottish, Irish and Welsh affairs; but when Highland crofters resort to deforcement and defiance of the law; and when Irishmen, infuriated by the brutal tyranny of centuries, resort to fire-raising, to cattle driving, to assassination and to murder, then the English "brutal majority" hears reason; then it discovers that English ways and English ideas are not exactly heaven-born, and that it is desirable to make concessions to outraged feeling and to the desperate sentiment of the peoples whom they have so long misgoverned. In other words, the "bomb" and the action of violence and of destruction which it represents, take the place of argu-

ment, of reason and of constitutional agitation in the very heart and core of the British Empire. Did not the Clerkenwell "bomb" outrage induce Mr Gladstone to take up the question of the wrongs of Ireland, and introduce and carry through Parliament land legislation, which has gone a long way to lessen disturbance and to create prosperity in that "distressful country"?

Do English people ever consider the disgrace and the infamy which they have brought on their good name, as a civilised people, by allowing the existence of this foul blot to spring up and to continue in the working of their much vaunted parliamentary system? Their apologists say that the evil is owing to the congestion of business at Westminster; that it is impossible to push the most necessary measures through the Commons and the Lords, owing to the many petty measures which have to be discussed and dealt with in some form or another. But who is to blame for this, but the English majority in Parliament? That majority has the power to pass measures of "Home Rule All Round," which would effectually put an end to congestion in the Imperial Parliament. But the House of Lords stands in the way, it is said. Have the English Liberals or the English Tories ever shown any disposition to make this question of the devolution of the international legislation of the United Kingdom—not of Ireland merely—the question of questions, as it undoubtedly is? No. As we have already pointed out, it has been denied by the stupidity of the English Tories, and trifled with and put aside by the selfishness and hypocrisy of the English Liberals. And now, the Liberal Premier comes before the country with the miserable, halting statement that the Ministry propose to give Home Rule to Ireland; but that the position of Scotland and Wales will be left untouched. For that is the inevitable deduction from Mr Asquith's utterance. This is not statesmanship. It is mere political patchwork; and, moreover, it is doomed to failure, as the Ministry will find out when they come to unfold their measure to the British people.

It is curious that while Anglo-British ministers are so blind to the necessities of constitutional reform in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, the ministers who control the policy of the Dominions of Canada and New Zealand, and of the Commonwealth of Australia, see clearly what should be done to give the British peoples a good working Constitution. When the Premier of Queensland was in Scotland about a year or more ago, he pointed out the necessity for the establishment of sub-national parliaments in the four nationalities of the United Kingdom. And at a later date, on the 27th of October last, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Prime Minister of Canada, concluded a brilliant speech to the Women's Canadian Club at Montreal with the following remarks:—

"God forbid that I should interfere in British politics. But it seems astonishing to me that Mr Gladstone did not act on the federated principle, which I believe would

be a remedy for the Irish question. The British Parliament is now overloaded with petty details; one day discussing the greatest of problems, and the next day roads and ditches, or a piece of bog in Ireland. Such petty details ought not to impede the action of the Imperial Parliament. Perhaps sometime or other the federated principle will be applied to Scotland, England, and Ireland in a new form of constitution for the British Empire."

These are weighty words, and wise ones, and embody a policy which would be advocated and endorsed, we venture to say, by every Premier who is at the head of affairs in the British self-governing states beyond the seas. It is a policy which would give peace and contentment to all the four peoples of the British Isles—a portion of English Jingoes and blustering "John Bullies" perhaps excepted. Why, then, is it not adopted by the present Ministry? Does Mr Asquith hold the opinion that the Scottish and Welsh peoples are less capable of managing purely Scottish and Welsh affairs than the English parliamentary majority? In Germany, Prussia does not interfere with the purely national affairs of Bavaria, of Saxony, of Baden-Baden, or indeed of any of the minor German states. Why, then, should the English majority in Parliament refuse the same power to Scotland and to Wales? The spirit of English liberty, of which we hear so many boasts, seems to have departed, and is now replaced by a spirit of "Bullyism" and of "Jingoism," which resents any interference with English predominance in Westminster. But when "a bomb bursts," and violence s resorted to, then this "Bullying" policy gives way. In other words, as we have already pointed out, violence and law-breaking have become an essential feature in the working of the British Constitution!

—o—

No. 56

A GRAND OLD HIGHLANDER

SIR ALLAN CAMERON OF ERRACHT

FEW districts in the Scottish Highlands—if indeed in Britain—are more famous in the annals of history, of romance, of poetry and of war, than far-famed Lochaber. To the Highlander it is as sacred, and is filled with as many endearing memories, as the vale of the Tweed is to the Scottish Borderer. Its situation is a happy one, and its inhabitants have long been famous for the strength of their character, alike in peace and in war. Of the clans that have had their home in this romantic region, the Camerons are perhaps the most eminent. Certainly, some of the chiefs of the name have acquired a renown that has shed great lustre on the Highland character. With the more famous of these chiefs it is not our purpose now to deal. We have to bring before our readers, one of the less known notabilities of the clan; but nevertheless one, who in these days of puling servility to royal arrogance, and royal injustice, deserves at least at our hands a meed of praise and of commendation for his manly vindication of Highland rights and Highland honour, when they were attempted to be overridden in the end of the eighteenth century, by an overbearing scion of the royal family.

The subject of this memoir, as our

title implies, is Sir Allan Cameron of Erracht, who died at Fulham, near London, in 1828. Sir William Napier, the distinguished military writer, and author of the War in the Spanish Peninsula, after the death of Sir Allan, paid the following eloquent tribute to his memory in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1828 :—

"Died at Fulham on the 9th ult., at an advanced age, General Sir Allan Cameron, Colonel, 79th Regiment. By birth a Highlander, in heart and soul a true one, in form and frame, the bold and manly mountaineer. His adventurous career in early life, and subsequent distinguished gallantry in the field, gave him considerable celebrity, together with the unbounded admiration of his countrymen. The son of a private gentleman, but ardent and determined in accomplishing whatever he undertook, he brought to the ranks of the British army more men, and in less time than any other, who, like himself, were commissioned to raise regiments in 1793-4. During the American War he had the misfortune of being taken prisoner, but from which he escaped after two years' confinement, by an act of desperate daring. Fate, however, brought him in the course of his life the rare distinction of being successively the commandant of the capitals of two countries—Denmark and Portugal, 1807-8. Although of late years he was not able to go among his friends, yet they were always, and to the last, found at his house, and around his hospitable table. The number of this man's acts of friendship to his countrymen cannot be estimated ; therefore, the blank his death has created will be better understood than described."

Such was the tribute paid to his memory by the gifted and eloquent author of the "Peninsular War," the most able and the most famous of British military historians. It will be seen from this that Sir Allan was not only a distinguished soldier, but that he was a man of great determination and of great force of character, and it is to one striking and remarkable incident in his life, in which his love for his Highland countrymen brought him into direct antagonism with the British monarch of the day, and against whom he gained a great moral victory, that we now wish to draw the attention of our readers. In these days when flabbiness of character seems to pervade all the upper stratum of society in Britain, and the ruling monarch is permitted to trample upon the constitutional position of Scotland, and at his own free will is allowed without a remonstrance to degrade her nobles — even in their own country—below those of England of equal rank, it is well to make public an instance of manly and successful opposition to such attempted abuses of regal power.

In the last decade of the 18th century, when the wars that followed in Europe from the great disturbance of the French Revolution taxed the resources of Britain to the uttermost, she was sorely pushed for men to fight her battles. At that time the Scottish Highlands was a great nursery of gallant men, and it was freely drawn upon to supply the ever-growing demands for the army. Highland chiefs and Scottish noblemen raised regiment after regiment for the service of the State, and nobly did they maintain the honour of Britain in every campaign in which they met her enemies. Allan Cameron of Erracht, the subject of this memoir, was by no means a great Highland chief; he was only a scion of the great clan

Cameron; but his experience as a soldier in the American Revolutionary War, and his great force of character, brought him to the front. "In 1793," writes Mackenzie in his "History of the Camerons" (from which we get the materials for this memoir), "the Government ordered commissions to be issued for the enrolment of twenty-two regiments for general service. . . . Now was the time for Allan to bestir himself. Applicants with influence and claims on the War Office were greatly in excess of the number required. The previous recommendation by Lord Cornwallis in his favour was found of advantage in support of his present application; for the Letter of Service granted in his favour was among the first of the batch gazetted on the 17th August 1793. Among the conditions of service there was to be no limitation as to time, and there was to be no levy money on engagement; but the men 'were not to be drafted into any other regiment.' This was the condition that Erracht took care to have embodied in his agreement with the Government. His reason for this was based on the ill-treatment that had been accorded by the War Office to many of the regiments that had previously been raised in the Highlands. The London officials, with that disregard for the national sentiment of the Scottish people generally, and of those of the Highlands in particular, for which they were then, as now, notorious, had been in the habit, when English or Irish regiments were short of men, either through the wastage of war or of disease, of drafting into their ranks whole companies from the Highland levies. These men thus found themselves mixed up with officers and men, who not only were ignorant of their language, but were in the habit of treating their habits and dress with ridicule, and their national sentiment with contumely and insult. Erracht was well aware of this, and he determined that the clansmen he got to join him for his Cameron regiment should not be subjected to such ignominious treatment. He was, probably owing to this care on his part as to their conditions of service, highly successful in his efforts to raise a regiment. In less than two months, 'from Lochaber, Appin, Mull and Morvern, 750 men were collected at Fort-William,' and this without any bounty on enlistment. Such was the origin of the famous 'Seventy-Ninth,' or Cameron Highlanders, one of the most renowned regiments in the British service. After embodiment, the regiment was ordered to the Low Countries, where in the disastrous campaigns of 1794-5, under the Duke of York, it greatly distinguished itself. Returning from the Continent, 'it was ordered for quarters to the Isle of Wight, where it remained till the month of July, when it received the route for India; and Colonel Cameron was again ordered to recruit the regiment to the extent of its losses in Flanders.'"

It was at this stage of his service that the manliness and Highland spirit of Erracht were put to the test, and was met by him in a way that has made his memory famous. "While Colonel Cameron," writes

Mackenzie, "was making the most laudable endeavours to complete his regiment to the required strength, he received private information that it was intended to draft one of the newly-raised corps to others at the time serving in India, to make up for deficient numbers, and that the measure was resorted to solely on the plea of economy. Rumour, moreover, gave it that the Camerons were those to be sacrificed. This report reached the Colonel . . . and it caused him much uneasiness." He sought an audience with the Duke of York, the Commander-in-Chief. At this interview, "Colonel Cameron plainly told the Duke, that to draft the Seventy-Ninth was more than his Royal father dare to do. The Duke then said, the King will certainly send the regiment to the West Indies." As at that time, the West Indies was a most unhealthy station for both the army and navy, whole regiments and ships' crews being often almost destroyed by fever, this intimation on the part of the Duke that the destination was not to be the East Indies, which was considered a desirable field of service, but the West Indies, was regarded by the Colonel as a threat of an unworthy kind, and was made because he had stood up for the rights of his regiment. No doubt it was so, and was basely intended as a punishment to the Colonel and his gallant regiment for his resistance to the dictates of the War Office. But the Colonel was equal to the occasion. His Highland blood was up at the unworthy treatment accorded to him by the Commander-in-Chief, and he is reported to have bluntly said to him:—"You may tell the King from me that he may send us to hell if he likes, and I'll gang at the heid o' them; but he *daurna draft us*." A noble and worthy reply to an unworthy exhibition of royal spleen and spite; and one which ought to give Sir Allan Cameron of Erracht, the father and Colonel of the gallant Seventy-Ninth Cameron Highlanders, a front place in the illustrious roll of Highland worthies. When we contrast his spirited conduct with the crawling servility of the Scottish nobles of the present day, who, without a murmur of protest, allowed our present vindictive monarch, Edward the Seventh and First, to place them by an unconstitutional Scale of Precedence, after and below in rank *in Scotland*, English nobles of the same degree, we can only say, what a miserable contrast. The gallant old Highlander was an honour to his country, and indeed, to humanity. Our Scottish nobles of the present day are, as a class, a servile crew who are a disgrace to the Scottish race, and are only fit for the position they have allowed themselves to fall into, viz.—that of flunkies to a low-minded and constitution-slighting monarch!

———o———

A CONSTITUTIONAL PARLIAMENT

ASSUMING that the votes at the ensuing General Election will be such as to restore a Liberal Government to power, the question of most importance to the British Empire is, "What will they do with it?"

The immediate rocks ahead demand careful steering, and the best minds among the Liberals of the North advocate a clear

and narrow issue as essential to success at the polls. This issue has been well expressed as follows :—

1. The reform of the House of Lords in its composition ; while recognising
2. Its right to a suspensive veto on legislation ; and
3. The rejection once and for ever of any claim on the part of the House of Lords to a veto on taxation.

If confined to these issues, Liberal policy would command support as large as it received at the last General Election. But Mr Asquith, in his speech on the 10th of December, added some issues which may divert support and endanger success.

1. Home Rule.

Mr Asquith proposes to confer on Ireland *alone* the right of Self-Government in its domestic affairs. This is the same rock on which Mr Gladstone wrecked his party.

2. "The absolute veto of the House of Lords must go. . . . The will of the people, as deliberately expressed by their elected representatives, must, within the lifetime of a Single Parliament, be made effective."

"We shall, therefore," said Mr Asquith, "demand authority from the electorate to translate the ancient and unwritten usage into an Act of Parliament, and to place upon the Statute Book the recognition, explicit and complete, of the settled doctrine of the Constitution, that it is beyond the province of the House of Lords to meddle in any way, to any degree or for any purpose, with our national finance."

If Mr Asquith shall put this last as the single question to be answered by the people at the General Election, we venture to say it will receive an answer so complete as to render this axiom of our unwritten Constitution much more fundamental and unassailable than any Act of Parliament.

The immense majority by which the House of Lords rejected the Budget would stand convicted by the great assize of the nation of having deliberately attempted to abrogate the unwritten Constitution of the Realm.

Such an attempt on the part of the great majority of the Lords deserves condign punishment. Lord Courtney, a recognised authority on Constitutional law and practice, has pointed out that, if the House of Lords is to disregard the Constitutional usage by which the whole powers of taxation have long been exercised, exclusively by the House of Commons, the King, acting on the advice of his Government, could resort to the simple expedient of issuing Writs of Summons only to those Peers who are prepared to recognise the Constitutional powers of the House of Commons. By such a change of Royal usage—not less constitutional than the change made by the Lords—the continuity and powers of the Upper House would be preserved, and its composition alone would be altered, only such members of the Peerage being summoned to the House of Lords as are qualified by their personal character and ability, and the previous fulfilment of their duties to Parliament to form a working Upper Chamber. The Peers not summoned would not be thereby deprived of their qualification as such to take their seats at some future period if selected by Writs of Summons from the Crown to sit in the House of Lords. Their position may be illustrated by that of Elders in the Church of Scotland, who are qualified by their Eldership to sit in the General Assembly of the Church, but can only, when chosen as Ruling elders, represent the Laity in the highest Church Court.

Lord Rosebery, than whom no Peer is better qualified to form an opinion as to the number of his Brother Peers fitted to discharge their duties in the Legislature, has estimated the number of Peers thus fitted by character and ability to discharge legislative duties at about 150. It would, of course, be competent to the King, on the advice of his Government for the time, to create Life Peerages in the persons of others who are not hereditary Peers, but, if summoned to the Upper House, would add greatly to its weight as a revising chamber. An opportunity would thus be afforded for initiating a representation from the British Colonies in the Upper House of the Imperial Parliament. By taking seats there such Colonial Representatives need not be

afraid of giving rise to the idea that a pretext would be afforded for subjecting the Colonies to taxation by the Imperial Parliament—taxation being the exclusive province of the House of Commons. But the presence of Colonial Representatives in the House of Lords would be the beginning of a Parliament truly Imperial. Such representation has long been a *desideratum* in our Colonies. In the discussion of the question of Imperial Federation, the following opinion was expressed by the late Sir C. Gavan Duffy in an article in the *Contemporary Review* in January 1888, entitled *An Australian Example:—*

"A conference at the Colonial Office has done Colonists the honour of attempting to wheedle them into accepting the responsibility of Empire without any corresponding authority—to make them partners in wars over which they could exercise no more control than over the tides of the Pacific—but any just and adequate recognition of the greatest possessions of the Crown has still to begin."

It seems probable that, ere long, under such a system, many members eligible to sit in the House of Lords as hereditary Peers would gladly surrender their hereditary right in exchange for eligibility to sit, if elected, in the House of Commons, and they might gradually be superseded by Life Peers. The prevailing view in these times is well expressed by Lamartine. *Raphael*, in his pamphlet, "*What place can the nobility occupy in France under a Constitutional Government?*" "was for the suppression of all privileges of nobility save the memory of nations, which cannot be suppressed; and proposed an elective peerage, showing that, in a free country, there could be no other nobility than that of election, which is a perpetual stimulus to public duty, and a temporary reward of the merit or virtues of its citizens."

If Mr Asquith shall persevere in his proposal to give HOME RULE to Ireland alone, it may endanger the success of the Liberal party at the polls, and even if successful there, he would probably burn his fingers, as Mr Gladstone did, over what is called Constitution-making. Mr Gladstone, during his Home Rule campaign, tried each of the three ways by which alone it might have been possible to accomplish the last great object of his political life by giving Home Rule to Ireland alone:—

(1) To exclude Irish representatives from the Imperial Parliament.
(2) To allow them to attend during the transaction of purely Imperial business —the in-and-out plan; or
(3) To admit them for all purposes—*omnes omnia*, as it was called.

Mr Asquith, if he repeats the experiment in which his great predecessor failed, can hardly hope to succeed. But Mr Asquith will have a grand opportunity of initiating the required Constitutional reform in the next Parliament by simply submitting to the House of Commons a resolution, which neither party could consistently oppose, to the effect that, in consequence of the long acknowledged inability of Parliament to legislate for the domestic affairs of the four divisions of the United Kingdom, it has become necessary to delegate to a subordinate legislative body in each of these divisions legislative and administrative powers for affairs exclusively its own. When the powers proposed to be delegated are specified in such a Resolution, it will devolve on a Constitutional Committee, to be formed, outside Parliament, in each division, to consider how, where and by whom the powers of legislation and administration to be delegated should be exercised in the four divisions of the United Kingdom.

The Reports of these Committees when submitted to the Parliament then following could receive legislative effect so far as approved of. This has been the course followed in Canada and the other Colonies on which responsible Home Government has been conferred with so much advantage to themselves and the Mother Country.

Mr Asquith said in the course of his great speech that at this moment he did not commit himself or his audience to any precise details of machinery or method, and the foregoing suggestions are respectfully submitted for his consideration, with a sincere desire for his triumphant success in the ensuing Election, and, above all, for the welfare of Scotland.

W. MITCHELL.

HOW ENGLISH PARTIES TREAT SCOTLAND

By CHARLES WADDIE

(Hon. Secretary Scottish Home Rule Association).

HAVING been asked to support the Liberal party at the General Election of January 1910, I declined to give them any support, either financial or otherwise. As such a resolve on the part of a life-long Liberal is exceptional, I may be pardoned for giving my reasons for acting as I do. I have been more or less connected with politics for over fifty years; during that long time Scotland has supported the Liberal party by substantial majorities of her members. What has she got for this unselfish devotion?—Neglect of her business, spoilation, and insult! Praise has been lavished upon her for her steadfastness to the Liberal party, and promises of all good things for her—on the eve of a General Election — promises which have never been fulfilled. Such conduct fills the mind of every generous Scot with indignation and disgust. As far back as 1871 Mr Gladstone admitted that the Westminster Parliament could not attend to Scotland, and that she had just cause of complaint. Though for a quarter of a century after that declaration he was the most powerful statesman in the land, he never lifted his little finger to remedy the ills that Scotland suffered from; yet during that period he was full of fulsome flattery of the Scottish people. In 1886, when Home Rule reached the stage of practical politics, he refused to listen to the claims of Scotland, but entered into a conspiracy with John Morley to degrade Scotland into the northern province of England, because the English Liberal party could not afford to lose "the noble Liberalism" of Scotland! These are the men who wish to print the word "England" on the map from the Pentland Firth to Land's End. The present title assumed by the King goes a long way towards the consummation of that wish. This conspiracy against the honour and rights of the Scottish people was defeated by the determined resistance of the Scottish Home Rule Association, but we can never forget that it was the action of the House of Lords that saved Scotland from such an infamous plot. It was an Edward I. (the Hammer of Scotland) who made the first attack upon the national life of our country; since then English statesmen have never faltered in their attempt to extinguish our existence as a nation. Will the Ministers of an Edward VII. and I. be permitted to consummate a political crime of the first magnitude? The latest utterance of the Prime Minister was Home Rule for Ireland, but the claim of Scotland to an equal measure of justice was brushed aside with hardly-veiled contempt.

The little band of patriots who formed the Scottish Home Rule Association have had to fight both parties, and I, as their Secretary and mouthpiece, have come in for abuse and detraction. Stories have been spread abroad about me which, if true, would have shut me out from all decent political parties.

These were not understrappers who did this, but men in high positions, such as the Marquis of Hartington, Lord Randolph Churchill, the present Duke of Argyll, and Mr Bryce, now Ambassador to the United States. While these poured their venom on my devoted head, not a single word of sympathy, not a sixpence of money was given to the Association whose only offence was that they stood up for the national rights and honour of Scotland against the selfish interest of the English Liberal party.

Such is the past history of the Liberal party up to the advent of the present Parliament. They went back to power stronger than they had ever been before: every pledge of honour cried out, "Home Rule All Round," by which Scotland would have been delivered from her dependence on the ignorant whims of Englishmen. But because some English Liberals would not accept office if Home Rule was to be discussed in this Parliament, a Government headed by Scotsmen basely gave way to such an unreasonable demand. But it may well be asked why do the Scottish members submit to such treatment. I can only account for it by saying that for the most part they are a poor-witted, selfish crew, who only go to Parliament for their own glorification, and the hope of a few spoils of office. Some are knighted, and get posts with good pay and little work. For over thirty years efforts have been made to form them into a National party like the Irish, but they have always resisted such attempts. The late Dr Hunter, member for Aberdeen, one of Scotland's true patriots, told me he had been often asked by English members how it came about that an intelligent, well-educated country like Scotland sent up such a poor, spiritless crew to represent them. He could not answer the question, but I could. The reason was that the best Scots would not go to Westminster to see their country slighted and her business neglected, and the few who were of superior merit were soon corrupted by the spoils of office, and became practically Englishmen. The common herd imitated Sir Pertinax M'Sycophant, and bowed to the great Englishman, and got a sop by getting their wives called My Lady, and an entrance to the Snobs' paradise, London society.

It cannot be said that the present Government tries to conciliate Scotland by lighter taxation. On the contrary, she has most cause to complain of the iniquity of the present Budget. They have dealt a crushing blow to one of Scotland's greatest industries, while touching a kindred enterprise in England with the tips of their fingers. They think they are sure of Scotland, but must gang warily with England. Enough, I am heart sick to write thus about a party I have supported all my life.

When I turn to the Tory party, their present *alias* is Unionist; a dishonest title, for we are all Unionists in the proper sense of the word. I can only find this small comfort, that they are an open foe, not a hypocritical friend, and it is easier to combat the former than circum-

vent the latter. They are not often in power in Scotland, but when they are they take care to feather the nests of their friends; so that it comes about that the Courts for the most part are manned by Tories; surely a crying grievance in a Liberal country. This stupid party is going back to protection. Of course they use an *alias*; they are fond of them; it is Tariff Reform by which they hope to entrap the unwary. As there are few now who remember the good old times of protection, I may be permitted to recall some of the events that then happened. The unemployed then in proportion to the population was far greater than it is now; the hours of labour were greater; the pay was less than half what it is now. For example, a printer got 15s. a week; a tailor's cutter 21s. a week, and the food was not cheaper, but dearer. The four pound loaf was 10d., sugar 9d. per lb., tea 5s. per lb. When I look back upon these times I wonder how the people lived at all. Free Trade has changed all that. The artizan lives now as well as the upper middle class did in the so-called good times. The middle class now live as well as the nobility did in these good old times. All this is due to the blessing of Free Trade.

What, then, must be the feelings of a man like me, holding these views, when he sees the contention of parties in the State. The one party would degrade my country into a province of England; the other would bring ruin upon the whole British Empire by their idiotic Tariff Reform. I can only stand sorrowfully aside and pray that neither party may win a decisive victory, but that common sense and justice may be heard in the councils of the nation, and that Scotland may once more hold up her head as a free, independent nation, with an honourable alliance with England for all Imperial purposes.

The question the Scottish elector has to decide is, will he compel the members to form a National party by which his country can be alone safeguarded, or allow them to drift into the arms of the English Liberals or Tories as they have done in the past to the ruin of Scotland as a nation? As it is a matter of no moment to which side of politics a candidate for a Scottish seat belongs, as the one issue of paramount importance is the restoration of the Scottish Parliament, the voter can support either, provided he gets the candidate to accept the following pledge:—

"If returned as the member of this constituency, will you join a Scottish National party and obey an elected leader in demanding Home Rule for Scotland, and resist all other temporary measures that would impede the granting of that supreme need of our country."

———o———

NATIONAL MELODIES

"LET me make the ballads of the people, and let who will make their laws." This famous saying of Fletcher of Saltoun has perennial value in it, and was never more needed than at present. We hope the Budget, Small Holdings and other Scottish Rights will be won for the people, but all these great

principles would be of little value, apart from a wave of national sentiment, and the recognition of the life that underlies them all. We confess to a belief that all is not well just now with that life of the people. What would be the feelings of Burns and Scott if they could rise at Dumfries and Dryburgh and hear Harry Lauder? We can fancy how John Wilson and David Kennedy would feel if they saw "Ma Daisy," and "Ma ain Blue Bell," displace the genuine products of the Scottish Muse. We do not decry Harry. He spoils the Egyptians. The London press acclaims him as "the brainiest comedian of the day." In America he eclipses the gaiety of nations. If he does attract the English with his kilt and hurdies, he does no more than Mr J. M. Barrie is doing, who has amassed a fortune by the vulgarisation of his mother, and holding up his country to the jeers of the Cockney. It is precisely the same thing as Lockhart says Smollett had done for Scotland till Burns arose. Lauder is excellent, we fancy, in the Gorbals and Saltmarket, and can do no harm if he is kept there.

But there is a miserable section of the public that sets its head on the very latest Music-Hall song, in its uneasy affectation of being really knowing and up-to-date. Thirty years ago the best of the national melodies could be heard in the streets, but have well-nigh vanished from them to-day. (We are inclined to withdraw this remark, for at this very moment a man has started playing on a penny whistle, in the street, the "Crookit Bawbee," and Balfe's "Killarney.") Yet it is too true that the English Music Hall is leaving the trail of the serpent over all our national life. It has killed the Theatre—no great loss—and now threatens to demoralise the people. If the Scots, Welsh and Irish were wise, they would shut them all as the great corrupters of the genuine spirit of the race. What would Fletcher of Saltoun say of the ballads now sung in the streets of the British Empire, and what Imperial strength can be won from the happily dead and forgotten vulgarity, "The Absent-Minded Beggar," the Banjo-Laureate of "England's" typical strain?

The national melodies, like the national psalmody, are a priceless inheritance of the people, and should be jealously guarded. Plato and Aristotle devised pains and penalties for such as altered the tone of old Greek music. No doubt one of the real causes why Scottish Song is so rarely heard in drawing-rooms is not because it is national or Scottish, but because it requires for its interpretation brains and a voice, a rare combination in such places. "I am fairly scunnert, Mr North," declares the Ettrick Shepherd in the "Noctes," "wi' the young weemin in the present day. The hizzies cannot sing worth a bawbee. It is an outrage on language, sirs, to ca' it singing. It is mair like a lot o' new-born rottans squeakin' at the bottom o' a bowie." There is much in this. Look at the expression of utter boredom on people condemned to listen to and through politeness to applaud such rubbish as "The Gauntlet's Down," and "Juanita."

Another cause is the embargo, placed by half-educated Inspectors of Schools. Patriotic attempts have been made in Glasgow, at least, but the Inspectorate in their frenzied gentility have blocked the idea, being possessed by the importance of Wee Macgregor acquiring a pure English "awksint," and replacing the husky tones of the West with the genuine Board School culture. Everywhere national life is being crushed out, degraded to the lowest common denominator of colourless uniformity. The car of provincial English Juggernaut rolls over it all.

Listen to the English Ballad, such as Fletcher would hear it to-day! It is the true air of the made-in-Germany "Jute and Angle, lumbering about in a complacent state of pot-bellied equanimity," as Carlyle says, or awakening to a panic about the Army and Navy. They sang something like it on the night of Hastings and Bannockburn, when they were soundly thrashed next day by the Norman and Scot. Had that greatest fool in Scottish History but kept his ground at Flodden, the English, who were cursing the weather and the want of beer in camp would have been annihilated. Listen, we say, to the English true national air!

"Beer, beer, glorious beer,
Fill yourself right up to here;
Drink till you're made of it, don't be afraid of it,
Stick to your old fashioned beer."

This is the song that decides elections, the voice of Bermondsey and other seats of English refinement and learning. Such is the spirit that, together with accursed football mobs and weedy sporting papers, is degrading Scotland at present. Wherever they go, these English seem fated to lower the life of the Empire. They corrupt India, and call it following the flag. Having no national airs of their own, they wreck Imperial Colonial sentiment by jingo trash about "Soldiers of the Queen," and "An Englishman's Home." We take up a well-known school book. "In 1282," it gravely says, "Edward I. invaded Wales. The Welsh were defeated, their prince was slain, and his title, 'Prince of Wales,' given to Edward's eldest son. Since then England and Wales have been regarded as one country." Ask a Welshman. What can he think of this glorification of the burglar and the murderer?

They will talk of Daniel Webster's words about the power whose "morning drum beat, following the Sun, or keeping company with the hours, encircles the globe with one continuous strain of the martial airs of England." But it was a Scot that wrote "Rule Britannia." We see Mr Carnegie is awakening to the value of Scottish Song, and surely Gilfillan of "the lang grey toun" of Dunfermline, and Pringle of Roxburgh, in two songs have done more more for the Empire than all the Kiplings, Milners and Chamberlains.

Lately, we heard a man sing in the streets with an English accent:—

I am thinking to-night of my mother,
And the days that are gone long ago;
My grief for her I can't smother
In the fields where the wild-poppies blow.

This in Scotland! Could he have been an escaped lunatic?

WM. KEITH LEASK.

ENGLISH HISTORY BOOKS

IN *The Westminister Gazette* of 11th October 1909, Mr Wm. Clayton writes to "call attention to a fact lost sight of, also which militates against the establishment of a sound friendly understanding with the United States of America. I beg to offer," he writes, "a few remarks on American School History Books' hostility to England. This seems all the stranger," he continues, "when it is considered that out of thirty-eight text books on history used in British Schools, all but two or three are practically written in sympathy with America in the War of the Revolution. * * * It is to be hoped that the 'distinguished educationists' who are hard at work reforming these American text books will succeed completely in their great work." Very good, Mr Clayton; but what about the character of the history books used not only in English schools, but in England generally, as regards Scotland? These are not only full of historical mis-statements and blunders regarding the position of Scotland in the United Kingdom and the Empire; but they are, many of them, grossly offensive to the national feeling of the Scottish people. On this subject a letter signed "Drumclog" lately appeared in the *Evening Times* of Glasgow, pointing out the blunders in "A Short History of England," by Cyril Ransome, M.A., Oxford, and published, we regret to say, by Longmans, Green & Co., a firm that ought to know better than give its imprimatur to such a work. "Scotland in this work," writes "Drumclog," "is treated with the greatest contempt." It is nowhere recognised as a separate independent kingdom, and apparently has no part in the founding of the British empire. William Wallace gets eighteen lines. * * * John Knox gets three lines; and these only contain insult and contumely. On page 99, a paragraph headed "Attempt to Annex Wales and Scotland," reads, "Edward cannot be accused in either case of entering upon a war of wanton aggression." This is utterly false, both as Scottish and English history. Then further, on page 103, the author says, "meanwhile things had gone wrong in Scotland. A gentleman named William Wallace had murdered an Englishman." And so on. This book it would appear is used as a history book by the Cambusnethan School Board in Lanarkshire; and no doubt is used very largely in England. What a pass we have come to in these matters! And this is the age of empire-building, we are told. The British Empire cannot be built on historic lies, and on historic insults by the English people to the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish. A large portion of the English seem to think so; but some day they will have a rude awakening. Let the English do as the Americans are doing, and set about a re-writing and a re-modelling of their history books, and have them freed from the historical lies of which they are full, and of the slights and insults to the national sentiment of the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales, which are weaved through their whole texture.

There are few duties lying in the public path of the English people more incumbent than this one ; and yet not an Englishman raises his voice or uses his pen in its favour. It would seem that there is no nation more given up to self-glorification than the English. To gratify this foolish vanity, they treat truth as if it were a worthless trifle, and fairplay as a quality that need not be observed, if it conflicts with their national self-esteem. No wonder that on the Continent they are hated as a people.

———o———

CORRESPONDENCE

MENTEITH (STEWART OF RUSKIE) THE BETRAYER OF WALLACE

SIR, I thought it very strange to read in the November *Thistle* a correspondent, "Fess Checky," doubting the betrayer of Wallace. It was quite a surprise to me, more so when he says Sir John Menteith was too great a man and patriotic for such a transaction. I think his greatness consisted in being a great scoundrel, an arch-traitor of the deepest dye. He was a disgrace to the lowest type of humanity. No true Scotsman can see or hear his vile name except with a convulsive shudder. I will give a few proofs of the monster who betrayed the best, the greatest hero who ever lived. The first account we have of Wallace's betrayal was written in 1320, fifteen years after the event, an extract translated from the original in the Arundell MS. in the British Museum. William Wallace was captured in the house of a certain Rawe Raa by the Lord John de Menteith, and taken to London by the Lord John de Segrave, etc.

From the Chapter House Documents we get a list of the blood money received by this despicable wretch, Menteith, from the English King. There was land valued at £100. In June 1306 he got the Earldom of Lennox revenues, and the temporalities of the bishopric of Glasgow in Dumbartonshire — a very large sum in those days. From the King the attendant who watched Wallace got forty marks, and to others who were at the capture, sixty marks were to be divided amongst them. From Wyntown's Cronykil we have :—

> "Schyre Jhon of Menteth in tha days
> Tuk in Glasgu Willame Walays."

I consider M'Kerlie to be one of the most learned and accurate writers of Scottish history, and he says Wallace was betrayed at Robroyston, near Glasgow, on the night of the 5th of August 1305. Wallace was captured, and Kerlie slain. This infamous deed was carried out by Sir John Stewart of Ruskie, second son of the Earl of Menteith.

It is recorded that for generations when a Menteith was out dining it was customary for their knife and fork to be turned with their points outward.—I am, etc.,

ALEX. LAIDLAW.

A REPLY TO MISS MACKINNON. —A colonist writing to us from Waverley, New Zealand, takes exception to Miss MacKinnon's statement that the Episcopal Church is the Church of Scotland, and that

Presbyterianism is a man-made sect. "No, it is not," he says. "It was not made by man, but by the man Christ Jesus himself," etc. With this statement we close this controversy, as these pages are not meant for the discussion of religious questions.

———o———

A FAITHFUL COLLIE.—The collie is so essentially a Scots dog, that any striking incident connected with it must be of interest to our readers. We therefore publish the following from *The Melbourne Argus* (Australia) of the 26th October last :—

A RIDDELL'S CREEK DOG

A friend at Riddell's Creek mentions an interesting incident :—Mr David Carter, of Riddell, had occasion to drive a mob of sheep to beyond Lilydale a short time ago, and had, with other dogs, a collie about twelve months old. When passing near Tullamarine some luggage dropped from the waggon, unnoticed by all except the young collie ; and as he evidently could not attract attention, the dog thought it his duty to stay and guard it, which he faithfully did for no less than eight days. Mr Carter missed neither the dog nor the baggage until late in the evening, and concluded hat the former had got poisoned, and, as the baggage was of little value, he went on his journey.

The day after a six-year-old son of Mr Frederick Wright, blacksmith of Tullamarine, on going to school, noticed the dog, but it would not by any means leave the package. So the boy, very kindly and thoughtfully, brought it daily a supply of food. On the eighth day Mr Carter returned, and was surprised to find his dog and the belongings safe. Upon inquiry he found out who was the dog's benefactor, and rewarded Master Wright with the gift of a nice pet lamb which is certain to be well cared for.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 19. February 1910 Price 1d

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 19. FEBRUARY 1910. MONTHLY 1D.

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 57

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE CAREER OF BRUCE

THE fight for the independence of Scotland, which the traitorous jealousy of the great Scottish nobles had compelled Wallace to relinquish as a leader, was after his death taken up by Robert Bruce, son of one of the competitors for the Crown. Much has been written about the reasons why Bruce entered into the great struggle against the apparently overwhelming power of Edward, and it has been said by more than one writer, Scots as well as English, that he was not a Scottish patriot, but acted solely from ambitious motives. That is not our view of the character of Bruce; but it is not here that we will enter upon a discussion of Bruce's patriotism, or Bruce's merely selfish ambition. Suffice it to say, that if it was merely selfishness that stirred him to enter the field against Edward, a more hopeless task hardly ever confronted an ambitious man. His following in Scotland was practically valueless, for though he might be

able to call upon the support of his own feudal followers, these were more than counterbalanced by the followers whom Comyn and his friends could summon to their side as competitors for the Crown against the claim of Bruce. The support of the Scottish Commons Bruce could not at first look for or expect, for in the campaigns of Wallace against the power of Edward, Bruce had been not with the patriots, but with the brutal invaders. A more hopeless opening, then, for a fight for Scottish independence than that initiated by Bruce when he stole away from the English Court and began hostilities by slaying Comyn in the church at Dumfries, it is hardly possible to conceive. Yet the apparently desperate venture was, after about eight years of a struggle, crowded with romantic incidents almost unparalleled in history, crowned with complete success; and Scotland emerged from the gigantic contest with England free, and crowned with glory for desperate and sustained bravery that has made her name illustrious in the history of the world.

Rallying round him his own vassals of Annandale and Carrick, and joined by Sir William Douglas and a few of the more patriotic nobles and gentry, Bruce advanced from the west country to Perth, and on the 27th of March 1306 was crowned at Scone. "Since the days of Malcolm Canmore," says William Burns, "the representative of the family of MacDuff, Earls of Fife, had performed the duty of placing the Crown on the new king's head. The present earl was, unfortunately, for the time in the service of the English, but his sister, Isobel, wife of Comyn, Earl of Buchan, unexpectedly appeared, and demanded the privilege belonging to the family. In deference to popular prejudice, this could neither be refused nor neglected, and the ceremony was again gone through on Sunday, the 29th of March." The incident is notable for the after consequences to the patriotic lady. Shortly afterwards she fell into the power of King Edward, and that ruthless ruffian, true to his character for relentless cruelty to any who crossed him in his schemes of conquest, imprisoned her in a cage fixed on one of the towers on the walls of Berwick. There she lingered after the death of Edward till 1313. Such was the treatment accorded to a high-born patriotic Scottish lady by Edward the First and his son. After his coronation Bruce experienced disaster after disaster. He was defeated by Pembroke at Methven, a few miles north-west of Perth, and was compelled to retreat into the Highlands. There again, he was attacked by some of the adherents of Comyn, and was put to great straits. The common people were holding aloof from him, for he had not as yet purged himself in their eyes from his former connection with Edward. His following, therefore, was small, and so desperate was his position that with a few followers he was compelled to leave Scotland and cross over to Rathlin, a small island off the north coast of Ireland, where he lay concealed with a few followers for a few months. Returning to Arran,

and then to the Ayrshire coast, he surprised and defeated the English garrison of Turnberry, one of his own castles on the coast of Ayrshire. His career during the next two or three years was full of danger and of romance. The English still held a large part of southern Scotland firmly in their grip, and they made great attempts to surround and capture Bruce in the south-west of Scotland, in which district he was compelled to play a desperate game of hide-and-seek with them, sometimes escaping death or capture by a hair's breadth, so to speak. But this pertinacity and daring resistance on the part of him and his followers to the hated English began to tell on the minds of the commons of Scotland. They saw that another Scottish hero had arisen, who had shaken off the trammels of his English education and his English training, and was now a resolute and formidable enemy of the invaders. He was, moreover, a claimant for the Crown of Scotland, fully entitled, in the absence and surrender of Baliol to English authority, to stand as the true representative of Scottish royalty. This pertinacity on the part of Bruce gradually told on the minds of the Scottish common people, and he began to receive support from them in such numbers that in 1311 he invaded the north of England, and ravaged it from the middle Tyne to the Solway, returning into Scotland with much booty. In this year also he captured Perth, then the principal English stronghold in central Scotland. In 1312 he subdued and recovered Galloway and the adjoining districts, and moving eastward he took the strong castle of Roxburgh, and drove the enemy out of Teviotdale; Jedburgh being the only foothold left to them in that quarter. Edinburgh Castle was next gained by a most daring attack, and other fortresses fell to Bruce in such numbers that by the close of 1312 the English had hardly a footing in Scotland except the all-important castle of Stirling. Thus, in less than seven years, Bruce, who when he took the field against Edward seemed to have entered upon a hopeless task, now had almost completed the deliverance of his country from the hated enemy.

—o—

No. 58

THE GENERAL ELECTION

WE write while there are still 163 members to be elected, and with the curious result as stated in *The Scotsman* of the 24th of January, that the two opposiug parties — the Liberals and the Tories—are exactly equal, viz., 186 Ministerial Liberals, and 32 Labour Liberals = 218, against 218 Tory members; the Irish Nationalists returned at the same date, being 67. Substantially this proposition will be much about the final outcome of the poll. The Irish Nationalists, therefore, will have the fate of the Ministry in their hands. For our part we have no misgivings as to the future. As 'Home Rulers all Round,' a political situation in which the two great parties at Westminster are left to the mercy

of the Irish Nationalists, has no terror for us; for, as we said many months ago, the best chance for Home Rule for Scotland, Ireland and Wales will come when the Liberal and the Tory parties are closely balanced. Bitter experience has shown us that, if the Liberals have a triumphant majority, they care not for Scottish wants or Scottish wrongs, but go on coldly contemptuous of our national desire to have the control of our purely Scottish affairs. It is only the fear of losing place and power that makes the English Liberals sensitive to the national requirements of the three minor nationalities, and, therefore, it is with no great feeling of regret that we see that the balance of political power at Westminster is at the mercy of the Irish national party. For, be it clearly understood, that no grant of Home Rule to Ireland can rest there and there alone. If the Irish are allowed to manage their own Irish affairs, subject to the supremacy of an Imperial Parliament—and no other form of Home Rule is possible, or is, indeed, now asked for by the majority of the Irish people—then either Scotland and Wales will, at the same time, have their measure of Home Rule, or it must very speedily follow. It is the stupid fears of the Tory party that has hitherto been the great obstacle to the grant of Home Rule to Ireland, but, as Mr John Redmond has exultingly and sensibly pointed out, after the British people have seen that Home Rule in South Africa has not led to a renewal of enmity, or even of strife or dissatisfaction, but has completely destroyed it, then, surely, if the same policy is applied to Ireland, the same result will follow. The Irish people are not fools; on the contrary, politically, they are the cleverest and most knowing race in Britain. And to suppose that, if they be granted the control of their own purely Irish affairs, they are likely, out of pure enmity and devilment, going to wage war with the people of Great Britain, in order to make Ireland an independent country, is about as wild a notion of political action as it is possible for thinking men to conceive. It is worthy only of the stupidest section of the Tory party, and that is, indeed, going pretty low down. We regard, then, the result of the Election, so far as it places the control of the two parties in the hands of the Irish Nationalists, as quite favourable to the cause of Scottish and Welsh Home Rule, as well as of that of Ireland.

The Tory Stronghold—Southern England

Those who have been close readers of *The Thistle* will know how often we have pointed out the faults and failings of the Southern or Saxon-English; how spiritless they are compared with the Northern English or the Scots; and how their servility to wealth or social position makes them the ready tools of Tory landlords and of Toryism in general. It is not saying too much, that had it not been for the laziness in action, and the stupidity in thinking of these Saxon-English, Britain at the present day would not have been eclipsed so egregiously

as it now is by Germany in so many enterprises of trade—in chemical and electrical industrial developments more especially to wit. Had the North of England and Scotland been able to control British legislation, and to override and cast aside the inertness and apathy of the South, education in Britain would not have lagged behind that of Germany; and we should never have lost several of the great industries that now have gone to that country. It need not surprise us then, if in the roll of reactionary constituencies in the present General Election we find that the bulk of them hail from Southern England. It is there that the House of Lords has its stronghold; and on its sleepy cathedral cities, and its dead-and-alive market boroughs, it chiefly depends for its political power.

There is, however, one consolation that British Liberals have in connection with this great political support that the House of Lords has received from Southern England. It has led the Peers to their doom. Thinking in the blind conceit of their privileged position, that all England was as Southern England, they have at last challenged the British people to a fight for political supremacy, and they are now receiving their answer in a way they did not expect. They quickly found out—or rather, their political allies, the Protectionist party found out for them—that as a direct issue between the Peers and the People, the contest was a hopeless one; so it was quickly changed to one between Tariff Reform and Free Trade. But the common sense of the electors has, on the whole, refused to allow this to be the great issue of the Election; and a Liberal majority of over a hundred will compel the House of Lords to accept the Budget, and will then come to closer quarters with the Peers in regard to their arrogant claim to control the policy of Britain. The present General Election is merely the beginning of the great fight between the people and the privileged classes; and those who are doubtful of the issue have only to look at the triumphant position of democracy in the Britains beyond the Seas! The victory for the people is only a question of time; and let this important fact be borne well in mind. Every General Election, every appeal to the people, is educating the people to a better knowledge of their rights, and to a greater confidence in their political power. Even the dull apathy and the wretched servility of the Southern English will gradually lessen and largely disappear as appeal after appeal is made to their political intelligence. At present they are in a condition of democratic puppyhood, so to speak. By-and-bye their eyes will be opened, and they will become alive to the importance of the great contest that is now before the people of Britain. Then, if among them there should arise a new Cobbett, or a new Cobden, who will be to them what Lloyd-George is to the people of Wales, these now Tory-ridden Saxon-English will join the popular cause, and place themselves heartily in line with their fellow-countrymen in the North of England, and with the Scottish, Irish, and Welsh peoples!

SIR WALTER SCOTT AND HOME RULE

THE number of Members of Parliament declaring for Devolution and Home Rule for Scotland increases. It would have gladdened the heart of Scott, who was heartily devoted to the cause. In 1826 the Tory Ministers threatened to deprive the Scottish Banks of the right to circulate notes as money, and to limit the Bank of England to the issue of notes of £5 value and upwards. Scotland rose, and Scott led the opposition in the three Letters of Malachi Malagrowther in the *Edinburgh Weekly Journal*, to the astonishment of the Tory Croker and the party. "Scott," says Lockhart, "ever sensitively jealous as to the interference of English Statesmen with the internal affairs of his native kingdom," took the matter up. "The country is rising," Scott entered in his Journal, "I should rejoice to see the old red lion ramp a little, and the Thistle again claim its *nemo me impune*. I do believe Scotsmen will show themselves unanimous at last, where their cash is concerned. They are gradually destroying what remains of nationality. Their loosening and grinding down all those peculiarities which distinguished us as Scotsmen will throw the country into a very dangerous state."

He notes the view of a lawyer to Lord Elibank, that at the Union the English law should have been extended all over Scotland. "I can not say how that might have answered *our* purpose," was the reply, "but it would scarce have suited yours, since by this time the Aberdeen Advocates would have possessed themselves of all the business in Westminster Hall." It is satisfactory to find his descendant to-day, Captain Murray, M.P. for Kincardine, declaring for a Parliament in Edinburgh. "I hope to see it soon," he said, on January 7th.

"I act from nothing," said Scott, "but an honest desire of serving this country. Depend upon it, a succession of violent and experimental changes from session to session [wrecking of Budgets, Licensing Bills, Small Holdings, etc.] will read a fearful commentary on my Epistles. My head may be low before the time comes. Scotland will be the most dangerous neighbour to England that she has had since 1639. If you *unscotch* us, you will find us damned mischievous Englishmen, the most formidable revolutionaries who ever took the field of innovation."

What a Commentary on Scott's jealousy against English interference in Scotland is to be found in the loss of the United Free Church's money to gratify the political hatred of the Tory House of Commons and the English lawyers against the Presbyterian Church, eager to deal a blow against Scotland, and to read the English Noncomformists a side lesson! On July 4th, 1902, three judges of the Second Division of the Court of Session affirmed the judgment of the Lord Ordinary. Scotland and her law courts would hear nothing of "constituting documents," that joy of the attorney, but stood for history and the practice of the Church since 1560. And blundering and plundering meddlers have saddled Scotland with a fresh

ecclesiastical legacy of strife. Who doubts for a moment that Lord Halsbury and Lord Robertson gratified their political animosity by dealing a blow against Presbyterianism and Scottish nationality?

We wish the Established Church of Scotland could see its certain fate—ere it be too late—at the hands of Englishmen, and that, if it is to be judged, then it must be judged by Scotsmen alone. It is their affair only. Fancy allowing the ecclesiastical system of Scotland to be weighed by ignorant Unitarians like Chamberlain, Jews like Rothschild, political Gallios like Lansdowne, and insolent Pro-consuls of India like Curzon, who insulted Presbyterianism in Madras, and who hates us with all the petty malevolence of the son of a parochial English parson! If the leaders of the Church of Scotland think they can depend on the Lords to defend a system which, as landlords and Episcopalian aliens, they hate, let them be warned by the fate in the immediate future of the Welsh Church. What have the Church of Scotland and the people to gain by linking the fate of the national establishment to the votes of men who robbed them at the Reformation, and have been robbing them ever since? We must, as Scotsmen, stand by the Treaty of Union, and demand that our ecclesiastical affairs shall be managed by ourselves alone. In England the children of John Bunyan, of Oliver Cromwell, of John Wesley are outlawed, harried and despised by the wild peers and the political backwoodsmen of the Lords; they must be left to settle, and they soon will, their grievances of centuries with Episcopalians. But we must tell them all very plainly that neither Church nor Dissent in England, nor Papists in Ireland shall interfere with the children of Knox. "What I have been to my country," said the Reformer, "posterity will yet allow." When Scotland is left to decide, there need be no fear for national ideals.

What the Tory party and the Peers in Scotland would desire is to perpetuate the alien system of Episcopacy, that miserable exotic and invention of James VI. for political purposes, to secure denominational "Church" schools to lower the national efficiency. They know that under Home Rule for Scotland not a single dissenting school would be left, and that the gangrene of Anglicanism would be for ever cut out of the body by the operation for political appendicitis, and that a great United Presbyterian Church would arise. They know, as Voltaire saw and said long ago, that Presbyteranism has been fatal alike to Kings and Dukes.

The pity of it is that this game of the Peers and Tories in Scotland should be played by professing Liberals. It must be painful for us, as Scotsmen, to hear Mr John Morley declaring that "the English Liberal Party cannot afford to do without the noble Liberalism of Scotland." What have we to do with the political necessities of England? Surely we need the "noble Liberalism of Scotland" at home for our own use, to bring Licensing Reform, Education Bills

and Small Holdings, which are all long overdue. And we will not rest till we have them.

"Civilisation," says Lord Curzon, "is created by aristocracies." Not in Scotland, certainly. Let the Scot in Princes Street, Edinburgh, look at that monument to the national pride, Sir Walter Scott. No other nation can equal it. What have all the Dukes of Buccleuch and all the race from Wat of Harden done for their country in comparison with the son of the Writer to the Signet, the true feudal-superior of his "own romantic town" and people? It is the comforting belief of mediocrity and socialists that all men are born equal. Scotland will never believe that doctrine for men or for nations, and will no longer submit to the interference of England in her local and national affairs. The voice of Bermondsey and Peckham, very huskily "voiced" by stunted Cockneys in London public-houses, is certainly not the voice of Scotland, and that voice, unless we misread the signs of the times, will not long be silent, but make itself heard both at home and in the Colonies for the preservation of our national Past, Present and Future. When will the briefless in Parliament House see that the great sum annually sent out of the country for Private Bill Legislation at Westminster is given to the foreigner, and that this "capital leaving the country"—actually and visibly—can be retained at home?

Wm. Keith Leask.

———o———

THE LATE JOHN ROMANS, J.P., C.C., OF NEWTONGRANGE, NEWBATTLE

On Sunday, the 16th January 1910, there departed this life at the ripe age of ninety-one a notable Scotsman, who deserves more than a passing notice. Born in the Parish in which he died, he followed his father's occupation as a millwright, and after serving a long apprenticeship, migrated to London, entering the employment there of a maternal uncle. The young man possessed all the shrewd instincts of the Scot, and soon rose to distinction. A self-educated, diligent student, he made the acquaintance of all the British classics, and had the good fortune to see some of the fine old English dramas enacted at Sadler's Wells, then under the management of Mr Phelps, a famous actor of his day. He soon rose from being a mere journeyman mechanic to be the under manager of one of the great London gas companies, and from that time forward was known as an expert gas engineer. Among a long list of candidates he was chosen to be the manager of Plymouth Gas Company. He had by this time married a London lady, who bore him a large family, all of whom were born in England. Theirs was a long, happy married life. Tired of being a mere servant, he returned to his native country, and set up in business as a consulting gas engineer, besides doing a large business in pipes and cannel coal, and other material used by gas companies. By this time he inherited a small estate in Midlothian, and always having the ambition to be a county man, and being in possession of a handsome income, he built a stately mansion, Newtongrange House.

Never during these long years, while engaged in building up his fortune, did he forget the claims of his native country. When in Plymouth, he found the Scottish regiments there forced to attend the English Church, as there was no Presbyterian place of worship. After a long correspondence with the War Office, this grievance was done away with, and a Presbyterian chaplain was appointed to

attend to the religious welfare of Scottish soldiers. In 1853 he became a member of the "National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights," which, after many years, bore fruit in the appointment of a Secretary of State for Scotland. In 1843 he marched from the Assembly Hall to Tanfield Hall, where the first Free Church Assembly was held. The bitterness of these times can hardly be realised now. The landed gentry refused sites on which to build Free Churches, and Newbattle Parish was one where such a refusal was made. John Romans granted a feu on his estate on which the present Free Church stands. No new houses could be built in the Parish, because the landlords wished to preserve the amenity of their mansions. John Romans granted feus on his estate, and a large part of the village of Newtongrange is built on these feus. An active, spirited, public man, he represented Broughton Ward in the City of Edinburgh for a number of years. At this time Edinburgh was in great need of an extra supply of water, and the controversy over the various sources of supply was more than keen; it was bitter. Councillor Romans advocated St Mary's Loch, and it is amusing to recall the terrible tales of water fleas and other noxious vermin, said to infect that sheet of water. In an evil hour for the city, the St Mary's Loch scheme was rejected in favour of the Moorfoot scheme.

Determined to make his mark as a county man, he looked up the old road maps of Midlothian, and found that the Marquis of Lothian had shut up a number. He called upon his lordship to re-open them. He refused, and there ensued an action in the Court of Session in which John Romans was entirely successful, and a large number of useful roads were opened to the public. It is ill for a man of moderate means to contend with a Marquis, for he had it in his power to take a mean revenge on his successful rival in the road business. As near as he could get to Mr Romans' beautiful mansion he opened a shaft into one of the seams of coal on his property, and a colliery village sprang up. John Romans, a true democrat, did not mind that; he loved all Scotsmen, gentle or simple, but the refuse of the mine, dumped down to destroy the prospect from the windows of his house, vexed him exceedingly. While he was fretting over this annoyance, a bolt from the blue fell upon his fortune. His firm entered into a contract to light the city of Prague with gas. Misled by the report of a London engineer, this contract was taken at a price that could not pay; and although he knew it would ruin him, like the high-spirited gentleman he was, he carried through the contract. Prague was enriched, and he was a beggar. This fell upon him at a time when he was no longer a young man, but with characteristic energy he set about repairing his fortune, and, above all, to preserve the estate that had been in the possession of his ancestors for over three hundred years. He recalled his son, Duncan, from Vienna, where he was under gas manager, and the firm then became John Romans & Son.

It was about this time, 1885, that the writer of this article became acquainted with Mr Romans. The famous Orr Ewing case was before the Scottish Courts. Need I remind our readers that the English Courts were attempting to found jurisdiction over the estates of Scotsmen, and that a legal controversy of vast importance to Scotland was before the Court of Session? Under the pen name of "Thistledown" I wrote to *The Scotsman* on that question. Having a few years before re-published "The Treaty of Union between Scotland and England," with an historical introduction, Mr Romans asked through *The Scotsman* who was "Thistledown." I sent him a copy of my little work, and gave him my name. From that hour to the day of his death we were fast friends.

The important question of Home Rule for Scotland cropped up in 1885, and a meeting of a few patriotic Scotsmen assembled at 5 St Andrew Square on 20th May 1886, and founded the Scottish Home Rule Association. John Romans was one of the founders. Professor John S. Blackie was elected chairman, an office which he held to his death, and was succeeded by John Romans. As the old question of Home Rule is again in the

forefront of politics, it will be interesting to our readers to note the A B C of the Constitution of this Association, which gave rise to the phrase Home Rule All Round.

A. "To protect the integrity of the Empire, and secure that the voice of Scotland shall be heard in the Imperial Parliament as fully as at present when discussing Imperial affairs."

B. "To promote the establishment of a Legislature sitting in Scotland, with full control over all purely Scottish questions, and with an Executive Government responsible to it and the Crown."

C. "To secure to the Government of Scotland, in the same degree as at present possessed by the Imperial Parliament, the control of the Civil Servants, Judges and other officials, with the exception of those engaged in the Military, Naval and Diplomatic Services, and in collecting the Imperial revenue."

I need hardly remind our readers that this controversy has been going on ever since, and that John Romans has ever been in the front of the fight. The Liberal party was wrecked over the ignoring of the claims of Scotland, but it seems they have not learned wisdom, but are prepared to repeat the old blunder of Home Rule for Ireland only. The protest of the 13th October 1890 is as pertinent to-day as the hour in which it was issued. John Romans was one of the committee which framed this protest, which we print below.

Such is a too brief notice of the life of one of the truest Scots that ever breathed the breath of life. Men like John Romans are an honour to Scotland. Unselfish devotion to the good of his country, and no self-seeker, he asked no reward; and while men, who compared with him were as nothing, got titles of honour and lucrative posts, his was the path of true virtue, to serve his country without fee or reward of any kind. Peace be with thee, brave heart; thy toils are over, and he who writes these lines will drop not an unmanly tear that thy labours were not crowned with success.

CHARLES WADDIE.

Protest of the Scottish Home Rule Association against the Denial or Delay of Home Rule for Scotland.

I. The proposal to grant a Legislature and Executive Government to Ireland, and withhold them from Scotland, is unjust to a loyal, industrious, patient, and intelligent people, and appears to set a premium upon disorder.

II. If any priority were possible in the granting of Home Rule, then Scotland might claim it first, seeing that in 1707 she was deprived of a real Parliament, which had worked to the satisfaction of the people of Scotland for hundreds of years; whereas the Irish never possessed such a Parliament, but at the best enjoyed in Grattan's far-famed Parliament a Protestant Council, empowered to govern a Roman Catholic country.

III. The granting of Home Rule to Ireland first, without any promise or guarantee that the claim of Scotland to a Legislature and Executive Government will be conceded, would be destructive of the National life of Scotland, an act of treachery towards the Scottish people and a wilful throwing away of the support of the Irish vote, which in some small degree has tempered the overwhelming vote of the English members on bills relating to Scotland. For as Scotland as such never entered into a Treaty of Union with Ireland, but only with England, whenever Ireland gets a Parliament and Executive of her own, the state of affairs that prevailed before the Union of Great Britian with Ireland is restored, and Scotland would thus be deprived of the whole Irish vote for Scottish Home Rule or any other measure.

IV. The retention of the Irish members in the British Parliament after being granted a Legislature of their own would be unjust alike to England, Scotland, and Wales, as the Irish would have a vote on the domestic concerns of tbe other three countries, while they would have no control of the domestic affairs of Ireland. Even if provision were made for giving the Irish members a vote on Imperial affairs only, they would still be able to exercise control of our business, for by an indirect vote or by allying themselves with a discontented minority in the British Parliament, they could upset the Government on an Imperial question and by so doing retard measures relating to Scotland, while their own domestic concerns were secure in their own Legislature. In point of fact, the Irish would become the Masters of the British Parliament!

V. The Incorporating Union of 1707,

against which our forefathers protested and which was passed against the wishes of the vast majority of the Scottish people, having had ample trial, has been found to act unjustly towards Scotland by (*a*) Altering the Laws of Scotland by English votes against the voice of Scotland's representatives; (*b*) Retarding our business and leaving us without any intelligent Government; (*c*) Enabling the Government of the day to extract from Scotland millions of money more than her just share of the Imperial burdens, and starving all the institutions in Scotland which go to mould the character and refine the life of a civilized people; (*d*) Depriving Scotland of the fame derived from the deeds and genius of her own people by encouraging the practice of calling the United Kingdom England, the Government English, the Army and Navy English, in violation of the 1st Article of the Treaty of Union, and thus treating Scotland as an English Province.

VI. These evils can only be removed, and the business of the British Empire properly conducted by Home Rule all round; and whether the Home Rule measures for the four divisions of the country be passed simultaneously or in rotation, is of no moment, since none can come into operation till all are passed. We believe that the vast majority of the people of Scotland are in sympathy with this protest, and we ask the Leaders of the Liberal Party to recognise the right of the Scottish people to manage and control all purely Scottish affairs.

Nobles Must Live on Their Estates.—"One of James the First's (Scotland) efforts for restoring civil government after his return from his English captivity was to ordain that 'ever ilk lord hafande lands beyond the Mounth in the quhilk landis in auld tymes, there was castells, fortalyces and maner places, big, reparel and reform their castels and maners, and dwell in them by themsell, or by ane of their frends for the gracious governall of their lands be gude polising, and to expend the froyte of their landis in the cuntre whare the landis lyis.'"—"*Early Scots History*," *by Cosmo Innes, p.* 443.

SCOTLAND AS TARIFF REFORM COUNTRY

THE following letter appeared in *The Westminster Gazette* of the 8th of January:—

Dear Sir,—In yesterday's issue you mention the unhappy lot of Captain Tryon in accusing a gentleman with a Scotch accent of being a foreigner.

This reminds me of an incident during the by-election here in 1906.

An exponent of Tariff Reform was explaining how agricultural labourers received better wages in protected countries than they did in Suffolk. The never-failing "voice" ventured to ask the speaker to give the name of any such protected country. The Tariff hero hesitated a moment or two, and then in a triumphant tone cried, "Why, in Scotland!"

Difficult as it may be to believe this episode, it is vouched for by the audience, and by the "voice," who is a prominent farmer in the S.W. corner of the constituency.—Yours, etc.,

Harold Pearson.

Saxmundham, Suffolk, *January 4th*, 1910.

Our readers perhaps have sometimes thought that we are too severe a critic of the Southern or Saxon-English, and of their general ignorance and political servility. But we have had a long experience of the various sections of the British peoples, and we write not without reason when we class the people of the southern half of England as the most bigoted and Tory-ridden of all the races of the United Kingdom. It will be seen from the above that Captain Tryon, the Tory candidate for Brighton, could not discriminate between a Scotsman and a foreigner, and also that a Tory canvasser, or agent, in "Silly Suffolk," actually thought Scotland to be a foreign country. And yet it has been these stupid Saxon-English who have hitherto been, and are now, the backbone of the Tory party, and have enabled the House of Lords, and their Tory allies to block and mangle the greater portion of Liberal legislation up till now. Let us hope that at last their power is near an end.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir John Menteith and the Betrayal of Wallace

SIR, while it is not my intention to try to make a great Scottish hero out of Sir John Menteith, it is only fair to that much-maligned man to state some known facts of his career that are inconsistent with his character as portrayed by his traducers. It is known that Menteith remained in exile at a time when Bruce, Douglas and the other barons made servile acknowledgement of the English power. But, later, having given his oath, he kept it as long as Edward I. lived. No sooner, however, did the death ofthat monarch absolve him from his oath than he threw in his lot with Bruce. At the Battle of Bannockburn Menteith greatly distinguished himself, and was rewarded by Bruce with extensive lands in Kintyre. That he enjoyed the entire confidence of Bruce is evident from the missions on which he employed him, and the rewards he bestowed on him. Menteith accompanied Randolph in the expedition to Ireland in 1315, and again in the following year on one of that leader's raids on the north of England. Here his traducers have to reconcile such companionship on the part of Randolph—whom they themselves describe as "loving honour and loyalty, hating falsehood above all things, and ever fond of having the bravest knights about him whom he dearly loved"—with one whom they would have us believe a dishonoured knight, worthy of eternal infamy. There is no proof that Menteith was present at the capture of Wallace, nor that the 100 livres paid to him had any connection with the capture. Indeed, the 40 and 60 marks paid to the valet and others who were present seems to imply the contrary.

The whole truth of the matter seems to be that popular opinion demanded a sacrifice to the manes of the dead hero, and Sir John Menteith, as representative of the English power in the district in which Wallace was captured, offered the easiest victim.—I am, etc.,

Fess Checky.

[With some reluctance we publish the above letter, for we regard the guilt of Sir John Menteith in the betrayal of Wallace as a settled matter of history. Our correspondent brings forward some facts as to Menteith's subsequent connection with Bruce and Randolph, and holds that they would not have employed him in any service had he not been innocent of the betrayal of Wallace. But this is far from being conclusive, and is quite insufficient to dispose of or to disprove the facts that have come down in history. Besides the money reward that Edward I. bestowed on Menteith after the capture of Wallace, Dr Charles Rogers, in "The Book of Wallace," points out that "Menteith received from Edward in June 1306 the revenues of the earldom of Lennox, also the temporalities of the bishopric of Glasgow in the County of Dumbarton. Then when Robert the Bruce was in 1306 prosecuting his patriotic labours, Menteith undertook jointly with Sir Hugh Bisset to cut off by a fleet his retreat from the Western Isles. And in July of the following year he is

described as with some others guarding, on Edward's behalf, the town of Ayr." No doubt Menteith, with his Stewart lineage and connection, was a personage of some power and importance, and Bruce and Randolph found it convenient to overlook his guilt in the matter of Wallace's betrayal. No doubt, also they—Bruce especially—did not regard the removal of Wallace from the scene in the same light that the democratic patriots of Scotland regarded it. To them Wallace was the great national hero, but to the claimants for the Crown and their Norman adherents he was looked upon as a disturbing intruder, and they never rested till they had destroyed his power. That they afterwards employed Menteith and gave him posts of honour only shows the lax views of patriotism that the Scoto-Norman barons of the time held. Dr Rogers remarks on this subject, "An attempt to exonerate the memory of Menteith, first made by Lord Hailes, and afterwards by some less conspicuous writers, has been conclusively disposed of by Mr Tytler."

Ed. of *The Thistle.*]

The Stern Character of the Presbyterians.—In the twofold dread of Rome, and of . . . absolute authority, Presbyterianism came to birth in Scotland, and took the stern lineaments with which the world is familiar. Calvinism, by the characters which it formed, saved Protestantism in Europe, and with equal truth it may be said that Presbyterianism saved it in Scotland.—*Hume Brown.*

AN ENGLISHMAN ON DR JOHNSON

Englishmen generally speak and write of Dr Johnson in terms of such exaggerated praise that it is refreshing to come across one of them who regards him as a rude and bigoted person, and one who can by no means be looked on as a credit to his country. Captain Edward Topham, a Yorkshire gentleman, visited Scotland in 1774-75, and resided for six months in Edinburgh. During his stay there Dr Johnson's account of his travels in Scotland had just been published, and this is what Captain Topham says of the book:—

"Dr Johnson's account of his tour into Scotland has just (January 1775) made its appearance here, and has put the country into a flame. Everybody finds some reason to be affronted. A thousand people, who know not a single creature in the Western Isles, interest themselves in their cause, and are offended at the accounts that are given of them. But let this unfortunate writer say what he will, it must be confessed they return it with interest. . . . I must confess that Dr Johnson has deserved the treatment he meets with. He was received with the most flattering marks of civility by everyone, and his name had opened to him an acquaintance which his most sanguine wishes could scarce have wished for, and which his manners certainly would never have obtained. He was, indeed, looked on as a kind of miracle in this country, and almost carried about for a show. . . . But the Doctor, who never said anything that did not convey some gross reflection upon themselves, soon made them sick of jokes which were at their own expense. Indeed, from all the accounts I have been able to learn, he repaid all their attention to him with ill-breeding, and when in the company of the ablest men in the country, and who certainly are his superiors in point of abilities, his whole design was to show them how contemptibly he thought of

them. . . . The Scots, who looked up to Dr Johnson as something supernatural, should not have been surprised at finding him quite the reverse. . . . Had the Scots been more acquainted with Dr Johnson's private character, they would have expected nothing better. A man of illiberal manners and of surly disposition, who all his life long had been at enmity with the Scots, takes a sudden resolution of travelling amongst them, not, according to his own account, 'to find a people of refined and liberal education, but to see wild men and wild manners.' Confined to one place and accustomed to one train of ideas, incapable of acquiescing in all the different tempers he might meet with, and of mingling with different societies, he descends from his study, where he had spent his whole life, to see the world in the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland. Behold this extraordinary man on his journey in quest of barbarism, and at length sitting down wearied and discontented because he has met with some degree of civility in the most desert parts; or to speak more properly, because he has found nothing more barbarous than himself. Poor Johnson, who probably had never travelled more than a few miles from London before he came there, must naturally be astonished at everything he saw, and would dwell upon every common occurrence as a wonder. One cannot, therefore, be surprised at his observing 'that the windows in some of the little hovels in Scotland do not draw up as his own do in London; or that such a spot of ground does not produce grass but thistles.' He found himself in a new world; his sensations were those of a child just brought forth into daylight, whose organs are confused with the numerous objects that surround him, and who discovers his surprise at everything he sees. Men of the world would not have descended to such remarks. A petty and frivolous detail of trifling circumstances are the certain signs of ignorance or inexperience. . . . For my own part, to say the best of it, I look upon all his observations in regard to men and manners to be those of a man totally unacquainted with mankind."

"THE BREEZE" AT THE ROYAL SCOTTISH GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY MEETING.—We did not allude to this matter in any of our previous issues, partly owing to the pressure of other matter on our limited space, and partly for other reasons, more or less obvious. The editor of *The Fiery Cross*, Mr Theodore Napier, however, deals with the subject so well in his January issue, that we feel tempted to quote the greater portion of his article. He writes as follows:—

PROFESSOR GEIKIE'S "PATRIOTISM"

"At the annual business meeting of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society, held in November in Edinburgh, Mr T. D. Wanliss, formerly an Australian colonist, and M. L. C. of the Victorian Parliament, but now resident in Edinburgh, criticised a statement which appeared in the Society's Magazine, in a lecture by Mr Geo. G. Chisholm of Edinburgh University, in which he improperly used 'England' for the United Kingdom. Mr Wanliss moved that instructions be given that in all publications of the Society 'care should be taken that the terms "England" and "English" should not be used in an Imperial sense.' He stated further that if the lecturer who used it did not alter and withdraw the offensive and incorrect terms, he (Mr Wanliss) would regard it as 'an insult to the Scottish members and to patriotic Scotsmen.'

"The Chairman's reply to this harmless and most reasonable request of Mr Wanliss was, that he, as Editor of the Magazine, was responsible for its contents, and that, moreover, 'he was not at all ashamed to use the term, England, meaning, thereby, Great Britain and Ireland.' He further said that it was in 'common use all the world over,' and then pleaded that he was 'quite as good a Scotsman as any there and finished by saying it was not a matter 'for discussion at that meeting.'

"The writer of the article, Mr Chisholm, also pleaded that he too was a 'very

patriotic Scotsman,' and did not intend any insult to Scotland.

"Mr W. G. Burn Murdoch asked what right was there to put aside the first term of the Treaty of Union, in which it was provided that what was previously English, Scottish and Irish, should for ever be called 'British' when used in an Imperial sense? He maintained that they, as a Scottish Geographical Society, should be careful of their terms, as well as in political circles. Later on Mr Burn Murdoch intimated that if the Magazine still continued to use the objectionable terms, he would be under the necessity of withdrawing his subscription until the Articles of the Treaty of Union were recognised by that Society, and he believed many others would do the same.

"The chairman finally put a stop to the discussion by taunting those who had made and supported Mr Wanliss's motion with weak-mindedness and foolishness.

"Consequently, according to the dictum of that very learned man—Professor James Geikie—who professed himself 'as quite as good a Scotsman as any present,' and who proclaimed, not only before the members of the Royal *Scottish* Geographical Society, but before the whole world that he, a 'patriotic Scotsman,' was *not at all ashamed* to call the United Kingdom 'England,' even although by so doing he sank Scotland to the level of an English province instead of an independent Nation that had united with England to form 'Great Britain' and the latter (*not* England) had united with Ireland to form the 'United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland,' but *not* England. No wonder that Professor Geikie's remarks were greeted with cries of *Shame!* But, we fear, a man of his temperament is beyond all sense of shame, when he has fallen so low as to excuse, nay, justify, the use of a term that reduces by a word his own Nation to be an *English* province."

[Professor Geikie afterwards found the feeling of the members of the Society so strong against his unpatriotic action, that he found himself under the humiliating necessity of writing a letter to the *Scotsman*, saying that in future, the terms "England" or "English" would not be used in the Journal of the Society in an Imperial sense.—Ed. of *The Thistle*.]

The Name of Campbell.—"Campbell" itself is pure Norse. * * * I should say that the first term in the name is the old Scots word Kamp or Kemp. * * * As to its import, the word is equivalent to hero, champion, warrior, hero-chief, etc. * * * The term "bol" signifies a dwelling, a hall, a tower, etc., and in different periods has been written in various forms, such as bole, boel, beil, bell, etc, Campbell means the hero-chief's hall. —"Landmarks of Scottish Life," by W. Lytteil.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 20. March 1910 Price 1d

CONTENTS

Printed by J. & J. Gray & Co., St James Place, Edinburgh and Published on the First of every Month by "The Thistle," 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 20. MARCH 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz. 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is 1d., post free 1½d.; outside British Isles, post free, 2d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 North Bridge Edinburgh.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 59

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

BANNOCKBURN

SCOTLAND was now approaching one of the greatest and most memorable events in her chequered history. Edward Bruce, the bold but sometimes rash and daring brother of the king, had been investing the important stronghold of Stirling Castle from the beginning of 1313 till mid-summer. It was held for the English by Sir Philip Mowbray, one of those Norman barons who were sometimes on the side of England and sometimes on the side of Scotland. Running short of provisions, he succeeded in obtaining from Edward Bruce a relaxation of the siege on the condition that if he were not relieved by an English army within twelve months that he would then surrender the fortress. This was on the 24th of June 1313. It is said that King Robert was not well pleased at this arrangement of his brother with Mowbray, for he saw, what Edward apparently did not, that it would bring about a struggle

of the most desperate kind between the Scots and the invaders, and if ill-luck should attend the Scots, it would in all probability prove fatal to the cause of the patriots. Their plan for several years back had been to avoid great pitched battles, but to harass the enemy, destroy his convoys of provisions, and so to render his occupation of the southern half of the kingdom impossible. But this agreement of Edward with Mowbray would naturally bring the whole strength of England into Scotland during the latter part of June 1314 in order to relieve the garrison of Stirling, and King Robert saw that in such case a great pitched battle was inevitable. But the king by this time had made himself a great general as well as a great statesman. He had gained the confidence of the common people of Scotland, and though a certain number of the nobles were either actively supporting the English or were cunningly lying by to see which side was likely to be the stronger, he nevertheless had now got the better portion of them over to his side. He at once set to work to prepare for the great struggle. Douglas, Randolph, The Stewart, and the chiefs of some of the great western clans agreed to do their best, and early in the summer the king found that by the middle of June he would have before Stirling an army of between thirty and forty thousand men to meet the English invasion.

Meanwhile the English king was not idle. He summoned all the forces of his monarchy to be ready at Berwick by the following June. The Welsh and Irish tributaries were called upon to serve, and from the English dominions in France a considerable body of men were brought over to join the army of invasion; for it must be remembered that Scotland had not only to contend against England, which of herself must have then had a population five or six times more numerous than that of Scotland, but she had besides against her the levies from Wales, Ireland, and nearly the half of France. It is those terrible odds against her which makes the successful fight of the Scots against the English so marvellous. At Berwick, by the middle of June, Edward the Second had assembled an army of close upon a hundred thousand men. As William Burns says, "There can be no doubt that the army thus assembled for 'the final conquest of Scotland' was the most numerous and best equipped that ever, before or since, stood on British ground." All that it wanted was a great leader, and this it had not. Edward the Second led in person, but he was far inferior to his father in warlike ability. He did not want ambition, as the persistency with which he pursued the attempted conquest of Scotland showed, but he was too fond of pleasure and too easily influenced by favourites to carry out a great scheme of conquest. From Berwick he led his army to Edinburgh, and then by way of Linlithgow to Falkirk and the Torwood, where Bruce and his army lay. As Edward approached that point Bruce withdrew his force to the neighbourhood of Stirling,

and encamped on the position where he had made up his mind to make his stand against the invaders.

The battle of Bannockburn being one of the notable battles of history, much has been said and written about it. We have not space to go into a detailed description of it, but we may point out the great skill displayed by Bruce in his choice of a position. There was only one way by which a great army coming from the south and east could get to Stirling, and this was by marching along the high and hilly ground lying to the south-west of it, through which the Bannock burn flowed, and in which it had cut a deep ravine, just before it spread itself over the great wide morass that lay between it and the Forth. In those days these flats or marches were quite impassable—to an army at least—in winter and early summer; for the streams that fell into them from the high ground, unless they were large and so could cut and force a channel for themselves through them, spread out and over the surface and made it a quaking mass of spongy herbage, generally impassable for man and beast. This was then the condition of the flat country lying to the south-east of Stirling. Edward, therefore, had to avoid the flat and marshy land, and to march his huge army along the broken and hilly country through which flowed the stream of the Bannock. Here was Bruce's opportunity. His army, though only about a third in numbers of the English, was large enough to hold in force the route which Edward's army was compelled to follow in order to reach Stirling. His men were nearly all spearmen, by this time trained to act together, and led by nobles in whom they had confidence. So long as these spearmen held together, and were not broken up, as at Falkirk under Wallace, by the English archers, they could and would form a barrier that the English men-of-arms were unable to penetrate or break down. Formed into schiltrons or roundish groups of men, with their long eighteen feet spears presented to the enemy, the heavily armour-clad English men-of-arms could press against them in vain. For the horses, though also protected with mail, could not be entirely covered, and when they were urged forward by their riders on the spear points, they got wounded and plunged desperately, throwing their riders to the ground. The heavy armour then became the death-shrouds of the knights and their mounted followers, for they were unable to get up quickly or move nimbly, and from out the ranks of the Scottish schiltrons the hammermen issued with their deadly hammers or axes, and with quick powerful blows crushed the life out of the prostrate knights and mounted men. Such we believe to be in brief the outcome of the combat between the two contending forces, the heavy mail-clad English knights and men-at-arms and the Scottish spearmen. The one great danger to the schiltrons—the attack by the archers—Bruce had skilfully provided against. He had a small body of cavalry lightly mounted, and thus capable of quick move-

ment among the broken and hilly ground lying on either side of the Bannock. These he launched against the English archers when they came forward to make their deadly attack against the spearmen, and completely broke them, so that they ceased to be dangerous. The great struggle then lay between the strongly mounted and heavy mail-clad English men-at-arms and the Scottish spearmen.

Up till the time of Wallace mounted men-at-arms had always overcome the men who fought on foot, for, unless these could present an unbroken front to the onward pressure of the mounted men, they were practically helpless. But Wallace, at Stirling Brig, had shown how spearmen could successfully meet and overcome the English chivalry, and the lesson was never forgotten. The new mode of warfare suited the Scottish people. They were brave, cool and steady in the presence of danger, and when they had confidence in their leaders, and had some training, they proved on many a well-fought field to be a match for any enemy. This was the case at Bannockburn. All the efforts of the English to get through and past the schiltrons proved unavailing, and, after many hours of desperate effort, their courage failed them, and they began to hesitate and then retreat. This quickly became a rout, and ere long the remains of the large army—leaving, it is said, 30,000 behind, dead or wounded—streamed away towards Edinburgh and Dunbar; Edward, with a body-guard of 500 mounted men, leading the retreat. He reached Dunbar in safety, and there got into a small vessel which landed him at Bamborough, in Northumberland. So ended the great battle of Bannockburn, the most disastrous defeat ever inflicted on an English army. Thenceforth it may be truly said that the independence of Scotland was secure, for she could now oppose to her southern enemy, not merely that strength which lies in the hands of brave and resolute men fighting for their country, but that moral force which attends on great victories in a good cause, and which, for the next 250 years held the liberty of Scotland inviolate, amid many trials and many perilous periods.

———o———

No. 60

THE DEGRADATION OF EDINBURGH

THE state of degradation into which Scotland has fallen, owing to the character of its political union with England, has been well illustrated by the discussion which has lately taken place in the columns of *The Scotsman* with reference to the speed of motors and motor cars in the streets of Edinburgh. All the residents of the city have for years back been painfully aware of the dangers they run when crossing some of the principal streets, and more especially Princes Street, owing to the excessive speed at which motors and motor cars are allowed to travel. Lives have been lost in some cases, and many persons have been injured, and still, despite repeated remonstrances, the evil has been allowed to go on. Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, ex-Com-

missioner of the City of London Police, when lately on a visit to the city, was so struck with the danger to the citizens from the license allowed to the drivers of motors and motor cars, that he gave expression to his surprise in a letter to *The Scotsman* of the 12th of February. This, and other letters in the same journal, put the city authorities on their defence. And what a disclosure is that defence! Will it be believed in any part of the Empire out of Scotland that the Lord Provost and the Magistrates and Councillors of the city of Edinburgh—the historic capital of historic Scotland—have no power to regulate or control the speed of motor or motor cars within its limits; that this power belongs to a government department in London, administered by the gentleman who, for the time being, is Secretary for Scotland, but which more probably is administered by one or two of the head officials in that department. We all know how officials are apt to ride on the top of their commission, and to assume power or powers which do not rightly belong to them; or which, if they do, it would be only ordinary common sense not to exercise, but allow to be carried out by the authorities directly interested in the matter. But "Bumbledom" is ambitious and fond of displaying its power, and the department of the Secretary for Scotland in London is a notable instance of this official bumptiousness. From the statement of the City Council, which they publish in their own defence, it would appear that, for the last seven years, appeals have been made again and again to the authorities in London for power to regulate the traffic in the streets of Edinburgh, but, without avail. The London "Bumble" knew better than the city authorities here what was right and proper to do in the matter. The first appeal, of which notice is given, was in November 1903, when the Tory government was in power. At that time leave was asked to have the city recognised as "an area in which a person shall not drive a motor car at a speed exceeding ten miles an hour." This application surely was a reasonable enough one, but the reply was simply an acknowledgment of its receipt. Subsequently, on the 13th of January 1905, the Town Clerk forwarded to the Secretary for Scotland, on behalf of the City Council, a further request, asking that the city be declared "an area or place in which a person shall not drive a motor car at a speed exceeding ten miles an hour." To this a reply was received on the 3rd of February, saying that the Secretary did not "consider himself justified in framing such regulations applicable to the whole city," but asked the Council to specify particular points or limits where the restriction of speed was deemed desirable, "and he would take the matter into consideration." To this the City Council replied that the route between the Post Office and the Haymarket was one in which it was desirable for the public safety to restrict the speed to ten miles an hour, and that there were other places also, "but the thoroughfare between the two points above mentioned is so obviously in need of protection that they venture

to submit this for his Lordship's consideration." It will be observed how humbly the representatives of the capital of Scotland approach the government representative of Scotland in London. The spirit of meekness seemed to have entered into their councils; but humility apparently did not soften the hearts of the high and mighty Lord and his official advisers, for about three weeks after, the Council was informed that the "Secretary for Scotland is not prepared to issue such a regulation. *Prima facie the thoroughfare proposed for restriction has none of the characteristics which make a case for special treatment.*" The italics are ours. A year later, on the 7th March 1906, the resolution of the City Council dealing with the matter was again sent to the Scottish Office. By this time the Liberal government was in power, and Mr Sinclair was the Secretary for Scotland, but he evidently was and is a weak Minister, and in such a matter as this, unconnected as it is with the policy of the Cabinet, he evidently became merely the mouthpiece of the officials. The reply consequently was, "that Mr Sinclair did not feel justified in departing from the policy of his predecessor as indicated in the Scottish office letter of the 3rd of February 1905." On the 4th April 1908 the Town Clerk renewed the application of the City Council, and on the 14th May he received a reply that, "so far as he (Mr Sinclair) is aware, there has been no change of circumstances" to alter his previous decision. Then, on the 30th July 1908, the Town Clerk wrote:—

"The Corporation have had under consideration your letter to me of 14th May last. The Corporation are disappointed that the Secretary for Scotland adheres to his previous decision in regard to this matter.

"With reference to your observation that there has been no change of circumstances since the date of the previous application, I am instructed to point out that the reply given to some of the previous applications made by the Corporation was that the Secretary for Scotland had not made regulations restricting the speed of motor cars in any other town in Scotland. I understand that this is no longer the case, and that regulations have now been made restricting the speed of motor cars in many towns and villages in Scotland. It appears to the Corporation that the necessity for regulations reducing the speed of motor cars is much greater in the crowded thoroughfares of a large city than in small country towns. For this reason the Corporation respectfully urge the Secretary for Scotland to reconsider their application, especially in view of the recent replies of the President of the Local Government Board as to the practice in England."

A mere acknowledgment was received of this letter from the Scottish Office on 31st July 1908, and there the matter ended.

Such is an epitome of the correspondence, as published in *The Scotsman* of the 15th February, between the representatives of the capital of Scotland and the Scottish Secretary of State. We make no apology for the length of the quotations, for they afford an admirable example of the contemptuous way in which Scottish business is treated in London, not merely by an Imperial department of the State, but by the department specially set aside by the Legislature to attend to Scottish business. We have some difficulty in deciding on which party lies the greater blame and the

stronger condemnation ; whether on the servility and flunkey-like spirit of the Corporation of the Capital of Scotland, or on the insolence and bumptiousness of the officials of the London Scottish Office, and the inepitude of the several Secretaries of State—Tory and Liberal alike.

In the first place, why should the City Council of Edinburgh require to go to London for power to regulate the traffic in its streets? We could understand such a limitation of civic power in despotic Russia ; but in Britain it seems hard to believe that such a restriction should be allowed to exist. If the civic authorities of Edinburgh are allowed to manage the lighting, the cleansing, the paving, the sewering, the building and the numerous other necessities of municipal life in a great city, surely they are also capable of managing the traffic of the streets. They must have an intimate knowledge of the difficulties connected with such traffic ; of the streets and crossings where it is dangerous ; while, on the contrary, such knowledge must only be known to the authorities in London in a second-hand and imperfect manner—probably from wealthy users of motors, who disdain being compelled to go at merely ten miles an hour when they are on pleasure bent. To many members of this class the continual dread and terror inflicted on pedestrians who have daily to use the streets, by the great speed of motors, is regarded as a trifle; and the injuries sustained by the citizens, or even the loss of life, is simply regarded as one of the ordinary incidents of city life. The London authorities, in fact, have taken the side of the wealthy classes who use motors, and have turned a deaf ear to the repeated requests of the City Council, who seek to protect the limbs and lives of the citizens. But the question arises, why have the civic authorities been so meek and humble? They have degraded the position of Edinburgh—and, indeed, of Scotland—by their tame inertness and servility. Years ago they should have called a public meeting or public meetings of the citizens to protest against the insolent policy of the Scottish Office in London, and to demand power to regulate the traffic in their own streets. They should also have brought the matter up in Parliament through their members. Had they done so, the London officials would have been compelled to give in. The authorities of Liverpool or Dublin or any other great city would not long have tolerated such interference from London ; but Edinburgh seems to have lost its spirit, and accepts the contemptuous snubbing of insolent officials with the utmost complacency. Seeing that the members for the city have been so quiescent, and apparently so afraid to tackle in Parliament the insolence and the intermeddling of the Scottish Office with Edinburgh purely civic affairs, we would suggest a change of tactics. London officials care not a whit for Scottish Members of Parliament. They look on them as dumb dogs, who do not bark and cannot bite ; but of the interference of Irish members in Parliament at "Question time" they are as afraid as rabbits are at the sight of a terrier. Why,

then, not borrow a member from Mr John Redmond for a few weeks, to show our dumb representatives how to overcome official insolence? If this were done, in a few weeks Edinburgh would get the control of the traffic of her own streets. That we look on as a certainty.

———o———

No. 61

THE POLITICAL CRISIS

THE situation at Westminster changes from day to day, and sometimes from hour to hour, and we who have to write, if we write at all, concerning the varying conflict of parties, a couple of days after the debate on the Address has begun, are likely to find our remarks, so to speak, in the air. What we have to say, therefore, will be in very general terms. It is now about forty years since D'Israeli made a sneering remark about the rapid political changes of Ministries in Australia, and the general political turmoil there, as a somewhat discreditable feature "of those wretched Colonies," as he termed them. D'Israeli had not much of the philosopher in his mental composition, else he would have seen that those changes which he sneered at, were the natural outcome of the then political condition of Australia. That country which had formerly been under a bureaucratic government of a narrow and selfish character, had shortly after it received in its principal States or Colonies the boon of responsible government, established universal suffrage, vote by ballot, and other democratic measures. The fight then began between the old system and the new; and as the old *régime* had in its favour, in the majority of the Colonies, Second Chambers based on a restricted and monetary electoral system, the struggle between the two lasted for many years, and brought about constant changes of Ministries. This, to the mind of British publicists of the D'Israeli stamp, betokened a people unfit for self-government. But the people, at every General Election, were becoming more enlightened as to their rights and as to their duties; and after a couple of decades, they settled down into orderly communities of a stable character, with Ministries lasting in some of the States during several successive triennial Parliaments.

Now what we have to point out is this—that here in Britain we are entering upon a political course or career, which has been gone through and completed in Australia. Feudalism—the political domination of the Peers and of the landed classes, is now making its last stand against the advance of Democracy. That stand will be a determined one; for wealth and privilege, and the power connected with the possession of land, can interpose many obstacles to the establishment of power by the people. But there can be only one end to the struggle. Democracy has many faults, and will, especially at first, commit many errors; but it aims, and must necessarily aim, at the establishment of a political system which shall be, not for the benefit of a narrow and selfish class, like that of the aristocracy, but for the people as a whole. Let the popular party, then, be not afraid of General Elections. They are the best forms of political education.

Southern England has yet to be brought into line with the democracy of Northern England, of Scotland, Ireland and Wales; and this may take several General Elections to bring about. But the day will come when it shall be freed from Toryism, and from its political subservience to the privileged classes. Feeling assured of this, we look upon the political complications that now confront us in Britain with comparative complacency. The future is for us; and the time is not far distant when England will cease to be Tory-ridden, and while governing herself according to her own political ideas, will cheerfully acquiesce in self-government being established also in Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Then, indeed, Britain will be a United Kingdom, which, with the friendly alliance of Canada, Australasia, South Africa—and more important still, of the United States—will be the greatest Power for good that the world has ever seen.

———o———

THE REVIVAL OF SCOTTISH NATIONALITY

THE declaration of the Master of Elibank on the announcement of the Midlothian poll is very significant, and will attract the attention of all Scots. It is to the effect that in the coming Parliament the Scottish Members must sit together as a sort of Standing Committee in the interests of Scotland, and that the next step must be some measure of Home Rule for that country. His brother, the member for Kincardine, and Captain Pirie, M.P. for North Aberdeen, are active supporters of an Edinburgh Parliament. We notice that the Prime Minister himself was asked the question direct in his own constituency. "One thing at a time," was his significant reply, and the inference among his hearers was that the question was ripening for practical solution.

The unique solidarity of Scotland at this election has staggered the Southron. In his utter ignorance and insular impertinence he has already begun to refer to Scotland as the Celtic Fringe; all good Scots are believed to be already domiciled in England, conformed to English light, and to have complacently swelled the voice of England. *The Scotsman* and *The Glasgow Herald*, after years of futile Tory roaring and lamentation that the country is backward, hopelessly given over to a moribund and Cobdenite Liberalism, unable to respond quickly to the stimulus of new ideas "like the great educated constituencies of Croydon, Bermondsey, Peckham and Birmingham," have begun to see that their unnational vapourings and Iago-like motiveless malignity, have only served to expose themselves to the contempt of Scotland. Sir Reginald Macleod writes to *The Times* to declare his belief that Inverness-shire was lost to the Tories simply through the utter ignorance of the people, and their wilful blindness to his transcendent merits as a candidate. Sir Robert Finlay is reported to have exclaimed "Thank heaven! there is an England," an unfortunate prayer that will yet cost him the rest of his exploded reputation.

In fact, the lesson of the Election

is so clear that it can be mistaken by no one. Scotland has declared that no longer shall she submit to the dictation of English voices and majorities. She has a history and a people of her own, and this unique victory must not be lost. The question of Home Rule for Scotland was raised all over the land, and the feeling is clearly seen to be no longer local but national. The consciousness of the people has been stirred by the superiority which separates Scotland from the vulgar and illiterate mob of panic-stricken voters in the English Home Counties. They are in alternate fits of alarm over their "rotten nyvy" and their "tryde stolen by the furriner." They have been humbugged by the antics of Blatchford and Beresford. "Gawd 'elp England if Charlie B. can't get a seat!" Apparently Scotland regards the circus-admiral as simply a case for the police. The parson and the squire, no doubt, are still potent factors in English rural life, but there is also a national question at the bottom of the English Counties and the Tory vote. The labourer has changed nothing since 1066, when he was boozing on the night of Hastings. It is certain that he has remained fundamentally unaltered since the days of Hengist and Horsa. He is a political Bourbon, and has learned nothing and forgotten nothing, yet we are told by the Tory press that the heart of rural England beats true to the Empire and to Tariffs, and that such a breed of men can nowhere else be seen! As Brougham said, the schoolmaster is abroad, and Scotland's superior education for centuries has won the battle. The Duke of Sutherland's disgraceful letter would in England, through territorial pressure, have won any constituency; in Scotland it simply meant the extinction of Toryism from Inverness to Wick.

We remember Dr Hunter, late M.P. for North Aberdeen, saying, "If any man thinks Scotland cannot produce talent and material for a Parliament of her own, he little knows Scotland. I know it, and could name the men." Those who know their country, and who, arguing from her past, can look forward to the future, need have no fear for the lead she can give to the Empire. Put the question in America and the Colonies, and the answer will open the eyes of those who think Chamberlainism has a future. Scotland, under the express stipulation of the Treaty of Union, on which she is going to insist in a very threatening tone, will settle her own Church Question, if the leaders of the Established and United Free sections can agree. She is ready to-day for Land, Education and Licensing Reform, and she is not going to wait.

What is to prevent Scotland seeing once more the Edinburgh of Scott, Jeffrey, Cockburn, Hogg and Constable? Nothing but a lack of belief in herself. Too long have we seen people like Barrie making money by the ridicule of their country, and Harry Lauder acclaimed as the highest and most sustained note of Scottish life. This constant degradation of the nation cuts deep. It began, as Lockhart

said, in Smollett's portraits of Scottish Jockies and Archies, and it lasted till Burns and Scott arose and drove them from the stage. Of recent years the cheap novelist and the Music Halls have revived this caricatured type. We regret to see such an old-established paper as *The People's Journal* lend itself to the sporting spirit and to the reporting of football matches and the biographies of professionals. Nothing more truly can show the vulgarisation of the national tone, and the influence of the coarse English life.

But the signs of the times are hopeful, and must cheer those that for the last thirty years have worked for the recovery of a Scottish Nationality and a Scottish Parliament. It will attract, there can be no doubt, to itself the very best ability in the country. A great General Assembly of the Church, a National Parliament, the consciousness of her history in the past and her possibilities in the future, all these will change the face of the country in a decade. All that remains for those who have worked for this great cause is to redouble their efforts and to keep the question before the people. At no Election have so many Parliamentary candidates pledged themselves to the principle as on this occasion. The end is in sight, and the Dukes are already on the run. Let us not fetter the hands of Mr Asquith at this juncture, when so many great issues must be determined, but let us in the meantime strengthen the hands of his colleagues by every means in our power.

Wm. Keith Leask.

GOVERNMENT NEGLECT OF SCOTTISH ANTARCTIC ENTERPRISE

In Numbers 2 and 16 of *The Thistle*, emphatic protests were made against the unfair way successive British Governments had treated the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, organised and led by that distinguished scientist or Scotsman, Dr William S. Bruce, F.R.S.E., of the Scottish Oceanographical Laboratory, Edinburgh. The unmerited neglect of this eminently successful expedition was contrasted to the handsome treatment accorded by the Government to the contemporary expedition of Captain Robert F. Scott, and the later one of Sir Ernest Shackleton, on both of which financial assistance and Imperial rewards had been showered. From the facts then recounted, it was abundantly clear that once more Scotland had been snubbed. The neglect of her claims on the Treasury amounted to nothing short of boycotting. In spite of the protest then made, here and elsewhere, there has since been no attempt on the part of the Government to redress the manifest injustice done to Scotland in this matter. On the contrary, the grievance has been intensified, and Scottish feeling deliberately flouted. The Government has added insult to injury. That this is not exaggerated language, but the sober expression of fact is proved by what follows.

After the scurvy treatment his splendid scientific achievements had received, Dr Bruce might well have felt discouraged from further Polar exploration work. Not only had the nation, to whose flag

he had added the lustre of his discoveries and research officially ignored him and his work, but he was actually allowed to be the loser monetarily thereby. His great personal sacrifices were accounted as nothing. A poorer-spirited man would have felt discouraged, but our intrepid countryman is not a man of that stamp. The luck of merited recognition appears to have acted only as incentive to further efforts. Like his knightly namesake in Scottish history, he would try again, and in April 1908 he published plans for another Scottish expedition to the Antarctic. In October 1909 he applied to the Prime Minister for a Treasury grant in aid of the equipment of the projected expedition, and in the month following he received the following somewhat curt refusal :—

Treasury Chambers,
November 5, 1909.

Sir,—The First Lord of the Treasury has laid before the Board your letter of the 22nd ult. requesting His Majesty's Government to consider the claims to a grant from public funds of an expedition to be organised in Scotland for the purposes of Antarctic exploration.

In reply, I am directed to inform you that they regret to be unable to submit to Parliament a note for assistance to this enterprise.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, S. H. Murray.

Here was an opportunity for the Treasury to make some amend for the previous neglect of Scottish enterprise, and in view of the grants of £45,000 and £20,000 given to Scott and Shackleton, it might reasonably have been expected that the Scottish explorer with, in some respects at least, a superior record, would at last get similar assistance. But no, the English official has learned from experience that the claims of Scotland can be disregarded with impunity. If Scotland desires to render service to science, and bring credit to the British Flag, well, let her do so at her own expense! The British Treasury is the preserve of England! That would seem to be the attitude of the permanent officials in London. At anyrate not a penny was forthcoming for Bruce, but Captain Scott, whose *Discovery* Expedition was granted £45,000, and was relieved at Government expense, publishes his plans in the summer of 1909, and receives the promise of a Government grant of £20,000 on 6th January 1910.

In face of these facts is it an exaggeration to say that Scottish scientific enterprise is being boycotted and insulted? Even so moderate a journal as *The Glasgow Herald* was moved by the publication of the facts in a letter from Dr James G. Ferrier, F.R.S.G.S., to publish two strong leading articles within a week, from which the following are extracts :—

"Last week we had occasion to congratulate Captain Scott upon the intimation that the Government had made him a grant of £20,000 towards an Antarctic expedition, which is expected to get under way about six months hence. It is much to be regretted that this grant appears to have exhausted the generosity of the Treasury for the time being, and also its interest in Antarctic exploration. . . . The refusal of aid to Dr Bruce is the more pointed and the less defensible, seeing that the Shackleton enterprise was endowed with the liberality now shown to Captain Scott, and the step-motherly treatment of Dr Bruce is not made any more tolerable

in relation to the fact that he 'was there first,' as Mr Ferrier indicates. . . . One need not elaborate the issue of priority; the point to be emphasised is that the Government, in determining upon the Scott grant, was fully aware that there was another claimant with as sound a title to consideration. No one can have any desire to support Dr Bruce's claim to a substantial subvention by belittling the work of other men in the same sphere. It may be admitted that his Antarctic enterprise had not the spectacular and dramatic value which attaches to dashes to the North Pole, or planting of ensigns 'Farthest South.' And just on that account the extent of his achievement, in adding to the sum of human knowledge, is apt to be overlooked. In the first year of the *Scotia's* voyaging, an area of 4000 miles of ocean was explored; in the second season the south-eastern extremity of the Weddell Sea was reached, and a great barrier of inland ice was discovered, indicating that the Antarctic Continent was 600 miles north of its supposed position. But the general public, and the Treasury, are less interested in the dredging of Ross's Deep than in the more picturesque aspects of exploration; and therefore an expedition aiming chiefly at scientific results of the highest importance is apt to be slighted; the more readily, as Mr Ferrier suggests, if it is of Scottish origin. . . . This denial of a subsidy would be doubly regrettable if it were likely to check the flow of public and individual subscriptions. But the value of Dr Bruce's work is sufficiently well known and appreciated accurately enough in Scotland to preclude any such secondary result of a refusal which is inimical to the advance of science, which is unjust to Scotland, and which must be reconsidered, perhaps by a more enlightened Treasury.

"The official attitude towards Scotland's claims is not unfairly described by the correspondent who deduces from it that anything originating in London is British in character, and that nothing of value to the nation can originate elsewhere. Our members of Parliament, as a class, have too readily fallen in with this view. They cannot make a better beginning towards a new way of life in a new Parliament than by pressing the equitable claim of the Scottish Antarctic expedition."

The Glasgow News, too, has taken up a patriotic attitude in the matter. It had the following comment:—

"No one will grudge Captain Scott the Government grant of £20,000 now promised in aid of his forthcoming Antarctic expedition. At the same time, we cannot help hoping that the Government will see its way to giving a little more encouragement to the Scottish enterprise of the same kind which has hitherto been virtually ignored, and is at present in need of help to publish the scientific results obtained."

And in a later article the same journal referring to the various expeditions now proceeding, or in view, remarks:—

"Then there is the purely Scottish Antarctic enterprise with which the name of Dr Bruce has been most intimately associated. As regards the latter, a circumstance is brought into prominence to-day which would certainly bear some explanation. Although a Government grant has just been promised for Captain Scott's project, a similar request put forward in November on behalf of the Scottish enterprise was refused. Why? . . . Why this persistent refusal to give countenance and support to Scottish geographical research while similar schemes which have their origin in the South can get encouragements and help for the asking? If satisfaction cannot be obtained, otherwise this question will probably be one of the first to find its way into the new Parliament."

These and other vigorous protests made by leading Scottish dailies, together with the great volume of supporting correspondence, to which they have given publicity, indicates that there is a widespread and genuine feeling of indignation in Scotland over this grievance. The question now is, will the newly-elected Scottish M.P.'s give ex-

pression to that feeling and follow it up by action? On national as well as purely scientific grounds they have a strong case and a unique opportunity of making an effective stand on behalf of Scottish interests, which it is their first duty to protect and preserve.

Not a single Scottish Member can honestly plead ignorance of this outstanding Scottish grievance. Thanks to the energetic and timely action of The Scottish Patriotic Association, The St Andrew Society and The Scottish Rights Association, every candidate that stood for a Scottish seat at the recent General Election had this, among other grievances, brought to his personal notice by way of a direct question. The replies received to the joint circular issued by the Associations, and the verbal replies to heckling at the public meetings, warrant the statement that practically all the Scots M.P.'s are pledged to support in every way possible the claims of Dr Bruce on the Imperial Treasury.

The Master of Elibank, immediately after the General Election, threw out the hint to his colleagues that the present was an opportune moment for the formation of a Scottish National Party, the urgent need for which has been insisted on time and again in these columns. But whether or no this step is taken by the Scottish Liberal Members, it is the duty of Liberal and Tory alike to act together as a National Party in regard to the Government's neglect of Scottish Antarctic enterprise. If appeal and argument are unavailing, the Scottish representatives should let it be known that even at the risk of their action being misunderstood, they will protest against the neglect by voting for a nominal reduction of the grants to Dr Bruce's friendly rivals when these grants are submitted for the assent of the House of Commons. No Government in the position occupied by the present one can afford to flout the reasonable demands of any considerable section of the House of Commons, especially if that section includes many of its own best supporters. Such an attitude of enlightened opportunism on the part of the Scottish representatives as a whole would almost certainly have the effect of bringing the Government to a speedy realisation of the expediency — if nothing else — of granting adequate support to the Scottish enterprise which they have treated so shabbily. But, of course, this much to be desired consummation can be attained only by the subordination of merely party loyalty to the claims of nationality. In this case, it must be Scotland and her interests before party, and if ever there was a subject on which it should be easy for Scottish Members of all parties to take concerted action, surely this deeply-felt grievance is one.

Over and above this action, and apart altogether from its success or lack of success, the newly-elected Scottish Members will be expected to urge the Government to give a favourable response to an influentially supported appeal for funds to complete the publication of "The Scientific Reports of the Voyage of the *Scotia*," which was made early in December by the Committee of

the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, and which is still under consideration by the Government. This memorial points out *inter alia* that the *Scotia* expedition appears to be the only one of the recent Antarctic expeditions, British, Belgian, German, French, Swedish and Argentine, that has not received Government help. Yet to Scotland's credit the work was carried out to as successful an issue as any of the others, with the least cost of any, and that so far at least three scientific volumes have been published. This has only been done, however, by the munificent contributions of Mr James Coats, Jun., Paisley, and Major Andrew Coats, D.S.O., who between them contributed £30,000; by several hundreds of enthusiastic subscribers, and by the great personal sacrifice of Dr Wm. S. Bruce and his personal friends. The appeal is supported by the most eminent of Scottish scientists, the principals of the Scottish Universities, and many other influential people. It will be a lasting disgrace to the Government, and reproach to the Scottish Members of Parliament if this modest appeal is refused. *

———o———

The Glasgow Students and Lord Curzon.—The students of the University of Glasgow have shown a commendable spirit of independence with respect to their discourteous treatment by their Lord Rector, Lord Curzon of Keddleston. He has not yet delivered his Rectorial address to the students, a proceeding, we believe, without precedent in the Annals of the University. They accordingly, some weeks ago, passed a resolution of condemnation of his discourtesy. To this Lord Curzon replied, pleading political complications which had been, and were taking up his time, and hoping that this would be accepted as a sufficient excuse. But at a largely attended meeting of the students they refused, by a vote of 533 to 306, to accept the apology, and so the Lord Rector stands condemned. Would that a similar spirit of independence to English discourtesy and insolence were more generally shown. If so, Scotland would not be treated so contemptuously as she now so commonly is by her Southern neighbours.

The Desolation of the Highland Glens:—The sylvan grandeur of the margins of Loch Arkaig, stretching away for many miles to the northward, lend a peculiar charm to the vista; but one cannot help recalling that Glen Dessary, Glen Pean, and Glen Kingie—now relegated to sheep and deer—were at one time thickly peopled by the peasantry class, the representatives of whom are now scattered over the plains of Canada and Australia. It is somewhat pathetic nowadays to wander through these desolated glens. There is pathos in the ruined homesteads, a requiem in the breeze, and even the waves on the beach, lapping unceasingly, seem to croon dolefully for the stalwarts that have passed away.—*Lochaber in War and Peace*, *p.* 187.

[The following articles are unavoidably held over:—"The Scottish Australasian," and "Professor Blackie as a Patriot."]

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 21. April 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

Printed by J. & J. Gray & Co., St James Place, Edinburgh and Published on the First of every Month by "The Thistle," 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 21. APRIL 1910. MONTHLY 1D.

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is 1d., post free 1½d.; outside British Isles, post free, 2d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 62

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE REIGN OF BRUCE

THE victory of Bannockburn, great and overwhelming as it was, by no means ended the attempt of the English to conquer and enslave Scotland. For som eyears, indeed, the spirit of the invaders was so broken that no great effort was made by them to avenge the disgrace that the Scots had inflicted on them, but still the English king and his advisers steadfastly refused to acknowledge the independence of Scotland, or to grant to Bruce the title of King of that country. Again and again Bruce made overtures for peace between the two countries on the basis of Scottish independence, and of the frontier as in the time of Alexander the Third, but his advances were consistently repelled. Seeing this, Bruce adopted the bold policy of compelling England to grant him his terms by turning the tables on that country, and invading and ravaging her northern shires by inroad after inroad. In 1318 Berwick was re-

captured by Bruce, and stung by this success, Edward II. made great preparations to retake it. A powerful army was summoned to assemble at Newcastle in the latter part of July 1319, and a strong fleet was fitted out by the Cinque Ports to accompany the army and assist it by entering the Tweed and attacking the fortress from the river side. Bruce, acting on what had now been established as the national tactics of Scotland, declined a pitched battle and Edward was thus enabled to surround the city with lines of circumvallation, which effectually prevented all succour, either of men or food being supplied to the garrison. But a strong garrison had been thrown into the city under the command of The Stewart, Bruce's son-in-law, and it was provisioned for upwards of a year. Repeated assaults were made by the besiegers, both on the land and the river front, but they were successfully repelled by the garrison. Seeing this, and that the lines of circumvallation were too strong to attack, Bruce decided to lay waste the north of England, and thus compel Edward to raise the siege. He sent an army of 15,000, all, or nearly all, mounted on small hardy horses, across the border; they got as far as York unopposed, where they hoped to capture the Queen of England, and hold her as a hostage, but she had taken the alarm and escaped to the South. The Scots then began to ravage the country round York. This roused the inhabitants, and the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of Ely and the Mayor of York hastily raised an army of 20,000 men, which attacked the Scots at Mitton near Boroughbridge, to the north of York. But they were completely defeated, losing from three to four thousand men, including the Mayor of York and some 300 ecclesiastics. The country was now at the mercy of the invaders under Randolph and Douglas, and they committed such terrible devastation that Edward was obliged to raise the siege of Berwick and go South to meet the enemy. He tried to come to close quarters with them, but Randolph and Douglas were too able for him, and managed to retreat to Scotland laden with spoil and with many prisoners.

But all the Scottish attempts to harass and annoy the enemy were not so fortunate. Edward Bruce, the King's gallant but somewhat rash brother, in the year after Bannockburn, went over to Ireland at the head of 6000 men for the purpose of attacking the English forces in Ireland, and enabling the Irish to free themselves from English domination. No doubt it was the ardent nature of Edward Bruce that led King Robert to support this expedition to the sister kingdom; but we cannot but regard it as mistaken policy, and one which it would have been much better to have left alone. After a struggle of three years, during which Edward Bruce was assisted for a short time by King Robert, it was finally unsuccessful. At one time, the two brothers, after defeating the English forces in several battles, marched south as far as Limerick. "Had Robert," says Burns, "with his calmer courage and military skill

remained to guide the expedition, the chances seemed all in favour of success. But the Irish failed to exhibit the same patriotic energy as the Scottish people had shown in their struggle. They seemed equally divided between their allies and their so-called oppressors, and their cause failed." In 1318 Edward Bruce, who had been crowned King of Ireland, and who was now without the support of King Robert, who had been obliged to return to Scotland, somewhat rashly fought a pitched battle with the Anglo-Irish forces near Dundalk, and was defeated and slain. And so ended this ill-judged and unfortunate expedition, in giving way to which King Robert did not display his usual good judgment and statesmanship. For even had it been successful, and the English had been driven entirely out of Ireland, this would only have enabled them to devote more of their power to the attempted subjugation of Scotland during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

After the raising of the siege of Berwick in 1319, and the successful inroad of the Scots into England as far as York, there was a comparative cessation of hostilities on a large scale for a year or two. But Edward II., having overcome some of his difficulties with his nobles, again in 1322 made up his mind to enter Scotland with a great army for the purpose of a complete subjugation. "The army," says William Burns, "is said to have amounted to as many as 100,000 men, and this great army crossed the Borders about midsummer 1322. . . . Bruce adopted the tactics suggested by Wallace prior to the battle of Falkirk, and afterwards rendered famous as *Bruce's Testament* . . . . The country was laid utterly bare; the Scottish army, if not the general population, retired before the invaders, and again the provisions, expected by sea, failed to arrive. There were now no traitors to disclose the whereabouts of the defenders or otherwise assist the enemy; the invaders were reduced to starvation, and without reaching the Forth this mighty Anglo-Norman host was compelled to retrace its steps southwards, defeated by mere passive resistance. . . . So ended this ignominious campaign—the last occasion, during the War of Independence proper, on which an English army entered Scotland.

Quoting from *The Scottish War of Independence* in a previous issue, we showed that previous to Bruce entering the field there had been twelve invasions of Scotland in force by the English; and from the same work we now can state that in Bruce's time there were ten similar invasions. From this it will be seen that Edward II. was by no means a weakling, or one whose power and ambition could be trifled with, so that Bruce had by no means an easy task, even after the great victory of Bannockburn. Let us quote Burns' statement of the invasions that took place after the death of Edward I. "(1) First came the army of at least 40,000 under Pembroke by which Bruce was defeated at Methven, (2) There were the successive minor bodies of knights and men-at-arms

under St John, Pembroke and others, which Bruce, his brother Edward and Douglas encountered during the early struggles in Ayrshire, Lanarkshire, Galloway and the North—thenumbers of which cannot well be calculated. (3) Edward II., having succeeded to the throne; according to the English authorities, he raised a well-appointed army under the Earl of Richmond, which certainly crossed the border, although, as we have shown, it did not defeat Bruce. (4) Edward himself advanced with an army as far as Cumnock in Ayrshire. (5) In September 1310 he again assembled a powerful army, which, under the Earls of Warrenne and Gloucester, Lords Henry Percy, Clifford and other nobles, penetrated as far as Renfrew. (6) An army, under the Earl of Cornwall, about the same time crossed the Forth, and boasted of having reduced the country 'as far as the mountains.' (7) Another, under the Earls of Gloucester and Surrey, entered the Forest of Selkirk, and reduced that district for a time. (8) To crown all these came the mighty host of 100,000 men, that in 1314 marched to the assured conquest of the country, but was defeated at Bannockburn. (9) Not to speak of minor attempts during Bruce's absence in Ireland, the next organised invasion was by the great army that unsuccessfully besieged the town of Berwick. And now (10) we have just witnessed the discomfiture of another host under Edward and his chief leaders. Thus, since the war began, apart from smaller parties, no fewer than twenty-two invading armies, embracing the *elite* of the Anglo-Norman barons, their mail-clad horsemen and terrible archers, aided by foreign auxiliaries, had been hurled against the devoted little country—only in one shape or another, to retire baffled and disgraced." Such is the summary of the desperate attempts which powerful England, with her allies and tributaries made during some five and twenty years to enslave little Scotland, and which, as William Burns in his admirable history proudly claims, were all in vain, There are few, if any, peoples who can show such a record of sustained and successful resistance to apparently overwhelming force. Well may Scottish patriots be proud of the glorious deeds of their brave ancestors! And yet, we see in these days some Scottish cravens whose ambition it seems to be to belittle the Scottish name and Scottish history, and to bewail and deride any and every attempt of Scottish patriots of these days to uphold the honour and glory of their native land.

—o—

No. 63

THE ROYAL STANDARD AT BALMORAL IN ENGLISH FASHION

THE KING AT IT AGAIN

"ETERNAL vigilance is the price of liberty," is a saying, the truth of which has been exemplified by the bitter experience of many nations and many peoples; and if we extend the meaning of the word "liberty" to the inclusion, as it may well do, of the words "national honour," then Scotland during the last two hundred years exemplifies in a crucial form a perennial verifi-

cation of the deep significance of the immortal phrase. Fortified and buttressed as regar dsher national rights and national honour by the Treaty of Union with England, Scotland might well have thought when that Treaty was signed, that henceforth she might relax her vigilance, and rest satisfied and secure that the day of danger to her people was over. Alas, she has found to her cost that her trouble has only been transferred from one field to another. She had gained, or rather maintained her liberty in the open field of war; and had, so to speak, compelled her antagonist to sue for peace and enter into an honourable and perpetual partnership. But during the two centuries that have elapsed since that partnership began, not a generation has passed without her witnessing sometimes open, and sometimes insidious encroachments on her rights and liberties. Her iron trade was interfered with in the first half of the 18th century by the English traders, but she successfully resisted the interference. As time went on, and her nobility became Anglicised by intermarriage, and largely by being educated in England, interference with her rights became more general; and stipulation after stipulation of the Treaty of Union was either openly destroyed, or was quietly altered or set aside. During the last century, it was openly attempted to set aside and regard as waste paper the first article of the Treaty by which her national honour was maintained in the change of the name of the two kingdoms to Great Britain or Britain.

All or nearly all of these encroachments on Scottish rights, up to the beginning of this century, arose from action in Parliament, where England has a huge and unscrupulous majority, or from the ignorance and arrogance of the English people generally, who have little or no regard for the rights of other peoples, if these peoples are weak or powerless. But with the beginning of the reign of our present monarch, a new and important factor of interference with Scottish rights and Scottish honour has come into play. The Sovereign of these realms, whose first duty as Parliamentary Head of the State is to act fairly and justly to the peoples of the four nationalities of the United Kingdom, so far at least as he as Monarch is personally concerned, made the first step of his accession to the Throne a direct and deliberate insult to the national honour of Scotland. Instead of assuming as his title—his baptismal name—"Albert Edward the First," which would have signalised the beginning of a new dynasty—the Saxe-Coburg—and would have given no just cause of offence to any one of his peoples, he dropped the name "Albert," and chose the title of "Edward the Seventh of Great Britain, etc."—thus giving a deadly insult to Scotland by implying that all the six previous Edwards had also been kings of Scotland. Then, a few years after, followed the Scale of Precedence, another direct insult to Scotland. Both of these acts were acts of State, and therefore of great and historical significance. There have been some smaller slights—such as those to the

Scottish capital—which from time to time we have duly made known to the readers of these pages; while we have clearly pointed out, and proved almost to a demonstration that these insults and these slights have arisen from the fact that "His Most Gracious Majesty"—so called—was, when Prince of Wales, hooted in the streets of Edinburgh—not, be it noted, without strong justification—by a portion of the people assembled in the streets.

If our readers will turn to the correspondence which has passed between The St Andrew Society of Edinburgh, The Scottish Patriotic Society of Glasgow, and Lord Pentland, the Secretary of State for Scotland, which we publish on page 66 of this issue, they will find that His Most Gracious Majesty seldom lets slip an opportunity of venting his characteristic vindictiveness against this portion of the United Kingdom. It will be gathered from the correspondence in question that "when His Majesty is in residence in Scotland, the Royal Standard displayed at the places where His Majesty is residing, is marshalled in the English manner," instead of in the Scottish. As this is a direct slight to the national sentiment of the Scottish people, the two patriotic Societies in question, with the aid of Mr John A. Stewart of Glasgow, well known as learned in matters of Heraldry, took the matter in hand, with the object of having Scottish sentiment treated with courtesy and respect. When the question was first dealt with in 1908, it was thought that the offence committed at Balmoral was an inadvertent, not an intentional one, and was due simply to the ignorance of the household officials at the royal residence. The correspondence which followed completely dispelled this view of the matter. "By His Majesty's Command" the question was referred to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whose reply was, that he "was unable to advise His Majesty to comply with the request." Now, from this arises two important matters for the consideration of patriotic Scotsmen. If, as is here tried to be shown, the question of whether an English or a Scottish flag should be flown at Balmoral was left to the discretion of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, then the question becomes a political one, and the Ministry, through the action of one of its important members, must be held responsible for this slight to Scotland. Lord Pentland, in his reply, takes this view of the matter, for he says, "it would not be in accordance with practice to re-open a question *so recently decided on ministerial responsibility*" (italics ours). Here, then, is a direct issue between the Members of Parliament for Scotland and the Cabinet, and they are therefore quite justified in making a national question of it, and in asking on what grounds the ministry can justify the advising of His Majesty to treat Scottish national sentiment with contempt by flying on the royal residence at Balmoral a flag marshalled, not in the Scottish, but in the English fashion. It is of no use saying, as it is the fashion of pure materialists to say, that this is a trifling matter, and that

it can make no difference to the Scottish people whether the flag flown at Balmoral is a Scottish one or an English one. To this, we say, that it is far otherwise, for it implies the subordination of Scotland *in Scotland* to England; a historical untruth of the most flagrant character in the first place, and a gross insult to the Scottish people in the second. National flags are the symbols of national sovereignty, and any insult to a national flag by a foreign country must be properly atoned for and disowned, or very serious consequences — even war itself—are almost certain to follow. History affords too many examples of the truth of this to leave any room for doubt. It is quite true that, as between Scotland and England, there can be no fear of any consequences other than political, but why should there be any occasion for even political resentment between the two countries? If it be said that the flying of an English flag, or a flag marshalled in the English fashion in Scotland, or of a Scottish flag in England, inflicts no material injury on either country, then on the other hand it is equally true that no material benefit will follow. Then why, without rhyme or reason, take a course of action that is slighting and repulsive to the national sentiment of patriotic Scots? To this there can be only one reply, that the flying of a so-fashioned English flag is indefensible, and should, without further ado, be stopped.

We have said that there is another view that may be taken of this question, and that is, that in reply to a Scottish remonstrance on this subject, the late Secretary of State, Mr Gladstone, said, "he was unable to advise His Majesty to comply with the request," thus leaving the British public to infer that the matter was one of which he had political cognisance, that he had duly considered it, and after such consideration he "was *unable* to advise His Majesty to comply with the request." This, we say, is the apparent and obvious reading of Mr Gladstone's letter of reply. But there is another view to take of it, and that is, that while Mr Gladstone wished the public to infer that he had "advised" His Majesty in the matter, the real position may have been and almost certainly was quite otherwise. We know now too painfully what are His Majesty's feelings towards Scotland, that they are of the nature of an unmitigated dislike, and that he seldom misses an opportunity of displaying them if he can do so safely. In this case we think it is very evident that Mr Gladstone was quietly made aware of the views of His Majesty in the matter, and thus knowing that the flying of the English-marshalled flag at Balmoral was not through the inadvertence of an official, but was by the direct wish of His Majesty, he consequently felt himself *unable* to advise His Majesty to undo what His Majesty deliberately had done, and wished to continue to do. Such we believe to be a plain statement of the case that is now before the British public.

We will now briefly summarise the whole matter, and call upon the Scottish people at home and abroad to come to a decision and say whether

our view of it is right or wrong. (1) The hoisting of a national flag is a symbol of sovereignty. When two hostile ships of war are fighting, the hoisting of a British flag, on, say, a French ship during the Napoleonic wars with France, meant that the French ship had surrendered and had become British property, or *vice versa*. So with a fortress or a kingdom. When a national flag is lowered and that of another nation is raised, the act, simple as it seems, means conquest. Thus, when Prussia went to war with Austria and her allies in the German States in 1866 and was successful, she annexed Hanover, which had been an independent kingdom, and made it part of Prussia. Thenceforth, and at the present time, the flag that is flown in Hanover is that of Prussia. So in Poland, once an independent kingdom, there is now no national Polish flag, but in the three divisions —Russian Poland, Austrian Poland and Prussian Poland—the national flags of these three countries have taken the place respectively of that of Poland. (2) Therefore the hoisting of the English "marshalled" flag at Balmoral, or what is equivalent to it so far as is possible, viz., the Royal Standard with English marshallings instead of Scottish, means, in the opinion of the monarch who so uses it, that Scotland is subject to and a Province of England, and that he wishes to proclaim this as his view of the national position of the two countries. (3) This view is not in accordance with British history or with the British Constitution. British history records that Scotland united with England as an independent kingdom, and the British Constitution, by the Treaty of Union of 1706, again records the fact in most unmistakable terms. (4) Then it follows as unmistakably that the hoisting of the Royal Standard at Balmoral in Scotland, with English marshallings instead of Scottish, is a direct slight to Scotland, and practically is a historical untruth. Who, then, is the perpetrator of this historic slight? Was it the late British Secretary of State for Home Affairs, the Right Honourable Herbert J. Gladstone, a passive and—in this matter—indifferent Minister of State; or is it the present Ruler of these Realms, His Most Gracious Majesty, King Edward (of Saxe-Coburg), well known to be an active meddler in State affairs, and a vindictive opponent of Scottish national rights and Scottish national honour? We think there can be only one answer to this question, and that is, that His Most Gracious Majesty's low and vindictive temper has once more got the better of him, and so far as Scotland is concerned, that he has been "at it again."

King Edward on Flags

As a comment on the above article, and as confirmatory of our view that His Most Gracious Majesty is not advised by any official or by anyone in the matter of flags or other symbols or decorations, we here reprint from *The Westminster Gazette* of a few weeks ago the following remarks on His Majesty's action relative to flags on Government buildings :—"The custom of hoisting flags upon Govern-

ment buildings," says *The Westminster Gazette*, "is in future to be more uniform than it has been in the past. By command of the King a notice has been sent to all the public departments that the flag is to be hoisted only on the occasions approved by His Majesty, a list of which is given, and that it is to be flown from 8 a.m. until sunset." This is a curious commentary on the correspondence we publish in this issue, relative to the hoisting of the Royal Standard at Balmoral with English instead of Scottish marshallings. It will be observed that the responsibility for this slight to Scotland is attempted to be put upon the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, who stated "he was *unable* to advise His Majesty to alter the arrangement." It is evident from the above paragraph that His Majesty, who looks after the flags on ordinary Public Buildings so carefully, is not likely to leave the choice of the kind of flag that is hoisted at Balmoral to any Government official. His Majesty is great on flags, buttons and decorations of all kinds, and if fate had fortunately so ordered it, he would have made a model Master of the Ceremonies at some of the minor German Courts. He, in that capacity, would have been in his true element.

———o———

No. 64

"PADDY" IS KING

THE whirligig of time occasionally brings its revenges, and a notable instance of it is the present position of the Irish party in British politics. Mr John Redmond is at present the most important and the most powerful man in the House of Commons, and the Tory and Radical parties alike acknowledge his supremacy. The position gained by him and his followers is well deserved. They have sacrificed everything for the cause of Ireland. Not one of the party has been base or servile enough to accept office or title from the Government of the day; and now, after many years of wandering in the political wilderness, they seem at last to have reached the promised land. So evenly divided at present are the two contending parties in East Britain, that the balance of power is held, and decidedly held, by the sixty or seventy West British members who follow the lead of Mr John Redmond. Nor is this position of power apparently a mere chance or temporary one. On the contrary, it promises to last for several Parliaments. For, be it observed, that the British people have at last begun their great campaign against the landed and privileged classes; and. as at present, the contest is pretty evenly balanced, owing to the ignorance and the servility of the Southern English, the compact and patriotic party of Irish patriots can give temporary success to either the Radical party or the Tory party, just as it suits their policy for the time being. In other words, the party that will most readily and promptly give Home Rule to Ireland will get the support of Mr Redmond and his party. It is generally supposed that the Tory party is so utterly opposed to the principle of Home Rule that the

Radical party need fear no competition on that side, but this is a mistaken view. It is all a question of leadership. Had Disraeli been in the plentitude of his power at the present juncture, he would have devised some scheme "to dish the Radicals," as Lord Derby at one time made his famous leap in the dark "to dish the Whigs." So, also, had Mr Chamberlain retained his health and strength, there can be no doubt whatever that in order to carry out his policy of Tariff Reform he would have secured the aid of Mr Redmond by granting Home Rule to Ireland; and the Tory party would have had to accept the lead of such men, however unpalatable at first sight such a policy might be to them. However, at present we see no sign of such a bold step of leadership being taken by anyone on the Tory side. That party, at present, is destitute of any policy but that of the usual humdrum kind—to hold on to the old worn-out formulas of Toryism—that the interests of land and of money must be supreme, and the welfare of the great body of the people be made subservient thereto.

It may be taken for granted then, that though Mr Redmond may for a time coquet and play somewhat fast and loose with the Radical party, he will not break away from them; simply because there is not a man among the Tories strong enough to give him what he wants. So far as we can see, the good time has at last come for Ireland which her people have fought for so long and so strenuously—through good report and bad report. The old evil and vile policy which English Toryism has endeavoured to press upon the British people—that English ways, English thoughts and English rule shall prevail over the whole broad field of Britain—from Dover to Donegal, and from the Lizard to Duncansbay Head, is now nearing its end; and ere long, the Irish, the Scots, and the Welsh peoples must receive from the British Parliaments the power to manage their own sub-national affairs—just as the people of England have all along been able to do, owing to their great numerical preponderance in the House of Commons, and in the House of Lords. When that day comes, and it cannot now be long postponed, there will be, for the first time in the history of the British Isles, a contented and happy people. And for such a boon when it does come, let us not forget that it will be due to the unswerving and long continued patriotism of the people of Ireland. They have set an example to the other members of the British people, which, if followed, ought to quicken a broader British patriotism, and give to our great Empire in the future a vigour and a strength which will carry it triumphant through many future ages.

The Scottish Annual Year Book.—We have received a copy of this Annual for the current year, and can safely recommend it to our readers as a patriotic publication of much merit. With many illustrations, and full of facts connected with Scotland and Scottish affairs, it is well worth its price—a shilling—The publisher is Mr John Wilson, 83 Jamaica Street, Glasgow.

PROFESSOR BLACKIE AS PATRIOT *

PROFESSOR BLACKIE was a devoted Scot and a true patriot, and to read his letters must be a stimulus to his countrymen. Here we give extracts from a few of them :—

The fact is, there is a tremendous dreariness and bareness and solitude and desolation about great parts of Sutherland, utterly abhorrent to the daintiness of female mind and the delicacy of the female foot, but in some parts there is a magnificent display of fantastic Bens, graceful crags, green knolls, dashing waterfalls, brawling rivers, long, gleaming lochs, and even fragrant birchen plumes, which compensate for many woes. Besides, what were travel if it were merely lolling on a soft-padded couch and rolling along from hotel to hotel without any touch of discomfort or cold wet brush of disappointment? I, for my part, am quite heretical on this point, and prefer an atmosphere such as we have in Scotland, fretful with alternate gloom and glory, to the cloudless brightness of an eternal summer.—*Letter from Lochinver, July* 6, 1844.

Yesterday there was an examination of the school of this district by Mr Macleod and an agreeable dramatic touch was given to it by the presence of the Pro. and the poetess of the district, by name, Macpherson. About 150 comely young persons of both sexes, generally clean and well dressed, though one or two were rather ragged and dirty, screamed out with harsh voices some of the well-known English and Scotch songs generally sung in Lowland schools. Not being particularly edified by this exhibition, I asked for a Gaelic song, but, as I expected, could get none—so little do the red tape gentlemen upstairs know of the first principles of moral education, one of which is to cultivate the heart by the agency of the mother tongue and of popular song, the growth of the soil. The spirit immediately moved me to stand up and exhort the master and the scholars to the cultivation of native song, and to nail down my exhortation and suit the action to the word, I took a pound note out of my purse, and, wrapping a shilling in it (a gentleman is a man who, when a subscription list is carried round, always gives a guinea and never a pound!) proclaimed a guinea prize for the best Gaelic song to be sung at the next examination.—*Letter from Skeabost, Skye, September* 12, 1879.

If Blackie had been a Highland earl and had lived a hundred years ago, he might have done great things for the Highlands, but now he can only gather money from unwilling pockets, and found a Celtic Chair for preserving to all eternity the mummy bandages of a dead Celt.—*Letter from Auchmore, August* 20, 1882.

This morning we had a stroll through a museum, a tasteful collection of Sutherlandshire antiquities and objects of natural history. There we saw an elegant cane, found on the field of Bannockburn, captured from some "English epicure," with the date 1314 on its neck. I kissed the silver neck with great patriotic *empressement*, but none of the party followed my example—such is the degeneracy of the times!—*Letter from Dunrobin Castle, September* 5, 1884.

At a lecture the Professor began to talk on Scottish song, seasoned with the stock amount of denunciation against the disnatured prigs of the male sex, and the fashionable maids-in-waiting on John Bull, who find the Scottish music too high to be sung, and the Scottish language too vulgar to be spoken (the language which Ruskin, in a letter to Archie, described as "the richest, subtlest, and most musical of all the living dialects of Europe"), and Scotland altogether worthy only to be attached like a bunch of heather on the majestic bosom of omnipotent John Bull.—*Letter from Laggan, Dulnain Bridge, September* 4, 1891.

Out of the sixty passengers there is a fair proportion—fourteen—either living in Scotland or Scotsmen settled in London, the silly notion that far birds have fair feathers, which turns so many Scotch boobies into English prigs, operates always less and when the fictitious vision of the eye becomes the tangible reality of the hand. — *On board R.M.S. Chimborazo, April* 3, 1892.

* A few selections from "The Letters of John Stuart Blackie and His Wife." 12s. 6d. net. Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons.

VIEWS OF COLONIAL STATESMEN ON HOME RULE IN BRITAIN

THE so-called Unionist or Tory party make a great claim to be considered as the only British patriotic party, and that Scottish, Irish and Welsh Home Rulers are unpatriotic, and desire to break up the Empire. The Tories also maintain that they only are in accord with the patriotic feeling of the self-governing British states beyond the seas. Well, if so, it is a curious fact, requiring explanation, that when our leading colonial statesmen and public men have anything to say on the question of British Home Rule, it is all against and not in favour of the views of the British Tories. In our issue of last January (page 6) we pointed out that Mr Kidston, the Premier of Queensland, and Sir Wilfred Laurier, the Premier of the Dominion of Canada, both expressed themselves as surprised that the British Government did not establish a system of Home Rule; not merely for Ireland, but for the whole of the United Kingdom. Apparently they did not know of the stupidity of the British Tory party, and of the unreasoning and one-sided system of vetoing in the House of Lords. Lately, we have other expressions of opinion in favour of Home Rule by two prominent public men in Canada, one an eminent Irishman, the other an eminent Scotsman. Here is what they say:—

A Canadian on British Home Rule

Mr William Mackenzie, the President of the Canadian Northern Railway, who arrived in London on the 15th of March, was then interviewed by a reporter of *The Times*. Speaking of British politics he said:—

"Preference is not so essential to the Colonies as it is to the Empire as a whole. The question, in fact, is whether we are to be an Empire or not. The present Imperial Parliament is too much occupied with local affairs. I should like to see each part of this kingdom with its local Legislature as well as a central Parliament—like our Provincial Legislatures and Federal Parliament—and, to crown all, a truly Imperial Parliament in which the whole Empire would be fully represented. There will not be the slightest difficulty in deciding what matters belong to the Imperial and what to the local authorities."

Sir Tho. Shaughnessy on Home Rule

Montreal, 18*th March.*

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, President of the Canadian Pacific Railway, addressing a gathering of Irishmen at a St Patrick's Day banquet, spoke at some length on the question of Home Rule. In the course of his remarks he said: "The Land Purchase Act accomplished a great deal, but why stop there? Ireland is entitled to and shall have local self-government, as should England, Scotland and Wales if they want it. In the case of Ireland, separation is as undesirable as it is impossible."—*The Times*, 19*th March.*

———o———

THE CANADIAN BOAT SONG

We extract this beautiful song and the remarks which follow it from the first issue of *The Scottish Australasian.*

Listen to me, as when ye heard our father
Sing long ago the song of other shores,
Listen to me, and then in chorus gather
All our deep voices as ye pull your oars.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

From the lone shieling of the misty island
Mountains divide us, and the waste of seas,
Yet still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
And we in dreams behold the Hebrides.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land,

We ne'er shall tread the fancy-haunted valley,
Where 'tween the dark hills creeps the small clear stream.
In arms around the patriarch banner rally,
Nor see the moon on royal tombstones gleam.
Fair these broad meads—these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

Where e bo ld kindred in the long time
va[ni]sh'd,
Conquered the soil and fortified the keep
No seer foretold the children would be
banished.
That a degenerate lord might boast his
sheep.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary
woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

Come, foreign rage—let discord burst in
slaughter.
O then for clansmen true and stern
claymore.
The hearts that would have given their
blood like water,
Beat heavily beyond the Atlantic roar.
Fair these broad meads—these hoary
woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

This beautiful poem is named by the above title, though it is more often known by the name "From the lone shieling"—the first words of the second verse of the poem. The name of the author of this poem is shrouded in mystery, and various names have been ascribed as to its authorship. Among others the Earl of Eglinton, a Lowland Scottish Earl, whose seat is near Irvine in Ayrshire, and if he was the author he must have been a consummate Gaelic scholar, not only in language but in tradition and true Gaelic sentiment, to have composed such a poem essentially Gaelic. The poem has been ascribed to one M'Leod of Skye, and M'Leod of Asgat, both of whom it is said emigrated from Scotland. Anyhow a record has been made and established that Professor Wilson of Edinburgh received this poem, either in the original English language or as a translation from Gaelic, from a Gaelic native of Greenock, then in Canada. This poem appeared in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1829. The sentiments are so Highland and Gaelic in their traditions that there remains no doubt apparently that though the real author is not discovered, the origin is distinctly Gaelic and comes from Canada. After the Battle of Waterloo many of the Highland regiments were disbanded, and the soldiers emigrated to Canada, taking service with the Hudson's Bay Company. There they have ever since remained, and have written their names large on the topography of the country in the names of lakes and rivers throughout the present Dominion of Canada.

THE ROYAL STANDARD IN SCOTLAND

THE FLYING OF AN "ERRONEOUS FLAG" TO CONTINUE

The following correspondence has take place between the representatives of the St Andrew Society and the Scottish Patriotic Association and the Secretary or Scotland:—

PETITION

104 Cheapside Street,
Glasgow, 16th December 1909.

To the Right Hon. Lord Pentland of Lyth'
Secretary for Scotland.

We, the representatives of and on behalf of the St Andrew Society and the Scottish Patriotic Association, desire to call your Lordship's attention to the fact that on those occasions when His Majesty is in residence in Scotland the Royal Standard displayed at the places where his Majesty is residing is marshalled in the English manner.

We do not require to remind your Lordship, especially in view of the instructions which you recently issued to Government Departments in Scotland with reference to the correct marshalling of the Royal Arms in Scotland, that the armorial achievement of His Majesty in Scotland, as of his predecessors since 1603, shows the Scottish Lion in the first and fourth quarters of the Royal Shield, the crest being the Royal Crest of Scotland, and the Scottish Unicorn (the dexter supporter) bearing the banner of St Andrew. The Great Seal of Scotland, approved by His Majesty in Council at Buckingham Palace on 24th April 1902, has the Royal Arms so marshalled, and this is the authorised form for use in Government offices in Scotland.

As your Lordship is aware, the Royal Standard is the personal banner of His Majesty, and we now urge upon your Lordship the desirability of ensuring that the Arms displayed upon that Standard in Scotland shall be in accordance with the usage of the Court of the Lord Lyon, instead of being, as is too often the case, in the Anglo-British form. In view of the revival of Heraldic Art we suggest that the Royal Standard for His Majesty's use in Scotland should be made under the supervision of the Lyon King's Herald Painter. We may add that there is strong

feeling against the use of the Anglo-British marshalling of the Royal Arms in Scotland.

Your Lordship's obedient servants,
(Signed) Stair, hon. president, the St Andrew Society.
(Signed) David MacRitchie, president, the St Andrew Society.
(Signed) Geo. Eyre Todd, president, Scottish Patriotic Association.
(Signed) John A. Stewart, secretary, Heraldry Committee.

Scottish Office, Whitehall, S.W.
10th February 1910.

Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary for Scotland to refer to your letter of the 16th December last forwarding a petition on behalf of the St Andrew Society and the Scottish Patriotic Association, urging the desirability of taking steps to ensure that the Arms displayed upon the Royal Standard when used in Scotland shall be marshalled in accordance with Scottish usage, namely—with the Scottish lion in the first and fourth quarters.

In reply, I am to state that Lord Pentland understands that a similar representation was addressed on the 18th August 1908 to the Lord Steward of His Majesty's Household by the Scottish Patriotic Association, which was referred by His Majesty's command to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, and that the Home Secretary was unable to advise His Majesty to comply with the request. I am to enclose a copy of the reply addressed to the Association on 2nd November 1908, and to state that it would not be in accordance with practice for his Lordship to re-open a question so recently decided on Ministerial responsibility. I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) John Lamb.

J. A. Stewart, Esq., Secretary to the Heraldry Committee of the Scottish Patriotic Association, 104 Cheapside, Glasgow.

In a note it is explained that the representation of August 1908 was addressed to the Steward of the Household at Balmoral, as it was thought that the display of the English form of the Royal Standard was a mistake on the part of an official, and not a deliberate act of the Crown. But the Home Secretary, who no doubt consulted the English Heralds (who have no jurisdiction out of England), decided that the erroneous flag should continue to be flown in Scotland. The Secretary for Scotland, it will be seen, declines to re-open the matter in the meantime.—*The Scotsman.*

CORRESPONDENCE

[*To the Editor of* "The Thistle"]

The Lion Rampant

Sir,—In the report of a lecture delivered at Glasgow by Mr Archibald M'Donald on Scottish and Scoto-British Heraldry, *The Glasgow Herald* quotes the lecturer as saying "The Rampant Lion, which was of course the King's personal device."

There must be some mistake here, as the lecturer previously stated that many Scottish families have for arms the Rampant Lion, differenced only by a change in the tinctures or some other matter of detail.

As a matter of fact the Lion Rampant has been adopted as a Coat of Arms by Edinburgh, Perth, Linlithgow, and also Wigtown, the latter being white on blue.

What the lecturer possibly meant was that the King made a claim on the Lion Rampant when having the double tressure Flory counter-Flory, but the King having adopted the Royal Standard of the United Kingdom has not taken out a payment for the Lion Rampant, he simply places it in one quarter, not two as many Scotsmen thought, and expected he would do, when used in Scotland.

The Lion Rampant and the silver saltire on blue ground are both national flags of Scotland, the former being the better known of the two. Through custom of centuries the former was used chiefly on land, and the latter at sea.

It is commonly believed that Wallace carried the Lion Rampant, not as King, nor yet in the presence of John Baliol.

No one can definitely say when or by whom this beautiful design was first adopted.

One of the Stuarts took out a patent for it, but his patent was, as it is said in legal phraseology, bad, the flag having been common property for centuries before then.

As I have already stated the present King has not taken out a patent for the Lion Rampart, but irrespective of this, it is within the right of any one—presumably of Scottish birth—to fly it.

Two or three years ago the Secretary for Scotland issued an interdict against its use, but I challenged the legality of this, and intimated to the Secretary and the Lyon King-at-Arms that I would fly it on Bannockburn day, and did so, but strange to say the interdict was withdrawn, showing that there was no power to prevent any one from flying it, and that it was simply a case of bluff on the Secretary's part.

Scotland has suffered a lot by being done out of her rights and privileges; notably the closing of the mint, the dismantling of Dumbarton Castle, the attempt to remove the Scots Greys, the anglicising of the Admiralty flags, the coinage, the King's title, etc., *ad nauseam*.

I trust that Scotsmen will continue to fly the world-widely known Lion Rampant for all time coming, and not be cajoled out of their rights either by King or Commoner. —Yours truly,

JOHN BELL.

——o——

THE SCOTTISH AUSTRALASIAN.

We have received from the Honorary Secretary of the St Andrew Society of Edinburgh the first and second numbers of this new patriotic publication, which is published at Sydney, New South Wales. These numbers appeared on the first of December and the first of January last, and are highly creditable to the spirit and enterprise of the patriotic Scots of New South Wales. The first number contains a portrait and a sketch of the life of Sir Normand MacLaurin of Sydney, where he has long been one of the leading citizens. He is Chancellor of the University of Sydney, and is also a member of the Legislative Council of New South Wales. Sir Normand is a native of Kilconquhar in Fife, where he was born in 1835. The January issue contains a portrait of one of the leading business men in Australia, Colonel the Honourable James Burns, head of the great shipping and trading firm of Burns, Philp & Co., who do the largest business in the Australian and South Pacific trade. Colonel Burns was born near Edinburgh in 1846, and was educated at the Royal High School. He went to Australia in 1862, when he was sixteen, and has built up his great business since then by his clear-headedness and his marvellous business capacity. We wish our Antipodean contemporary a long and prosperous career. Its conductors have a fine field before them; for a Scottish patriotic journal to watch over Scottish interests and Scottish national honour is greatly wanted in the Commonwealth. Had our contemporary been in existence two years ago, we venture to say that the Government would not have been able to perpetuate that outrage on the national sentiment of the Scottish, Irish and Welsh peoples—the absurd Australian Coat-of-Arms.

THE SCOTTISH PEOPLE.—Scotland, with its small population and comparatively poor soil, has usually been the most intellectual part of the United Kingdom, and Scotchmen all over the world have usually been successful in the race of life. The national diet of Scotland was oatmeal porridge, broth, vegetables of all kinds, and fish—meat only occasionally. It would be well for the present generation of Scottish people to go back to their old diet, which gave such satisfactory results, and to remember that mothers, whose whole systems are saturated with stewed tea, can never bring healthy men and women into the world.—Conway Scott, in his Pamphlets on *The Production of Distinguished Men at Athens and National Health.*

The pamphlet referred to was issued recently by a Dublin publishing house at 1s. 6d.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 22. May 1910 Price 1d

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 22. MAY 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz. 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 65

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

BRUCE COMPELS ENGLAND TO MAKE PEACE

AFTER a score of years of desperate warfare, during which Bruce suffered the most terrible hardships — exposed to all the severities of many Scottish winters —often with insufficient food, and without the shelter of even a humble roof, the health of the gallant king began to give way. During the last few years of his reign, after his return from the campaign in Ireland, he entrusted the leading of the armies that he sent into the north of England to harass the enemy to Douglas and Randolph. These renowned leaders proved to be more than a match for the English generals. At the head of twenty-three thousand men—all, or nearly all mounted on small but hardy horses —they entered England early in the summer of 1327, and ravaged the country to the centre of Yorkshire; moving with such rapidity that the enemy were never able to get up to them and bring them to battle. By

this time, the second Edward had been deposed and made away with, and his son, who was afterwards famous as Edward the Third, was placed on the throne at the age of fourteen. The government of England was thus in the nature of a Regency, which was so far favourable to Scotland; for great as were the powers of Edward when he reached maturity, his youth, at this time, made him a comparative cipher in the distracted nature of the country. The result was that England was compelled to sue for peace; for so desperate was the condition of her northern districts, owing to the almost unrestrained inroads of the Scots, that there was great danger of them being altogether lost to England. Under the auspices of the successful invasions of the Scots, numbers of the hardy borderers of Northumberland and the other northern counties were contemplating a transference of their allegiance to King Robert; and so formidable was the outlook, that the advisers of the young monarch were compelled to open negotiations for a peace. Of course, a peace could only be procured on terms that fully acknowledged the independence of Scotland, and this was fully and finally admitted. Commissioners from the two kingdoms met at Newcastle, which drew up articles of pacification. All claims of feudal superiority of England over Scotland were given up, and Robert was fully acknowledged to be the king of an independent Scotland, such as that country was in the time of Alexander the Third. The terms of the Treaty were agreed to by an English Parliament at York, and then were confirmed by the Scottish representatives at Edinburgh, in the month of March 1327. A final ratification of the Treaty by the English Parliament took place at Northampton in May, "ratifying and confirming the original charter and indenture, and the contract of marriage" between David, the son of King Robert, and Joan, the sister of young King Edward. Hence the arrangement of peace between the two kingdoms was and is known as the Treaty of Northampton. It is highly discreditable to the English authorities, and no less to many English historians, that attempts have been made to utterly deny that such a treaty took place. Burton, in his history of Scotland, says of it, "It is treated by some of the early annalists (English) as one of the acts of treason to the country committed by those who had command of England at that time. Others again deny that it was ever accepted by England. The denial has been repeated in later times, and it is curious to find that while so many diplomatic papers, comparatively of trifling moment, have been preserved among the records of England, this treaty has been dropped out of them. We have it only from the duplicate preserved in Scotland, which is, however, authenticated by the representatives of England." When we consider the persistent attempts of Edward the First to destroy the ancient records of Scotland, and see here in this instance that the record of a great State Treaty fully acknowledging the independence of Scotland was afterwards carefully

obliterated by the English authorities, we cannot but come to the conclusion that the attempt on the part of English statesmen and English historians to establish the English claim of superiority over Scotland is utterly baseless. For a just and true claim needed not such low and disgraceful tactics to sustain it.

The Treaty of Northampton was the crowning act of Bruce's career. It brought to a triumphant close his unparalleled efforts on behalf of the independence of Scotland ; and what a career was his. From the beginning of the year 1305, when he rode away with a few followers from the English court, and openly took up arms against Edward the First, down to 1328, when he was acknowledged to be the lawful King of Scotland by Edward's grandson and his English Parliament, what a wonderful series of adventures took place! Hardly in the history of any country, or of any monarch or hero, can a more stirring record be found. Defeats and repulses in abundance ; narrow escapes from pursuit and from death innumerable ; the imprisonment of many of his dearest friends, and the execution on the scaffold of many of his nearest relatives and chief supporters ; the opposition at the beginning of his career of nearly all the leading Scottish magnates, and the withholding from his support for several years of the Scottish commonalty—all these adverse circumstances had to be endured and faced by this extraordinary man for several years before any gleam of substantial success came to cheer him and encourage him in his arduous and terrible struggle. It is the fashion with some petty and carping writers to say that Bruce was no patriot, that he was a self-seeking, ambitious man who fought and struggled for a throne and not for the independence of Scotland. This is not our view of his character or of his career. His patriotism certainly was not the patriotism of Wallace, but that may well be allowed, and yet Bruce be placed high in the scale of national heroes and great patriots. For Wallace stands almost alone in the front rank of great and pure patriots. The divine spark of patriotism possessed him from boyhood. His soul was strung to the highest tension with love of country, and with the spirit of liberty and of independence. The patriotism of Bruce, on the other hand, flowered late. He had arrived, if not at full maturity, at least at full manhood ere he devoted his life to the service of his country. And this may fairly be pleaded for him, that he was educated and trained in the court of the usurper Edward, and taught to look on the resistance of the Scots as contumacy and rebellion. From this mental thraldom he slowly emerged, and that he, at the age of twenty-three or twenty-four, boldly decided to defy the then almost irresistible power of Edward the First, and link his fate with that of his oppressed and down-trodden country, shows that he had been seized by a power, and was actuated by a feeling, stronger and purer than that of mere ambition. For a merely ambitious man coldly and warily calculates the chances in his favour, and waits for the hour or the

day when fortune seems to beckon him onward. We see no sign of this kind of caution in the action of Bruce when he declared himself the opponent of Edward. On the contrary, his chance of success seemed to be utterly hopeless, and, therefore, we say, that while no doubt a desire to obtain for himself the Crown of Scotland formed one of his great motives of action, his chief compelling power after he had fairly taken up the cause of Scotland was love of his country and a desire to free it from the domination of England.

—o—

No. 66

"NO EVICTIONS FOR DEER FORESTS"

WEALTH, however great in wrong-doing, can always find bold and unscrupulous advocates, who delight in trying "to make the worse appear the better reason"; while poverty, however good and just its cause may be, has to come before an indifferent and unenlightened public as a weak and humble suppliant for consideration and for justice. The wrongs of the Highland race in their exclusion and banishment from their ancestral glens and muirs have been before the British people for many generations back, but the reparation of those wrongs has not yet begun; for be it understood that the grievances of the Hebridean crofters —generally speaking a sea-coast community—which have partially received some amelioration at the hands of the British Parliament, are in quite a different category from those of the mainland Highlanders, who have suffered, and have largely been expatriated, by the Highland lands being appropriated—first for sheep, and latterly for deer. In one of his recent patriotic speeches on behalf of his countrymen in Wales, Mr Lloyd George linked the Highland land question with that of Wales, and made an appeal for justice to the poor Highlanders, who had been driven from the land so that it might be used for the sport of the leisured and wealthy classes, chiefly of England. He was promptly challenged and attacked on both grounds—that of Wales and that of the Highlands—and accused of being a wild and unscrupulous agitator, whose statements were not in accordance with facts. It will be readily granted that, as regards the rights and wrongs of the Welsh land question, the Chancellor of the Exchequer needs assistance from no one; but, as regards the Highland grievance, perhaps we may assist him by exposing the falsities of the defence urged on behalf of the Highland landholders.

That defence is not now, as was that of the Marquis of Tullibardine last autumn, that the land used for deer forests is wild and barren, and fit for nothing else; a specious and wrong statement which we exposed and refuted in our issue of October last (*pp.* 228-31). It is now boldly stated that there have been no evictions for deer forests, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in saying that there had been, was simply a bold orator, who had little or no regard for truth. The statement that there had been no evictions for deer forests appeared in *The Times* some weeks ago over the

signature of "Western Highlands," and as the letter was accorded the honour of being printed in large type, it no doubt emanated from some high and important personage. Well, let us examine this statement, and see whether this anonymous correspondent of *The Times* or Mr Lloyd George is the more correct in his statements. "No evictions for deer forests" is the statement used by "Western Highlands," and, as such, it must be accepted as a general statement that none of the inhabitants of the Highlands have been displaced to allow large tracts of country to be made into deer forests; in other words, that Highland men with their wives and families have not had to give way to deer. This statement is so utterly irreconcilable with the facts of the case, that the writer must be guilty either of a wilful misstatement, or he must attach another meaning to the term "eviction" than the obvious one, viz., of a family having to leave its holding or its cottage, so that the landlord may have his land free for another purpose—in this case, that of sport. We do not accuse "Western Highlands" of a deliberate misstatement, but only of endeavouring to mislead the British public by using the term "eviction" in a restricted sense, while leading that public to understand it in a general sense. There have been, and are, "evictions" and "evictions." There were the evictions in the Highlands of the latter part of the eighteenth and the first three decades of the nineteenth century, when straths and glens and muirs were cleared of their inhabitants by the chiefs and lairds, to make room for sheep-farmers and their flocks. Beaton, in his book, "The Highlands of Scotland since 1800," says that "between 1773 and 1775 thirty thousand persons from various parts of the Highlands crossed the Atlantic, but it was not until about the beginning of the last century that the tide of emigration reached its full height, when the crofters were swept away to make room for the wealthy sheep-farmers from the southern dales, who invaded the Highlands, and offered an enormous increase for the summer shielings of the poor crofters." Another author, Alexander Mackenzie, in his "History of the Highland Clearances," goes more into detail, and gives a picture of the savagery of the Highland landlords and their agents in their wholesale methods of eviction of the poor and helpless inhabitants, which makes the readers of these days, if they have a spark of humanity in them, wonder how such acts of cruelty and of atrocity could have been perpetrated in Britain.

We will not go into that side of the question now, except to say that nearly all over the Highlands, but more particularly in Sutherlandshire, evictions of the inhabitants from their holdings, to make room for sheep, took place on a most extensive scale, and this continued down to about 1830. This was the first great scheme of eviction, and it was carried out, no doubt, by the Chiefs and Lairds, to make room for sheep, not for deer. But mark the sequel. The time came about the middle of last century, when, by the extension of railway communication

between England and Scotland, wealthy Englishmen began to turn their attention to the Highlands as a great field for sport; in the first place for grouse shooting, and in the second for deer stalking. The sojourn of the Court at Balmoral every autumn made the Highlands and Highland sport fashionable. Sheep-runs were soon found to be less profitable to the chiefs and lairds than deer forests, which became greatly in demand, and then a second scheme of eviction took place, when the thinly-peopled glens and muirs were practically deprived of their inhabitants and made a desert. Hardly a seed-cottage of the ancient inhabitants was left over thousands of square miles; for it is of the very essence of deer forest sport, that, so far as possible, not a living soul shall live within the bounds of a forest but the keepers who are employed to prevent poaching. Passes across the mountains that had been used by the inhabitants from time immemorial were closed, very often illegally and unjustly; for how could the humble inhabitants fight the wealthy landlords in the Courts of Law to maintain the rights of way? The case then stands thus, that so far from it being true, as stated in *The Times*, by the writer of the letter signed "Western Highlands," that there have been "No evictions for deer forests," the very contrary is the case. It may with some certainty, indeed, be affirmed that no deer forest has been formed without evictions of some sort, the extent of the evictions depending entirely upon the character of the country. Some deer forests may have been created without displacing many people, owing to the ruthless completeness of the evictions for sheep; but, as the area of the Highlands now under deer forests closely approximates to four millions of acres, it follows as a certainty that thousands of souls have been obliged to leave their homes to make room for the sport of wealthy strangers. First, then, the Highland landlords began by evicting the people from their estates to make room for sheep, thereby reducing the population in many cases by at least a half. Thus, in "The History of the Highland Clearances," it is stated that "the whole inhabitants of Kildonan parish (in Sutherland), amounting to near 2,000 souls, were (with the exception of three families) utterly rooted and burned out." This, no doubt, was an extreme case, but the reduction of the population was to a serious extent. Then later came the more serious clearances for deer. These did not cause so much excitement or remonstrance, simply because there were comparatively few people to evict. But that between three and a half to four millions of acres in the Highlands could then be made into deer forests without extensive depopulation is impossible. The statement admits only of one answer. It may be said of the clearances for sheep that the landlords with their selfishness and cruel policy made the country drab, but that the clearances for deer have made it black. That such a policy should have not merely defenders, but supporters and eulogists, simply shows how powerful and degrading is the influence of wealth

in this country. It was by such selfishness and by such misuse of property in land, that the power of Rome was destroyed, and if the selfishness of British landlords is not checked, and the British policy as affecting land is not largely altered and amended in favour of popular rights, disaster, ere long, will fall on Britain. The landed policy of every country should be based on the interest and well-being of the people, and not on the interest and pleasure of a narrow and selfish class.

Ill fares the land, to hast'ning ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade;
A breath can make them, as a breath has made.
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride
When once destroyed, can never be supplied.
—GOLDSMITH.

Supplementary to the foregoing remarks, and as a striking commentary on the statement in *The Times* by the writer of the letter signed "Western Highlands," that "no evictions have taken place for Deer Forests," we reprint the following from "Mackenzie's Highland Clearances" (*pp.* 341-43).

ATHOL

Donald Macleod, referring to the evictions from this district, says:—"A Duke of Athol can, with propriety, claim the origin of the Highland clearances. Whatever merit the family of Sutherland may take to themselves for the fire and the faggot expulsion of the people from the glens of Sutherland, they cannot claim the merit of originality. The present (6th) Duke of Athol's grandfather cleared Glen Tilt, so far as I can learn, in 1784. This beautiful valley was occupied in the same way as other Highland valleys, each family possessing a piece of arable land, while the pasture was held in common. The people held a right and full liberty to fish in the Tilt, an excellent salmon river, and the pleasure and profits of the chase with their Chief. But the then Duke acquired a taste for deer. The people were, from time immemorial, accustomed to take their cattle in the summer season to a higher glen, which is watered by the Tarf; but the Duke appointed Glen Tarf for a deer-forest, and built a high dyke at the head of Glen Tilt. The people submitted to this encroachment on their ancient rights. The deer increased, and did not pay much regard to the march; they would jump over the dyke and destroy the people's crops. The people complained, and His Grace rejoiced; and to gratify the roving propensities of these light-footed animals he added another slice of some thousand acres of the people's land to the grazing ground of the favourite deer. Gradually the forest extended, and the marks of civilisation were effaced, till the last of the brave Glen Tilt men, who fought and often confronted and defeated the enemies of Scotland and her kings upon many a bloody battlefield, were routed off, and bade a final farewell to the beautiful Glen Tilt, which they and their fathers had considered their own healthy and sweet home. According to history, an event occurred at this period which afforded a pretext to the Duke for this heartless extirpation of the aborigines of Glen Tilt. Highland chieftains elsewhere were exhibiting their patriotism by raising regiments to serve in the American War, and the Duke of Athol could not be indifferent in such a cause. Great efforts were made to enlist the Glen Tilt people, who are still remembered in the district as a strong, athletic race. Perpetual possession of their lands at their existing rents was promised them if they would raise a contingent force equal to a man from each family. Some consented, but the majority, with a praiseworthy resolution not to be dragged at the tail of a chief into a war of which they knew neither the beginning nor the end, refused. The Duke flew into a rage, and press-gangs were sent up the glen to carry off the young men by force. . . . By impressment and violence the regiment was

at length raised; and when peace was proclaimed, instead of restoring the soldiers to their friends and to their homes, the Duke, as if he had been a trafficker in slaves, was only prevented from selling them to the East India Company by the mutiny of the regiment. . . . Their conduct in this affair was given out as the reason why he cleared them out from the glen—an excuse which, in the present day, may increase our admiration of the people, but can never palliate the heartlessness of his conduct. His ireful policy, however, has taken full effect. The romantic Glen Tilt, with its fertile holms and verdant steeps, is little better than a desert. . . . On the spot where I found the grass most luxuriant, I traced the seats of thirty cottages, and have no hesitation in saying that, under skill, the industrious habits and the agricultural facilities of the present day, the land once occupied by the tenants of Glen Tilt is capable of maintaining a thousand people, and have a large proportion of sheep and cattle for exportation besides. In the meantime it serves no better purpose than the occasional playground of the Duke. The glens of Athol are intersected by smaller valleys, presenting various aspects, from the most fertile carse to the bleakest moorland. But man durst not be seen there. The image of God is forbidden, unless it be stamped upon the Duke, his foresters and gamekeepers, that the deer may not be disturbed. In 1841 the parish of Blair Athol had a population of 2231; in 1881 it was reduced to 1742, notwithstanding the great increase in Blair Athol and other rising villages."

It would appear from this that so far from the statement of "Western Highlands" being true, it is the reverse. And that one of the first, if not the first important eviction of the gallant Highlanders from their ancestral homes, was carried out by a Highland landlord for the special purpose of making a deer forest.

THE CANADIAN BOAT SONG

I SEE by the last number of *The Thistle* that the discussion has again broken out as to the authorship of this famous song. This time it has taken place in the first issue of the *Scottish Australasian*. Since 1845 it has raged, and possibly will rage again at intervals, for the disputants never know the facts. I think the time has come to settle it once and for ever, at least, till the missing link is accidentally discovered. But I do not believe that it ever will be. I myself have been answering questions on the Boat Song for over twenty years, so that I gladly avail myself of the wide circulation of *The Thistle* to lay this question to rest, especially among Scots abroad.

Let me quote once again the words that have gone all round the world:—

Listen to me, as when ye heard our father
Sing long ago the song of other shores,
Listen to me, and then in chorus gather
All our deep voices as ye pull your oars.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

From the lone shieling of the misty island
Mountains divide us, and the waste of seas,
Yet still the blood is strong, the heart is Highland,
And we in dreams behold the Hebrides.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

We ne'er shall tread the fancy-haunted valley,
Where 'tween the dark hills creeps the small clear stream.
In arms around the patriarch banner rally,
Nor see the moon on royal tombstones gleam.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

Where the bold kindred in the time long vanish'd,
Conquered the soil and fortified the keep.
No seer foretold the children would be banished.
That a degenerate lord might boast his sheep.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand ;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

Come, foreign rage—let discord burst in slaughter.
O then for clansmen true and stern claymore.
The hearts that would have given their blood like water,
Beat heavily beyond the Atlantic roar.
Fair these broad meads — these hoary woods are grand ;
But we are exiles from our father's land.

They have been attributed to Professor Wilson, the Earl of Eglinton, John Galt, Sheriff Nicholson, and many others. When and where did they first appear? They saw light in *Blackwood's Magazine* for September 1829 in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ;* and North, in character, thus introduces them :—

"*By-the-bye, I have a letter from a friend of mine now in upper Canada. He was rowed down the St Lawrence lately, for several days on end, by a set of strapping fellows all born in that Country, and yet hardly one of them could speak a word of any tongue but the Gaelic. They sung heaps of our old Highland oar-songs, he says, and capitally well, in the true Hebridean fashion; and they had others of their own, Gaelic too, some of which my friend noted down, words and music. He has sent me a translation of one of their ditties—Shall I try how it will croon?*"

That is the source, the whole and only source, for the Wilson authorship. It is clearly concocted from the lines themselves. But it is now known that the autograph of that Blackwood paper still exists, and it is entirely in the handwriting of Lockhart. That alters the case. The belief that Wilson was responsible for all the *Noctes* lasted down to the authoritative edition issued by his son-in-law, Professor Ferrier; the paper in question is excluded as being by Lockhart. The song of recent years has again become famous, through the quotation in books of the "shieling" stanza, which no one ever manages to cite verbally and exactly. Dr Cameron Lees gave it vogue in *Stronbuy* (1881), and Stevenson followed in his *Silverado Squatters* (1883). Mr Henley assured me that he and Stevenson had sought high and low to find the author ; they never could find him or learn more than the four lines.

In 1885 fresh attention was directed to the question, through the quotation of the same stanza in a garbled version by Chamberlain in his crofter-agitator days, at a great meeting in Inverness. An ear-witness of the scene tells me the effect on the audience was electrical. In 1901 the whole issue was taken up in Canada, and the Dominion was searched thoroughly along the St Lawrence for evidence as to the scene and the writer. It was in vain, and up till now no fresh evidence is forthcoming. A modern re-writing of the song from memory was written by Sir John Skelton in *Blackwood's Magazine* for June 1889, under the heading of "An Arcadian Summer."

But the controversy had raged for long years before. Professor Blackie,

who knew nothing of the facts, popularised the belief that Wilson wrote the lines. When Norman Macleod visited Canada in 1845, crowds hung upon him as he declaimed the "shieling" stanza. On his return home he set himself to find out the author, and failed. After repeated inquiries addressed to Lockhart and Wilson, no reply was sent. They had not the smallest reason to deny authorship of what had become famous, and the idea that they were ashamed of the political attitude is too absurd. That fact alone, their resolute silence, is suspicious. Some half dozen years ago, the words set to modern music were issued as Galt's, from Stirling, by a publisher there, because the present Mr Blackwood thought they might be his, as he was in Canada at the time and would see it. But no unhappier guess was ever made. Galt, in 1829, was a famous man; by 1820 he had written the *Ayrshire Legatees*, and in 1821 *The Annals of the Parish*. Lockhart would have been only too glad to have mentioned his name. Galt never alluded to them, and his son, Judge Galt of Canada, never claimed them for his father. Galt's editor, Canon Ainger, justly derided the idea, though I see these egregious people, Neil Munro and Wilfred Campbell, the Canadian poet—to the last of whom the lines have also been ascribed!—have declared for Galt. Lockhart's introductory talk is obvious patter; a writer of the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* never expected to be taken as speaking on oath.

In *Tait's Magazine* for June 1849, Lieutenant Donald Campbell, a writer of repute on emigration and subjects connected with the Highlands, and a witness of unimpeachable social standing; for, with his brother John, he was a claimant in the Lords to the title of the Breadalbane family, inserted the lines uncontroversially. He did so with the heading: *Canadian Boat Song: From the Gaelic: Found among the papers of the late Earl of Eglinton.* He incidentally asserts he had in his hand the autograph set of words and music by the late Earl. He was the 12th Earl, M.P. for Ayrshire 1784-89, the "Sodger Hugh" of Burns. The statement was never denied by Lockhart or by Wilson, to whom the lie direct is given. Their game was up. Eglinton died in 1819. His great-grandson, the present Earl, informed me he had been in Canada, and knew Gaelic well.

It has been asserted that the lines, as poetry, are beyond Eglinton. It is not denied that he composed airs, for his *Maid of Glenconnel* ("The pearl of the fountain, the rose of the valley,") is still sung. Allowing that Campbell was wrong in ascribing to him *the words*, the direct challenge to the Blackwood talk of 1829, and the silence of both Wilson and of Lockhart must be regarded as conclusive. And no one, reading the 1819 Introduction to the *Legend of Montrose*, can fail to see Scott knew the lines. The coincidences are too strong. The final word, therefore, is: the lines are before 1819, the year of Eglinton's death. The author is not known, and most probably will never be found.

Wm. Keith Leask.

CORRESPONDENCE

(To the Editor of "The Thistle.")

Public Library,
Dumbarton, 5*th April* 1910.

The Lion Rampant

Sir,—I bear Dr Bell record that he hath a zeal for Scotland, but not according to knowledge.

The flag, commonly but incorrectly styled the "Scottish Standard" is a true heraldic banner. Now, there is no evidence that heraldry had any existence prior to the time of the 3rd Crusade (1189-1192). It was invented after the adoption of the cylindrical helmet, which hid the wearer's face. Its object was to distinguish one mail-clad warrior from another—even if the other were his nearest-of-kin. Nothing could be more individual than a shield of arms as it first existed. And according to heraldry, a banner such as the "Scottish Lion Flag" is simply the equivalent of the shield from which it is copied. The banner bore the personal insignia of the leaders. A badge, such as the Thistle, was adopted as "common property" for the followers. This is just where a badge differs from coat-armour however displayed.

How many men, in the Scotland of the middle ages, could have ridden into battle, with vizor closed, and bearing for device the red lion rampant surrounded by its characteristic double tressure, without exposing themselves to the penalty for high treason? Only one man—the King of Scots!

"Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's" is a good rule to follow. By attending to it we strengthen our position when Cæsar puts himself in the wrong, and we have a genuine grievance against him.

Dr Bell need not feel heroic when flying the banner of Scotland's ancient kings. The chief-constable of his district (along with the other chief-constables in Scotland) was officially instructed to extend toleration to anyone doing so—"although the flag in question represents one quartering of the Royal Standard." See *Police Circular*, No. 512, 17th March 1907.

The pity is that thoughtful men who weigh their own words, and know something of the history of their country, are apt to be prejudiced at the outset against the cause of Scottish patriotism, by the unguarded utterances of some of its advocates.—Yours truly,

Archd. Macdonald.

A Notable and Noble Saying.—"Better bairns greet than bearded men," was said by the Master of Glamis to James VI. at Huntingtower, near Perth, during the "Raid of Ruthven," when the person of James, then aged sixteen, was seized by some of the Scottish barons for a national purpose.—*Hume Brown.*

The Terms England and Scotland.—"Scotland or England are words unknown in our native language. England is a dishonourable name imposed on Britain by Jutland pirates and mercenaries usurping on their lords."—*The Earl of Cromarty in the Debates on the Union.*

FRAUDS IN HISTORY

OUR Melbourne Correspondent, "St Andrew," writes to us as follows about the frauds in English history :—

As to some of my views on the history of old times, I may tell you how I first came to be sceptical of the truth in historians of the by-gone days. "Josephus" was a great book in the days when I was a boy at school, and I saved up my sixpences and fourpenny bits till I managed to buy that great book. I read it wonderingly ; the very immensity of the slaughter destroyed the spirit of Criticism and the book was "swallowed whole," as one would say, or just as some people swallow the Bible—boards and all. Some years later I got a plan of the city of Jerusalem, and found that it was somewhat less than St Andrews. As Josephus boldly states that eleven hundred thousand Jews were slain in the place in a seven months' siege I began to count up what they had to eat, and how they could exist in such a small spot. So the scales fell from my eyes, and I saw it was a fraud. Now every *Critic* calls it a fraud. It was a work of the monks to give some status as a nation to the Jews, and to introduce Jesus Christ, not only by the so-called evidence of Josephus, but by the fraud on Pliny. Now the monks who wrote the Chronicles we Scots have to struggle against were equally fraudulent, and their aims were, in the first place to glorify themselves ; and in the second place, to make the crown of Scotland dependent on that of England. No Scotsman ought to put any faith in these English Chronicles, as they are all written by enemies for their own purposes. The chief of these is Bede. He pretends to write fifty or sixty or seventy books on the various parts of the Bible before a Bible was in existence, but the Church has taken Bede under its protection, and his Ecclesiastical History is now dogma. His story of the Angles was got up as an English claim. He had to explaim how they lost their hold, and explains it by a battle at a place which cannot be discovered, said to be Dunnichen, but probably no more real than the great battle won by Athelstan at Bramby or Brunanburg, which has defied every attempt to find it out.

When I wrote you on these things I merely pointed out my reasons for believing that the Chronicles were false from the beginning, and should not be accepted as evidence by any Scot.

There was *no history of England* before the middle of the sixteenth century, when Polydore Vergil, tried his hand, making a very poor affair of it, as he had no data to work upon.

Nearly *all the Chronicles* appear to have been after this time. *No* Chronicles were written down by contemporary writers. One vouches for the authority of another and so on. If you will recognise, these facts, the frauds will be obvious. Not only so, but all the English Records were tampered with in the same style, as I endeavoured to prove to you, so that there can be no faith in either English Record or Chronicle.

———o———

SCOTTISH RIGHTS

CONFERENCE AT GREENOCK

A CONFERENCE of patriotic organisations to discuss questions of interest relating to Scotland was held on the 16th April in the Tontine Hotel, Greenock. Mr John Arnot, president of the Scottish Rights Association, by which the meeting was convened, occupied the chair, and there was a large attendance, including Greenock representatives, and delegates from the St Andrew Society, Edinburgh ; the Stewart Society, the Scottish National Song Society, the Scottish Patriotic Association, Glasgow, and its branches in Paisley, Dumbarton and other towns. The continued neglect of Scottish affairs in Parliament, and the tardy and often insufficient recognition of Scotland's claims, even when these are incontrovertible, formed the subject of the first resolution. It was moved by Mr George Eyre-Todd, who remarked that Scottish rights had been very much invaded in the past, and that there was a certain touch of aggression in the treatment which Scotland received from the "predominant partner." It

seemed to him that if our Parliamentary representatives united as a national party much more might be done for Scottish interests. A resolution viewing with satisfaction the increased importance attached to Scottish history in public examinations conducted by the Scottish Education Department, the Scottish universities and other responsible bodies was moved by ex-Provost Erskine, Greenock, and seconded by Mr Alexander Gemmell.

THE SCOTTISH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

Mr David M'Ritchie, Edinburgh, moved: —"That this conference expresses its appreciation of the valuable scientific work accomplished by Dr Bruce in his Arctic and Antarctic expeditions, and would urge upon the Government the equity of giving adequate grants towards the expenses of the 'Scotia' expedition, and to the contemplated Antarctic expedition under the leadership of Dr Bruce." Comparing what the Government had done for Dr Bruce and what it had done for others, Mr M'Ritchie pointed out that grants had been given to Captain Scott for his previous expeditions to the amount of £99,000. Sir Ernest Shackleton had received £20,000, and Captain Scott had been given a further grant of £20,000 for his forthcoming expedition. Dr Bruce had received nothing. (Cries of "Shame.") It was now nearly five months since the "Scotia" Publication Committee applied for a grant of £6800 from the Treasury to finish the publication of the scientific reports of the voyage of the *Scotia*. During that time unceasing efforts had been made by Mr Ferrier, secretary of the Committee, Mr C. E. Price, M.P., and others to obtain common justice for Scotland. In face of these facts he failed to see why there should be continued hesitation and delay on the part of the Treasury.

Mr J. Harvey Shand, Edinburgh, in seconding, said he did not think Dr Bruce's services were sufficiently appreciated. So far the British Government had ignored Dr Bruce, the only thing it had done for him being to lend a few scientific instruments to the "Scotia" expedition.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

A resolution in favour of the movement for reviving interest in Scottish song was passed on the motion of Mr John Wilson, Glasgow, seconded by Mr William Laurie; while another expressing regret that the training colleges for the British Army and Navy were situated in the south of England, thereby making it difficult for young Scotsmen of moderate means to become officers in these services, was agreed to on the proposal of Mr Donald Dewar, Glasgow, seconded by Mr Fred. Coutts, Paisley. Mr W. D. Low, Greenock, submitted the following: — "That the various societies which at present exist for the maintenance of Scottish patriotism and the assertion of Scottish rights should unite under some common name which would embody the distinctive features of each, that annual or other combined meetings be held to consider Scottish questions and pass resolutions, and that by delegates or otherwise an endeavour should be made to form additional societies in various places." Mr James Watson and Mr William Kidd spoke in support of the suggestions put forward, and the resolution was adopted, it being explained that if the scheme were carried out each society would still retain its individual existence. —*Glasgow Herald.*

A COMPLIMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES.—*The Western Scot*, a patriotic and lively monthly paper, published at Omaha, Nebraska, U.S., pays us the following compliment:—*The Thistle*, a Scottish Patriotic Magazine, is published the first of each month at Edinburgh for one shilling a year. It is worth the money, which, with postage, would be half a dollar.

The Western Scot is glad to say a good word for this splendid monthly, which is doing more for the upbuilding of the patriotic spirit in Scotland than anything we know.

ENGLISH PREJUDICES.—"Defoe, who shows that he can estimate the shortcomings of his own countrymen with impartial frankness, takes them to task as being the nation in the world the most addicted to national prejudices."—*James MacKinnon.*

MR LLOYD GEORGE AND THE HIGHLAND LAND QUESTION

Mr Lloyd George addressed the inaugural meeting of the Gladstone League in the Queen's Hall, London, on the 23rd of March.

After dealing with the land question in Wales, he made the following remarks on the way the poor Highlanders had been treated by their landlords, and how they had been evicted wholesale to make deer-forests. This statement was, of course, taken up by the advocates and supporters of the wealthy and privileged classes, and notably by a letter in *The Times* which boldly denied that there had been any evictions for deer forests in the Highlands. In our article, No. 66, in the leading pages of this issue, we deal with this aspect of the question. The following is a portion of Mr Lloyd George's speech :—

"You have got in this country 2550 landlords, who own two-thirds, of the soil. . . . What is still worse, by virtue of their ownership, they possess and exercise complete sway and power over the livelihood of millions of men, women and children. That is a very serious fact. Not only do these landlords possess complete control over their fellow-men, but as comparatively recent events prove, they are prepared to exercise it. Take the Scottish deer forests. There you had scores of thousands of industrious, hard-working, thrifty, happy crofting families. They produced some of the most gallant defenders of this Empire—all swept away with the disastrous brush of landlordism—swept clean, as if they were dust, clean from the board. What for? Purely in order to provide a few weeks' pleasure every year for a few rich plutocrats. What does that mean? It means not only that the power of feudalism over the land, which is the basis of our living in this country, is absolutely complete, absolutely without appeal, without challenge, but that you have got landlords prepared to exercise it to the detriment of the public welfare."

"Scotland's Work and Worth".—The last number—the fourteenth—of this patriotic and excellent book by Mr Charles W. Thomson, M.A., of Larkhall, has now been issued. We reviewed it at some length in our issue for November 1909, and now again draw the attention of our readers to it. To our countrymen abroad especially, it must be a most welcome book, for it gives a very good account of the high position they have attained in all the outposts of the British Empire—whether self-governing or dependencies. Writing of Scottish Music and Song the author has the following remarks, which show that while in his work, like a just and sound critic, he fully appreciates the many fine qualities of his countrymen, he is also alive to their failings. "It has been sad to notice," he writes (*p.* 414), "during the past twenty years or so, the readiness with which our 'street corner' youths, and even many who ought to know better, have given themselves over to the latest music-hall rubbish from England, to the neglect of our noble store-house of national melody. Jingo doggerel, 'coster' trivialities, rants of doubtful purity, or even of doubtless impurity, all have been greedily accepted, heaven knows why! Neither rhyme, nor reason, nor melody, nor rhythm justified their adoption; and the folly is the greater in the case of a people capable of something so much higher."

Scottish Missionaries and English Paganism. — "Archbishop Usher tells us that the Scots

preachers from Iona converted the greater part of England from Paganism; and," says Dr Jamieson, "it deserves to be mentioned, that how little soever some now think of Scottish orders, it is evident from the testimony of the most ancient and most respectable historians of South Britain that by means of Scottish missionaries, or those whom they had instructed or ordained, not only Northumbrians, but the middle Anglians, the Mercians and East Saxons, all the way to the river Thames—that is, the inhabitants of by far the greater part of the country now called England—were converted to Christianity.—Scotland and Iona, as the headquarters of Scotland's Christianity, was in fact the spiritual mother of England. * * * A full account of all this will be found in several histories, but especially in Dr Brown's Letters on Puseyite Episcopacy. There the reader will see the primitive Presbyters of Iona holding solemn consultation or missionary meetings about Pagan England, as we do at present about Pagan India, first sending Cormac, then sending Aidan, and after him sending Finan to convert the degraded people, as we at present send a Wilson and a Duff."—Reverend James Begg in *Free Church Magazine* 1846.

Sir Walter Scott on Scottish Nationalism.—To one thing, he (Scott) clung with all the tenacity of a romantic spirit, that was the supreme value to Scotland of her own national distinctiveness. . . . "Scotland," he writes to Croker, "completely liberalised as she is in a fair way of being, will be the most dangerous neighbours to England that she has had since 1639. . . . If you un-Scotch us, you will find us damned mischievous Englishmen." From "A Century of Scottish History," by Sir Henry Craik, Vol. II., *p.* 346.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 23. June 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

Printed by J. & J. GRAY & CO., St James Place, Edinburgh
and Published on the First of every Month by
"THE THISTLE," 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 23. JUNE 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz. 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1*d., post free* 1½*d.; outside British Isles, post free,* 2*d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 67

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE CLOSE OF BRUCE'S REIGN

BY the terms of the Treaty of Northampton, Bruce had secured the independence of Scotland, so far as it was possible to secure it, against the ambitious designs of a great and unscrupulous enemy. One of the conditions, the marriage of David, Bruce's son and heir, to Joan, sister of Edward the Third, was celebrated at Berwick "with great joy and magnificence," David being only five years of age, and his bride seven. Shortly after the marriage the disease under which Bruce was suffering ended his life at Cardross, on the Firth of Clyde, on the 7th of June 1329, at the comparatively early age of fifty-five. Tytler, in his history, writes highly of Bruce, and he well deserves to do so. He says, "his manners were dignified and engaging; after battle nothing could be pleasanter or more courteous, and it is infinitely to his honour that, in a savage age, and smarting under injuries which attacked him in his kindest and tenderest relations, he

never abused a victory, but conquered often as effectually by his generosity and kindness as by his great military talents." . . . "He was," he continues, "directed by an admirable judgment, an unshaken perseverance and a vein of strong, good sense. . . . These are the qualities which are especially conspicuous in his long war for the liberty of Scotland." This praise is not too high for the career and character of Bruce. Among the kings of Scotland he certainly stands pre-eminent, and in the long list of English kings there are none who did more for England—the somewhat shadowy King Alfred not excepted—than Bruce did for Scotland. When we contrast his character and his career with those of the ruffianly Edward the First, we seem to pass from the contemplation of a brave, and on the whole, a humane man—despite the death of Comyn at Dumfries—to that of a ruthless and unprincipled savage.

When we look closely into the nature of the struggle for Scottish freedom, which Bruce carried to a triumphant end, there is one feature which we think has not attracted the attention it deserves, and that is the great importance which the support of the common people had on the ultimate result. For the first four or five years of his warfare Bruce depended almost entirely on the support of his friends among the nobles of the country, and on his own immediate feudal followers. During the greater portion of that time his career was that of a bold and daring but hunted fugitive. And, had Edward the Second been an able monarch, it is pretty certain that Bruce would have been thoroughly overpowered and his career ended in the first five or six years of his desperate fight. But when the sturdy and indomitable Scottish people became thoroughly impressed with the patriotic character of Bruce's struggle, they rallied round him year by year in increasing numbers, and by their bravery and determination and their continuous vigorous support, thoroughly turned the scale in his favour.

In those days personal strength and skill in combat were important attributes of a leader in war. In this respect Bruce was well gifted. One of the old Scottish traditions was to the effect that Bruce, in personal combat, was an easy match for any two ordinary men, but that Wallace, alone, would have been a match for two men like Bruce. Tytler says of the latter, "the king was tall and well-shaped. Before broken down by illness, and in the prime of life, he stood nearly six feet high; his hair curled closely and shortly round his neck, which possessed that breadth and thickness that belong to men of great strength; he was broad-shouldered and open-chested, and the proportion of his limbs combined power with lightness and activity. . . . He excelled in all the exercises of chivalry to such a degree that the English themselves did not scruple to account him the third knight in Europe."

Of his ancestry, it is well known that, by the family name and history, they were of Norse descent. From a quotation which, in another part of this issue, we give from Laing's

"Early Kings of Norway," it appears that, in the eleventh century, a Norse Earl, named Sigurd, who was settled in Orkney, "married a daughter of the Scottish king, Malcolm (who must have been Malcolm the First, surnamed Canmore), and their son was called Thorfinn. Earl Sigurd had, besides other sons, viz., Somerled Bruse and Einar Rangmund." The name here given, though a prenomen, is significant of others, and the Bruce family thus seems to have been connected with Scotland and with the Scottish royal family, through another and earlier branch than that which gained the Crown in the person of Robert the Bruce They were thus partly of pure Norse —partly of Norman or Franco-Norse—and partly of English and Scottish descent. Thus the strain of English blood in the family must have been so small as to be almost non-existent. For the Norman conquerors of England, for the first two hundred years after the victory of Hastings, retained their separate existence as the ruling race, and disdained to mingle their blood with that of the Saxons, whom they despised and treated with the greatest cruelty and oppression. The royal line of Scotland, thus after the great interregnum of 1286-1306, fittingly began with a family in which was mingled the blood of the ancient Scottish kings, and that of a race—the Norsemen—who more than any other people from overseas helped to build up the wonderful tenacity, daring and love of liberty of the Scottish people.

———o———

No. 68

WHY SCOTSMEN GET ON IN POLITICS

THE ADVANCE OF DEMOCRACY

IN the Jubilee year of 1887, all over the British Empire, high festival was held, and all cities of importance put on their best, and decorated their streets and public buildings to the uttermost. Melbourne, the capital of Victoria—the name State of the illustrious Queen —naturally put her best foot foremost, and for the time was gayest of the gay among the Australian cities. In particular, the Treasury, a fine imposing building at the head of the principal street, was hung with flags—one feature of them being the national flags of all the countries of the civilised world. But, if on such an occasion it is possible to introduce a jarring note in the universal melody of joy, be sure that some ignorant or conceited English member of the British family is sure to do it. The decorations on the Government buildings, of which the Treasury was the most important, were carried out by the officials of the Public Works department; and the majority of these being Englishmen, or the chief official among them being one, and an ignorant one to boot, the national flag that was hoisted for Britain, was labelled England. The agitation for the use of the proper national name of the Empire was not then so pronounced or so vigorous as it has since become. But even then there were plenty of Scotsmen who resented the slight to their country; though few cared then to make the initiatory protest. Mr Theodore Napier, however, was

then a resident of Melbourne, of which he is a native, and he entered a protest, and demanded that the flag labelled "England" should be taken down, and one labelled "Britain" be hoisted in place of it. Politicians in a mixed community like that of Australia are sorely afraid of acting in a matter of this kind; clear though the right of the matter may be to their eyes. They fear the loss of votes at the next election. At this time, the political head of the Public Works department was a Scot, but not a very manly specimen of the race. He was timorous, and refused to change the flag; but replied that if Mr Napier chose to do so at his own expense, he would be allowed to do it. Those who know Mr Napier can easily guess what was done. The wrong flag was taken down, and the right one was hoisted at Mr Napier's expense.

The matter caused some excitement, and some of the more aggressive Englishmen looked upon it as a slight to England; but the right of the question was so much against them, that they hesitated to take any public action. The writer of these lines was in Melbourne at the time, and among his professional friends was an able journalist, a Yorkshireman. Now Yorkshiremen are probably more active minded and more aggressive than the natives of any other English county, and this gentleman, Mr H——, came to the writer, and said the Scots were becoming too aggressive and too powerful in the Colony; they were holding, he said, most of the chief positions, in politics as well as in commerce, and he and some of his friends were proposing to organise an English association to try to check them. The writer said how can you do it. The Scots hold their leading positions by the force of mere merit and ability. They are not clannish; they never back one another in wrong-doing. Look at the course of Victorian politics, and mark this patent fact, that when a Scotsman is the leading politician for the time, and you think he occupies it unfairly, who is his chief opponent, and the leader of the opposition? Why, another Scotsman! This was the case at the time, and Mr H—— was silenced; and no more was heard of the English Anti-Scottish Society.

The incident is a simple one, but it is illustrative of a phase of English life and English thought, which is beginning now and then to show itself in this country. It was owing to the advance of democracy that the Scots came so markedly to the front in Australia, as they have also long done in Canada. In the early bureaucratic days of Australia, the Scots were almost unknown in the political world; the chief posts were held by Englishmen, or by Irishmen connected with the class that then ruled Ireland. Englishmen who had been educated at any of the public schools of England, or who had graduated, however humbly, at Oxford or Cambridge, were regarded as the fittest men to hold office. But universal suffrage soon destroyed this ignorant and absurd tradition; and the best men in the community gradually came to the front, and step by step took the

leading position in politics. Admittedly the Scots are a democratic race, and many of the chief positions quickly fell to their lot, simply because they had proved their right to them. In British politics, the same results are being developed here, by the extension of the suffrage and the advance of democratic principles. A generation ago nearly all the members of a British Cabinet were members of the Universities of Oxford or Cambridge; and nearly all were educated at some of the great English public schools. So unvarying and so strong was this traditional policy, that men of third or even fourth rate ability, provided they had thus been educated, were made members of the British Ministries of the time. Mr W. E. Forster, a leading member of one of Mr Gladstone's Cabinets, and Secretary of State for Ireland, is reported to have said that he should have been a Member of a Cabinet ten years earlier had he received a Public School education, and had gone to Oxford or Cambridge.

Contrast the *personel* of the Cabinets of Mr Asquith or of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman with those of Mr Balfour or of the late Marquis of Salisbury, and at once will be seen the great change in the class of men who now take the lead in British politics. Political ability and hard-headedness—not aristocratic rank or a University career—now tell the most in the selection of members of a ministry, and this evolution of ability, in the place of rank and station, is growing and will go still further. This is why the Scot during the last ten years has come so much to the front in the British Parliament. He does not depend on family connections, or on public school or Oxford and Cambridge University traditional influence, but on hard-headedness and the power of work. Not brilliant like the Irishman, and probably not much excelling—if at all—the better class of Englishmen in ability, he excels the men of both of these nationalities in his devotion to work. The Irishmen, from a high patriotic motive, refuse to take office in the British Cabinets till the wrongs of their country are righted, and the Englishmen handicap themselves severely by their love of pleasure and their devotion to sport. And so the hard-working and resolute Scot gets a chance in British public life, as well as in trade and commerce, of which he takes full advantage. The result is that now, with the free-play accorded to hard work and ability in the Parliament and in the public life of Britain, the Scot takes the lead out of all due proportion to his numbers. Thoughtful Englishmen who know that this Scottish supremacy is well deserved, accept it with good grace, and make it a subject of good-humoured banter. But, on the other hand, the question is a sore one with a large portion of the English people, and some of them give vent to their annoyance in insolent jibes, and in coarse invective. We subjoin specimens of these two kinds of comment on the success of the Scots, each illustrative of the two points of view. The first honestly accepts the Scots as winners in the British battle of life, and with great

good humour makes some fun of it. The second looks at the question from the ignorant, envious and bigoted standpoint so common among Englishmen when judging the acts of countrymen other than their own. With such, anything that is not English, or not done in accordance with English notions, must be wrong. Every country in Europe knows the type, as does also Canada and the United States; while in India the rude and brutal insults these men throw, not merely at the lower classes, but at the natives of rank and of birth, constitute a real danger to the Empire. But Englishmen, as a rule, take no care or trouble to put down such insolent brutality. And again we say, as we have more than once said before in these pages, that until John Bull takes it upon him as a national duty to sternly discountenance and put down the brutal insolence of John Bully towards other countrymen than his own, he must expect other nations to regard him with dislike, and to resent what they regard as peculiarly English insolence. True Scots especially are not prepared to accept such insolence tamely, and quietly hold to their national motto, *nemo me impune lacesset.*

Herewith we subjoin the remarks and humorous banter with which a writer in the London press greets the political success of the Scots.

THE INVASION OF ENGLAND BY THE SCOT

The "Saturday Review," in the beginning of last year, published an amusing article, entitled "Novissima Scotia," in which the writer discusses the invasion of England by the Scot. He says:—"No nation has carried the principle of peaceful penetration to a higher pitch than Scotland. In nearly every profession in England it is a Scotchman who now rules the roost. The Irish are always complaining of the English garrison in Ireland and its denationalising effect, but the ascendancy in its prime of England over Ireland has never been so thorough as the moral and intellectual domination of Scotland over England to-day. The political hegemony, for instance, is virtually complete. It may be said to have started when Mr Gladstone went over, bag and baggage, to Midlothian. Since then we have had an almost unbroken sequence of Scotch Premiers, beginning with Lord Rosebery and including Mr Balfour and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. But the Government of to-day has broken all records. It is no hyperbole to say that not Downing Street but Scotland Yard would be for it a far more appropriate address. Its Scottish members, past and present, include Mr Haldane, Mr Sinclair (Mr Birrell), Lord Elgin, Lord Tweedmouth, and Mr Bryce. Even the sorry handful of Englishmen in the Cabinet mostly sit for Scottish constituencies, and, like the unhappy license-holders, they are therefore more or less tied down to represent the whisky and oatmeal ideals of the country of their adoption."

As a specimen of English jealousy and English bigotry, we subjoin the following extract, which a Leeds correspondent forwarded to us a few weeks ago. It may be said that the ignorant utterances of the writer are quite exceptional; but this is not true. In the large English cities, and in their workshops, the Scottish workmen are often treated with insolence and with expressions of contempt or dislike; quite different to the way in which English workmen are almost universally treated in Scotland. And the worst of it is, that English public men and English

journals seldom or never come forward to rebuke this ill-treatment by their fellow-countrymen of Scotsmen. This is one of the worst features of the situation; and this is one of the chief reasons, why in these pages we so generally denounce the unfairness, the insolence, and the arrogant self-conceit of the English people. So long as they allow this ill-treatment of their Scottish fellow-subjects to go on unrebuked, so long do they practically endorse the national wrongdoing. And the curious part of it is, that while at one time the Irish, as a race, were reviled and insulted in an infinitely worse manner than the Scots are now, this practice of abuse has ceased; and the Irish are severely let alone! Why is this? Simply that the Irish resentment of English ill-treatment took so fierce a shape some thirty years ago, that they made the English people afraid of them! But the peace-loving and law-abiding Scots have still to endure English insolence and English abuse. This is not exactly a compliment to the English character, but it is, nevertheless, pretty near the truth.

THE UBIQUITIOUS SCOT

A LETTER WHICH RECALLS DR JOHNSON'S OUTBURSTS

ARE OUR "RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES" IN JEOPARDY?

A Leeds correspondent, signing himself "Justitia," writes to us to-day (*Yorkshire Evening Post* (Leeds) of the 8th of April) as follows:—

Woolwich will soon be a thing of the past. The Arsenal, with its huge works, is being removed to Scotland, thereby throwing thousands of men out of work, causing great distress, and enormously increasing the national expenditure. We English are not only deprived of the work and means of livelihood, but must at the same time find money for the buildings and yards necessary to receive the Arsenal!

Are we not heavily enough taxed already?

It is part of a plan which has been systematically carried out by Mr Haldane and this Scotch Ministry ever since they came into power. The torpedo factory is the next department to go. We are told many of the men own their houses, and are forced to sell; some of the children hold County Council Scholarships, which will lapse, and the tradespeople of Woolwich will lose a purchasing population of between 2000 and 3000. As long as we allow ourselves to be ruled by a Scotch Ministry, so long shall we continue to be robbed of all the best offices in Church, State, or Municipality!

We Leeds ratepayers are but too well aware of the Scotch bureaucracy in our Municipal offices, and it would be interesting to know the amount of English money finding its way into Scotch pockets, beginning with the two Archbishops.

Anyone who has lived in Scotland knows how jealously they keep their appointments for their own countrymen. Can we not rise up and defend our rights and liberties? How long shall we be at the mercy of these rievers and rovers, plundering and greedy as in the days of old! Heaven send us an English Prime Minister.

If a Scotch matron be appointed to any of the "Homes" for women in the Colonies or abroad, she gives all the best posts to her countrywomen, not because they are better workers; the "soft jobs" are kept for the Scotch.

Some years ago a Scotch manager was appointed to the works at Barrow; he at once dismissed thousands of English workmen, and brought Scotchmen to fill their places. Boastful and insolent, their tyranny is bringing about the downfall of the Empire, and Britons are no longer respected abroad. I know of instances where they have been compelled to pass themselves off as Germans! The kid-

napping of Kaid M'Lean was a notable instance; had he been an Englishman he would have been left to his fate—indeed, an English doctor was tortured and put to death in Morocco at that very time. No one avenged him, but this Scotch Government paid a king's ransom for Kaid M'Lean, and changed the policy of the Empire to set him free. I could give many other instances of Scotch injustice did I not fear to weary your readers.

[Note, as one of the peculiarities of this English expression of bigotry and hate, the attitude of the conductor of *The Yorkshire Evening Post*. So eager is he to give publicity to this ignorant outburst of his correspondent, that care is taken to publish it on the very day it is received. Those who are acquainted with the working of a daily newspaper, will gather from this promptness in publication that the editor is of the same mind as his correspondent.—EDITOR OF *The Thistle*.]

———o———

HIGHLAND LAND LEAGUE

AT a meeting of the Highland Land League held on Friday, 6th May, in the Religious Institution Rooms, Buchanan Street, Glasgow, Mr C. A. Paterson, M.A., LL.B., Advocate, who presided, spoke on the present conditions of the rural peasantry, and advocated Nationalisation of the land as the only effective remedy for their grievances. Thereafter Mr Thos. Johnston, author of "Our Noble Families," delivered a lecture on the land history of Scotland, which was listened to by a good attendance of members and friends with great interest. Dr G. B. Clark was re-elected president. Mr C. A. Paterson, Mr Thos. Johnston, and the Rev. Malcolm M'Callum, Muckkairn, vice-presidents. Mr John M'Leod, 100 Bedford Street, Glasgow, treasurer, and Murdoch Martin, 186 New City Road, Glasgow, hon. secretary. County Committees were formed to undertake local organisation, and a vigorous campaign was projected. All interested in land law reform in the Highlands, and those wishing to join this useful organisation, should communicate with the hon. secretary.

[We are glad to see that in Glasgow The Highland Land League is moving on behalf of the much-afflicted crofters and working people of the Highlands. We hope, ere long, to see a branch of the League established in Edinburgh.—EDITOR OF *The Thistle*.]

———o———

THE CHESTER HISTORICAL PAGEANT

AS is the fashion nowadays in England, the people of the old and most interesting city of Chester are to hold a historical Pageant from the 18th to the 23rd of July next. From the text of the pamphlet sent to us we learn that in 973

"King Edgar, as king of the English, and overlord of many princes, came to Chester by sea to receive the homage of those who held their titles under him. The ceremony in this City must have rivalled in brilliance and impressiveness even the crowning at Bath, by which it had been preceded. *All the princes of the Isle of Albion came to render their homage and take their oaths of allegiance, and they themselves rowed Edgar in the Royal barge up the Dee to the Collegiate Church of St John*, where was witnessed a scene of splendour such as never had been known in these realms." (*i.o.*)

All this is presumably very gratifying to the inhabitants of Chester, and it is no doubt written with the intention of making them proud of the history of their beautiful and interesting City. That history is interesting enough without resorting to fiction, which the part we have italicised undoubtedly is. It is simply a preposterous invention of the monks, who were notorious for such fables. It is intended to claim that King Edgar was monarch of the whole of Great Britain, and that all its princes, and presumably kings, as they were then termed, acknowledged his supremacy and obeyed his rule. There is no warrant for this in authentic history—Professor Freeman's historical romances notwithstanding. Had King Edgar ventured to conquer Scotland, he would have either been destroyed with all his army, or been obliged to beat an ignominious retreat. And it is a matter of correct history that within about a generation of time after this mythical pageant on the Dee—viz. in 1017—Canute conquered the whole of England, and destroyed the Saxon power. While before this, and in the latter quarter of the 10th century, the English or rather Saxon monarchs were so craven and so afraid of the Danes, as to pay them tribute—the well-known Dane—Geld, to be freed from invasion. At the same period Scotland was free from Danish invasions; or at least from successful ones. For the Danes found out by experience that the Scots were too strong for them; while the Saxons were easily overcome. To try then to make out that the Saxon King Edgar held supremacy over Scotland as well as England, is quite absurd, and the Chester city authorities had better strike the scene out of their pageant; and thus bring it more into line with historical truth.

CORRESPONDENCE

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We hope to find room for the letter of Mr John Stevenson, Glasgow, in our next issue. The letter of Dr James R. Stevenson of South Australia having already, in great part, appeared in *The Scot*, published in Melbourne, renders it unsuitable for our columns.

58 BATH STREET,
Glasgow, 7th May 1910.

The Lion Rampant

DEAR SIR,—I admire the courage of Mr Arch. Macdonald when he proclaims that my "zeal for Scotland is not according to knowledge." He, however, gives no indication as to wherefrom he derives his special knowledge, but instead thereof, he builds up a beautiful theory castle upon a sandy foundation, which cannot stand the storm of investigation; or perhaps I should say it is a "castle in the air," which has no foundation whatever.

We all have access to the same reference authorities that he has, and nowhere can I find it stated who invented the lion rampant design, or who first used it on shield, coat of arms, flag or banner, either with single or double tressure, and I defy Mr Macdonald to produce any authentic record regarding same, or as to whether the design

was first used by a King, a Knight, or a Commoner. In default of such evidence or valid title, I maintain that the design is common property, and can be used by anyone. The Lion Rampant has been known for centuries all over the world as the Scottish flag, and may be quite correctly described as the Scottish Standard, notwithstanding Mr Macdonald's dictum.

One of the Stewarts (Charles the Second, I think) took out a patent for it, but as I said before, his patent is what is described in legal phraseology as bad, and of no value whatever, the design having been common property for centuries previous to its registration. King Charles II., like many other kings before and after him, made claims and laid hands on many things that he had no right or title to, and fawning sycophants simply allowed him to do so without protest, but I trust the present race of Scots will not allow any King to filch them out of their good old lion rampant.

Mr Macdonald refers to the Police Circular, No. 512, of 17th March 1907, but he ignores the gist of the second circular, which nullified the first. The second was printed in the "Daily Record" of 20th June 1907, under the bold type heading of "EMBARGO ON SCOTTISH FLAG REMOVED." I may here say that I do not agree with the heading adopted by the "Record," as no one could lay an embargo on the flag, hence the word "removed" is out of place.

The remarks regarding the Cylindrical Helmet and the Thistle Badge are interesting in themselves, but have no bearing on the subject under discussion, and may be likened unto the proverbial red herring.

If I mistake not, the Lion Rampant has been flown from Dumbarton Rock—near Mr Macdonald's home—farther back than man can remember, without let or hindrance. Long may it continue so to do there, and "wherever Scotsmen gather."—Yours faithfully,

JOHN BELL.

LEITH, 12*th May* 1910.

A New Zealand Scot

SIR,—"I enjoy 'The Thistles' immensely; reading them makes me proud I am a Scotsman." The foregoing is an extract from a letter I received recently from a young Scot in Auckland, New Zealand, and it is not the first tribute I have had to the worth of your paper in developing Scots patriotism abroad.

Wishing you more success in awakening the apathetic Scot at home to a sense of the privileges of his birthright, and the assertion of his rights.—I am, yours, etc.,

R. S.

[We are glad to receive this testimony of our success in making Scotsmen proud of their country. It is one of our great aims in carrying on *The Thistle*. For if Scots are proud of being Scots, they will not readily submit to any damage to their country's interest, or slight to its honour. And it is only by eternal vigilance in this respect that our national interests and our national honour can be maintained. —EDITOR OF *The Thistle*.]

THE ANCESTRY OF KING ROBERT THE BRUCE.—English historians are fond of pointing out that The Bruce's ancestors came from England into Scotland, and would like to draw the conclusion that he was an Englishman. The fact is, that his ancestors were mere temporary sojourners in England, having come to England among King William's followers, who conquered England at Hastings, and afterwards utterly subdued it. But these Bruces went from Norway to Normandy. Thus Laing, in his "Early Kings of Norway," Vol. II., *pp.* 130-1, writing of the Norsemen in the Orkneys and the North of Scotland, says:—"In the days of Sigurd the Thick came Olaf Trygvesson from his Viking expedition in the Western Ocean, and with his troops landed in Orkney, and took Earl Sigurd prisoner in South Ronaldsha, where he lay with one ship. King Olaf allowed the Earl to ransom his life by letting himself be baptized, adopting the true faith, becoming his man, and introducing Christianity into all the Orkney Islands. As a hostage King Olaf took his son, who was called Hund, or the Whelp. Then Olaf went to Norway and became king, and Hund was several years with King Olaf in Norway, and died there. After his death, Earl Sigurd showed no obedience or fealty to King Olaf. He married a daughter of the Scottish King Malcolm, and their son was called Thorfinn. Earl Sigurd had, besides other sons, viz., Somerled, Bruse and Einar Rangmund." It will be seen from this that a Bruse, most probably a progenitor of Robert the Bruce's family, was connected with the Royal family of Scotland in King Malcolm's time—say, in the latter half of the eleventh century, so that the connection with England was a subsequent and less important matter.

———o———

"ONLY" OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.—Writing on "The Training of British Officials for India," *The Spectator* of 23rd April 1910 says:—

"We are inclined to agree with Lord Wellesley (that the Training College should be in India). It may be possible to show that the training can be as adequately given here; and if it is so, we shall acquiesce. If it cannot, then we should like to see a Training College or Colleges established in India. One year at *Oxford or Cambridge*, and a year at an Indian Training College should, in our opinion, be the rule, not merely for the Covenanted Service; but for all British Administrators." So this is what the leading English weekly paper thinks is fair and proper administration for Britain. All British administrators must pass through Oxford and Cambridge Universities. This is what they call English fair play! We believe it would more conduce to sound and just principles of administration in India, if in the training of officials those from Oxford and Cambridge were altogether excluded, rather than they should be the only British Universities for training purposes.

The Army Pageant and Scotland.—We have received, at a somewhat late date for notice, a copy of "The Book of the Army Pageant," edited and arranged by Messrs F. R. Benson and A. Tudor Craig. The Army Pageant is to be held at Fulham Palace, London, from the 20th June to 2nd July next, and is intended to be in aid of the funds of the Incorporated Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society. The book, which is published at the price of 2s. 6d., is a handsomely got up and illustrated volume, giving a history of British warfare just after the prehistoric period down to the close of the Peninsular War. The narrative is interesting; but as usual with English publications, does not avoid occasional errors, detrimental to the national sentiment of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. In British warfare, these three nationalities took a share more than proportionate to their relative population with that of England; and as a narrative of war is one which peculiarly appeals to national sentiment, the utmost care should have been taken to deal in this respect with extreme fairness to the minor nationalities. We say with extreme fairness advisedly; for it is obvious that the less populous sections of the United Kingdom are naturally sensitive on this point of national honour; as it is apt to be, and is, moreover, frequently encroached on and slighted by ignorant and arrogant Englishmen. But with military men, honour is the first point to be considered; and therefore the national honour of the Scots, Irish, and Welsh should have been most generously guarded and respected in a narrative dealing with British warfare. We admit that this book does not err grievously in this respect, as nearly all English books do. But it does so occasionally. We have not had time to go over it minutely; but, for instance, why should the only battle—we think it is the only one—between the Scots and English dealt with, be that of Dupplin Muir? The battle was lost to the Scots. Surely that cannot be the reason; but, if not, it was a good reason for leaving it out. Then look at the quotations preceding the narrative of that battle. One is from Burns—not appropriate to the occasion; the other is insultingly inappropriate, for it says:—

> "Walled towns, stored arcenalls and armouries, goodly races of horses, chariots of warre, elephants, artillery and the like. All this is but a sheep in lion's skin, except the breed and disposition be stout and warlike. Nay, number itselfe in armies importeth not much, where the people is of weak courage. For as Virgil saith, 'It never troubles a wolfe, how many the sheep be.'"

Does the compiler mean to say that the Scots are "of weak courage," and that it is right to compare them to sheep before the English wolves? Then again, the narrative says (p. 133) "The *English* army, under Sir John Moore, arrived at Corunna on 19th January 1809." Since the Treaty of Union in 1707, there has never been an "English" army in the field. All have been "British." However, on the whole, the narrative is much more correct than English narratives and histories usually are. And with these qualifications and comments we commend it and its object to our readers.

THE LONDONERS IN MOURNING.—The London newspapers, in giving a description of the funeral procession of the late king on Friday, the 20th of May, would lead their readers to believe that the vast city was given up to woe for the loss of their beloved monarch. No doubt there were many sincere and many respectful mourners, but the countless masses of the lower classes of London knew little of the career or true character of King Edward, and cared less. The affair to them was simply a London sight, to be enjoyed in a fashion not to be admired by ordinary respectable citizens. Here is what the special correspondent of the *Evening News* (Edinburgh) says of it :—

Can London mourn? The question may startle, after yesterday's solemn pageant and the innumerable thousands who came in black array to witness it. If she can, when she does she sucks oranges; she litters the route of kings and princes with a slippery carpet of peel and dirty paper, as if there had been an Armageddon of dust carts; she laughs and jokes; she transfers Hampstead Heath in holiday mood to the scene of processional woe; she goes home, after the passing of a beloved monarch, wrapt in the last emblems of purple pomp, to thump jingling pianos and grind raucous talking machines, and shake up the night with suburban parties.

"I hope never to see a Royal funeral again." Such was the comment of a witness to London's mourning. He had gone forth at an early hour to take a point of vantage in the Mall. The first touch of disillusion came at the Tube. He expected decent sobriety of demeanour; in place of that, merriment and scampering for seats. At Trafalgar Square, within measurable distance of the Hall of the Dead, the rushing mob of men, women and children wanted but a touch to their accession of high spirits, and it might have been the Carmagnole.

But a graver sense of things would descend upon them on the line of route. What happened? Open-mouthed admiration of the decorations, and jokes. Cheap Cockney jokes. For a taste of the repartee: "See that p'leeceman there with four medals," says one, a large cigar in his podgy fist, and his waistcoat heavily loaded with a flashy watch-chain. Responds another of his kidney: "Them ain't medals. Won them at cricket matches, I expect." Later, during the very procession itself, when the Seaforths were approaching: "Hi, Harry Lauder!" greets their steady swing of a march.

———o———

JOHN BULLIES CARRYING A JOKE TOO FAR.—The *Melbourne Argus*, under date of the 28th of March, narrates the following, which illustrates in a small but striking manner the insolence with which too often Scottish ways and Scottish sentiment are treated by Englishmen. For, be it noted, that the offenders were members of "The St George's Rifles."

Sunday.—A volunteer camp is being held at Liverpool, near to Sydney, and yesterday some pretty manœuvres were spoiled through a section of the Scottish Highlanders becoming bushed. Subsequently some humorists of the St George's Rifles tucked up their trousers, donned blankets for kilts, blew penny trumpets for bagpipes, and marched up and down in imitation of their northern friends. The Highlanders simulated amusement, and tried to regard the pantomime as an English joke, but, emboldened by the applause of the crowd, the masqueraders encroached on the Scottish lines, and repeated the performance. This was more than Celtic blood could bear. With a wild yell the pipers dashed from their tents, followed by the men of the regiment, in one fierce Highland charge. They scattered their adversaries, tore from their backs the blankets and trappings, and dipped a few of the Southerns in buckets.

ENGLISH FAIRNESS.—*The Times*, in a review of a book, entitled "The Campaign of 1815 in the Low Countries," by a Dutch Officer and a Belgian Officer, says: "Many nations were involved, so that it was only too easy to be partial while the event was fresh. The *English*, on whom the heaviest stress fell, tended to claim exclusive credit for the great triumph achieved." And further on says: "Nor do the authors, who stand up for the valour of Bylandt's men, while honestly admitting that they were *écrasés*, better their case by arguing that their self-devotion gave time for the *English* reserves to come up." The italics are ours. It will be seen that the writer in *The Times* claims exclusive credit for the "English" portion of the British army in the success of the great day. Let us point out, that had it not been for the assistance of the Scots and Irish troops in the British army, the English would have been swept off the field long before the Prussians could have come to their assistance. But this is like the usual English bumptiousness and braggadocio. They think that they only represent the British Empire; while it is notorious that had it not been for the co-operation of the Scots and Irish, there would have been no British Empire worth speaking about. The English are too lazy and too spiritless to found empires. They leave that to the Scots and Irish; and when success is achieved, they step in and say, "We did all that." So much for English fairness!

DR JOHNSON IN SCOTLAND.—A Fife gentleman, now resident abroad, sends us the following amusing stories of the hoggishness of Dr Johnson when a guest in Scotland:—

I see that you have been dressing old Dr Johnson and giving him a general "combing down." It recalls the old days when I was first sent to school at St Andrews, and was boarded at my uncle's house. My aunt was full of all the old tales of St Andrews and the ancient inhabitants, from the days of Cardinal Beaton down to her own time; and she had stories to tell about every nook and cranny of the old, tumbledown place—and it was all that till golf and the Madras College again set it on its legs, and trampled down the green grass which had possession of the streets. My aunt was well aware of Johnson's visit to the Ancient City, and had abundant anecdotes of his rudeness to all and sundry, but most of these have been forgotten by me long ago till *The Thistle* revived some recollections of the old brute, as told by her. There is, or was, a very large sycamore tree at Lamboletham, which Johnson said "was the only tree on which a man had a chance of hanging himself." At a dinner to which he had been invited the hostess said to the servant, "Mary, tak' awa' the fools!" "*Fowls*, Madam," said Johnson. "Yes, Mary," continued the lady, "tak' awa' the *fowls* and let the *fool* remain!" She had lots of these, and I saw a good one in *Notes and Queries* which may amuse you if you have not seen it; but, before doing so, I may state that the old lady told these tales with great glee, as the lexicographer frequently had the worst of the encounter. —In *Notes and Queries*, July 11th, 1908, there is an extract from *The Lady's Realm* of October 1897—"The Real Flora Macdonald," by Margaret Macalister Williamson. Allan Macdonald of Kingsburgh, who married Flora Macdonald, was the authoress's great-great-grand-uncle. Near the end of the article is the following:—

"I shall finish by giving one or two anecdotes culled from the same long-lived

individuals, *i.e.*, certain grand-aunts and grand-uncles.

When Dr Johnson made his tour to the Hebrides with Boswell he was hospitably entertained at Corry by my great-great-grandmother, Kingsburgh's daughter, Anne, who was first married to Macalister of Strathaird, Isle of Skye, and secondly to Mackinnon of Corry. At dinner, one day, Mrs Mackinnon said to Dr Johnson, "Sir, how do you like the Scotch broth?" He politely replied, "Madam, it is fit for pigs." She quietly rejoined, "Will you allow me, sir, to give *you* another plateful?"

This anecdote is *not* recorded by his admirer, Boswell.

Mrs Mackinnon's daughter, Margaret Macalister, then a young bride of sixteen, having just married Dr Macdonald of Gillen, took a bet with some sprightly young ladies that she would sit on Dr Johnson's knee in the drawing-room and kiss him. These young ladies had dared her to do it, saying he was too ugly for any woman to kiss.

This anecdote *is* recorded by Boswell.

So much for the great lexicographer, who has been preserved for the benefit of Englishmen by a Scot, who has been well laughed at for his pains. Johnson, born 1709, died 1784. Some of the better-class Englishmen are harsher to Johnson than his "natural enemies" have been.

———o———

ITALICS ARE OURS.—Readers of newspapers often see these words used, when the writer has deemed it desirable to put in italics some portion of a paper or extract which he is quoting. We have often found this remark tedious and troublesome; and in our extract in this issue from the pamphlet of "The Chester Historical Pageant," we have used the abbreviation (*i.o.*) to signify that the italics are ours. In future, we shall continue to do so; and we have no doubt that by-and-bye our example will be followed by others.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 24. July 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 24. JULY 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS
HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY
No. 70

THE SET-BACK TO SCOTLAND—
YOUNG BALIOL CROWNED

THE young King, David, succeeded to a stormy inheritance. The position of the two countries, England and Scotland, was now reversed. During the latter years of Bruce, when, though weakened in body, he was still strong in mind, and, above all, ripe in the experience of war and statesmanship, Scotland was in safe and strong hands. England, on the contrary, had a king, young, inexperienced and therefore still compelled to trust to advisers, who were more disposed to serve their personal ambition than to further the warlike interests of their country. Scotland, then, had the strong and able guidance; England the weak and inexperienced. But Edward had great qualities, and he soon began to show them. Reversing the old saying, Edward the First had sown the whirlwind, and the after-kings of England and Scotland were to reap the winds in generations of racial hatred and of bloody war.

Englishmen, generally, naturally felt humiliated at the success which Bruce gained for Scotland by the Treaty of Northampton, and Edward the Third, who was fifteen years of age when he came to the throne in 1327, as soon as he reached manhood, began to show signs of dissatisfaction with the terms of peace. He, at first, did not openly show his hostility to his brother-in-law, the young King David, but he allowed the English barons, who were entitled to certain lands in Scotland by the Treaty of Northampton, to ally themselves with those Scottish-Norman nobles, who had been deprived of their Scottish estates by The Bruce, owing to their having joined the English invaders. It appears that three English nobles, viz., Percy, Lord Wake and Henry Beaumont, were to have certain lands in Scotland restored to them by the Treaty, but when the two latter allied themselves with the disinherited Scottish barons, and joined with them in making Edward Baliol again a claimant for the Scottish Crown, Randolph, the Regent of Scotland, very properly refused to place them in possession of their Scottish lands. Randolph, the able Scottish Regent, was a great obstacle to the designs of these discontented barons, and to get rid of him it is alleged that they, or an agent who thought he was carrying out their wishes, or furthering their views, poisoned the Regent. This left the kingdom with a boyish king, and without an able leader, and faction, as usual the curse of Scotland, broke out with disastrous results. At a Parliament held in Perth, Donald, Earl of Mar, was made Regent. He was nephew to King Robert, but this seems to have been his only claim to the position. He was incompetent and weak, and, though at the head of a powerful army, allowed the Baliol party to land in the south of Fife and establish itself there. Thence, having gained some accessions from the nobles who were enemies of the Bruce dynasty, Baliol advanced to Strathearn with the intention of seizing Perth. Had there been a leader of only moderate ability at the head of the Scots, Baliol and his English and discontented Scottish adherents could have been easily crushed. But Mar was utterly incompetent. "Aware," says Tytler, "of the near presence of the enemy, he kept no watch, and permitted his soldiers to abandon themselves to riot and intemperance." They were encamped on the north bank of the river Earn, on the slopes of Dupplin, about six or seven miles west of Perth, and there they were attacked at night by the invaders, and slaughtered in great numbers. It was one of the most disastrous defeats that the Scots ever experienced from the English, and, as was usually the case, the defeat—though partly arising from the treachery of some Scottish nobles—was chiefly owing to the utter incompetence of the Scottish leader.

This crushing victory seemed at one blow to undo all the great work done for Scotland by the illustrious Bruce. Baliol immediately pushed on and seized and fortified Perth. He was, after some further opposition by an army, at whose head was the

Earl of March, joined by that nobleman and others, and shortly afterwards was, at Scone, crowned King of Scotland. Thus, in a few months, the kingdom was again practically deprived of its independence, and placed under the sway of Baliol, who was simply a nominee of an English cabal; supported secretly by the young Monarch, Edward the Third, now beginning to show his powers and to unfold his aggressive and ambitious policy.

Of this extraordinary change in the position of Scotland, Tytler says, "the chief causes which led to this remarkable revolution, destined for a short time to overthrow the dynasty of Bruce, are not difficult of discovery. The concluding part of the late King's reign, owing to the severity with which he punished the conspiracy of Brechin, had been unpopular, and part of the discontented nobility were not slow in turning their eyes from the line of Bruce, which his great energy and military talents had compelled them to respect, to the claims of Baliol, weak in personal power, but, as they imagined, better supported in right and justice. A party of English barons, headed by Henry Beaumont, one of the most influential subjects of England, having been dispossessed by Bruce of their estates in Scotland, determined to recover them by the sword, and united themselves with Baliol, concealing their private ambition under the cloak of re-establishing the rightful heir upon the throne. They were mostly men of great power, and were, all of them, more or less connected with the numerous sept of the Comyns, the inveterate enemies of Bruce. They received private encouragement and support from the King of England, and they began their enterprise when the Civil Government in Scotland, and the leading of its armies was in the hands of Mar and March; the first, a person of no talents or energy, and suspected of being inclined to betray his trust; the second undoubtedly a favourer of the English party." Thus, once again, the liberties and the independence of Scotland were placed in jeopardy by her wretched nobility, chiefly descendants of those Norman barons, who had been brought into the kingdom and endowed with great estates by King David the First for the purpose of advancing its progress in civilisation. David has been described by a modern Scottish historian as one of Scotland's greatest kings. We hold quite a different view of his character. Scotland had, in herself and her people, all the elements of a steady progress, quite equal to that of any other country. And if she had been left to develope her civilisation in her own way, untainted and uninterfered with by the malignant influence of a greedy Norman baronage, in all probability she would have escaped more easily, and emerged more readily from the terrible war inflicted on her by the unscrupulous ambition of that royal ruffian, Edward the First of England.

THE SIZE OF THE CALEDONIANS.—Varro allegeth out of Pacuvius that Caledonia breedeth and nourisheth men of exceeding big bodies.—*Camden's "Scotland."*

No. 71

RELIGION AND NATIONAL RIGHTS

WE have not yet got so far in this country as they have done in the United States, Australasia and Canada, as to the fair and equable treatment by government of the various religious organisations of the British people. We are getting on, it is true, but getting on very slowly. The Church of Scotland is becoming more liberal in its views year by year, and the time is now within sight, we think, when there will be a practical merging of the various Presbyterian bodies in Scotland into one more or less harmonious whole. But in England —Tory England—the State Church still holds itself aloof, not merely from friendly intercourse with other British Protestant Churches, but insolently denies to these the very name of a Church or Churches. Even the Church of Scotland, "by law established," just as legally and as constitutionally as the Church of England itself, is regarded as being out of the pale of "churchism," and it is not attempted to extend to it a certain measure of courtesy by recognising its existence even as a "Kirk." All Protestant Churches outside the pale of Anglicanism are branded with the name of Dissenters, and the only consolation left to such followers of Christianity is the important fact that when these high-sniffing representatives of the lowly Jesus cross the Tweed, they themselves — the Archbishop of Canterbury not excepted—become at once "Dissenters."

Thanks to the progress of the British people in Liberal principles, this offensive form of religious Toryism is becoming year by year more difficult to uphold. But it dies hard, as all forms of intolerance and of bigotry do in England. It has its chief strength in Southern England, and Oxford is its chosen and beloved seat. The English "Free Churches," as they are termed; in other words, the so-called "Dissenters" of England, have long fought against this Anglican intolerance, but it has been an uphill battle, for the law has been against them, and, perhaps, still stronger, the views and the influence of what is called Society. Long-prolonged agitation against a flagrant religious wrong may prove effective through the action of Parliament, but to such action Society remains obdurate. For a long time the Scottish Church and the Scottish people tamely submitted to the snubs and to the intolerance of Anglicanism, as exhibited, for example, in the refusal to allow Scottish regiments to celebrate worship in the garrison churches in India, but the spirited persistence of the late Dr Theodore Marshall in bringing this injustice before the Government of the day, at last was successful, at least to a moderate degree. In the Committee Reports of the Church of Scotland, now published, and which were submitted to the General Assembly at its last meeting, we are glad to see that attention was drawn by "The Committee on Army and Navy Chaplains" to certain slights to the Church, which, though small and comparatively insignificant, it is the duty of the Church of Scot-

land, as representing the Scottish nation, to do its best to get removed. No good but only harm will result from allowing even small slights to Scottish national or religious sentiment to remain unredressed, for Anglican intolerance is only the more strengthened and encouraged by such an exhibition of tameness and irresolution. It appears from the report of the Committee above mentioned, that when the consecration of colours at Windsor Castle took place in June of last year, though many of the units(regiments) were Scottish, "the ceremony of consecration was performed by the Chaplain-General of the Forces—a clergyman of the Church of England —no clergyman of the Church of Scotland having taken part in the services." In other words, no clergyman of that Church was allowed so to act. To the complaint made on this head, a reply was received :—

"Expressing the regret of the Army Council that 'circumstances did not permit of a separate share in the ceremony being accorded to the representative of the Church of Scotland as had been originally intended,' and promising that 'on a future similar occasion the Army Council will endeavour, when colours of Scottish Regiments are consecrated, to take steps for the special recognition of the Church of Scotland.' The Committee report that, with the view of providing their chaplains with a suitable form of service for the consecration of colours, they have taken steps in concert with the Committee of the United Free Church and representatives of the English and the Irish Presbyterian Churches, to prepare such a form, and to have it authorised by the War Office on the same footing as the existing forms of service for chaplains of the Church of England and of the Roman Catholic Church.

This is so far satisfactory, and it is pleasing to note that in the action taken in this matter by the Church of Scotland it has associated itself with its sister Presbyterian Churches in England and Ireland. But why not go further? The Congregational, Baptist and Methodist Churches in the United Kingdom have many of their members in the British Navy and the British Army, and for all practical purposes, as regards the provision of religious services, these churches could and should be joined with the British Presbyterian Churches in making common cause against the arrogance and the intolerance of Anglicanism. It is quite right, and indeed necessary, that the Church of Scotland should take the lead in this question, for she has a constitutional and legal right which the other non-Episcopal Churches of Britain have not. And when we now put the Church of Scotland in the foreground, we do so simply because she is the most effective weapon with which to fight this ecclesiastical battle against Anglican bigotry. But let it be clearly understood that the question is one which affects the rights and the dignity of all the non-Episcopal Churches of the United Kingdom. In the Navy, for instance, much has yet to be done in the way of providing for religious ministration to men in the Navy who are not members of the Anglican or Roman Catholic Churches. And not only this. It is high time that the Admiralty officials should be compelled to be courteous when they are dealing with the affairs of those British

Churches which are not Anglican or Roman Catholic. In "certain naval documents" the expression was used of "Presbyterian Meeting House." To this objection was taken by the official representative of the Church of Scotland, and the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty replied that "the term appears to have been inadvertently used. * * * Steps are being taken by the issue to the Fleet of a circular letter," and "Presbyterian place of public worship" is now the expression to be used. This apparently is what the Admiralty authorities regard as courtesy and fairplay. A "Presbyterian meeting house" is to be changed to a "Presbyterian place of public worship." Now we contend that as by the constitution of these realms the Church of Scotland is "by law established," just as firmly and decidedly as is the Church of England, it is not for the officials of the Admiralty, of the Army or of any other government department to take upon themselves the right to deal in doctrine or dogma, and say that the Church of Scotland is not a Church, and that the buildings in which its members or adherents may worship are not entitled to be termed Churches, but must only be designated as "Presbyterian places of public worship" The term—a Presbyterian meeting house—*inadvertently used*, according to the Admiralty, in reality may be regarded as less offensive and less insolent than the term "Presbyterian place of public worship," used after thought and after deliberation. It is here evident that the Admiralty coolly sets itself up as an authority in religious doctrine, and lays it down that "the Church of Scotland," by law established, is not a Church, and that it can only worship in "a place," while Anglicans and Roman Catholics only can worship in a Church. This insolence in ecclesiastical nomenclature, of course, arises from the dogma of Apostolic succession, and its sequence that buildings erected by the Church of Scotland for public worship have not been consecrated according to Episcopalian rites. But what in the name of commonsense has the Board of Admiralty to do with such a dogma? Is Mr M'Kenna or his officials at Whitehall entitled to set aside and overrule the constitutional position of the Church of Scotland, as a Church by law established? How long is this exhibition of Anglican intolerance to be allowed to continue? In the British dominions beyond the seas it was relentlessly rooted out long ago, and we may truthfully and fairly add, with the cordial agreement of the great bulk of the Anglican laity. But here in Britain, Anglican bigotry is still supreme. Why do not the Scottish members bring the question up in Parliament? Assisted by the Nonconformist members they could soon put an end to this Anglican nonsense. No government — not even a Tory one—in these days could long support or defend such narrow intolerance.

———

The question dealt with in the foregoing article, we venture to think, needs no further argument. But there can be no harm in citing facts that bear materially on it.

There have been numerous addresses presented to the present King during the past month in honour of his accession to the Throne; and among these many have been from Noncomformist and other Churches. We subjoin a list of some of them that were presented to him on one day at a Court held by him at Marlborough House:—"From The Church of Scotland. From the Dean and Canons of St George's Chapel, Windsor. From the Wesleyan Methodist Church of Great Britain. From The National Council of Evangelical Free Churches. From The French Walloon Huguenot Church, Canterbury Cathedral. From The German Lutheran Church of St Mary-le-Savoy. From The Dutch Reformed Church, Austin Friars."

Here, then, is an array of "Churches" presenting their addresses to King George, and not a word is said about King George or *his* officials in Marlborough House objecting to them, and snubbing the Presentors by telling them that they had no right to use the term "Church" in their Addresses, and that they should have humbly recognised their inferior position in the United Kingdom, and have done homage to the supreme importance of The Church of England by using the terms:—"From the Presbyterian *places of public worship* in Scotland. From the National Council of Evangelical *places of public worship*. From the German Lutheran *place of public worship* of St Mary-le-Savoy," etc., all be it noted according to The Admiralty phraseology, without the capital letters in "places of public worship." So that Mr MacKenna and his officials in this matter place themselves higher than King George, and show him how in future he should treat those wretched dissenters who presume to disassociate themselves from Episcopal ordination and the Church of England! Verily, there is no form of pride more offensive, and we may add, more ridiculous, than spiritual pride! Great are MacKenna and the Admiralty Officials!!

———o———

No. 72

THE ABSURD FEAR OF BRITISH SOCIALISM

IT is part of the stock-in-trade of the British Tory party to conjure up political dangers from the advance of Liberalism that exists only in the region of wild fancy or in unrestrained visions of the probabilities of the future. One of these bogies, dear to the old women of the old-womanish section of the Tory party, is the dread of Socialism. In dealing with this question some time ago, we pointed out the obvious truth that in Europe the existence of Socialism is a co-existent of despotism, and that where Liberalism is repressed and does not get fair play, then arises and flourishes the spirit of Socialism. In fact, looking at the field of European politics, we may diagnose the position thus. Extreme and unfettered despotism becomes confronted with the policy of the Anarchist, as witness Russia. Extreme Toryism or a moderate despotism begets Socialism, as witness Prussia and other states of

Germany; while extreme Liberalism stifles Socialism, as witness the Australian Commonwealth. In Australia, if the fears of British Toryism have any—even the slightest—foundation in fact, there ought to arise a Socialistic policy of a most dangerous kind, for there, democracy has the fullest swing of power of any country in the world. Both chambers of the Legislature are elected, not by manhood suffrage, but by adult suffrage, so that every woman has a vote as well as every man. Well, what was the result of the late—not General Election—for the members of Senate only retire in compartments, as it were, but an Election general enough and extensive enough to give a complete view of the popular political feeling for the time? Was Socialism, then, a prominent and dangerous feature in the fight of Parties as British Tories would lead us to believe must be the result, when Liberalism is carried out to its fullest extent, as is the case in Australia. The answer is a simple one. Socialism was practically nowhere. As a party, it did go to the poll, but only in one state, that of New South Wales; and it was simply to receive a crushing defeat, which completely confirms our view that Socialism, as a power, is the co-existent of despotism. Destroy despotism and you stifle Socialism. Here is the result of the late Federal Election in New South Wales, which we take from *The Leader* (Melbourne) of the 23rd of April. We cite only the returns for the House of Representatives in New South Wales, for the simple reason that it was only there that Socialist candidates came into the field.

NEW SOUTH WALES

P. signifies Protectionist; F.T. Fiscal Trucer.

A. M'DOUGALL (P.—Labour) ...	239,345
A. GARDINER (P. Labour) ...	236,494
A. G. RAE (P. Labour)	228,697
J. P. M. GRAY (F.T.—Fusionist)	210,988
E. C. PULSFORD (F.T.—Fusionist)	205,881
J. C. NEILD (F.T.—Fusionist)...	200,594
JOHN NORTON (Independent)...	49,626
R. MACKENZIE (Socialist) ...	12,946
J. O. MORONEY (Socialist) ...	9,280
T. C. HOARE (Socialist) ...	8,255

(Incomplete.)

The return is said to be incomplete, but the qualification certainly does not refer to the position of the Socialist candidates, for to them the returns are a complete and overwhelming defeat. In fact, when taken in conjunction with the fact, that in none of the other Australian States did Socialism come forward as a political entity, it may safely be assumed that when the Tories here talk of Socialism as a great political danger in British politics, they simply talk arrant nonsense.

———o———

No. 73

A SUPER-CECIL-IOUS LORDLING

In another part of this issue we publish an extract from *The Westminster Gazette*, which deals somewhat sharply with the opinion expressed by Lord Hugh Cecil as to the unimportance of the views of Scottish members as to Scottish legislation. In a debate on the 21st of June on the question of the Census for 1911, and of having a separate Bill for Scotland, which was advocated by Sir Henry Craik, who taunted the Scottish Radical

members for not supporting him, Sir Walter Menzies said :—

His reply to that was that a Scottish Grand Committee would serve the purposes of Scotland at the present time so far as Home Rule was concerned. His belief, however, recently received a severe shock at a meeting of the Scottish Grand Committee, when a noble Lord told them that the idea that Scottish opinion should be deferred to in legislation simply because it was Scottish opinion was of no moment.

Lord Hugh Cecil—My recollection is that I said the Scottish opinion was not decisive. Of course, it is natural that Scottish opinion should have paid to it that deference which is due to local opinion, but the doctrine that Scotland is a separate country entitled to manage its own affairs is a doctrine which is absurd, both from the point of view of history and of commonsense. (Laughter and cries of "No.")

Sir Walter Menzies said the words of the noble Lord were that there were some muddle-headed Irishmen and Scotsmen who supposed that the opinion of the Scottish members upon Scottish legislation ought to be deferred to. "Nothing of the kind," said the noble Lord. That being so, a great deal was to be said for the proposal for having separate Bills for everything relating to Scotland.

"That Scotland is not a separate country (from England and Ireland) and is not entitled to manage its own affairs," is the opinion of Lord Hugh Cecil, and to think otherwise, he says, is "absurd from the point of view of history and of commonsense." We know that Oxford teaching is supposed to be very strong in the matter of history when looked at from a purely English point of view. But, then, there is this drawback, that the English point of view, when dealing with Scottish affairs, pays little attention to facts, and is *not* in accordance with commonsense. This question has to be looked at from two points of view—the National and the Imperial. Lord Hugh Cecil looks at it only from one. Or rather he looks at it from the one point when it suits his mode of impertinence for the time being; and from the other point, when he is on another tack. For example, what about Scottish law? Is it the same as the law of England? What of the Scottish Church? Is it the same as the English Church? History, here, entirely differs from the view of Lord Hugh Cecil. For here clearly, Scotland nationally is different from England. Then, as to commonsense, as radiated from Oxford through the brain of the noble Lord, is it "absurd" to suppose that the Scottish people cannot manage their own Scottish affairs unless they are guided and controlled by an English legislative contingent, outnumbering them by seven to one. Again, to come to a personal view of the question. If Scotland is not a separate country from England, then England is not a separate country from Scotland. And, if so, what countryman does this noble Lord, with the full flavour of Oxford culture, claim to be? Is he an Englishman? Of course I am, he will proudly exclaim. I am an Englishman. But, if he says so, his pride is outshone by his ignorance. For, if England and Scotland are not separate countries, they must have a name common to both. Well, what is that name? History, says "Great Britain"! But the noble Lord, of course, will say, "Here history is wrong. England is a separate country, and I claim to be

a true-born Englishman." Just so, but, if he is so, and England and Scotland are not separate countries —which he denies—then Scotland must be part of England? This, of course, is the consummation that all Englishmen of the Lord Hugh Cecil and Oxford type assert to be the case. But, then, how do they reconcile this with the facts of history? Oh, simply enough. When history is not in accordance with the Oxford view, then history *is* absurd. So much for this insolent and super-*Cecil*-ious lordling.

More Super-Cecil-iousness

The following epitome of a debate concerning a Scottish Bill is from *The Westminster Gazette* of the 15th June:—

"The Scotch Temperance Bill was yesterday considered in the Scotch Standing Committee. 'The disposition to endeavour, if possible, to arrive at a compromise,' so the *Times* says, 'seemed to be making headway in the Committee Room, when Lord Hugh Cecil intervened with a denial that there was a special Scottish interest in the matter, and an assertion of the doctrine that Scottish, like Irish interests, were equally those of the United Kingdom.

He 'insisted that whatever bargain Scottish members made the Bill could not be treated in the House of Commons as an agreed Bill.' When Sir Henry Dalziel 'protested against the remarks of Lord Hugh Cecil, and hoped the Scottish people would draw the obvious lesson—namely, that it was absolutely impossible under existing conditions for them, however united they might be, to get the legislation they desired,' Lord Hugh's retort was 'to object to the United Kingdom's being broken up in order that the Radicals, who were in a majority in Scotland, should get their own way.' We are sure Scotland will take due note of this, and we are astonished that at this time of day we should have it openly avowed that Scotland cannot be allowed to settle for herself such a matter as its licensing laws. Lord Hugh Cecil clearly contemplates Scotch opinion being deliberately overruled by Parliament. We are well used to that as regards Ireland, but it is a queer sort of Unionism which can go to Lord Hugh Cecil's length. How can Scotland be content to be worse off than New Zealand in a matter of purely domestic concern?"

It is high time that the practice of allowing a certain number of English members to sit in the Scottish Standing Committee of the House of Commons was put an end to. It simply makes a farce of the procedure; for while English members, with their huge majority in the two Houses of Parliament, can practically do as they like, they will not—so far as Tory members are concerned—allow Scottish Bills to pass through the Standing Committee without great opposition; and subsequently do all they can to prevent them becoming law, however great may be the Scottish majority in their favour.

BANNOCKBURN DAY.—The celebration this year was a very quiet affair. Mr Theodore Napier attended at the Borestone on Friday, the 24th June, and placed a wreath to the memory of those who fell. On Saturday there was the usual attendance of patriotic Scots, and Mr Menmuir of Edinburgh delivered a stirring address in favour of Home Rule for Scotland. The day was celebrated by other parties from Glasgow and Edinburgh, visiting the Castle, Abbey Craig, Cambuskenneth Abbey, and other places of historical interest.

CORRESPONDENCE

OMAHA, NEBRASKA,
28th May 1910.

The Depeopling of Scotland

DEAR SIR,—Tell me—tell me gently, what is wrong with Scotland? Is her trade so awfully bad that the bulk of her people must leave? Or are the conditions under which her population lives too burdensome to admit of their remaining?

Something must surely be amiss, as the influx of young Scots into Canada and the United States is to me, seemingly, a very alarming state of affairs for my native land.

Why such a condition as this?

A Canadian paper a week ago, in mentioning with glee the big lot of Scots who had arrived, asked, "Is all Scotland coming?" and this evening I had a visit from a young Kilmarnock lad who is the last of four brothers to leave the family hearth, and court fortune in the West.

It is all very well for this country to welcome with open arms Scotland's sons, as they make the very best of citizens in their adopted land; but if the best all leave, what sort of place will Scotland be to live in—and what will her future be?

As the trade and prestige of Scotland seems at the present moment to be backward, I, for one, would welcome the establishment of a Royal Mint in Scotland, a parliament of Scots at Edinburgh, and if these things cannot be brought about, then, a separate nation.

Although I have been many years in America, the land of my birth is as dear to me as ever. The leopard cannot change his spots—and I am reminded of the old song I heard in my boyhood, which I hope may yet take effect:

"Uprouse ye sons of Scottish homes,
Defend your sacred right,
And show the world that as of old
Ye *still can bravely fight*."

Oh shade of Bannockburn!—Yours for Scotland and her rights,

JAMES C. LINDSAY,
Editor, The Western Scot.

[This evil of depopulation and many other evils that now afflict Scotland would all be done away with were Scotland to get Home Rule. But the House of Lords is the main—and indeed the only—obstacle to that consummation. So let all true Scots aim at the extinction of the unqualified veto of that fossilised institution.—EDITOR.]

---

104 CHEAPSIDE STREET,
GLASGOW, *14th June* 1910.

The Lion Rampant

SIR,—On actuarial science and music, Dr Bell is an authority; when he speaks on these subjects, let no dog bark. It is a pity that his views on the lion rampant neither balance nor harmonise with the facts.

No one can use armorial bearings without authority, and the owner of an authorised coat-of-arms (be he king, or peer, or pauper) has the right to object to the unauthorised use of his personal cognisance. That is the law of arms, and it seems to me to be truly democratic.

The title of the King of Britain to the Royal Arms is perfectly valid, and was settled long ago by various Acts of the Scottish, English, and British Parliaments. The Police

Circular of March 1907, referred to the Royal Standard (of the U. K.), and the subsequent Circular issued in June made it clear that, so far as action by the police is concerned, anyone may fly the lion rampant—although it is part of the Royal Standard. But it has been pointed out time and again, by the Lyon Office and by private students of Heraldry, that the use of a Royal Banner by a subject is an irregular proceeding. Further, in the blue banner with "the silver cross to Scotland dear," we possess a grand old national flag, of which we may well be proud; and in the three cross Union Flag we have our authorised national flag, in which Scotland has a most honourable share. I suppose that neither Mr Macdonald nor I would care to see the lion flag altogether neglected; but it is a scandal to see it of wretchedly small size, and displayed in most undignified circumstances. To all flag users I make this appeal—see that your flags are correctly made and flown in a manner that is honourable to them and to you.—Yours truly, JOHN A. STEWART.

The Lion Rampant

SIR,—Mr MacDonald takes Mr Bell to task on this subject, and says his zeal for Scotland is "not according to knowledge." With Mr Bell I hold that both the Lion Rampant and the saltire are national standards, and, supposing no evidence was to be found that heraldry existed prior to 1189-1192, that does not signify that the King has any more right to the flag than a commoner. If it has been public property for centuries, then it cannot be his personal property. I should like to know if previous monarchs raised any objection to its use in public. Few modern monarchs (if any) have claimed it, and if the insignia of leaders was also worn by the rest of their clan, then that explains it. William the Lion reigned from 1165 till 1214, and I read that he was so-called, as "he adopted the lion as the armorial bearing of Scotland" (not for himself). This discussion seems to place great importance on the "fleur-de-lys" or double tressure. Possibly it was adopted as an addition at the time of the French marriage of Mary Queen of Scots, and out of compliment to her, but I do not place so much stress on that head. The point at issue is the displaying of the Lion Rampant. This flag has been displayed at our house for years, both on Bannockburn and St Andrew's Days, and has scarcely ever been noticed (except in ridicule). The chief constables of the districts had no need to extend toleration to anyone, but this state of affairs has been brought about by the sycophancy of those who must toady to officialdom rather than show a spark of individualism. I can scarcely believe that Mr MacDonald penned the last paragraph. To admit that sterling patriotism could suffer through the "unguarded utterances of some of its advocates" sounds strange indeed.—Truly yours,

J. STEVENSON.

[We have now given a large portion of our space to the discussion of this question during the last few months, and must now close it.—EDITOR.]

THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE PARTY.—We learn from the *Edinburgh Evening News* that Mr Pirie, M.P., has called a meeting of this party for the 27th June to take measures for concerted action in the future. We are delighted to hear it, and we wish Mr Pirie and his colleagues every success in their patriotic movement. We write before the meeting takes place, and can only impress on Mr Pirie and his party this patent fact that they must be prepared to face ridicule and sneers from their foes, and all kinds of underhand work from many of their professed, but insincere friends. The government will oppose them through the latter; but let them persevere and be firm, and they are bound to succeed. Twenty Scottish Home Rulers, if they will ally themselves to fifteen or twenty Welsh Home Rulers, could compel the Government at the present juncture to come to serious terms with them. For instance, they could compel the Cabinet to transfer the Scottish Education Department to Edinburgh; for has not the Speaker declared that that is simply a matter of administration, and does not require an Act. The disestablishment of the Welsh Church does; but the Government could be brought to pretty close terms on this matter, if they are pressed. And let there be no mistake on this point. Mr Lloyd George, though publicly he would be compelled to speak against the Welsh members thus acting; in reality would be with them. For he would then be able to say to his fellow members of the Cabinet:—"See, my countrymen are getting out of hand by your inaction in this matter; and we cannot afford to delay the settlement of this measure any longer. We must place it among the questions that we must settle without delay, as soon as the Veto of the Lords has been satisfactorily arranged." A Scoto-Welsh alliance for national purposes is thus quite practicable; and its importance is obvious; for it would make success certain.

———o———

SCOTTISH AFFAIRS AND THE SCOTTISH OFFICE.—Lord Pentland must either be a very wrong-headed Scotsman or a very weak-headed one, and a mere tool in the hands of the officials of his department. A short time ago we drew attention to the disgraceful interference of his Office with the City Council of Edinburgh as to the management of the traffic in the streets, and now again the East Lothian County Council is indignant that he will take no action regarding the flaring advertisement boards which have been erected along the roads in the County, much to its disfigurement. Surely a County Council should know better than the Scottish Office in London as to such business. The Council complained to the Office in London, and its letter was acknowledged, but though repeated applications were made, it was nine months before an answer was got, and that was to the effect:—

That the Secretary for Scotland could not approve of the only by-law they could frame, and which he (the chairman) held they had a right to frame under the Act,

for the purpose of making the provisions of the Act effective in the county. All this by-law sought to do was without objectionable interference to protect the county against disfigurement by an objectionable display of advertisements, as he held they had a right to do under the Act.

It is about time that the Premier got another Secretary of State for Scotland. Lord Pentland evidently has outlived his usefulness.

———o———

HIGHLANDERS MUST LEAVE THEIR COUNTRY.—The Highlanders, in the eyes of a certain class, have served their turn in Britain. They largely helped to save the Empire in the great wars in the end of the 18th and in the beginning of the 19th centuries, and having done so, they are now told that they had better make themselves scarce in the land of their fathers, as they stand in the way, either of certain economic theories, or of the sport of the wealthy people who wish to enjoy grouse shooting and deer stalking. There is a fine field for the poor Highlanders "over the seas" they are told by *The Scotsman*, and if they only would betake themselves there "the problem of the Western Isles might be quickly solved." So writes *The Scotsman* of the 28th May. What a shocking thing it is that these wretched Highlanders have human feelings, that they love the land of their fathers, and would rather cling to it and bring up families there, however humbly and poorly, than go, as *The Scotsman* suggests, "over the seas," and become "rich and prosperous beyond their wildest dreams." It is really a shocking state of affairs that an ignorant and benighted people like these Western Gaels should so misconceive the present position of affairs in this blessed British Kingdom of ours—with its House of Lords and its privileged classes—and not see that nowadays the land in the Highlands is not intended for men with wives and families, but for sheep, deer and grouse. Were not these British dominions, "over-seas," gained to a large extent by the gallantry of their Highland ancestors? Then why should these stupid Gaels not now go and enjoy these "over-sea" estates, and make *them* prosperous, and leave their miserable Highland hills and glens for the autumn sport of their superiors from wealthy England? Is it not better that the rich Southrons should have a free field in the Highlands for sport and for pleasure, than that the miserable natives should contentedly bring up families in poverty? Is this not the right policy for the Highlands? When wealthy bankers and brewers and stock-jobbers from London wish to spend their money in renting Highland grouse moors and deer forests, why should they not be allowed to do so, even though the miserable natives should have to emigrate to the Colonies, or betake themselves with their families to the slums of Glasgow and Edinburgh? If such be not the true and natural order of things for this land of the privileged classes, what on earth is the use of the House of Lords? Is it not its first duty and

chief aim that wealth should have free play for its pleasure, and that the welfare of the common people should not interfere in any way with such a desirable consummation?

———o———

"NO EVICTION FOR DEER FORESTS."—Step by step, bit by bit, goes on the deadly process of the turning off the soil of their native country, men whose ancestors have largely contributed to build up this great British Empire, and all to minister to the sport of the unworthy and unpatriotic men of wealth, who think that their pleasure is the first thing to be considered in this best of all possible worlds. In *The Westminster Gazette* of 2nd May last, a correspondent writes as follows :—

"In Lochcarron, Ross-shire, most of the land is under deer forests, and nearly all the young men of that district are leaving for the backwoods of America. One very glaring instance of a small holding being swept away is the "eviction next month from Attadale forest of the only remaining small holder there. The land was held for a number of years by his father, who died a few months ago, and this young man is making a home for his two sisters, and he is also an enthusiastic Territorial. When the Attadale Farm was first made into a deer forest there were three good-sized small holdings, but they have all been absorbed into the deer forest, this being the last."

So goes on, as we have said, this disastrous policy. In this case it is only one eviction, it may be said. But it may be all the more tragical for that, for there can be no doubt that the glen or dale at one time supported many families, and this now is the last one. And all for deer, and for the sport of rich men. When will the country wake up and put a stop to this fatal policy, so ruinous to the true welfare of the nation?

———o———

LORD KITCHENER.—*The Sketch* says :—

"What Lord Kitchener would do and say if he went to the War Office no man knows, or what guarantees he would require if he went there, but of this every man is sure—that he would make quite a large number of people feel extremely uncomfortable in a very short period."

To this we say, that the sooner Lord Kitchener goes to the War Office then the better for the country, for there is, perhaps, no government department in Britain that more needs a thorough overhauling.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 25. August 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 25. AUGUST 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

No. 74

FURTHER DISASTERS TO SCOTLAND

THE crowning of Baliol at Scone placed Scotland once more in great jeopardy. This took place in 1332, only a few years after the signing of the Treaty of Northampton and the death of Bruce, and apparently the country was to be placed again, owing to a disputed succession, in as great danger by Edward the Third as it had been by the deep-laid and villainous designs of his grandfather, Edward the First. That the patriotic leaders of the nation looked at the position in this light soon became evident. David the Second was then only a boy of nine years, his wife, little older, was an Englishwoman, or, what was worse, a Norman damsel, and sister of the English king, and if the latter could get hold of the young couple and bring them up and train them in England, they could then be made humble instruments to serve his ends. If they had children they could be brought up with English ideas, and taught

to regard Scotland as a tributary kingdom. In those days, as Wallace had found, the legitimate monarch possessed a power and influence that the people could not easily overcome, and if that power was backed by the power of such a powerful neighbour as England, it would be irresistible. Hardly ever was Scotland in greater danger. But the patriotic party was fully alive to it, and their first step was to get the young king and his wife out of the country. They were hurried off to France, where they were well and thankfully received by Philip the Sixth.

Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, brother-in-law to The Bruce, was made Regent. Edward the Third now came openly forward as a supporter of Baliol, who in return acknowledged Edward as his feudal lord, and promised to aid him with men and money in all his wars. This roused the patriots to fury. Baliol was encamped in the south-west of Scotland at or near Annan, thinking himself quite safe, when he was suddenly attacked late in the evening by a strong body of horsemen, under the Earl of Moray, son of the lately deceased or poisoned Randolph. The surprise was complete. Baliol had to take to horse and fly across the Border to save his life. His brother, Henry, was killed, as were also some of his chief supporters. After this the Scots, incensed at the interference of Edward, crossed the Border and committed some devastation. The English king, though the first offender, chose to regard this as an infringement of the Treaty of Northampton, and complained of it to the Pope. War then began between the two nations, and continued with varied success for many years. But as Scotland had the disadvantage, not only of a minority of the crown, but of its young king being in a foreign land, she had a disastrous time of it. Sir Andrew Moray, the Regent of the kingdom, was captured in a Border fight, and several of the leading Scots warriors, including Sir William Douglas, were made prisoners in the fights that took place in 1333. This encouraged Edward, and he crossed the Border at the head of a large army, and laid siege to Berwick. The city was valiantly held for a time, but the defenders agreed to surrender if it was not relieved by a certain day in July. This was an unfortunate stipulation for Scotland, for it induced Archibald Douglas, who had been made Regent, to risk a battle in order to relieve the city. This took place at Halidon Hill, and resulted in a terrible defeat of the Scots. It is said that they lost 14,000 men. Douglas, the Regent, was slain, along with many others of the Scottish leaders. Berwick and its castle were immediately given up, and for a time the whole kingdom lay at the mercy of Edward and his army.

Then began the usual desertion of many of the great Scoto-Norman nobles to the enemy. The eastern half of Scotland from the Forth to the Tweed was solemnly annexed to England, and declared to be forever part and parcel of Edward's kingdom. Baliol acknowledged Edward as his liege lord for the rest of the kingdom, and the cause of

Scotland once more seemed utterly ruined. But the people were not subdued, and only waited for a favourable opportunity to fight again for their freedom. This soon came; dissensions broke out among the great nobles, to whom Edward and Baliol had allotted the forfeited lands. Sir Andrew Moray of Bothwell, who had been released from captivity, and Robert the Steward of Scotland, grandson of The Bruce, headed the risings of the people, and meeting with some important successes, soon became formidable. The patriotic Scottish nobles held a meeting, and appointed these two, joint regents of the kingdom under the exiled King David. Alarmed at the success of the patriots, Edward determined on a winter campaign, and crossed the Border and advanced to the Forth, but the two Scottish leaders prudently avoided a battle, and laid waste the country, so that Edward's army was reduced to great straits. As the season advanced the invaders received supplies by sea, and during the summer, Edward, accompanied by Baliol, made a triumphal and destructive march to and through the north of Scotland, and shortly afterwards, thinking his conquest secure, Edward returned to England. But the spirit of the people was indomitable. Athole, one of the greatest of the Scottish nobles, who had gone over to the enemy, was attacked and slain. Edward had again, in 1335, to re-enter Scotland. He marched to Perth, and then to the north, destroying everything in his way. But the Scots, who were under the command of the Regent, Sir Andrew Moray, warily kept out of his way, and harassed him in his marches so thoroughly, that at last he was compelled to go back to England. During this period the relations of Edward with the French king had gradually become more strained. Edward laid public claim to the French throne in October 1337, and this, to the joy of the Scots, led to war between France and England.

No. 75

SCOTTISH EDUCATION AND A SCOTTISH NATIONAL PARTY

FORTY years ago English politicians thought that they had Scotland completely in their hands. At that time Parliament was almost entirely led by men who had been educated at the great English public schools, and who had passed through the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. So ignorant then were English public men of Scotland and of Scottish history, that one of them, who afterwards came to be a British Premier, openly and deliberately advised his countrymen to conquer Ireland, and then there would be no more difficulty with that country. For, said he, see how peaceful and contented Scotland now is, after England had conquered her, and the same result would no doubt follow if Ireland were subjected to the same process. This illustrious Englishman, we need hardly say, was educated at Oxford, that dismal educational relic of monastic times, and was apparently under the impression that England had never conquered Ireland, but that it had conquered Scotland.

When written to and asked by the late Mr John Romans of Newtongrange when did England conquer Scotland, the reply was, "at Culloden." This was the state of mind of the late Lord Salisbury regarding British history, and when men so ignorant of British history were placed at the head of British affairs no wonder that Scotland was not only regarded, but was actually treated as an English province.

But it was not only from the Tory side that Scotland received ignorant and contumelious treatment. The Liberal party was quite as contemptuous in their treatment of it, though we daresay they were not quite so ignorant of its history. The "Grand Old Man," as Liberals, and Scottish Liberals in particular, delighted to call him, was probably a more deadly enemy to Scottish rights and Scottish sentiment than any member of the Tory party. When the educational system of this country was remodelled in the early seventies of last century, Mr Gladstone, then at the head of one of his ministries, instead of continuing and leaving the management of Scottish education in Scotland, transferred it to London, with disastrous results to the system, as well as to Scottish nationality. Why was Scottish education thus divorced from Scotland? There was every reason why it should have remained in Scotland. This country has held the lead in education ever since the time of John Knox. Every Scottish working man before 1870, however poor and struggling, deemed it a sacred duty to send his children to the parish school and pay for their education there. Any statesman possessed with a sense of fairness would have regarded it as his primary duty when dealing with the great question of national education for Scotland to build on the broad national lines laid down by John Knox three centuries before, and since then carried on with such magnificent success, despite the baneful influence inflicted on the system after the Union, by the ignorance and indifference of the Parliament sitting in London. But Mr Gladstone was no statesman, neither had he a high sense of justice. He was then, in 1872, of the opinion that Scottish nationality could be treated with contempt, and that England should be regarded as the only national factor in the United Kingdom. This was the view then held and preached *ad nauseam* by the English so-called historians, Freeman, Seeley and Green; and Gladstone, to his disgrace, adopted their views, and in his educational policy tried to give it effect by placing in London instead of Edinburgh the Board of Education for Scotland. Why was this done? There can be little doubt that it was part of a deep-laid scheme, then strongly in the minds of leading English politicians, that Scotland must be Anglicised, and that a most effective step towards that end would be the transfer of the management of Scottish education from Scotland to England. It was a base idea and a base resolve, and so far as carried out has done immense harm,

not only to Scotland but to England also. For if Scotland had had the full control of her own educational system she would have undoubtedly held the lead she took in the 16th and 17th centuries, and which she only lost through the strangling of it, as we have more than once pointed out, by the ignorance and the indifference of the legislature in London.

There is, then, a paramount duty before the Scottish National Party in the House of Commons, recently established by the persistent work of Mr D. V. Pirie, M.P. for Aberdeen. That party has a great work before it, which is its avowed object; and that is Home Rule for Scotland. Were that secured, the Scottish Education Department would at once be transferred to Scotland. But Scottish Home Rule is a big and a difficult question, bound up, as it necessarily is, with the still bigger question of "Home Rule All Round." For it is evident to every practical politician who thinks the question out that Home Rule cannot be given to one section of the United Kingdom only; but must be a system of devolution of legislative power to the four British nationalities, to deal with their own sub-national affairs, in four sub-national parliaments or national councils. But this, we say, is a big question, the biggest that is likely to come before the British public for a generation at least. And even were the Tory party to give way on the question; the carrying of it into practical operation would take a few years of hard political work. Such, we say, is the hard fact. But why should the transference of the Scottish Education Department to Edinburgh wait for that? It can be settled at once by a stroke of the pen; by the decision of the Cabinet at a single meeting. The Premier has only to say, we must give way on this question, and the effete Lord Pentland and his London-loving officials in the "Scotch" Education Department; as, Cockney-like, they have vulgarly styled it, must at once give way. Why, then, should not the Premier be compelled to say the word that is necessary. Let the new Scottish National Party make this their first business. Let them secure the aid of half-a-dozen members of the Welsh party and a small contingent from the Irish Nationalists. These parties must at once see that this cause is also their cause, and that when it is carried the success of the bigger question of Home Rule All Round has been advanced a step. And in this matter the first step is an all-important step. Mr Pirie and his supporters will be surprised at the hold that such a success will give them in Scotland. The Scottish people only wait for a lead. They are sick at heart at the contemptuous treatment their country receives in Parliament, and would leap to the support of and rally round Mr Pirie and his party if they make a bold stand on this question. If they succeed in carrying it—and this they can do if they are earnest and determined—they will create an enthusiasm in Scotland which will astonish them. It would be the making of the party; and not only that, it would be the first grand step towards "Home Rule All Round."

No. 76

MR ARTHUR LYNCH, M.P., AND THE COLONIAL OFFICE

THE CASE OF SIR WILLIAM MACGREGOR

WE hear a great deal in these days of the rise of an Imperial feeling among the British people at home and abroad, and no doubt there is a strong desire among the leading public men in Britain to cultivate a feeling of friendship with the peoples of the British Dominions beyond the seas. Old colonists of the "Forties," "Fifties," and even the "Sixties" of last century must occasionally laugh in their sleeves at the changed attitude of the governing classes in Britain towards what D'Israeli termed "the wretched colonies." The late Lord Salisbury in his salad days was quite as uncomplimentary. In his hot youth he paid a visit to Tasmania and to Victoria for a few months; and when he returned to London, and took to journalism for a living, he described Australian society in *The Saturday Review*, as a substratum of convicts with a top layer of officials. As regards Tasmania in the early "Fifties," the description was not much out of the way; but as regards Victoria, it was wofully incorrect. But Lord Robert Cecil as he then was, was not sparing of his jibes and insults, and did not care much though they had only a sparkle of truth in them. But his insulting attitude was a fair reflex of the Society of the period towards the Overseas British peoples. Australian snobs—male and female—at that time held it to be a necessity to conceal their connection with their colonies when they visited Britain. And dire were the sneers and the insults that some of them received when journeying from Ceylon to London in the mail steamers of the period.

All this is now changed. Englishmen, Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen—if they hold any public position in the States of the Commonwealth, or in New Zealand—are accorded in London a respect and an attention which must be flattering to their self-esteem. A Scotsman or a Welshman, for instance, who occupies a public position in Scotland or Wales of great importance, when he goes to London on any public business, is generally treated with indifference, and not seldom is snubbed by London officialdom. But an Australian Scot or Welshman holding a public position in The Antipodes, when he visits London is treated with the utmost respect. This attitude of the governing classes in London — nearly all English, of course—is of course snobbery, pure and undiluted; for it is based on fear; fear that the oversea Dominions will break away, if their public men, when they visit London, are not flattered and caressed to the top of their bent. This "jockeying" of public men from the Colonies—to use the old term—is a branch of high art assiduously cultivated in London; and truth to say, it is within certain limits, highly successful. But to a large extent, it is an unnatural and uncertain alliance; for it is not based on a sound principle of Union. People at The Antipodes, as in Canada, are essen-

tially democratic; while the governing classes in London are just as essentially aristocratic. Political power in the Dominions and political power in Britain are based on different social systems, and they move on different planes of action. The London Press and the *claqeurs* of the privileged classes try to conceal this essential difference; but it cannot be hidden; and Mr Arthur Lynch, M.P. for West Clare, in the debate in the House of Commons on the 29th June on the Colonial Office vote, laid bare the falsity of the position. He said, "Nothing could be more false to Australian sentiment than the setting up of a spurious aristocracy; and with reference to the Governors sent out to Australasia, he said, "Never was there sent out a really distinguished man, such as the people could honour." Colonel Seeley (Under Secretary for the Colonies): "What about Sir William MacGregor? Hear, hear." We have to remark on this discussion, that Mr Lynch knows the views and the feelings of the Australian democracy perfectly, having been bred as one of them. London officials take their knowledge of it from the colonial cliques who live in London; or from the courtly language that it is the fashion for representative Colonial politicians to use at official banquets. These are far from representing the true views of the Australasian people. The late general election in the Commonwealth, at which an overwhelming majority of Labour members was returned, shows clearly that Mr Lynch understands the political position in Australia, better than London officialdom, or *The Times* correspondent at Sydney.

Colonel Seeley, by his interjection as to Sir William MacGregor, tried to counteract the force of Mr Lynch's remarks, but to those who know the career of that able public servant, the argument will not apply. Mr Lynch's contention was that, in the selection of Governors for the Colonies or States, ability or merit was seldom or ever considered, but simply the finding of an opening for some political hack, or for some personage favoured by Society. Well might Colonel Seeley, in contradiction of this, interject the name of Sir William MacGregor; but that gentleman's career only brings out with great force the obstacles that ability alone, unfavoured by London social influence, has to contend with in the department of the Colonial Office. Sir William is a native of Aberdeenshire, that district so fruitful of eminent men. Following his profession as a medical man, he settled in Fiji, some thirty or forty years ago. He was appointed medical officer to the government there, and it came by some strange chance that, in the absence of the Governor and other officials, he for some time did duty as acting governor. He showed so much practical ability in this position that when the post of Resident Officer in British New Guinea fell vacant he was appointed. It was not by any means a desirable post. The climate was most unhealthy, the isolation was great, and the salary was small, and no credit was due to the Colonial Office for the appointment, for probably it could not get one of

its favoured officials to take it. But Sir William is a man who has a high sense of duty. He accepted the position, and he acted so ably there, and so impressed the Queensland government (of which colony British New Guinea was then a sort of dependency) with his merit as an administrator, that the Colonial Office after some years had to promote him. But what a promotion! He was sent to the West Coast of Africa, as if the department wished to finish him, and be no longer bothered with an official who had nothing but merit to commend him. However, even in pestilential West Africa Sir William distinguished himself, and what is more, survived. As time went on, the department had to find another post for him, and this time they sent him to be Governor of Newfoundland. It would almost seem as if some malignant official in the department had set his evil wits to work to find some post where either by pestilential heat or by Arctic cold this distinguished official could be officially got out of the way. But the hardy Scot survived even the rigour of the climate of Newfoundland and of Labrador; and at last so far overcame what seems to have been official antipathy or official neglect that he was lately appointed to the honourable position of Governor of Queensland. But let not Colonel Seeley, or rather his department, take credit for the appointment of so able a man to such a post. On the contrary, it is a crying disgrace to the department that he was not appointed to high office much earlier in his career. Had he passed through Oxford or Cambridge, or had he been educated at one of the English public schools, he would long ago, like many of the commonplace favourites of London officialdom, have been appointed to high office, and would probably be now complacently sunning himself in the titled ranks of London Society. No. The Colonial Office cannot take credit to itself for the present position of Sir William MacGregor. On the contrary, the difficulties he has encountered in his laborious but distinguished career furnish a discreditable example of its snobbery and of its neglect of middle-class merit. But it is for *The Thistle* to note that when Colonel Seeley tried to answer the censures of Mr Lynch, the readiest, and, indeed, the only name among his officials whom he could cite "for merit" was that of a Scotsman. And if Mr Lynch is cynical, which he has good reason to be, he might have improved the situation by retorting on Colonel Seeley that he was pleased to find that the champion official of the Colonial Office by merit was a MacGregor and a Scot, for he himself (Mr Lynch) was by maternal blood half a Scot and half a MacGregor!

———o———

Continental Fear of the Scots Soldiers.—The "March of the Scots" was the terror of the Spaniards in Holland, and the Austrians in Germany. German and Swedish troops often used it to secure their positions from attack. It was composed in 1587 for the old guard of King James V.—The Scots in Germany, by T. A. Fischer. Note *p.* 80.

THE HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND*
No. 1.—Rev. James Mackenzie

THE sight of this book after forty years awakens in us the most lively and pleasant memories. It has gone through many editions, and has influenced the mind of Scotsmen of our time perhaps as no other has done, if we except Scott's *Tales of a Grandfather*. It is not too much to say that the present race of public men in Scotland and in the Colonies is the product of Mackenzie. He is the political father of us all. He holds his country in mortmain, and in the Colonies he must hold his readers in thousands. Personally we had not read the book for many years, but we found we had remembered all the leading chapters, the incidents and the illustrations. It has been boiled down in various forms and editions, copied, pirated, imitated, but its merits are as strong as ever, and there was never a time when its circulation was more needed.

For long the study of Scottish history was crushed by the Scottish Education Department, and nothing but confused hubbubs and disastrous ineptitudes about Anglo-Saxons, Battle of Hastings, Wars of the Roses, the wives of Henry VIII., and purely English parochial rigmarole was served up to Scottish schools. The result has been that a whole generation, trained on colourless manuals and inaccurate compilations, has grown up in well-nigh total ignorance of the history of their country. The enemies of Scotland, religious and political, were in no error as to the educational importance of Mackenzie. So many books are now in use—poor, "fusionless" stuff, Hamlet with no royal Dane, monstrosities about English navies and English victories—that Board Schools now can scarcely realise the fights about thirty years ago over Mackenzie and his Scottish national teaching. Every year the Mariolatrats and the Royal Martyr devotees, snivelling over the beautiful Mary and the Stuarts, were up in arms. The papists were frantic. Was he not sound on the national heroes? Baliol, Wallace, Bruce, Knox, Cromwell, all stood out grandly in this book, better than they have ever done since in the dull compilations. The Edinburgh Episcopalians and the Irish in the Cowgate leagued, as they do yet, to oust him and to secure denominational teaching by the priests.

The style, clearly modelled on Carlyle, is admirable, and often rises into original insight, while the presentation of "puir auld Scotland's" chequered history is so vigorous and dramatic, that the early impression with many has lasted unimpaired through life. What might a generation not accomplish trained on his powerful narrative? In our parochial complacency we sneer at the Johnson-Jeffries fight, and thank Heaven Scotland, at least, is not as America is. This, from a race that tolerates vulgar English music halls in our midst, football mobs, sporting special editions of evening papers, and the steady degradation of everything specifically Scottish in our national life! Bit by bit the predominant

* **The History of Scotland,** by Rev. JAMES MACKENZIE. (T. Nelson & Sons, 1907.) 664 *pp.*

partner yearly strives to reduce us to her own low level of social and political thought. Have not even *The Glasgow Herald* and *The Scotsman*, in their political insanity, lectured Scotland on her "hide-bound Liberalism" in contrast with "the candour and intellectual receptivity" of Tariff Reform and Lords' Rights shown by the Cockneys and the southern English counties? Fancy John Knox on Sir Robert Finlay and Lord Lansdowne! "Neither Earl, Lord nor Baron, yet a profitable member of this commonwealth." In that famous reply lies the Liberalism of Scotland. It will not fail her till she fails it.

Perhaps many that know the book never knew who the writer was. The Rev. James Mackenzie was the eldest son of William Mackenzie, parish schoolmaster of Barry, who, at the Disruption, was expelled from office by the Presbytery of the bounds for adhering to the Free Church. He was educated at the High School of Dundee, and entered St Andrews as a bursar at fifteen. He took his Arts course there, dividing his theological attendance between that university and Edinburgh, where the reputation of Chalmers drew so many. His first charge was, on the eve of the great struggle, to the *quoad-sacra* of Dalbeattie, and he was the youngest of the pre-disruption men. Translated to Annan in 1844, he was called to the Abbey Free Church of Dunfermline in 1849. All through his book he shows a strong regard for these places. He will ever force a note to bring in a reference to the "auld grey toun" and its Abbey, to recall its power and opulence in its palmy days, to quote its chartulary, to record its fifty estates and lordship of Dunfermline, Kirkcaldy and Musselburgh. He died at Dunfermline on June 10, 1869, in the twenty-sixth year of his ministry, and the fifty-first of his age. He had been associated with Hugh Miller in *The Witness;* he edited the yearly blue-book of the Church and the *Missionary Record* for the last seven years.

Mackenzie was thus a townsman by adoption of Mr Carnegie. The M.P. for Dunfermline, Mr Ponsonby, we believe, has a political future, and we suggest that a memorial of the historian in that burgh should be proposed by him to Mr Carnegie. Sound national teaching and the memories of the place will retain the seat for the Liberals till the end of time. Indeed, a conjoined memorial of Mackenzie and the late Liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who so long represented Dunfermline in Parliament, would be, we are persuaded, as fitting as widely popular with all classes of Scotsmen. It was in 1886, on the suggestion of the late Professor Alleyne Nicholson, the naturalist, who said to me with deep feeling, "Better for St Andrews and her great memories to cease for ever than for some of us to stand by and see her grinding poverty," that in the interests of the then existing Scottish Rule Party the present writer addressed the facts to Mr Carnegie. I recalled the great past and the forlorn present of the most ancient of the universities of Scotland. He is fond of patriotically

associating himself with the illustrious dead in the Abbey, nor did I forget them. His reply from New York by return was that he was one day not to forget. He has kept his word. We hope that he will remember one who has done so much for genuine Scottish feeling, as Mackenzie did.

Mackenzie never concealed his standpoint :—

"The religious element in Scottish history, from the Reformation to the Revolution, is well-nigh everything. It is hard to understand how any man not sympathising with the religion of Scotland could write her history fairly. But some of our ablest historians have altogether lacked that sympathy, and the consequence is that their descriptions of our religious struggles cannot be read without indignation. Scotland, to borrow the language of Defoe, 'has been represented to the world in so many monstrous shapes, and dressed up in so many devils' coats and fools' coats,' that her own sons do not know their mother. There is a foolish, sentimental generation whose only ideas of Scottish history are taken from novels, songs and ballads. It is impossible to speak the truth about that bloody House which fell at the Revolution and its minions without giving offence to such persons. It is equally impossible to speak the truth about the great contendings of our glorious forefathers for their religious freedom without offending the enemies of our Scottish Presbyterianism."

This, of course, is the trouble with the Board School book. It must lie in order to keep peace. It must give a largess of a few idle paragraphs on Wallace and Bruce, vague references to Knox, to find room for twaddle about the Armada and the Civil Wars. The sentimentalist is an everlasting Perizzite and Hittite in the land. The declamatory cant on the ruin of the abbeys is perpetually with us. It crops up in the cheap manuals and ignorant compilations. How different is the plain truth !

"The English were the wholesale destroyers of our ancient Scottish abbeys and churches. In the mad invasion of 1544, which was intended to force 'our lass' to marry 'their lad,' the English burned and destroyed the Abbeys of Melrose, Kelso, Dryburgh, Jedburgh, Eccles, Haddington, Newbattle, Holyrood, with many a church in the Merse, Teviotdale and Lothian. To this large extent the work of destruction was accomplished sixteen years before the Reformation, when Knox was a simple tutor in the quiet country house of Longniddry. . . . Cautious Robert Baillie, writing little more than seventy years after the time, and who, of course, must have conversed with many contemporaries of the Reformation, says, 'I have not heard that in all our land above three or four churches were cast down.' . . . In 1588 the Assembly appeals to the King, craving him to avert the ruin which threatened the Cathedrals of Glasgow and Dunblane and the Abbey of Dunfermline. Yet we have the absurd story still repeated about the Cathedral of Glasgow having been saved from Principal Melville and his mob by the craftsmen of the city rising in arms to defend it."

We commend that to the maudlin sentimentalists and the perverters of history.

"The blame lies with the nobility and gentry who grasped the rents and lands attached to the buildings, but who never laid out a single merk for their repair. The rain soaked the roofs, the frosts of winter rent the walls. This is the real history of the destruction of the abbeys. To speak of such vast and massive structures as having been 'razed to the ground' by a mob in a few hours shows how like parrots men can talk. 'Pinches or fore-hammers will never pick upon't,' said Hugh, the blacksmith of Ringleburn, when the baffled party stood before the

tower of Westburnflat; 'ye might as weel batter at it wi' pipe-staples.' The fingers of a mob can do less than even pinches and fore-hammers against solid masonry two yards thick."

Mackenzie is capital on Wallace and Bruce. He sees there is a problem to be explained. A little nation, poor and deserted by its natural leaders, cannot be held down. Again and again it rises. To hear the ignorant compiler one would think that the historical burglar, Edward I., who embittered two peaceful nations for three centuries, was a model king. Yet the compiler evades the scientific question, the rise and progress of the national feeling from the death of Alexander III. till the present. Why did a handful of Normans overrun England? Why did "the pot-bellied Jutes and Angles, lumbering about in ignorant complacency," as Carlyle styles the made-in-Germany idols of Freeman and Green, take Duke William lying down? Why the petty resistance of Hereward, "the last of the English," with Eadwine and Morcar? That is the question.

Very admirable are his remarks on the first General Assembly in the little Magdalen Chapel in the Cowgate of Edinburgh:—

"Looking over the balustrade of George IV. Bridge in Edinburgh, a mass of dingy roofs and cracked chimneys, and a long street resembling a deep and narrow trench, lie below your feet. Edinburgh is here a city of two storeys, and that is the sunk storey into which you are looking down. As you stand on the footway of the bridge you are on a level of the bartizan of a small, old, plain, church steeple, which lifts its primitive form among the dingy roofs at a few yards off. . . . Such was the magnificent educational fabric which the Reformers essayed to rear. To this day no country in the world has a supply of the means of education equal to that which these noble hearts designed for Scotland."

He is sound on Cromwell, and is on Carlylean lines. Worcester fight was a "crowning mercy"—"indeed it was a stiff business," as Oliver writes—but the Protector has always been understood in Scotland.

But quotations are needless. The book is too well known to need them. We should consider our trouble amply rewarded if words of ours could induce a new generation to procure it and read it. They will see, then, the great fact—unknown to "able editors" of Tory papers complacently at their ease in Zion, Fleet Street omniscient garblers, and Parliamentary vote-catchers—that there is and always has been a very distinct history of Scotland.

Wm. Keith Leask.

———o———

The Saxons and the English. —"Once when speaking of agriculture, the Chancellor (Bismarck) went on to compare the Pomeranians and the Nether Saxons. The former were sober, moderate, and easily satisfied; while the Saxons, on the other hand, bearing more resemblance to the English, sought to make life as easy and as comfortable as possible." This extract, (which is from Lowe's 'Table Talk of Bismarck' pp. 281-2), confirms the view that we have so often published in these pages of the self indulgence and spiritlessness of the Southern or Saxon English.

EPISODES OF "THE FORTY-FIVE"

EVERYTHING connected with the Rising of the Jacobites in 1745, and their subsequent fate, is interesting to Scotsmen. Much has been written about the period, and every few years new facts come to light, as old family records are searched, or letters or memoirs of the period that have been mislaid or forgotten, fall into the hands of those who know their value. Through the courtesy of Mr J. Spence Brown, Honorary Secretary of the St Andrew Society, 65 Castle Street, we are enabled to publish for the benefit of our readers the following interesting letter, written by the private secretary, or one of the *aides-des-camp* of the Duke of Cumberland, a month and a day after the fateful day of Culloden.

The letter discloses two significant facts. One, that the Duke of Cumberland was decidedly of opinion, a month after the battle, that in Edinburgh there was still a strong Jacobite feeling, which had to be seriously guarded against by the military authorities there. The other is, that the opinion so generally held in Scotland, that the Duke of Cumberland was a man of a cruel and basely vindictive nature is here confirmed in a striking way by this letter from one of his officials. His savage conduct for months after the battle to the inhabitants of the Highlands, has earned for him the unenviable epithet of "The Butcher," a term applied to him owing to the cruelty he displayed, not only to the men of the Highlands after the battle, but to their women and children. In this letter we see the innate brutality and low vindictiveness of the man's character. He orders the colours of the brave and gallant clansmen taken at Culloden to be burnt at Edinburgh by the hands of the "common hangman." Soldiers of a gallant and chivalrous character always treat a fallen and helpless foe with humanity and kindness; but in the character of this Hanoverian Duke, these qualities were not only entirely absent; but their opposites—savagery and vindictiveness—were so strong and so rampant in him that they extended even to those emblems which all true military men hold as dear and sacred, viz., the colours under which they fight; and for the preservation of which they are willing to give up their lives. To "The Butcher," these emblems of military honour were only fit for destruction by the "common hangman." It is well and fitting to keep these two terms in close historical connection with his name for the future. They are a fitting pair, "The Butcher," Cumberland; and the "common hangman" of Edinburgh.

INVERNESS, the 17*th May* 1746.

My Lord,—I have the honor of your Lordship's letter, and have his Royal Highness the Duke's commands to acquaint your Lordship that he has sent the Colours taken from the Rebels at Culloden to be burnt at Edenburg by the hands of the Common Hangman; and that the too general disposition there being so evident, to prevent any ill consequences from it, His Royal Highness would have the Battalion which is there under arms upon this occasion, to be disposed as your Lordship may see convenient. The Lord Justice Clerk will give your Lordship notice of the time and place fixed for this

occasion, and orders are given to the Lord Mark Kerr to make the proper dispositions in the Castle, against whatever may happen. I am with great truth and respect, my Lord, Your Lordships most obedient and most humble Servant,

Everard Fawkener.

The Right Honble.
the Earl of Home.

The other correspondence connected with the period after the battle, which through the courtesy of a friend we are here enabled to reprint, is of a more pleasant and manly character. It is from a Highland gentleman, who, second only to President Duncan Forbes, was the chief instrument in holding Scotland true to the Hanoverian dynasty—viz., Major-General Campbell, afterwards Duke of Argyle. It will be seen how different is the character of the Highland chieftain from that of the German Duke. Major-General Campbell writes firmly and clearly in giving his orders to his clansman, Campbell of Dunstaffnage; but the kindly feeling of a Highland gentleman, and the innate racial courtesy to the fair sex, are visible all through his correspondence. The fair prisoner, or as he notes, "the very pretty young Rebell," is Flora MacDonald, the brave Highland heroine, who has made her race and her country famous in history; and who got into "a most unhappie scrape by assisting the Young Pretender to make his escape." Observe the chivalrous tone in which Major-General Campbell alludes to the young lady, and also to the gallant but unfortunate Prince Charlie. This bit of correspondence, little and unimportant no doubt as he thought it at the time, is nevertheless highly creditable to Campbell, and also to his country. For it shows that with all the sternness and hardness that are generally supposed to belong to the Scottish people, at bottom they have a kindliness of heart which often renders their actions sweet and tender:—

Horse Shoe Bay,
August 1st, 1746.

Dear Sir,—I must desire the favour of you to forward my letters by an express to Inverary, and if any are left with you lett them be sent by the bearer. I shall stay here with Commodore Smith till Sunday morning, and if it is not inconvenient, should be glad to see you. If you can't come, I beg to know if you have any men now in Garrison at your House, and how many. Make my compliments to your Lady, and tell her that I am obliged to desire the favour of her for some days to receive a very pritty young Rebell, her zeal and the persuasion of those who ought to have given her better advice has drawn Her into a most unhappie scrape by assisting the Young Pretender to make his escape. I need say nothing further till wee meet, only assure you that I am, dear sir, Your Sincere Friend and Humble Servant, John Campbell.

I suppose you have heard of Miss Flora M'Donald.

To Neil Campbell, Esq., Captain of Dunstaffnage.

August 1, 1746. *On His Majesty's Service.* To Neil Campbell, Esq., Captain of Dunstaffnage. From Major General Campbell.

If Dunstaffnage is not at home, his Lady is desired to open this letter.

Wednesday evening.

Sr,—You will deliver to the bearer John M'Leod Miss M'Donald to be conducted her in his wherry, having no officer to send it would be very proper you send one of your garrison alongst with her. I am, Sr, Your most obedient Humble Servant,

John Campbell.

To the Captain of Dunstaffnage.

THE FALSITY OF EARLY ENGLISH HISTORY

OUR Melbourne correspondent again deals with this question, on which we regard him as an authority. He writes:—

As nothing of moment can be done till your readers are satisfied as to the correct position taken up by the critics, and accepted by me after years of close inquiry, I will point out now, as well as I can, the reasons why "*English*" history is false, and why the *Scottish* Records may be trusted.

There were so many usurpers on the English throne that each king, when in power, tried to obliterate all traces of illegitimacy or underhand working by which he had won the crown. And, likewise, he had to condemn and nullify, as far as possible, the claims of the contending party. So, in a double sense, the so-called "records" were overhauled and falsified to suit the interests of the rival houses at every change of king. Henry IV., Henry V. and Henry VI. (the sainted king) were all denounced as usurpers; and Henry VII., Henry VIII. and their successors had—and have—a still worse claim to the crown; for Henry VII. was descended from an *illegitimate* descendant of the usurping family; that is, they descended from John Beaufort, first Duke of Somerset, who was the natural son of John of Gaunt by his concubine, Catherine Swynford; and this is the *only* claim of the present family to the throne of "England." It belongs to the Mortimers, by right, and six or seven thousand Stuarts have a better title.

You can easily imagine how the "records" would be manipulated in the interests of successive kings of England. As Macaulay states, "The motives to falsification become almost irresistible."

In Scotland there were no such motives, and the few early Records we have may be trusted.

There were tales of English Records lost and found, but finally lost to human ken; and Edmund Johnson says, "Strype" (the Antiquary), "says that in 1529, the year of Wolsey's fall, there was at the Rolls no more ancient Record than of the reign of Henry VII., with the exception of a few years of Richard III." As Richard III. only reigned from 26th June 1483 till August 1485, you can see how far back you may look for genuine *English* Records, especially as even *these* have been tampered with.

The great period for working up records and chronicles was during the time of Henry VIII., when English sentiments and ideas were bitter against the Scots.

As for the times of Wallace and Bruce, there is *not a single authentic* ENGLISH *Record* to show the dark deeds of that most unscrupulous scoundrel, Edward the First. But a new history has been furbished up, which declares him to be everything great, the "English Justinian," etc.

William Rishanger, Edward's "Historiographer," as he is called, was a Benedictine of Bury—probably of 15th or 16th century, as there is *no* contemporary English history of any events before the Tudors.

The "Book of Fawkirk" is evidently a fraud, as I stated before; rather, I should say, it is an innocent

copy of a fraud, which Bain has treated as a genuine history from the Records, so-called; but the Records examined by Bain are of recent concoction, being part of the system agreed upon for writing out English history. It is quite modern in the get-up, and is not history. As you will recollect, I proved that Lang—*re* Wallace and the beer story was wrong—even from his own authorities; but I told you at the time that the whole thing was a fraud; and so it stands.

The great John Selden "cites several statutes from the time of Edward I. Yet he adds that *the Original Rolls*, with many others, *have been lost*."

Edmund Johnson states:—

"The student who will consult Strype, another scholar of Queen Anne's time, will see from the strange tales he tells about the Records that they were not begun till about the *middle of the sixteenth* century, and were *then written* in support of the *dogma of British History* already received. In no one departmet of learning had men the honesty to say openly that no such thing as notes of events in Edward's reign had descended to the Tudor period."

I think all the above have been sent to you before—that ALL *English* Records before the Tudors are fabulous, and made to benefit England at the expense of Scotland—just as the lying chroniclers have done—and mostly written about the same time, the 15th and 16th centuries.

It is desirable that Scottish literary men should get Edmund Johnson's "Rise of English Culture" for their own study; it would be a tower of strength to them in historical criticism. It was published by Williams & Norgate of London in 1904.

As to "Bede," I have got *Hardouin's Prolegomena*, and *he* laughs at it, as does Rabelais, so does Thomas Fuller.

It is curious that the Anglican Church should continue to defend so plain a lie, and quite unaccountable that the Church of Scotland should submit to it. As to the Church, here is what Johnson states:—

"The Church must now abandon her claim to be the teacher of History, which is the science of letters and of human nature. The more secular Truth has in this department more slowly come to light from various causes which I hope have been sufficiently explained. . . . I believe there is a growing feeling in the minds of many who are of our blood and language in America and the Colonies against the teaching of History as it has been hitherto conceived. They do not believe that the Church has told the Truth in the common and valuable acceptation; and they are in the right. And how injurious to Society to continue a system of education rooted in false opinions of life and human nature! . . .

"The pretensions to obtain knowledge about so-called supernatural things by so-called supernatural channels, is, of its nature, a fraudulent imposition on Society."

With regard to Edward I. and his deeds in Scotland, there is no reason to doubt the Scottish accounts, though the question of dates is often turned up against Blind Harry. But he received the traditions as he got them, and the mere question of time did not invalidate the fact. How could Harry find out every exact date in those troublous times? Besides, who can give the correct dates that prove Harry wrong? It must be an

enemy who finds fault with his dates, otherwise, what about the Christian religion which declares that Christ was born on 25th December—a manifest falsehood—and no one can tell the year, yet some four hundred millions worship the unknown. The main facts of Harry's tale must be accepted; the tradition was comparatively fresh, and had been burned into the souls of men and women by the horrible barbarities of the three first Edwards.

The earlier poem of Barbour has been sufficiently criticised to stand on its merits; it was a god-send to Scotland, and should be modernised.

I have now given you the facts about *English* history; the scribes were manufacturing that so-called "history" even up to the reign of Queen Anne! What faith can be placed in such a concoction? I may be asked, do I look on the records of those times as fabulous?—meaning the times of Wallace and Bruce. I point out that there are *no authentic "English" Records*, so that belief is out of the question, as the present so-called "records" are mere modern patchwork unworthy of belief. I again remind your readers of the so-called document *re* Alexander's fealty—a patent fraud: Also the Treaty of Northampton (English Copy), which has disappeared—being inconvenient. The only correct English Records date from Queen Elizabeth, and I have tried to explain how the earlier Records were ransacked, altered, or destroyed to suit the immediate interests of the crown.

Our correspondent continues:—Read Edmund Johnson's "Rise of English Culture." It is a mine of wealth for any student of ancient history, which has been carefully sifted, and the results given bit by bit in a way that will astonish the reader. It is a very laborious performance, and the honesty of the writer is apparent. . . .

With regard to Scottish history, it must be admitted that the very early portion is fabulous; but daylight comes in with the documents regarding Alexander. Regarding the Scottish Records carried to London by Edward I., I saw a paragraph stating that the documents were still in London, and should now be sent back to Edinburgh as a tardy recognition of the Treaty of Northampton. But you may take note, that if the English Records have been lost or destroyed, the Scottish documents must have shared the same fate. There need be no doubt on that point.

———o———

THOSE ENCROACHING AND ALL-PERVADING SCOTS.—No wonder Yorkshiremen in general, and the citizens of Leeds in particular, now and then get into a fume about the pre-eminent positions that the Scots so often hold in England. Yorkshire claims to hold the same leading position among English counties, as regards the acuteness and the energy of its natives, as Aberdeenshire does in Scotland. But it finds its claim to such pre-eminence in trade and in social positions interfered with not only in England generally, but even within the broad bounds of Yorkshire by Scotsmen; and by Scotsmen even who do not have the advantage of hailing from Aberdeen-

shire. To the Yorkshire mind this is a somewhat galling fact; or, rather, to those Yorkshiremen who have not much, if any, feeling of justice or fairplay, and who thus resent any encroachment by Scottish "foreigners" on what they regard as their own peculiar preserves. It must be unpleasant for such people to read the remarks lately made by Mr Herbert Samuel, the Postmaster General, at "a concert held at the Holborn Restaurant in London, to mark the retirement of Mr Alfred Eames of the Central Telegraph Office at St Mary's-le-Grand, after over half a century of work." Mr Samuel said :—

"Mr Eames was remarkable for the fact that he had risen to a high position in a Government department although he was born south of the Tweed. (Laughter.) When he (Mr Samuel) went to the Home Office he found at what anyone would suppose to be a typical English department, four 'heads,' all of them Scotsmen."

We need hardly say that this was a dreadful statement to make to a meeting—no doubt mostly English—the leading men perhaps excepted. Cannot something be done to check the inroads of the encroaching and all-invading Scots? Why, the threatened invasion of the Germans is a less serious matter. They, at least—Englishmen may say—are of our own race and blood—for are we not Anglo-Saxons? But the Scots! Are they not half-clothed savages, who rejoice in barbaric music, and thrive on the coarsest of food? Such are the wails of those Englishmen "who only England know," and who think Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen are and ought to be outside the pale of what they call "English citizenship."

Sir George Reid's Nationality.—*The Scotsman* (July 2) writes as follows :—

"The Right Hon. Sir George Houston Reid presented the prizes at Leys School, Cambridge, yesterday afternoon. The Head Prefect, E. Forrester Paton, is a Scotsman, and took advantage in his speech to claim the High Commissioner as a fellow-countryman. Sir George Reid, in his address, said it was true he was a Scotsman, but it was a narrow shave. He was only two months old when he followed the irresistible national instinct to begin travelling south. What made Scotsmen so successful in other countries was their training, which made them loyal to the countries in which they resided. Their success was always happily blended with the success of the community in which they endeavoured to excel."

Sir George is an inveterate jokist, and he here is trying to get a joke out of his nationality, and in doing so he apparently was playing upon and taking advantage of the ignorance of an average English audience. He says he is a Scotsman, "but only by a narrow shave," evidently implying that if he had been born three months later, he would have been an Englishman, as his parents had by that time removed to England—to Liverpool, where his father was for many years Presbyterian Minister of the church in Oldham Street. Sir George is a learned lawyer, and though probably international law has not been a branch of jurisprudence with which he has had much to do, he no doubt is aware that the nationality of a man is not determined by the accident of his place of birth, but by his parentage; and primarily by his fatherhood. Had the parents

of Sir George removed to Paris, and had he been born there, he would not thereby have become a Frenchman. Subsequent naturalisation would have been necessary for that. Thackeray was born in Calcutta; but that did not make him a Hindoo; and the late Mr Gladstone though born in Liverpool, did not thereby become an Englishman, but was a true Scot, as he sometimes owned to be—though in our opinion the avowal came somewhat reluctantly. For Oxford, and the strong Anglican bias he got there, had to some extent corrupted him, and deprived him of his national sentiment as a Scotsman. How far the *genius loci* goes in law; and how many generations are required to deprive a family stock of its original nationality we cannot say; and we are not aware that the question has as yet been decided by international law. But we believe it is certain that the nationality of the father makes the nationality of the son, and the undoing of such nationality cannot be effected by the lapse of time, but must be carried out by an act of naturalisation, or by some statutory enactment of the country in which a man may have taken up a permanent residence. We write as a layman only, and therefore subject to correction. But we believe we have stated the case correctly. Sir George Reid's "close shave" then is only imaginary; and he might have opened his eyes for the first time in Liverpool, and still have had not the slightest claim—except his personal appearance—which, however, is not a slight one, to be an Englishman.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 26. September 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 26. SEPTEMBER 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

No. 77.

The Return of David the Second from France

HIS DEFEAT AND CAPTURE BY THE ENGLISH

THE war with France which Edward had now entered upon, came opportunely for Scotland. For seven years the country had been subject to the worst evils of war; at first from civil war, and then from the usual English war of devastation and of attempted conquest. Without her king, who was a minor, and in France; with nearly all her best leaders poisoned, slain, or captured, and with several disastrous defeats, and with nearly all her chief strongholds in the hands of the enemy, the country might fairly have been expected to submit to what seemed to be her inevitable fate—a complete surrender to England. This is what England herself had done in a tame and ignoble fashion after the defeat of Hastings in 1066. But the course of events from 1286, after the death of Alexander the Third, prove conclusively

that the Scottish people are an entirely different race from the English people. It has been the fashion during the last half century for English writers and historians, and for some renegade Scots, to assert that the Lowland Scots are Angles; and thus, being of the same race, they should in these days quietly and complacently accept their fate and become a contented "part and parcel" of the English people. There is no warrant in history for such a contention. In the first place, the term "Engles" and "English" only became known late in the tenth century; and after that period there was no incursion into, or settlement of such people in Scotland. Besides, it is almost an incontestable fact that the term Engeland or Angleland, comes not from an invading race or people—who indeed cannot be found in history—but from the character of the country, now called England. Eng or Aeng in Norse and Danish, means a meadow; and England being to them—especially to the Norsemen, essentially a meadow-land, or an Enge-land, hence came the name England. But were there any doubt as to the essential difference of the two races, the ordinary observer or thinker who is guided by facts, and not by fabulous monkish Chronicles, or by national vanity, has only to look at the history of Scotland for the fifty or sixty years after the death of Alexander the Third, and he will inevitably conclude that the Scottish people differ essentially and fundamentally from the English people. And this difference comes out again and again in the terrible years of the minority of David the Second, the events of which we have been and are now recording. Great as was the disaster of Halidon Hill, terrible as were the destructive invasions that thereafter followed, the spirit of the Scottish people was untamed and untameable. And it is well for the Scottish people of the present time to note these truths and try to emulate the patriotism of their ancestors. Edward Baliol, with his English armies and with his Scoto-Norman followers, year after year marched through the country, slaying and devastating; but the Scots, taught by bitter experience, avoided pitched battles, and harassed their foes by unexpected attacks at every favourable opportunity. This kind of warfare, however, wore out the strength of Sir Andrew Moray the Regent—once the companion of Wallace—and now an old man. He died, and the High Steward, the grandson of Bruce, was made sole Governor of the kingdom.

Heavily involved in his war of aggression on France, Edward was unable to give much aid to Baliol and his party in Scotland; and the Steward soon began to make considerable headway. He besieged and took Perth, and then Stirling, two of the most important fortresses in the kingdom. Then some time after, Edinburgh Castle was taken by stratagem. These important events took place, the first in 1339, the last in 1341. Other successes followed to the patriots, who now had so nearly cleared the country of the enemy, that they decided to bring back the young king and his

consort from France. They landed safely at Bervie on the East Coast in June 1341.

David the Second, who had now returned to Scotland, was in his eighteenth year; but though personally brave, he had none of the qualities that make a great king; and a great king was highly necessary to Scotland in the cruel position in which she was now placed. Fortunately, the French war greatly tried the resources of Edward; and after a series of Border raids on both sides, the two monarchs concluded a truce for two years. This, however, was broken by Douglas, called the Knight of Liddesdale, who, irritated by some English raids, crossed the Border, and ravaged Cumberland. Of course the war was renewed by Edward, who on this occasion was not the aggressor. David mustered a powerful army at Perth, and marched to the Border, where he had at first some success. Douglas advised him then to remain on his own side of the Border, and act on the defensive. But David was rash and self-willed, and said to Douglas that the English forces were now all in France, and that he would march to London. He paid dearly for his folly. Near Durham he was met by a powerful English army, which had been hastily embodied. David was a bad general, as well as a rash one; and in a great battle which took place near Durham, he was defeated with great slaughter, and made prisoner. The loss of the Scots in this affair, which took place in October 1346, is said to have been fifteen thousand. David, with many of the Scottish nobles, was taken to London, and Scotland was again apparently ruined.

—o—

No. 78

THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM

ONE would be inclined to think that by this time the leading politicians of the kingdom, and more especially those who have been Prime Ministers, should be able to speak correctly on this question, and avoid foolish blunders. Yet this is far from being the case. We already have had occasion to correct in these pages mistakes in British nomenclature committed both by Mr Asquith, the present Prime Minister, and his predecessor, Mr A. J. Balfour; and again we have to draw attention to another blunder in the same matter perpetrated by the latter gentleman. In his speech at Ipswich on 6th of January, Mr Balfour is reported by *The Scotsman* to have said, "In other words, the Government know very well that they must induce the Irish to support the Budget, to which the Irish object, and in order to gain the Irish vote, they may promise the Irish a change to which the 'British' may object." Here Mr Balfour clearly differentiates between Irish and British, and if he is correctly reported, would lead his readers to infer that the Irish are not British. This is a mischievous kind of blunder, and quite inexcusable on the part of an ex-Premier, or indeed of any leading politician, for it implies that the Irish are not British, and as a sequence

that Ireland is not one of the British Isles. In a sense, Mr Balfour here presents himself as a disunionist of a most pronounced kind; for if Irishmen are not Britishmen, then clearly they have a strong claim —indeed, we might say an undoubted claim—to a separate Parliament, if not to complete separation, and to the management of their own Irish affairs—these not being British, according to Mr Balfour.

It is really high time that some moderate modicum of brainwork should be applied to this question of proper British nomenclature by the politicians and other public men of this country. A year or more ago a lecturer on Geography in the Edinburgh University said he used the term "England" for the whole of the United Kingdom, because otherwise he would be compelled to use the cumbersome words, the "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland." He said also that he was a Scottish patriot, though he used the term "England" in an Imperial sense. Evidently, therefore, he erred from pure ignorance, and from not having thought out his subject. So with Mr Balfour, and also Mr Asquith. We may therefore be pardoned if we state the true position of the question. The word "England" is quite inadmissible as a representative term for the United Kingdom, inasmuch as in the first place it is contrary to the Treaty of Union of 1706, and is therefore a direct slight and insult to the Scottish people; in the second place, it would lead to endless confusion and blundering if it were used as a representative term for the four British nationalities. English law, for instance, is not British Law, and the English Church does not exist in Scotland, and now not even in Ireland. Then what about the representation in Parliament. Are the Irish members to be called "English," and the Scots and Welsh members, are they representatives for English constituencies? In fact, the assumption of those ignorant or arrogant Englishmen, or renegade Scots, that "England" is a correct term to use for the United Kingdom is so palpably absurd, that nothing but the most egregious national vanity on the part of Englishmen would ever think of putting forward a claim for such a misuse of the word "England."

The solution of the question is very simple and very clear. The generic term for the United Kingdom is not England, but Britain. And the term Britain properly includes the whole of the United Kingdom. Great Britain does not, as it excludes Ireland, which is really Little Britain. The Roman term for England and Scotland being *Britannia Magna*, and for Ireland, *Britannia Parva*. In speaking then of England and Scotland as a whole, it is quite wrong to use the adjective "British" as applicable to them only, and the term Irish, as applicable to Ireland in contrast to the term "British." Either the terms "Great British" and "Little British" should be used in this connection; or the terms "East British" and "West British." These terms may seem strange at first, but they are strictly correct, and usage would soon render them familiar. We

have the same usage in the largest of the European countries, Russia, for there, the terms "Great" and "Little" Russia are well recognised. Then as regards the second appellative, the term "West Britain" was accepted by O'Connell, perhaps the greatest of Irish patriots. But the Peers and the Tory party repudiated, and rejected the attempts then made by the Whigs to conciliate Ireland after the Reform Bill of 1832; and so insulted and infuriated the national sentiment of the Irish people that they went into bitter and determined opposition to everything English. The consequence has been, that so far as the Roman Catholic Irish are concerned, they repudiate every name but Irish, and will not even own that they are "British." This, of course, is a great mistake. They are as much British as the English, Scots or Welsh are. But despite this obvious fact, we find the present Premier, Mr Asquith, as we have already pointed out, and the ex-Premier, Mr Balfour, falling into the blunder of regarding the Irish as Irish only, and not British. This ignorant misconception of the true British nomenclature thus becomes an incitement to separation and to disunion. For if the Irish are not British, and Ireland is not a part of Britain, who can say that the Irish would be wrong if they were to try to get a purely Irish government? So much for the blundering of prominent politicians and of Englishmen generally, in the matter of Imperial nomenclature.

———o———

No. 79

THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE MANIFESTO

WE republish in another portion of this issue the manifesto of the Scottish Home Rulers, who have at last organised themselves, and given tongue to their views and their demands. The document is a moderate statement of the disadvantage under which Scotland now labours as regards legislation; and expresses in a very quiet and modest manner what is wanted to remedy the existing evil. What is wanted, it says, is "some system of representative control over Scottish affairs in Scotland, . . . which if applied to the different parts of the United Kingdom, would provide for a true expression of the will of each nationality in respect of its own affairs, leaving the Imperial Parliament free to transact the business of the Empire." There is the Home Rule case in a nutshell; and all the quibbling and all the misstatements of the Tory press as to the real issue, cannot get over or gainsay the plain fact, that the demand here set forth is a moderate one; and, moreover, one which is absolutely necessary for the proper work of the Empire. What on earth has the Imperial Parliament really got to do with English, Scottish, Irish or Welsh education for example? Would not national parliaments or national councils in each of these divisions of Britain, know better how to carry out educational legislation than the present Parliament, overloaded as it is with the business of one-fourth of the civilised world?

We will take the Education ques-

tion as a crucial one. If the Scottish Home Rulers cannot succeed in bringing back to Scotland the Education Department now settled in London, they may as well give up their cause as hopeless. For, as we have already more than once pointed out, the transference of the department to Scotland is a mere administrative act, not a legislative one; and it can be done at an ordinary meeting of the Cabinet. What, then, are the steps necessary to bring about the proposed change? It is clearly a question of parliamentary coercion. No amount of talk without action will avail. Mr Asquith, with whom the decision of the matter primarily and lastly rests, will not move a step, unless he is confronted with a loss of his voting power. There are twenty-one members who have signed the Scottish National Manifesto. Will these gentlemen take their courage and their conviction in their hands, and boldly state to the Prime Minister that if he will not restore the Education Department to Scotland, they will refrain from voting in the critical measures shortly to come before Parliament? It may be said that this is an extreme position to take up. But the step is absolutely necessary if any success is to attend the movement. There is only one exception as regards non-voting, which may be put forward as a legitimate one. If there is a plain and clear issue put before the House of Commons as to the nullification of the acts of the House of Lords within the course of one Parliament, then we think the Scottish Home Rulers may fairly, and in accordance with their avowed principles, support the government. And why? For the clear and potent reason, that if such a measure be carried, the question not only of Home Rule for Scotland but of Home Rule All Round is practically assured. The lesser question then will go with the greater, and the party may, with a complete accord with their principles, support the government should such a plain and direct issue come before them. But on all other questions their decision must be adamantine. There must be no compromise, or they are lost as an effective and useful party. All sorts of arguments and all sort of blandishments will be brought to bear upon them not to desert the Ministry and the Liberal Party. Let their reply be that if the Ministry will adhere to Liberal principles, and allow Scotland to have the control of her own system of education in Scotland, then they will be entitled to the support of Scottish Nationalists. But not otherwise. For the refusal to grant this is pure and unmitigated Toryism, and Toryism of the worst kind. For it is a device to sap and destroy the very best elements and principles of Scottish nationalism at its root. What has made Scotland since the Union notable and famous among modern nations? It has been her devotion to popular education; to her holding clearly and firmly the enlightened idea that no nation can attain to eminence in modern times unless its people, down to the lowest grade, is thoroughly educated. That view permeated the whole strata of the

Scottish nation in the eighteenth, and at least in the first half of the nineteenth century. If it has since fallen from that high ideal, it has been due chiefly to the endeavour made by the so-called Liberal Party, led by Mr Gladstone, to Anglicise Scotland by the transference to London of the Scottish Education Department. There the system is in a false, and what may be termed, so far as national sentiment is concerned, in a foreign environment, and the Scottish youth have been and are being trained in a fashion that has left them indifferently Scottish, and only maudlin English. In the name of commonsense let that be altered, and let us have our system of education fixed in Edinburgh, and be there free from Anglican influence and Oxford intermeddling. The Scottish Nationalist Party should appeal to the two great Scottish churches to help in this important matter. Their interest is identified with that of the Scottish people, and in this question they should go hand in hand with the political party that is aiming to secure for Scotland the management of her own affairs, of which education may justly be regarded as one of the most important.

The Scottish Home Rule Manifesto

The following manifesto to the people of Scotland was issued last night by the Scottish National Committee (*Scotsman*, Aug. 5):—

The Committee to Promote National Self-Government for Scotland has been formed at the instance of Scottish Liberal members having long experience of the Parliamentary and Departmental conditions governing Scottish affairs. It appeals for support to all those interested in Scottish legislation and administration.

The settlement of the Constitutional question will offer an opportunity for reorganising Parliamentary business on a basis of Devolution. Ireland's claim to self-government is not likely to be overlooked. That of Scotland is in its own way no less urgent.

A policy of Devolution for Scottish affairs involves a break with the antiquated procedure of two centuries. This procedure was imposed upon us at the Union, when Scotland was practically delivered into the hands of bureaucracy. The creation in our own time of the Scottish Office aroused hopes of securing for Scottish representatives a greater measure of control. That has not been the result. It is probable, indeed, that under the system in vogue during part of the nineteenth century, when the Lord Advocate and the Scottish representatives virtually settled Scottish policy by agreement, there was more representative government than there is to-day.

Moreover, Scottish legislative and administrative needs have meanwhile so enormously increased that the conditions of to-day cannot be compared with those of fifty years ago.

From its formation in 1885, the Scottish Office, centred in London, has been the closest of bureaucracies, and at present no machinery is available, and time and occasion are lacking to enable Scottish members to have a real control over their affairs.

The Scottish Education Department is as firmly rooted in London—practically out of reach of local education authorities—whilst the other Boards in Edinburgh, being detached from the Scottish Office and without Advisory Councils, are equally out of touch with the representative system.

Scotland is frequently legislated for as an afterthought. Clauses dealing with her affairs are unexpectedly tacked on to Bills intended to deal with purely English questions. Such Scottish legislation as is introduced is initiated by the permanent officials of the different Boards, is prepared in London, and becomes a Government Bill before Scottish members have had a chance of discussing it or an opportunity of putting their views before those responsible for its introduction.

This has been the fate of Scotland under all Governments. An outstanding fact in connection with present conditions is that, however overwhelming the preponderance of opinion may be among Scottish representatives in favour of any particular social or political reform, it is rarely possible for the will of the people of Scotland to secure legislative effect.

The problem before us is to devise some system of representative control over Scottish affairs in Scotland, a principle which, if applied to the different parts of the United Kingdom, would provide for a true expression of the will of each nationality in respect of its own affairs, leaving the Imperial Parliament free to transact the business of the Empire.

Further, it should be noted that men who are actively engaged in the local life and business of Scotland are less and less able to undertake Parliamentary responsibilities necessitating residence in London during practically the whole year.

We hold, then, on these and other grounds, that the time has come when the public opinion of Scotland should be definitely directed without further delay towards a practical scheme of Devolution. Scotland has already given an emphatic vote against the continuance of government by an hereditary Chamber. Let her pursue at once, and with equal resolution, an ideal of Constitutional Revision which will include, so far as she is concerned, the concentration of her legislative and administrative machinery in Scotland, and its control by her representatives under such safeguards as may be necessary to retain the absolute supremacy of the Imperial Parliament.

The moment is opportune to raise this question, for under any comprehensive scheme of Constitutional Reform it is essential to provide for the representation of the nationalities of the United Kingdom upon a proper basis through Devolution.

We call upon our fellow-countrymen to support this movement, confidently believing that we shall not appeal in vain to the good sense and patriotism of the Scottish people.

R. C. MUNRO FERGUSON, HENRY DALZIEL, D. V. PIRIE, JOHN D. HOPE, A. ROLLAND RAINY, W. H. COWAN, W. A. CHAPPLE, GEORGE N. BARNES, HENRY A. WATT, THOMAS F. WILSON, ALPHEUS C. MORTON, W. WARING, ROBERT MUNRO, J. W. CLELAND, ALEX. WILKIE, J. GALLOWAY WEIR, W. M. R. PRINGLE, GODFREY P. COLLINS, JAMES P. GIBSON, J. S. AINSWORTH, J. CATHCART WASON.

The honorary secretaries of the Scottish National Committees are Mr W. H. Cowan, M.P., and Mr H. A. Watt, M.P., to either of whom communications may be addressed.

NOTES OF A VISIT TO GERMANY

BY THE EDITOR

EARLY on a Monday morning about the middle of July the writer found himself in Hamburg. We were in quest of health; for though our labours in connection with *The Thistle* are not exacting, yet the burden of many years compels careful attention to the machinery of life, to see that it is worked with care; and should it be clogged in any of its parts, that such should be put right as gently and as speedily as possible. An experience of many years had made known to us that in this respect the waters of Bad-Kissingen in Northern Bavaria are wonderful in their curative power. It was in July 1863 that we, a broken-down journalist, almost despairing of life, when travelling on the Continent in the hope of some restoration to health, first heard of Kissingen at Geneva. There, a lady whom we met, hearing of the nature of our illness, advised us to try the waters and the baths of Kissingen. She said a relative of hers, an overworked barrister, who had completely broken down from nervous exhaustion, had gone to Kissingen; and after a five or six weeks' stay there, had been quite restored to health. We took the kindly advice. We went, and after a six weeks' stay went back to Scotland so renovated, that ever since, with care and judgment, we have enjoyed fairly good health; and indeed are now a fairly vigorous octogenarian. We have often since described to friends and acquaintances the effects of what is termed "the cure." We

went there, we said, in much the same condition as regards the working of our bodily organs, as a watch is, when for a long time it has not been cleaned. It is taken to a watchmaker; he takes down the parts of the mechanism, cleans them thoroughly, oils them gently, puts them again together, and gives back to the owner his property in good working order; and almost as good as new. This was what the waters of Kissingen do to many men who break down, or who suffer severely from mental overwork and worry. This was the effect they had on our overworked brain, and our consequently debilitated body. At our visit in 1863 the place was but little known; but in that year the late Empress of Austria visited it, and was cured of an ailment which had previously puzzled her physicians. Since then, its fame as a health resort has become well known, especially on the Continent. And the continuous visits to it of Prince Bismarck, during the latter part of his life, made it so famous that the number of visitors, which in 1863 was only between four and five thousand, has for some years back closely approached to thirty thousand.

Lubeck and the Wallace Document

So much for the main object of our visit to Germany. We had also a subsidiary one, which will be of much more interest to the readers of *The Thistle*, and indeed may be said to be the only excuse we can offer for this narrative of our journalistic ramble. We were desirous of seeing, when in Germany, the famous Wallace document or letter sent in 1297 by Wallace and his brother-Governor of Scotland, Sir Andrew Moray, to the authorities of Lübeck and Hamburg. We gave the text of that letter or dispatch in *The Thistle* of June 1909, p. 164, and being under the impression that the document had been signed by the two Patriot-Governors, we felt that to get a sight of it was worthy of a long journey. On mentioning our intention in this respect to an acquaintance in Scotland, he said that we should try and learn whether the document could be got from the Lübeck authorities for the great National Exhibition to be held in Glasgow in 1911. If it could be shown there, he said, it would be an immense attraction to patriotic Scotsmen, and would probably induce many of them to come from the various British Dominions beyond the Seas to have a look at it. We felt the force of the remark, and determined to see what could be done in the matter. Leaving Hamburg on the afternoon of the 18th July—the day of our arrival—we got to Lübeck in about an hour. The country between is almost flat, and signs of harvest were already visible in the shape of some stooks of rye, and of the reaping machine being used on a few fields. Lübeck is a fine old city, situated on the river Trave, about twelve miles or so from the Baltic, and in the pre-Reformation period was one of the most important cities of Germany. It was one of the famous Hansa cities, as the Germans term them—to Britishmen, known as the Hanseatic League—

which then did all or nearly all the foreign trade of Northern Germany. Piracy was then a common, and indeed a flourishing trade, and the Hanseatic cities, to protect their trade, united their naval strength, and "policed" the northern seas in much the same fashion that in the 18th and early 19th centuries the British government protected all European traders in the Eastern seas.

Lübeck shows many signs of its ancient importance. Like Paris and Venice, its site had been chosen because of the protection and safety given to it by the surrounding water; in this case, the river Trave. An area of probably five hundred acres is enclosed by water, either of the river, or of artificial channels made to strengthen the city. Walls, with strong turreted gates, which still survive, further protected the inhabitants and the wealth which their industry and activity soon accumulated. There are several churches, with lofty, sky-piercing steeples, easily visible in that flat country for fifteen or twenty miles; and the Rathhaus or City Hall with many other important public buildings is still extant. Of course, the streets are narrow as was the general custom in those old walled cities—the High Street of Edinburgh being a remarkable exception—and in one of these, the Koenig Strasse, is the "Stadt Archiv," or the City Archives, where is kept the city records from the 12th century onwards. It is here that the Wallace document is kept. On calling and making known our wishes, we were met most kindly by an elderly gentleman, whom we took to be the keeper, or master of the Archives. He got out the printed catalogues of the treasures in his charge, and after some search, under the date of 1297, showed us the name of the one we wished to see — William Wallace. At ten o'clock on the following day, he said, the document would be ready for our inspection. We need hardly say that we were there to the minute.

We had hoped that the document would have the signatures of Wallace and Moray attached to it, but this is not the case, and so far it is disappointing to patriotic Scotsmen; for the signature of Wallace on a document would have made it priceless to Scotland. The paper is simply a recommendatory letter or despatch by the then two Governors of Scotland to the authorities of Lubeck and Hamburg on behalf of two or more Scottish merchants who were about to visit those cities for the purpose of trade. It is on parchment, or skin of some sort, is about 12 inches wide and 6 inches deep, and has a waxen seal attached to it of a dingy grey hue, with some figuring or lettering which we could not decipher: The text is in Latin, and the writing is clear, distinct and angular, as was the fashion of the time, and no doubt was written by some member of the patriotic clergy, who followed the standard of Wallace. Even as it stands, without the signatures of the two Governors, the document is of the highest interest to Scotsmen; and the civic authorities of Glasgow should be urged to write to the

civic government of Lübeck and endeavour to get a loan of it, and have it sent over to Scotland to be placed in the great Exhibition to be held at Glasgow next year. As the main object of the Exhibition is to endeavour to secure a fund for the purpose of endowing a Chair of Scottish History in the University of Glasgow, there is no document extant that could be regarded as a more fitting exhibit than this one now in the Lübeck Archives. For to all readers of history, and, above all, to all lovers of national freedom, the name of Wallace is dear. In Germany we found his name well known and his memory cherished as that of a typical patriot. In conclusion, let us add, that the officials at the "Stadt Archiv" were from first to last most kind and sympathetic. They did all they could to further our wishes, and would accept no fee or reward. So far as we could gather, like citizens of a once free and powerful city, and now of a great nation that has done its work in the world and has established itself as a world power, they had a warm feeling for Scotland and Scotsmen, and were proud of this precious relic that they held of a country that had made a name so celebrated in the history of liberty.

To Berlin and Dresden

In the early 80's of last century we had been in Berlin several times, and had resided for over two years in Dresden. These cities, we were told, had, like Hamburg, increased so much in extent and population since that time, as to nearly double their population. In the short survey we had made of Hamburg we were astonished at the advance it had made, both in the city itself and its suburbs and in the harbour. In the latter especially the visitor cannot but be impressed with the wonderful extent of the waterway available for shipping of all sorts and for shipbuilding. The Elbe at Hamburg, or rather a little below it, is over half a mile wide, with a depth of water suitable for the largest class of steamers. At and opposite the city the river is broken up into several channels, all made navigable, and on the islands thus formed, which are of considerable extent, are several of the great shipbuilding yards and other establishments connected with shipping that have made Hamburg one of the most important and up-to-date ports in the world. It is now keenly competing with and closely approaching London as a great "world-port" or *entrepot*, and it is not at all unlikely that within the next twenty years it may even surpass the great emporium on the Thames.

We did not return from Lübeck to Hamburg, and go thence to Berlin, but went there direct from Lübeck. The country between is very flat; when you get half way to Berlin, almost entirely so, and bears strong evidence of having once been the bed of a shallow sea. The soil is almost a pure white sand, becoming a coarsish gravel as you get near to or pass south of Berlin. But the hand of industry is everywhere visible. Where the soil is not cultivated it is under forest, and the

most seems to be made of it everywhere. The further south I went the further advanced was the harvest, and when we got near Berlin, on the 20th July, stooks were plentiful. It was about dark when we reached the city on the north side, and as we drove rapidly through the streets and the "Thier Garten" to reach an hotel near the railway station for Dresden, the scene was bright and animated in the extreme. Electric lights everywhere; beautifully paved streets, over which the taxi-cab ran smoothly and swiftly; groups of statuary lining both sides of the avenue running through the "Thier Garten" to the entrance of the "Unter den Linden," showed that the city had been lavishly and beautifully embellished since 1882, when we last saw it. To the present Kaiser the greater part of this is due. He has endeavoured to make Berlin a rival to Paris as a show city, and he has succeeded. He cannot give to his capital the romance and the historical associations which make Paris, like Edinburgh, so full of interest to visitors, but in every other respect Berlin may vie with the fair city on the Seine.

From Berlin to Dresden is a three or four hours' journey by an express train. The country, as we have said, is flat. About twelve miles south is Grossbeeren, where a French army advancing on Berlin in 1813 was met and defeated. Harvest south of Berlin became general; the country was covered with stooks, and much of the stubble, even where the stooks were standing, was ploughed, or being ploughed, sometimes by oxen or cows; for, in Germany, the cows, as well as the women, are made to take an important share of the work of the countryside. At Dresden, next day, we soon found that it also had shared in the wonderful advancement of the leading German cities. In 1880-82 our apartments looked out on open fields, where now we found a mile or so of streets, with large, handsome houses, of from four to five stories. The old one-horse trams were replaced by electric trams, and they ran everywhere. Next day we went in the afternoon to Leipsig, and we found there the same development. Wonderful, indeed, is the progress made in Germany during the last thirty years. Its population has increased by about one-third, and its trade and commerce extend all over the globe, greatly to the enrichment of its people. How has all this come about? But this cannot properly be dealt with at the end of a chapter!

———o———

THE HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND

No. 2.—George Buchanan

LORD ROSEBERY, we see, in opening the restored Auld Brig at Ayr, advised his hearers to read again the biographical letter sent by Burns to Dr John Moore. There is another similar piece, known we fear to very few, that contains in modest compass the same genuine Scottish humour and racy touches. We mean the little Latin sketch of his life by George Buchanan, written at seventy-four, in 1579, two years before his death.

It is the work of a relative of the orator. It is noteworthy that the great historian and scholar through his mother Agnes Heriot, whose name his filial affection has immortalised, was of the same family as George Heriot, who for his second wife married a daughter of James Primrose, Clerk of the Privy Council.

"There are not, perhaps," writes John Hill Burton, "above three or four names holding so proud a place in the homage of his countrymen." Certainly in more than one sense few Scots have been so influential in relation to their country, and fewer still are aware of the source of the debt. Educationally he is most vitally alive to this stricken hour. The pride taken by his countrymen in his European fame as a classical scholar determined the Latin element so congenial to and distinctive of Scotland. While other European nations—Spain, France, England—were all laying the foundations of a vernacular literature, Scotland, like Holland, clung to the Humanistic note, and continued writing in the classic tongue long after Cervantes, Rabelais, Montaigne, and Shakespeare had produced classics in the languages of their country. It is the note so familiar to all Scots through the Baron of Bradwardine and Dugald Dalgetty on Scott. Bacon was the last great writer in Latin of the English School, thinking, as Dr Johnson said of Buchanan, that modern languages suffered from the instability of the vernacular.

Buchanan has been called the Father of Scottish Liberalism. This title he has earned not so much through his History, as from the tone of his dedications to James VI. and the teaching of his *De Jure Regni*. The last is one of the most influential books ever written, and his enemies were well aware of the fact. He influenced Milton's political pamphlets, and both their works were burned by the University of Oxford in 1683. In 1710 the Lords burned the Oxford decree at the hands of the common hangman. The doctrine of Buchanan, substantially that of Milton and of the Solemn League, of Cameron in the Sanquhar Declaration, is nothing more or less than what became accepted and respectable at the Revolution. It was again taken over in the American Declaration of Independence and the French Revolution. Carlyle showed all this long ago in detail. Truly an extended sphere of influence for the 1579 book of Buchanan. Possibly no political treatise has had such demonstrable results in history.

Yet in all this he was preceded by another Scot, who is the real father of the politics of his country. This is old John Major or Mair, a native of North Berwick, who at Glasgow was the regent of John Knox, and at St Andrews was the teacher of Patrick Hamilton and George Buchanan. Major was the last of the Scholastics in Scotland, and the first of the Liberals. He remained in the old Church, but in politics he was an advanced Radical. It is time Major should have his niche in Scottish history, for it is certain that he determined much of the thinking of Knox and Buchanan, as Dugald Stewart was the source of great light through his Edinburgh class-room. Major's note can be heard in the *De Jure Regni*, translated out of his crabbed Latinity into the classic diction of Buchanan. Major also is the first of the Scottish Latin historians. His book saw light at Paris, the second home of

the Scot, in 1521; Hector Boece of Dundee followed there in 1527; John Lesley came out at Rome in 1578, while Buchanan died in Edinburgh in 1582, with his book in the press of Arbuthnot, the King's printer.

Buchanan, who spoke Gaelic as his mother tongue at Killearn, French, Scots, English, as well as Latin, did for his country at the time what Sir Walter Scott did in the nineteenth century. Through him Scotland and her story became familiar to Continental readers. Issued at Edinburgh in 1582, it was reprinted next year at Geneva; an edition followed at Frankfort in 1584. An English translation in 1690 ran through seven editions. It was the *Quentin Durward* and *Ivanhoe* of its day. The Scot was ubiquitous in Europe long before that. They entered France at Dieppe, which long retained Scottish ways. The Royal body-guard in Versailles almost to the time of the Revolution, in changing sentinels, gave the watchword in Scots. Buchanan's narrative became European, and settled for ever with posterity the historical fate of Mary and Bothwell. In his handling of the old Scottish kings, whose fabulous descent is vouched for by the pictures in Holyrood, Major was much more critical than Buchanan, who viewed them from the position not of the scholar but of the man of letters. France had led the way in the glorification and falsification of her own national annals; England replied with the mythical Brute and the Trojans. Should Scotland take this lying down? So we have the full-blown story, begun in Fordun and continued in Boece, of the Greek Gathelus, who married Scota, the daughter of the Pharaoh that perished in the Red Sea. Their descendants reached Portugal, and Ireland, and from thence Prince Rothesay landed in Argyll. Everyone knows the purple patch in Macaulay's Essay on Ranke, about the Papacy outshining in antiquity the proudest royal houses in Europe. But there was one exception. Protestant and Catholic alike gloried in it. Poor the Scottish Crown might be. The French, apart from the political designs of the Guises, thought the marriage of the Dauphin and Mary a poor match. Buchanan taught Europe the reverse. The unique position of the Monarchy in Scotland gave it a prestige far beyond any other, and ennobled France for ever. The belief lasted far into the seventeenth century, and its last note can be heard in the famous speech of Lord Belhaven on the eve of the Union in 1707.

It is Buchanan who is the author of the hackneyed quotation about the *præfervidum ingenium Scotorum*. It occurs in the History, xvi. c. 51, over the Treaty of Berwick, between the Scots and English on February 27, 1560. It is curious that the source should be so little known. Burton maintained that it came from Andrew Rivet of Poitou, in his *Jesuita Vapulans*, but Buchanan had it when Rivet was a boy of ten. Scott said it came from the law books. Buchanan, however, was only translating the French proverb, *fier comme un Ecossois*, which John Major said was a phrase in his own time, and Scott rightly puts it into the mouth of Louis XI. in *Quentin Durward*. What a light does that single phrase shed historically on the national characteristic! Flodden, Pinkie, Dunbar, Darien were all due to it. What an expose of that detestable characteristic foisted on us by the ignorant compiler—"the pawky Scot!" A mark, maybe, of the Harry Lauder school, but unknown to history. "The dear old country," says George Heriot, in *The Fortunes of Nigel*, over Richie

Moniplies, "all over, pride and poverty." It is about time to explode the vulgar and detestable "pawky" touch.

Of course, much of Buchanan's history has not stood the test of critical examination. Innes, the father of critical Scottish history (1662-1744), Principal of the Scots College in Paris, demolished the Boece legend of the kings. But there is a limit to be borne in mind by a generation that errs in the other extreme through its devotion to the State-paper and research. These can do much. But the latter can distort the evidence through remoteness, and the former can lie with all the hardihood and disingenuousness of diplomatists. It is really time to discount considerably the dead — Dryasdust — historian with his documents. Buchanan, in the Mary-Bothwell period is a witness and eye-witness of incomparable value, and the combined phalanx of Jacobites and Mariolatrats has never ceased to revile his memory. But it is vain. That a man of his intellectual calibre, with his European culture and training, familiar daily with Knox, Lethington, the Queen, Darnley, Bothwell and all the actors in the drama—the man that was the product of the Renaissance and the Reformation, Keeper of the Privy Seal, Moderator of the General Assembly, Principal of St Andrews—acted, wrote and believed as he did about the Queen, is a fact never to be forgotten. That the man of Buchanan's powers could not diagnose French queens, Italian fiddlers and Scottish rakes is incredible.

The last scene of all presents the greatest European scholar of his day in a curious but characteristic attitude. It shows him as he lay dying in Kennedy's Close, the second off the High Street of Edinburgh, above the Tron Church. He died so poor that the Town Council had to bury him at the public expense. Knox and Buchanan died in their beds, otherwise they made nothing financially out of the Reformation. They served their nation and saved it for nothing. The passage is from the diary of James Melville.

"That September, in tyme of vacans, my uncle Mr Andro, Mr Thomas Buchanan, and I, heiring that Mr George Buchanan was weik and his historie under the press past ower to Edinburgh annes earend to visit him and sie the wark. When we cam to his chalmer we fand him sitting in his chaire teatching his young man that servit him to spell a, b, ab; e, b, eb, etc., etc. Efter salutation Mr Andro sayes, I sie, sir, yie are not ydle. Better this, quoth he, nor steiling sheipe or sitting ydle, quhilk is as ill. He shew us the epistle dedicatorie to the King. Sayes he, I may do no mair for thinking on another matter. What is that? sayes Mr Andro. To die, quoth he. . . . We went from him to the printer's wark hous, whom we fand at the end of the 17 buik of his Chronicle, at a place quhilk we thought might be an occasion of steying the haill work, anent the burial of Davie [Rizzio]. . . . The King wald be offendit at it. Tell me, man, sayes he, giff I have tauld the treuthe. I will bide his feud and all his kin's, then, quoth he. Pray to God for me and let Him direct all."

"Steiling-sheep" has always been taken in the sense of sheep-stealing. But it really means "stelling-sheep," folding sheep in the pen. All the humour of Buchanan, the genuine Scottish sardonic type, so utterly abhorrent from the vulgar and stupid "pawky" school, is there. Surely it is time to explode another fiction dear to the sentimentalists about beautiful queens, iron bigots, gloomy reformers, and all the current cant. What company Knox must have been in that High Street house of his with men like Buchanan! What a fund of racy anecdote and wit! We have Dryasdust on them! Fancy them on Dryasdust!

WM. KEITH LEASK.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 27. October 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH
AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY
"THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. NO. 27. OCTOBER 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is 1d., post free 1½d.; outside British Isles, post free, 2d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 80

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

King David's Disgraceful Reign

HIS DEATH

DAVID THE SECOND, whose capture by the English at the Battle of Durham we mentioned in our last chapter, lived till 1370, when he died in the Castle of Edinburgh at the early age of forty-seven, after one of the most inglorious reigns in the annals of Scotland. Weak and incapable, he possessed not a kingly quality, except courage, and his courage being combined with obstinacy and rashness, led not merely to his own undoing, but brought his country to the verge of ruin. If we except the period from the accession of John Baliol by the decision of Edward I. down to 1310, when Bruce by his successes began to give some measure of security and prosperity to a sorely tortured land, there is no other time than this reign of the second David when Scotland suffered so much from, and was so nearly overwhelmed by the power of England. It would

almost seem as if Providence in its wisdom had determined to subject the Scottish race to the greatest trials, short of extinction or subjugation, to bring them before the world as among the proudest and most resolute upholders of national freedom that history records. If only the degenerate Scots of the present time would turn to and carefully read the tale of the struggles and the sacrifices of their ancestors between 1296 and 1370, as recorded in the pages of Tytler, William Burns and other native and loyal historians, they would feel ashamed of their present apathy, and would endeavour to relieve their country from the contemptuous treatment to which it is now subjected by arrogant and bullying Englishmen.

Let us give a brief summary of these sufferings after the Battle of Durham and the capture of David. After that the English overran the south of Scotland, and annexed it from Carlops on the Pentlands to Soutra and Cockburnspath on the East Coast—of course with the usual devastation. Then Glasgow and the district to the west of it was overrun and wasted. Baliol, as the King of Scotland, was now thrown aside, and an English justiciary was appointed for what the English authorities regarded as their "new kingdom." But another trial was to fall on the unfortunate country. The plague, which had been prevalent on the Continent for some years, now reached Scotland, and its ravages were terrible. Meanwhile the wretched King, who was a captive in London, became a traitor to his country, and recognised Edward as his Lord Paramount, and consented to take the oaths of homage to him. In this humiliation he was followed by some of the leading nobles, including the Knight of Liddesdale, one of the heads of the famous Douglas family. This nobleman was slain, however, by one of his kinsmen, who was indignant at his treachery. In 1354 a mission came from France, and the leader brought with him 40,000 *moutons d'or*, whatever that may mean—for Tytler says not—and these were distributed among the patriotic Scottish nobles. This gift from France was, no doubt, intended to encourage the Scots to persist in their resistance to England. This they did to some effect, for, aided by the French contingent, they laid an ambuscade for a strong body of the English near Nisbet in Lower Teviotdale, and captured them. Shortly after this the city of Berwick was taken by the Scots, but the castle held out, and Edward, who was at Calais, hearing of this, hastened to the Border with a powerful army and laid siege to the city, which was compelled to surrender. Edward was in a fury against the Scots, whom he thought he had before this effectually subdued, and at the head of a huge army, said to number 80,000 men, he marched to the Forth, ordering his fleet to follow him there with provisions and munitions of war. So powerful a force intimidated many of the weaker-minded nobles, who made their submission to Edward. The wretched Baliol, now an old man, also made an abject

surrender to Edward of all his rights to the Scottish throne. But the Earl of Douglas, who now led the Scots, was undismayed by the great army of Edward. Pretending that he wanted to come to terms, he got a ten days' truce, and while it lasted he had the country cleared of everything that could give food and support to the army of Edward, and what could not be removed in time, such as forage, etc., was burnt or destroyed. Edward was so enraged at this that he "gave orders for the total devastation of the country." But this severity only recoiled on himself and his army, and he soon was in great straits. His fleet, on which he depended for supplies, instead of reaching Leith, was dispersed by storms, and as the country south of the Forth by his merciless policy had been made utterly waste, he was compelled to retreat with heavy loss, and with difficulty he reached Carlisle. "So cruel in its execution, and so inglorious in its result," says Tytler, "was an expedition in which Edward, at the head of an army far greater than that which fought at Cressy, had for the fifth time invaded Scotland, declaring it to be his determined resolution to reduce it for ever under his dominion."

Thus ended for a time the effort of the third Edward to conquer Scotland. Utterly baffled, he agreed to a truce, and this ended in the ransom and delivery of King David from his captivity in England. His ransom was one hundred thousand pounds, an enormous sum for those days, and one too great for the devastated country to bear. But in those days the absence of a monarch from his country was a great calamity, and the joy of the Scots was great when they got King David back again. He, however, was an unworthy son of his great father, and ere long proved himself to be a traitor to his trust. He had no children, and the Steward who was the next heir to the throne excited in him a strong feeling of jealousy and hatred. So far did he carry this enmity that he entered into a secret treaty with Edward to make one of his sons the successor to the throne of Scotland. In order to carry out this policy, Edward, by bribes and by promises of future gifts, seduced and secured the support of many of the Scottish nobility. The danger to Scotland was indeed great, for her King turned traitor, and actually summoned a parliament to carry out the arrangement he had made with Edward for the subversion of the independence of the kingdom. This parliament met at Scone in March 1363, and David then laid before it the terms on which, as he said, perpetual peace would be established with England. On his death he proposed that the parliament should elect as his successor, Lionel, the third son of King Edward. If this was agreed to, he said "he was empowered to disclaim on the part of the King of England and his heirs all future attempts to establish a right to the kingdom of Scotland under any pretence whatever; and he expressed his conviction that in no other way could a safe and permanent peace be established between the two nations."

David, in taking up this position, completely misunderstood the character of his countrymen. They were taken aghast at the base proposition made to them by their King, and would have none of it. The Three Estates met, and unanimously declared, says Tytler, "We never will allow an Englishman to rule over us." This determination staggered David, and he gave way and pretended to be satisfied. An uneasy feeling, however, arose among the patriotic nobles, and they rose in rebellion against David. This, however, was put down, and a truce was agreed upon between the King and his party and that of the Steward and the patriots. Under this agreement the Steward, in default of David having no issue, was to succeed to the throne. The ransom of King David, owing to the penury of the country, had not been paid to England, and Edward took advantage of this to press David again for a secret treaty by which the King of England and his heirs should succeed to the throne, on terms ostensibly preserving the rights and privileges of Scotland as a separate kingdom. The ransom of the King was also to be remitted. David seems to have secretly agreed to these proposals of Edward, and did all he could to have them carried into effect. What the result would have been to the independence of Scotland it is difficult to say, for great as was the spirit and resolution of the Scottish people, it would have been a terrible task for them to contend with the power of England, working in conjunction with a traitorous monarch and a host of selfish and unpatriotic nobles. Fortunately at this critical conjuncture relief came to the distressed kingdom. Edward quarrelled again with the King of France, and declared war against him, and under these circumstances peace with Scotland became absolutely necessary to him. The deep-laid scheme then against its liberty and independence was for the time laid aside, and the death of King David following soon after, in 1370, Scotland was freed from one of the greatest perils that have affected its stormy and chequered history.

———o———

No. 81

TRUE BRITISH STATESMANSHIP

THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL PARTY

ENGLISH Toryism is hard to kill and difficult to convince. It is encased in prejudice, and refuses to hear or listen to reason. It despises facts, and declares that English ways are the best in the world, and must not be changed whatever and however other nationalities may suffer. If the Irish, the Scots, or the Welsh people agitate for a measure of Home Rule, then, say the English Tories, do you wish to restore the Heptarchy? It is no use telling them that when the Saxon Heptarchy existed the various kingdoms were separate and independent, and were warring against one another to see which would be the strongest; while now, in Britain, the fight is essentially of a peaceful and purely political character, and is simply a struggle on the part of the minor nationalities for power to manage their own sub-national affairs un-

disturbed and unimpeded by the ignorance and stupid interference of Englishmen. All this is perfectly clear and obvious to every unprejudiced politician who gives the slightest thought to the question, but the English Tories can see nothing but danger and dire disaster in such a change. Home Rule to Ireland means to them a desperate enemy at the gate, for, according to the Tory idea, two and a half millions of Irishmen—of whom, at least, one half are quite peaceable—are quite sufficient to defy and overawe the other forty millions of Britons in the United Kingdom, these forty millions, moreover, having at their command all the military and naval resources of the Empire. But this fact is as nothing to the disordered imagination of the English Tories. So currish do their antiquated ideas and old-womanish notions make them, that they declare the safety of the Empire would be endangered if sub-national management of their own affairs were given to Irishmen. Oh! but say they again, the Irish are always quarrelling among themselves, and there would be perpetual trouble in Ireland! Well, how does this assertion concord with the statement that there would be great danger to the rest of Britain from these quarrelsome Irishmen if they had Home Rule. If they are always to be fighting—one against another in Ireland—surely the thirty odd millions of Englishmen might afford to go to bed at night, undisturbed by fears of an uprising and an invasion of wild Irishmen. But this is the big Bogey that Tory politicians conjure up to alarm and intimidate their ignorant English followers.

To such men it is of little use pointing out that Parliament, as now constituted, cannot get through the all-important Imperial duties that are entrusted to its care, that such duties have to give way constantly and continually to the consideration of petty questions, which, to an Imperial Parliament, are as unimportant as street rows or public-house squabbles are to the staff of a great army. How the work of the British Empire goes on when its great guiding power is so hampered and interfered with is marvellous to contemplate. But this is certain, that unless a great and important change in the machinery of Imperial Government is made, and made ere long, some crisis will arise, when what can now be done peaceably and effectively, will have to be done, certainly hurriedly, and, perhaps, ineffectively to the great danger of the great Imperial fabric. The government of the British Empire surely requires the highest form of Statesmanship. At present it is practically under the control and at the mercy of the English Tory Party, who may be fit to rule over and control the destiny of a squire and parson-ridden Southern English county, but are fit for little else.

This question of devolution of political power, of relieving the Imperial Parliament of work which it must always do badly, and of enabling it to do work of a hundredfold more importance, which it cannot do now, is at present the question of questions for the British people. A reform of the House of

Lords is important, but its main importance lies in the fact that it is the first and the chief step to the greater reform of "Home Rule All Round," and the consequent liberation of the Imperial Parliament for truly Imperial work. Much small talk goes on about Colonial preference and of its importance in binding the Empire together, but it is simply idle prattle, a mere attempt to "putty" the great Imperial fabric. No. The great British Dominions beyond the seas are not to be held in that way. They must be united with Britain by truly Imperial bonds, by sharing with her the perils and the difficulties of Empire in one grand Imperial Assembly or Parliament, which shall represent fully and not grudgingly all the self-governing dominions of Britain. It is by a British Imperial sentiment alone, and not by a paltry juggling of preferential duties, that the great Imperial union is to be attained, and by which it is to be preserved. The first grand step to such a policy lies in the adoption of a system of Federal Government in the British Isles, and the granting to each of the four British peoples power to regulate their own sub-national affairs. The Scottish National Party then is on the right track, and we trust it will go on boldly and resolutely with its program. In doing so, it is acting in conformity with the highest and most enlightened principles of true Statesmanship.

———o———

NOTES OF A VISIT TO GERMANY

BY THE EDITOR

THE great increase in the population and wealth of Germany during the last thirty years has astonished Europe, and the advocates of Protection in this country have not been slow to bring forward such progress as one of their chief arguments for adopting the same policy in Britain. As the adoption of Protection in Britain means the establishment in power of a Tory Government, and the consequent relegation to the distant future of a measure of Home Rule All Round for the United Kingdom, we hold that Scotland is vitally interested in the question, and we therefore propose to discuss the German aspect of it in this paper. There can be no dispute about the facts. That Germany in thirty years has increased its population from forty millions to sixty millions, with a corresponding increase in wealth and in general commerce, is indisputable. But to attribute all this, chiefly or only, to its policy of Protection is quite another matter. We hold a different view. We hold that the wonderful advance made by Germany since 1880—for then the great strides in progress began—is due not to Protection or to any internal legislation, but to its security and safety as the leading power on the Continent. The increase of capital depends on security; and its investment, especially in great industrial enterprises, is still more dependent on security and safety. Up till 1880 these essential conditions of national prosperity Germany did not possess, at least not in that absolute way

which she attained from that day onwards. The war of 1870-71—great as was its success—did not give her complete security. Russia, which in 1870 had been friendly, and, indeed, had been a latent ally—for it was the fear of Russia which kept Austria quiet in 1870—was far from being friendly in the latter half of the decade, 1870-80. Germany, after 1875, began to loom too large and too powerful in Central Europe to suit the views of Russia, and thenceforward she began to look on Germany and not France as the power to be dreaded. The policy of Germany in 1878, after the Russo-Turkish war, completed the alienation. At the Conference in Berlin Bismarck was not subservient to Gortchackoff, the Russian Chancellor, and the latter bitterly resented it. His policy after this became decidedly unfriendly to Germany, and he became the jealous rival instead of, as formerly, the patronising friend of Bismarck. Bismarck was at Kissingen in the month of August, 1879, undergoing the "Kur" there, and thereby hangs a curious incident. We happened to be there at the same time for the same purpose, and curiosity led us often to observe the Chancellor going to what is called "The Saline" to take his daily bath. For some days the powerful face and personality presented nothing unusual, but one day when he came on his usual visit there was an expression of great anxiety and perturbation of spirit on his face. We attributed this to the action of the waters which are homœpathic in their action, and at the tenth day bring on what the physicians term "the crisis" But on the day following there seemed to be more than this the matter with the great German Statesman. His face betrayed an agony of mind greater than I had ever seen in any human being; he looked as if his soul was stirred with anxiety to its very depths. The agony of the Laocoon seemed mild in comparison. Naturally we were interested, and next day went to the baths at the usual time to see the Chancellor pass. But he came not, though he was in the middle time of his "Kur." A few days afterwards news came that he was in Vienna, and curiosity was aroused as to what so unexpectedly took him there. The first explanation, so far as we are aware, came about a fortnight afterwards from the Vienna correspondent of the *London Standard*, which announced that Prince Bismarck had been to Vienna, had had several interviews with the Emperor and his Minister for Foreign Affairs, and that a Treaty of Alliance—offensive and defensive—had been arranged between Austria and Germany. Soon after came the explanation that Prince Bismarck, while undergoing his "Kur," had received information from his Ambassador in Paris that the French Government had been asked by Russia to join in an offensive alliance against Germany. Such an inimical conjunction of two great Powers, if completed, must have given the deepest anxiety to Bismarck, and if it were joined in by Austria, then Germany would have been placed in a position of the utmost danger. The great work done by the Germans in 1870-71 would probably have been undone,

and Germany again might have been dismembered and broken to pieces. This, no doubt, was the situation which faced Bismarck when his face betrayed the agony to which we have alluded. But the great master of Statescraft was equal to the occasion. He saw that in Vienna was the key of the situation. If he could keep Austria out of the coalition the situation, though perilous, would not be desperate; if he could secure her alliance Germany would be safe, for Austria and Germany conjoined would be more than a match for France and Russia. Bismarck got what he wanted at Vienna, and Gortchackoff was foiled.

This treaty with Austria gave Germany what she never had before —a position of absolute security in Europe, a position made still more secure by the alliance which the two German Powers subsequently made with Italy. German traders, manufacturers and bankers quickly perceived the advantage that was secured to them. On every side, and in all parts of the Empire, especially in Westphalia, with its great deposits of coal and iron, trade advanced "by leaps and bounds." Emigration to the United States, at one time carried out on a scale so extensive as to exceed that of Ireland—the proportion of inhabitants in the United States of German origin in 1880 being 3·92 per cent. of the total population, while that of Irish origin was 3·70 per cent.—dwindled to a paltry stream. In the five years from 1870 to 1874 the emigration from Germany to the United States was over half a million, viz., 543,000, or over 100,000 a year; in 1877 it was only 41,000, and it has become much less since. The fact was that Germany, which owing to the insecurity of its position had been for generations under-peopled, began, after 1880, to develop its trade and commerce, and grow up to that point which its extensive territory and its central situation in Europe entitled it naturally to have. Before the Reformation Germany was the most populous and most prosperous country in Europe, but the devastation caused by the wars of religion was appalling, and at the end of the Thirty Years' War its population was under ten millions, less than half what it previously had been. In the period following hardly a generation passed without Germany being subjected to devastating wars, and this continued down to the period of which we write. During that time Germany was always a divided and weak Power, and lying as she did in the centre of Europe, she became the chief theatre of the destructive wars of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Under such circumstances a great national developement of German trade and commerce was impossible. But when the genius of Bismarck had consolidated Germany, and, above all, when he completed the Triple Alliance — Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, with Germany as its pivot and directing Power—then the German people saw that their time had come, that thenceforward the question of peace or war in Europe lay in their own hands, and they set themselves to work to develop their internal trade and to

extend their foreign commerce, feeling confident that they would reap the reward of their industry without being disturbed by internal dissension, or harried, as formerly, by foreign invaders. Such, and not the policy of Protection, we hold to have been the chief cause of the wonderful progress of Germany during the last thirty years.

In making these remarks we do not wish to be considered an ardent admirer or an indiscriminate advocate of the policy of Free Trade as now carried out in Britain. Here the Free Trade horse is being ridden to death, and there will be a breakdown ere long if that policy be not somewhat altered. There is no necessity for being more of a Free Trader than Adam Smith himself. In his time, for instance, there was a duty on foreign linen yarns, and the abolition of this duty he was against, "not out of any favour for the flax-growers, but for the protection of the poor women scattered in the cottages of the kingdom who made their livelihood by spinning yarn" (Rae's Life of Adam Smith, p. 94). Adam Smith was wiser than many of his followers in the present day, who seem to forget that as a great State must have a large revenue, it may be necessary to raise a portion of that revenue by duties on imports. Such duties, if wisely chosen, are not inconsistent with the policy of Free Trade. Duties on all the necessaries of life should be absolutely prohibited; but why, for instance, is not a duty levied on motor cars, which are used only by the rich? Free Trade and Protection as national policies are not based on scientific principles, and cannot, by any process of reasoning, be proved to be the one right and the other wrong, or *vice versa*. Both policies are questions of expediency, and the true statesmanship is that which, in raising a revenue, places as small a burthen as possible on the poor and struggling classes of the people, and avoids custom duties that are troublesome in collection, and cause a vexatious interference with trade. To say that no duties other than the present customs duties shall be levied on imports is an indefensible and unreasonable policy, and, if persisted in, will make the task of the Liberal Party, when a General Election comes, an unnecessarily difficult one. Yet this seems to be the position taken up by many of its leaders. Let them study a little more closely the doctrines of Adam Smith. He was a wise man, and did not push his doctrine to extremes, and it would be well if some of his disciples of the present day, in this respect, followed his example.

———o———

JOHN BULLYISM.—Mr John A. Dycke, a Russian Jew, who had been nine years in England, contributed an article to the *Contemporary Review* for January 1898 on "The Jewish Workman." His concluding remarks are as follows:—"The moral or immoral force, the motive power of this anti-alien agitation is race hatred, and that instinct so peculiar to Englishmen, which impels them to gratify the powerful and the strong, and to deride and persecute the poorer and weaker peoples who might need their sympathy."

THE HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND
No. 3.—John Barbour*

ABERDEEN, says Sheriff Aeneas Mackay, has done more for Scottish History than all the rest of Scotland combined. Outside Robertson, Scott, Tytler, of the moderns this is true, and it is not unfitting that the father of Scottish literature should hail from the Granite City, and bear to this day unmistakable marks of the place of his nativity. His townsman and fellow historian, John Hill Burton, thus describes his work :—

"Scotland is fortunate in the possession of such a memorial. The national hero of a country is seldom thus celebrated until centuries have passed and the manners have utterly changed. The chronicle or romance, whatever it may be called, is then an echo of the manners of its own day, not of the age it professes to commemorate. The whole school of Arthurian romance is an eminent instance of this. Barbour, however, was at his studies at Oxford within thirty years after Bruce's death. The Archdeacon was not a man of bold or luxuriant imagination, whence one is apt to give the more faith to his narrative. It has been accepted pretty freely into history, even by the dry and doubting Lord Hailes. Yet Barbour sets out with a statement showing a determination to subordinate facts to his notion of the artistic structure of a story, calculated somewhat to appal the searcher after truth. He makes his hero the same Bruce who was the competitor for the crown in 1291, thus identifying the hero of the tale with his own grandfather, and, in fact, finding materials for this hero in three generations. This enabled him to tell how Bruce scornfully refused to hold Scotland as a fief of England, so that Baliol, who was so base as to accept the crown on such terms, was chosen in his stead."

This contains one fatal error of statement which, were it true, would greatly invalidate the credibility of Barbour. It has been widely repeated, but it is clearly a delusion. Barbour was Archdeacon of Aberdeen, and held the Parish of Rayne. He can be traced, in state papers, at Oxford and Paris ; he was clerk of the household to Robert II., and auditor of the Exchequer. He was thus a practical man of affairs, in touch with the best sources of the day. He died on March 13th, 1396, and up to the Reformation his anniversary was kept in his native town and cathedral church. Witlings have decried him as a royal pensioner, forgetting that his book was composed without any such expectation of his modest reward, and there is nothing of the courtier or sycophant about Barbour. "Who now reads Cowley?" asks Pope, and it might naturally be surmised that Barbour was forgotten by his countrymen. No greater mistake could be committed, for he is, in the truest sense, the best known of all the historians of Scotland. Consciously, indeed, he may have passed from the familiar acquaintance of men, and how few Englishmen, apart from schoolbook drudgery, know, or really care to know, anything of Chaucer. But Barbour is, in his quincentenary, most vitally alive. On the deck of steamers in the West Coast, in Skye and elsewhere, you can hear him, with very little change, quoted by tourists and incorporated into the very texture of the guidebooks. Scott, in his *Lord of the Isles*, has

* **The Brus**, by JOHN BARBOUR, Archdeacon of Aberdeen. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Appendix and Glossary, by W. M. Mackenzie, M.A., F.S.A. (London, A. & C. Black, 1909).

followed him closely, and in his Bannockburn scenes drops into his very words. All the schoolbooks and historians follow him and cite him. Their most familiar episodes are pure Barbour, so that to this hour he has his readers by thousands at home and in the Colonies, who have professedly never seen a page of his work. Two standard quotations, never associated with the old Archdeacon, are from *The Brus*: "Freedom is a noble thing," and "he lives at ease that freely lives." They are quoted by Quentin Durward to the Countess of Croye in the novel by Scott.

Barbour wrote in what he called "Inglis," English. His work is the great literary monument of the Northern speech, the old tongue of Northumbria, the English once spoken from York to Aberdeen. With a little practice it can be read with great ease, and is much closer to the spoken and written English of to-day than Chaucer is, whose French caste and idioms still make him difficult to most. By the *Scottish* tongue, *Scottis*, Barbour understood the language of the Scots proper, or Gaels, the Gaelic. Dunbar styled Chaucer the flower of "oure tong," and the makars all wrote in English. It was not until the estrangement of the two races and hate of the Southron—the work of that idol of the Anglican compilers, Edward I.—led to the feeling of separate nationalities, that the rise of the Scottish tongue, in the modern sense, appears Flodden in 1513 had done its work, and another idol of the English, Henry VIII. Gavin Douglas is perhaps the first writer to say he writes in *Scottis*. But he meant by that, nevertheless, simply the old literary tongue north the Humber, the tongue of Bede and Barbour, of the nation and Court. Since Barbour it has moved much, yet the Aberdonian of to-day can feel in diction and in tone that he is very close to the Archdeacon. His type is quite clear; he could never be mistaken for a man of Fife, or of Lothian, or a Borderer. His very accents can be heard on the streets of his town to-day.

Barbour's aim is precisely that of Herodotus. The Father of History professed in his opening words to preserve from decay the remembrance of what men have done, and to prevent the great and wonderful actions of the past from losing their due meed of glory. He has an epic tone and stride, and feels that he is far removed from the mere chronicler. He has a moral aim. It is exactly the same with Barbour, and we should hear less about his credibility if his critics read him with greater care. "Stories, even when fabulous, have a charm about them, but true stories have a double one, from the composition, and the showing of the thing right as it is." He will do his best to tell "a true story," and the theme he regards as a noble one, preserving for all time the memory of the men that made Scotland free.

Tharfor I wald fayne set my will,
Giff my wyt mycht suffice thartill,
To put in wryt a suthfast story,
That it lest aye furth in memory
Swa that na tyme of lenth it let,
Na gar it haly be forget.
For aulde storys that men redys,
Representis to them the dedys

Of stalwart folk that lyvyt ar,
Richt as thai than in presence war.
And certis, thai sald weill have prys
That in thar tyme war wycht and wys,
And led thar lyff in gret travaill,
And oft, in hard stour of bataill,
Wan rycht gret price of chevalry,
And war voydyt of cowardy.
As wes King Robert off Scotland,
That hardy wes off hart and hand;
And gude Schir James of Douglas,
That in his tyme sa worthy was
That of hys price and hys bounte,
In fer landis renouynt wes he.
Off thaim I thynk this buk to ma:
Now God gyff grace that I may swa
Tret it, and bryng it till endyng,
That I say nocht but suthfast thing.

From this it will be seen that his subject is double—the deeds of Bruce and Douglas. He ends accordingly with the death of Douglas in Spain and the burial of the heart in Melrose. He is not a mere item-chronicler; he is in his way an artist, with beginning, middle and end. His "buk" is a rounded whole, and he claims for it that it is true. He was a Churchman and a man of affairs, and we may surely take him at his word and infer that he is not the mere idle singer of an empty day.

But devoted to the idol and devil-worship of their fetich, "the English Justinian," Edward I., Freeman and Green set themselves to write Barbour down. To the latter he is "historically worthless," to the former he is "a conscious liar." At most he is declared to be historical only in the outline, which he could hardly miss! His details, say the critics, are all wrong. This is, indeed, to contradict the plain words of the writer. On the other hand, the excellent little edition of *The Brus*, which now enables the reader to follow him in critical detail, shows how closely he keeps to facts, dates and state papers. Bain, in his *Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland*, ii.-iv., an authority of the greatest competence, regards Barbour as possessing "the highest value for the period," and "in details he is almost always correct, with occasional errors in names." This is crushing to the historians that speak without book. We shall for the future hear less of pensioned eulogists and conscious liars. They appealed to Cæsar, and they have got their answer. His tone is that of a man of affairs, writing with dignity and restraint. Look at this eulogy of Sir Giles de Argentine at Bannockburn, literally followed by Scott. He never rails at or depreciates a foe, and there is nothing of the Anti-Boer-Great England tone of the Kipling-and-Milner school of the upper and lower dog. On this point Mackenzie writes well:—

"It is worth noting that Sir Walter Scott, on the publication of the *Lord of the Isles*, which draws so handsomely upon *The Bruce*, was accused of a lack of proper patriotism, meaning the pungent and rather aggressive patriotism of a long-irritated Scotland, distinctive of *The Wallace* and certain subsequent productions, but not of *The Bruce*, the spirit of which, too, was in harmony with that of the great reviver of romance. There is no malice in *The Bruce;* the malice and bitterness are in the contemporary war-literature of the other side. And Barbour is no sentimentalist; his patriotism is not pretentious or exclusive, nor such as leads him to depreciate an opponent, and is, therefore, not a distorting influence on facts. It is not possible to point to a single error on Barbour's part which is fairly traceable to this cause."

Let us see the charges brought against Barbour. His work, say the critics, is self-condemned. Does he not style it a Romance? He most certainly does (i., 445-6).

> Lordyngis, quha likis for till her,
> The Romanys now begynnys her.

His "suthfast thing" turns out a Romance! So say the critics. There was no other possible name for him to call it. It was based in metre and form on the French metrical Romaunt, written in the octosyllabic Scott metre, and shows in a good example the great and long-continued influence of France. The Romaunt gave the technical model to Barbour, but had nothing to do with the facts or matter. Barbour's readers were in no danger of being misled. Milton, like Homer, called his work an Epic, but believed every word was a "suthfast thing." *The Brus* in form was simply one of the type read and recited by the King in crossing Loch Lomond to keep up the hearts of his followers. Lord Hailes was certainly a critical historian, "as well entitled to be called," says Scott, "the restorer of Scottish history, as Bruce the restorer of Scottish monarchy," yet he follows Barbour closely, and regards him everywhere as worthy of confidence. Long ere "the auld alliance" began between Scotland and France, the influence of France on literature had been preponderant. The very oldest fragment of Scottish verse, which Barbour (i., 37-8) himself quotes, "Quhen Alysander oure Kynge wes dede," is on a French model, the octave in three rhymes, the identical metre of Burns' *Mary Morison*. Literature is not made in a day.

It is said again that he confuses or purposely identifies Bruce, the King, with the Competitor, his grandfather (i., 477). Sir Herbert Maxwell, who seems to regard Bannockburn as a disaster to Scotland, and is not very patriotic in any sense, regards this as "almost irretrievably discrediting" our author. Even Burton and Cosmo Innes thought so too. But the mistake was impossible to the auditor of the Exchequer, who wrote also the *Stewartis Oryginalle*, the genealogy of the race, and who, therefore, must have known perfectly that the Competitor, the Earl of Carrick and the King were all three and distinct persons. Mackenzie shows it is due only to a little awkwardness on the part of the author. He had mentioned the Competitor in line 153, and "I spak of ayr" has been referred to him, when it can be clearly taken for the hero of the book introduced in line 25. He had nothing to gain by such perversity. His audience knew the difference, and the Romance begins in 445. For that there is only one Robert, the King. It is not the writer that errs, but the critics.

There is a sin in Barbour, but it is of omission, not of commission. He makes no reference whatever to Wallace. Bruce had much to forget, and, of course, his party preferred silence on many things. Precisely the same thing has happened in Augustan literature at Rome. Virgil, Horace and others knew nothing or wished to hear nothing of Julius Cæsar, for Augustus desired the Dictator and his memory to be discreetly cast into the shade. Apart from this blot, and it is a

blot, Barbour cannot be said to pervert history. Indeed, in his book he shows a curiously modern tone, as distinguished from his contemporaries. He knows nothing of monkish miracles, legends or portents. He is totally devoid of Hector Boece's digestion of the marvellous. He tells what he professes to tell, a soothfast story, and is quite unimaginative, even where he could have embellished. He is in that respect a genuine Aberdonian, a native of the city which has produced no poets, and while it has one painter in George Jameson, and believes it has a Picture or Art Gallery, takes it on trust and remains outside.

It is curious that the battle of Marathon, Salamis, Bannockburn and Waterloo, epoch-making battles, should yet in every detail still be the field of endless discussion among the military experts. Sir Herbert Maxwell's plan is that of General Sir Evelyn Wood. Hume Brown thinks that "even the position and arrangement of the Scottish army must remain matter of dispute." The De Bohun incident is universally misplaced on the eve of the battle on Monday, whereas it took place on the Sunday. Discussing its historical importance, Maxwell says, "What tremendons issues depended at that moment on the nerve and skill of a single mortal! The whole future history of Great Britain, involving the existence of dynasties and the welfare of millions, was staked on the fibre of one arm and the coolness of one head. . . . It is easy to imagine to what pitch of confidence and enthusiasm the Scottish soldiers were raised by this display of personal courage and feat of arms enacted on that bright summer noon in plain view of the English and Scottish troops." Barbour says the axe-shaft broke in two :—

> And he doune till the erd can ga
> All flatlyngis, for him falyheit mycht :
> This wes the first strak of the fycht.

Yet Maxwell, in defiance of grammar and obvious sense, can actually write, "The axe-shaft broke, and the force of the blow carried Bruce forward, so that he fell from his saddle flat on the ground." Thus is history written, but, of course, not by Barbour.

It is to be regretted that the famous words about Douglas flinging the heart of the King,

> Now passe thou forth before,
> As thou was wont in field to be,
> And I sall follow, or els die,

though found in the text of Barbour (xx., 426-428), are not by him. They are interpolated from the 1616 edition by Andro Hart, the bookseller, whose shop in the High Street of Edinburgh, on the north side, opposite the Cross, was the actual shop up to 1825 of Archibald Constable. The lines are modelled on the *Buke of the Howlat*, by Richard Holland. But there need be no fear of their not being actually historical. Such things are too *vero* to be merely the lucky *ben trovato* of a romance writer.

Why should successive generations of children in Scotland be condemned to the garrulous fictions of Chaucer, especially his poorer work, and to the consideration of the battle of Barnet, the tale of Lambert Simnel (not forgetting the

inevitable tag of his becoming "a scullion in the King's kitchen"), or the meaningless squabbles of the Red and White Roses? Why should we not have real Barbour extracts in schoolbooks? What has the Church of Scotland got to do with Henry VIII., Anne Boleyn, Nell Gwynn and other patentees of Episcopacy? Is it too much to ask that the new Scottish Party will see to it, as an essential plank of their policy, that Scottish Education be managed in strict conformity with national sentiment and historical accuracy? The Board School action in the past has been a disaster to Scotland, and has landed us nearly in the loss of everything distinctively Scottish in tone and feeling.

Wm. Keith Leask.

———o———

Bismarck's True German Patriotism.—In striking contrast to the unfairness and real "Bullyism" of many English public men who will only recognise England as the representative of the British Empire, is the view that Bismarck took of the position of Prussia in the German Empire. He said once (Low's "Bismarck Table Talk," p. 159): "I began early to dream of a united Germany. Whenever anyone asked me abroad what my country was, I never said that I was a Prussian—I know not why—but always that I was a German." The fact was, that Bismarck being a great statesman and a great man, intuitively knew the infinite importance of national sentiment in the government of mankind; while English politicians and Englishmen generally are utterly ignorant of it. Their absurd national vanity overrides their sense of justice and of fairplay.

ROBBIE BURNS AND HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND

By Dr Arthur Lynch, M.P.

A FAR cry from Robbie Burns to Home Rule! Robbie Burns had never heard of flying machines, or railways, or the minority Report on the Poor Laws, or the compromises on the Education Question, or the juggling on the Veto. He had never wondered at Gladstone, scribbled a verse on Parnell, or mused on the greatness of, shall we say, Asquith?

No. And yet, and yet! It is not the formal letter we want. It is the spirit of the man. That spirit lives, or should live, as brightly and vividly in Scotland to-day as when Robbie penned his "Twa Dogs," and was rewarded by the bureaucrats with the rank and office of a gauger.

Robbie Burns! The name is like a spell to me. And as I stop a moment to dream and ponder, visions of Scotland's greatness, at that potent spell, come crowding on my brain, swimming before my eyes—from Bruce to Killiecrankie, from Culloden to Carlyle—confused, interwoven, yet bearing the great legend—Scotland, the land of warriors, the land of thinkers, the land of poets.

Oh, what a splendid quality there is in Scottish courage—Warriors! of Roman garb and more than Roman fire!—the flame of generous impulse, the steady, staunch, dour fighting of men with iron in their soul. And thinkers—the steady, keen, grave, serious thought of men who held the problem before their eyes till the fine beams of God-given reason had shewn the clefts to their analysis.

And poets. Not alone Robbie himself, but the vague anonymous brood of poets of the people from whose hearts sprang the lays so tender, so fine, so spirited, that gave the sap and savour of the life of the country, that shone or sparkled again at length in "Annie Laurie," in "Within a Mile frae Edinboro Toun," as well as in "Hallowe'en." Aye, and all the marvellous old Jacobite songs; those songs that again found all that was true in their devotion written with steel in "Scots Wha Ha'e."

These are some of the thoughts that come to me, that flash to my mind, when I think of Robbie Burns. And I know that when a true national chord is struck, there vibrate hidden impulses that have their origin in a thousand years of history; and, as at the gathering of the clans, from remote hills and almost forgotten valleys come trooping the clansmen claiming kinship, warm with the passion of life and devotion that thrills through the clan as a whole, so come these memories, these dreams, these hopes of Bonnie Scotland. And of these the bard and prophet is Robbie Burns.

And perhaps it is in these moments of ecstasy confused that one appreciates Robbie at the highest; for his greatness is in the whole containment of his thought, his work, his up-bubbling, vivifying spirit—from the tender and good poet of the "Wee Cow'rin' Beastie," to the Scotsman so large, so fine, universal in "Hallowe'en," to "Rantin', rovin' Robbie of Poosie Nansie's," and of "Tam o' Shanter," to the flagellator of sham greatness, sham piety, in the "Twa Dogs" and "Holy Willie," to the poet whose song was as a spear-head in "Scots Wha Ha'e," to the great Republican of "A Man's a Man for a' That." Republican! Yes. For that, transmuted, interpreted in Scottish form, was the very soul and spirit of all that was great in Robbie.

I have known Robbie lectured at an Anniversary dinner for his sins, or timidly let off with a caution by one of the Holy Willies such as he castigated. I have known him patronised and fêted by the class that frowned on his manful struggles.

Faults in Robbie Burns? Regrets for his life? Aye, there were faults, regrets. But Robbie Burns appears again in all the greatness of his accomplishment, and faults wither to nothingness. Regrets? There is nothing here for tears, cried Milton in his splendid rage, when in the mouth of the father of Samson he flung out the pæan of triumph for the hero, dead but victorious, immortal.

Who dares point out the faults of Robbie? Let Robbie himself accuse the man. Let that man read again the matchless poems of Scotland's national scriptures, let him take that lesson to heart, and let him ask in how far he has come near the greatness that breathes in these lines. How many shrink from the true Robbie Burns, not from his faults, but from his greatness; how many quaver before the boldness of the Democracy that he swirled out as a banner to Scotland. They degrade Robbie Burns who try to prettify him, mollify him as with vague pompadour graces! Even in his portraits, Sir Walter Scott noticed, there is lacking something of that air of genius sprung from the earth, the douse guid man whose inspirations woke Scotland to a knowledge of her soul.

How shall we honour Robbie Burns? By following him, by seeking all that is best in his soul, by displaying to view all that was great and noble and fearless in the poet who flung in the face of the

eighteenth century, "A Man's a Man for a' That"!—that eighteenth century that compensated for its timidity, its hypocrisy, its moral cowardice, by the greatness of its martial deeds.

But now the greatness of martial deeds is paling in our modern life. We are opening to a newer phase of civilisation, we are entering upon wider horizons. Shall we retain only the hypocrisy, and the recreant cowardice? Shall we be the creatures, the "coward loons" whom Robbie lashed, or followers of the essential man—"The Man's the Gowd for a' That!"

And now to make a bridge to the present. Scotland is apathetic. Scotland needs rousing, Scotland wearies for a lift, the Holy Willies want the lash. The coward loons should have the kick the ploughman gave them once.

Scotland is not led by her aristocracy. They have become anglicised. Scotland is sinking into the condition of a more or less well-fed province, following in the wake of England.

The aristocracy! Who are the aristocracy of Scotland? In the old clans we were all brothers, or at least all cousins after the manner of Scotland, and the best man had the ordering o' it. And the leader was the leader; he led in war, and he led in peace; in the shock of combat his claymore flashed the signal that showed the thickest of the fight; and in peace his prudent counsels gave the ordering of things for the good of all. Aristocracy? What was the descent of Robbie Burns himself? He was sprung from the soil of Scotland. Let the tree be known by its fruit. What titles of the anglicised aristocracy of to-day but shrivel in their meanness beside the shining glory of Scotland's greatest poet?

No. Let us fling overboard all this spurious aristocracy, or at least all that is spurious in their pretended aristocracy. This is in the true spirit of all that gave Scotland a real aristocracy, the aristocracy of her leaders in peace and war, the aristocracy of her poets and thinkers.

Home Rule for Scotland! Yes. The Home Rule that preserves the national characteristics, the national spirit. In no sense is this a reactionary doctrine; it is the veritable doctrine of progress. Show me even in patriotism one factor that runs counter to that broad movement of evolution of which national progress is a phase; show me that, and I will turn my back on it. But as the past with its battles, its heroism even in rancorous feuds, had its lesson; so has the greater life of peaceful development its lessons, its tasks, its combats, demanding a courage as true, as staunch, as high, as ever shone in the van of a charge with targe and broad-sword.

Home Rule for Scotland? Yes. Ireland has shown the way. Scotland must follow. There will be no clashing.

A country apathetic, a spurious aristocracy, the vapid, colourless feeble spirit of Liberalism of this actual Liberal administration: and this some hundred and fifty years after Robbie Burns had stood in the sacred fields of Scotland—more glorious than he knew—and sent abroad to time and history the greatness of Scotland's spirit.

Awake Scotland! The time is now. A new era is dawning. A new phase of the world's history is at hand. The old things of sham, hypocrisy, tyranny, and meanness must go by the board; and in the forefront of the battles of progress and greatness the slogan of Scotland must again be heard as the rallying cry of the true and the brave.

King Edward's Youthful Antipathy to Scotland.—An Australian correspondent sends us the following extract from *The Weekly Scotsman* of the 14th May 1910. It is important in its way as illustrating the innate antipathy borne by the late king to Scotland and things Scottish. We hear much of the tact and graciousness of his late Majesty, but his flatterers never alluded to this ungracious and discreditable feature of his character; and as it is well, that when the career of a king is written about, the truth should not be hidden or obscured, we reproduce this little incident as being a key to much that the late king did in after life, and which his eulogists always took care to keep in the background.

"King Edward when a boy was, at Queen Victoria's desire, in order to take lessons in Gaelic, placed under the tuition of a well-known Gaelic scholar, Mr Donald Macfayden, a native of North Argyllshire, who afterwards became parish minister of Laggan, in Inverness-shire.

"In the course of conversation one day the talk between the tutor and his Royal pupil wandered in the direction of drawing comparisons between the Highlanders and the other inhabitants of the British Isles. The young Prince, forgetting himself, applied an epithet far from complimentary to the Highlanders. Macfadyen's blood was up at once.

"He raised his hand and struck the future King full in the face. The Queen on being apprised of the altercation, summoned both the Prince and the tutor into her presence, and inquired minutely into the circumstances of the case. The tutor she exonerated from all blame, but she reproved her son severely for using such unbecoming language."

The narrative here given is, we presume, substantially correct, as the name of the Prince's tutor, as well as his subsequent position as parish minister of Laggan in Inverness-shire, is stated in detail. There is, however, one part which we think is wrongly given, viz., the words, "he raised his hand and struck the future King full in the face." Macfadyen was presumably a young Highland student of divinity at Aberdeen when he was chosen as tutor to the Prince of Wales, and most probably, also, had previously been a tutor to other boys, or assistant teacher in some school or schools. Now, sixty years or so ago for a Scots tutor or assistant teacher to strike one of his pupils "full in the face" is a most improbable statement. That, of course, implies with a clenched fist. That was not the kind of punishment used to an unruly pupil, even of the poorest class. To punish in such a way would then have been regarded as an outrage by teachers and boys alike, and the tutor or teacher who so acted would have utterly ruined his career. The mode of punishment, when it was on the head, was with the open hand applied smartly to the cheek or the side of the head, and this, no doubt, was the way in which Macfadyen punished the young Prince. That Queen Victoria took the tutor's part and absolved him from blame makes this almost a certainty. By-the-bye, the Reverend Mr Macfadyen, if he is alive still, ought to be complimented by Highlanders all over the world for his spirited action in defence of their nationality. And, if he is dead, there should be an inscription on his tombstone in Gaelic and English, narrating his spirited deed. We hope to hear more of this.

———o———

Professor J. H. Millar.—This gentleman, who is described as being Professor of Constitutional Law and History in the University of Edinburgh, delivered on the first of August the introductory lecture to the international gathering in Edinburgh for the study of modern languages. His subject was "A Hundred Years of Edinburgh, 1732-1832." It is to be

hoped that the circle of intelligent foreigners who listened to the Professor's address did not regard him as quite so able and impartial an authority on Scotland as he evidently imagined himself to be. He described the Union of 1706 between Scotland and England as "an honourable and equal one." We may guage the Professor's patriotism by this remark, when we consider that the number of Members in the House of Commons accorded to Scotland, viz., forty-five—was about the number that the County of Cornwall then returned as Members of Parliament. In the House of Lords the representative Scottish Peers bore much the same proportion. In Professor Millar's view, Scotland, as a political entity, was about equal to the County of Cornwall. When the Professor comes to deal with Hume, he says, "It was not so pleasant to remember that having had less attention shown him in London than he thought his due, he conceived a foolish and unworthy antipathy to England and to things English." Here the Professor again shows his ignorance. It was not Hume's vanity that was flouted by the Society of London, but his national pride—a very different thing. No man worth anything internationally will contentedly allow his country to be insulted without resenting it in some shape or another. And the Society of London in Hume's time was about as insolent to Scotsmen as Dr Johnson generally was, and Hume naturally did not like it, and preferred the Society of Paris. There he had a reception which was highly flattering to him, and was worthy of his genius. In London he would have been pretty sure, had he remained there, to have been subjected to the insolence of Dr Johnson, as Adam Smith was on more than one occasion. Dr Johnson had some excellencies, and undoubtedly was an able but much overrated man. But in his manners he was hoggish in the extreme, and about as bigoted and unfair as a man of culture could possibly be. Professor Millar also falls foul of Herbert Spencer, and of John Stuart Mill, and then proceeds to have a sneer at the admirers of Burns, as well as at Burns himself. It would seem that the learned gentleman is out of place in Edinburgh. He should try and find a minor post in Oxford, where no doubt his detraction of Scotland and things and persons Scottish would find a congenial atmosphere, and perhaps by-and-bye lead to an expected advancement in the professorial world.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 28. November 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 28. NOVEMBER 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is 1d., post free 1½d.; outside British Isles, post free, 2d.*

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 82

HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

The Reign of Robert the Second

THE wretched David the Second having left no children, the succession to the throne fell to Robert, called the High Steward, the only child of Marjory, eldest daughter of Robert the Bruce. He had stood out manfully for the rights of Scotland when they were being tampered with, and threatened with destruction by the intrigues of David with Edward the Third, but when he became King he did not fulfil the promise of his youth. He was indolent, and latterly allowed his love of ease to govern his conduct so much as to allow the turbulent nobles to largely usurp the reins of government. They had some ground for this rough and ready conduct; for owing to the ransom of the late King due to England being still partially unpaid, considerable portions of Southern Scotland—including Annandale—were still in the hands of the English as security. This was galling to the fierce Border nobles, and they were little disposed

to keep any of the truces that were from time to time established between the two kingdoms. Constant raids, sometimes of an important character, took place, and the English nobles were not slow to retaliate. The death of Edward the Third, and of his son, the Black Prince, in 1377 and 1376 respectively, left the succession in England to a boy, only eleven years old—son of the Black Prince—who was crowned at Westminster in July 1377 as Richard the Second. These events in England, which placed the Crown in the hands of a minor, were advantageous to Scotland, so far as any attack on its independence was concerned, but they tended to increase the system of forays on the Border, and there established a state of almost open and constant war.

It is right to condemn the turbulence and the ruthlessness of these Border warriors, but let the blame rest on the right shoulders. Now, and for many generations yet to come, the two countries, for a hundred miles on either side of the Border, suffered, and were to suffer, all the horrors of almost continuous warfare—the fruit and result of the unprincipled ambition and savage cruelty of one man, the ruffianly Edward the First. English historians, and Englishmen generally, taking their cue largely from the teaching of Oxford, continue to describe that monarch as one of the greatest kings and law-givers. Such eulogies are simply a perversion and reversion of the truth; for his great schemes of conquest fell utterly to nought, and his boasted improvements in English administration and in English jurisprudence come, not from his initiative, but in despite of his determined opposition. His cruel and unnecessary wars compelled him continually to appeal to his subjects for means to carry them on, and the great nobles and the leading ecclesiastics took advantage of his necessities to stipulate for a limitation of his despotic power, and for a strengthening of the control of the national assembly of notables or magnates over what may be termed the power of the purse. Edward yielded grudgingly to these demands when in straits, but almost invariably tried to evade them and nullify them when his difficulties had passed. To call such conduct high statesmanship, and to attribute to its author, or rather to its perpetrator, high qualities, entitling him to one of the highest places in the records of Britain, is an utter and unscrupulous perversion of national history.

For such a state of turbulence as now existed on the Borders the character of Robert the Second was quite unfitted. And equally on the English side the youth and the experience, as well as the natural incapacity of Richard the Second, rendered the English government comparatively helpless. It was the disposition, then, of the nominal governments on both sides to arrange for truces. These prevented war on a great or national scale, but did not prevent serious and important forays. A most important result from these was the recovery from English domination of all of the territory and all of the fortresses—Berwick excepted—that the English had held for a considerable time north of the

Cheviots. It was during this time also that the French King made advances towards a closer alliance with Scotland, and actually sent a powerful division of men-at-arms to Scotland under a noted leader, John de Vienne. But this French expedition was not a success, and brought out in a striking manner the characteristic difference between war as carried on after the manner of France, and war as carried on after the Scottish fashion. It having been decided—much against the wish of King Robert—that England should be invaded, an army of 30,000 men was assembled at Edinburgh and crossed the Border, ravaging and destroying the country up to the walls of Newcastle. Then word was brought that the Northern and Midland English nobles had collected a powerful force, and were advancing by forced marches. What, then, was to be done by the invaders? The Scots leaders wished very wisely* to avoid a pitched battle, but the French leader was anxious to fight, and it was with great reluctance he retreated with the Scots to Berwick. Richard, in the meanwhile, had got together in the south a very powerful army, with which he entered Scotland and destroyed everything in his way till he reached Edinburgh, which he laid waste. But here he had to stop. The country had been cleared by the Scots of all supplies, and Richard's army was soon in the greatest straits for food; he therefore decided to retreat. While the English were thus engaged in advancing to and retreating from Edinburgh, the Scots, with their French allies, ravaged Cumberland in the most merciless manner, and returned to Edinburgh laden with plunder. But the French had seen enough of the Scottish system of warfare, and now wished to return to their own country. This, however, they were not permitted to do till they made payment for the injuries and depradations they had inflicted on the country people. It had been their fashion, when marching through Scotland, to plunder the inhabitants in the way they had been accustomed to do in France, but the rude and hardy Scots resented this mode of treatment, and insisted on payment being made for the losses they had sustained. To this Vienne was compelled to agree, and he and the surviving portion of his followers were then allowed to embark for France, having learnt by bitter experience that the Scots would stand no injury, either from friend or foe. Thus, even in those early years, they were acting up to the spirit of their proud and famous national motto. *Nemo me impune lacessit.*

Shortly after this, in the year 1388, the great Border fight of Otterburn took place between a Scots party, under Douglas, and an English party, under Percy. The Scots won and captured Hotspur and his brother, and a great portion of the nobles of Durham and Northumberland were either killed or made prisoners. The heroic Douglas, however, was slain in the fight. Not long after this Robert the Second died in 1390 at the age of seventy-four. He was a good and kindly monarch, but not strong enough in character for the troublous time in which he reigned.

No. 83

"THE SPEAKER'S" ATTACK ON SCOTLAND

THERE is an interesting little village in North Cumberland called Bowness, famous in a way as the western terminus of the Roman Wall of Hadrian, which ran from the Tyne to the Solway. It is a small place, but the residents seem to have some life and spirit, and in the latter part of September they had a considerable gathering at the laying of the foundation stone of a new public hall. The Honourable Geoffrey Howard, Liberal M.P. for North Cumberland, presided, and the chief orator was the Right Honourable James Lowther, the Speaker of the House of Commons. This gentleman has a certain reputation for humour, and, we believe, fills the position of Speaker in a way that is both dignified and impartial ; but if dignity and impartiality are the qualities that distinguish him in his position in the House of Commons, it is pretty evident that he does not always carry these qualities with him when he appears on the platform in his native County of Cumberland. The honourable gentleman, like a great many other Englishmen, seems to have a strong dislike to Scotland and the Scots ; and though the meeting at which he spoke was, in a sense, a friendly one, and there were present lady and gentlemen visitors from the Scottish side of the Border, he did not fail to make remarks that must have been exceedingly unpleasant to all true Scots ; for, if what he said was not exactly insulting, it was certainly of a slighting and irritating character, and quite inconsistent with that quality of kindness and of courtesy which ought to mark the conduct of a gentleman alike to peoples as to persons. It would appear that in the Parish Church of Bowness they have two bells which had once been Scottish, but which had been seized in some of the old Border raids into Scotland, and given to the Bowness Church. Of these, Mr Lowther said :—

> "During the short time in which he had had the privilege of looking round their town he had seen two very old bells in the church. He must say he congratulated them most heartily upon having them. They were the only things, he thought, that the English people had ever got out of the Scotch—(laughter)—and been able to keep. (Laughter.) And for that reason also they seemed to be a very remarkable people." (Laughter.)

Possibly this was intended to be a humorous remark on the part of the honourable gentleman ; but, if so, it must be a kind of humour suitable only to a board of English vestry men of a very common type ; for, it is not only untruthful, but of a character intended to be slighting and annoying to a friendly people. Of course, we know that the usual English comment will be made, why take notice of such trifles? Well, if the remark had come from an ordinary speaker at an ordinary meeting of vulgar Englishmen, it would have been wise of Scotsmen to treat such a remark with silent contempt. But the gentleman who made these insolent remarks about Scotsmen is the Speaker of the British House of Commons ; a gentleman who, above all other gentlemen in Britain, ought to main-

tain a courteous and kindly tone when speaking of the peoples of the four nationalities of the United Kingdom. It is certain that Mr Lowther would not have dared to have made a remark of this sneering character against Ireland and the Irish people, for he knows well that had he done so he would have been taken to task by some of the Irish members when Parliament again meets. He also knows that in such a matter the Scottish members are, as a rule, dumb dogs, and, therefore, that he could, so far as they are concerned, slight the Scottish people with impunity. This instinctive feeling on the part of the honourable gentleman, as to what it is safe to say in the way of international slights, is, no doubt, creditable to his shrewdness; but let us also add, that it betrays, at the same time, a quality of mind of rather an ignoble character. For the man who choses for his attack only those who are unwilling or unable to retaliate, is generally one of those not very admirable characters who is ever ready to sneer at and to strike the weak, while he "is ever strong on the stronger side."

It may be urged that this was a very mild attack on Scotland and Scotsmen, and that it is hardly worth while to allude to it. This would be quite true if it stood alone. But it does not; for, in the course of his speech, the right honourable gentleman went on to further illustrate his ill-feeling to the friendly nation on the other side of the Solway. He said, we quote from *The Cumberland News* of the 24th of September last—which presumably is correct :—

"As he came along that day, he crossed over a part of Burgh Marsh. As they knew, Burgh Marsh was the site on which King Edward the First's army was encamped soon after defeating the Scotch, and where, unfortunately, King Edward died, and a monument still stood to his memory. He was reading an old historian the other day—the historian Camden—who gave a remarkable account of Edward First, which might be of interest to them. Referring to the town of Bowness, he said —'This little town is noted for nothing more than the untimely death of King Edward I. after he had triumphed over his enemies on all sides. He was a prince exceeding glorious, in whose valiant breast the spirit of God, as it were, pitched his tent; and as by his courage and wisdom of mind, so also by his gracefulness of body, he arose to the highest pitch of majesty. Providence exercised his youth with constant wars and difficulties, to fit him for the government of England, which, after he came to it, he administered so nobly, by conquering the Welsh and subsiding the Scotch, that he justly deserves the character of one of the greatest glories of Britain.' *They could do with a few Edward the Firsts now*, remarked the Speaker, for the conquering of the Welsh and the subsiding of the Scotch—(laughter) —as he thought the Welsh had conquered us and the Scotch had subsided us." (Much laughter.) (*i.o.*)

Here let us observe that the honourable gentleman betrays his ignorance of British history like the generality of his countrymen. Edward was not encamped at Burgh "soon after defeating the Scots." On the contrary he was only on the march to Scotland; and after his death his son, Edward the Second, though at the head of a great army, did not defeat the Scots; he marched as far as Ayr, and raised the siege of the castle there by the Scots. He

then ingloriously retreated and retired to York. So much for the Speaker's historical knowledge. As for his eulogium of Edward the First, even if his view of Edward's character were correct, it surely was in very bad taste to utter a wish for a few more "Edwards the First." That monarch, as we have before shown—*vide The Thistle* for December 1909, *pp.* 261-65—was one of the most cruel and unscrupulous ruffians that ever sat on a British throne. It was his deceitful and unprincipled policy, and his ferocious attempts to destroy the liberties of Scotland that gave rise to the three hundred years of war that ensued between the two countries. Mr Lowther quotes Camden in praise of Edward, and, as we have given his quotation, let us cite another English author on the other side, viz., Buckle. That writer says:—

"In 1290 Edward I. determined to avail himself of the confusion into which Scotland was thrown by disputes regarding the succession to the crown. . . . In 1296 the sword was drawn, and Edward invaded a country *which he had long desired to conquer*. But he little recked of the millions of treasure and hundreds of thousands of lives which were to be squandered before that war was over. The contest that ensued was of unexampled severity, and in its sad course the Scots, notwithstanding their heroic resistance and the victories they occasionally gained, had to endure every evil which could be inflicted by their proud and insolent neighbours. The darling object of the English was to subjugate the Scots, and if anything could increase the disgrace of so base an enterprise, it would be that, having undertaken it, they ignominously failed. The suffering, however, was incalculable." (*i.o.*, History of Civilisation in England, Vol. II., *pp.* 167-69, and Note 14.)

Buckle here writes of the aggressors as being the English people, but in this he is wrong. The arch-invader from first to last was Edward. He was the author of all the woes that were brought upon Britain from 1296 to 1600 by the wars, invasions and Border raids that took place between the two countries. He has been praised and glorified by scores of English writers and publicists from his own time to this, but it is seldom that we find an Englishman occupying a high position give voice to such foolish talk about Edward as the remarks we have quoted of Mr James Lowther. "They could do with a few Edwards the First now, for the conquering of the Welsh and the subsiding of the Scots." If this means anything at all, it means that because the Scots and the Welsh, as peoples, strongly support a Radical policy of government in Britain, it would be well if they could be put down by force and violence, if such were possible. Mr Lowther seems to take up a position as a representative of extreme Toryism, such as is held among the extreme Socialists by Mr Victor Grayson. Of the precious pair, the latter, on the whole, is the more moderate and the more reasonable. For, so far as we know, he has never, in his wildest vapourings, appealed, say, to the career of Robespierre in support of his political theories; while "The Speaker" has not scrupled to conjure up, in support of his political views, the conduct of such a paragon of regal ruffianism as Edward the First. It is indeed high time we had "Home Rule All Round." *That* would soon put a stop to these displays of English arrogance and English insolence to the minor nationalities of Britain.

No. 84

THE IRISH NATIONALISTS AND HOME RULE

A WARNING

IN the beginning of October the New York correspondent of a London newspaper stated that he had had an interview with Mr John Redmond, in which that gentleman gave an outline of the terms which his party was now ready to accept as a settlement of the question of Home Rule for Ireland. The Irish leader has, since then, but only at a late date, and apparently under the coercion of the extremists of his party, repudiated the statements of the New York correspondent, but there seems good reason to believe that the report, as first published, though not, perhaps, uttered as the direct and authorised programme of the Irish party, gave a more or less substantial outline of what Mr Redmond, Mr T. P. O'Connor and a few more of the more moderate and far-seeing members of the party are prepared to accept as a settlement of the Irish claims for self-government. Here is the statement attributed to Mr Redmond:—

"Our demand for Home Rule does not mean that we want to break with the British Empire. We are entirely loyal to the Empire as such, and we desire to strengthen Imperial bonds through the Federal system of government. We do not demand such complete local autonomy as British self-governing colonies possess, for we are willing to forego the right of making our own Tariff and are prepared to abide by any fiscal system enacted by the British Parliament; also, we are prepared to bear our full burden with England, Scotland and Wales in supporting such Imperial charges as the Army, Navy and Diplomatic Corps, which is not done by the colonies. We deslre to have Irish members sitting at Westminster, not only to form a nucleus of the ultimate Federal Parliament of the Empire, but also to assist in legislation concerning Great Britain and Ireland collectively, such as old age pensions. But we want Ireland to reserve for herself such local measures as do not concern in any way Great Britain, and an Irish Legislature for this purpose is a Home Rule *sine qua non*. We are strongly in favour of a Federal Empire, and once we receive Home Rule we shall demonstrate our Imperial loyalty beyond question."

Now, though this statement has been subsequently maimed and discredited by its alleged author, and, indeed, repudiated by him, we are strongly of opinion that the report when sent was substantially correct, and that its withdrawal or denial is simply due to the exigencies of politics. The irreconcileables of the Irish party are, by the nature of their convictions, stronger and more resolute than the moderate members, and as among the latter there is no one of commanding supremacy like O'Connell to control and lead the party, the extremists too readily and too easily find it possible to have their own way. Mr Dillon, who is said to lead this section of the party, has apparently overborne Mr John Redmond's saner and better judgment, and driven him back into the ranks of the extremists. We regard this drawback and setback as a great calamity. Mr Redmond's views, as attributed to him by the New York correspondent, are so sane, so reasonable and so statesmanlike, that if they had been endorsed by his party, the settlement, not only of Irish Home Rule, but of Home Rule All Round, would

have been made certain within a very few years. Not all the opposition of the English Tories or the Ulster Orangemen could have availed in face of the reasonableness of such a programme for the settlement of this all-important question. For it not only would have had the support of all the Liberals of the United Kingdom, but it would have been backed by the weighty opinions of the leaders of both political parties in the British dominions beyond the seas. Against such a consensus of opinion in favour of the settlement of this great Imperial question the Tories and the bigots of the United Kingdom would have been helpless. That, then, this hopeful settlement has been frustrated for the time by the opposition of the Irish extremists is, we say, a public calamity. And the more so that *their* opposition is based on an utterly false and foolish view of the political situation, and of their power to control it and bend it as they please.

For the basis of the action of Mr Dillon and his followers is that the Irish party now hold the balance of power in the House of Commons, and have not only the present government but any future government at their mercy. They think that if they only are firm and determined they must have their own way, if not from this government, then from the next, or the next after that. And as *their* way is an independent parliament for Ireland, sitting in Dublin, they mislead a certain portion of the Irish people by this extreme and plausible presentation of their case. We beg to say that this view of the Irish position is an utter delusion. The Irish party has now the control of the situation in the House of Commons only so long as their views of, or demands for, Home Rule are of a moderate character, and are in conformity with what the English, Scottish, and Welsh Liberals think is in strict accordance with the unity of Britain. If the Irish demands for Home Rule go beyond that, they at once come in conflict with a much stronger and more insuperable obstacle to their ambition than the opposition of the bigoted and antiquated Tory party. *That* opposition, if the Irish Nationalists are reasonable, can be overcome, for the great majority of thinking people now see that a wide and important scheme of devolution of political power is absolutely necessary, and can, with safety to the State, be no longer delayed. But such devolution must be within such lines as to preserve the unity of Britain as a kingdom, great and undivided in its action as against the rest of the world. Unless this all-important condition is maintained, and is agreed to by the so-called Irish Nationalists, there is at once a block to their action and an overturn of their political power. For the great majority of English, Scottish and Welsh Liberals will go against them, and will join the more sensible and reasonable portion of the Conservative party in forming a government that shall be loyal to the integrity of the United Kingdom. Such a transformation of political parties would necessarily delay the carrying out of a scheme

of Home Rule All Round, and would thus be pleasing to none but the more stupid and bigoted section of the Tories. But it would inevitably take place. For there is nothing more certain than that the British people are overwhelmingly in favour of, and determined to maintain the unity of the kingdom as against the rest of the world. This is not the age for small kingdoms. It is certain that neither England, nor Scotland nor Wales—if they were separate nations—could long stand alone in this age of great empires. England alone, powerful and strong as so many of her stupid sons imagine her to be, it is certain could not long maintain her independence if she had only her own strength to depend upon. She was conquered by the Danes, and fell an easy prey to the attack of the army of a Province of France. In later days had she not had Scotland as an ally and partner she would have been overpowered by France, under Louis the Fourteenth or under Napoleon. It is also certain that Scotland in these days, if alone, resolute and liberty-loving as are her people, could not long maintain her independence as a separate kingdom. These two countries, for their common safety and independence, became united two hundred years ago, and though a great part of the English people have since then become bumptious and arrogant, and have tried to assert themselves, not as partners with, but as conquerors of the Scots, that evil tendency is being rapidly destroyed, and a real and reasonable Union of the four British peoples, on terms which shall respect and maintain the national sentiment and national honour of them all, is now apparently the strong desire of the English Liberals. Why, then, should the Irish National party stand out and refuse to join in this great policy of British unity? As we have pointed out, they cannot stand alone for long. No doubt they have many terrible wrongs and slights and cruel oppressions from the English to look back upon. But much and many of these came from English rulers and English despots, and it is well that too much should not be made of them, now that the English people are ready to atone for them, and to join with the Scots and the Welsh in giving to the Irish all the advantages of a reasonable policy of Home Rule, together with the benefits arising from a share in the prosperity and glory of the world-spread British Empire. Mr Dillon and a few other Irish extremists may think it spirited and grand to reject such an offer and such a policy, because they are of opinion that they have the complete command of the British political situation, and can bring English Tories and English Liberals alike to their knees. We have shown that this view of the political situation is an erroneous one. And if Mr Dillon and his fellow extremists persist in their irreconcileable policy, they will show clearly that they are utterly destitute of even a very moderate allowance of statesmanship, and are simply suffering from a bad attack of what in common parlance is termed, "swelled head."

NOTES OF A VISIT TO GERMANY

BY THE EDITOR

IT may properly be asked of us, what have we to say as to the prospect of a friendly understanding between the German and the British peoples, for, on this head, Scotland is as deeply interested as is England. Well, we may safely say, that if the only two factors concerned with the maintenance of peace were the peoples respectively of Germany and this country, peace would be thoroughly assured. So far as we could gather, the German people are as peaceably disposed as are the people of Britain, and that is saying a great deal. But, politically, Germany is in quite a different position from this country. Though a war with this country, if put quietly to the vote in Germany, would not receive the assent of one-sixth—more probably not of a tenth—of the population, yet it is quite conceivable that by a certain manipulation of political incidents on the part of the Kaiser and the Court party in Germany, such a state of feeling might be excited as to lead to a breach of the peace with Britain. And war once begun, however improperly or unnecessarily, the German people would, of course, rally to their government. The fact is, to speak plainly, that the Kaiser is not to be trusted beyond a certain point. If this country is well prepared to defend herself against any attack by Germany, depend upon it the Kaiser will keep the peace, and allege that he never has had any intention of breaking it, and that he never will do so. But if we are foolish enough to allow him to attain a position which would give him a good chance of success, we fear that the question of peace or war would hang on a very slender thread. The British government, then, must of necessity take care that the Kaiser is never exposed to any temptation in the way of breaking the peace with this country.

Any intelligent and unprejudiced British visitor visiting Germany, and having his attention directed to the question of Home Rule, must come to the conclusion that the opposition to the carrying out of a scheme for "Home Rule All Round" in Britain has not a very sound basis. In Germany "Home Rule All Round" is the rule all over the Empire. And it is carried to much greater lengths than it is proposed to carry it in Britain. When we arrived at Kissingen, which is in Bavaria, we found that the postage stamps which we had bought in Prussia, and which were German Imperial stamps, were useless there, and we had to buy Bavarian stamps. The Imperial stamps were good all over Germany—except Bavaria. Then the Bavarian army is not German, unless and until war is declared, when it passes from the command of the King of Bavaria to that of the Kaiser, and becomes part of the great German Imperial army. Bavaria in such respects holds a unique position among the minor German States, and thus ranks next to Prussia as regards self-government. But Saxony and Wurtemberg have also their own kings and extensive systems of self-government, though not equal to those of Prussia and Bavaria.

Then there are about a score of other States—Grand-Ducal, Ducal, Princely and Trading—all of which possess ample powers of self-government with their own revenues and their own officials. Yet, who can say that one and all of these various German Kingdoms and States are not intensely patriotic and devoted to the cause of the Fatherland. And they are so, largely, if not chiefly, because of their powers of self-government; in other words, of their so-called apparent separateness, but in reality strict and unbending unity. Bavaria, in a sense, is jealous of Prussia. To call a Bavarian a Prussian is a dire insult, and no Prussian official dare take such a liberty; for to do so would be regarded as an offence against German unity and German brotherhood. In England there is a different code. Such offensiveness on the part of Englishmen in Britain is regarded, not merely as venial, but as a right and proper assertion of national dignity and national superiority—of numbers—English national vanity and bumptiousness in this matter over-riding all sense of justice or of fairplay, or of imperial unity or brotherhood. In this and some other matters connected with international government Englishmen have much to learn, and the sooner they begin seriously to learn their lesson, of being only a unit and not the whole of an Empire, the better will it be for them and those with whose fate they are linked as one great people.

A great watering-place, such as is Kissingen, where are gathered together during a season of three or four months some twenty-five to thirty thousand people — chiefly German—of course, gives a visitor some opportunity of observing national traits of more or less importance. To deal with these hardly comes within the program of this publication, but our readers will perhaps pardon us if we deal with one or two of them. Physically, then, the Germans are a big, powerful race; the men, when of middle age, developing paunches, which denote their fondness for good living; while among the females the predominant busts are significant of their devotion to family life. In this latter respect the German people, both men and women, are alike in their fondness for and devotion to their children. There is another trait which also came under our notice, and with which I will conclude these notes of our journey. It has been the remark of travellers in Germany during recent years that the people are irreligious, and that they have ceased to be frequenters of the National Church—those of them who are Lutherans. That they may not be such constant church-goers as were their forefathers, may be, and undoubtedly is the case, but this is not confined to the Protestants in Germany, for the same may be said of the peoples of France and Italy—and to some extent also of other Protestant and Roman Catholic Countries of Europe —more especially as regards the male population. But the German men, though they may not be church-goers, are far from being irreligious. And this was brought pointedly under our notice at

Kissingen. In the Kur-Garten there, every morning during the season, a splendid band plays for an hour. They begin at seven, and generally the first item on the programme is what is termed "A Choral." We were only present at two or three of the openings near the end of our term, and on the first occasion our attention was arrested by the reverent attitude of the audience. Instead of walking up and down or sitting and gaily chatting, as is generally the case, during the performance of the secular music, we saw some five or six hundred of the guests, nearly all males, standing round or near the music-stand, many with heads uncovered, and all having an earnest and reverential bearing. On making inquiry we were told that these "Chorals," which are preludes to the ordinary music of the great German, Italian and French composers which the band played, are from the old German devotional Protestant psalms and hymns, and it was the music of these, which are well known to every devout Protestant-German family, which had arrested the attention of these men, and held them reverent and spell-bound while they were being played. One of these "Chorals," the second at which we were present, was headed thus :— "*Was mein Gott will, das g'scheh allzeit*," "What my God wills, shall always be." Such an incident shows in a simple but striking way that the religious spirit lies deep in the heart of the German people—although they may not be constant church-goers. May we never have anything but a friendly rivalry with these, must be the earnest prayer of all true British folks.

THE HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND

No. 4.—Blind Harry

He has Blind Harry and Sandy Traill
Slain with his shot of mortal hail,
While Patrik Johnstoun micht not flee.
Dunbar.

THE little that is known of the Minstrel is entirely derived from a single sentence of John Major, the historian. He says he was blind from his birth, and in his (Major's) infancy composed the book on Wallace, committing to writing in the vulgar tongue what was commonly told about him, and which he, Major, believes only in part; by the recitation of his work before nobles he got his food and clothing. To this account nothing can be added or subtracted; it is clear, explicit and critical. As we know, Major's own birth was in 1469, we may date Blind Harry's work about 1460. The Accounts of the Treasurer contain certain disbursements to him by James IV., and the last payment is in 1492. Dunbar, in his Lament for the Makars, sets his death before that of Johstoun, who died in 1494. We shall not materially err if we assign Harry to the period of 1420-1493.

Harry, then, was a professional minstrel; but his Court recognition and his recitation before nobles rather exclude him from the "vagabonds, fules, and sic like idle pepil" that were dealt with by statute law. Professor Mahaffy believes Homer sang or recited his lays in the halls of the Achaean chiefs, and not of the people. Bentley declared in memorable words, cited admiringly by Wolf, that "Homer wrote a sequel of songs and rhapsodies to

be sung by himself for small earnings and good cheer at Festivals and other days of merriment." Harry would be analogous to "Wandering Willie" in Scott's *Redgauntlet*, and the narrator of the greatest short story in the language was certainly in diction and imagination far removed from the lower orders. "I had," he says, "the best teachers baith England and Scotland could gie me." Like Burns himself, not the mere isolated singer of the uncritical tradition, he would be the last of a dynasty; standing in a clear relation to his predecessors, whose work he would know, adapt and incorporate. So it was with Scott's own "Last Minstrel" in the *Lay*, who (iv., 34-5) had his teachers and the recollections of his "minstrel brethren."

Harry claims to have authorities. But, if he was born blind, he did not read but was read to. He bases his story on the "Latin buk" of Master John Blair, chaplain to Wallace, and Thomas Gray, parson of Liberton. They were, he says, one or both of them, with Wallace in his work, and so he will specially make mention of them. No such book exists or is known to have existed, and Harry does not refer to it as existing. Tytler thought that from some such source the Minstrel may have "derived those authentic particulars, which may be detected cropping out, as geologists say, from beneath the more fabulous superficies of his history." He declines to follow the usual sceptical witlings that write Harry down. Coxcombs, Pope says, vanquish Berkeley with a grin; and it is easy to declare that the Minstrel's alleged authorities are as mythical as the Spanish Veremundus and the John Campbell of Iona, whom Boece professes to follow. "Some late researches," he adds, "and an attentive perusal of his poem, comparing it as I went along with contemporary documents, have placed the *Life of Wallace* in a different light. I am persuaded that it is the work of an ignorant man, who was yet in possession of valuable and authentic materials. On what other supposition can we account for the fact, that while in one page we meet with errors which show a deplorable perversion of history, in the next we find circumstances unknown to other Scottish historians, yet corroborated by authentic documents, by contemporary English annalists, and by national muniments and records, only published in modern times, and to which the Minstrel cannot be supposed to have had access?"

His work is a long one, over 11,000 lines. A blind man hardly performs such feats, unless with the help of men to whom he dictated his book as he worked up the materials. His recitations were doubtless, as in Homer's case, the more stirring and particular passages, and, like Scott's own Minstrel, he would remember his work was for no "village churls, but for high dames and mighty earls." He has his Court recognition from James IV.

My old friend, Mr Craigie, of the Oxford New English Dictionary, has noted a remarkable fact. The close of the *Wallace* is as follows, where he declares himself a "burel"

or rustic man, with no special claim to learning :—

Go, nobil buk, fulfillyt of gud sentens,
Suppose thou baran be of eloquens.
It is weill knawin I am a burel man,
For here is said as gudly as I can :
My spreit felis na termis asperans.

This, he shows, is reproduced from the prologue of the Franklin's Tale in Chaucer.

But, sires, bycause I am a burel man,
At my beginning first I yow biseche,
Have me excusèd of my rudè speche.
My spirit feeleth noght of swich mateere.

He speaks of his "rural dyt," but claims that it is "suthfast deid." He says he has no charge from king or lord, but simply thought Wallace's great work should not be "smored"; he keeps to the facts, "near as the process gais," and has "feigned nocht for frendship nor for fais." But all this shows the Minstrel was in poetical and Chaucerian surroundings, such as we know Henryson of Dunfermline to have been in—"Chaucer's aptest and brightest scholar," as Mr Henley calls him. Harry did not read Chaucer, but knew him to be in the air, just as other touches show he knew Barbour. The verbal identity of Harry with the Chaucer passage is striking and undeniable. But it may have been a sort of literary commonplace, of modest self depreciation. *Artis est celare artem.* James I. in his *King's Quair*, strangely enough, has it :—

Go, little treatise, naked of eloquence,
Causing simpless and poverty to wit ;
And pray the reader to have patience
Of thy default and to supporten it ;
Of his goodness thy brukilnesse to knit,
And his tongue for to rule and to steer,
That thy defaultis healèd may be here.

And Sir David Lindsay in the *Papingo* is full of the same ideas and words.

To Barbour he stands in two relations, poetical and historical. In the poetical he is superior to Barbour, showing more fire, more feeling, and a greater variety and command of verse. Barbour never varies his octosyllabic couplet, while Harry, besides his heroic couplet, has several metres common to or derived from Chaucer, such as the ballad-royal ; and in his lament for Sir John the Graeme and Wallace, touches a note quite beyond the Archdeacon. Historically there is a great falling off. His very *praefervidum ingenium* has been his undoing, and his relentless hate for the Southron leads him astray. He begins :—

Our antecessouris that we suld of reide,
And halde in mynde their nobile worthi deid,
We lat ourslide throw very sleathfulness,
And castis us evir till other besynes.
Till honour ennymis is our haile entent,
It has beyne seyne in thir times bywent,
Our ald ennymis, cummin of Saxons blud,
That never yet to Scotland wald do gud.

We are here far from the chivalrous and debonair tone of Barbour and Froissart. Yet even Froissart himself, as he grew older, became more hostile to the English. The long devastating wars had done their work, shown in nothing more clearly than the depreciation of the coinage, once of the English standard. The pound Scots! What a commentary on Edward's policy! Burke would have said the age of chivalry was indeed gone when Harry declares his hero's abiding

passion was to get rid of Englishmen :—

It was his lyff and most part of his fude
To see them shed the byrnand Southrone blude.

But, really, when historical burglars like Edward I. knock down and rob nations, it is not to be expected that the nations should remember them in their prayers. His ideal quality is physical strength, and his hero is drawn on a gigantic scale. Yet some of his detailed features must be substantially correct, and had become traditional. Barbour preserves the lisp, the lean body and the black hair of Douglas. Harry ascribes to Wallace brown hair, and a wen below the left chin, His strength clearly was great. Saul and David were certainly of this type; and, no doubt, David in the hold, among his own men of valour, was like Wallace, as Dugald Dalgetty said of his friend, "a pretty man and a good soldier." Stirling and Falkirk had no need of weaklings.

Harry's episodes must sometimes be discounted, especially his advance of Wallace on London. But when you are smiting your enemy from Dan to Beersheba, a few odd leagues are immaterial. Though the authorities do not mention it, the visit to France in 1299 to the Court of Philip, to secure the aid of that King against England, may well be true. Philip's letter exists, and letters were found on Wallace at his capture, from Philip, Haco of Norway, John, King of Scotland, and others. His diplomacy was active and unceasing, and Scott, in the seventh chapter of the *Fair Maid of Perth*, in the story of the Red Rover, follows the episode of Wallace on the authority of "ancient and uniform tradition, which carries in it great indications of truth." It will be new to many Scots, who, perhaps, have missed this incident in the history of the Charteris and Kinfauns house.

Rude in art the Blind Minstrel may have been. But what an influence on modern Scotland has been his! He is the most influential of the Makars, beyond Sir David Lindsay, who eclipsed the name of Dunbar for centuries in his own country. Printed first in 1508, then in 1570, and in many versions after, Harry became widely known. In 1722 William Hamilton of Gilbertfield issued the modernised version of the *Wallace*, the only edition Burns knew, who possibly never saw the original. Hamilton is a greater figure in the national revival than is thought. Besides his edition of Harry, his poetical correspondence with Allan Ramsay established the Burns stanza, while his "Willie was a wanton wag" is the original of Burns' "Robin was a rovin' boy." In his Epistle to Simpson of Ochiltree Burns has recalled his own three models and masters, Allan, Gilbertfield and Ferguson."

Should anyone wish to see and to feel what Burns did for Scotland and national feeling, let him turn to that masterly fifth chapter of Lockhart's *Life of Burns*, the best book yet on the poet. "No man can point out any Scottish author of the first rank in all the long period between Buchanan and Hume." He protests, in his closing pages, against Smollett's degradation of the Scottish characters in his novels, where he makes low sport for the Philistines with his country, "the Jockies and Archies of farce," with "submissions to the prejudices of the dominant nation." He contrasts the state of things then and now, due to Burns' "achievements never in their kind to be surpassed." It was fitting

that he should at the very outset of his career become known to Mrs Dunlop, the daughter of Sir Thomas Wallace o. Craigie, descended from the brother of the Liberator. On reading the *Cotter's Saturday Night* she sent a messenger to Mossgiel, fifteen miles off, with an order for six copies of the Kilmarnock edition. Everyone knows the reply :—

"The first book I met with in my early years, which I perused with pleasure, was the *Life of Hannibal*, the next was the *History of Sir William Wallace;* for several of my earlier years I had few other authors, and many a solitary hour have I stole out, after the laborious vocations of the day, to shed a tear over their glorious but unfortunate stories. I remember, in particular, being struck with that part of Wallace's story where these lines occur : Syne to the Leglen wood, when it was late, To make a silent and a safe retreat.

I chose a fine summer Sunday, the only day of my life allowed, and walked half-a-dozen miles to pay my respects to the Leglen wood, with as much devout enthusiasm as ever pilgrim to Loretto ; and, as I explored every den and dell where I would suppose my heroic countryman to have lodged, I recollect (for even then I was a rhymer) that my heart glowed with a wish to be able to make a song on him in some measure equal to his merits."

His account of the same books is given also in his letter to Dr John Moore :—

"The first two books I ever read in private, and which gave me more pleasure than any two books I ever read since, were the *Life of Hannibal* and the *History of Sir William Wallace*. . . . The story of Wallace poured a Scottish prejudice into my veins, which will boil along there till the flood-gates of life shut in eternal rest."

Look at Lockhart's account, in the *Life of Scott*, how Sir Walter at Abbotsford received, with a sort of "reverential courtesy," the poor, half-pay lieutenant descended from the knight whom Blind Harry had celebrated as fighting by the side of Wallace. Leyden was the oldest of the great Border trio, Leyden, Hogg and Scott, and all were due to Burns, and Burns to Harry. Think of what nationality can do for literature, and contrast Pringle of Roxburgh's *Farewell to Teviotdale* with the unutterable vulgarity of Kipling's *Absent Minded Beggar*. Think on Dr Livingstone, lost in the interior of Africa, entering in his Journal over the grave of his wife, "Poor Mary lies on Shupanga brae, and beeks forenent the sun." The biographers miss it. What would not Scott have done for the man that remembered the ballad of "Bessy Bell and Mary Gray," dying in regions which, through him, are now united to the Empire, and have parcel-posts in the almanacks?

But these men were not reared on paltry denationalised *Royal Readers* that forget everything but parochial English squabbles. When will statesmen awake to the obvious fact that Houses of Lords, reformed or unreformed, never can be a bulwark against Socialism? The Trades Congress orators have long seen the two outposts are Religion and Nationality, and assail them both with all the force of concentrated hate and ignorance. "The Scottish people," said Livingstone, "reads history, and they are no levellers."

The Liberal Party has a great chance in this Church Union Movement in Scotland. Anything like expediency, the saving of money in removing overlapping of agencies, will defeat itself. It must rest on the old Scottish feeling of unity and nationality. When the old Blue Banner of Presbyterianism is given to the air, there need be no fear for the answer of the people of Scotland. It simply means the extinction for all time of frothy agitators of the Keir Hardie school. We are all waiting for a lead from the Convention on this point. If Mr Asquith can give the word, Scotland

will take a greater hold on the Empire than she has ever done. There are no Little Scotlanders. Blind Harry and Burns killed the breed. WM. KEITH LEASK.

CAPTAIN MARRYAT ON SCOTLAND AND SCOTSMEN.—It is the custom with many English writers to sneer at Scotsmen and their ways, and to put forward, as their chief characteristic, avarice and a general meanness of character. Not all, however, do so, and Captain Marryat, the eminent naval novelist, has, in one of his portraits of sailors, given one of a Scotsman, which is highly favourable and truthful. In "Frank Mildmay, or the Naval Officer" he has, as one of his characters, "Jock Thomson" from Aberdeen. He was an impressed sailor, as was the cruel custom in those days, and was one of Mildmay's sailors when he was captured by an American privateer. Mildmay, when this happened, had been placed in command of a large prize, taken by the frigate in which he sailed, and had with him a crew to navigate the vessel to the English Channel. These were nearly all Englishmen, and when the Yankee privateer picked them up at sea in an open boat—the prize having sunk—they all joined the crew of the privateer, except Thomson, who steadily refused, despite all inducements and threats. A Yankee Captain on board said to Mildmay:—"What a noble specimen of a British sailor you have with you." "Yes, I replied, he is one of the right sort—he comes from the land where the education of the poor contributes to the stability of the rich; where the generality of the lower orders are brought up in the honest simplicity of primitive Christians." Such is the testimony of the able and honest Marryat to the worth of Scotland and Scotsmen.

THE REVEREND MR MacFADYEN OF LAGGAN

IN our last issue we reprinted a paragraph from *The Weekly Scotsman*, which stated that the above gentleman, when he was a teacher of Gaelic to the Prince of Wales at Balmoral in the '50's of last century, was insulted by the young Prince, who made an attack on the Highland race, and was at once punished by Mr MacFadyen for his insolence "by a lick in the lug." Whether this gave rise or not to the late King Edward's antipathy to Scotland is a matter for conjecture, but at all events it is a noteworthy incident in the relations of royalty to the people, and of the people to royalty. It was characteristic of the Scottish people, Highland and Lowland alike. For while there are no people more loyal to their monarchs, if these are deserving, and are loyal and kindly to their subjects, yet, as history shows, the Scots will not tamely submit to insult even from royalty, or those connected with it. When we look back on the false flattery with which the late King was beslobbered after he ascended the throne, and the veil that was thrown over his manifold indiscretions, more especially by the people of London, we feel a pride in the spirited way in which the young Highland teacher resented the insult to his race by the then Prince of Wales. We asked for some particulars about Mr MacFadyen and his career, and an esteemed correspondent of ours in Glasgow sends us the following notes, which he got from Mr Robert Bain of the Mitchell Library in Glasgow:—

"The Rev. Donald MacFadyen was a native of Colonsay, where his father was a teacher. He was appointed minister of Aucharacle (*q.s.*) in 1856, of Ardnamurchan in 1860, and of Laggan in 1869, where he remained till his death. His mother was

a daughter of the Rev. Dr John Smith of Campbelltown. He had a brother a minister in Islay, and his sister was the mother of the Rev. L. MacLachlan, some time minister of St Columba Parish Church, Glasgow.

"Mr Bain further states that he has gone over the lists of graduates of all four universities in Scotland but has failed to find Mr MacFadyen's name. However, if you would like further details, he thinks Professor MacKinnon of Edinburgh is likely to be able to give them, as he is a native of the same island as MacFadyen."

It is now the duty of patriotic Highlanders to have a few lines in Gaelic put on Mr MacFadyen's tombstone, testifying to his manliness in defending the honour of his race against princely insult.

———o———

THE WALLACE DOCUMENT REPRODUCED.—*The Graphic* (weekly) of London of the 8th of October has a reproduction of this famous paper, by permission of the authorities of the city of Lubeck. There is also a translatiou of the text, and the history of the document is given in a very interesting manner by "W. K. L.," whose identity will be known to not a few of our readers. Those who wish to have a permanent record of this interesting and invaluable document will do well to secure a copy of *The Graphic* of the date given. To all patriotic Scots it will be a most interesting record of one of the greatest—if not the greatest — of their countrymen.

———o———

THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE PARTY.—A private meeting of this Party was held in Edinburgh on the last day of September. The honorary secretaries, Mr Cowan and Mr Watt, presented a very encouraging report as to the progress that had been made since the last meeting. Offers of support had come from all parts of Scotland, and numerous applications for speakers for meetings had been received. It was also mentioned that an official communication had been received from Welsh Radicals suggesting co-operation on certain lines for the advancement of the devolution movement.

Mr Pirie, the treasurer, reported that a very substantial annual income had been guaranteed, which justified steps being taken for an active organisation and propaganda throughout the country.

———o———

THE SCOTTISH EXHIBITION AT GLASGOW AND WALLACE.—In the Exhibition which is to take place at Glasgow next year, the main object of which is to provide a fund for the endowment of a Chair of Scottish History in the University of Glasgow, it is somewhat curious that in the Historical Pageants which the Pageant Committee have arranged for, the name of the illustrious Wallace is conspicuously absent. The names of Bruce, Queen Mary, Thomas the Rhymer and Burns are to be the subjects of pageants, as also is Jacobitism ; but the illustrious Wallace, the greatest figure of all, is omitted. Dr John Bell of Glasgow, a true patriot, lately drew public attention to the omission in a letter to *The Glasgow Herald*, but, at the time we write, we understand there has been no promise of amendment on the part of the managers of the Exhibition. We trust that this error will be remedied, and that, if there are to be historical pageants, the figure of Wallace, at, say, "Stirling Brig," shall be included. We trust also that the Wallace document, now in the city archives of Lubeck, will be got a loan of from the authorities there, and be made visible to the Scottish people.

THE FIERY CROSS.—We have received the 36th issue of this Scottish periodical, now issued quarterly. It, as usual, combines a strong element of Scottish patriotism common to all true Scots, with as strong an element of Scottish Jacobitism, felt only by a limited but very enthusiastic number of our country-folks. In this respect, however, the Scottish Jacobites have the advantage of the purely Scottish patriots, that they have, as fellow-disciples, a small but devoted section of English, Irish and Welsh supporters. We may go further, indeed, and say that even in the people of the United States there are still a few who hold to the Jacobite faith. Mr Theodore Napier, the editor and proprietor of *The Fiery Cross*, ministers to these followers of the old dynasty in a most thorough and uncompromising fashion, and those who are most opposed to his views must acknowledge the gallantry with which, in an ungrateful world, he upholds the banner of the Royal Stewarts. The contents of this issue are various, and include articles on "The Lia Fail, or Stone of Destiny," "The Robroyston Commemoration," "The Scottish Home Rule Manifesto," "The White Ensign Outrage" and other matters.

———o———

THE SCOTTISH MEMORIAL TO KING EDWARD.—There is an undercurrent of dissent to this movement that occasionally comes to the surface. At one of the meetings of the Dunoon Town Council, on the 11th of October, the Provost suggested that the town should be represented at the meeting at Edinburgh to be held on the 24th of October. Councillor Drummond thought it was unnecessary to send representatives, though he professed to be in sympathy with the meeting. Bailie Cameron said he was opposed to the suggestion of the Provost. "If it is a meeting of Scotsmen," he said, "the very wording of the letter is sufficient to debar Scotsmen from having anything to do with it. Edward VII. had no connection with Scotland whatever. I, as a Scotsman, object to that VII., and I beg to move that the letter lie on the table."

The Provost—I don't think so. I think we should recognise this letter.

Bailie Cameron—I don't think we should.

It was decided that the Provost and Mr Downie and Mr Dobie, if they found it convenient, should attend.

Bailie Cameron hit the right nail on the head. What did King Edward do for Scotland? He showed his dislike to this country so soon as he ascended the throne, and insulted it by his title of Edward the Seventh; he continued his slights and insults all through his reign, by flying the English flag at Balmoral, and by giving the English nobles precedence *in Scotland* over Scottish nobles of the same rank, contrary to the Treaty of Union and to International Law. Bailie Cameron deserves the thanks of all true Scots.

———o———

ENGLISH CUSTOMS IN THE 16TH CENTURY.—"The Country (England) is a good one, but the people are surely the worst in the world, . . . Three Englishmen and one Spaniard were hanged for brawling last week. Every day there is some trouble. . . . 'We Spaniards,' says the narrator, 'move about among all these Englishmen like so many fools. For they are such barbarians, that they cannot understand us nor we them. . . . Our joy will be boundless to be away from a land peopled by such barbarous folk."—"*The year after the Armada*," *by Martin A. S. Hume*. pp. 172-3.

The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

Vol. II.—No. 29. December 1910 Price 1d.

CONTENTS

PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH AND PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH BY "THE THISTLE," 8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.

The Thistle

VOL. II. No. 29. DECEMBER 1910. MONTHLY 1D

TO OUR READERS

OUR January issue began the second volume of THE THISTLE, *which in future will consist of twelve monthly numbers of each year, from January to December inclusive.*

An index of the first volume, now complete, has been prepared, and is now issued to our subscribers. Those of our readers who may not have got it, and who desire it, will get it gratis from The Publishers, THE THISTLE *Office, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh, on application.*

Cases for the binding of the first volume can be got from The Publishers at cost price, viz., 1s. each, 1s. 3d., post free.

To the Colonies, the self-governing British Dominions, etc., abroad, and the United States, the same will be forwarded for 1s. 6d.

Postal orders or postal coupons for such cases must be forwarded on application. Postal coupons can now be had at all Post Offices in Britain or abroad.

All business communications should be addressed to The Publishers of THE THISTLE, *8 North Bridge, Edinburgh; and all literary communications to The Editor or Proprietor, No. 4 West Stanhope Place, Edinburgh.*

PUBLISHERS' NOTICES

READERS will find THE THISTLE *in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and William Love,* 219A *and* 221 *Argyle Street, Glasgow.*

THE THISTLE *can be had in the Colonies at Gordon & Gotch, Sydney, Melbourne, and Cape Town. The price in Britain is* 1d., *post free* 1½d.; *outside British Isles, post free,* 2d.

Annual Subscriptions to be addressed to the Publishers, 8 *North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

The Second Volume of "The Thistle"

The present number for December completes the second volume. With the January number we hope to be able to give our readers an index for the year 1910. Cases for binding will be available to those who may require them. Particulars as to this and other matters will be given in our next issue.

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 85

THE GENERAL ELECTION

PRIVILEGE and privileged classes that have entrenched themselves as the leaders of national life die hard. The Roman Church in Great Britain required a deal of killing. Monarchy did not go under as the ruling force without a civil war and the lopping off of a kingly head. Now aristocracy has to meet its doom, and it also is determined not to yield its ground of vantage without a desperate struggle for its position of supremacy. It is now so much of an anachronism that it cannot fight under its own flag of privilege; but its defenders are loud of tongue and fertile in invention, and they find no difficulty in clouding the issue. One Chamber in

Parliament is pure despotism, we are told, and such a political position must be rejected at all hazards. The irony of the situation is here disclosed; for this is exactly the evil that the Radicals are also fighting against and resolved to end, once and for ever. We *have* been living under one Parliamentary Chamber, say they, and we find that the position is intolerable. Parliament, in which a hereditary peerage has the final word, and in which all liberal legislation has to be moulded and mangled till it is harmless to the privileges of the great and the wealthy, is at last declared by the Liberals of Britain to be out of date, and must be altered to suit the demands of modern democracy. That is the plain issue which is now before the people of Britain, and which must be fought to a finish; if not at this General Election, then at the next, or the next, or the next. There is to be, and there can be, no evasion. As we have said, the Church has gone down as the ruling power before the march of events; monarchy, also, has gone down as a ruling power, and both have been moulded into a form suitable to modern requirements. It is now the turn of the landed and privileged classes, and they must also be taught that they are only a part of the British people, and that their interests and their political power must be made subservient to the general welfare.

Such, we say, is the great issue now before the people of this country. Many minor issues are being raised by a noisy and a clamorous press. Tariff Reform and a Bi-Cameral Parliament are dangled before the electors, the one as being necessary to the welfare of the working-classes, and the other as being essential to the safety of our political life. Then Ireland, independent and armed to the teeth against Great Britain, is held up to us as a terrible and dangerous bogey. All these are brought before us to cloud the grand issue. But let there be no deception. Democracy and aristocracy are the two antagonists; and it is for the British people now to say which shall, in the future, control the destinies of their country. This, and this only, is the grand issue of the present General Election.

———o———

No. 86

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL AS A HISTORIAN

AN anonymous donor has set aside a certain sum of money to provide for the delivery of a series of lectures on Scottish history in connection with the movement for the endowment of a Chair of Scottish History and Literature in the University of Glasgow. The authorities of the University selected Sir Herbert E. Maxwell of Monreith to deliver the first lectures of the Course. We cannot congratulate the University authorities on their selection of that gentleman, either as the first lecturer, or as a lecturer at all in connection with the Course. Sir Herbert is an able man of varied acquirements; but, as a Scotsman, he is not merely unpatriotic; he is a renegade of an extreme stamp. According to his view of history it is a great misfortune that Scotland

exists in history as an independent kingdom. Her proper place, he insists, should have been simply that of an English province. Speaking in the House of Commons on the 23rd of June 1893, as member for Wigtonshire, he said :—"Standing there as a Scotsman, and proud as they were of Bannockburn, and great as was the lustre reflected on their arms on that day, he looked upon it as the greatest misfortune that ever befell his country, and especially the lower orders in it." How a gentleman holding such a view should have been selected by the University of Glasgow to lecture to its members on Scottish history is a great puzzle. Nor is this the only point in which Sir Herbert shows his bitter antipathy to the good name of Scotland, and to the gallant men who fought and bled for her independence. M'Kerlie, in his history of Galloway, says, "But what is to be said of Scottish authors, when Sir Herbert Maxwell, in his *Robert the Bruce*, insults the memory of the patriot Wallace by stating that he was a thief, an outlaw and a brigand." We need hardly say that a writer of this stamp is capable of presenting the history of his country in the most humiliating aspect possible. And so we find it in the course of his second lecture, which, at the time we write, is as far as he has gone. He claims for Edward the First that "he never interfered actively with the government of Scotland until invited to do so by the leaders of both parties in the disputed succession." Yet it is well known that he had carefully and cunningly laid his plans to take advantage of the disputed succession to destroy the liberties of Scotland. As many of the great nobles, and nearly all of the claimants for the Scottish Crown held lands in England, he was placed in a commanding position towards them, which he skilfully and cunningly used to the uttermost. He got these nobles to place in his hands the chief fortresses and cities of the kingdom, on the pretence that he, as arbitrator between the claimants, should hold them, as it were, in trust, until the question of the succession was decided. But this preliminary position was a mere step in the deep-laid scheme of Edward for the annexation or the conquest of Scotland. Tytler, says William Burns, in "The War of Independence," puts the matter of Edward's plans in a single sentence. "The motives of Edward's conduct and the true history of his influence are broadly and honestly stated in these words by an old English historian—'The King of England, having assembled his privy council and chief nobility, told them that he had it in his mind to bring under his dominion the King and realm of Scotland in the same manner that he had subdued the kingdom of Wales.'"

It is impossible for us here to go over in detail the various processes by which Edward cozened the nobles and leading authorities of Scotland, till he had them and the country practically at his mercy. He professed that he was only anxious for the welfare of the kingdom, but at the same time he put forward his claim to be Lord Paramount. As the people of Scotland had always

resisted this claim on the part of an English monarch, it was pretty evident that he meant serious mischief to the independence of the country. But in so helpless a position comparatively was it placed by the interregnum and the disputed succession to the crown, that no serious opposition could then be made to Edward's claim. Protests were entered, and the Scots authorities declared that they were ignorant of any such right of superiority; but this only roused Edward's ire, and, as William Burns writes (quoting Hemingford), "being off his guard, he exclaimed, By Holy Edward, whose crown I wear, I will vindicate my just rights, or perish in the attempt." Among the various claimants for the crown Edward gave his award in favour of John Baliol; and in this he was right. Had he then retired and allowed Scotland to work out its own destiny under its own kings, there is little doubt that within a very few generations from that time the two countries would have come peaceably together on terms satisfactory to both; and the Union of Great Britain would have taken place some centuries before it did. In that case, Edward would have earned his title of being a great king and a great British statesman. But such was not to be. He was utterly faithless, cruel, and unprincipled; and he went on in his crooked and ruthless way till he drove the Scots to fury and to resistance to the death, till he established between the two peoples of Scotland and England a constant warfare, which lasted for three centuries, and brought unutterable desolation and misery to both.

The great mistake that historians make who aver that Edward's policy was right and statesmanlike, is their assumption that the only representatives of Scottish opinion and Scottish independence were the semi-Anglicised nobles, who, holding estates in both England and Scotland, could be easily bent to the will of the English monarch. When he got these Scottish magnates to acknowledge his supremacy, it is asserted by his defenders that all those Scots who resisted his authority were rebels. It is, however, to be noted here, that even looking mildly on this statement of Edward's position, he was so ruthless and so faithless in the carrying out of his policy, that in a few years he goaded his puppet king, John Baliol, and nearly all the Scottish nobility into fierce opposition, and then war. It is true that he utterly destroyed such opposition, and for a time had the country at his feet. But let it be clearly seen and understood that in doing so he acted not as a great statesman; but, in the first place, as Dr Henry says, as a chicaning attorney; and, in the second, as a cruel and savage conqueror, who, to gain his ends, depended entirely on brute force and the utter extermination of those who opposed him. As such, then, he must be judged by the results of his policy. And the result was utter failure. He did not conquer Scotland, but he succeeded in making it the most constant and bitter enemy of England for three hundred years. Those writers, then,

who, like Sir Herbert Maxwell and others, extol the greatness of Edward, and eulogise his policy as consummate statesmanship, only show a gross superficiality of judgment, and an unfairness so palpable as to disqualify them from being regarded as fair-minded and serious historians.

PATRIOTISM AND SIR JAMES H. RAMSAY OF BAMFF

THE FOUNDATIONS OF ENGLAND

THE above gentleman, the head of an old county family in Perthshire, lately wrote to *The Times* to point out that the story of the dispute between the English nobles in the Temple gardens as to the merits of the plucking of a red rose and a white, and the ensuing quarrel, which led to the disastrous Civil War, termed "The War of The Roses," is a myth. In all probability Sir James Ramsay is right in this matter, for he is a very able and learned man, and has made a special study of early and mediæval British history. But able and learned as he is, Sir James himself is a great blunderer in the special historical department in which he is looked on as an authority, and the worst of it is, that his blunders are of a strongly unpatriotic character, and are intended to magnify and glorify England, and to belittle and to degrade Scotland. It may be said or be thought that this cannot be; that such a falling off from the straight path of duty is impossible in one of the representatives of a family, famous in the history of Scotland as defenders of her liberty and her honour; but so it is. And this lapse from patriotism is only one instance out of many on the part of the old historical families of Scotland, and is illustrative of the fatally debasing influence on high-placed Scottish youths, caused by the modern fashion of sending them to English schools and to English Universities to be educated. We will not now go more fully into this question, but will proceed to show how seriously Sir James Ramsay has blundered historically, and how, without doubt, his unpatriotic blundering has been caused by his being educated in England.

Sir James, we believe, is the author of many learned books, but the one to which we beg to draw the attention of our readers is one published several years ago, entitled "The Foundations of England, or Twelve Centuries of British History," published in London in 1898. We began—many years ago—the perusal of that book hopefully enough, expecting that we should find the early relations between Scotland and England treated in a patriotic spirit, and that it would be to some extent corrective of the historical misrepresentations of Freeman, Green, and other English historians, who have endeavoured to prove that Scotland was a vassal or tributary of England, and that Edward the First, in his unprincipled attack on the liberty and independence of Scotland, was a great monarch who was only endeavouring to maintain and secure the historic rights of England over Scotland. We soon, however, found out our mistake. We found that Sir James, in his history of "The Foundations

of England," included Scotland, thus making of his own country an English Province; and further, that in the course of his narrative there is a notable vein of depreciation of Scotland and exaltation of England, which, reprehensible as it might be from an English pen, is in a high decree discreditable, coming from the pen of a Scottish gentleman.

Let us give some of the notes made by us, when we read Sir James Ramsay's book, in support of the charge we now make against him of being, not only an unpatriotic writer, but also an incorrect and blundering one. Thus he writes :—

1. The courage and independence of the Germans are too well recognised to need proof. The fact that they, *and they alone*, were able to stem the tide of Roman conquest, speaks for itself. Among their tribes the Saxons are placed in the forefront for their courage and enterprise. (Vol. I., *p.* 138.) (*i.o.*)

This is pretty well for an unpatriotic beginning. We home-loving and home-staying Scots have hitherto been under the comfortable delusion that we, small a nation and sparse a race as we were, and always have been, did something unique, or at least notable, in the staying the advance of the Romans in Caledonia, and in compelling them, after a long struggle, to build two ramparts against our attacks on them; the first from Forth to Clyde, the second, when they were compelled to withdraw from our country, from Tyne to Solway. But our author coolly ignores this glorious record, and replaces it by a laudation of the Saxons, one of the most servile and the most lubberly of the Teutonic races. But, then, Sir James was educated at Rugby and at Oxford, both within the Saxon zone of England, and that accounts for much with a certain class of weak-kneed Scotsmen.

2. Conquering Wessex had now (793-871) her own troubles in store for her. Even under Egbert her resources were sorely taxed to stem the new tide of invasion. The movement was, in fact, but a repetition or revival of that by which Celtic Britain had been converted into Saxon England. (*p.* 229.)

Here the author shows plainly his unpatriotic bias and his historical blundering. He states that Britain, or presumably Great Britain —for at the period mentioned there probably was not a Saxon in Ireland or West Britain, and certainly no Saxon conquest — had become Saxon England, though it is certain that at this time the greater part, if not the whole of what is now Scotland, was quite free from Saxon domination.

3. The allegation of a cession of Cumbria or Strathclyde to Scotland must be dismissed as an idle boast of our chroniclers, but one quite in accordance with the turgid pretensions of the royal charters of the period. (*p.* 297.)

This statement apparently refers to Scottish pretensions and to Scottish chroniclers, which are regarded as worthless. But what had our author in a few pages preceding the above, viz., *p.* 287, said of the Saxon king, Athelstan — "Certainly he had done a good deal to justify his claim to be considered the first overlord of all Britain and the first king of a united England, loose as we shall find the bonds of that union to have been." Again, on the same page, Sir James goes on to say :—

4. The victory of Brunanburh was fought with important political consequences. The battle was a final struggle for supremacy between North and South. The question as to which power in Great Britain should rule the destinies of the Island was there put, and settled once and for ever. The ascendency of Southern Britain could never again be seriously challenged.

This battle — Brunanburh — was fought, according to the author, at Bourne in Lincolnshire, between the Scots under Constantine, King of Scotland, the Picts, Danes, etc., and Athelstan, King of Wessex, who was victorious. The English historian, Professor Freeman, has made many wild and blundering statements as to the overlordship of the Wessex kings over the whole of Britain; but he seems to be outdone in his assertions of Saxon supremacy by this Scottish county gentleman, who has been educated at Oxford. If the battle of Brunanburh—which we are inclined to think to be largely mythical—gave such an advantage to Wessex and the south of England as to settle for ever its ascendency over Britain, what is to be said of the disgraceful tribute—the Danegelt paid by these same servile Saxons to the Danes for many generations? Does the payment of tribute mean national ascendency? Then what about the conquest of England by Canute, while Scotland remained independent? What about the Norman conquest, when England lay down at the feet of the Duke of a French Province after one defeat, while Scotland remained independent? Then, has Sir James never heard of a battle named "Bannockburn"? According to him, "Bannockburn" in history is mute, while "Brunanburh" is loudly vocal, and stands pre-eminent as a landmark in the history of Britain. Verily the puerility and anti-national bias of these Oxford trained Scots are marvellous.

So far we have dealt with the first volume of Sir James Ramsay's learned but most inaccurate book. We shall deal with the second volume in a future issue.

———o———

On English Arrogance.—*The Westminster Gazette*, one of the ablest of London journals, in an article criticising a stupid letter of Lord Hugh Cecil on the Home Rule question, makes the following allusion to the prevalent custom in England of regarding that country as the only representative of the United Kingdom:—

"There is no meaning in the word 'united,' if we can tolerate no nationalities but one, and that one the 'British,' which almost invariably on the lips of those who use this language means 'the English.' If we had really worked that principle to its logical conclusion, we should have had no Empire, and as little peace and goodwill in Scotland and Wales as in Ireland. The whole problem either of an Empire or of a *United* Kingdom is to find scope and place under one system of government for diverse nationalities and national sentiments. Germany solves it by a wide toleration, which ensures her a great variety of different types of culture, and we may claim to have solved it by the same method in our Empire but not in our Kingdom. The difficulty is that *the Englishman cannot rid himself of the idea that Scottish, Irish and Welsh are all really English*, however much they may pretend otherwise, and that some horrible disaster would befall the country if they were allowed to fall away from this dominant type. That is a theory which will not work because it is divorced from fact, and Englishmen are now called upon to realise that a 'United' Kingdom implies variety in its component parts." (*i.o.*)

THE HISTORIANS OF SCOTLAND

No. 5.—Sir Walter Scott

"Born universal heir to all humanity."

THE critics that attempt to diminish the halo of Sir Walter Scott have generally had to regret their attack. Some writers, and Scott is one of them, have by this time passed into a region beyond the buzz of these petty assailants, and it may be safely asserted that Carlyle himself, in his rather stingy and grudging review of Lockhart's *Life*, did his own reputation but little service when he subjected Scott to the very unworthy treatment he receives in that essay. Whatever deduction—literary, historical, or political—be made, he emerges from the ordeal greater than ever. His reputation grows every year, and the sale of his works is the best test. No one attends or should attend to the petty critics of the great Sir Walter. Like the Beattison in his own *Lay*, "little *he* cares for their winded horn."

Scott can be criticised only by his own countrymen. When they do it, they do it with regret; with full and avowed intentions of reinstating him in his just rights. Some men and most women can never understand Scott; they are born with blinkers, and may be discounted. Cranks and men with a mission and all sentimentalists can never feel or see his greatness. Only one man of ability, George Borrow, has assailed him with violence. Hazlitt's sketch is only the raving of a lunatic.

Scott would perhaps have maintained that he had mastered three things—land, publishing, and politics. It is an axiom now, that of all these subjects he had never attained to an elementary knowledge. The tragedy of Abbotsford, which, however, no true Scot or admirer of Scott would for a moment wish undone, sufficiently illustrates the first point. He saddled the Ballantyne Press with such a mass of unsaleable material that no one could have doubted the result. In politics he was, like Burke, the victim of his own emotions and romantic feelings. He halted between two opinions, and shrank from an analysis of the grounds of his belief. This may have served him as the novelist, but it is often fatal to his historical insight. History he viewed from the point of view of the pageant, not of the scientific investigator, and, of course, the comparative method of study was neither in his day nor to his taste. His own darling book, his *liber carissimus*, was Froissart. His frenzied and unrestrained Tory politics blinded him; especially if nationality lent an additional motive. He eulogises, with needless generosity, Smollett as a historian, because in many ways Scott was drawn to him as a novelist, whose own early political standard also had been deserted. Macaulay, of course, knew better. "It is," he writes, "exceedingly bad; detestably so. I cannot think what had happened to Smollett. His carelessness, partiality, passion, idle invective, gross ignorance of facts, and crude, general theories do not surprise me much. But the style, wherever he tries to be elevated, and wherever he attempts to draw a character, is perfectly nauseous, which I cannot under-

stand. He says of old Horace Walpole that he was an ambassador without dignity, and a plenipotentiary without address. I declare I would rather have a hand cut off than publish such a precious antithesis." The fact is that Smollett had neither the necessary knowledge nor restraint, and was as unfit as Landor to conduct an argument.

It is curious to read Scott's rather feeble and fumbling advice about the Scottish history reading of the young Duke of Buccleuch, and his fear about "the wild political speculations now current." To Scott, George the Fourth was "an amiable prince," and he took the Duke of York as a serious politician and buttress of the throne; that Duke of whom Goldwin Smith said, the only meritorious action of his life was that he once risked it in a duel. Strangely enough Constable, Laidlaw, and Cadell were strong Whigs. Lockhart styles Cadell "an inflexible specimen of the *national* character, who considered the Tory creed as a piece of weakness," and the same superior biographer forgets himself in an unworthy sneer at James Ballantyne in his last notice of Scott's old friend. Ballantyne, in his paper, saw that the Reform Bill was inevitable, and prepared to support it. He disappeared "abruptly without saying farewell, and when Scott understood that he had signified an opinion that the reading of the Church service, with a sermon from South or Barrow, would be a poor substitute for the mystical eloquence of some new idol down the vale, he expressed considerable disgust." This ignoble sneer at the religion of Scotland, and the not very conscientious appreciation of South—not likely to benefit spiritually either Scott or Ballantyne—is quite in Lockhart's snobbish and perverted vein. Ballantyne had vision in 1831; Scott had none. Hear his letter to Sir Robert Dundas:—

"The whole burgher class of Scotland are gradually preparing for radical reform—I mean the middling and respectable classes—and when a burgh reform comes, which perhaps cannot long be delayed, Ministers will not return a member for Scotland from the towns. The gentry will abide longer by sound principles, for they are needy, and desire advancement for their sons and appointments and so on. But this is a very hollow dependence, and those who sincerely hold ancient opinions are waxing old."

This is melancholy reading for a Scotsman. Reform in Church and State must be delayed, because the Dundas Dynasty, resting on patronage of the lairds and their sons, must be maintained at all hazards. Turn to Trevelyan's *Life of Macaulay* and see the extraordinary state of affairs Scott was determined to prop, and Lockhart tamely agreed:—

"The Constituencies of Scotland, with so much else that of right belonged to the public, had got into Dundas's pocket. In the year 1820 all the towns north of the Tweed together contained fewer voters than are now on the rolls of the single burgh of Hawick, and all the counties together contained fewer voters than are now on the Register of Roxburghshire. So small a band of voters was easily manipulated by a party leader, who had the patronage of India at his command. The three Presidencies were flooded with the sons and nephews of men who were lucky enough to have a seat in a Town Council, or a superiority in a rural district; and fortunate it was for our Empire that

the responsibilities of that noblest of all careers soon educated young Indian Civil Servants into something higher than mere adherents of a political party."

If any one wishes to study Scott's attitude—a balance between feeling and reason—let him turn to the introductory remarks to *My Aunt Margaret's Mirror;* an essential passage for the full knowledge of Scott's mind. This explains why he declined to write a biography of Queen Mary, "because his opinion was contrary to his feelings." He repeated the lay of Prince Charlie by the Lake of Avernus, and stood, rapt in imaginative emotion, before the tomb of the Stuarts in St Peter's at Rome. No one better knew the paltry and worldly side of the Jacobites, and no one preferred more to shut his eyes to it all. By the deepest instincts of his nature he viewed history from the synthetical and emotional point only, not from the analytical and critical. He dwelt with pleasure—what would the modern whole-hogger Jacobite say?—on the illusion that the death of the phantom Pretender, the Cardinal of York, had given George IV. both a legitimate and a hereditary right to the throne. The "dispensing power of his imagination," as Lockhart not inaptly styles it, lay at the bottom of his political errors and confusions. His treatment of Lord Holland, "cut with as little remorse as an old pen," is too well known, and goes far to justify Macaulay's assertion that Scott was "a bitter and unscrupulous partisan." It says much for Lockhart's candour that he cannot pass it over in silence:—

"I have thought it due to truth and justice not to omit this disagreeable passage in Scott's life, which shows how even his mind could at times be unhinged and perverted by the malign influence of political spleen."

Then there is the disgraceful *Beacon* episode. Lockhart, whose own early *Blackwood* days are remembered to his discredit, and which doubtless prevented Scott from securing for him legal promotion in Scotland, is rather disingenuous on the point. He would have us believe that Scott, who financially backed the paper, never even saw it. He says, "the results were lamentable; it was made the subject of Parliamentary discussion, from which the then heads of Scotch Toryism did not escape in any very consolatory plight." Scott admitted to Croker it was "a blasted business, and will continue long to have bad consequences." He deliberately excluded Sir John Moore from *Don Roderick*, because he was a Whig General, and foamed about the retreat to Corunna, now seen to be a great strategic triumph, in the style of the yellow press insulting Buller in the Transvaal. Scotsmen can see with perfect clearness that Scott, when he forsook the political and religious traditions of his father's house, made shipwreck of his life, and committed the unique mistake of his career. Cockburn's *Memoirs* reveal with perfect truth the fact that Scott was not in touch with the best men of the day in his own country, and that he was blind to the true interests of the people. This is why his own contemporaries make so poor a figure by omission in the great biography.

It led to his one fatal defect as a man and a writer. Scott was not a spiritual man. At every point in which he touches religion he is seen not to be in his element. He is decorous and coldly correct, but not more. He writes about it, as South did in his sermons, that James Ballantyne could not stand, as one not personally conversant with it. He never understood the Puritan movement in history any more than Shakespeare did, or Ben Jonson, who, in his *Bartholomew Fair*, has left us only a dull and absurd squib. The history of Scotland from 1560 onwards can never be drawn, and let no one at his peril attempt it, by a writer, blind to the fact that the main current of the national life, both in Scotland and England, has run strongly in the Puritan channel. It is as true as it is obviously true. It is, therefore, the lament of all judicious Scotsmen that in *Old Mortality*, Scott, through ignorance or prejudice, or both, should have stooped to the perpetration of a wanton outrage on the national religion. From that evil quarry the witlings have never ceased to draw. His religious characters are caricatures drawn from the outside, as can be seen in the English fields of *Peveril of the Peak* and *Woodstock;* but in the Scottish area he was by very temperament precluded from the task. One passage of Lockhart should never be omitted from careful study—the reminiscences of the Rev. James Mitchell, where that sagacious monitor had early foreseen Scott's adoption of the "Moderate" position in Church affairs. Scott's own autobiographical touch is the first and last word in scientific criticism of the man. He contributes in his own words the only true portrait of himself:—

> I, with a head on fire, was a Cavalier; my friend (Mitchell) was a Roundhead. I was a Tory and he was a Whig. I hated Presbyterians, and admired Montrose with his victorious Highlanders; he liked the Presbyterian Ulysses, the dark and politic Argyle, so that we never wanted subjects of dispute, but our disputes were always amicable. In all these tenets *there was no real conviction on my part*, arising out of acquaintance with the views or principles of either party. I took up my politics at that period, as King Charles II. did his religion, from an idea that the Cavalier creed was the more gentlemanlike persuasion of the two."

Scott, writing to Surtees, says:—

> "The tales of Stuart of Invernahyle were the absolute delight of my childhood. I became a valiant Jacobite at the age of ten years—*never quite got rid* of the impression which the gallantry of Prince Charles made on my imagination."

The fact is that Scott, as Dryden says of himself, was enslaved by these "Dalilahs of the imagination," and lost the main current of the national life. The Jacobite Rebellions were but paltry, damp squibs, and he gave too much attention to them. He never outgrew that early attitude of taking his history "with no real conviction on my part." He mistook the religious standpoint entirely, which Burns in his four lines on the League and Covenant put in a nutshell. "It is impossible," wrote the late Robert Wallace, M.P. for Edinburgh, "to appraise too highly the service done by the Covenanters for the cause of liberty and popular education; and although they had their obvious

faults, one is always sorry to think that the aristocratic and Episcopalian prejudices of Scott should have led him to hold them up to ridicule, while glad that a higher and juster view was taken by a greater Scotsman even than Scott, when, in answer to a contemptuous critic of the men of the Covenant, Burns turned on him with the withering *impromptu*." Scott is still in the bond and gall of the eighteenth century, and complacently repeats the usual shibboleth about "enthusiasm" and "gloomy fanaticism" so liberally payed out by the Humes and Robertsons, and men of the "Jupiter"—Carlyle of Inveresk kidney. When he comes to deal with vital religion, he is like a whale in a hay field, and the result would be ludicrous if it were not also tragic. For the result was *Old Mortality*.

Here Lockhart is remarkably candid. He keeps his head, as he does in the treatment of Burns. The review of Scott by Scott in the *Quarterly* is not a pleasant recollection for the admirers of Sir Walter. Dr Patrick, in his article on M'Crie in Chambers' *Cyclopædia of English Literature*, writes :—

"In 1817 he published in three successive numbers of the *Christian Instructor* a trenchant review of *The Tales of My Landlord*, whose authorship was not yet revealed, as regards their treatment of the Covenanters and their persecutors. His aim was to prove that the author showed gross partiality by ignoring or glossing over the severities and cruelties they perpetrated, and by making the oppressors, especially Claverhouse, seem admirable, contrary to historic truth ; while he unfairly exaggerated the peculiarities of certain extreme Covenanters, and, in defiance of fact, represented the Covenanters generally as mere ignorant, foolish, and violent fanatics. On these matters M'Crie was a much more accurate historian than Scott, and easily convicted him of many misapprehensions and misstatements in general and detail. Scott had at first pooh-poohed M'Crie's strictures, and resolved not even to read them ; but, as Lockhart said, he 'found the impression they were producing so strong that he soon changed his purpose, and devoted a very large part of his article for the *Quarterly Review* to an elaborate defence of his own picture of the Covenanters—that is, Scott as Scott defended in the *Quarterly*, in a review of his own unacknowledged works his own historical representations there set forth.'"

M'Crie's demolition of *Old Mortality* is simply crushing, and shows that Scott did not know the subject. The whole fabric of the novel, however brilliant it may be—the *Marmion* of the novels, Lockhart calls it—is shot through and through with inaccuracy and absurdities of mere melodrama. The result of the M'Crie exposure was not lost on Scott, who was not the man to keep up ill-will. In 1818 he made amends by the *Heart of Midlothian*, the greatest of his works. He did better in the *Tales of a Grandfather*. "You have paid a debt which you owed to the *manes* of the Covenanters," wrote his old friend, John Richardson. His own final and matured opinion (*Journal* ii., 404 *n*) was that both Covenanters and Malignants were more picturesque than beautiful, and that one was tempted to hate the party uppermost for the time. This may or may not be the truth, but it is simply the result of never settling on moral grounds, to his own satisfaction, the issues at stake. The

same yielding to merely picturesque writing is seen in his ballad of *Cadzow Castle*. It is an unworthy attack on the Regent Murray, of whom Buchanan, who knew the man, writes far differently; and "injured Bothwellhaugh" rests on an exploded fiction. There again M'Crie crushed Scott. And Knox, who was not in Linlithgow, could not there and then "relax his bigot pride." The thing is simply an offence in history.

The whole attitude reveals Scott's dullness on the religious side. He is found recommending Logan's *Sermons*, on the ground that one poet should recommend another, which shows admirable good nature but little penetration. Even Hugh Blair, who at least wrote the thirty-second paraphrase, might have had a chance. Yet the same man, when he could forget his "Cavalier" prejudice, could draw Bessie Maclure and Jeannie Deans. It is curious to reflect that both Burns and Scott should have written squibs on the national religion, for Burns' *Holy Fair* is both feeble and vulgar. The reader that is not aware of the complete *exposé* of Burns on this side of his career will do well to turn to the long account by the Rev. Dr Clason in Dean Ramsay's *Reminiscences*. On that subject Lockhart—"the mansified Lockhart," as Henley sneeringly calls him, in total ignorance of Scottish life and character—is admirable, and his criticism is based on personal knowledge. The pity of it all is that the merely Bacchanalian Burnsite never knows or cares to know history. In truth, Ephraim Macbriar and Habakuk Mucklewrath are about as grotesque and absurd as Daddy Auld and other worthy men maligned by a rural wit set on by a very low and, happily, long extinct type.

Lockhart admits that Scott is open to the charge of idealising the aristocracy of Scotland, and of a too ready adulation of the great. There is much in this, and the biographer's treatment of the question is at least candid, for Lockhart was amenable to the same charges himself; he was a snob, but "a Scotch snob," as Thackeray says, and he explains that means the worst of the breed, for he had very great ability. His candour at times comes often perilously near to what is now called "giving away the show," from the side of his own party. Yet the famous and really splendid book does not give the real Scott. We hear too much of people like Terry the actor, and of ducal correspondents. The real man is buried. We do not see the Scott whom Cockburn and Jeffrey knew and always loved. The death-bed of Johnny Ballantyne, briefly done in Lockhart's best style, and his burial in the Canongate Churchyard—what memories are associated with it!—are worth all the correspondence with people like Morritt of Rokeby and the letters to Cornet Scott—the last being weary and dreary in their worldly wisdom, and which no reader can praise. But all the same we agree with Mr Lang:—"that all the anecdotes of the Ballantynes were strictly necessary to illustrate their characters and the relations between Scott and them, I am far from being convinced;

and Constable, too, might have been much more gently handled."

Possibly his historical defect, halting between two opinions, was beneficial to him as a writer and man. It is his unique breadth of sympathy that is at the bottom of his great and ever-growing popularity. "His sympathy," says Ruskin, "is universal; there is no rank or condition of men of which he has not shown the loveliest aspect. His code of morals is entirely defined, yet taught with a reserved subtlety like nature's own, so that none but the most earnest readers can perceive his intention; and his opinions on all practical subjects are final, the consummate decisions of accurate and inevitable commonsense, tempered by the most graceful kindness."

After all that can be said against Scott, what does it amount to? Little or nothing, It may be said of Scott, as was said of the great surgeon, Liston, "Liston may have had faults, but they were like spots in the sun, lost in the blaze of its total effulgence." A Scotland without Scott is unthinkable. His country owes everything to him, her European position in literature and her commercial modern expansion. He has done as much on the last side as all her captains of industry. Of every inch of his "own romantic town" he is, by a sort of divine right, feudal superior, and holds it all in fee. Sir William Stirling Maxwell, speaking in the Corn Exchange of Edinburgh in 1871 on the centenary of his birth, made an admirable point:—

"The work that Burns yearned after from the depths of his passionate heart, Scott has actually accomplished. From the story of our feuds and factions, from the dust and blood of the past his genius and his patriotism have culled all that was pure and lovely and of good report, and have woven it into an immortal chaplet for the brow of Caledonia. He has fanned the fire of Scottish nationality—without detriment, nay, with positive advantage to that higher and nobler nationality—which rallies round the flag whereon the white cross so compactly fits into the red. Wherever the *British flag* flies it will find no better or truer defenders there than those Scotsmen who best know and love their Scott."

The Little Englanders and Jingoes should mark that. The Englishman is periodically in a fog of pseudo-patriotism. At one moment someone calls for a Victoria Day to salute the flag; Wessex men write to *The Times* to proclaim the necessity of a King Alfred Day. No man knows St George's Day. "We are all subjects of King Shakespeare," Bishop Welldon has said some days ago; "let us erect a national theatre in London to his memory." His fellow-subjects of the bard seem bent on a morbid interest in Crippen and Belle Elmore, and in multiplying the number of music-halls and variety entertainments all over the country. But Burns and Scott, as Stirling Maxwell saw well, are already pillars of Empire, and the British Empire finds in them two of her very finest assets.

Some superior people there may be who think little of nationality. They have no idea of it, what it is and does. They tell you that the difference between Scotland and England is now one of purely

distant and antiquarian interest, or that the dividing line is simply that of one county from another. Burns and Scott thought differently, and so did Dean Ramsay. What else, he asks, keeps nations living and great, on a purely scientific argument, but the remembrance of a present and a past greatness, "the patriotic spirit that identifies national honour and national distinction with its own?" If Britain is in trouble, she can rest securely on *Scots wha hae* and *March! Ettrick and Teviotdale*, but she will derive little support from banjo-lyrists of Empire and vulgar rubbish about the *Absent-Minded Beggar*. No Prime Minister of this country could ever address Scotland as Mr Roosevelt has to address his mongrel followers on a material platform, or to descend to the undignified appeal of "Boys! let's lick 'em on to the ropes and beat 'em all to a frazzle!" Nations that remember a past greatness will demand a present and a future greatness.

To the present growing movement for Home Rule in Scotland to preserve the heritage of the past on a firm basis, Scott would have been warmly attached. Lockhart expressly says:—

"Whenever Scotland could be considered as standing separate on any question from the rest of the Empire, he was not only apt but eager to embrace the opportunity of again rehoisting, as it were, the old signal of national independence; and I sincerely believe that no circumstance in his literary career gave him so much personal satisfaction as the success of Malachi Malagrowther's Epistles."

Scott found then he had to face Crokers, and his country to-day has to fight croakers. But a nation with such advocates and exponents of nationality as Burns and Scott need have little fear that her legitimate demands must soon be met by their realisation.

Wm. Keith Leask.

"WINDSOR MAGAZINE'S" ENGLISH HISTORY

Gleniffer House,
Edinburgh, *17th October* 1910.

Sir,—When on holiday I came across the *Windsor Magazine* for October, and saw they had had a series of articles entitled "Picture History of England." The article of this month relates the doings of Edward Plantagenet, surnamed "The Hammer of Scotland." The first picture, by frontispiece, is entitled "The Removing of the Coronation Stone of Scotland," a gentle way of mentioning the theft of the Stone of Destiny from Scone Palace. I have nothing much to complain of the pictures, though rather poor samples of the printer's art, but I do object, most strongly, to the letterpress explaining the acts of Edward, and, most decidedly, to the closing sentences, which reads as follows:—"Edward was undoubtedly a great ruler, despite obvious faults of stubbornness and severity, manifested chiefly in his dealings with Wales, Scotland and the Jewish community, and as a man, again to quote Mr Jenks, he was *a brave, affectionate, just, pure, devout, frugal, dignified, faithful, persevering and sympathetic human being*." If this is a true estimate of this man's character, why is he not canonised as a Saint? He is certainly better entitled to it than George of Cappadocia, the Patron Saint of England. It is hardly possible for a Scotsman to keep his temper when such a panegyric is put upon one of the most atrocious villains that ever polluted the earth. This is a strong statement, but I will justify it by reference to the undoubted facts of history.

Before the above Edward came upon the historic scene, Scotsmen and Englishmen were upon the same amiable terms as they are at present. Malcolm Canmore married an English Princess, but not of the Norman line. This amiable and pious woman was canonised, and is known as Saint Margaret, and, where the present Naval Base is being erected, is known as Saint Margaret's Hope, so called as being the hope (or haven) of the mariners when caught in a storm in the North Sea. When Alexander Third was killed at Kinghorn, and the Maid of Norway died, there was a

vacancy of the Scottish Crown, for which certain nobles contended. This was Edward's opportunity, and the cunning and perfidy of the man stood out in bold relief. The base nobles of Scotland betrayed their country, but the middle and lower orders, led by Wallace, vindicated the national independence of Scotland. Here are some of the ruthless acts of this Edward Plantagenet.

Edward having quarrelled with his puppet, John Baliol, who, mean as he was, could not brook the insolence of his overlord, invaded Scotland and besieged Berwick, at that time the most flourishing seaport of both kingdoms. He took the city by assault, "seventeen thousand persons, without distinction of age or sex, were put to the sword, and for two days the streets of the city ran with blood like a river. A small band of Flemish traders, faithful to the Scots, defended their factory with such courage that it could not be taken. Edward ordered it to be set on fire, and the brave defenders perished in the flames." Wallace being betrayed into the hands of Edward, was, after the farce of a trial at Westminster, in imitation of the wicked Jews who put a crown of thorns on the head of Christ, mocked with a crown of laurel, then dragged at the tail of horses to Smithfield. "After being hanged, but not to death, he was cut down, yet breathing, his bowels taken out and burnt before his face. His head was then struck off, placed on a pole on London Bridge, his right arm above the bridge at Newcastle, his left arm was sent to Berwick, his right foot and hand to Perth, and his left quarter to Aberdeen." Thus perished the hero, Wallace. The virtues of a thousand average kings would not make up the sum of a Wallace or a Garibaldi. Nigel Bruce, the youthful brother of King Robert, was hanged and beheaded at Berwick. "The beautiful person and engaging manners of Nigel Bruce rendered his fate a subject of horror and indignation to the Scots, and excited sentiments of pity in every bosom but that of Edward. It was the age of chivalry, when women were almost worshipped, but no such sentiment was found in the heart of Edward. The Countess of Buchan, who had dared to exercise her hereditary right to place King Robert Bruce on the throne at Scone, falling into the hands of Edward, was treated as follows:- "In one of the outer turrets of the castle of Berwick was constructed a cage, latticed and cross-barred with wood and secured with iron, in which this unfortunate lady was immured. No person was permitted to speak with her except the women who brought her food, and it was carefully stipulated that these should be of English extraction. Confined in this rigorous manner, and yet subjected to the gaze of every passer-by, she remained for four years. The wife and sisters of King Robert were also treated with extreme rigour. The Queen was closely confined in an English castle. Christina Bruce was given to Percy, who placed her in confinement in a convent, but the unfortunate Mary was subjected to the same barbarous treatment as the Countess of Buchan, the place of her punishment being Roxburgh Castle.

The last picture in the Magazine shows Edward, now an old man, being carried on a litter towards the Borders to again invade Scotland, but before he reached that country he died, leaving as a last command to his son that his bones were not to be laid in earth till the Scots were subdued. In obedience to this pious wish of his father, the son continued to make war upon Scotland, slaying without mercy. To raise the siege of Stirling Castle the King levied the largest army ever known in England, and invited all the military adventurers of Europe to join him with the avowed intention of exterminating the Scots and dividing the country among his soldiers. With this object in view, the army carried all manner of agricultural implements and other effects for making a permanent settlement. This was defeated by the decisive battle of Bannockburn, and happy would it have been for both peoples if the English had accepted their defeat as a just punishment for an unjust war. But evil passions were aroused, and the crimes of Edward Longshanks brought bitter wars between two peoples for nigh three hundred years.

Did the writer in the *Windsor Magazine* know the facts of history when he said of Edward, "A man worthy of the name of Englishman is this, the greatest of the Plantagenets"? The worst enemy of England could not have penned a more odious sentence; fortunately it is not true. I know Englishmen well, having lived many years among them. The average Englishman is an upright, honest, God-fearing man, and would shrink with horror from approval of the awful crimes of this Plantagenet.—I am, etc.,

CHARLES WADDIE.

———o———

SCOTIA.—The Martinmas number of this patriotic magazine, which is the quarterly organ of the St Andrew Society, is an excellent one. Its first illustration, "The Valley of the Shadow, Loch Coruisk," is a beautiful reproduction of the painting by Robert Burns, A.R.S.A., and is well worth the price of the magazine—sixpence—many times over. The first paper, "Camden's Britain," is by Mr David MacRitchie, and is a scholarly review of that well-known historical work. "The Music of the Gaelic Mod" is an enthusiastic appreciation of Gaelic music and literature by Mr Duncan Fraser. A paper in Gaelic, "Ainmean Na H-Alba," by Mr W. J. Watson, is a Celtic feature of the magazine, which must be of interest to Gaelic readers and speakers. One of the most interesting papers is a memoir of Mr William Burns of Glasgow by his son-in-law, Mr W. C. Maughan of Musselburgh. Mr Burns is the author of "The Scottish War of Independence," one of the best works on the subject, and one which has been often quoted by us in our historical papers. Mr Burns lays bare in his history the low tricks and cunning devices by which Edward the First deceived and lured on to their ruin, and to the desolation of Scotland, the claimants for the Scottish Crown, and the selfish nobles who then controlled the destiny of the kingdom. He also in his history gives a full and admirable account of the numerous great invasions in force, which entered Scotland to carry out the unscrupulous designs of the first and second Edward. A memoir of Mr Burns was much required, and Mr Maughan has given in short compass an excellent account of the career of his distinguished father-in-law. A portrait of Mr Burns also accompanies the sketch of his life. "Superstetions," by Mrs John Lang, is a sketch of an auld Scots wife, which the writer, with her clever literary touch and true reproduction of her native Doric, makes peculiarly interesting. "At the Sign of The Thistle" is another interesting paper, and Mr D. G. MacKemmie, in his "West of Scotland Notes," gives, as usual, an interesting and admirable summary of the patriotic doings and news of Glasgow and the district round during the quarter. Other interesting matter follows, with another illustration, "Leith Docks," after the painting by W. E. Lockhart, R.S.A. On the whole, this last number of *Scotia* is an admirable one, and when we say that it can be got post free to any part of the world for 2s. 8d. per annum, we feel sure that our country folks at home and abroad will allow that it is a magazine well worthy of their support. The publishers are Messrs R. & R. Clark, Ltd., 72 Hanover Street, Edinburgh.

The Scottish Historical Review.—We do not know who is the editor of this periodical, but presumably he is a Scot; and, if so, we respectfully suggest that in future he should take care to correct the blunders of his contributors when they improperly use the terms "England" and "English" for those of "Britain" and "British." It is bad enough when such blunders are made by English writers in English newspapers and periodicals, but it is highly discreditable to the editor of a Scottish periodical when he allows such blunders to pass without correction. In the October issue of the above magazine at least two of the contributors are allowed to commit these offences against the national sentiment of Scotland. One, Mr C. T. Atkinson, who reviews Mr Julian S. Corbett's "Campaign of Trafalgar," is presumably an Englishman, and he repeatedly uses the offensive terms. Trafalgar is the most conspicuous naval victory "gained by England." The force sent by the British Government to southern Italy in 1805 to help to expel the French is termed "England's" contribution, etc. Then we have "the naval supremacy of England," "the main fleets of the English," and other blunders, which ought to have been corrected. The next paper in the *Review*, "England and the French Revolution," which is by a Dr Laprade, an American writer, is reviewed by Miss or Mrs Sophia H. Maclehose, and in it also the same blunders appear. She writes of "the politics of English ministers," "the commercial treaty of 1786 between France and England," "the repressive measures to which the English Government had recourse." As the publishers of *The Scottish Historical Review* are James Maclehose & Sons of Glasgow, this lady is presumably connected with them, and, consequently, these unpatriotic blunders are less pardonable than those of the English contributor. We trust that in the future the editor will have the good sense to correct such mistakes on the part of his contributors.

———o———

Scotsmen in India.—The Scotsmen in India entertained Lord Minto at a farewell dinner in Simla on the 12th of October. Forty-six gentlemen were present, and the Honourable B. Robertson, C.S.I., C.I.E., Member for Commerce and Industry, presided. In proposing the health of Lord Minto the chairman (we quote from *The Scotsman*) made some interesting remarks as to the position of Scotsmen in India. He said:—

"The Chinese domination in Tibet is not in it with what the Scottish domination has recently been on this side of the Himalayas. In March last, owing to the breakdown in health of a distinguished Irishman, whose subsequent untimely death we all deeply deplored, I was called upon to occupy a seat on the front bench of the Imperial Legislative Council. There I found sitting in almost solitary state a Southron, whose name I need not mention. Well, this solitary Southron used to say that he had never been in such a collection of Scotsmen in his life. There were Scotsmen to right of him, Sir H. Adamson and Mr Miller; Scotsmen to left of him, Mr Holms of the United Provinces and myself;

Scotsmen in front of him—I need mention only Sir Douglas Haig, Mr Stewart Wilson and Mr Dempster ; while behind him sat an almost unbroken array of Scottish Secretaries to Government. He thought when he came out to India that he would find the prevailing language to be Hindustani. In the Legislative Council he found this idea was mistaken. He found nothing but Scottish.

"But to leave the official Scots, what do we find in the business world among the men whose industry is helping so much towards the prosperity and development of this great country? In Mr Ker we have here to-night a prominent specimen of the Scotsmen who are making India. And on a recent tour I found that in the three principal cities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras the Chambers of Commerce were presided over by Scotsmen, worthy representatives of the spirit of Scottish enterprise which has made itself felt all over the world, but which is nowhere more in evidence than in India."

———o———

English Ignorance or Bumptiousness.—*The Spectator* of the 29th of October has the following remarks :—

"We believe that 'the cool discussions of a convention would show, what we endeavoured to point out last week, that Federalism must be wrecked on finance ; unless, of course, England is to subsidise the other portions of the United Kingdom, and yet have no say in regard to the expenditure of those subsidies."

To this we reply that it is one of the usual bumptious English statements not based on facts. In reality, so far as Scotland is concerned, we pay more than our share of the Imperial taxation. And we believe that Wales also pays, at least, her share of it. The sneer of *The Spectator*, then, can only refer to Ireland. And if that country does get a subsidy from the Imperial Government it will take a large one to make up for the plunder she has been subjected to, and the wrongs that she has received in the past from the hands of England.

Australia and English Educational Books. — We observe that Sir George H. Reid, the High Commissioner in this country for The Commonwealth of Australia, has called the attention of the English Board of Education to the ignorance displayed in its school books regarding Australia. This may well be the case, for the English school books are a compilation of ignorant prejudice and of national bigotry. They are utterly careless of historical facts, if facts conflict with English national vanity. Scotland is written of and regarded as an English province, utterly oblivious of history. It need not, therefore, be matter for surprise if Australia is treated carelessly and ignorantly. But there is this to be said about this matter. Sir George Reid's remonstrance will be treated with the greatest respect, and Australian sentiment will be satisfied for two reasons. In the first place, the English authorities, in other words, our esteemed friend, "John Bully," is afraid to offend Australian sentiment, and, in the second, there is nothing in the amendments that will have to be made that are likely to conflict with English national vanity. But if remonstrance be made by patriotic Scotsmen as to the slights and insults to Scottish national sentiment to be found in English school books, depend upon it a deaf ear will be turned to such complaints. "John Bully" in such a matter does not make amendments from a sense of justice. He knows not what justice or fair play is when his national vanity or national bigotry is concerned. In such a case, as we have often previously remarked, he has to be kicked into acting fairly and doing justice.