



2 vols

21/-

Scarce



140000  
2000s.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

# THE THISTLE

A SCOTTISH PATRIOTIC MAGAZINE

VOLUME ONE

---

1908-9

---

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 to the page in which the person or subject is first mentioned in the article, *e.g.*, “The Kaiser” is mentioned upon pages 70, 71, and 72, but page 70 only is given in the index.

## ERRATA

Page 63 for “Scotland” in heading “Royal Arms of Scotland,” read “Britain.”  
„ 214, last line but one, delete “the” and insert in place thereof, “Second and.”

# INDEX

---

- AGRICOLA'S Invasion, 19  
 Aims of *The Thistle*, 3  
 Alexander III., 51, 82, 265  
 Alleged Meanness of the Scots, *see* Scots  
 American Fleet in Australia, 39  
 Anglo, *see* Nomenclature  
 Anglicisation, 2, 139  
 Anglicised Scots, 223  
 Anglo-Celtic, 12  
 Appreciations of *The Thistle*, 48, 79, 110, 111, 112, 204  
 Arms of Britain, 63  
   — of Australia, *see* Australia  
 Army, Cavalry in Scotland, 59  
   — Council, 61, 73, 160, 173  
   — Re-organisation of, 59  
 Asquith, Mr, and "British" or "Irish," 192  
   — Meeting at Earlston, 52  
 Austria-Hungary compared with Britain, 55  
 Australia, 6, 11, 53, 56, 140  
   — American Fleet in, 39, 41  
   — Coat of Arms, 8, 13  
   — Opinion of Hereditary Legislation, 77  
   — Scottish Fishermen in, 77  
 Atholl Deer Forest Excursion, 228
- BALFOUR, Mr, on English Ignorance of Scotland, 189  
 Baliol, John, 51, 84, 98, 114, 194  
   — Edward, 100  
 Bannockburn, Battle of, 195, 271  
   — Celebration, 183  
   — Day, *see* Scotland's Day  
   — Why we Celebrate, 181  
 Barbour's Bruce, 176, 184, 206, 271  
 Barra Land League, 48  
 Befooling of King Edward, 148  
 Berwick, 82, 98, 114  
 Bit of Edward First's Family History, 206  
 Blackie, Professor John Stuart, 152, 203  
 Blanc, Louis, Appreciation of Wallace, 261  
 Blind Harry, *see* Harry  
   — Karl, Appreciation of Wallace, 261  
 Brave Scottish Missionary, A, 66  
 Britain, British, Brito, *see* Nomenclature  
   — Dominated by England, 55  
   — *versus* England, *see* Nomenclature  
   — Germany, 142  
 Brown, Professor Hume, History of Scotland, 236
- Bruce, Dr, Antarctic Expedition, *see* Science, Government's Treatment of  
 Bruce, King Robert the, 176, 272  
 Budget (of 1909) 216, 221  
 Burns, Robert, Ter-Jubilee, 112
- CADDIES, 123  
 Caledonians, 19, 50, 224  
 Calendar of Documents Referring to Scotland, 175  
 Calvin and Calvinism, 197  
 Campbell-Bannerman's, Mr, Election Address (1895), 165  
 Canada, 6, 11, 53, 56, 137, 181, 224  
 Carham, Victory of, 51  
 Carlaverock Castle, Siege of, 181  
 Catrail, 50  
 Cavalry in Scotland, *see* Army  
 Celts, 19, 37, 50  
 Centenary of a Patriotic Scot, 203  
 Characteristics, *see* National  
 Chicanery, 4  
 Christianity, 51  
 Church, 52, 115  
   — Anglican, 146, 185  
   — Histories, 62  
   — of Scotland, 185, 197  
 Clan Combat on North Inch, 128  
 Colours, *see* Scottish Regimental Flags  
 Commonalty (*see* also Democracy) 4, 8, 83  
 Comyn, 51, 179, 194, 226  
 Consecrated Churches, *see* Presbyterian Soldiers in India  
 Constitution of U.K., 3  
 Convention of Royal Burghs, 156  
 Correspondence, 18, 48, 79, 96, 110, 111, 127, 128, 191, 207, 223, 239, 255  
 County Councils, 90  
 Crofters and Old Age Pensions, 126  
   — Ultimatum to Secretary for Scotland, 205  
   — *see* also Land Question and Barra Land League  
 Culloden, 160, 208  
 Curzon's, Address on India, Lord, 256
- DAVID I., "The Sair Sainct," 82  
   — Prince, *see* Edward "VII."  
 Decadence of the Saxon-English, *see* Saxon-English  
 Decay of Scottish Education, 201, 219


- Degenerate Scots, 110  
 Deer Forests, 24, 44, 228  
 Defoe on Scotland and Scotsmen, 64  
 Democracy, Rights of the, 10  
 Development Fund, 235  
 Diplomacy, 66, 72, 148  
 Disloyalty to British Throne, 3  
 Douglas, John, London Scottish Year Book, 251  
 — Sir William, 131  
 Dreariest Scotch Debate, 171  
 Dumbarton, 50, 115  
 Dunbar Castle, 115
- EARLSTON Meeting, 52  
 Edinburgh, 37, 115  
 Education, 35, 135, 167, 201, 219  
 — Department, *see* "Scottish Education Department"  
 Edward "VII." of Britain, 3, 9, 16, 37, 62, 63, 67, 71, 78, 101, 106, 117, 120, 148, 231  
 — "I. of Britain," 78  
 — I. of England ("Longshanks") 8, 32, 83, 98, 114, 131, 163, 179, 184, 194, 206, 211, 226, 258.  
 — — — His Character, 261, 265  
 England, Aggressions of, 3, 8, 55, 181, 185, 265  
 — a "Partner" since the Union, 4  
 — Indictment Against, 167  
 — Norman Conquest of, 268  
 — Wallace Invasion of, 162  
 — *see also* Nomenclature, Imperial  
 — a Bye-word for Inefficiency, 138  
 English Arrogance, 9, 15, 94  
 — Church Law limited to England, 25  
 — History Falsities, 62  
 — Ignorance, 80, 189, 267  
 — Inordinate Conceit, 133  
 — Law in Colonies, 6  
 — "Love of Justice and Fairplay," 6, 11, 86  
 — Majority in Parliament, 6  
 Englishman, The, 80  
 English Press Refuses to Discuss Question of Nomenclature, 5  
 — Ruling Passion, 240  
 — Sneers, 171  
 — Statesmen, 191  
 — Usurpation, 34  
 — Vanity, 6, *see also* English Arrogance  
 Evils Due to Interference of Englishmen, 167  
 Exhibition, Scottish National (1908), 12, 50  
 — — — (1911), 160
- "FAIR PLAY," English, 6  
 Falkirk (1298), 178  
 Falsification of History, 85  
 Falsities of English History, 62  
 Fishermen, Scottish, in Australia, 77  
 Flag, *see* "Union Flag" and Scottish Regimental Flags
- Flemish Element in Scotland, 51  
 Fletcher, Andrew, 233  
 Fordoun, 174  
 France, League with (1295), 100  
 French Opinion of Scotsmen, 221
- GÆLIC, 96, 127, 267  
 Galgacus, 19  
 Garibaldi's Appreciation of Wallace, 260  
 Garter, English King-at-Arms, 8  
 George III., 67, 73, 168, 214  
 Germany and Britain, 120, 142  
 — Compared with Britain, 55  
 — Emperor of, *see* William II.  
 Good Cheer from Galloway, 79  
 Government of Scotland Bill, *see* Home Rule  
 Government's Treatment of Science in Scotland, *see* Science
- HADRIAN'S Vallum, 20  
 Haldane, "Backing Down" of Mr, 59  
 — Mr, and National Sentiment, 173  
 Hamburg, 164  
 Hailes, Lord, 130  
 Hanseatic League, 164  
 Harry the Minstrel, 130, 174, 206, 255  
 Headlines of Scottish History—  
 The Fight with Rome, 18  
 Scotland "Makkin' Hersell," 34, 50  
 The Demise of the Crown, 82, 98  
 Wallace Comes Into View, 114  
 The Time of Wallace, 130, 162, 178  
 The Threefold Battle of Roslin, 194  
 The Fate of Wallace, 210  
 Edward's Twelve Invasions of Scotland, 226  
 Wallace *versus* Edward the First: A Comparison, 258
- Heraldry, 223, 255  
 Heriot, George, 203  
 Highland Chiefs and Clansmen, 127, *see also* Heraldry  
 — Ministers on Land Question, 93  
 — Society of London, 73  
 Highlanders, Descent of the, 52  
 History, Chair of, in Glasgow, 160, 184  
 — of Scotland, Hume Brown's, 236  
 — Books, *see* Scottish History in Schools  
 Historiographer, Royal, 73  
 Home Rule, 45, 53, 55, 62, 93, 134, 136, 152, 165, 169, 191, 244, *see also* Scottish Home Rule Association  
 — Pirie's Bill for, 11, 18, 26  
 Honour, National, 3  
 House of Lords, 11, 24, 54, 57, 77, 135  
 How Scotland is "Done" by the Treasury, 159
- IGNORANCE of English Tory Noblemen, 80  
 Imperialism, 62  
 Improvement in Parliamentary Machinery, 54

- Indian Churches, *see* Presbyterian Soldiers  
 International Law in Regard to Table of Precedence, 101  
 Ireland, 6, 8, 55, 74, 79, 94, 136, 171  
 Irish Australians, *see* Nomenclature, Imperial  
 ——— and the United States, 41
- JACOBITE Feeling in Royal Family, 184, 208  
 James VI., 185  
 John, King, *see* Baliol  
 John Bull, 45, 79, 86  
 ——— Bullyism, 7, 43, 45, 79, 110, 269  
 Johnson, Dr Samuel, Bi-centenary, 240  
 Justice, Duty of King, 3
- KAISER of Germany, *see* William II.  
 Kenneth MacAlpine, 51  
 King and Edinburgh, 37, 231  
 ——— and the Radical Party, 16  
 ——— of Arms, *see* Lyon  
 ——— "of England," 32  
 ——— responsible for Scottish Scale of Precedence, 117  
 ——— *versus* Kaiser, 70, 120, 151  
 ——— *see* also Edward  
 King's Duty to Hold Scales of Justice and Honour, 3, 9, 104  
 ——— Own Scottish Borderers, 160  
 Kirkpatrick of Closeburn, 227  
 Kossuth, Louis, Appreciation of Wallace, 260
- LAND Question, 23, 43, 48, 53, 90, 143, 205, 228, 239  
 Lang, Andrew, and Wallace, 175  
 Laying Foundation Stone of New Royal Infirmary, 63  
 Leask, \*Mr W. Keith, Notes on Scottish Songs, 249  
 Lia Fail, *see* Stone of Destiny  
 Liberalism, 52, 152, 166, 169  
 Liberty, 4  
 ——— of Speech, 106  
 Limner King's, 73  
 London Scottish Year Book, 251  
 ——— *versus* Edinburgh, 159  
 Lord Chancellor "of England," not "of Britain," 104  
 ——— Provost of Edinburgh and King Edward, 37, 232  
 Long's, Mr Walter, Insult to Scotland, 93  
 Lübeck, 164  
 Lyon-King-of-Arms, 9, 63, 144
- MACALPINE, King Kenneth, 51  
 Malcolm II., 51  
 ——— III. (Canmore), 51  
 Margaret, "Maid of Norway," 51, 83  
 Maxwell, Sir Herbert, and Wallace, 64, 174  
 Mazzini's Appreciation of Wallace, 261  
 Missionary, A Brave, 67  
 Modern Forms of English Aggression, 265
- Monarchs as Diplomats, 66  
 Mons Grampius, 20  
 Moore, Sir John—A Scotsman, 111  
 Moray Firth Trawling, 15, 76  
 Murray, Sir Andrew, 133, 164
- NATIONAL Sentiment, 173  
 ——— Traditions, Policy of Army Council with Regard to, 61  
 ——— Characteristics, 184  
 Nationality as an Imperial Factor, 271  
 ——— Gaelic and, 96  
 ——— of Sir John Moore, 111  
 New Zealand, 6, 11, 43, 53, 56, 181  
 No English Need Apply, 6  
 Nobility, Anglicised, 4, 8, 16  
 Nomenclature, Imperial, 12, 156, 158, 181, 184, 191, 192, 237, 253, 256, 269  
 Norse, 37, 224, 267  
 Norsemen, 52  
 North Inch Combat, 128  
 Notes on Scottish Songs, 249
- OBVIOUS Duty of the Scottish People, 141  
 Ogilvie's, Will. H., Poem, "Scotland," 142  
 Old Age Pensions, 126  
 Order of the Thistle, *see* Thistle  
 Oxford "Taint," 64, 207, 223, 256
- PARLIAMENT, British and Australian, 56  
 ——— Improvement in the Machinery of, 54  
 ——— Restoration of, to Scotland, *see* Home Rule  
 Party Ties *v.* Scotland, 16, 57  
 Payment of Members of Parliament, 55  
 Picts, Origin of the, 34, 51  
 Pirie's, Mr, Bill for Home Rule, *see* Home Rule  
 Plundering of Scotland, 185  
 Poetry, 142, 238  
 Policy of *The Thistle*, 4  
 Political Crisis (1909) and Socialism, 242  
 Politics, Philosophy of, 213  
 Popular Government, 56  
 Position of Scotland ("Internationally" and "In British Empire"), *see* Scotland  
 Precedence, New Table of, Contrary to International Law, 101  
 ——— Contrary to Treaty of Union, 105  
 ——— King Responsible for, 117  
 Prefatory, 2  
 Presbyterian Sailors in Navy, 146, 199  
 ——— Soldiers in India, 24  
 Presentation to the Earl of Wemyss, *see* Wemyss  
 Professional Classes, 4, 8
- QUADRENNIAL Parliaments, 55
- RADICAL Party, 16  
 Ragnan's Roll, 115  
 Redford Military Station, 59  
 Religious Intolerance, 24, 146, 199

- Removal of Scottish Education Department to Edinburgh, 75  
 "Rise of English Culture"—Review, 62  
 Robert I., *see* Bruce  
 Rome, Fight with (A.D. 80-420), 18  
 Romans, John —, Home Rule, 154  
 Rosebery, Earl of, on the Down Grade, 89  
 Roslin, Battle of, 144, 194  
 Royal Arms of Britain, 63, 80  
 — Burghs, *see* Convention of  
 — Navy, 142, 144, 147, 199
- St Andrew Society, 8, 13, 73  
 St Andrew's Day, 50  
 St George's Cross, 8, 144  
 — — the Emblem of a Foreign Dynasty, 11  
 Sangschaw, 50  
 Saxon-English, 61, 124, 133, 136, 143  
 Sassenach, 36, 96  
 Scale of Precedence in Scotland, New, *see* Precedence  
 School Board Candidate, Questions for, 157  
 Science, Government Treatment of, 31, 246  
 "Scotch" Education Department, *see* Scottish  
*Scotia* Magazine Review, 144  
 Scotland after Departure of Romans, 36  
 — and the Development Fund, 235  
 — Defoe's Opinion of, 64  
 — English Claims of Suzerainty over, 62, 84  
 — How "Done" by the Treasury, 159, 235,  
 — Injustice to, 200, 235  
 — Overtaxed, 186  
 — Plundering of, 185, 190  
 — Population of, 52  
 — Position of, 5, 8, 62, 83, 104  
 — Table of Precedence in, *see* Precedence  
 Scotland's Day, 12, 181, 183  
 — Glory Review, 61  
 — Work and Worth Review, 252
- Scots, Alleged Meanness of the, 86  
 — Greys, 59, 60, 73, 90, 173  
 — Guards, 62  
 — Origin of the, 35  
 — The Strongest Race in the Empire, 95
- Scotsmen in England, 109, 111  
 — Regarded as a Subject Race by English, 168  
 — Treated with Respect and Kindness in France and Germany, 139
- Scott, Michael, 185  
 — Sir Walter, 185
- Scottish Antarctic Expedition, *see* Science  
 — Australians and the United States, 4  
 — Business in House of Commons, 15  
 — Education Department, 15, 75, 201, 208, 217, 237, *see also* Education  
 — Fishermen in Australia, 77  
 — History in Schools, 156, 184, 252  
 — Home Rule Association, 165
- Scottish Home Rule Bill, *see* Home Rule  
 — Jocularly and the Surgical Operation, 122  
 — Language, 96, 143  
 — Liberal Association, 152  
 — M.P.'s and the Education Department, 208  
 — National Exhibition, *see* Exhibition  
 — — Sangschaw, 50  
 — Nationalists, 152  
 — Patriotic Association, 8, 13, 61, 78, 101, 110  
 — Patriotism and Scotsmen in England, 109  
 — People, Law-abiding, 167  
 — Regimental Flags, 160, 188 (*see also* Union Flag)  
 — Soldiers in India, *see* Presbyterian  
 — Songs, 249  
 — Stalwarts, 112  
 "Seventh" or "First," *see* Title, King Edward  
 Severus, Emperor, Invades Caledonia, 20  
 Sins of the Budget, 221  
 Small Holdings Bill, 53  
 Sound the Clarion, Poem, 239  
 South Africa, 6, 11, 140  
 Southern Cross, 14  
 — English, *see* Saxon-English  
 Speech, *see* Liberty of  
 Stirling, 115  
 — Brig, 132, 164, 195  
 Stone of Destiny, 115  
 Sydney Smith's Surgical Operation, Origin of, 122
- Table of Precedence, *see* Precedence  
 Taxation, 186, 190  
 Tax-payers, Unjust Treatment of Scottish, 157  
 Teetotallers and Mr Waddie, 207  
 Temperance, 135  
 Territorial Flags, *see* Scottish Regimental Flags  
 Ter-Jubilee of Burns' Birth, 112  
 Thackeray on English Insolence, 249  
 Thinking Nationally, 79  
 Thomas of Ercildoune, 185  
*Thistle*, *see* Appreciations of the  
 — Order of the, 63  
 — Policy of the, 4  
 Threefold Battle of Roslin, 144, 194  
*The Times* on Calvin, 197  
 Title, King Edward's, 78, 101, *see also* Edward "VII."
- Tory Party, 135  
 Toryism, 136  
 Trade Supremacy, Decadence of British, 167  
 Trawling, *see* Moray Firth  
 Transference of Scottish Education Department, 217  
 Treaty of Brigham, 99

- Treaty of Union, 3, 4, 80, 99, 103, 105, 166, 253, 266  
 — — — Regarded as Non-existent, 5
- UNEMPLOYED, The, 233
- Union, *see* Treaty of  
 — — Flag of Britain, 144, 256, *see* also  
 Scottish Regimental Flags
- United States of America, 56, 136
- Unjust Treatment of Scottish Tax-payers,  
 157
- VALENTIA, Roman Province of, 21, 36
- Vatersay Prisoners, 16, 79, *see* also Land  
 Question  
 — — Purchase of, 143
- Vigilance, 4
- WADDIE, Charles, and the Wrongs of  
 Scotland, 152, 185, 190, 191, 201, 219,  
 221 233
- Wallace, Sir William 99, 116, 130, 163  
 174, 179, 194, 210, 255, 258, 272  
 — — "A Thief," 64  
 — — Appreciations of, 260  
 — — Commemorations, 32, 48  
 — — Monument at Stirling, 260
- Wales, 7, 9, 54, 79, 83, 86, 94, 95, 136, 153,  
 189
- Waleys, 175
- War Office, 59, 73, 189
- Welsh Australians and the United States,  
 41
- Wemyss, Presentation to the Earl of, 159
- Westwater, Dr, Missionary, 66
- Whisky, Taxation of, 186, 190, 207
- William II. of Germany, 66, 71, 120, 148  
 — — of Scotland (III. of England), 214
- Why We Celebrate Bannockburn Day, 181  
 — — — Start *The Thistle*, 2
- YOUNG Scots' Society and Home Rule, 244





# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 1.

August 1908

Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFATORY . . . . .	2
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 1.—WHY WE START "THE THISTLE" . . . . .	2
" 2.—THE POLICY OF "THE THISTLE" . . . . .	4
" 3.—THE AUSTRALIAN COAT OF ARMS . . . . .	8
" 4.—THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL . . . . .	11
SCOTLAND'S DAY . . . . .	12
THE AUSTRALIAN COAT OF ARMS — A SCOTTISH PATRIOTIC PROTEST . . . . .	13
SCOTTISH BUSINESS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS . . . . .	15
THE VATERSAY PRISONERS . . . . .	16
THE KING AND THE RADICAL PARTY . . . . .	16



PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH,  
AND PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR BY  
THE SCOTTISH NEWSPAPER PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,  
8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.



# The Thistle

No. 1.

AUGUST 1908.

MONTHLY 1D.

## PREFATORY

*THE aim of THE THISTLE and its policy will be found fully set forth in the articles which follow. Here I may be permitted to state that its success will entirely depend on the way in which it is received by Scottish patriots at home and abroad. If they approve of its conduct and its policy, I hope they will support it, and make it known as widely as possible. It is only in this way that it can be made a success. The advertisement of its existence must be done by the friends of THE CAUSE. For my part, I will—so far as the cost of printing and publishing goes—endeavour to keep THE THISTLE alive for a couple of years, so that it may have time to be made known to Scottish patriots at home and abroad. If in that time it does not prove to be nearly self-supporting, then I shall consider that I have not correctly gauged Scottish feeling, and will pass on the task and the duty of vindicating Scottish rights and Scottish honour to some future champion.*

THE EDITOR.

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. I

### WHY WE START “THE THISTLE”

IN bringing *The Thistle* before the notice of the Scottish people, it is only fitting that we should give some reason for so doing. We hold that it is not only desirable, but necessary that there should be a literary organ exclusively devoted to Scottish affairs—to the maintenance of Scottish National Rights; and more especially to the preservation of the National Honour of Scotland. Owing to the wave of materialism which during the last half century has submerged and obscured much of the fine old Scottish pride and spirit, the progress of Anglicisation has been considerable; and though a check has lately been given to that movement, yet it seems to us that the efforts of Scottish patriots would be greatly advanced and strengthened, if they had a cheap and popular organ for the dissemination of their views, and for communing with each other for the purpose of defending their country and their nationality against

English arrogance and English injustice and aggression.

Such an organ of opinion is all the more necessary, owing to the unprecedented action of our present monarch. That personage—the head of the British Empire—whose duty it is to hold the scales of justice even, as between the three kingdoms and the four peoples over whom he rules—England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales—has thought fit to sully his high position by taking part in the unjust aggressions of England against his ancient kingdom of Scotland. In such action he has violated the constitution of the United Kingdom, and has thus proved himself to be a creator of disaffection to his person, and even of disloyalty to the British throne.

But even more dangerous to Scottish national honour than this ebullition of royal spleen against Scotland is the deep-set and persistent policy of the vast majority of the English people to submerge the name of Scotland in the name of England, and to treat the Scottish people as if they were subjects of England. Kings, after all, can only strut their little time on the world's stage, while a people like that of Scotland, so long as they maintain their national honour, will for ever hold their own in the stream of history. But this is what the brutal English majority in the United Kingdom seems determined to prevent. The national rights and the national honour of Scotland, as clearly and unmistakably defined by the Treaty of Union of 1706, are, if maintained in their integrity, an insuperable obstacle to

the unjust and arrogant attempt of England to assert herself as the sole representative of the British—or as she would like to term it—the English Empire. Such an unblushing attempt to degrade the Scottish race, by treating them as if they were a subject people, must be resisted at all hazards. On this point there will be no compromise on the part of *The Thistle*. Its policy on this point may be stated in a few words—we would rather see Scotland robbed or plundered annually by England of many millions sterling than pay a pound a year to her by way of tribute. A people may be ruthlessly deprived annually of many millions sterling, and still be able to hold a high position amongst the nations. But let them tamely give up their national honour, and they at once become a subject and a servile race, whose place in history is one of gloom and of degradation. Are Scotsmen going quietly to submit to such a fate? We think not without persistent and determined resistance.

To give voice then to those Scottish patriots at home and abroad—male and female—who hold such views, and who are determined, at all hazards, to maintain the honour of their country, *The Thistle*, as a monthly magazine, has been started, and now appeals for support to the Scottish people. It appears in a very plain and modest guise, and its cost—one shilling a year—practically places it within the reach of every member of the Scottish race. It is intended to be the mouthpiece—not of the Scottish nobility, for, with a few honourable exceptions,

they have become Anglicised—not of the Scottish commercial or professional classes, for they, to a large extent, have during the last generation basely given themselves up to materialism—but of the Scottish commonalty, who in all the critical stages of Scottish history have been the surest and most stalwart defenders of the liberty and the honour of Scotland. For such a class *The Thistle* will speak with no uncertain sound. Its aim will be not only to defend, but also to attack; and whether the violators of Scottish rights be English commoners, English nobles, or the monarch on the throne, *The Thistle* will not shrink from censure, or be slow to criticise or attack. Such a policy of offence, as well as of defence, is now absolutely necessary for the Scottish people. For the sake of peace and goodwill towards their English fellow-subjects, they have for the last two or three generations quietly submitted to English encroachments on their national honour, till the cry arose among the offenders: "We have absorbed Scotland"—"Scotland is now practically an English province." But though National Sentiment may for a time be quiescent, it never dies when it has such a glorious history to give life to it as Scotland has. She stands proudly pre-eminent among the nations of the modern world as the staunch and unswerving upholder of freedom for many centuries against apparently overwhelming odds. And though the attack on her independence and her good name is not now by force of arms, but by chicanery, by perfidy

and by political injustice, it is on that account none the less dangerous. For it has been well said, that "Eternal vigilance is the price of Liberty." Scottish patriots, then, must recognise the change in the conditions of the fight against English aggression. They must be forever on the alert. Their position is impregnable, if they will only manfully defend it. To maintain this defence, there must be unity of action among representative Scotsmen; not only in Scotland, but throughout the Empire. To secure such unity is one of the chief aims of *The Thistle*. Through its pages, information can be conveyed, and above all, ideas can be interchanged between patriotic Scots in all parts of the Empire. Such an interchange will have an important effect on the issue of the Campaign against English injustice and English aggression. Nay, more, the time is coming when the Scots abroad will exercise a most important influence on the destiny of the Empire. But this important aspect of the question will have to be dealt with in a future issue.

---

No. II

**THE POLICY OF "THE THISTLE"**

ALL true Scots, wherever they may be placed in the world, must view with extreme dissatisfaction the position their country at present occupies in its relation to England. Poor, but unconquered, Scotland by the Treaty of Union in 1706 became a partner with her southern neighbour on the clear and

direct understanding that for the future they should be partners, materially and morally. In other words, that though England was the richer and more powerful member of the new kingdom of Great Britain, still she was to share jointly with Scotland in all the honour and glory that their united efforts and united strength might in the future bring to the Empire. It was not to be a partnership in trade alone, but a partnership in honour and glory as well. And by the terms of the first article of the Treaty it was made as clear as words could make it that high and strong above all mere monetary and material considerations the question of national honour and national sentiment was regarded as of paramount importance, and was deemed indeed the most essential condition of the union.

So far well. But how in these later generations has this condition of the great Treaty been kept? It is not going beyond the truth when we say that, by the great majority of the English people, this primary condition of the national compact is regarded as one which is now non-existent; and that while the Scots may share equally with the English in the trade and commerce of the Empire, they shall do so only as a portion of and under the name of the English people. In other words, they are to be placed in the position not of a partner, but of a clerk or assistant, who cares nothing for personal dignity or honour so long as he gets a share of the profits of the business. A share, moreover, which under the *regime* of British free trade is now open to all the

peoples of the earth as well as to the people of Scotland.

This, then, is the position in which the injustice and the faithlessness of the English people seek now to place the people of Scotland. Eager as they were to induce the Scots to join them as partners, now that they have gained their point they openly repudiate the terms of their partnership, and practically treat Scotland as if it were a province of England. It is urged as an excuse for this unfairness that it is only a fashion of speech; but in this case words mean things, and the so-called mere fashion of speech directly implies the subjugation of Scotland by England. In other words the so-called harmless usage is in reality as gross an outrage as one nation can inflict on another without a resort to material subjugation and conflict.

The strenuous and continued agitation of the Scottish people during the last quarter of a century against this unjust treatment of their national rights has brought the question very prominently before the English people. No intelligent Englishman can now fairly say that he is ignorant of the right of Scotland to have a share in the national glory of the British Empire as exemplified in the use of the terms "Britain" and "British" in an Imperial sense. Yet despite this almost universal knowledge, Englishmen, by an overwhelming majority, speak and write as if they had the sole claim to be representatives of the Empire. And further than this, they refuse in their press to discuss the question, and thus prevent Scottish people from making known

in England the injustice with which they are treated. Let any indignant Scot, for example, attempt to defend the honour of his country by writing to an English newspaper on this subject, and in nine cases out of ten, probably in nineteen cases out of twenty, he will find that his complaint is treated with contempt, and publicity or a discussion of the wrong is refused to him. Here then we have the great gravity of the charge against the English people. They prate about their love of justice, and would wish to make the world understand that the term "English fair play" is a great practical truth. But alas, whenever the question of fair play conflicts with English vanity, it is the latter that triumphs and the former that is cast down.

The grievous wrong thus inflicted on the Scottish people becomes more glaring when we consider the important part which they have taken in the building up of the British Empire. It may be truly said that in such work every Scot has been equal to three Englishmen, if indeed the proportion may not be extended further in favour of the hardy and enterprising Scot. Go to Canada and the impartial observer will find that the population of Scottish is about equal to those of English descent. While if the result of the action of the two races in the way of colonisation be considered, it will be found, as we have said, that the Scots are superior to the English by at least three or four to one. So low indeed has the English element fallen in the estimation of the Canadian people, that when a call is made for workers the

terribly insulting notice is sometimes publicly made known, "No English need apply," and this in a great nascent empire which the complacent and bumptious home-staying Englishman arrogantly talks of as one of *his* colonies. In Australia, New Zealand and South Africa the same feature is observable, though in a less striking degree. There, the Scots, though forming only a fourth or a fifth of the population, as compared with the English proportion of more than half, hold almost an equal position in all the important work of empire—that relating to law excepted. For the obvious reason, that as English law forms the basis of Colonial law, the Scottish emigrants are all but debarred from such an outlet for their ability; at least in the first generation.

Here then we are confronted with the important fact that while the Scots have at least doubly done their duty as builders of the British Empire, they find themselves checked and maltreated by their English fellow-subjects in pure despite of Treaty rights and of the solemnly-pledged faith of the Parliament of England. And while this glaring measure of injustice is dealt out to the Scots, not merely in the matter of national sentiment, but also in grossly material affairs, a very different policy is adopted by the English majority in the British Parliament towards the people of Ireland. While Scotland has to fight for years to get her most urgent needs attended to, the demands of the Irish members of Parliament, in almost every question but the granting of Home Rule, are

most obsequiously granted, whether the party in power be Liberal or Conservative. How then arises this difference of treatment? The answer is a sad one, but it is plain and undeniable. The brutal English majority in Parliament turns all but a deaf ear to the manifold requirements of Scotland, because the Scottish people are peaceful and law-abidding—but it truckles to the remonstrances and complaints—civil and religious—of the Irish people, because they resort to violent means if their demands are refused. The inference then is obvious and inevitable. That the English people have to be, so to speak, kicked into fair play if the exercise of fair play in the slightest degree interferes with their national interest or their national vanity. They are quite ready—indeed go out of their way—to back up and cry out for justice to the Poles and fair play to the Danes, the Finns, the Slovaks, the Mohmands or to any of the minor and oppressed peoples under the sun so long as it is safe to do so. But when justice and fair play are demanded in the British Parliament for the Scots and the Welsh it is found that a deaf ear is turned to the demands of these two peoples because they are law-abiding, while the two political parties, which are controlled by and give the full voice of Englishmen—the Conservatives and the Liberals—tumble over each other in endeavouring to meet the demands of the turbulent and unruly Irish members. In other words, the policy of the English people is the policy of the bully, which only yields to fear.

It is high time then that the Scottish people should clearly realise this view of the situation, and refuse any longer to be dragged at the heels of the two great political parties. Let a purely independent Scottish party be formed pledged to independent action. Or if they form any alliance at all, let it be with the Irish and Welsh parties in Parliament for the purpose of compelling England to do justice to the minor nationalities of Britain. Hitherto England has acted the part of a big political bully, who has taken advantage of his brutal majority to over-ride the reasonable wants and wishes of Scotland and Wales. And when she has yielded to Ireland, as in the case of the land question, she has only done so through fear. It is well then that the Scottish democracy should realise the facts of the political situation, and act accordingly. Historically, the Scottish people hold a position infinitely higher than that of their southern neighbours. They are willing to join the latter with them, and so stand before the world as representatives of the one country—*Britannia Magna*—which has never been conquered. But to throw away this precious heritage—unique in history—and accept in its place the position of a partner in a name—England—which represents successive conquests and shameful subjugations would be an act of national folly almost unparalleled in history.

Who then in Scotland shall take the lead in this movement for the assertion and maintenance of Scottish rights? Clearly not the nobility; for with a few exceptions

they have become Anglicised, and have betrayed the interests of their country. To a large extent, also, the professional and commercial classes have either followed in the footsteps of the nobility or have been so immersed in the noble art of making money that they have been quite indifferent to the maintenance of their country's rights or the redressing of their country's wrongs. No. Sad experience tells us that it is not to these classes, but as in the days of Wallace, it is to the Scottish commonalty we must look for the redemption of Scotland from its condition of political serfdom to England. It is to the Scottish commonalty then—to the Scottish democracy—that *The Thistle* appeals for the maintenance of Scottish interests and of Scottish national honour. As in the days of the ruffianly Edward the First, the fight for freedom was carried on by Wallace and the Scottish commonalty, so now in these days Scotland must look for the maintenance of her position against English aggression to her sturdy democracy. Let then a Scottish National party be formed, and let England see that she will have to reckon with such, and not with a party composed largely of political indifferentists, and she will quickly begin to treat Scotland with respect and with justice. But not before.

---

No. III.

### THE AUSTRALIAN COAT OF ARMS.

**D**URING the last few months English aggression has broken out in a new sphere of mischief, and

for the time has gained a success over the, at present, disunited peoples of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. In the early part of the year the Commonwealth Cabinet of Australia decided to have an Australian coat of arms, as they termed it, to place in the front of the new building shortly to be erected in the Strand, London, for the transaction of Commonwealth business. The affair was bungled from the beginning. Mr Deakin, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth—a most amiable and eloquent gentleman, but rather weak-willed—is of English descent, but is by no means bigoted or unfair in the expression of his nationality. On the contrary, he is quite conscious of the claims of the minor nationalities of Britain to fair treatment as regards their national sentiment; and last summer, when in London, wrote to the Council of the St Andrew Society of Edinburgh, and assured it that he always used the terms “Britain and British,” instead of “England and English,” when dealing with Imperial affairs. When, therefore, it was announced in an Australian newspaper—*The Melbourne Leader*—that his Ministry had instructed the English Garter King-at-Arms to design a coat of arms, and that he had sent to London a design, in which the English Cross of St George was the central emblazonment, the St Andrew Society of Edinburgh naturally, and with much hope of amendment, sent to Melbourne a protest against such unfairness. This protest was backed up by one from the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow, and hopes were entertained that the unfairness.

in the original design would be given up, and a badge chosen which would be fair to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, and not one which represented them as subject peoples of England.

Alas, the arrogance of bumptious Englishmen has no limits, and is not deprived of its virulence, even when it comes from the Antipodes. Mr Deakin replied, through his secretary, that an amended design had been sent to Garter King-at-Arms, in which the claim of Scotland to recognition would be recognised in the colouring of the shield. This was not regarded as satisfactory by the St Andrew Society, and a further protest was being prepared, when in reply to an enquiry made in the British Parliament by Mr Robert Duncan, the member for Govan, he was informed that the affair was at an end; that new instructions had been sent from Melbourne to Garter King-at-Arms, who had prepared a design which had been approved by the King, and therefore the matter was settled.

#### THE NEW DESIGN.

The character of the approved coat of arms has now been made public, and the weakness of Mr Deakin in the matter is transparent. The most active member of his Cabinet is Sir William Lyne, who is a fair colonial representative of the bumptious and arrogant Englishmen so well known to us in Britain. We think we only do Sir William Lyne justice when we say that the coat of arms now approved of and adopted for the Australian Commonwealth is one of which he entirely

approves, and that it embodies his view of what such a badge should be. It consists of a shield, which is supported by a kangaroo on the right, and an emu on the left. Over the shield is a star, and beneath is the motto, "ADVANCE AUSTRALIA." In the centre of the shield, and constituting the chief and central emblem of it, is a St George's Cross, on the body of which are five stars intended to represent the Southern Cross, one of the chief constellations of the southern sky. The St George's Cross is thus made the chief feature of the coat of arms, and the claim of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales to recognition is ignored, or recognised, if recognised at all, in the heraldic representation in colours of red, white, and blue. As two of these colours are claimed by England, viz., the red and the white, the one-sided and grossly unfair character of the design is made more painfully apparent by the subsidiary features of the emblazonment. It is well also to remark that the design was carried through by Garter King-at-Arms, the English representative of heraldry, and approved by the king with suspicious haste. We believe that the Lord Lyon King-of-Arms, as representing Scotland, and Ulster King-of-Arms, as representing Ireland, were not consulted in the matter.

#### HIS MAJESTY'S ACTION.

As His Majesty is the constitutional guardian of the national honour of Scotland and Ireland, as well as of England, it was part of his duty to see that the right of these two kingdoms to be repre-

sented in a coat of arms representing a British dependency should have been recognised. But this part of his regal duty was entirely ignored by His Majesty, and probably the occasion was deemed an excellent one for him to give one more opportunity of showing his dislike to Scotland, and his contempt for her national sentiment and her national honour.

#### THE ABSURDITY OF THE DESIGN FOR A DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE

So far as we know, the question of what should constitute the Australian coat of arms never came before the people of Australia, but was decided by the ministry, or more probably by a member of it. However that may be, the incongruity of the decision is apparent. Australia is a democratic community of the most advanced kind; and if the question of a national coat of arms for the Commonwealth were to be decided by its people after due deliberation, there can be no doubt that its choice would be, as in the United States, the conventional eagle, seeing that there is no member of the Australian *fauna* sufficiently dignified or important to be chosen as a national emblem. If such were not the choice, and if resort were had to the heraldry of the mother country, then the Australian people would be untrue to the principles of democracy if they failed to recognise the rights and to honour the national feeling of the four peoples who have helped to build up the Australian Commonwealth. They would not be guided by the English Garter King-at-

Arms, who is simply the representative and modern exponent of the exploded ideas of an archaic state of affairs when the people were treated as serfs without political rights, and the nobility, who oppressed them, were regarded as the only representatives of the nation. The claims of the Scottish and the Irish peoples would be considered and recognised as well as those of the English. But a democracy, true to its principles, would not stop here. It would remedy the flagrant wrong of centuries of contumely and oppression, and would, with true and not false chivalry, give to "gallant little Wales" a place in the quartering of the Australian shield. On that the English Leopards should, doubtless, have the place of honour, as representing the most numerous, though by no means the most enterprising, nationality; then should come the Scottish Lion, as representing the oldest and most independent nationality of Britain; to be followed in the other quarters of the shield with the Irish Harp and the Welsh Dragon.

Such an emblazonment—if one of a heraldic character were chosen—would have been a just and democratic representation of Australian national life, inasmuch as it would be a recognition of the national sentiment of the four British peoples. But apparently the bumptious arrogance of a "hustling" member of the Australian Cabinet, probably aided by the officious zeal of some Anglican subordinates, has for a time foisted on the Australian democracy a coat of arms, the dominating feature of which is a St George's

Cross, the emblem of a foreign dynasty—the Plantagenets, which for centuries held the people of England under the most abject thralldom. And this is the emblem that Australian democracy is now asked to bow down to and worship as the sign of a new and free nationality! Truly national hoodwinking seems to be an easy matter—for a time.

—o—

No. IV

### THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL

WE regret we are forced to hold over the text of Mr Pirie's Scottish Home Rule Bill, the first reading of which was carried by a majority of 155. Our readers will see when the text is published how moderate and how reasonable it is in its clauses and in its general purport. It simply aims to give to the Scottish people the power to legislate for purely Scottish affairs; just as power is given in Australia, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa for the peoples there to manage their own affairs, unmeddled with, or undelayed by the assumption of supreme controlling power on the part of the British Parliament. The case for the Bill can be put even in a stronger light. For in Canada and Australia there are supreme Parliaments—supreme, that is, over purely Canadian and Australian affairs. Yet these supreme Parliaments leave the purely state business, pertaining to the various States of the Dominion and the Commonwealth, to the State Legislatures. So that there is an exemption within an exemption in these two outlying "Britains beyond the Seas,"

from the control or meddling in their affairs of the Imperial Parliament. And it may be said here, and very plainly, that if these great British Communities were not made free from British parliamentary meddling and muddling, or from what would be still more disastrous, the denial of parliamentary action to meet current and pressing wants, the British Empire would not long continue to hold these great and growing powers under its flag.

Then why is such a power of sub-national legislation, as we may term it, denied to Scotland, and also to Ireland and to Wales. It is simply due to the innate selfishness and wretched Toryism of the majority of the English people. *They* can manage to get English affairs carried through in Parliament, for the simple reason that they hold more than two-thirds of the voting power; and knowing this, they turn a deaf ear to the crying wants of Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen. It may be said that an English majority has, on more than one occasion, voted for Home Rule for Scotland and for Ireland. But what avails this when it does not become law. The House of Lords objects. Yes, the House of Lords is the stronghold of English Toryism, and, of course, it objects. But if the English people suffered under as great disabilities from the want of self-government as do now, the Scots, Irish and Welsh, can it be doubted for a moment that long ere this the House of Lords would have been coerced into submission by the indignant and enraged English people? No. The House of Lords is only an

obstacle to Home Rule all round, because the English people are practically indifferent to the political necessities of Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

As for Mr Balfour's objection to Home Rule legislation that it would enable Scots, Irish and Welsh members to control or meddle with purely English legislation, while English members would have nothing to do with purely Scots, Irish and Welsh legislation; it is altogether beside or outside the question. It is a mere throwing of dust in the eyes of the English people. Have *they* not got the power to assume Home Rule for themselves, when they grant it to the minor nationalities? Such an argument then is not an argument for enlightenment, but for humbug. It is simply an appeal to the stupidity and the selfishness of the English people, not to their reason or to their better nature. It is an argument good enough for the House of Lords perhaps, and no doubt there it will be regarded as conclusive as against Home Rule. And perhaps ere long it will become apparent to the great majority of the British people that a thorough and radical reform of the House of Lords is the most urgent political measure that is now before them. It is there that the obstacle to all political progress in Britain lies. At present we do not have popular government. We have only government by a privileged class. And it is only when that class becomes afraid—not when it becomes convinced—that it yields to popular pressure. Must we then establish terrorism as a leading feature of the British Constitution?

### SCOTLAND'S DAY

UNDER this heading, Bannockburn Day, the 24th of June 1314, was celebrated at the grounds of the Scottish National Exhibition, Edinburgh. The Earl of Cassillis presided at a meeting which was held in the Concert Hall, and which was fairly well attended. Sheriff Ferguson, K.C., in the course of an address, said that "Scottish patriotism had always combined in a remarkable degree the spirit of liberty with the spirit of loyalty." He pointed out also that the use of the expression "Anglo-Saxon," to denote the people of the United Kingdom, was false in fact. The expression "Anglo-Celtic" would be more correct, as regarded the United Kingdom as a whole, but the name they gloried in was that of Britons. (Applause).

Mr William Laurie of the Scottish Rights Society, Greenock, also spoke, and said he thought the King could have prevented that disagreeable and uncalled-for numeral that he allowed to be put upon his title. His Majesty knew history perfectly well, and knew that he was not entitled to be called Edward VII. (of Great Britain).

[The expression "Anglo-Celtic," recommended by Sheriff Ferguson, though better than the absurd and narrow term "Anglo-Saxon," is still misleading. The proper term for the mingled races of Britain is "Teuto-Celtic" or "Teuto-Briton." The tribe of Angles was the most insignificant branch of the Teutonic race that overran and conquered England.]

EDITOR.

**THE AUSTRALIAN COAT OF ARMS—  
A SCOTTISH PATRIOTIC PROTEST.**

THE following protest of the St Andrew Society of Edinburgh was forwarded to the Right Hon. Alfred Deakin, Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, in the beginning of the year. A similar protest was also sent by the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow:—

“SIR,—Our attention has been drawn to a statement in the *Melbourne Leader* of the 9th of November last, that your Government is now making arrangements to have a coat of arms for the Commonwealth; and on application being made by a member of our Council to Captain R. Muirhead Collins, R.N., C.M.G., your representative in London, we find the statement confirmed.

“From the description given in the *Leader*, it appears that the central portion of the heraldic design, which has been prepared by the Garter King at Arms of England, is a St George’s Cross, the badge or device of England. From the description given by the *Leader*, this appears to be the only national device in any way connected with the four nationalities or races of the United Kingdom; not one of the other three peoples of the United Kingdom, viz., the Scots, the Irish, or the Welsh, being represented in any way whatsoever.

“It appears to us that in this action on the part of your Government a very grave and serious blunder has been committed. A coat of arms, or heraldic device, intended to represent the Commonwealth of Australia should not be one which only represents the English people. That

people, though no doubt the most numerous of the British peoples in the Commonwealth, only exceeds the aggregate of the other peoples by a very small proportion, probably not exceeding in all five per cent. of the total population.

“Under such circumstances we beg most respectfully to say, that not only are you acting unfairly to the non-English part of the people of Australia, but that you are unnecessarily and improperly casting a slight on their national sentiment, and are thus originating a grievance and a soreness which will always be felt more or less by the non-English portion of the Australian people.

“As many of our countrymen are already citizens of the Commonwealth, and as more are constantly migrating to your shores to become permanent residents, we feel it our duty to protest most respectfully, but most firmly, against this proposed slight to their national sentiment. We trust that your Government will see fit either to do away altogether with the St George’s Cross, or to so amend the device as to make it representative of the United Kingdom.”

STAIR, *Hon. President.*

DAVID MACRITCHIE, *President.*

CASSILLIS, *Vice-President.*

J. HARVEY SHAND, *Vice-President.*

HUGH BEVERIDGE, *Secretary.*

The following reply was returned to both of the societies in question:—

MELBOURNE, 14th March 1908.

SIR,—In acknowledging the receipt of your letter of the 1st February relative to the proposed coat

of arms for the Commonwealth, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that when the design containing the red cross was approved, it was for reasons of symmetry only, and without any thought of the fact that any cross of the shape might be taken to be St George's, and as such an emblem of one part only of the United Kingdom.

The due recognition of the several parts of the several parts of the United Kingdom is intentionally provided, as far as circumstances permit, in an amended design which has been forwarded to the Imperial authorities, in which it has been suggested that the colours on the shield shall be red, white, and blue. It has been pointed out that this has been done to preserve the traditional red, white, and blue of the British flag. As the blue in that flag is derived from the blue field of the Scottish national flag, the emblem of that part of the Empire finds recognition in the Australian coat of arms.—I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,

A —, *Secretary*.

In reply to the above, both societies renewed their protests, urging that the reply was not satisfactory. Subsequently the following letter was received from the agent of the Commonwealth in London in reply to an enquiry from a member of the St Andrew Society:—

72 VICTORIA STREET,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W., 9th May 1908.

DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter of the 6th instant, I beg to inform you that the Cross of St

George's "charged" with stars, to represent "The Southern Cross," forms the central "charge" on the new coat of arms of the Commonwealth.

The method whereby the colours of the arms in question will be shewn on the representation thereof to be placed outside the proposed offices in London has not been decided.—Yours faithfully,

R. MUIRHEAD COLLINS.

On the 12th May, Mr Robert Duncan, M.P. for Govan, brought the matter before Parliament in a question he asked of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. In reply, Colonel Seeley, the Under Secretary, said, "The design for the armorial bearings for the Commonwealth of Australia was settled in consultation with the Commonwealth government and their representative in this country. It was also submitted to Garter King-at-Arms, and had already received His Majesty's approval." Mr Duncan asked whether the Lyon King-of-Arms of Scotland had been consulted. The Under Secretary for the Colonies said he did not know \* \* \* but seeing the Garter King-at-Arms has approved it, I suppose that in heraldic language "it is all proper." (Laughter.)

It will be seen from the above with what contempt and levity the English majority treat the national sentiment of the other nationalities of the United Kingdom. In Mr Deakin's reply it is stated that the design containing the red cross was approved for reasons of symmetry only, and without any thought that

any cross of that shape might be taken to be St George's, and as such an emblem of one part only of the United Kingdom.

Then later the Agent of the Commonwealth in London boldly states that "the Cross of St George, charged with stars to represent the Southern Cross," forms the central "charge" on the new Coat of Arms of the Commonwealth. And this is followed by the statement in Parliament that the design had been submitted to Garter King-at-Arms (the Heraldic representative of England only), and had been approved by His Majesty.

A pretty specimen indeed of English arrogance and of English contempt for the national sentiment of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Meanwhile our leading article on the subject will be found on another page. We may here note that the blame rests not—except indirectly—with Mr Deakin, who is a fair-minded man, and is sympathetic in this matter. But at least one of his colleagues and some of the official subordinates have apparently run riot in the matter.

—o—

### SCOTTISH BUSINESS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

#### THE MORAY FIRTH QUESTION.

—During the last two months the Scots members in the House of Commons have on two or three occasions departed from their usual party servility, and have spoken out in a way that if persisted in would ere long ensure to them a little more decent treatment than is generally accorded to them. If it

is possible for a ministry—whether Liberal or Tory—to shunt a Scottish question, it is almost invariably done. The preservation of the Moray Firth as a fishing ground from so-called foreign trawlers is a case in point. If this had been an Irish question or an English question, it would have been settled in favour of the complainants long ere this; but being a Scottish one, it is being considered, and considered, and considered again, till by and bye there will be little left to be considered, for the fishery will be destroyed. What, for instance, is to prevent the Government from doubling, or even trebling, the number of the Admiralty cruisers that look after illegal trawling? That would be something which it is not necessary to consult foreign governments about. But no. It is a Scottish question, and what is the use of bothering about that. Then the speed of these vessels, why is not that increased? At present the Government cruisers are from ten to eleven knot corvettes. Why should they not have a speed of from fifteen to sixteen knots? But anything is good enough for a Scottish service!

THE "SCOTCH" EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.—An animated debate on the question of the proper nomenclature to be used for this Department took place in the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills on the 9th July. At present the Department is termed "Scotch," and is thus linked with whisky, shortbread, tweeds, canniness, meanness, and everything that the vulgar English choose to associate with

Scotland. A vigorous effort was made to have this undignified term altered to "Scottish," but it was of course ineffectual. The Secretary for Scotland was not merely unsympathetic, but was brusque even to rudeness. We have not room for the discussion which took place, but need only mention that nearly all the Scottish members—even including the semi-Anglicised ex-Secretary of the "Scotch" Education Board, Sir Henry Craik—spoke strongly in favour of the alteration of the term "Scotch" to Scottish. There was only one exception, viz., Sir George Macrae, who feared "the members were making themselves ridiculous."

On the 14th July, Mr Pirie was received with cheers when he rose to move that the office of the Department should be in Scotland. This was opposed by the Secretary for Scotland, and was defeated by 34 votes to 17. Evidently the Scots members generally care more for party ties, than for the interests of Scotland.

---

#### THE VATERSAY PRISONERS

THESE men were released from prison on Saturday, the 18th July, at the request of Lady Cathcart, their landlady. We are compelled to hold over, with other matter, an article which deals with this incident and the Scottish Land Question generally.

---

#### THE KING AND THE RADICAL PARTY

THE sickening cant, so common in the London press, as to the marvellous tact of the King, has

at last received a check. The striking out, in the list of invitations to the Royal Garden Party, of four members of the Radical party, who in the House of Commons spoke against the King's visit to the Czar at Reval, has shown pretty clearly what has long been obvious to every observant Scot, that His Majesty, instead of being a courteous gentleman and a man of tact, is capable of great rudeness, where it is safe to indulge in rudeness, and is, moreover, one who is not merely ill-tempered, but is deeply vindictive. His treatment of Scotland shows the latter trait very conclusively. In his treatment of the four members of the Radical party, His Majesty has made a blunder so obvious, that his adulators are compelled to pause and to try and place it on the shoulders of the Lord Chamberlain or some other thoughtless Court official. But on this head there can be no mistake. The act was the act of the King personally, and not of any official. But the tact which was wanting before will come later on. Ere long it will be seen that His Majesty will try to atone for his blunder in some way or other, for the Radical parliamentary party is powerful, and unlike the Scottish members, sticks together and will brook no insults. The insult to them will not be repeated. The Labour party at a meeting subsequent to the insult, agreed to stick together, and refuse invitations from Royalty in future, in this regard giving a lesson to the Scottish nobility who tamely submitted to insult in the precedence question.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 2.

September 1908

Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL . . . . .	18
CORRESPONDENCE . . . . .	18
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 5.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . . . . .	18
„ 6.—THE LAND QUESTION . . . . .	23
„ 7.—PRESBYTERIAN SOLDIERS IN INDIA . . . . .	24
TEXT OF THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL . . . . .	26
GOVERNMENT TREATMENT OF SCIENCE IN SCOTLAND . . . . .	31
THE KING OF "ENGLAND" . . . . .	32
THE WALLACE COMMEMORATION AT ROBROYSTON . . . . .	32



PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH,  
AND PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR BY  
THE SCOTTISH NEWSPAPER PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,  
8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.



# The Thistle

No. 2.

SEPTEMBER 1908.

MONTHLY 1D.

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls of Menzies & Co. in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow.*

## THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL

WE publish in this issue the full text of Mr D. Y. Pirie's Home Rule Bill for Scotland, chiefly for the benefit of our readers in the British Colonies.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

CHARACTERISTICALLY enough, the first welcome we have received, apart from personal friends, is from an Irish correspondent in far away Waterford. The Irish are an alert race, and are quick to show their sympathy and approval. So Mr Edmund Harvey of Suir View, Waterford, writes to welcome our appearance.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. V.

### HEAD LINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE FIGHT WITH ROME, A.D. 80-420

FROM the earliest dawn of history mankind has been engaged in almost incessant warfare. Empires have risen and fallen. Great conquerors have appeared and disappeared, and always two great principles have been the incentives to action, whether offensive or defensive. Religion and Liberty or Freedom have been the chief motives which have made man the fighting animal of the ages. Whether on the offensive or the defensive, it has been that one race or nation has endeavoured to impose its form of religion on its neighbours; or proud of its strength, has tried to make its neighbours subject to its power—thus evoking in opposition the desire for liberty, for freedom, which all virile races have regarded as a pearl beyond price. In these two great lines of human action the Scottish race has attained a pre-eminence which has given them a high place among the nations, not, of course,

for the magnitude of the work done by it—its limited numbers precluded that—but for the quality shown by it, alike in its long continued and successful struggle for national independence against the Romans, the Danes and the English, and in its fight for religious liberty in the time of the Reformation and of the Covenant.

It is with the long continued fight for national independence that we now propose to deal. Modern Scots, especially those of the younger generation who have been educated in a system tainted and contaminated by the baser influences of England, have, we fear, failed to appreciate the unique position that their country holds in history. They are either unaware or are apt to forget that in the history of their country they have a PRICELESS HERITAGE, which is not only their duty, but ought to be their pride to cherish and uphold to the uttermost, and which they ought not to allow to be blemished or lessened by any material considerations, howsoever great or tempting they may be. We will endeavour to lay before them the grounds on which our estimate of Scotland's position in history is based.

Caledonia steps proudly and boldly into the ken of history in the time of the Roman invasion of Britain. It is in the glowing pages of Tacitus that she may be said to have received her historical baptism. The Roman arms had thoroughly subdued South Britain, but not without a vigorous resistance. One hundred and thirty-five years after the first landing of Cæsar on the coast of

Kent, "Agricola led the Roman army across the debatable land of the Scottish border, and began to hew a way through the Caledonian forests." The districts south of the Tay were overrun, but somewhere in Perthshire—the best authorities place the locality in the Stormont, the district lying between Coupar-Angus and Dunkeld and between the Tay and the Lower Grampians—the Caledonians, under a chief called Galgacus, made a stand, and a desperate battle ensued. According to the Roman authorities, the Caledonians were defeated; but if so, it must have been but a Pyrrhic victory for the Romans, for their advance was stayed, and they soon began to erect a line of forts between the Forth and the Clyde, thus virtually acknowledging a repulse. What kind of people they were that then peopled Scotland north of the Tay historians do not say. They seem to accept the theory that they were Celts, and of the same race that peopled the island from the Forth to the Isle of Wight. This is not our view. The facts all go to show—if not to prove—that north of the Tay, there was a much harder stratum of mankind than those who peopled the south—a people more powerful in body and more resolute and unflinching in spirit. Tacitus, in his brief but illuminative way, makes this clear, for he points out that the soldiers of Galgacus were men of ruddy hair and large limbs. Now these were clearly not Celts, who had swarthy complexions and dark hair. It seems to us, then, that the district of Scotland extending from the Tay to the Moray

Firth had been overrun in prehistoric times—as the Western Highlands were subsequently from the seventh to the eleventh centuries—by a wave of Norsemen from Scandinavia, and these mingling with the original Celtic inhabitants had evolved a hardy and indomitable race, that brought even the Roman advance to a standstill. But on this head we shall probably have more to say by and bye.

In his learned work, "Prehistoric Annals of Scotland," Dr, afterwards Sir Daniel Wilson, gives an admirable account of the doings of the Romans in Scotland. There is no touch of high colouring in his narrative; but simply a measured and impartial account of the Roman advance, check, defensive attitude; and finally the withdrawal to the wall of Hadrian between the Tyne and the Solway. Hadrian became Emperor in A.D. 117, and when he visited Britain "the chief memorial he left of the imperial presence," says Sir Daniel, "was the vallum which bore his name, extending between the Solway and the Tyne. Up to this period, therefore, it is obvious that the Roman legions had established no permanent footing in Caledonia. \* \* \* Nor was it till the accession of Titus Antoninus Pius to the Imperial throne, and the appointment of Lollius Urbicus to the command in Britain, nearly two centuries after the first landing of Cæsar in England, that any portion of our northern kingdom acquired a claim to the title of *Caledonia Romana*. Lollius Urbicus, the legate of Antoninus, fixed the northern limits of Roman Empire

on the line previously marked out by the forts of Agricola, and beyond that boundary, extending between the Forth and the Clyde, the chief traces of the presence of the Romans are a few earthworks and some chance discoveries, chiefly of pottery and coins, ascribable it may be to such fruitless northern expeditions as that of Agricola, after the victory of Mons. Grampius, or the still more ineffectual one of Severus. \* \* \*

The reign of Commodus was marked by a still more determined rising of the North. The Caledonian Britons again took to arms; assailed the legions with irresistible force; defeated them, and slew their general; broke through the rampart of Antoninus, and penetrated unchecked into the most fertile districts of the Roman province lying between the walls of Hadrian and Antoninus. Another legate, Ulpus Marcellus, had to hasten from Rome to arrest the Caledonian invaders, and a few more years of doubtful peace was secured to the Northern province. Severus succeeded to the purple A.D. 197, learned that the Caledonian Britons were once more within the ineffectual ramparts, and after a few years of timid negotiation, rather than of determined opposition to these hardy Northern tribes, Virius Lupus, the legate of Severus, was compelled to own that the occupation of *Britannia Barbara* was hopeless. The aged Emperor immediately commenced preparations for marching in person against the Northern foe. About 208 he effected his purpose, and entered Caledonia at the head of an overwhelming force; but it was in vain,

He penetrated, indeed, as far it is thought as the Moray Firth, but only to return with numbers greatly reduced to fix once more the limits of Roman empire where they had been before marked out by the wall of Hadrian, between the Solway and the Tyne. It is possible indeed that the northern wall was not immediately abandoned. At Cramond have been found both coins and medals of Caracalla and Diocletian. The Roman tenure of the North, however, was manifestly insecure, and the successor of Severus was little likely to recover what that able emperor had been compelled to abandon. A period of sixty-eight years is thus the utmost that can be assigned for this occupation of the country to the north of the Tyne and south of the Forth as a Roman province, and the history of that brief era is amply sufficient to justify the oft-claimed title—whatever be its value—of the unconquered Caledonians. \* \* \* “The successors of Severus were glad to secure the forbearance of the Northern tribes on any terms; and for seventy-three years after the departure of his sons from Britain its name is scarcely mentioned by any Roman writer. In subsequent allusions to the restless inroads of the Caledonians on the Southern province, they are mentioned for the first time in the beginning of the fourth century by the name of Picts; but it is not till the reign of the Emperor Valentinian, A.D. 367, that we find the Roman legions under Theodosius effectually coping with the northern invaders, and recovering the abandoned country between

the walls of Antoninus and Severus. This was now at length converted into a Roman province, and received the name of Valentia in honour of the Emperor, and to this latter occupation should probably be ascribed many of the traces of the Roman occupation between the Solway and the Forth, which were still unoccupied when Ptolemy recorded the details of British geography in the second century. But the meagre history of Roman Scotland is that of a frontier province. The Picts were ever ready to sally forth from their mountain fastnesses on the slightest appearance of insecurity or intermitted watchfulness. Again and again they ravaged the Southern provinces, and returned loaded with spoil. \* \* \* Early in the fifth century, about the year 422, a Roman legion made its appearance in Scotland for the last time \* \* \* but it was no longer possible to retain the province of Valentia. The legionary colonists and the Romanised Britons were advised to abandon it, and they once more withdrew within the older limits fixed by Severus on the line of Hadrian's Wall. So ended the second and last Roman occupation of Southern Scotland, extending over a period of about fifty years. \* \* \* The presence of the Romans in Scotland under the earlier emperors \* \* \* was little more than an occupation of military posts. Their second settlement in the latter end of the fourth century was the precarious establishment of a Roman province on a frontier station, and within sight of a foe ever watching the opportunity for

invasion and spoil. Hence the paucity of Roman remains in Scotland, and the trifling influence exercised by Roman civilisation on its ancient arts." (Prehistoric Annals of Scotland, Vol. II., pp. 26-32).

Here then we have from the pen of an able and impartial writer a narrative of the attempted conquest of Scotland by the mighty power of Rome. It is a narrative of which Scotsmen may be proud, for it conclusively shows that within the limits of Caledonia there was a race of men of indomitable courage and of unswerving resolution who brought the Roman advance to a standstill, and even drove it back to a line south of the borders of modern Scotland. English writers in their usual fashion say that the Romans did not conquer Scotland because they found it so poor a country that it was not worth conquering. But Roman pride was not of the ignoble character of English pride. They took pride in conquest for the sake of conquest, and, besides, they knew that they would find in Caledonia, if they had been able to subdue it, as they subdued Southern Britain—the modern England—that which they valued more than a rich country, viz., a race of men of the hardest character who could face any kind of hardship, and who, moreover, were unsurpassed as men of war. To Rome, always looking out for brave auxiliaries to assist in her career of conquest, such a race of warriors would have been of infinite value, and had she succeeded, she would have drafted the Caledonians to her armies in Africa,

and perchance even to Eastern Europe and to Asia. Roman emperors then did not leave their capital, and lead powerful armies to invade Caledonia for the lust of conquest only—though that also was doubtless with them a powerful motive. There can be no doubt that Rome tried what was then its best to conquer Caledonia, and had to acknowledge defeat, partly from the character of the country, but chiefly from the indomitable character of the men who peopled the provinces north of Tay, and extending to the Moray Firth. Tacitus, in describing the appearance of these men, says, as we have already noted, "Thus the ruddy hair and large limbs of the Caledonians point out a German derivation." But "ruddy" hair is not a peculiarity of the Germans, but of the Norsemen and of the Danes—that of the Saxons or Southern Germans being of a light or flaxen colour. The Caledonians then at the time of the Roman invasion were of a much more mixed race than the inhabitants of Southern Britain, and even at that time seem to have been, at least north of Tay, a people of mingled Norse and Celtic blood, such as is now a predominant feature of the modern Scots.

In her onward career of conquest in Africa, in Asia, and in North Eastern Europe, Rome was not stayed by the resistance of the peoples she met, but by the difficulties and dangers arising from the character of the countries she tried to subdue. The cold and inhospitable steppes of Scythia—modern Russia—the wild and mountainous

character of eastern Asia, and the burning and waterless deserts and vast expanses of Africa were barriers that in those days it was difficult, if not impossible, to overcome. But in Caledonia there were no such insuperable obstacles. The sea coast was open to the Roman fleets along and round which they sailed without opposition. But on land there was the indomitable and unconquerable people whose pride could not be tamed, and whose resistance could not be overcome. After a century of persistent, and two centuries more of desultory efforts to conquer Caledonia, the Romans were completely baffled, and when they were compelled to abandon Britain, the Caledonians held the proud position of being the only British people that had maintained their freedom. So far, then, we modern Scots may well be proud of the first appearance our ancestors made in the historical period. Alone, or almost alone among nations, they baffled and repulsed Rome!

---

No. VI.

### THE LAND QUESTION

THE case of the Vatersay Squatters brings again into prominence the great—the everlasting importance of the Land question to the people of the British Isles. These poor, struggling crofters, who in despair of getting a foothold in the land of their birth on which to maintain and rear their families, went and squatted on a few acres of land in the island of Vatersay belonging to Lady Gordon Cathcart,

with the result that they were sentenced to two months' imprisonment. It is only fair to Lady Cathcart to say that she personally is said to be of a kindly disposition, but, like nearly all landholders, she is guided as to the control of her landed property by her factors or agents. Almost universally in the Highlands and not seldom elsewhere, these factors have a great aversion to leasing the land of their principals to small holders. They prefer to have tenants who occupy considerable areas; for then they have little trouble in collecting rents; and probably also they have in that matter more certainty in the matter of collection. But when the question of property in land comes to be fully and fairly considered, it is found that the mere monetary convenience or interest, even of the landlord or his agents, is by no means the most important matter. There is beyond and above that, the interest of the State, for whom, going to the root of the matter, the landlord himself is neither more nor less than an agent. This principle holds good especially, and indeed is of the first importance, as regards agricultural, or even pastoral lands; for as the importance, and even the very existence of a state depends on the comfort, wellbeing, and number of the people who occupy its territory, it is clear that the rights of landlords must be subject to the interests of the State. It is obvious that in the Highlands of Scotland this principle is ignored, or at all events is far from being recognised to the extent that the welfare of the country demands. Indeed, in

the matter of deer forests, it is a public scandal, how the interests of the landlords are allowed to overlap and destroy the interests of the State; and the so-called sport of monied men is allowed to make desolate millions of acres, from which, at one time, the finest soldiers of the Empire were obtained in tens of thousands. This infamy must be put a stop to at whatever cost. The British people must make it known, and with no uncertain voice, that the land must be administered for the benefit of the people, and if the obstacle to such a consummation be the House of Lords, then the House of Lords must be amended or stricken down, whatever the cost may be. The temporary loss of a Second Chamber will be a small price to pay for the amendment or even the destruction of an infamous land system; for the good sense of the British people will in good time, re-establish a Second Chamber of a character which will not be an instrument for the aggrandisement of the landlords, and for the debasement of the people, but will be simply a check on party and ill-considered legislation.

—o—

#### No. VII.

### PRESBYTERIAN SOLDIERS IN INDIA

THE question of providing churches in India for the use of Presbyterian soldiers, and for the other Protestant soldiers, who are not connected with the Church of England, again came before Parliament in the end of July. Mr MacLean, M.P. for Bath, who introduced the question, moved "that

in the opinion of this House, the churches in India, built or maintained wholly or in part by the government of India, should be available for the religious services of His Majesty's troops of all denominations." An animated debate ensued, in which Messrs Eugene Wason, Munro Ferguson, C. E. Price, A. C. Morton, Dundas White, Scottish members, and Mr Bright, M.P. for Oldham, took part. These members insisted that the government churches should be free and open to all British soldiers of whatever creed; but the Under-Secretary for India (Mr Buchanan), in his reply, stated that the Anglican Church authorities dominated the situation. He said that in 1899 the Government took legal opinion, which was confirmed by the law officers of the Crown, "to the effect that, under the form in which these churches were allowed to be consecrated, the Bishops had a right to exclude. They had the right side of the law, said Mr Buchanan, and it was useless to attempt to deny it. \* \* \* They could not go back on the agreement made with the authorities of these consecrated churches, supported as it was by legal opinion. It had been observed for nine years and was a binding arrangement. They could not force the Anglican bishops." It would appear from this that Anglican Church law and regulations are as supreme in British India as they are in England, and that once a church is consecrated by a Bishop of the Anglican Church that church *ipso facto*, becomes closed to the members of all other denominations;

at least to those who are Protestant. For it is part of the irony of the situation, whether the Roman Catholics have not a better claim to use such churches than have British Protestants, who are not in conformity with the Church of England. However that may be, it is, we think, clear that Mr Buchanan in his reply took up a position which is weak in the extreme, and which is quite unworthy of the representative of a strong Liberal government. In the first place, the legal opinion on which he stands so obstinately, is the opinion of the law officers of the Tory government of 1899. Surely the law officers of that time were not infallible. The question was not brought before the great Courts of Law, but was decided privately, and the present Liberal government is weak enough to bow down to that decision.

Now, while we are quite ready to admit that, as regards England, such a decision would be in accordance with law, it is quite another question when the venue is changed to a British dominion outside England. The question of international law then comes in, and the grave constitutional consideration arises, has England a right to assume that her canon law is binding in all parts of the British Empire. England is only one of two sovereign kingdoms who entered into a Treaty of Union and who each have separate and independent church establishments—the minor one as paramount in her own sphere, as the major one in hers. By what law then, does the major church claim to be paramount

in India as well as in England? If there is a law to that effect, duly passed by the British Parliament, or to be found in the articles of the Treaty of Union of 1706, then the question is settled. But if not, then we hold that international law comes in, and by that, Scotland has her status in India as well as England so far as regards matter ecclesiastic. England cannot force her canon law, outside England, on the conscience and convictions of members of the Church of Scotland, or on Scotsmen generally, whatever legal right she may have to do so on English Nonconformists; and here it is we think where Mr Buchanan is wrong. He regards the views of the English lawyers as infallible, forgetting that in such a question as this, English lawyers are too ready to assume that England is the Empire, and that English law is British law.

It is quite clear that the question should not and cannot be allowed to rest where it is. The Anglican Church during the last thirty years has been putting forth pretensions to ecclesiastical power and to social assumptions which it is difficult to reconcile with modern ideas of popular government. And in this matter of her assumption of supreme canonical power in India, it is high time that the matter be put to the test in the highest Courts of Law in the Empire. Should the law be found to be in her favour, then let the consecrated churches in India be entirely at her disposal until the indignant opinion of the British people compels Parliament to alter such a law, and allow all British

Protestant soldiers to worship in all churches built by government money. When a bigoted State church, as the Church of England now is, takes up a position inconsistent with modern ideas of religious liberty, a Liberal government should not hesitate to challenge its claims and powers and put them to the test of legality. In such a contest it is not the Government that will suffer, but the Church; for even should she gain her point in the Courts of Law, it would only result in her subsequent discomfiture by parliamentary action. These are not the days when a hierarchy shall override the State.

—o—

### TEXT OF THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE BILL

**S**UBJOINED is the text of this Bill, which was brought before the House of Commons in the last week of May by Mr D. V. Pirie, M.P. for North Aberdeen. Mr Pirie said: "The main purpose of the Bill was to devolve on a legislative body in Scotland the power to make laws on matters exclusively relating to Scotland. It specifically enumerated these matters, and there was no power to legislate on matters other than these specifically enumerated. The executive power continued with the Crown, and it was proposed to revive the old Scottish Privy Council, so that an executive might advise His Majesty as to what was most required for the Government of Scotland. Power was also given to impose taxes, except Customs and Excise duties, and arrangements were made for

the much-needed adjustment of the financial relations between Scotland and the Imperial Parliament. He wished to emphasise the fact that every provision of the Bill was subordinate, and subject to the paramount control of the Imperial Parliament."—(*Scotsman*). The voting for the first reading was 257, and against, 102, leaving a majority for the Bill of 155.

There was issued on 1st June the text of the Government of Scotland Bill, which was introduced in the House of Commons on Tuesday of last week by Mr Pirie, Radical member for North Aberdeen, and which is "backed" by the following other Scottish members of Parliament:—Mr Barnes, Mr Gulland, Mr Robert Harcourt, Mr Lamont, Mr Murray Macdonald, Captain Murray, Mr Ponsonby, Mr Charles Price, Mr Sutherland, Mr Eugene Wason, and Mr Wilkie. The Bill, which consists of twenty-four clauses, is prefaced by the following memorandum:—

The object of this Bill is to provide for the establishment in Scotland of a legislative body (to be called the Scots Parliament), and for the devolution to that legislative body of the power to make laws on matters *exclusively* relating to Scotland.

By the scheme of the Bill the subjects delegated to the Scots Parliament are specifically enumerated, and the Scots Parliament have no power to make laws on any other subjects. The Executive power will continue vested in the Crown, and provision is made for the revival of the old Scottish Privy

Council which existed before the Union. Power is given to the Scots Parliament to impose taxes other than duties of Customs and Excise, and arrangement is made for the adjustment of the financial relations between the Scots Parliament and the Imperial Parliament.

The following is the text of the measure :—

A BILL TO AMEND THE PROVISIONS  
FOR THE FUTURE GOVERNMENT OF SCOTLAND.

Whereas the responsibilities of an ever-growing Empire, together with that demand for closer attention to domestic affairs which has arisen out of continually widening developments of industry and civilisation, have so increased the labours of the Imperial Parliament that devolution of its work has become necessary in the interests of efficient government.

And whereas devolution can be best accomplished by the establishment of subordinate national Legislatures, by means of which local affairs can be administered locally, thus removing the disabilities involved in a Legislature sitting out of a country whose local affairs it controls, whilst also facilitating a truer representation of the interests of the people by securing the services of representatives with greater knowledge of local affairs and interests.

And whereas differences in law, religion and custom between Scotland and England render it specially difficult for the Imperial Parliament to legislate in harmony with the requirements and wishes of the Scottish people, so that a subordin-

ate Scottish Legislature has become a crying necessity.

And whereas it is expedient to make provision for the establishment of such a Legislature in Scotland, with powers to make laws for Scotland, and with power to provide for the administration of the affairs of Scotland, but subject always to the paramount control of the Imperial Parliament :

Be it therefore enacted by the King's most Excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows :—

GENERAL

1. On and after the appointed day there shall be in Scotland a Legislature which shall consist of His Majesty the King and a House of Representatives, and which is hereinafter called "The Scots Parliament," or "The Parliament."

2. A Lord High Commissioner appointed by the King shall be His Majesty's representative in Scotland, and shall have and may exercise in Scotland during the King's pleasure, but subject to this Constitution, such powers and functions of the King as His Majesty may be pleased to assign to him.

3. The Lord High Commissioner may appoint such times for holding the sessions of the Scots Parliament as he thinks fit, and may also from time to time, by proclamation or otherwise, summon, prorogue, or dissolve the Parliament.

4. (1) The members of the Scots

Parliament shall be returned by the Parliamentary constituencies in Scotland for the time being, and their number shall be the same as that of the members of the House of Commons for those constituencies.

(2) The law relating to the qualification and disqualification of members of the House of Commons shall apply to the qualification and disqualification of members of the Scots Parliament, except that Peers shall not be disqualified for being members of the Scots Parliament. (3) The electors of members of the Scots Parliament shall be the Parliamentary electors for each constituency with the addition of Peers qualified as hereinafter mentioned. (4) Every Peer otherwise qualified to be registered as a Parliamentary elector in any constituency, but disqualified by reason of being a Peer, shall be entitled to be registered in that constituency for the purpose of voting in the election of members of the Scots Parliament, and when registered shall be entitled so to vote.

5. After any general election the Parliament shall be summoned to meet not later than thirty days after the appointed day for the return of the writs.

6. The Parliament shall be summoned to meet not later than six months *after the passing of this Act*.

7. There shall be a session of the Parliament once at least in every year, so that twelve months shall not intervene between the last sitting in one session and the first sitting in the next session.

8. The Scots Parliament when summoned may, unless sooner dis-

solved, have continuance for five years from the day on which the summons directs it to meet, and no longer.

#### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

9. The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Scotland with respect to—

1. The establishment and tenure of executive and administrative offices, and the appointment and payment of executive and administrative officers.

2. Local government and municipal institutions.

3. Public health.

4. Criminal law.

5. The administration of justice.

6. Police.

7. Prisons.

8. Marriage and divorce.

9. Education.

10. Hospitals, asylums, and charities.

11. Lunacy.

12. Railways.

13. Fisheries.

14. Canals, inland navigation, and harbours.

15. The holding acquisition, disposition, and descent of land.

16. The acquisition by any public authority of any property on just terms from any person for any purpose in respect of which the Parliament has power to make laws.

17. The regulation of labour in factories and mines.

18. Conciliation and arbitration for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes.

19. The regulation of trade in intoxicating liquors, but not so as to

include the power to impose any duty or tax on the sale of intoxicating liquors.

20. The Church, as by law established, and its endowments. Any law made by the Legislature of Scotland which relates to any matters other than those mentioned in this section shall be void so far as it relates to such other matters.

#### ROYAL ASSENT

10. Where a Bill passed by the Parliament is presented to the Lord High Commissioner for the King's Assent, he shall declare according to his discretion, but subject to the provisions of this Act, and to His Majesty's instructions, either that he assents thereto in the King's name, or that he withholds the King's Assent, or that he reserves the Bill for the signification of the King's pleasure.

11. Where the Lord High Commissioner assents to a Bill in the King's name, he shall without delay send an authentic copy of the Act to His Majesty's Prime Minister, and if the King in Council, within six months after the receipt thereof by the Prime Minister, thinks fit to disallow the Act, such disallowance being signified by the Lord High Commissioner by speech or message to the Parliament, or by proclamation, shall annul the Act from and after the day of such signification.

12. A Bill reserved for the signation of the King's pleasure shall not have any force unless and until, within six months from the day on which it was presented to the Lord High Commissioner for the King's Assent, the Lord High Commissioner signifies by speech or message

to the Parliament, or by proclamation, that it has received the assent of the King in Council. An entry for every such speech, message, or proclamation shall be made in the journal of the Parliament.

#### THE EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY.

13. The executive power in Scotland shall continue vested in the King.

14. The provisions of this Act referring to the Lord High Commissioner extend and apply to the Lord High Commissioner for the time being of Scotland, or other the Chief Executive officer or Administrator for the time being carrying on the government of Scotland on behalf and in the name of the King, by whatever title he is designated.

15. There shall be a Council to aid and advise in the government of Scotland, to be styled the Privy Council for Scotland, and the persons who are to be members of that Council shall be chosen and summoned by the Lord High Commissioner and sworn in as Privy Councillors, and members thereof may be removed by the Lord High Commissioner.

16. There shall be an executive committee of the Privy Council of Scotland to aid and advise in the government of Scotland, being of such numbers and comprising persons holding such offices as His Majesty may think fit, or as may be directed by an Act of the Scots Parliament.

17. The provisions of this Act referring to the Lord High Commissioner shall be construed as referring to the Lord High Commissioner

acting by and with the advice of the King's Privy Council for Scotland.

18. Until the King otherwise directs, the seat of Government of Scotland shall be in Edinburgh.

#### FINANCE

19. The contribution of Scotland to the expenditure of the Government of the United Kingdom shall be a fixed proportion of that expenditure, and this proportion shall, in the first instance, be the average, as near as may be, of the sums contributed by Scotland to the expenditure of the United Kingdom as a whole during the three financial years that immediately precede the coming into operation of this Act. Thereafter the proportion shall be revised every five years by the Treasury of the United Kingdom in accordance with a minute of that Treasury laid before the Parliament of the United Kingdom.

20. The Scots Parliament shall have power only to impose direct taxation within Scotland in order to the raising of a revenue for Scottish purposes.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL PROVISIONS.

21. (1) Subject as in this Act mentioned, all existing election laws which relate to the House of Commons and the members thereof shall, so far as applicable, extend to the Scots Parliament and the members thereof, but such election laws, so far as hereby extended, may be altered by the Scots Parliament.

(2) The privileges, immunities, and powers to be held, enjoyed, and exercised by the Scots Parliament and the members thereof shall be such as are from time to time defined by the Act of the Legislature of Scot-

land, but so that the same shall never exceed those at the *passing of this Act* held, enjoyed, and exercised by the House of Commons and the members thereof.

(3) The laws and customs relating to the procedure of the House of Commons shall be applicable to the Scots Parliament unless and until the same be altered by the said Parliament.

(4) Unless and until altered by the Scots Parliament, all Acts and Orders of either House of the Imperial Parliament applicable to private Bills or Provisional Orders relating exclusively to Scotland shall remain in force as if this Act had not been passed.

22. Except as otherwise provided by this Act, all existing laws in force in Scotland, and all existing courts of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and all existing legal commissions, powers, and authorities, and all existing officers, judicial and administrative, shall continue as if this Act had not been passed, subject nevertheless to be repealed, abolished, or altered in such manner and to such extent as the Scots Parliament may determine.

23. In this Act—

The expression "the appointed day" shall mean such day after the *first day of January One thousand nine hundred and ten* as may be determined by order of His Majesty in Council:

The expression "existing" means existing at the *passing of this Act*.

24. This Act may be cited as the Government of Scotland Act, 1908.

### GOVERNMENT TREATMENT OF SCIENCE IN SCOTLAND

UNDER this heading, Dr W. S. Bruce, late leader of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition, has published in *The Times*, *The Scotsman*, etc., a spirited protest against the unfair manner in which the Government has treated the Scottish expedition, compared with that of the English expedition, which was organised for the same object. The latter expedition, says Mr Bruce, had a sum of £45,000 placed at its disposal by the Government, through the medium of a joint committee of the Royal Society and the Royal Geographical Society, the sum being in addition to a similar sum contributed by public subscriptions in England. The Scottish expedition was also largely supported by public subscriptions in Scotland, but the Government refused to help it, and still refuses to do so. The officers connected with the English expedition received on their return recognition and rewards from the Government, but this was refused to the leader and officers of the Scottish expedition. "In fact," writes Dr Bruce, "the Scottish expedition is the only one of six Antarctic expeditions, namely, —Belgian, German, Swedish, French, English and Scottish, that has not received any financial help from its Government."

This is a plain unvarnished tale, and it is simply another illustration of the unvarying contemptuous and contemptible treatment which nearly all things Scottish receive at the hands of the British government. In a matter of this kind, a great

deal depends on the way in which the claim for Government aid is regarded by the permanent officials of the Treasury, or of any of the Public departments who have any say in the matter. In this connection, it is safe to assume that if the application made is made on independent Scottish grounds, and not as a provincial claim for aid—Scotland, to them, being an English Province—then it is all but certain to be cold-shouldered by English officialdom. In such an atmosphere, John Bullyism reigns triumphant, and whenever a Scottish appeal for aid comes as a purely Scottish appeal, it is all but certain to go before the Secretary of State as one that cannot be entertained. Such treatment cannot, of course, be carried out in the case of ordinary parliamentary expenditure, such as for Education, for the Postal Service, etc., for these matters come too closely under the notice of the whole cabinet, of which the official world stands in some dread. But in such a case as that of assistance to scientific expeditions and other similar matters, the blighting hand of John Bully is at once made apparent. The Ben Nevis Observatory, the Piershill Barracks, Holyrood, etc., to wit. How long is this to continue? Just as long we fear as the Scottish Members of Parliament continue to be the servile followers of the two English Political Parties. English Tories, and English Liberals are both utterly indifferent to Scottish demands for fair play for Scotland, because they look upon Scottish members as shepherds look on their colliers—servile creatures,

that must obey their masters. And yet the Scots are supposed to be a practical people! In the matter of politics they seem to be the most helpless race in Europe. Why, the young Turks can teach them a lesson. Poor Scotland.

—o—

### THE KING OF "ENGLAND"


THE *Westminster Gazette* a week or two ago, drew attention to a blunder committed by the President of France, M. Fallieres, in alluding to King Edward as *Roi d'Angleterre*. As nearly all the London newspapers commit the same blunder, it may be said that they originally are the culprits who have misled the French President. Of course, it may be said that in a sense, Edward the Seventh "and First," is King of England, as he is King of Scotland, Wales and Ireland. But the London Press, and no doubt the French President also, use the term "England" in an Imperial sense, a diplomatic blunder which the head of the French Republic ought not to have committed. We commend the matter to the vigilance committee of the Scottish Patriotic Association, a body that has already done most excellent service in the correction of such stupid mistakes.

—o—

### THE WALLACE COMMEMORATION AT ROBROYSTON

THIS now annual meeting was held at Robroyston on the afternoon of Saturday, the 8th of August, and our readers abroad will be glad to learn that there was a large attendance, and that great enthusiasm was displayed on the

occasion. The place of the betrayal of Scotland's immortal hero is a lonely spot on the bare uplands about eight or ten miles to the south-east of Glasgow. Though some two or three miles from a railway station, considerably over a thousand people—one journal says several thousands—gathered at the sacred spot, where, by the treachery of Monteith, Wallace was captured and hurried off through Scotland and England to London, where almost immediately on his arrival the brutal Edward tried him in Westminster Hall, and then executed him in the most cruel and barbarous way that was possible even in those cruel times. The chairman of the meeting, the Rev. J. F. Miller of Millerston U.F. Church, introduced to the meeting the Rev. James Barr of the U.F. Church, Govan, who delivered an eloquent and interesting address, which was well received by an enthusiastic audience. *The Glasgow Herald*, in an able and appreciative article on the Monday following, remarked:—"The history of Scotland presents an almost ideal progress from an Homeric period of individual derring-do to a period in which the descendants of heroes became active members of a social organism that denied none of its members an opportunity of honourable distinction. So much, we make bold to say, cannot be asserted of the history, up to the middle of the 18th century, of any other European country. For this reason, if for no other, Scottish history has a claim upon the sympathy and support of all classes in Scotland."



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 3.

October 1908


Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION BILL . . . . .	34
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 8.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY ( <i>contd.</i> )	34
,, 9.—KING EDWARD IN THE SULKS. . . . .	37
,, 10.—THE AMERICAN FLEET IN AUSTRALIA . . . . .	39
,, 11.—THE AUSTRALIAN SCOTS, IRISH AND WELSH AND THE UNITED STATES . . . . .	41
,, 12.—THE LAND QUESTION IN THE HIGHLANDS	43
HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND . . . . .	45
WALLACE MEMORIAL . . . . .	48
BARRA LAND LEAGUE FORMED . . . . .	48



PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH,  
AND PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR BY  
THE SCOTTISH NEWSPAPER PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,  
8. NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.



# The Thistle

No. 3.

OCTOBER 1908.

MONTHLY 1D.

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls of Menzies & Co. in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow.*

## THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION BILL

*The Edinburgh Evening News* of 22nd September in an article dealing with the Audit and Surcharge proposals of the Scottish Education Bill, says:— But, as everybody knows, the main element of educational extravagance is not the local Boards, but the Department itself, with its fanciful and ever-changing schemes. It is to be hoped that School Boards all over Scotland will show a firm front to the centralising process, which threatens to drain all vitality, and all independence, out of the elected representatives of the people. This centralising of authority in London is making Scotland a mere province of England. An educational Bannockburn is required to check this new form of English usurpation.

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 8

### HEAD LINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

SCOTLAND “MAKKIN HERSELL,”  
A.D. 420-1286

FROM the departure of the Romans from Britain, till the death of Alexander the Third in 1286, Scotland may be said, in homely phrase, to have been “makkin hersell.” During the greater portion of this long period, the people in Scotland—for they were not then the Scottish people—are shrouded in a haze that is impenetrable to history, and when now and then gleams of light appear, the records that then become visible are distorted by monkish bigotry, or lessened or enlarged, as the case may be, by racial enmities and racial pride. Even to this day, though by the industry of archæologists, much has been done to clear up many disputed points of history, there is still much to be said for or against the old-standing points of historical controversy. Mr Oldbuck and Sir Arthur Wardour in “The Antiquary,” disputed hotly as to the racial origin of the Picts; and

we question whether the latest historians of Scotland can say with any degree of certainty which of those notable antagonists was right, and which was wrong. Then as to the origin of the Scottish race which at last gave its name to the Caledonia of the Romans, who can say with certainty from what country they originally came—Mr Hill Burton lays down the law in the most positive manner, and asserts that undoubtedly they came from Ireland; adopting in this matter the authority of the monkish chroniclers of the sixth and seventh centuries. To make this theory probable even, we must assume that previous to this period, there were no Scots in what is now modern Scotland; and that the Scots in Northern Ireland came over to the West of Scotland in such numbers that they not only overpowered the inhabitants there, but pushed on to the East Coast, and did, what the Romans were unable to do, completely conquered the inhabitants, and gave to the country a new name and a new people. The tale to us seems to be utterly improbable. We have no record of any invasion of Scotland from the North of Ireland that could bring about such a great historical change. Such an alteration of the racial position in Scotland could have come about only in two ways; either by a persistent invasion by a superior race, extending over many generations or centuries, and gradually exterminating or destroying the original inhabitants; or by an invasion in great force and by a crowning victory completely overpowering resistance, and plac-

ing the country at the mercy of the conquerors. By the first plan the Saxons at last conquered all or nearly all Southern Britain, and gave their name for a time to the country. By the second, the Normans overpowered the Saxons, and completely took possession of the land.

But nothing of this kind took place in Scotland. And further, we have it stated by a Roman author, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, that in A.D. 360, the Scots and Picts invaded and devastated the Roman provinces of Britain. Here then we have from an unbiassed authority the fact that in the latter part of the fourth century there was a people in Caledonia or Scotland called Scots who were evidently a ruling race, and strong enough to brave the Roman power and invade its provinces. What need then to go to the North of Ireland some centuries later to find a people strong enough to invade and give their name to Scotland. That Ireland was called Scotia is held by some writers a proof that the Scots came from Ireland; but this cannot override the fact that the Scots were a ruling race in Caledonia in the fourth century when Ireland was known as Ierne, and as *Britannia Parva* of the Romans. How or why the term Scotia came to be applied to Ireland, or to the northern part of it, is no doubt a puzzling question; but if, as some writers maintain, *Scoti* is derived from Scythi, the name which the Romans gave to the inhabitants of modern Russia, we have at least a glimpse of a solution of the difficulty.

Scythia would be to the Romans the generic term, not merely for the district now known as Russia, but for the whole of Northern Europe outside the boundary of the Roman Empire; just as subsequently the inhabitants of all Western Europe were known in hither Asia as the Franks; and as all the Teutonic invaders of Britain were for a long time known to its Celtic inhabitants as Saxons or the Sassenach, simply because for several centuries the Saxons were the most formidable and most successful invaders of the most important portion of Celtic Britain.

After the departure of the Romans, the position of what is now modern Scotland seems to have been this. From the Forth to the Cheviots—for a time the Roman province of Valentia—there must have been a people partly Roman, or at least Romanised; partly and no doubt chiefly Celtic; but on the whole, broken and as it were denationalised. In the north-west, and in what is now known as the Highlands, the original Celtic inhabitants must have continued to be much what they were before the coming of the Romans. While north of Tay, and within a line running from the Moray Firth along the lowlands of the old province of Moray, south by Strathspey, and following roughly the line of the modern Highland railway to Perth, there lay to the east, bordered by the North Sea, the country of the Scots, and perhaps also of the Picts—the district whose hardy inhabitants had held Rome at bay, and which therefore may justly claim to be re-

garded as the “kernel” of the country which subsequently became Scotland.

What then took place in these three districts of Ancient Caledonia between the departure of the Romans and the time, say of Malcolm Canmore, who died in the end of the eleventh century, and after which the records become more distinct? There was first the conversion to Christianity. Of that there is a certainty; but when we begin to go into the racial history of the period we meet with nothing but uncertainty. A haze seems to overcloud the historic atmosphere, and he is a bold writer who can venture to give a definite form to the doings of the period—unless at fitful times, when the veil is lifted. Tytler prudently avoids the difficulty by beginning his history at the death of Alexander the Third. In these sketches we do not affect to give more than a mere outline of Scottish history. We may say then that as regards the district north of the Forth, the outstanding facts seem to us to be these. There were repeated invasions both on the East coast and on the West. Those on the East were by the Danes, and were repelled again and again; those on the West, made by the Norsemen, were successful, and introduced a new power into that part of Scotland. On the East, the Danes made many attempts to land and make permanent settlements; but they never were successful; and it is a tradition among the people of central and north-eastern Scotland that their country was called “the grave of the Danes.” The fact seems to be,

that the pre-historic invasion of Norsemen in that part of Caledonia, which in our opinion is disclosed by the remarks of Tacitus, had by the mingling of the Norse and Celtic blood produced a race which was able to maintain, inviolate, then till now, the country they made their own.

*[Owing to pressure on our space we are obliged to hold over the concluding part of this article.]*

—o—

No. 9

### KING EDWARD IN THE SULK

HE SNUBS THE LORD PROVOST OF  
EDINBURGH

ON Monday, the 14th of September, His Majesty arrived at the Waverley Station, Edinburgh, on his way to visit Mr Sassoon at Tulchan Lodge in Strathspey. The Royal train arrived at 2.25 p.m., five minutes before schedule time, and stayed for ten minutes before leaving. "In anticipation of His Majesty alighting, the part of the platform in front of the Royal saloon was laid with red baize, but much to the disappointment of those in the vicinity of the train \* \* \* His Majesty did not leave the saloon. \* \* \* Among those on the platform were Lord Provost Gibson and Mrs Gibson, and the chief city officer, Mr James Russell, was in attendance. \* \* \* Several of the ladies and gentlemen of the party alighted, and His Majesty's little dog, a rough-haired fox terrier, was taken for a walk up and down the platform. The King, who was looking in the best of health, remained seated in his saloon, which he occu-

ped alone during the time the train was at the platform, but on the signal being given for departure he rose and stood at the window, smoking a cigar, and smiling and bowing his acknowledgments. \* \* \* The information had been conveyed to the King that the Lord Provost of the city was on the platform, and His Majesty had a message sent to his lordship graciously thanking him for his presence, and explaining that he did not intend to leave the saloon. \* \* \* During a brief stay at Perth His Majesty was presented with a beautiful bouquet of flowers by Lord Kinnoull's little daughter. The King had a short<sup>4</sup> conversation with Lord Kinnoull, Lord Kinnaird and others."

We quote from the newspapers these extraordinary details of His Majesty's contemptuous treatment of the chief magistrate of the capital of Scotland as an illustration of the peculiar character of the monarch who now rules over these kingdoms. We are told by the English press, and by the foreign press, following the English press, day after day and week after week, that His Majesty is possessed of great tact, and that he is also possessed of a most gracious and winning manner. In our notice of his conduct at the garden party in August, when, though there were nine thousand guests invited, he deliberately left out of the list four members of Parliament who had offended him by their votes in the House of Commons, we pointed out that "His Majesty, instead of being a courteous gentleman and a man of tact, is capable of great rudeness

where it is safe to indulge in rudeness, and is, moreover, one who is not merely ill-tempered, but is deeply vindictive." For this statement, which we need hardly say was not made without good grounds for our censure, we were abused by some of those sycophants who think that our present monarch can do no wrong. We were accused of being "scurrilous," "incendiary," etc. But His Majesty himself has come forward to justify our statement, and to show clearly that he is a deeply vindictive man. He deliberately snubbed the Lord Provost of the capital of Scotland, refused to see him though he was waiting on the platform to pay his respects to His Majesty, and resumed his journey without allowing him to have a word of personal intercourse. At Perth it was different. He there received a bouquet of flowers, and conversed with Lords Kinnoull and Kinnaird, though his stay there was much shorter than in Edinburgh.

Why, then, this contemptuous treatment of the chief magistrate of the capital of Scotland? Of course there is a reason for it. We are so often told of the unerring tact of His Majesty, that we may be quite sure when he so pointedly snubbed Lord Provost Gibson he did not do so unthinkingly or unwittingly. No explanation of that sort can be accepted for a moment. What, then, was the reason for this rude and discourteous treatment of a civic official, who, we venture to say, never gave His Majesty the slightest possible cause for discourtesy? It is simply this. Some forty years ago, more or less, His Majesty, when

as Prince of Wales he laid the foundation-stone of the new Royal Infirmary here, was greeted with unpleasant cries, and, we believe, also was hissed. His Majesty must know that there was some excuse at least, if not fair reason, for such an ebullition of feeling from the mob of a big city, and had he had only a small spark of manliness in his character he would quickly have forgiven, even if he could not have forgotten, the unpleasant incident. But that is not His Majesty's way. It is said that shortly afterwards he vowed when he became King that he would have his revenge on the people of Edinburgh, and on the people of Scotland. Hence the title of Edward the Seventh of Great Britain—so insulting to Scotland; hence the Order of Precedence published two or three years after his accession to the throne, by which English noblemen take precedence over Scottish nobles of the same rank, not merely in England, but in Scotland. These two acts of state are, we need hardly say, not in accordance with the constitution of these kingdoms, but what of that? His Majesty's feelings had at one time been ruffled by an Edinburgh mob, and not only Edinburgh, but Scotland must be humiliated, so far as it is possible for an irate monarch to humiliate a proud and loyal people. We are told that "folly is set (sometimes) in great dignity," and that "better is a poor and wise child than an old and foolish king, who will no more be admonished." And surely these words are applicable to the personage whom it pleases the Almighty to allow for

the present to rule over us. Conceive what must be the character and the temper of a monarch, under whose sway are about four hundred millions of people—one quarter of the human race. And yet who, after the lapse of forty years—more or less—cannot forget or forgive a display of rude and unruly temper on the part of the mob of a great city! The courtiers and the sycophants may cover over for a time the unkingly traits of such a ruler, but it can only be for a time. The winds of flattery are not lasting. They always cease when the sun goes down.

---

### THE AMERICAN FLEET IN AUSTRALIA

No. 10

#### ITS ENTHUSIASTIC RECEPTION

**T**HE reception of the American Fleet by the people of Australia is, in our opinion, the most significant event in the history of the British people that has taken place for many years. It is not necessary to wait for details to understand the significance of that reception. To do so, indeed, would lessen its importance by the multitude of side issues and side influences that would tend to withdraw the mind from the central idea of the grand demonstration of Australian national feeling. That central idea is just this. That the Australian people feel that they are now a nation—young indeed, and by no means full-fledged; but full of the hopes of youth, and looking with a keen intelligence to their future as a people, who have the destiny of the South Pacific in fee.

And feeling this, they see in the visit of the magnificent fleet which the government of the United States has allowed to visit their shores, the opening to them of a new destiny. Is Britain or the United States to be in the future the political planet round which for a time we shall revolve, till we fill up our own Continent and become a great and self-contained power in the world? That seems to have been the latent but overpowering idea which brought over a quarter of million of people to the shores of Sydney Harbour to welcome the Americans, and which gave them in Melbourne a welcome that was wild to extravagance in its enthusiasm. Here, they seem to have said, we have brothers of our own race, of our own speech, and with a fleet of a power and majesty such as we have never seen before! Let us welcome them as a big brother who in many ways is nearer to us in political feeling and in political views than the Motherland in Europe which now controls our destiny, and sometimes interferes with and thwarts our aspirations and our desires. Such appears to have been the feeling which in a few short months seems to have sprung up in the hearts of the Australian people, and which culminated at last in what seems to have been almost an orgy of enthusiasm.

Attempts are being made we see to lessen the importance of this reception given to the Americans, and to deprecate it as simply an outburst arising partly from curiosity, and partly from the pleasure of being heartily recognised by the

imposing fleet of the greatest and most powerful State in the world. We do not look on the reception in that light. On the contrary, though coming at an earlier period than we thought it would come, we regard the Australian display of feeling towards the Americans as an expression of national affinity to a people who are at one with them in their leading political views. Australia, in fact, is on the same political plane as the United States, and Britain is not. There is the startling and potent fact. Both peoples are democratic in the extreme; and both utterly repudiate the influence and interference of hereditary legislators in the management of their affairs. It is true that Australian legislation is, in the last resort, subject to the control or veto of a hereditary monarch; but this interference is strictly limited to Imperial matters, and would be at once resented and resisted to the uttermost in all domestic legislation. And it is here, where there is a rift in the Australian lute. Those who are intimately acquainted with the drift of Australian politics, know that there is a strong tendency among the Australian people for a separate national life; and that so soon as they think that they are strong enough to stand alone, they will make a move towards complete independence of the Mother Country. An Australian Republic is the aim and "ideal" of the more advanced section of the Australian people. And it is because the visit of the American Fleet brings the realisation of this idea, a step, or rather many steps nearer—that the wel-

come given to the Fleet of the Great Republic has been so warm and so enthusiastic.

Does this idea come within the region of practical politics, or is it a mere dream of the far distant future? It is the latter, exclaim the superficial observers, and the official interpreters or exponents of popular feeling. Australia is loyal to the British Empire, and has not the slightest desire to separate herself from the power of Britain. Within certain limits, and for a more or less indefinite time, this view of the situation is strictly correct. We see no immediate probability of the separation of Australia from the parent State; but that events are working that way, and that within the lifetime of the present generation the question of separation will become a live one and a pressing one, we regard as a certainty. But if Australia separates from Britain, what power can protect her from Germany? To this we answer that if Germany had a free hand, and were foolish enough to try to subdue and annex Australia, she would begin a task which would in the course of a generation or so exhaust her strength and compel her to retreat. Already there are in Australasia five millions of people of the British race, and ere long this will be increased to seven or eight millions. There is no power in Europe which could continue to hold in permanent subjection such a number of the British race settled in a country so far away as Australia. But there is Japan. Yes there is Japan; and there is also the United States! And right

through the Australian mind there can be no doubt there went the other day a thrill of exultation that here we have visible to our eyes a power—another power if you will—that we can look to with confidence should we have a death struggle with the great Yellow Power to the north of us. The Monro Doctrine is not necessarily limited to the American Continents.

—o—

### THE AUSTRALASIAN SCOTS, IRISH AND WELSH AND THE UNITED STATES

No. 11

IN our previous article we have dealt with the visit of the American Fleet to Australian waters, and remarked on the great significance to be attached to the magnificent welcome that it received. It may be asked what has this to do with Scottish affairs, and with the policy of *The Thistle*? In reply to this, let us point out that at the close of our first article in our August issue we said, "the time is coming when the Scots abroad will exercise a most important influence on the destiny of the Empire." When we used these words, we had in view the growth of nationalism in the Britains beyond the seas, and the inevitable tendency of these communities to separate themselves from the Mother Country, and erect themselves into independent states. As Australia and Canada become populous and powerful, nationalism with them will become a form of patriotism, which will constantly try to assert itself. Democracy, according to Burke, is "the foodful source

of ambition," and the vanity and love of power of extreme democrats will continually call for a political condition, which will open out for them the possibilities of being supreme rulers of independent states. The visit of the American Fleet has brought out this latent desire, and has for a time given it life and form; but the time is not ripe for its assuming a strong permanent existence, and becoming a virile political force. It is still weak enough to be pooh-poohed by the lovers of routine and the hangers on of the powers that be. A population of five millions, even of vigorous and ardent Australasians, is not quite enough to set up housekeeping on its own account, especially when there is at the back door a big part of the family estate as yet unoccupied, and offering a tempting residence to the brown and yellow peoples that dwell a little to the North.

To understand the significance of this all-important question of the future, we must also thoroughly understand the idiosyncrasies of the various British peoples who now rule in Australasia. Of these the English, form of course, the majority, but it is a majority of a very different numerical power to the English majority in Britain. Here the English people form considerably more than two-thirds of the whole population; there they form the majority by only a moderate percentage—somewhere between five and ten per cent. of a majority we take to be their numerical position, as compared with the Irish, Scots and Welsh, who with a mere percentage of Germans and other

Europeans make up the white population of Australasia. But the English population of the great Southern Continent is of a political character, very different to their forefathers on this side of the world. Here they are the stronghold of Toryism, the very essence of *laissez-faire*, the servile followers in Southern England of the squire, the parson and the men of money. From the sway of these they have not, unlike their fellow-countrymen in Northern England, as yet been emancipated. But as serfs, when newly endowed with political power, are sure to run into the extremes of democracy, so it is with these men of Southern English descent—the Saxon English let us term them—in Australasia. They, or rather their descendants, form the advanced wing of democracy in the great southern land, and are the leaders, or rather the facile dupes of the leaders of Trade Prohibition and of Socialism. It is among these people then that there will be found the strongest advocates of a political change towards an independent Australasia. With hardly a trace of racial sentiment, sordid in feeling, and easily led away by clap-trap orators, they will become the facile followers of the advocates of Republicanism, who are now beginning to lift their heads in the politics of Australasia. Of the English portion of the Australian people, these men will be the most active and aggressive, and it may be safely anticipated that they will carry with them at least one half of that section of their fellow-countrymen.

As the continuous connection of

“the Britains beyond the seas” with the central Britain in Europe is of the most vital importance to the greatness of the Empire, the question thus becomes of great interest, what in this matter will be the attitude of the Irish, Scots and Welsh peoples in those great outlying communities? Will they tend towards Republicanism, and a probable connection or Federation with their brethern in the United States, or will they oppose the advocates of Republicanism, and determine to continue the connection with Britain. To arrive at a reasonable conclusion on this point, we must consider what are the motives that are likely to guide or influence the peoples of Australasia and Canada. The great disintegrating motive will, of course, be Republicanism—the desire to form an independent state and make a name in the world. As we have said, this motive, weak and powerless at present, will become powerful, when the Commonwealth and the Dominions become powerful. Against this tendency may fairly be set the desire to leave things alone, common to all peoples who are doing well, and who have no political grievance of which they can fairly complain. It will thus become a contest between the Conservative principle and the Progressive principle, and there can be no doubt whatever that among the British peoples the contest will be a long one, with many ups and downs, and will be fairly fought. It will, in our opinion, be a struggle that will in the end be decided by sentiment—by national sentiment. And it is here wherein lies the weakness of the Conservative

position. If only half, or even if two-thirds of the English portion of the population decide against the Republican movement, it is clear that unless they receive a very large support from the Irish, Scots and Welsh elements of the population they will fail to hold their own, and the ultimate result will be a victory for the Progressive or Republican party.

Will then the Conservative party in the Commonwealth and in the Dominions receive the support of the Irish, Scots and Welsh elements of their population? The decision, in our opinion, will entirely depend on whether in Britain these peoples will be allowed by the great English majority to manage their own Irish, Scots and Welsh affairs in their own way. In a few words, the question of "Home Rule All Round" is not merely a question affecting the policy of the United Kingdom, but it is a policy affecting the existence of the British Empire as now constituted. Herein then lies the significance of the enthusiastic reception of the American Fleet by the peoples of New Zealand and Australia. The issue as to the destiny of these communities will mainly be decided by sentiment, and in what way have the English people treated the national sentiment of the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh? Simply with contempt. Unless then a very great change in this respect is entered upon by the people of England, the tendency of the people of the minor nationalities in Australasia will be to give their influence to the party favouring independence and a Federal Union with the United

States. The inevitable tendency, in fact, of John Bullism is to break up the British Empire!

—o—

### THE LAND QUESTION IN THE HIGHLANDS

No. 12

IN reply to letters received from a number of crofters in the townships of Bruenish, Bolanobodach, Earsary, and some neighbouring townships in the island of Barra, the Secretary for Scotland, Mr Sinclair, sent them the following:—

*26th August 1908.*

Sir,—I am directed by the Secretary for Scotland to inform you that he has received an unsigned letter purporting to come from "the landless people of Bruenish, Bolanobodach, and Earsary," stating that necessity will compel them to take possession of land which belongs to other people. Since receiving this letter Mr Sinclair has received through the Congested Districts Board several letters signed by yourself or other crofters or cottars in these and neighbouring townships. Some of these letters are simply applications for land, and some contain an offer to pay a fair rent for it. They should in the first place be addressed to those who own the land, to whom they have now been sent, and not to the Congested Districts Board, who have no land available for such use. Other letters go on to express the intention of those who have signed them to take land by force if it is not otherwise provided for them.

Mr Sinclair has read these letters with deep concern and regret. He instructs me to convey to those who

have signed them an earnest and emphatic warning against all such threats and intentions. If translated into action these must be fraught with serious consequences, culminating, it may be, in criminal proceedings, of which the end cannot now be foreseen. Grave responsibility, therefore, rests upon those who take any step in the direction of the illegal seizure of land, and I am to intimate to you plainly and without reserve that such proceedings can receive no countenance or sympathy from the Government.

Mr Sinclair trusts that you may see fit to abandon and discourage all thought of unlawful conduct, and that you will follow the course which is open to you, in common with all His Majesty's subjects, if redress is not otherwise obtainable, of bringing your grievances before the Government.

I enclose copies of this letter for distribution to the crofters and cottars whose names are given in your letter.—I am, sir, your obedient servant,  
REGINALD M'LEOD.

Mr Sinclair is a kindly man, with most liberal instincts, and in forwarding the above reply to the poor crofters in Barra, he was only doing what his position as a Minister of State compelled him to do. "You must not break the law; or if you do, you will have to suffer, for we shall be compelled to take criminal proceedings against you, and the end of that cannot now be foreseen." "If redress is not otherwise obtainable, bring your grievances before the Government," further says Mr Sinclair. Now what is likely—nay certain—to be the practical result to

the crofters if this advice is followed. Absolutely nothing. Experience tells these poor Scots crofters that nothing hitherto has been gained from any government simply by sitting still and appealing for relief. Mr Sinclair himself in his inmost heart must know and acknowledge this. In the eighties of last century, it was only because the law was repeatedly broken, and that in a pretty determined way, that the crofters' grievances were considered by Parliament, and some measure of relief given. But a great deal more still requires to be done. The principles of recent Irish land legislation must be extended to Scotland, and especially to the Highlands, where the inhabitants have suffered, and are still suffering so much from land being made a desert for deer, to give sport to wealthy men from London and the United States. Even now this process is going on, though in a mitigated degree. From a return just issued by the Government we learn that in 1883 the acreage under Deer Forests in the six northern crofting counties of Scotland was 1,709,892 acres. Twenty-one years afterwards (1904) it was considerably over a million of acres more—viz. 2,920,097 acres; and even within the last year this has been increased, so that now the total area in six counties of Scotland is 2,958,490 acres, of which the total annual assessment is £131,841. This is the melancholy tale that has to be told the British public, and it shows that under the protection given by the House of Lords to the greed of grasping landlords, to do as they like with their own, as the

phrase runs, the poor Highlanders are gradually being squeezed out of existence. As a race, they are being throttled to death, just as surely as if sentence of execution had been passed against them—with this proviso, that it is being done slowly; and that most graciously, work will be given to a remnant to act as guardians for the deer.

The crofters must remember that under the British Constitution, land is held to be sacred to the interests of the owner; and the public interest in it, or what is the same, the interest of the people in it, is now held to be invalid, and can only be touched or obtained with the consent of the House of Lords, which is a House of *Landlords*. What chance then have the crofters of obtaining redress or relief from their present miserable position? There is only one way, as painful experience has shown. They must act in a way that will draw the attention of the people of England to their position and their misfortunes. John Bull has a conscience, and it sometimes becomes stirred and acts; but then it is very difficult to get it to act. The crofters then must do something which will appeal to and move the liberal instincts of John Bull. If they can waken him up, and especially if they can arouse what is called the Non-Conformist conscience, he may act in a way that will frighten the House of Lords and compel it to give way. It is of no use appealing to the Tory Party, represented by John Bull. He has not a conscience—only a belly, and so long as that is comfortable he cannot be stirred.

It is then for the crofters and for their friends to consider how English liberal opinion can be stirred into action on their behalf. The Irish know how, and have succeeded; but the Scottish people seem to have lost all original political action, and are content to be humble followers of the two great English parties, and take the crumbs that they occasionally let drop for the benefit of poor Caledonia. If some of the crofters are prepared to make sacrifices for the benefit of their class, and go to gaol, if need be, they may awaken sympathy among the English working classes, and get something done. But if they simply wait on the Government, we fear they will get little or nothing. For the keen Tory leaders in Parliament closely watch public opinion; and if they see that it is not stirred by any strong movement of the English democracy, they will mutilate and destroy every attempt to give the people—whether in the Highlands or Lowlands, or in England itself—any proper footing on the soil of their country. Deer before men is the motto of the monied and landed classes of England; and to them Scotland is simply a huge game preserve!

—o—

### HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND.

[*Communicated.*]

Another popular organ for Scottish patriotic opinion should be welcomed by all true Scots. Having studied all the phases through which Home Rule Legislation has passed since 1865, we cannot however take the same sanguine view

as the Editor of *The Thistle* regarding its latest development in the shape of Captain Pirie's Bill. Although it has had a first reading, two previous Bills—the first Dr Hunter's and its successor two years ago by Captain Pirie—reached the same stage and got no farther. These Bills can only be regarded as an expression of the desire now entertained by all enlightened Scotsmen that the legislation and administration required for matters exclusively affecting Scotland should be restored to the Scottish people under such arrangements as they themselves are best able to devise. The arrangements formulated by Captain Pirie well deserve the careful attention of his countrymen and will help to educate them. But even if the present House of Commons had a mandate for Home Rule legislation (which it has not), a different course will require to be followed. In now considering what that course should be we have, fortunately, both warnings and examples. Mr Gladstone began and continued, with all the courage and dexterity for which he was distinguished, a ten years' conflict on behalf of Home Rule for Ireland alone. His first Bill of 1886 provided for a legislative body in Dublin to deal with purely Irish affairs, deprived Ireland of representation in the Imperial Parliament, and would have subjected it to a tribute for Imperial purposes. It contravened the essential principle that there can be no taxation without representation. His second Bill provided for an Irish Legislature, and for Irish representatives taking part in the Imperial Parliament

when dealing with taxation and legislation affecting Ireland. He called it the "in and out" plan but abandoned it when convinced that it was beyond the wit of man to say on what occasions representatives from Ireland would be entitled to take part in the Imperial Parliament. His last proposal was to provide a Legislature for the domestic affairs of Ireland in Dublin, and to allow a limited number of Irish M.P.'s to sit for all purposes in the Imperial Parliament. Backed as this proposal was by the ingenuity of the present Prime Minister, it failed to persuade the people of England and Scotland to give the Irish Home Rule for Ireland and to subject the domestic interests of the sister countries to the control of irresponsible Irish Representatives. Does Captain Pirie expect his Bill, which would give the same inconsistent powers to Scotland as Mr Gladstone proposed to give to Ireland, to escape the rock on which Mr Gladstone's Home Rule Bill was finally wrecked?

If Mr Gladstone did nothing else, he demonstrated, in the last years of his strenuous life, that it is impossible to give Home Rule to one only of the four nations which inhabit the United Kingdom, that the only constitutional course is to give Home Rule simultaneously to all of them and to preserve for each representation in the Imperial Parliament on the present footing.

Examples for our guidance in the course to be followed are to be found in the United States of America and in Canada and other British colonies. Perhaps that of Canada is most germane to the present situation.

After years of conflict between French *habitans* and British Colonists and futile plans of government devised for Canada by Pitt and other distinguished statesmen at home, the Canadians thought themselves entitled to a voice in their own government. Accordingly in 1867, thirty-three men of common sense representing the various provinces and interests to be reconciled assembled at Quebec to discuss the matter. After much consideration they agreed upon a Report which was substantially given effect to by the Imperial Parliament in the great Act which forms the Charter of Self-Government for the Dominion of Canada. Under it there is a Dominion Parliament at Ottawa and Provincial Legislatures—now if we are right, eight in number—each attending to the domestic affairs of its own province and sending Representatives to the Dominion Parliament which regulates interests common to all. The result has been local contentment and general progress and prosperity.

In all the examples cited, Constitutional legislation followed and did not precede an expression of the will of the people who have been or are to be endowed with self-government. As Carlyle says in his "French Revolution," "The Constitution which men live under is the one which images their convictions."

If the present Government profits by the warning and examples referred to, it will submit to the House of Commons before it is dissolved a Resolution specifying the powers to be delegated to the four great his-

torical divisions of the United Kingdom—England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales—so that the congestion which renders the Imperial Parliament unfit for either domestic or Imperial legislation may be ended, and it will then fall to the several peoples concerned to consider and report to the next Parliament where, how, and by whom, they respectively desire such delegated powers to be exercised.

Scotland has been too long the catspaw of Liberal Governments, and unless its people assert clearly and decidedly, their constitutional rights it may become so again. May it be the effort of *The Thistle* to defend and assert not only the honour of our country but its rights as a Nation proud of its history and of its sons, who, like Alexander Hamilton, did much by his papers in "The Federalist" to mould the Constitution of the great American Republic. The hysterics of the Celt in the sister country have brought discredit on the name of Home Rule. Be it ours to combine in a cause now recognised as essential to the good government of the several divisions of the United Kingdom and to the cohesion of the British Empire, the *perferendum ingenium* and the quiet sagacity of the Scottish people.

[The writer of the above is one of the veterans of the Scottish Home Rule Association which began its operations in 1886. He was one of its leading honorary office-bearers, and whatever he says is entitled to the respectful consideration of patriotic Scots.—Editor of *The Thistle*.]

### WALLACE MEMORIAL

A VERY successful meeting in aid of the movement was held at Elderslie on the 12th September, under the auspices of the Scottish Patriotic Association. There was a large attendance, about 1200 people being present. Mr George Eyre Todd, president of the Association, took the chair, and besides many gentlemen from Glasgow and the district round, there were present Messrs A. Skene Smith, W. I. Douglas, and Mr W. A. Bowie, chairman, vice-chairman, and hon. treasurer, respectfully of the Elderslie Wallace Memorial Executive Committee, London. Resolutions in favour of the erection of a Wallace Memorial at Elderslie, and of the establishment of a Scottish History Chair in Glasgow University were passed unanimously and a collection taken by a Ladies' Committee, under the management of Mrs MacLachlan, for the memorial amounted to close on £17. We understand the amount now subscribed for the memorial exceeds £1000. We hope that this will be largely added to by our colonial friends, so that a worthy memorial of the great national hero may be erected. Any subscription for the memorial sent to the hon. treasurer, Mr W. A. Bowie, care of the National Bank of Scotland, Ltd., Edinburgh and Glasgow and branches, will be thankfully acknowledged.

### BARRA LAND LEAGUE FORMED

THE land agitation in Barra is spreading. Last night a crowded meeting of crofters, cottars,

and fishermen was held at North Bay, at which it was decided to form a Land League, and the necessary office-bearers were appointed. A number of resolutions were adopted, in which it was declared that the land of Scotland was made by God for the equal enjoyment of all the people brought to life on it, that a system which compels the people to work to yield up the greater part of the produce of their labour as rent is robbery, and that economic rent should be devoted to purposes of common benefit. The House of Lords was denounced for obstructing the will of the people, and the Government was called on to make the Scottish Land Valuation Bill an integral part of the Budget.

A great deal of dissatisfaction is being expressed with the dilatory policy pursued by the Congested Districts Board. It is described as active only in letter writing. The Vatersay heroes are assiduously pursuing the peaceful avocation of cultivating the soil.—*Evening News* (Edin.), 2nd September.

### FROM OMAHA

THE following kindly notice of *The Thistle* is from *The Western Scot*, of Omaha, United States:—" *The Thistle* is a new patriotic magazine issued from Edinburgh. Number 1 has just reached Omaha. The magazine starts out well, and is as full of patriotism as an egg is full of meat."



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 4.

November 1908

Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL SANGSCHAW . . . . .	50
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 13.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . . . . .	50
" 14.—THE EARLSTON MEETING AND ITS MORAL . . . . .	52
" 15.—THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE PARLIA- MENTARY MACHINERY . . . . .	54
" 16.—QUADRENNIAL PARLIAMENTS AND PAY- MENT OF MEMBERS . . . . .	55
" 17.—THE REDFORD MILITARY STATION AND THE BACKING DOWN OF MR HALDANE	59
SAXON ENGLISHMEN'S DEEP THINKING . . . . .	61
THE FALSITIES OF ENGLISH HISTORY . . . . .	62
THE ROYAL ARMS OF SCOTLAND . . . . .	63
WALLACE DUBBED "A THIEF" BY SIR HERBERT MAXWELL	64



PRINTED BY J. & J. GRAY & CO., ST JAMES PLACE, EDINBURGH,  
AND PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR BY  
THE SCOTTISH NEWSPAPER PUBLISHING CO., LTD.,  
8 NORTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH.



# The Thistle

No. 4.

NOVEMBER 1908.

MONTHLY 1D.

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls of Menzies & Co. in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow.*

## THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL SANGSCHAW

THIS patriotic Society is progressing well under the able and energetic management of the Honorary Secretary, Mr John Wilson. The two concerts held in the Scottish National Exhibition in the end of September were a great success, and another concert is to take place in Edinburgh on St Andrew's Day. The subscription to the Society is only five shillings a year, for which more than ample value is given in the way of tickets. Mr Wilson's address is 83 Jamaica Street, Glasgow, and subscriptions sent to him will be duly acknowledged.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 13.

### HEAD LINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

SCOTLAND "MAKKIN HERSELL,"  
A.D. 420-1286

The district south of the Forth to the Cheviots, which for three centuries was the debatable land of the Romans and Caledonians, seems for a time to have retained in its western half a fairly homogeneous Celtic population. In fact, a Celtic kingdom known as Strathclyde stretched along the west coast from Dumbarton to the border of Wales. The Catrail, a rampart extending from the eastern shoulder of the Moorfoot Hills to the Cheviots, is supposed to have been built by the Strathclyde Celts as a defence against the attacks of the Teutonic races that landed on the east coast and attempted to seize and settle in the districts lying between the Forth and the Tweed. These invaders do not seem to have been Saxons, though they are often described as such by historians. They were a hardier race than the Saxons, and apparently were from the coast of

Friesland. At all events, the Scottish population of the present day in the district extending from the Tay to the Tweed are utterly unlike Saxons, but bear a marked resemblance to the people of northern Germany between the Elbe and the Zuyder Zee. They seem also, especially in the valley of the Tweed, to have had a considerable Flemish element, and further north an infusion of Norse blood.

Here, then, we have in ancient Caledonia, as a result of the comingling of races after the departure of the Romans, a people who came to be known as Scots, and in whom there was based on the original Celtic blood large strains of Norse and of North German races. If the Picts were the representatives of the Celts, and the Scots the representatives of a prehistoric Norse element, as most probably they were, then the accession of Kenneth M'Alpine, about the middle of the ninth century, to the Scottish throne north of the Forth marked the close of the struggle between the two races, and their racial fusion under the name of the Scots. This fusion gave great power to the Scottish rulers, and the result was that after nearly two centuries of fighting, a Scottish King, Malcolm the Second, in 1018 by a great victory at Carham-on-Tweed over the King or Earl of Northumbria, established his power to the Cheviots, and made the southern frontier of Scotland practically what it is now. When shortly after the people of Strathclyde lost their king, and King Malcolm by a happy chance became his successor, the whole people of

what is now Scotland—a few districts in the north excepted—came under his rule. In 1057 a great king called Malcolm Canmore, or Big Head, ruled Scotland for nearly half a century, and his descendants held the Scottish throne and ruled practically over what is now modern Scotland till 1286, when Alexander the Third was killed by a fall from his horse near Kinghorn in Fifeshire. When his granddaughter, the Maid of Norway, died in 1290, the throne became vacant, and the country was without a direct heir to the throne. Then began the disastrous period of the contest for the Crown by Baliol, Bruce, Comyn, and other Norman barons, and the fatal reference of the dispute to Edward the First of England.

On the West Coast, where alike in the Mainland and in the Isles, the Celts alone held sway during the Roman period, and apparently were not molested by that power, there was a great racial change between the sixth and the twelfth centuries. If we are to believe the monkish chronicles, the Scots invaded and conquered the country, and after a time, from what they called Dalriada as a base, they overran and subdued Scotland, and gave it the name which it now holds. As we have already said, we regard this as a fable. That the missionaries from the north of Ireland, said to be *Scoti*, exercised a great moral influence on the Scottish, Pictish and Celtic races, or whatever names may be given them, and converted them to Christianity, may be readily granted. We have a fair amount of evidence on that head, but we

look in vain for evidence of a racial conquest. In those days the Church held all the sources of records, and it, in the well-known monkish way, would take care to exaggerate all the doings of its followers, and would not scruple even to invent and falsify chronicles to exalt its power. It was not from Ireland that the character or purity of the western Celts was disturbed, but from Norway. For several centuries the hardy Norsemen came over to Scotland in countless invasions and in such force as to overpower the native population and drive them inland to the mountain fastnesses lying in the centre of the island. Within a day's march of wherever a galley could swim, the power of the Norseman was felt. Settling in strengths along the coast and seizing the females for wives, they gradually, generation by generation, largely changed the character of the people, inhabiting what is now known as the Scottish Highlands, and by the eleventh and twelfth centuries the people there had become what they now are, a Celto-Norse or Norse-Celtic race, combining the grace, the poetry and the fire of the Celts, with the energy, enterprise and indomitable courage of the Norsemen. It is from the Norsemen that the Highlander gets his brown or golden hair and his big limbs and great stature. Dasent, writing of the Norsemen, says, "the ancestress of the race of nobles has golden hair, beaming brows, and a neck whiter than the driven snow. Her son, Jarl, has light hair, glowing cheeks, and grey eyes. \* \* \* In a word, every man who claimed to be

well born and handsome must have fair or at least brown hair."

The population of Western Scotland from the Firth of Clyde to the Pentland Firth thus became by the eleventh and twelfth centuries a Celto-Norse race, full of vigour and possessed with a wild and turbulent spirit. So strong and powerful were they that at the death of Alexander the Third, with which our present chapter ends, they gave only a very limited obedience to the Kings of Scotland. But the Norse racial element thus introduced into the Highlands of Scotland has become one of the chief glories of the Scottish people. Wherever Scotsmen are to be found throughout the British Empire the names of the Highland people are sure to be among the first, whether in peace or war.

—————o—————

No. 14

### THE EARLSTON MEETING AND ITS MORAL

THE great Liberal meeting at Earlston on the 3rd October, when Mr Asquith stated the ministerial policy for the present session of Parliament, is stated by the party newspapers to have been a great success, and an overpowering demonstration of Scottish Liberalism. There were about four thousand people present in the huge tent or marquee, and these fully represented without doubt the sturdy and stalwart Liberalism of at least southern and eastern Scotland, and with enough of representatives from Lanarkshire and the West to show that that all-important district was

in unison with the demonstration. To look down from the platform on the countless rows of the close-packed Liberal delegates from all parts of Scotland; to note the thoughtful faces and the massive heads of the great gathering as they keenly and eagerly listened to the address of the Prime Minister of Britain, was indeed a sight worth seeing as a great picture of political humanity. To many also—probably to most of those present—it was a sight which gladdened their hearts, and which made them, if they were young and ardent, think that their political aspirations for the benefit and well-being of their beloved land would soon be realised. But was it so? To us old and disappointed Scottish patriots who have for the last five and twenty years been contending for Scottish Home Rule; for the right of the Scottish people to manage their purely Scottish affairs, the sight of that great meeting suggested other and sadder thoughts. Will anything come of it all? Will any practical good to the people of Scotland result from the unanimity of these Scottish delegates, and from the outspoken policy of the Prime Minister — at the head of the biggest majority that ever backed a British Liberal ministry? The most favourable answer must be a doubtful and a halting one. It will depend on the House of Lords, say all, or nearly all who know anything of British politics. The great question before the meeting was how to place or to keep the Scottish people on the land; how to give them a home on the soil for which their fathers

fought and held for centuries against great and terrible odds; how to keep them and their children out of the debasing slums of the great cities; how, in fact, to enable them to live like free men, and to know and feel that if they give their labour and their lives to the cultivation of a moderate portion of their native land, the results of that labour, and of the improvements which it will effect on the soil, will be their own and not the landlord's.

Such a question one would think should be left to the decision of the Scottish people. If it were so, and if the policy enunciated by Mr Asquith with respect to the Scottish Small Holdings Bill depended on the decision of the representatives for Scotland, then we say that the great political gathering at Earlston would have been a joyous and a momentous event. But in truth it seemed to us, as it must seem to every publicist who has seen the working of public affairs in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, to have been a pitiful exhibition of political futility and barrenness. In those "Britains beyond the Seas," a great political meeting such as that at Earlston, at which the wishes and the views of the people of a State were represented in such overwhelming force, would have been regarded as the practical settlement of any question, however important; and in less than a year the decision of the meeting would have become the law of the land. For this reason we say that the Earlston meeting was after all a demonstration not to be proud of, but one to be pointed to as a delusion. For if

anything can safely be predicted of the action of Parliament during the next six months, it is that the House of Lords will amend and mutilate the Scottish Land Bill into utter futility—if indeed they do not contemptuously refuse to discuss it, or give it a second reading. Is not the land ours, say the nobles of the country, and can't we do as we like with our own? A very dangerous position to take up with millions just on the verge of starvation. But selfishness when in power is slow to take warning.

—o—

No. 15

### THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY MACHINERY

UNDER the present system of government in Britain, progress in the direction of the establishment of popular rights is remarkably slow. It often takes a generation to get translated into legislative action a question of first-rate importance, and deeply affecting the happiness and welfare of a large section of the people. Session after session, and parliament after parliament the dreary fight goes on between the party of progress and the party of resistance; and then when at last the *vis inertiae* is overcome, it is found that—thanks to the citadel of Toryism—the House of Lords—the measure of reform has been shorn of some of its most important and most valuable qualities. If so much can be said of matters of general legislation affecting the whole body of the people of the United Kingdom, what may not be said of that which

affects the distinctive national interests of the minor nationalities—the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. There, for many generations, progress may be said to partake of a geologic character, and advance can only be noted when there is, as it were, some convulsion of nature caused by pent-up forces of passion at last asserting themselves, and bursting through the crust of English selfishness and English Toryism. For how many centuries did Irish patriotism struggle and wrestle with English domination and English oppression before they could win even a moderate recognition of their national rights in the matters of religion, and above all, of the land. How long have matters of the highest importance to Scotland—for example those affecting religion, education and the land—been mangled and stifled by English ignorance and English selfishness. And has Wales a better or more hopeful story to tell of her political well-being under the brutal domination of English legislation? No. For centuries Wales has had meted out to her the vile treatment of neglect, of indifference, and of contempt. And now she stands, as the result of such treatment, an alien people holding grimly to their own language, their own forms of religion, and their own national ways and traditions alongside the overpowering might and so-called majesty of brutal, arrogant and selfish England.

Does it never strike English public men—those of them who manage to attain to the position of British statesmen—that such a state

of things within the circle of the United Kingdom is a standing reproach and disgrace to the people of England. Germany has diverse kingdoms, and even diverse races within her boundaries, yet what a great and harmonious whole she now presents to an envious and jealous Europe. Austria has racial difficulties to contend with, compared with which those of the United Kingdom are trivial. Yet even she, amid great and manifold dangers of State, holds her position with Hungary as her co-partner with little more political friction—if not with less—than does the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Whence arises this comparative success in the government of Austria-Hungary, and the superlative success in the government of Germany, as compared with the political discontent and failure in the United Kingdom? Simply this, that in Austria-Hungary and in Germany, racial feeling and sub-national interests have been allowed more or less free play, and the central governments have confined themselves to duties which properly belonged to them. These two great empires, in fact, have by dire experience found out the great secret of governing a vast empire—the relegation to the various provinces or sub-nations of the government of their own provincial or sub-national affairs; while Britain, under the blundering, blustering and arrogant domination of England, tries to govern from London the vast and complicated domestic affairs—not only of England, which may be natural and reasonable—

but of Scotland, Ireland and Wales, which must be not merely unnatural and unreasonable, but which must be, and are stupid and absurd.

How long is this wretched system of mal-administration to continue? Is it to be, so far as the present generation is concerned, a never-ending muddle of political helplessness? Apparently such will be the result unless the British people wake up and amend that antiquated bit of political machinery, called the British Parliament. Good enough a century ago for the wants of England—but never any good for the wants of Scotland, Ireland and Wales—it is now utterly out of date, and a complete negation of popular government. Even with a reformed and liberal Second Chamber, it would be quite unfit and unable to perform the legislative work of England alone, to say nothing of that of Scotland, Ireland and Wales; and of the outer portions of the Empire. What then should be at once done, preparatory to the carrying out of a great system of Home Rule all round? But this question is large enough, and important enough, to require a separate article.

---

## QUADRENNIAL PARLIAMENTS AND PAYMENT OF MEMBERS

### No. 16.

THE British people are generally supposed to have now the great privilege and boon of popular government; but when we examine the fruits of such government during the last twenty years, we find that though the noise may have been great the result has been small.

Every step in the onward progress of the people towards a more comfortable position in the State is resisted by a class, which, possessed itself of every comfort, regards progress and reform as dangerous to its privileges and its power, and the political machinery of the kingdom is of such a character as to aid this party in its policy of the retardation of popular progress. What matters it to the hardworking countryman, to the hardy and venturesome fisherman, or to the millions toiling in the dingy slums of the great manufacturing and commercial cities that they have household suffrage, and are therefore able, or are supposed to be able to return their own representatives to parliament. Are they able to do so? No—the right to return members to parliament is largely a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. The power of wealth blocks the way. To get into parliament, except in some forty or fifty constituencies which are under the control of miners or of some other highly organised bodies of working men, is hardly possible to men of moderate means, and quite impossible to young men of bright intelligence and of strong political instincts, but who have not wealth at their command.

This is not the case in the United States, in Canada, or in Australia or New Zealand. There, though the franchise is not much freer or more extensive than it is in Britain, popular feeling gives life and vigour to the parliaments or to Congress, and any measure which the body of the people clearly deem to be desirable or necessary, quickly

becomes the law of the land. See the vigour with which the Commonwealth Parliament dealt with the question of a White Australia. That measure bristled with difficulties; for to carry it out, conflicted with the Imperial rights of the British Parliament; insomuch as coloured British subjects were denied certain political rights which by law apparently belonged to them. Then see the resolution with which—despite all opposition from the so-called peace party—the measure to arm and give a military training to all Australian young men was carried through by the ministry of the Commonwealth. Such vigour and such promptitude of political action would have been quite impossible in this country; unless indeed, it were public action, decisively demanded for the safety of the State. In that case, the opposing forces of Conservatism and of Liberalism would join and act as one body. But let the question be not one of resistance to foreign aggression, but one to relieve the vast millions of struggling humanity from the evils which the Land laws of Britain inflict on them, and which at every turn, and at every attempt towards the betterment of their position, cover the working population of Britain as if with a shroud, then see how slow is the political progress, and how helpless are the millions of working men voters, who are supposed to control the parliament of the United Kingdom. No, we have not popular government in Britain, except in name. It is wealth which controls parliament, and which throttles the action of

popular representation. The two great political parties—the Liberals and the Conservatives—hold in their hands the destinies of the British people, and every step in the way of advance or of political improvement must be done by, or through either one or the other of them. The avowed policy of the Conservatives is to do nothing that interferes with the so-called rights or privileges of the landed or wealthy classes. The avowed policy of the Liberals is to legislate for the benefit of the people. But there are two obstacles in their path. One, bold and rampant, is the House of Lords; the other, latent but ever-present, is the delays, the difficulties, and the innumerable obstacles interposed in the way of popular legislation by the ever-pressing necessity of finding money to get progressive candidates into parliament, and then of finding money to keep them there, should they succeed in entering what is commonly and truly termed the gilded Chamber of Westminster. But plenty men of little or no means become members of parliament. No doubt they do—but on what terms? They take the field or the platform as the Tory Candidate, or as the Liberal Candidate. Their expenses are paid, they may even be supported, while in parliament, by the party funds, as are many of the members of the Irish National Party, but as Tory or Liberal members, they are not free agents, they are not popular representatives. They are, the majority of them, as much political officials as are the liveried servants of the House of Commons. They, in fact, are “tied”

members, just as there are “tied” publicans, who are the servants of the wealthy brewing houses. If the party which supports and controls them chooses to mark time, then they must mark time. If, on the other hand, the party tactics make it desirable that they should advance, they are ready to advance, or to go to the right or to the left as the case may be. And all the while these movements may have no more connection with the wants or the interests of the long-suffering British working classes, than if the orders to execute them had emanated from Mars, or from the man in the moon.

But what would you have, say the party politicians? In politics, in the House of Commons, the members must submit to discipline. Even your extreme democratic members, your men who represent Labour or the working classes, have to submit to certain rules, and must try to act together, otherwise they become helpless units in the conflicts of parliament. Quite true, but the crux of the situation is this, that in the management or discipline of the Irish Party, or of the Labour Party, it is not wealth which is the controlling power. It is the interest of the party, and of the political principles which it represents. Then another consideration comes in which largely influences all members of parliament. When the cost of gaining a seat in the House of Commons is so great, it is natural that members should wish the tenure of it to be as long as possible. In this respect then, the inevitable tendency of even the wildest

Radical is to become conservative so far as regards his seat. Public opinion may have greatly changed since his election on more than one important question, but on that head he is often conservative enough to wish to delay the advent of a general election till the last possible moment. And this view is also strongly held by the leaders of both of the great political parties—with both of them it is the ever-recurring difficulty to find funds to contest every likely constituency, and to secure as many “tied” members as possible.

If then, the advocates of reform of the Land laws, and of Home Rule all round, wish to bring these great measures nearer practical realisation, they must at once take in hand the simplification and the cheapening of the machinery of parliament. Septennial parliaments are entirely out of date, and are only aids to wealth to delay most necessary legislation, and to obscure the great political issues that press for settlement. Four years is the longest term for which any parliament should be elected. With this should come payment of members. There are, no doubt, certain evils connected with such a step, but with a pretty large knowledge of the question we say that in this country such a measure as payment of members is absolutely necessary if the great reforms required on behalf of the British working classes are to be carried out within a reasonable time. Britain is, so far as we know, one of the few States, if not the only great State that does not pay her legislators. In France, the United

States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the members of the Legislative Assemblies are paid. In the Australian Federal Parliament they get £600 a year with free railway passes over the whole of the Commonwealth, and in all the States, the members are paid, generally £300 a year. The work of legislation is thus free and open, not only to the men of wealth, but to the young men of talent and public spirit, though perchance possessed of little or no means. Then the entrance to parliament is not made impossible to such men as in Britain, by the heaping up of costs against every candidate. All the expenses connected with the polling and with the polling booths are paid by the government, and in Victoria and probably in the other States as well, the electoral expenses, even for the Upper House, are limited to £200 per candidate. The members of the Legislature are thus freed so far as possible of all unnecessary cost, and the entrance to parliament is made easy and accessible to all men of talent who wish to serve the public. In this way the Legislatures or Parliaments, whether they be of the Commonwealth or of the various States, become the ready instruments for carrying out the popular will—not as in Britain for delaying, impeding, and if possible for destroying measures that are absolutely necessary for the welfare and the happiness of the people.

No. 17

### THE REDFORD MILITARY STATION AND THE BACKING DOWN OF MR HALDANE

WHAT has come over Mr Haldane, the great War Minister who two or three years ago flouted Scottish public opinion in the most offensive manner, and withdrew the Scots Greys from Scotland to England; first on one pretext, then on another; and at last gave up all pretexts, and openly avowed that the War Office deemed the removal desirable, and that he would not be coerced, despite all that the Scottish nation might plead or might say in the matter. It is impossible to forget or to overlook the miserable and floundering position which the then nascent War Minister took up in this question, so important to the military sentiment of the Scottish people. Their only cavalry regiment—their one ewe lamb—was to be taken from them, and Anglicised—for that was the evident intention of the movement—simply because War Office officials who think that every British soldier should dance or fight to English tunes, considered that “The Greys” should be stationed in the South of England for the purpose of Divisional training. If this argument was good for a Scottish cavalry regiment, it was also good for English and Irish regiments. But cavalry regiments were to be retained in Yorkshire and in Ireland, whence they would be quite as troublesome to remove to the South of England as the Scots Greys from Edinburgh; so that could not have been the true ground for the transference.

The strong and vigorous discussion that the proposed transfer then evoked in Scotland showed clearly that in one all-important respect Mr Haldane was not the man for the office of a British War Minister. With four nationalities to deal with, with also the growing military feeling of the “Britains beyond the Seas” to be fully considered, Mr Haldane entered upon his great work for the re-organisation of the British Army with apparently not a spark of sentiment in his mental composition. A heavy-headed, dull “Saxon-English” sergeant set aside to drill Highland, Irish, or Welsh recruits, could not have begun his work with less sympathy, or with less real knowledge of the most important elements of military character than did Mr Haldane. What is the first and most important element in the military character? Sentiment—national sentiment! It is that which makes the true well-trained soldier a perfect machine for war; without it, he is only half a perfect fighting man—if even that. Napoleon is reported to have said that in battle the moral force is to the physical as three is to one; and under certain conditions the dictum may be accepted as a true one. Yet this all-important quality Mr Haldane treated with contempt. Utterly destitute of it himself, no doubt—for otherwise he never would have allowed the officials at the War Office to control his judgment in so important a matter—he began his work by trying to take from Scotland, on a false pretext, its one cavalry regiment; and a regiment which, in one of the greatest battles

in history, had made itself immortal by its decisive and destructive charge on and through the battalions of D'Erlon at Waterloo. The glory of that charge was shared in as well by an English and by an Irish regiment of cavalry—the Royals and the Enniskillens—but it was on the burly forms and the death-dealing swords of the gallant Greys that the eyes of Napoleon and of his staff who were watching the movement were chiefly fixed. “Ah. Ces chevaux gris-qu'ils sont terribles.” “Ah. These grey horsemen, how terrible they are,” the Emperor is reported to have said, as he saw them riding through his discomfited regiments and sabreing his gunners as though they had been dealing merely with a pack of school-boys. And yet this was the regiment with such a history whose glory in British military annals is imperishable, which Mr Haldane in his callous thoughtlessness tried to denationalise. Englishmen are proud of the traditions connected with many of their national regiments, and would be furious if any attempt were made to take away the honours which adorn the colours of so many of them. Why then should the more noble-minded of English military men not foster and encourage the same sentiment in connection with the Scottish, Irish and Welsh regiments?

Let us for the present be thankful that Mr Haldane's stupid attempt—that is the proper term—to lessen and destroy Scottish military sentiment, has received a check. Who has applied that check is not made known, and is not likely to be made known for some years. But that a

wiser head than Mr Haldane's has interfered, and has compelled the War Office to pay due respect to the national sentiment of Scotland is obvious. No thanks all the same to Mr Haldane for the change of policy. He is a man of ability undoubtedly in his own line; but in military matters an able man without sentiment is a square peg in a round hole, and that is a perfectly fair description of Mr Haldane's position as a British War Minister.

Since writing the foregoing, we have been favoured with a letter from the War Office to the Council of the St Andrew Society, which will be published in our next issue. That letter throws a flood of light upon the question of the attempted Anglicisation of the Scots Greys. The first action of the War Office officials evidently was to deprive “the Greys” of their Scottish domicile, and practically to make them an English regiment. Had there been no intention of doing this, the very serious and indignant protests that were raised throughout Scotland when the regiment was taken from Piershill, would at once have evoked a statement of contradiction — if such a statement was consistent with the then existent policy of the War Office. But no statement favourable to the views and wishes of the Scottish people was then made. On the contrary, Mr Haldane treated the remonstrances of Scotland with indifference. The War Office officials—of the usual blundering routine stamp—had him by the nose, and he humbly and ignominiously carried out their policy to the letter. But

fortunately for Britain there is a power above the War Office, which it dare not disobey; and the bold stand made on behalf of his regiment by the Colonel of "The Greys" brought the question under the notice of the Army Council, and then the question was at once settled now and for ever. The Army Council evidently knows the importance of national sentiment in giving strength and enthusiasm to the various racial elements of the British Army. In the letter which will be given in our next issue is the following statement—"The Army Council fully recognise the desirability of maintaining the great national traditions of this fine Regiment." This is not merely a dictum on the question of the nationality of "The Greys"; it is the enunciation of a great Military Policy, which will now and for the future be carried out through every racial branch or territorial division of the British Army. The warmest thanks of the Scottish people are due to the gallant Colonel of "The Greys" for his bold declaration, which caused the Army Council to take action; and also to the Army Council itself for so promptly remedying the blunders of the War Office, and for establishing a policy which will make similar blundering for the future impossible. But what about our great War Minister? What about the blustering Mr Haldane, who "would not be coerced," despite all that the Scottish people might say? He must now feel like a badly-trained dog, who has been brought sharply to heel.

"SCOTLAND'S GLORY."—This is the title of a "New Scottish National Song," of which the words are by Mr Joseph Crosthwaite and the music by Mr John Bell, Mus. Doc. Both of these gentlemen are ardent patriots and prominent members of the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow, and it is noted that "the entire nett proceeds of the sale of this song up till the date of the unveiling of the "Elderslie Wallace Memorial" will be handed to the Committee of the same; and any future profits will be applied to objects for the maintenance of the rights and honour of Scotland. We trust the song will have a large sale. The price is one shilling, and copies can be got from Dr Bell, 58 Bath Street, Glasgow.

---

### SAXON ENGLISHMEN'S DEEP THINKING

PLACE—*Parlour of a "Pub."*

TIME—*Evening.*

*First Saxon Englishman*: "Well, Jarge, what be'est thee a thinking o', thee seems to be very happy."

*Second S. E.*: "A thinkin' o', Bill, why in coorse I'm happy. I'm thinkin' o' what I had for dinner to-day. And what are you thinkin' o', Jarge. You seem to be mighty well pleased with theesel'."

*First S. E.*: "What be I athinkin' o', Bill. Ah, I be a deeper thinker than thee, Bill. I be a thinkin' o' what I am goin' to have for dinner to-morrow!"

T. T.

## THE FALSITIES OF ENGLISH HISTORY

Mr A. N. writing to us from Melbourne, Australia, draws our particular attention to a work entitled "The Rise of English Culture," by Edmund Johnson, and published in 1904 by Williams & Norgate, London. A. N. writes:

"No one can fairly understand history unless he takes some trouble to understand the beginning of things.

"That is why people should read Johnson's book, which shows with great clearness how English history had been idealised, and then written out by the monks.

"The *very first* history—by Polydore Vergil, an Italian—was written about 1530-50. He rejected the English claims to Scotland as frauds; but had to put in many lies, because he would have had no 'History' if he hadn't put them in His own admission. The history of Geoffroy of Monmouth was current at this time. And William Camden, 'the good master of Westminster School,' as Johnson calls him, published his 'Britannia' in 1586, still upholding 'Brute,' and this teaching went on for 200 years, and is perhaps believed yet in some places! What 'history' can be built on such foundations?


"It was entirely the work of the monks. Johnson exposes the frauds, and shows clearly how they were perpetrated; all this in a way that should help immensely in the struggle for a Scottish voice in British history; and it will need all the help it can get if it wants fair play in the contest. A new set of

history books has been initiated for Britain, as I understand; and Johnson gives the most powerful help that Scotsmen can receive, and they should make the most of him they can. All the so-called 'Chronicles' were written in the 15th and 16th centuries—'Bede,' &c. It is all a Church ideal—for the glorification of the Church in the first place and to claim the overlordship of England over Scotland in the second.

"Scotsmen will have a lot to do to 'keep their end up' in the coming struggle over the new history, and if they throw away the aid of Johnson's book they will be very unwise.

"It is the work of an honest man, a scholar and a critic; and being an Englishman, of the utmost importance to the Scottish side. They can't afford to throw away a chance. And here I want to protest against the cry of the little Scotlanders who mislead the weaker vessels by crying Home Rule *v.* Imperialism. Imperialism is the very way to Home Rule, and the only way—unless you are to convert all the Dependencies into St Helenas! Nothing but Imperialism will suit Australians. See how the Commonwealth has joined all the States of Australia together, notwithstanding the muddling of parties. *Empire* means self government of States.

"By the way, I rather think the King is much against Scotland in his underhand way. When the old queen was alive the young heir was Prince *David*; whenever she died he was Prince *Edward*. His last exploit was to dismiss a battalion of Scots Guards, and Haldane got the blame; and his general *tendency* has been that way."



### THE ROYAL ARMS OF SCOTLAND

WE understand a communication has been addressed by the Secretary for Scotland to all Government Departments in Scotland that in future the Royal Arms are to be used in Scotland for all official purposes and on all official publications in the form above reproduced, which has been prepared by the Lion King of Arms and approved of by the Secretary. These arms will in future be seen at the head of the "Edinburgh Gazette." It will be observed that the Lion Rampant occupies the first and fourth quarters of the Shield, the Unicorn has precedence as dexter supporter, the crest is that of Scotland with the

motto, "In Defens," and the Shield is surrounded by the Collar of the Order of the Thistle.

—o—

THE LAYING THE FOUNDATION STONE OF THE NEW ROYAL INFIRMARY.—Will some of our readers who were present when the present King performed the above ceremony give us particulars as to his reception in Edinburgh on that occasion; also the date of the month and the year. It will be interesting to learn from eye witnesses and from ear witnesses, if we may use the expression, what took place on an occasion which the vindictiveness of His Majesty has made somewhat memorable to all patriotic Scotsmen.

### WALLACE DUBBED "A THIEF" BY SIR HERBERT MAXWELL

IN the *Galloway Advertiser* of 8th April 1897, there appeared the following paragraph—"Of King Edward's tour in the north many interesting details have been preserved in the Placita roll of his army. But there is one which transcends them all, as being in all probability the first public mention of an individual whose name was soon to be written large in the annals of his country. At the gaol delivery of Perth on August 8th (1296) Matthew York was accused of entering the house of a woman in company with a thief, one William le Waleys (Wallace), and robbing her of 3d. worth of beer. Matthew was a priest, and claimed benefit of clergy. Wallace seems to have escaped arrest, for he was not in the gaol. It is not possible to affirm the identity of this le Waleys with the patriot, but it is highly probable; and his escapade at Perth may account for the known fact that William Wallace was an outlaw when he made his appearance in the national cause."

The foregoing fully implies that Wallace was the le Waleys, and is published to the world as a great discovery by Sir Herbert Maxwell in his book styled *Robert the Bruce*; forgetting that such a vile, pitiful charge against so illustrious a man required very careful investigation before being put in print.—*M'Kerlie's History of Galloway, etc.*, Vol. I., p. 152-3.

### A SCOTTISH GENTLEMAN WITH THE OXFORD TAINT

"MOST of the Scottish records were lost or destroyed, and those of England are followed without a thought (by writers of Scottish history), or it may be want of knowledge of the bitter feeling towards Scotland which existed from an early period. Careful examination will expose that too often falsehoods were the rule. Hume in his *History of England* warns his readers in regard to this. While such was general from an early period, the intensity of hatred to Wallace was at white heat. But what is to be said of Scottish authors, when Sir Herbert Maxwell in his *Robert the Bruce* insults the memory of the patriot by stating that he was 'a thief, an outlaw, and a brigand.'—From M'Kerlie's *History of Galloway*, Vol. I., p. 152.

### DEFOE ON SCOTLAND AND SCOTSMEN

THE BEST SOLDIERS IN THE WORLD

WRITING before the Union, Defoe said:—"Scotland is an inexhaustible treasure of men, as may be demonstrated by the vast numbers of them in our army and navy, and in the armies of the Swede, the Pole, the Muscovite, the Emperor (Germany), Holland and France. What might England now do, had she in her pay all the Scots, actually in the service of those princes, where they are daily cutting one another's throats, and at the expense of their country's impoverishment, gain the empty reputation of being the best soldiers in the world."



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 5.

December 1908

Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
„ 18.—MONARCHS AS DIPLOMATISTS . . . . .	66
„ 19.—THE KING VERSUS THE KAISER . . . . .	70
„ 20.—THE ARMY COUNCIL AND RECRUITING FOR THE SCOTS GREYS. . . . .	73
REMOVAL OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT TO EDINBURGH . . . . .	75
TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH . . . . .	76
AUSTRALIAN OPINION OF HEREDITARY LEGISLATION . . . . .	77
SCOTTISH FISHERMEN IN AUSTRALIA . . . . .	77
KING EDWARD I. OF BRITAIN . . . . .	78
GOOD CHEER FROM GALLOWAY . . . . .	79



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



# The Thistle

No. 5.

DECEMBER 1908.

MONTHLY 1<sup>D</sup>.

## PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow.*

## A BRAVE SCOTTISH MISSIONARY

THE "Sunday Strand" Magazine for November has an article on Dr Westwater, a Scottish medical missionary, now residing in Edinburgh, comparatively unknown. It says:—"In the Far East Dr Westwater's name is, I am assured, a household word, and his face and figure are as familiar as that of any official in the Empire. Japanese and Russian soldiers know him. He tended them on many a bloody field, and they speak of him in the same unrestrained language Marshal Oyama had used when a war correspondent asked him why he took such interest in Scotsmen. "Because," said the Marshal, "you belong to the greatest nation in the world—the nation which has produced two of the greatest men the world has ever known—Sir Walter Scott and Dr Westwater." Yet at home Dr Westwater passes unnoticed and unknown.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 18.

## MONARCHS AS DIPLOMATISTS

THE amazing indiscretion of the Kaiser in his dealings with foreign affairs, as shown by the publication in *The Daily Telegraph* in the beginning of last month of his interview with a certain Englishman, has an interest for the British people more direct and more important than the public generally seem to apprehend. We do not refer to the expressions used by the Kaiser as to the attitude of the "English" people—the Scots be it noted are not mentioned—towards himself; although his language on that subject is by no means reassuring; for it might easily pass in the mind of so impulsive a ruler as the Kaiser, from complaint to menace, and from menace to war—if in war there were a reasonable prospect of success. We leave that view of the question for the present, and direct our readers to the fact that in our own country during the last few years there has been an approach by our own ruler to an interference with the foreign policy of the kingdom, which is not merely unusual, but is not in accordance

with the constitutional position of the reigning monarch. The superficial portion of the Press of London, giving voice to the superficial views of the unthinking and ignorant portion of their readers, have for the last two or three years been applauding His Majesty's action in foreign affairs, and have gone so far as to term him the greatest Diplomatist in Europe. It is to be observed here that it is only within the last few years that King Edward has taken a prominent position as a Diplomatist. When Lord Salisbury was Minister for Foreign Affairs the public heard nothing of King Edward as a diplomatist; and during Lord Lansdowne's administration the same policy was continued of keeping the occupant of the throne in the background with reference to all State affairs—foreign or otherwise. But with the advent of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman to power, a great change ere long took place. Whatever may have been the merits of Sir Henry as a Prime Minister—and they were important enough in their way—he certainly cannot be claimed to have been a man of commanding intellect, and his administration soon began to betray this defect in his character. His guidance of the Cabinet was of the free and easy character, and ere long this began to show itself in the management of State affairs, and in no department more decidedly than in the department of Foreign Affairs. Sir Edward Grey, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, is a comparatively young man, and though undoubtedly an able minister, and one who in deal-

ing with foreign governments has well held his own, he has evidently failed to do so in his attitude towards King Edward; and the result has been that His Majesty has been allowed to take a part in the management of the foreign policy of the kingdom, which has not been accorded to any British monarch since the disastrous reign of George the Third.

It is not difficult to see how this has arisen. His Majesty is ambitious, and like all ambitious rulers is desirous of interfering in those affairs of State that will most attract the attention of the world. With the accession to office of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and a Cabinet consisting mainly of what may be termed middle-class public men, the chance of King Edward came, and he was shrewd enough to quickly take advantage of it. He began his policy of interference in Foreign Affairs by dealing directly with the Prime Minister, and here probably Sir Henry thought that His Majesty's knowledge of foreign courts and his acquaintance with foreign potentates, with the majority of whom he was closely related, would prove an advantage. But as Sir Henry's management of his Cabinet was, as we have said, of a free and easy character, it need hardly be wondered at that in dealing with the King even more easiness would be shown, and that more and more the name of His Majesty began to be heard in connection with the foreign policy of the kingdom. Sir Edward Grey no doubt felt that this interference on the part of His Majesty was an

undesirable innovation ; but when the Premier concurred in it, and in a listless way encouraged it, he, as a young Minister of State, was in a very difficult position. Probably he felt that if he got into conflict with the King, and with the Prime Minister at the best indifferent in the matter, he would ruin his career as a statesman. However this may be, the fact remains that His Majesty has been allowed to interfere with, if not to manage, the foreign policy of the country in a manner that has not been shown for over a century. For be it remembered that though Queen Victoria had a will of her own as regards foreign affairs, it was not in the way of initiative, but of preventive—a very much safer policy for the country, and quite in accordance with the Constitution ; and, moreover, a policy which on one all-important occasion — viz., the Trent difficulty with the United States—saved Great Britain from a war that would have been of a most disastrous kind.

It is clear that any active and open interference by the reigning monarch with affairs of state is not only unconstitutional, but is an element of danger to the Throne. The unthinking multitude applaud his present majesty and deem him a heaven-born statesman, and pronounce him to be the greatest of living diplomatists. This is their ignorant babble, too often echoed and re-echoed by politicians of the courtier type who know, or ought to know, better. During the last two or three months this question has been dealt with by able writers in *The Times*, *The Spectator*, and *The*

*Nation*, and all in a spirit condemnatory of the action of King Edward. Thus :

*The Spectator* of the 5th of September, in a review of an article on "The King and the Constitution" in *The Contemporary Review*, says, "The main aim of the writer is to explain the genesis of the fantastic and mischievous myth commonly believed on the Continent, and especially in Germany, that King Edward, and not the Cabinet, is the decisive factor in framing the foreign policy of Great Britain. He shows how this mistaken idea has been confirmed by servile, ill-informed, or thoughtless scribes at home, as well as by the fact that the King has not been accompanied on his recent tours by the Foreign Secretary, and notes that journals boasting of an immense circulation, speak of Sir Edward Grey as "ably seconding his sovereign." The succeeding paragraphs are worth quoting, as they emphasise a doctrine laid down in our own (*Spectator*) columns years ago :—

"The fact is that even the great services which His Majesty is in a position to render to the cause of peace are endangered by such an inversion of parts. The king may be our Diplomat-King, but kings are only available as diplomatists when they are associated with the policy of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Even if the policy of Ministers had been originated by His Majesty, the more necessary it would be, in the interest of the Crown itself, that no credit should be claimed for the sovereign. Credit cannot be claimed when a policy

succeeds, without discredit attaching to the originator when the policy fails. If the exclusive responsibility of the minister is impaired, it is disastrous for the king."

*The Nation*, the weekly organ of the Liberal Party, is equally emphatic in its condemnation of King Edward's interference in the foreign policy of the country. In its issue of 5th September it says:—

"King Edward's personal popularity in French society probably enabled him to aid in the cementing of the Anglo-French *entente*. But the conclusion which is commonly drawn in London and Paris from this success, that he is an active and exceptionally gifted diplomatist, has done much more harm than good, based as it is on an entirely false and yet tenaciously held theory of our Constitution. If we were to accept it, we should necessarily have to speak with more freedom than the British Press usually applies to the action of a king who reigns but does not govern. We should have to point out that the friction between the British and German Courts has added for several years an element of special difficulty to Anglo-German relations. The notion that the king is his own Foreign Minister, has, we are bound to add, received some support since those days—and the results have not been fortunate. The king's sudden visit to Italy in 1907 gave rise to suspicions at Berlin, which were for the moment a positive danger to peace. . . . Of the Cronberg visit, one can only say that visibly it has done no political good, and it may have done much harm. Quite apart from the

constitutional impropriety of these proceedings, there is nothing in such a record to lead us to welcome the increased influence of the Crown in foreign affairs, or to condone the startling breach with established practice they indicate."

*The Saturday Review* of the 14th of November, writing of the Kaiser's indiscretions, deals with the same question, and says:—"All this may in any case be taken as a warning by those foolish persons who will always be dragging the Crown forward as a responsible agent, and sometimes the sole agent in British foreign policy. No nation will long endorse the self-contradictory proposition that the sovereign is to receive the credit for popular policies, and the ministers the discredit for the unpopular. The theory will not long stand investigation."

These expressions of opinion from the conservative and liberal press are important, and it will be well if Parliament keeps a sharp eye on this question, and insists that the Cabinet shall keep the King in his proper place. Of course it is too much to expect that the London Press in dealing with the question should bring to bear on it any argument arising from His Majesty's action in reference to Scotland. That is about the last place that is thought of by it when British policy or British interests are concerned. But it is in this quarter that the real gravamen of the question can be seen and the moral drawn. In His Majesty's dealings with Scotland we have shown in our previous issues (*vide* our October issue, p.

37) that he has a deeply vindictive nature; and that under a specious covering of what his flatterers term tact, he conceals a strong vein of malignant feeling which he does not hesitate to give vent to when he deems it safe to do so. Towards Scotland he evidently considers that he is quite safe in openly giving the reins to his spleen. He has not yet ventured very far in openly showing to the world the bitterness of feeling he entertains towards his nephew the Kaiser; but he has done enough to let us know that he has a by no means friendly regard towards that powerful relative. We ask then if it is safe or prudent for a British Ministry to allow a monarch who unfortunately possesses a temperament so undiplomatic and so vindictive to interfere actively in the foreign policy of Britain. That policy now and for the future hinges mainly on our relations with Germany. The Ruler of Germany is impulsive. In allowing King Edward, as representing British Policy, to come face to face with him, we have to consider whether the Kaiser's dislike or jealousy of the uncle may not cause his temper to flash out at some inopportune moment, and lead to results disastrous to both great nations. The old constitutional rule should then be strictly insisted on by Parliament—if the Cabinet is too timorous or too flabby to do so—that the King should not be allowed to act for the country in foreign affairs, except in the presence of and through the agency of the Minister for Foreign Affairs. He can be held responsible if a disastrous policy is entered upon; but

the King cannot. And nothing can be clearer than that public action without responsibility is not only unconstitutional, but is a great danger to the State.

—o—  
No. 19

### THE KING versus THE KAISER

A DANGEROUS SITUATION

SINCE writing the foregoing the warning therein conveyed has been strikingly illustrated by the further disclosures in the Press of New York of the Kaiser's impulsiveness and irritation. It appears that he has during the last six months been so annoyed by the diplomatic interference of his uncle in the Courts of the Continent as to give utterance to his irritation not only to an English gentleman, but to an American interviewer connected with the New York Press. Mr Hale, the gentleman in question, came over by invitation to the Continent to see His Imperial Majesty, and was received by him in his yacht off the coast of Norway. The substance of that interview was prepared for publication by Mr Hale, and submitted by him to the German authorities, presumably the Foreign Office, and doubtless through it to the Kaiser in person. The report as approved was returned to Mr Hale, with an intimation that it should receive publicity not in a newspaper, but in a magazine of high character. Mr Hale chose *The Century*, a New York monthly magazine, which quite deserved that stipulation, and early last month it was announced in the New York Press that *The Century*

would publish details of an important interview which Mr Hale had had with the Emperor of Germany.

So far, this statement seems to be admitted as true ; but henceforward we are left in a maze of contradictions and denials. When the publication in the London *Daily Telegraph* of the Emperor's remarks to an English diplomatic gentleman caused such excitement in every capital in Europe, and had aroused the indignation of the German people, the Foreign Office at Berlin saw that the Emperor had gone too far in making known his state of irritation with the British monarch and through him with the British people, and did all they could to allay the excitement. To a certain extent they had succeeded in doing so, when news came from New York of the intended publication in *The Century* for December of Mr Hale's interview with the Kaiser. It was felt in high circles in Berlin that such a publication following close on that in *The Daily Telegraph* would be a diplomatic blunder of the first magnitude, and steps were quickly taken to "burke" the article. This has been done so far as possible. It will not appear in *The Century*, and every care has been taken to destroy all copies and proofs of its contents. But it need hardly be said that New York is about the last place in the world where this could be carried out with success. No complete narrative of the interview has, at the time we write, as yet been published, but we have shreds of it which have been made known, and which seem to be

genuine, and these are startling and alarming enough in all conscience, and must make the hair of European diplomatists—those of them who have any—stand on end from amazement.

The broad and main points that have been disclosed show clearly that during the last two years the Kaiser has been in a growing state of serious irritation with the foreign policy of Britain ; and the significant feature of his irritation is that it seems to arise, not so much from the acts of the British people, but from the open and direct interference of King Edward with the policy of Germany. The personal element comes out in many ways ; and it is not too much to say that the two monarchs have, during the last two years, been engaged in a serious diplomatic skirmish in which the King has been acting on the offensive and the Kaiser on the defensive, with the result that the latter has been so irritated that the peace of Europe may almost be said now to hang on a thread.

The great element of success in diplomacy, said Frederick the Great, is secrecy. If you wish to gain your end do not let your opponent know what you are after ; and let him learn only when the deed is done, and cannot be undone. This is not the way of British diplomacy as now carried on by King Edward against the Kaiser. It has been conducted, as it were, by the blare of drum and trumpet at the various courts of Europe. By poaching on the German preserve at Rome, and by a personal and loudly proclaimed in-

terview with the Czar at Cronberg, these have been the grave indiscretions which seem to have irritated the Kaiser almost to the point of explosion. "So they are trying to hem us in, are they?" he is reported to have said after one of King Edward's fussy diplomatic missions on the Continent—to Rome, if we mistake not. Then we have from New York such startling phrases as these, "During the last two years the King has been constantly thwarting me and trying to humiliate me." "I am quite tired of this, and don't care how soon war may end it," or words of a similar import. It may be said that there is no authoritative report of the suppressed interview. This is quite true; but we think there can be little doubt that the details that have been made known are correct, if not to the letter, at least to the substance. The great effort made by the German Foreign Office to prevent publication, show that the disclosures would at this juncture have been most serious.

There is now, in conclusion, a very important statement to make with reference to this diplomatic conflict between the two monarchs. The German people almost with one voice, and with a freedom and a boldness which do them great credit, have demanded that their ruler shall in the future restrain his diplomatic utterances and his diplomatic action; and shall in such matters work in concert with his Minister of State, the Chancellor. And they have succeeded in getting a response from the Kaiser, largely, if not entirely, favourable. On the other

hand the British people seem, with the exceptions quoted by us in the foregoing article in this issue, to look upon the meddling of the King in our foreign policy with great favour. The courtier class has been loud in its praise of his action, and acclaim him as a heaven-born diplomatist, and as the first statesman in Europe. This is mere midsummer madness, and if persisted in, may lead ere long to a sad and bitter awakening. Edmund Burke says, "Magnanimity in politics is not seldom the truest wisdom; and a great empire and little minds go ill together." Apply these maxims to the actions of King Edward since he came to the Throne. He was hooted by some portions of an Edinburgh mob some forty years ago for some of his indiscreet actions—not as a youth, but as a prince of middle age. When he comes to the throne, he in retaliation, by two acts of State, inflicts gross insults on the people of Scotland—on them and on their rational history for centuries back. He even is so petty-minded as to cast a personal slight on the chief magistrate of the Scottish capital. Here is an exhibition of long-drawn personal vindictiveness, quite unworthy of a constitutional monarch. And this is the great functionary to whom a thoughtless or flabby ministry entrusts the conduct of the foreign policy of Britain in the face of a great crisis which it is too evident is in the near future. If the vindictiveness of the uncle inflames the rash impulsiveness of the nephew to an act which may lead to war, then farewell to comfort and

contentment for the British people for generations to come. Even if Britain is successful, the people will be laden with a debt which will render all amelioration of their condition an impossibility for a century or more. Is Parliament helpless in such a matter as this? In the reign of George the Third, who was also a great meddler in colonial and foreign policy—with consequences well known in history—a motion in the House of Commons was proposed by Dunning (afterwards Lord Ashburton) in 1780, and carried—“That the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.” Is there no one in the present Parliament who will speak out boldly, and demand that our present monarch shall keep within the well-defined lines of the British Constitution?

—o—  
No. 20

### THE ARMY COUNCIL AND RECRUITING FOR THE SCOTS GREYS.

THE St Andrew Society (65 Castle Street, Edinburgh) keeps a sharp eye on everything connected with the interests of Scotland, and since its inception has been the means of checking, to some extent, that inattention to Scottish wants and Scottish rights which is so common a practice with the governing classes in London. Thus the offices of Historiographer Royal for Scotland, and the King's Limner for Scotland, which had been vacant for years, were filled shortly after the Society began an agitation for that object. Apparently the object of London

officialism was to allow them to lie dormant for a number of years, and then to declare they were antiquated and unnecessary. Had they been offices connected with London, there would have been a score of greedy aspirants for them as soon as they were vacant, and they would doubtless have been filled up without a month's delay.

The attention of the Society was lately directed to the question of the recruiting for the Scots Greys. In the August (Lammas) number of *Scotia*, the Quarterly Magazine of the Society (p. 182), there appeared the following paragraph:—“At the annual meeting of the Highland Society in London lately, at which Lord Tullibardine presided, the Colonel of the Scots Greys raised his protest against the decision of the War Office to put an end to recruiting for the Scots Greys in Scotland. His words were, ‘the regiment is not allowed to recruit in Scotland. This sounds odd, but it is true.’ Such a startling declaration from the officer in command of the Scots Greys demands immediate and serious attention. It means nothing less than that the Scottish people are being robbed of the only remaining regiment of horse.”

The Council of the Society followed up this paragraph by a letter to the War Office asking for definite information on the subject. This brought the War Office face to face with a very awkward question. Apparently, with the usual propensity for

blundering, which seems to be innate to "English" War Office officials, they had thought it proper to regard "The Greys" as an English regiment, and so had given orders, after it had been transferred to England, to stop all recruiting in Scotland. The words of the Colonel seem to be conclusive on this point, for he evidently did not speak as he did without having ample authority for his statement. All honour to him for so doing. He is evidently a gallant soldier, who knows the importance of *esprit de corps* and of national sentiment, and who was not going to have the glorious traditions of his regiment destroyed by official stupidity if he could help it. His outspokenness, backed no doubt by the remonstrance of some of the greater military authorities, caused the question to be brought under the notice of the Army Council; and when this took place, *hey presto*, what a change. "No recruiting for the regiment to be allowed in Scotland," said the blundering, stupid, Anglicising War Office routine officials. On the contrary, says the Army Council, after public attention had been drawn to the matter, "all recruits for the regiment are to be drawn from Scotland," and "no recruits for the Royal Scots Greys are being enlisted in England or Ireland."

This little military episode is characteristic, and is also instructive. It shows what a nest of South or Saxon English bigotry and of South English stupidity the War Office is; and the British

public may thank their stars that the progress of reform in these latter years has constituted such a check to its stupid blundering as is the Army Council. With these remarks, we subjoin the reply of the so-called War Office to the enquiry of the Council of the St Andrews Society. If carefully read between the lines, and compared with the statement made by the gallant and manly Colonel of the Scots Greys, it will be found to be a very interesting and instructive document:—

27/ CAVALRY /113

(A. G. 2. B. Recruiting).

WAR OFFICE, London, S.W.,

7th October 1908.

Gentlemen,

With reference to your letter of the 17th ultimo., on the subject of the recruiting arrangements for the 2nd Dragoons (Royal Scots Greys), I am commanded by the Army Council to inform you that, from the records in this office, it is noticed that the Regiment has always been opened to recruiting in Scotland when recruits have been required for it. At the present time recruits are being taken in Edinburgh, and if further recruits are required to keep the Regiment up to its establishment, other districts in Scotland will be opened. No recruits for the Royal Scots Greys are being enlisted in England or Ireland.

The numbers of men allowed for the Army are laid down by Parliament, and cannot be exceeded. The establishment of all regiments has to be determined;

consequently it is necessary to open or close recruiting areas, as this establishment is either under, or well up to, the authorised numbers.

As regards the 1st (Royal) Dragoons, I am to acquaint you that this regiment is affiliated to the Royal Scots Greys for organisation purposes, and drafts required by the former regiment have to be found by the latter; but, in order to obtain recruits for the 1st (Royal) Dragoons, and to keep the Scotsmen in the Royal Scots Greys, the 1st (Royal) Dragoons is open for recruiting in England, and such recruits are only temporarily attached to the Royal Scots Greys.

In conclusion, I am to assure you, as is indeed evidenced by the arrangements detailed above, that the Army Council fully recognise the desirability of maintaining the great national traditions of this fine Regiment, and certain statements which have apparently been made and circulated as to the recruiting arrangements and organisation of the Royal Scots Greys are evidently founded upon a misunderstanding.

I am,

Gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

E. W. D. WARD.

The Council of the  
St Andrew Society,  
65 Castle Street,  
Edinburgh.

## REMOVAL OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT TO EDINBURGH

IN *The Scotsman* of the 11th of November, there is a paragraph on "Parliament in Session" dealing with the debate on Scottish Education, which says, "New clauses dealing with military drill and the removal of the office of the department to Edinburgh were ruled out by the Speaker on the ground that they could be affected by administration, and therefore did not require the heavy machinery of Parliament." No doubt the Speaker spoke with authority, and his dictum in this matter is of the highest importance. The business of Scottish education can never be properly administered in an English environment. Education to Scotsmen is a question of the first importance, and next to religion and the maintenance of their national honour is probably dearer to them than any other national interest. If then the transference of the Education Department to Edinburgh is merely a matter of administration, we would recommend that a deputation of Scottish members should wait upon the Premier and strongly urge that this change should be carried out with as little delay as possible. We are aware that Mr Sinclair has said that the administration of the department cannot be carried on properly away from London; but this is evidently an error of judgment on Mr Sinclair's part. He is an able man, and a true Scotsman who has the interest of his country at heart; but in this case the views of the officials have overpowered his

better judgment. We daresay some of the leading officials in the department, like that pert anglicised Scot, Lord Robertson, are of opinion that to be located in Edinburgh would be a dreary banishment to their Cockney temperament; but the feelings of such officials should not be allowed to prevent or delay a movement so dear to the wishes of the Scottish people, and so important also to the development and maintenance of their nationality. We hope to see action taken in this matter without delay. Mr Asquith cannot with justice refuse the very reasonable request. And should he do so, it will be the duty of the more stalwart of the Scottish members plainly to let him know that if he does so he will ere long have good reason to regret his refusal.

—o—

### TRAWLING IN THE MORAY FIRTH

**L**ORD HENEAGE, the champion of the Grimsby trawlers, initiated a debate in the House of Lords on the 11th of November on behalf of his clients. He wished the Government to remove the restrictions which now prevent British trawlers from trawling in the Moray Firth, alleging that as the Government cannot prevent foreign trawlers from doing so British trawlers should have the same privilege. The Moray Firth is perhaps the best breeding place in the North Sea, and is the fishing ground for from ten to fifteen thousand fishermen who live in the numerous fishing burghs that fringe the coast from Wick to Fraserburgh. The trawlers

very practically harrying the Firth to destruction; one witness, whose testimony was quoted by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, said, "If trawlers are admitted into the Moray Firth they would clear out the whole ground in six weeks." It is true the Government cannot prevent foreign trawlers from fishing in the Firth, but they prevent them from landing their fish in British ports, and this to a large extent neutralises the evil. Lord Heneage sneered at the Moray Firth fishermen; said they never ventured far outside the Firth, and were always at home on the day of election. In fact his speech and his sneering tone towards the Scottish line fishermen was a fair specimen of the usual arrogant Englishman's line of criticism towards anything Scottish, and was well answered by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, who said, "There was a good deal in the speech of Lord Heneage about the Scottish Office and Scottish character, with which he did not propose to deal. He supposed that what the noble Lord said about the Scottish Office would pass for wit in Grimsby or in Billingsgate—(laughter)—but it did not contain any serious argument. (Hear, hear.)"

The debate ended by Lord Heneage withdrawing his motion. His purpose, however, was only made too evident. He would have had the industry of the fishing burghs on the coast of the Moray Firth completely sacrificed for the benefit of the Grimsby trawlers if he could.

—o—

### AUSTRALIAN OPINION OF HEREDITARY LEGISLATORS.

AT a social meeting that was held in Adelaide on the 8th of September to welcome the Scottish Fishing Delegates, one of the speakers, Sir John Gordon, emphasised in a striking manner the different views of legislation held by Australians, as compared with those held in Great Britain, and especially in England. Sir John said, (*Adelaide Register*) "Scotsmen were lovers of freedom, and he could say this was the freest and most civilized country in the world. It was a big wrench to pull up family stakes and leave the land of one's birth. Once it was done he did not believe any Scottish family who came here in decent conditions would wish to return. He called this the most civilized country, as in it was the most generally diffused standard of comfort, and added to that was the greatest measure of political freedom. Was there a man who would not shoulder his musket and fight rather than have his laws made for him by an hereditary House of Lords? (Applause). Speaking with all reverence he would rather see every church steeple razed to the ground than the laws made by Bishops. (Mr Newlands — "You are walking through our history from end to end.") These were inducements to Scotsmen who had been champions of and fighters for freedom from the earliest times." If a speaker in this country, or at least in that part of it which is the land of Toryism,

viz., South England, were to use such language in public, he would be denounced as a Socialist, or Anarchist, and everything that is revolutionary and vile. Yet we venture to say that Sir John Gordon is an enlightened and law-abiding citizen; and was moreover giving voice to sentiments that are common to the community in which he lives. So much for living in a country that has utterly cast off the last relics of adabasing feudalism.


### SCOTTISH FISHERMEN IN AUSTRALIA.

A PARTY of Scottish fishermen from Argyleshire and Bute went to Australia some months ago, for the purpose of seeing whether there was an opening there for their enterprise in establishing fishing stations on the Australian coast. They seem to have gone first to Sydney; thence to Melbourne, and finally to Adelaide. At the two former capitals they were favourably received; and at Melbourne, Sir Thomas Bent seems to have been disposed to give them a lease or conditional grant of land on the shores of Bass's Strait for the establishment of a fishing station. It was at Adelaide, however, where the deputation arrived in the end of August, that the members of it received their warmest welcome. A government steamer, the "Governor Musgrave," was placed at their disposal, and along with some representatives of the government, and members of the press, a visit was paid to Kangaroo Island, a considerable island lying in the

Bay some thirty miles or so south of Port Adelaide. The delegates, Messrs Newlands, Grieve, and Eagleshaw, were much pleased with the prospects of the fishing industry on the island, and stated that "there are magnificent opportunities for the development of a big fishing industry there." The party then proceeded in the steamer to Spencer's Gulf, where they visited Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, and other smaller ports. Considerable interest was felt in the statement made by Mr Newlands, that the herring was in Australian waters. "Are they herring," queries the *Adelaide Register*, and goes on to say "the question has been frequently asked, since the Scottish fishing delegates reported having sight a vast shoal of herring when steaming in the vicinity of Kangaroo Island just prior to their landing in Australia a few months ago. It was expected that the point would have been settled once for all during the cruise of the "Governor Musgrave," but that did not prove to be the case. . . . All along, the delegates, who are expert fishermen, have maintained that the fish were herring, and the spokesman of the party, Mr Newlands, was emphatic in that contention. "If they were na herring," he said, "then I dinna ken a herring, and I have worked among them all my life." At the Adelaide Fish Market, Mr Newlands caused some surprise by indicating the common every day "tommy rough" as a herring. The Australian fishermen ridiculed this, but the Scotsmen persisted in their view. The opinion of Mr Zietz, Assistant

Director of the Museum in Adelaide, was asked his opinion, and he said the "tommy rough" belonged to the perch family, and that the shape of the tail showed that it had no relation to the herring. On the other hand, it was pointed out that Stead, in his book on Australian fishes, classed the rough with the herring family. Mr Newlands also persisted in his view of the matter. So that an interesting question is opened up, as to whether the herring is in Australian waters.

With reference to the above, the *London Standard*, in a telegram from Adelaide of the 25th November, says:—"The Scottish fishermen have settled on Kangaroo Island and begun fishing operations."



### KING EDWARD I. OF BRITAIN

"THE King is not, and never can be, Edward the Seventh. No Edward ever sat on the British Throne till now. The six Edwards referred to by the term "Seventh" were merely English Kings. To call the British Monarch "Edward VII." is to make it seem as if the British Throne were merely English, to violate therefore both Treaties of Union, and to affront all the British, but not English, portions both of Great and Greater Britain. The King is the first Edward of the United Kingdom and the first Edward of the British Empire."

THE above leaflet, which is extensively circulated by the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow, gives clearly and tersely

the statement of a great grievance that the Scottish people have against his present Majesty. In England the grievance is regarded as of no account, partly from the fact that it is a Scottish grievance, and partly because it is a statement of the position of the Crown, which tends to enhance the position of England in the empire at the expense of Scotland. It is a mere sentimental grievance, say the John Bullies, and what of that. It is nothing! Well, the time will come when sentiment will take its proper position as a natural force, and arrogant Englishmen will have to moderate their bumpiousness and be compelled to treat Scotsmen with some degree of justice. Meanwhile let all patriotic Scotsmen take note of the indifference and contempt with which their national sentiment is now treated by an overwhelming majority of the English people, and with patience wait for the time when they can adjust the national balance. When John Bull gets a little frightened, he then interferes with John Bully's bumpiousness and swagger, and tells him that he must behave himself and keep quiet; but only then! Scotsmen will please take note.

—o—

### GOOD CHEER FROM GALLOWAY

MASON LODGE, NEWTON STEWART,

6th October 1908.

The Editor of *The Thistle*, Edinburgh.

DEAR SIR,—I have just got the first three numbers of *The Thistle* . . . and I think I cannot sufficiently

congratulate you upon them. I hope—most fervently hope—that your generous effort will be encouraged.

Your *Thistle Papers* are splendid. I like to see that your aim is “not only to defend, but also to attack; a policy of offence as well as of defence.”

Such a policy is terribly needed. Never fear but the heart of the nation is still Scottish to the core, but the fact is, we *have got out of the habit* of thinking nationally. We have tied ourselves to the heels of the English Whig or Liberal party for generations, and we have got that we take more interest in an English by-election than in the raid of the Vatersay squatters—an event a hundred times more significant to us.

Article No. 11 of the Papers I was very much interested in, and the way in which it shows the inevitable tendency of John Bullyism to break up the Empire is novel and convincing at the same time.

Yes! a strong, whole-hearted aggressive movement for Home Rule must be inaugurated. It will be a stern struggle, and can only be carried to success by an alliance with Ireland and Wales.

I am glad to see, by the way, that you do not keep Wales in the background, and hope that some day you will have some articles on Welsh nationalism.

The brutal crying injustice of the present state of things is well exemplified just now, when England is relapsing into Toryism, and will drag democratic Scotland and

Wales after her into the slough of another decade of landlord rule, without their being able to lift a finger to help themselves.—Yours faithfully,


H. S. MACCREATH.

“THE ENGLISHMAN.”—We have received the first number of a paper which is published under this title, and is edited by Mr Charles Weld-Blundell of Ince-Blundell. It is well written, but being English, it is, we need hardly say, unfairly written as regards the national rights of Scotland, Ireland and Wales; again and again the terms “England and English” being used instead of “Britain and British.” It seems hardly possible for Englishmen apparently to avoid being offensive in this very plain and simple matter. Have they never heard of the Treaty of Union, by which England agreed to give up her name for ever for that of Great Britain? It would seem not, and they go on prating and talking and writing of “England and English,” as if they had conquered Scotland, and that we Scots are English subjects. This is the usual English blustering style, the indulgence in which in other ways makes them the most detested people in Europe. It would appear, as a general rule, that to get an Englishman to act justly in this matter, he must be frightened or kicked into fair play. So long as he thinks that the people whom he insults or treats unfairly are helpless or unable to punish him for his arrogance, he continues to disregard their remonstrance or complaints.

Why do not the fair-minded portion of the English people come forward and remove the stain on their national character. They cannot all be of the bullying type.

IGNORANCE OF ENGLISH TORY NOBLEMEN.—In the Memoirs of the Earl of Malmesbury (Longman's 1885), who was at one time Minister for Foreign Affairs in one or two Tory administrations, he gives a striking specimen of his own wonderful ignorance of foreign affairs. Under date of 22nd June 1844, he says he was at a party at Lady Palmerston's. “There was present a new lion, an Indian called the Nizam of some place I forget.” The Nizam of Hyderabad in The Deccan is the head of the most important native state in Hindustan, and yet this Tory Foreign Minister seems to have been in contented ignorance of there being such a Prince or such a Principality. But then, no doubt, he had been educated at Eton, and at Oxford, and that, in those high Tory days, was quite enough to give a nobleman of a third or fourth-rate intellect, a first-rate place in the government of the Empire.

A CORRECTION.—“The illustration given on page 63 of *The Thistle* for November, was a representation of the Scoto-British form of the Royal Arms of Britain.” By a slip the accompanying paragraph was entitled “The Royal Arms of Scotland” instead of “The Royal Arms for use in Scotland.”



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 6.

January 1909


Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
„ 21.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . . . . .	82
„ 22.—ON THE ALLEGED MEANNESS OF THE SCOTS . . . . .	36
„ 23.—LORD ROSEBERY ON THE DOWNGRADE . . . . .	89
A HIGHLAND MINISTER ON THE SCOTTISH LAND QUESTION . . . . .	92
MR WALTER LONG'S INSULT TO SCOTLAND . . . . .	93
THE SCOTS THE STRONGEST RACE IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE . . . . .	95
GAELIC AND NATIONALITY . . . . .	96



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



# The Thistle

No. 6.

JANUARY 1909.

MONTHLY 1D

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 21.

### HEAD LINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

#### THE DEMISE OF THE CROWN

THE death of Alexander the Third in 1290 is perhaps the most notable event in the History of Scotland. Not for five centuries afterwards was her people to attain to such comparative peace and comfort—and for the period such wealth

—as they then had. She had only one important city—Berwick—but that was reckoned to be next to London, the most prosperous city in Britain. The people were well governed and contented; they were just beginning to feel the first throbbing of national unity and national life when that most terrible of evils fell upon them—a disputed succession for the Crown. Such a calamity, trying and often disastrous to the European nationalities for several centuries afterwards, came at a most inopportune time for Scotland. Through the unwise policy of King David—that “sair sanct for the crown”—numbers of Norman nobles had been induced to settle in Scotland by the gift of lands and titles; and as many of those so favoured also held lands in England, their tendency to become nationalised and to regard Scotland as their native country was greatly lessened, and they were many of them at least as much English as Scottish, as unfortunately is at the present time again the condition with our nobility.

Hill Burton says: “It was known that there were several expectants

### PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, 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 Publisher, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

of the succession, but they were all distant collaterals. What was far more serious, however, they were all Norman Barons, with possessions in England as well as Scotland. There was no doubt, although Norman names are then so conspicuous in great State transactions in Scotland, that there was a strong middle class, backed by a peasant and burgher class, who disliked the Norman intruders, and felt a horror of any subjection to a Norman government, such as England had now been suffering under for two hundred years." This short statement is a key to the subsequent history of Scotland—a brave and liberty loving Commonalty, confronted with a tyrannous and oppressive nobility who were prepared to sacrifice the freedom of their country, rather than give up their claim to dominate and oppress their fellow-countrymen. On the selfishness then of this class, the English king, Edward Longshanks, was to play his game of deceit and of cruel tyranny, till he had almost succeeded in destroying the liberties of Scotland, and of making it as subject to his power as the Principality of Wales, which he had just then cruelly and ruthlessly subdued and made a province of England.

With the death of the Maid of Norway, the grandchild of Alexander the Third, there disappeared all the direct heirs to the Crown of Scotland.

Professor Hume Brown says: "All Scotland was in sorrow for the death of the child-queen, because no one knew what would happen next. A king must be chosen, and who

was he to be? No fewer than thirteen persons came forward, each claiming that he was the rightful heir—and who was to decide the matter? There was no one in Scotland who had the right to say who should be king, and the great barons of the country were so divided among themselves that they never would have agreed to choose one. As the only way out of the difficulty, the Scottish barons and clergy decided that Edward I. should be asked to settle who was to be their king. Edward consented, but he made a hard bargain beforehand. All those who claimed to be the lawful heirs to the Scottish throne had to admit that Edward was lord of Scotland, and had a right to say who should be king under him, and as a guarantee that they would keep their word, all the Castles of Scotland were put into Edward's hands."

Such was the pitiable position in which Scotland was now placed by the failure of direct heirs to the Crown. Behind the barons and the clergy, there was the Commonalty—the *Communitas*—composed of the burghers of the towns, the smaller proprietors, or bonnet lairds as they by-and-bye came to be called, and the peasantry. These formed a formidable body if they had a leader, but they had no leader, and they were not consulted or taken into account by the barons and the superior clergy, who assumed the right to act for the kingdom, and who thereupon called in the King of England as arbiter.

In the Treaty of Brigham of 1290, when Edward was trying to lull the suspicions of the Scottish authorities,

and to get them to place implicit confidence in his intentions for the welfare of the kingdom, should the marriage between his son and Margaret, the Maid of Norway, take place, he had guaranteed the independence of the kingdom. William Burns, in his history, *The War of Independence*, in our opinion the best authority on the subject, says the Treaty contained no fewer than fourteen stipulations, "whereby anxious provision was made for the personal freedom of Margaret should she survive her husband—for the reversion of the Crown failing her issue—for the protection of the rights, laws, and liberties generally of Scotland, the freedom of the Church, the privileges of Crown vassals, the independence of the Courts, the preservation of all charters and national monuments, the holding of Parliaments only in Scotland, and the levying of talliages, aids, or men. Feudal observances being of so much importance in that age, special attention is directed to the provision that "no crown vassal shall be compelled to go forth of Scotland, for the purpose of performing homage or fealty," akin to which was the stipulation that "no native of Scotland shall in any case, whether of covenant made, or crime committed in Scotland, be compelled to answer out of the kingdom, contrary to the laws and usage of Scotland heretofore observed." "It will be seen," writes Burns (vol. i, p 337), "how these stipulations came to hamper Edward in dealing with his mimic king, John Baliol."

These conditions, made, it will be observed, when the Maid of Norway

was alive and arrangements had been made for her to become the bride of Edward's son, seemed to ensure, so far as a treaty could ensure, the ancient independence of Scotland; but while, according to the letter of the Treaty, this was done, Burns points out that in two of the important clauses which strictly guarantee that "Scotland shall remain separate and divided from England, free in itself, and without subjection, according to its right boundaries and marches as heretofore," there was inserted this qualifying *salvo*—"Saving always the right of the king of England, and of all others, which before the date of this Treaty, belonged to him or any of them in the marches or elsewhere, or which ought to belong to him or any of them in all time coming."

The position of Scotland as an independent kingdom had before this been so well established, and any claim of superiority on the part of England had been so uniformly resisted, that probably the Scottish authorities regarded this saving clause as merely of an academic character. The contention of the Scots was, that any admission on their part of the superiority of England was limited strictly to the lands held by their kings in England. Thus, when in 1278 Alexander the Third went to England to do homage for his English estates on the accession of Edward the First, he used these words: "I become your man for the lands which I hold of you in the kingdom of England, for which I owe you homage, saving my kingdom."

Then said the Bishop of Norwich, "And saving to the king of England, if he right have, to your homage for your kingdom;" to whom King Alexander immediately answered, saying aloud, "To homage for my kingdom of Scotland, no one has any right but God alone; nor do I hold of any but of God." In the English document recording this event, the homage is or was stated to have been complete and comprehensive, but, says Hill Burton, "A zealous Scot, determined to see with his own eyes if it were so written in the bond, found that the passages had been written on an erasure." The true rendering given above Burton quotes from a Scottish register of Dunfermline, which fortunately had been preserved. This and other attempts on the part of the English authorities of the time to falsify the records, conjoined with the extensive and deliberate destruction by Edward of all of the Scottish records that he could lay hands on, show pretty clearly that the claim of supremacy of England over Scotland was a false one. A true claim required for its establishment no such persistent efforts at falsification.

But the position of affairs was all in favour of Edward, if he was unscrupulous enough to disregard justice and fair play, and exercise his power to the uttermost. Unfortunately for Scotland, Edward had no scruples whatever when he had any ambitious end to attain. He saw in the interregnum of Scotland an opportunity of subduing that kingdom, and he laid his plans cunningly and unscrupulously to

attain that object. Tytler quotes the words of an old English historian as follows:—"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." To carry out his purpose he summoned a number of the leading nobles and ecclesiastics of Scotland to meet him at Norham-on-Tweed in May 1291, when he, as Lord Paramount, would consider the claims of the various applicants for the Scottish Crown, and give his decision thereupon. It is recorded that the Scottish authorities—at least those of them who were not creatures of Edward—received this assumption of over-lordship on his part with surprise and dismay, and "declared they were ignorant of any such right of superiority, and insisted that while the throne was vacant, such a claim ought not to be urged." "All having hitherto gone right," says Burns, "the obstacles thus raised seemed to have thrown the king so much off his guard that he exclaimed, 'By holy Edward, whose Crown I wear, I will vindicate my just rights or perish in the attempt.'" He had ordered a large army to advance to the Borders, and he quickly showed that he was prepared to use it, if necessary, to enforce his claim to supremacy. In the face of such preparations, all the claimants for the Crown were overawed, and each and all of them, beginning with Bruce, acknowledged Edward's over-lordship over the kingdom of Scotland.

No. 22

## ON THE ALLEGED MEANNESS OF THE SCOTS

IT is often a matter of remark that Scots abroad are more ardently patriotic than those who never leave Scotland; and some persons have expressed surprise that such should be the case. But the reason is not far to seek. Scotsmen in Scotland live in a Scottish atmosphere; everything around them is Scottish; they may have their political wrongs to brood over, and these are great enough and serious enough in all conscience; but socially they are on the top, and it is the Southron who is in the minority. But the Scot who goes to England, or to any one of the Colonies where the English element is largely predominant, and spends his life among his Southron fellow-subjects, is often subjected to pin-pricks and insults, which if he be a patriotic Scot, sorely tries his patience and his temper. If he be one of those who has no spark of national sentiment, and who is content to hear his country spoken of day after day and month after month as if it were merely an English province; if he quietly accepts the position of being one of the subjects of the self-styled all-conquering and all-powerful England, he will be received into the English family circle so to speak, and be treated with a certain amount of friendliness by the people he meets and with whom he does business. But he must be silent on Scottish national rights, or Scottish national honour. If he is not, he will soon find out how little reality

there is in the claim so generally made by English writers and English speakers, that the English people above all others love and practise fairplay. Fairplay, yes! so long as it does not interfere with English national vanity, or with English selfishness. Fairplay to the Bulgars fighting against the Turks—fairplay to the Poles fighting against the Russians—fairplay to the Danes fighting against the Germans—all these, and many others, are national questions on which John Bull prates loudly and longly about the great principles of justice and fairplay, and fondly thinks that as he does so the world will take his loud-voiced professions as the working everyday standard of his own practice. But, alas, what say the Irish—what say the Welsh on this point? And above all, what have we Scots to say to it? Simply that John Bull, taking him in the mass, as a national entity, is really and practically “John Bully,” who cares little or nothing for the just rights or the proper feelings of his fellow-subjects in Scotland, Ireland, or Wales, unless he is frightened into a modicum of fairplay as he has been during the last generation by the Irish people.

Just let us consider, for instance, the question which forms the title to this article. “The alleged meanness of the Scots.” Scotsmen living in England and moving freely about among English people—especially in the south—must be aware that an impression is very prevalent in England, and not seldom given expression to either in conversation or in the press, and even in the

literature of the day, that the Scots are mean; and not seldom the matter is put in a still more offensive form—that the Scots are *the* mean people. Well-informed and fair-minded Englishmen know better, and do not often join in the sneer and in the false judgement of their more ignorant and more offensive fellow-countrymen. But then, on the other hand, they are few in numbers, and as is their custom as regards Scotland, they take no pains to rebuke their unmannerly countrymen for their injustice and their insolence to their Scottish fellow-subjects. Now, what are the facts of the case? We boldly affirm that the Scots are in reality a much more generous people than the English, where generosity is a virtue and not a vice. Being natives of a poor country—sterile alike in climate and soil as compared with England—they were compelled until, say, the middle of last century, by sheer force of circumstances, to be sparing in their expenditure. But thrift is not meanness; on the contrary it is a virtue which it would be to the infinite advantage of the English people, and to the great benefit of the Empire, if they were to practise as the Scots do. Thrifty and careful as the Scots are, they are not, now at least, so thrifty or so careful in their expenditure as the French, or the Germans, or the Italians, to say nothing of the Scandinavian nations. Yet the English never write or speak of the peoples of these countries as being mean. All their outspoken condemnation of national meanness is apparently reserved for the Scots. Why they

do so, we may go into on some future occasion.

We are quite aware that any formal and general denial of this charge against our countrymen is useless as against English unfairness to Scottish matters generally. But for the benefit of Scotsmen, who may find it somewhat difficult to refute the innuendoes and the sneers that they will find not uncommon in their intercourse with Englishmen—especially of the middle and lower classes—we will furnish a few striking facts that will enable them to give a counterblow that may prove useful and effective. In the colony of Victoria, Australia, there has been for many years back—thirty-five to be exact—a collection among the various churches for charitable purposes on a certain Sunday in the year. The amount collected during that period in Melbourne alone since the movement began, amounts to the handsome sum of £230,000. Victoria is a fairly representative colony of the British people. Its population previous to 1851 was small and unimportant, but the rush to “the diggings” from 1852 to 1857 increased its numbers by some three or four hundred thousands, with an unimportant exception—all people of the British race. Of course the English are predominant, but not nearly so much so as they are in the United Kingdom; their general ignorance in the middle of last century, and the lack of enterprise making them then a much more stay-at-home people than the other nationalities of the United Kingdom, the result being that instead of forming, roughly speaking,

two-thirds of the population, as in Britain, in Victoria they were and are represented by a little more than one-half. At the census of 1901, the various religious bodies in Victoria were thus numbered. We give the figures in thousands :—

Church of England	...	423,000
Roman Catholic	... ..	263,000
Presbyterian	... ..	191,000
Methodist	... ..	180,000
Baptist	... ..	32,000
Congregational	... ..	17,000
Lutheran	... ..	14,000

It is quite a fair assumption that the adherents of the Church of England and the Church of Rome as here given were respectively English and Irish, and that the Presbyterians fairly represented the quotient of Scottish people. Of the Baptists and Congregationalists nearly all would be English; and the same may nearly be said of the Methodists, though there the Welsh element comes in to an appreciable extent—probably to a fourth or a fifth. Well, taking these figures as fairly representing the various British nationalities in Victoria, we have the English churchmen exceeding the Scottish Churchmen or Presbyterians by more than two to one; the Methodists (chiefly English) very nearly equal in numbers to the Presbyterians; and the Baptists and Congregationalists, also essentially English, numbering about one-fourth of the Scottish body.

Now, how do the Scots come out in the list of contributions to the hospitals or infirmaries of Melbourne—that is, to the great cause of true charity?—for these institu-

tutions are open to the sick and injured of all races and all creeds. They are, on the whole, admirably managed, and form a common ground on which all feeling and charitable persons may meet and commingle and give of their charity to the often helpless and suffering patients. Here, then, are the figures for 1907 and 1908 (leaving out the shillings and pence) as given in the *Melbourne Leader* of 31st October last :—

	1907	1908
	£	£
Presbyterians	... .. 1205	1149
Church of England	... .. 997	942
Roman Catholic	... .. 666	644
Methodist	... .. 423	449
Baptist	... .. 227	205
Congregational	... .. 238	234
Church of Christ	... .. 97	87
Hebrew Congregations	... .. 154	169
Australian Church	... .. 20	19
Lutheran	... .. 33	43
Welsh Calvinistic Methodist	20	19

In 1906 the same proportions were fairly well observed, the Presbyterians being £1169; Church of England, £913; Roman Catholic, £580; Methodist, £429, etc. For their numbers, we would point out in all fairness that the Hebrew congregations head the list, and the Congregationalists make an excellent second; but this simply by the way. What is strictly to the point we have now under consideration is the fact that the Scots head the list, though far from being at the head of the list in numbers. And more than this. During the whole period of thirty-five years that Hospital or Charity Sunday has existed in Melbourne, we believe that we are correct in saying that they have headed the list in every year but

one. In 1907 the same charitable spirit on the part of the Scottish people was shown in Liverpool. There the collections for Hospital Sunday are given thus:—Church of England, £3297; Presbyterians, £1086; Unitarians, £841; Wesleyans, £399; Congregationalists, £334; Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, £238; Roman Catholics, £216; and Baptists, £202. If we compare the number of Church of England people in Liverpool with the number of Presbyterians, who are chiefly Scots, or of Scottish descent, we can readily see how well the Scottish element comes out in the great cause of charity—the best and truest way of showing a generous spirit. And here let us point out that the giving in all these cases we have quoted here is unostentatious, and therefore truly from a generous heart. No names are published in these church collections.

We ask any fair-minded man, whatever be his nationality, if these facts and figures do not utterly disprove and discredit the opinion so generally entertained, and so often uttered and published by Englishmen, that the Scottish people are mean. Among the English working classes this charge is launched very commonly against any Scottish workman who may work with or among them; and, of course, to a general charge of this kind it is difficult to make a substantive reply. Here, however, we give it; and “facts are chieils that winna ding.” Among the English upper middle class the sneer is generally to be found in their newspapers and in their light or so-called funny litera-

ture, from London *Punch* downwards. The conventional mean man is generally dubbed a “Mac” of some sort or other (*vide* London *Punch* of 16th December last); and he is brought forward as representing any and every phase of meanness that the witless scribe can conceive or manufacture. It is a fact, nevertheless, that the greatest misers we read of in British life have been English; while the biggest donor of great gifts—given during life—in modern times, or possibly of any time, is a Scotsman. But fairplay from the English to the Scots—whether in social matters or in national matters—seems to be altogether out of the question. Perhaps the reason may be found in the very obvious fact that presents itself so continually and so unpleasantly to the English mind, that the Scots are a superior race, and in British everyday life are, on an average, each and every man of them, equal to about a couple of Englishmen. John Bully tries to get over this awkward fact by dubbing every prominent Scot an Englishman; but even in this mean and dirty game he is slowly being foiled. And he doesn't like it. So he talks of the mean Scots!

—o—

No. 23

### LORD ROSEBERY ON THE DOWN- GRADE

LORD ROSEBERY is deservedly a favourite of the Scottish people, and may be said to be the most popular noble in Scotland. His love of, and enthusiasm for Burns; his advocacy of any cause which appeals to the national senti-

ment of the Scottish people—the case of the Scots Greys and the Twa Brigs of Ayr to wit—his great natural ability, and the high position he has held in the government of the Empire, combine to place him—not merely in the front rank of Scottish public men, but as the very foremost Scotsman of the present day. We are sure then that a large number of intelligent Scotsmen must have grieved to read the speech that his lordship delivered in Edinburgh some weeks ago at the annual dinner of the Scottish National Fat Stock Club. His subject was the measure which the Secretary for Scotland, Mr Sinclair, has had before the House of Commons last session for enabling the Scottish peasantry to obtain and cultivate small holdings in their native land. This is an object which ought to be dear to every Scottish patriot; for on the successful establishment of such a measure largely depends the happiness and the continued greatness of the Scottish people. There may be room for a difference of opinion as to the details of such a measure; but at all events it ought to be dealt with in a careful and thoughtful spirit, and to be criticised, not spitefully and jeeringly, but tenderly. This, however, was not the course adopted by his lordship. Ridicule and raillery were heaped on the measure, as if it had emanated from a man, or body of men, who knew nothing of land or of the wants or requirements of those who cultivate it. Because the measure is to be administered by a Central Board, instead of as in England by the County Councils, his lordship

would have none of it, and cast unsparring ridicule on it from beginning to end of his lively, but injudicious and unpatriotic speech. “Look what a paradise would be if it was inhabited by a population of crofters, governed by a Central Board” (we quote from the *Weekly Scotsman*). “But after all, when we have all become crofters, guided by a Central Board—(laughter)—we shall have some advantages in the neighbourhood of the Firth of Forth, because you will remember, gentlemen, that the crofter is not merely a farmer; but he supplements his agricultural industry by his fishing industry; and our crofters on the banks of the Forth may be able to assist themselves in a similar manner. When this system is in a state of complete development, I, at any rate, shall be able to walk down to the shores of the Forth, and see my neighbours and friends \* \* \* sweeping in their nets, like the early Apostles—(loud laughter)—in order to supplement the precarious earnings of their five or ten acres. (Renewed laughter).” Again, after a further description of the supposed universality of the Central Board system, as proposed by the present government, he said, “I do not despair if legislation goes on, on its present lines, of seeing three quarters of the nation as a Board of Inspectors over the other quarter of the nation. (Laughter). In these circumstances there could be no unemployed. (Prolonged laughter).”

Language of this kind might be “admirable fooling” from a rattling and bigoted Tory member of Parliament; but from the lips of Lord

Rosebery it is utterance of a kind to be deeply deplored. There may be some features of Mr Sinclair's Bill that it is desirable to amend; but its main principles are sound, and are vital to its beneficial working. Of these, the Central Board, fair rents, and thorough security of tenure to the occupying tenants may be said to be the chief. When the Bill was first introduced, Lord Rosebery strongly objected to it, because it deprived the landowner of the control of his property. If we remember rightly, he said that one of the great charms of landed property was to have a contented tenantry who looked up to their landlord as their adviser and friend. But sad and bitter experience has shown that under the present land system of Britain, this is practically unattainable, unless in a few exceptional cases. The law gives a great deal too much power to the landlord, even in the matter of large holdings; while small holdings have largely disappeared, because poor men have been unable to contend with the restrictions and difficulties that landlords and the agents of landlords so often impose on them. Surely Lord Rosebery by this time is old enough to know how human nature works; how, if power is given to a certain class over another class—say to landlords over tenants—that inevitably the administration of that power is strained to the utmost by the selfish members of the class that has the power. It is they who give vigour and form to the general action of the law; not the kindly and considerate members. Look at the action of the law as regards

land in the Highlands of Scotland. If there ever was a case in which the treatment of tenants or crofters by their landlords should have been kindly and fatherly, it should have been by the Highland chiefs and landlords. Yet where are now the descendants of the clansmen? Chiefly in the big cities of Scotland—many of them in the slums—while sheep and deer take their places on the Highland moors and in the Highland glens.

This painful process, partly of expatriation and partly of transference from the country to the cities, is now going on all over Scotland. Her grand peasantry are gradually being extirpated by the land system which, after the Revolution of 1688, the selfishness of the landed class gradually built up, and in the 18th century consolidated in the United Kingdom. It is to remedy to some extent the evils connected with land administration in Scotland that Mr Sinclair has brought forward his Bill, and has nobly stuck to it despite the jeers and sneers and the opposition of the landed class and their followers. The Scottish people had reason to expect that Lord Rosebery would have received such a measure with sympathy; but instead of sympathy, he has nothing for it but silly ridicule. Evidently his interest as a landowner has overpowered his feeling as a patriot; and his poor fellow-countrymen are as nothing to him compared with the privileges of the landowning class.

“Encourage the peasant, aided by his own family and relying on his own capital, to undertake a

small holding, and you are doing a good service"—so said his Lordship near the conclusion of his speech. Well, this is exactly what the government measure proposes, with this difference, that in order to save the peasant from the great outlay that would be imposed on him, were he compelled to purchase his holding and go through all the tedious and expensive preliminaries required to complete his legal title, the government intend that he shall get his holding handed over to him in perpetuity, subject only to the payment of a certain fixed rent. But this is a fatal principle, says Lord Rosebery, for it makes a dual ownership. Well, so far as we can see, it does not involve more of the principle of dual ownership than does the system of feuing, which is so common in Scotland, and which has enabled scores of thousands of the Scottish people to own their own houses, and become their own landlords, greatly to the benefit of Scotland. Why then not extend the same principle to small agricultural holdings? Oh, says Lord Rosebery, that would interfere with the rights of landlords; they would not have tenants on their properties; they would have independent feuars. Such we take to be the gist of his lordship's objection to Mr Sinclair's Bill, and to the establishment of a Central Board. But that a Central Board is absolutely necessary to the success of the measure is only too clear. At present the County Councils of Scotland are practically controlled by the landed classes, and if the initiation and the working of the government measure were

left to them, its success would not merely be imperilled; its destruction as a great popular scheme for retaining the Scottish peasantry on the soil would be certain. We trust that the government will not abandon their measure, despite the opposition of the landlord class, and the ill-timed raillery of Lord Rosebery. The Land Question is the question of questions for the British people; for there is not one of the great Powers of Europe—Russia with its village Mirs, we think not excepted—that has not a better and more liberal land system than Great Britain. And this, moreover, must also be taken into consideration, that Belgium excepted, Great Britain has the most congested population in Europe. Hence the odious and godless slums of the great cities of England and Scotland. But then, say our Tory friends, have we not got a House of Lords? Oh yes, that of course settles the matter. A country that has got a hereditary second chamber, which can block or mutilate all legislation that is for the benefit of the masses ought to be satisfied and contented. Similar views were held and carried out to the uttermost by the great and powerful nobility of France in 1785. In 1795 they were teaching dancing and deportment and the French language to the sons and daughters of the citizens of London!

---

#### A HIGHLAND MINISTER ON THE SCOTTISH LAND QUESTION

WE have given in the foregoing article some of Lord Rosebery's remarks on Mr Sinclair's Bill. Let us give the other side of the

question from a representative of the people—a Highland minister of religion. The Reverend Malcolm M'Callum of Muckairn, Argyleshire, addressed a meeting of the Young Scots Society at Partick, on the 10th of December, on the Scottish Land Question. His address was practical and full of common sense, and in quite a different vein from that of Lord Rosebery, the advocate and representative of the landlord class. Mr M'Callum said—we quote from the Edinburgh *Evening News*—"There could be no possible objection to the giving of security of tenure and fair rent to existing small farmers, and to the erection of more small holdings on the same terms. That was the aim of the Government Bill. The successful working of the Crofters Act had silenced all objections in the Highlands. The objections came from the Lowlands, where the working of the Act was not seen. No objection came, however, from the lips of the Lowland ploughmen, but from their would-be patrons—factors, gentlemen farmers, and farming parsons—who were crying out that the ploughman's occupation would be gone if this Bill were passed and small holdings were to be formed. Such holdings would give more work, and work of greater variety and interest, than the present monotonous, mechanical toil allotted to the ploughman. The large farmers' objection to the Bill was that it would pick out the "eyes" of their farms and leave the carcase on their hand. That was exactly what it would not do. There was compensation for injury provided, and

unless the Land Commission was composed of madmen they would not countenance the taking out of the 'eyes' of the large farms."

—o—

### MR WALTER LONG'S INSULT TO SCOTLAND

THE Scottish Conservatives do not seem to be happy in their choice of Englishmen to advocate their cause in Scotland. There must have been some of those Scotsmen who were present at the great Conservative meeting in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, on 27th November, who must have felt uncomfortable when Mr Walter Long, M.P., the guest of the evening, belittled Scotland and compared it to an English county. This is nothing unusual with Englishmen generally; indeed it may rather be said that it is a usual and general form of speech with them; but then this form of John Bullyism among the politicians is generally confined to English platforms, and to English audiences. Mr Walter Long, however, on the occasion in question had not been properly tutored for the occasion, or he had forgot his lesson, for he did not hesitate to compare the claims of Scotland, of Ireland, and of Wales to self government to that of Lancashire. To give his exact words, as reported in *The Scotsman*, he said:


"Turning to the Home Rule question, he said that some believed that Home Rule, originally claimed alone for Ireland, ought to be extended to Scotland, and who thereby advocated the breaking up of the Imperial Parliament and, by degrees no doubt, return to the old con-

dition of things under the Heptarchy. All he could say was that they had only to think over this problem for a few minutes and see how it worked out. If Scotland demanded Home Rule, Ireland had done so, and Wales would do so. Why should not Lancashire demand it? Why should they not divide England back into its seven or more separate divisions to have their own Parliaments? Were they quite sure that one Parliament would be quite enough for Scotland? (Laughter.) He was quite certain that one Parliament would not be enough for Ireland. (Laughter.) But did Scotland want Home Rule? (Cries of "No.") Those who said she did should look at it not with the excitement of party men, but from the cooler attitude of the student. What did Scotland not get in the way of legislation that she would get if she had Home Rule? He wondered if that question had ever been asked of these warm-hearted advocates of Scottish Home Rule. They would answer that the Scottish members in the House of Commons were frequently agreed upon some measure which they could not get carried because of the obduracy of members from other parts of the United Kingdom. But Home Rule once established in Scotland was likely to mean a complete change in the representatives of the country who were elected, and it would probably follow that in the Home Rule Parliament they would have two parties just as in the Imperial Parliament—(cheers)—and, therefore, it was by no means sure that a Home Rule Parliament meant getting more legislation." (Cheers.)

Scotland and Lancashire are here coupled together as having an equal claim to the benefit of Home Rule. Scotland, with her glorious history

of nearly two thousand years as an independent country, and which as an independent kingdom became united with England under a Treaty of Union which displaced for ever the name of England as a separate kingdom, is spoken of by Mr Long as if it were merely an English county. Then see the ineptitude and inability to comprehend the most simple features of political action displayed in the concluding portion of the above paragraph. Home Rulers in a Scottish Parliament "would have two parties just as in the Imperial Parliament," and therefore, thinks Mr Long, Scotland probably would be no better off than at present. Is Mr Long's intellect unable to see that the two parties in a Scottish Parliament would be Scottish parties, and not British; or, as Mr Long would prefer to term them, "English." A decision in a Scottish Parliament would mean that the question would be decided by a majority composed of Scotsmen, and would therefore be acceptable to the majority of the Scottish people. Moreover, it almost to a certainty would mean that the question, whatever it might be, would be decided one way or the other, after one year's, or at the utmost after two years' discussion. Is this the way that Scottish questions have been discussed and decided in the British Parliament during the last hundred years? What about the Church questions, the education questions, the land questions, and many others? Again and again these were decided not by Scottish opinion but by English opinion, with well known disastrous results

in some cases ; and only after great and calamitous delay in every case. It is true that English opinion is not now so obtrusive in purely Scottish affairs as it used to be ; but even now, if the English Conservative party thinks that any Scottish measure is connected internationally with any English interest, it takes care either that the measure shall be delayed for years and years ; and even when passed into law that it shall be mutilated and amended to suit the views of the English Tory party. Will any man, for instance, who knows anything of Scottish feeling and of Scottish views say that the Deer Forest system, which has depopulated the Scottish Highlands, would be in existence had we a Scottish Parliament? The thing is inconceivable. And yet Mr Walter Long comes down to Edinburgh and tells a Scottish audience that politically Scotland is merely an English province, and that even if we had a Scottish Parliament we should be in no better plight than we are now. And this ignorant politician is one of the leading lights of English Conservatism!



### THE SCOTS THE STRONGEST RACE IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

MR LLOYD GEORGE addressed a meeting of his countrymen on the 10th December at the Hotel Metropole, London, the occasion being the annual dinner of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, a Welsh National Society. After alluding to the patriotism of the Welsh, he said, "Wales was in a

period of struggle. It was getting on. Perhaps it had not yet arrived, but he thought it had had a training that would count for great things for her. She was called "Poor little Wales." Poverty was the best training for a nation, for it hardened her, strengthened her, gave her grit, stamina, and fitted her for the better land. (Cheers.) He believed the success of Scotsmen was due very largely to the difficulties of their climate — (laughter) — coupled, of course, with the magnificent educational system they had got. (Hear, hear.) And the result undoubtedly was that they were at the present moment the strongest race in the British Empire. (Hear, hear.) They would not be for long. (Laughter and hear, hear.) They had won the regard and the confidence of other kindred nationalities. The Scottish accent was almost as good as a testimonial. (Laughter.) They would not succeed as Welshmen until they put the Welsh accent in the same position. (Cheers.) In regard to education, they in Wales had achieved wonderful results, when it was remembered that they only began thirty or forty years ago. He was not sure that they had not a larger proportion passing through the secondary schools and colleges of Wales than in any other part of the United Kingdom — (laughter) — and he found that more than 35 per cent. of the boys and girls who had entered the University in Wales were the sons and daughters of workmen. (Cheers.)" We quote the above from *The Scotsman*, with the remark that *The Times*, in its report of the meeting, does *not* give

Mr Lloyd George's remark as to the superiority of the Scots. A remark of that kind is a bitter pill for Englishmen to swallow.

—o—

### GAELIC AND NATIONALITY

(To the Editor of THE THISTLE)

SIR,—In common with a great many Scotsmen of my acquaintance, I was very pleased to see the advent of *The Thistle*, a paper devoted to the cause of Scottish Nationality, and one not afraid to tread on John Bull's corns whenever necessary. At the same time I am sorry that there has been no reference to the necessity of reviving and extending the use of Gaelic, the national language of Scotland.

The Scottish Kingdom was the creation of men of Gaelic speech. For a long time after the consolidation of the kingdom under Maol Colum a' Chinu Mhoir, Gaelic continued to be the speech of the vast majority of the people of Scotland. English is only a foreign speech brought in by English refugees and adventurers at a comparatively late period.

The experience of other countries shows how disastrous it is for the national language to be neglected and despised. The Bohemians, the Hungarians, and many other nationalities have found this out. With the revival of the language, national prosperity returned. We see the same return of prosperity coming about in Ireland with the revival of the Irish Gaelic language. Scotland was most prosperous in her Gaelic days. She was then an independent nation with no parliament at Westminster to overrule her wishes.

Some people make the mistake of thinking that Gaelic is only a matter for the so-called "Highlands." In its palmy days referred to above, Gaelic was as much spoken in the so-called "Lowlands" as elsewhere. The promotion of Gaelic is a national matter, and any movement to be genuinely national, and to have the most beneficial and permanent results, must make it one of the main planks in its programme.—I am, etc.,

GAELIC NATIONALIST.

[We are quite in agreement with the movement for the preservation and even extension of the Gaelic language. It is a beautiful and expressive language; and though supposed by the "Sassenach" to be harsh and unmelodious, is in reality one of the sweetest and most musical tongues in Europe—especially when chanted by Highland maidens. But our first duty is elsewhere, and lies in the policy laid down by us in our first issue, viz. :—The maintenance of the national honour of Scotland against English encroachments and English arrogance. This is the first and most pressing duty of all Scotsmen—Highlanders inclusive. The preservation of Gaelic, our correspondent must surely know, has a powerful society—*An Commuinn Gaidhealach*—which works most strenuously in its behalf; and, moreover, has a monthly magazine—*An Deo Creine*—for the dissemination of its views. It would hardly be fair or courteous were we to enter into the same field of journalism, except in a very general way, as showing our sympathy with the movement.—Editor of *The Thistle*].



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 7.

February 1909


Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
„ 24.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . . . . .	98
„ 25.—THE SCALE OF PRECEDENCE IN SCOTLAND CONTRARY TO INTERNATIONAL LAW . . . . .	101
„ 26.—THE SCALE OF PRECEDENCE CONTRARY TO THE TREATY OF UNION . . . . .	109
SCOTTISH PATRIOTISM AND SCOTSMEN IN ENGLAND . . . . .	101
A SCOTSMAN'S EXPERIENCES IN LONDON . . . . .	111
THE TER-JUBILEE OF BURNS . . . . .	112



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



# The Thistle

No. 7.

FEBRUARY 1909.

MONTHLY 1D

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 24.

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE DEMISE OF THE CROWN

AT Berwick on the 17th of November 1292, Edward gave his decision in favour of John Baliol to the Crown of Scotland. Had he been content to do this alone, and not have interfered with the national rights of Scotland as an independent

kingdom, he would have acted in a way that would have entitled him to the praise he has received from his English admirers. For legally regarded, Baliol seems to have had the best claim to the Crown. But the whole proceedings of Edward in connection with the arbitration show a deep-laid plan for the subjugation of Scotland. Having a great army on the Border at the time he gave his decision, he quickly began to use it. He demanded that the kingdom with all its fortresses should be placed in his hands, and this was done by the traitorous so-called Guardians. For eighteen months the administration of the country was completely under English domination. All or nearly all the great nobles and the great dignitaries of the Church acknowledged Edward as their lord and master. What resistance there was was desultory, and was confined to the smaller gentry and the common people. And here it may be noted that among those who resisted the English commanders who took possession of the country, was a country gentleman or knight residing at Elderslie, near Paisley, named Wal-

### PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, 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 Publisher, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

lace. He was slain in some encounter with the English troops that were over-running and taking possession of the country. This took place in the year 1292, at which time his son, William Wallace, the great Patriot, is supposed to have been about twenty-two years of age. Some of the authorities, including the late Marquess of Bute, think he was born in 1274, which would make him at this time eighteen years of age, instead of twenty-two; but when we consider that in 1297 Wallace was the leader of the Scottish forces, and at the head of a considerable army defeated the English at Stirling Bridge, we can hardly place the year of his birth later than 1270. It is hardly credible that a youth of twenty-three could have been placed at the head of a Scottish army, and in the following year, at twenty-four, be elected one of the Guardians of the kingdom.

Edward had succeeded so far in his bold and unscrupulous policy. He had intimidated the chief nobles and ecclesiastics of Scotland; he had got possession of castles and fortresses, which were garrisoned by his troops; he had placed on the throne the claimant who had the best right to it, but before doing so, he had got him to acknowledge England's claim to supremacy. But behind the submissive king, bishops and nobles there was—sullen and discontented—the Scottish people; the community or *communitas* whose feelings and whose interests the proud and imperious nobility of the time, both in Scotland and in England, treated with contempt. In

England, almost to a certainty, such contempt the future would have justified. But now, events were to show, not merely in the great crisis which was rapidly coming but in the many centuries down to the Union of 1707, how different was the common people of Scotland from the common people of England—how the indomitable people that had baffled and repulsed the Roman power for two centuries and a half were for the next three hundred years to baffle and defeat the English power, and compel it at last to give up the struggle for subjugation as an impracticable and hopeless game.

John Baliol was crowned at Scone in the latter part of 1292; and when crowned was, a few weeks after, compelled at Newcastle to confirm his previous promises of submission by acknowledging his homage to Edward. He was then allowed to assume the functions of royalty; but ere long he soon found that in practice he was simply “a king on the leash,” and that the leash was in the hand of the exacting and unscrupulous Edward. He found that the Scottish Courts, which by the Treaty of Brigham were to be supreme in Scotland, were regarded as subject to the interference of Edward. Indeed, Edward, confident now in his power, and thinking that Scotland was completely subjugated, insolently stated, that if necessary, he “would summon the King of Scots himself to appear in his presence within the realm of England.” And, following up this, he obliged Baliol formally to renounce and cancel, not only

the Treaty of Brigham, but every stipulation of the kind "known to exist or which might thereafter be discovered."

It is of little use following in detail the miserable record of the so called reign of the wretched Baliol. Those who care to do so will find the subject most amply and fairly dealt with in Burns' history of "The War of Independence," an able work, which should be carefully studied by every Scottish patriot. Time-serving and subservient as Baliol was, he soon found the exactions of Edward and the humiliations to which he was subjected by that faithless monarch quite unendurable.

But now events were to take a curious turn, and Edward, who was inflicting on Baliol all the arrogant assumptions and humiliations that a feudal superior could then visit on his vassal, was himself brought to book by Philip the Fair, King of France—*his* feudal superior. Philip summoned Edward to appear before him for some breach of privilege under pain of contumacy. Edward in reply renounced his allegiance to Philip, and declared war against him. He then called on Baliol as his vassal to give him aid; and in short, as Burns states, "assumed an absolute and uncontrollable authority over the kingdom of Scotland." This was in 1294. This was too much even for the servile nobles, who had hitherto submissively obeyed the demands of Edward. A Parliament was convened at Scone; Englishmen were dismissed from office, and a committee of the estates appointed to act as guardians—Baliol's authority as titular

king apparently being disregarded. This of course was virtually a renunciation of Edward's power.

Steps were then taken by the Scottish leaders to secure support abroad. A league, offensive and defensive, was entered into, in October 1295, with the King of France; and a contract of marriage was arranged between Edward Baliol, the king's son, and the niece of the King of France. That king was to help Scotland if attacked by Edward; and if Edward attacked France, the Scots were to aid her by crossing the Border. Thus was begun the famous league between France and Scotland which had such an important influence on the subsequent history of Scotland—and indeed of Britain—and which was to last until broken to pieces by the progress of the Reform doctrines in Scotland. These important doings of the Scots were not unknown to Edward, and he at once began to make immense preparations for the complete subjugation of Scotland. Conscious of his power and of the distracted condition of the government of Scotland, it may readily be conceived that he viewed the action of the Scottish leaders as, in a measure, playing into his hands. He could now, without any necessity for disguise, hurl the whole power of his kingdom against Scotland, and doubting not that he would be able completely to subdue her, he would then reign supreme in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland; and thus, uncontrolled in Britain, would be able to attack the King of France, and wrest from him the portions of the French monarchy that did not acknowledge the sway

of England. It was a bold policy, and English historians dwell with complacency and extol with pride the grandeur of the designs of one whom they fondly term "the greatest of the Plantagenets"—a curious phase of national servility to bolster up and laud to the skies the ruthless and unprincipled policy of a ruler who was to the English people the representative and successor of the Norman tyrants, who had for two centuries oppressed them and treated them with an utter disregard of their national feelings and their national rights. But Edward was now to learn that in Scotland there was a race of people who were to check his ruthless career of conquest, and to bring to naught his dream of a great Anglo-Norman Empire of the West.

---

No. 25

### THE SCALE OF PRECEDENCE IN SCOTLAND CONTRARY TO INTERNA- TIONAL LAW

IN our issue for December (p. 78), we published a leaflet of the Scottish Patriotic Association, which exposed clearly and tersely the gross insult which King Edward had inflicted on Scotland by his proclaiming himself "Edward the Seventh, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith." As the leaflet pointed out, "no Edward ever sat on the British Throne till now. The six Edwards referred to by the term 'Seventh' were merely English kings. To call the British Monarch

'Edward VII.' is to make it seem as if the British Throne were merely English—to violate therefore both Treaties of Union, and to affront all the British, but not English portions both of Great and Greater Britain. The present King is the first Edward of the United Kingdom, and the first Edward of the British Empire." Such was the spirited protest issued by the Scottish Patriotic Association at the time of the King's accession, and we make no apology for again placing it before our readers, for it is a protest which ought to be, as it were, impressed deeply on the heart of all true Scots wherever they may be placed throughout the world. If there ever was any doubt in the minds of charitable or ultra-loyal Scots as to whether the false title is an insult, or merely an unintentional or inadvertent slight, such doubt must have been fully and thoroughly dispelled by subsequent actions of His Majesty. Even had there been none of these, the striking initiatory fact stands out strongly and condemnatory, that His Majesty deliberately changed his name from Albert-Edward to Edward. He is the first of a new dynasty in succession to that of Hanover—viz., that of Saxe-Coburg, and as such it was fit and proper that he should have taken as his title that of "Albert-Edward the First." Had he done so, no national pride would have been ruffled, and no national honour would have been slighted or insulted; nor would the name of the Almighty by the use of the Royal formalism have been brought in to give cover and currency to a lie. "Edward 'the Seventh,' *by the Grace of God* of the United

Kingdom of Great Britain, etc., *King*," is not merely a lie and an insult to Scotland, but may be said to be also of a blasphemous character, for it attempts to cover a foul wrong and a gross act of national injustice by invoking the name of the Supreme Being.

That the change of name, and the assumption of the title of "Edward the Seventh of Great Britain, etc.," was an act of State, deliberately intended to cast dishonour on Scotland is brought out very conclusively by the subsequent doings of His Majesty. A few years after his accession there appeared the following proclamation:—

EDWARD, R. AND I.,

Edward the Seventh, by the grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith.

To all and sundry whom these presents do or may concern. Greeting! Whereas it has been humbly represented unto us that a Scale of Precedence in Scotland has not been defined with due authority, and that doubts and a diversity of practice have arisen in consequence which it is desirable should be determined by the exercise of Our Royal Prerogative.

And whereas we have deemed it expedient for these and *other* (italics are ours) considerations Usthereunto moving that the place and precedence in Scotland of Peers, Officers of State, Lords of Session, Sheriffs and other persons having hereditary, official or personal rank, should be

regulated by warrant under our Royal Sign Manual.

Therefore, know ye that We, of our princely Grace and mere Motion, have ordained and declared, and do by these Presents ordain and declare that all such Peers, Officers, Lords of Session, Sheriffs and other persons entitled as aforesaid, and all ladies entitled as aforesaid, or in their own right, shall have on all occasions place, pre-eminence and precedence in Scotland in their degrees according to their respective positions in the Tables hereunto annexed, intituled "The Scale of General Precedence in Scotland," and "The Scale of Precedence for Ladies in Scotland."

Our will and pleasure therefore is that Lyon King of Arms, to whom the cognisance of matters of this nature in Scotland doth properly belong, do see this Order observed and kept, and do cause the same to be recorded in the Lyon Office in Edinburgh, to the end that Our Officers of Arms there and all others upon occasion may take full notice and have knowledge thereof, and for so doing this shall be his Warrant.

Given at Our Court at Buckingham Palace, the ninth day of March, one thousand nine hundred and five, in the fifth year of Our Reign.  
By His Majesty's Command,

LINLITHGOW.

We give the text of this important proclamation in full, so that there may be no mistake as to its deliberate meaning and purport. It will be observed that allusion is made to the fact that in Scotland "a Scale of Precedence has not been defined

with due authority, and that doubts and a diversity of practice have arisen in consequence," and this is put forward as the reason for the exercise of the Royal Prerogative in the matter. We can quite understand that in minor matters of Precedence, such as that of minor Officers of State, Lords of Session, Sheriffs, etc. ; and more especially with the ladies belonging to such officers, there may, in the course of several generations, have arisen disputes and grumblings connected with the question of Precedence, which required to be decided by the authority of the Crown. But all such questions were and are purely Scottish questions, and had no connection whatever with English Peers or English Officials. For be it remembered that Scotland being an independent Kingdom when it became united with England, and having still her own Church, her own system of Law, and her own Order of Nobility, cannot in matters connected with the systems be treated as if she were a part of England, or inferior in dignity to England within her own borders. Within the kingdom of Scotland the Archbishop of Canterbury, for example, is simply a Dissenter, and except by courtesy, has no precedence in church matters over the most humble Parish Minister of the Church of Scotland. The position of Scotland in such questions as regards her relation with England is decided ; firstly, by the terms of the Treaty of Union ; and secondly, where the Treaty is silent as to the respective national rights of the two countries, then it becomes a question

of international law. The ruling monarch, whoever he may be, has no dispensative power in such matters. He is monarch of England, and he is also monarch of Scotland, and by the very circumstance of his dual position as monarch of the two, erstwhile independent kingdoms, he is bound by all the principles of kingly honour and royal justice to act rightly and fairly in any international difference or dispute that may arise between the two kingdoms. If he acts otherwise, he is false to his trust, and, in fact, disgraces his high position as thoroughly as a Judge of a Supreme Court would, were he to favour one litigant to the detriment of another, simply because the one was poor and the other rich and powerful ; or, perhaps, what is more appropriate to the present case, as if some one of the obscure friends of the unsuccessful litigant had on some public occasion ruffled the dignity of the Judge, and he then proceeded to give a vindictive judgment instead of one based on the merits of the case. It may be said that such an illustration is an inconceivable one. Well, we shall see by and bye whether, sad to say, it is not exactly and appropriately in accordance with the indictment we now bring against the monarch of these realms.

Let us see, then, what are the terms of the new Scale of Precedence for Scotland which King Edward in 1905 declared and determined by the exercise of his Royal Prerogative. The greater portion of the details are simply in accordance with former custom, and those that are not, and that simply regulate the precedence of purely Scottish

officials as between themselves have little or no interest from a patriotic point of view. It is only from such a point that we deal with the question, and it is only from such a point that it is of interest and of the highest importance to the Scottish people at home and abroad.

The first item that strikes a Scottish reader is the term, "The Lord Chancellor of Great Britain." We are all aware of the Lord Chancellor of England, but not that his functions included Scotland. Is this one of those insidious encroachments on Scottish national rights, which, apparently unimportant, is made the footwork for future serious interference with the legal and historical position of Scotland? We leave the question to be answered by Scotsmen learned in the law. Then, by and bye, we come to this startling and important statement in the Scale of Precedence.

Dukes of England  
 Dukes of Scotland  
 Dukes of Great Britain  
 Dukes of the United Kingdom  
 and Dukes of Ireland created  
 since the Union of Great  
 Britain and Ireland.  
 Marquesses of England  
 Marquesses of Scotland  
 etc. etc.  
 Earls of England  
 Earls of Scotland  
 etc. etc.  
 Viscounts of England  
 Viscounts of Scotland  
 etc. etc.  
 Barons of England  
 Barons of Scotland  
 etc. etc.  
 Knights of the Garter  
 Privy Councillors  
 Senators of the College of Justice  
 Younger Sons of Viscounts  
 Younger Sons of Barons  
 Sons of Law Life Peers  
 Baronets—and then  
 Knights of The Thistle  
 etc. etc.

The Scale of Precedence for ladies in Scotland follows the same order so far as we can see. English Duchesses, Marchionesses and Countesses, etc., take precedence of Scottish Duchesses, Marchionesses, etc., and wives of Baronets take precedence of wives of Knights of The Thistle.

Such is the Scale of Precedence which, "of our Princely Grace and mere Motion," We, King Edward, "have ordained and declared to be observed in Scotland." It is a melancholy statement to make to Scotsmen, for it is neither more nor less than the open and wilful degradation of titled Scotsmen in Scotland to the advancement of titled Englishmen in Scotland, and this by the monarch who by the Constitution of these Realms is held to be, and is supposed to be, an impartial and just President over all matters affecting the international honour of the three kingdoms. We hold that by international law the Scale of Precedence is utterly unjust and unwarranted. Even in the smallest independent State or Kingdom of Europe the head of it will take precedence over the monarch of the mightiest kingdom or Empire who might choose to visit him. The kingdom of Greece is one of the smallest states in Europe, yet if the Kaiser or the Czar were to go to Athens each would have to take a secondary position as compared with the King of Greece. Any other course of action is inconceivable, for it would mean that Greece is a tributary state, either of Russia or Germany. As with the sovereigns so with the nobles. The

Russian or German noblemen would have to take rank in Greece after the Greek nobles of corresponding rank. This is common sense, and, what is more to the point, it is sound international law. For all the authorities regard it as a fixed principle that the nobles of any country when they pass into another independent country carry with them none of the privileges enjoyed in their own country, and also that any one state has no right with the domestic affairs of another. As Scotland was an independent kingdom when she united with England, she comes under these principles of international law, unless it was otherwise arranged or agreed to by the Treaty of Union; for, as we have said, the monarch of the two now united kingdoms has no dispensative power in such a matter, and if he tries to degrade one kingdom for the purpose of aggrandising the other, he violates the constitution under which he reigns. But King Edward seems to think that his 'Princely Grace and mere Motion' are above the rules of international law; either that, or he thinks that in thus humiliating Scotland by giving English nobles precedence over Scottish nobles within the realm of Scotland, he is empowered so to do by the terms of the Treaty of Union. Let us then see what are the terms of that Treaty as regards the question of Precedence. Our following article will deal with that view of the question.

No. 26.

### THE SCALE OF PRECEDENCE CONTRARY TO THE TREATY OF UNION

IN our previous article we have held, and we think we have conclusively shown, that the King's Scale of Precedence in Scotland is not in accordance with the principles of international law. That law is based not on force, but on common sense, and is intended to deal justly with the interests and with the feelings of small States as well as with those of great Kingdoms or Empires. For example, it is laid down as a rule, that no difference in constitution affects the quality of independent states, for all are equal in international law—a Republic being the equal of a kingdom, and a kingdom of an Empire. To put it in a manner that is appropriate to the question, "no Bullying is allowed," or at least is not recognised as legitimate. No doubt there are cases in which great and powerful States press their claims beyond the limits of fairplay and of justice, and also act on such claims; but then these are not acknowledged to be true articles or principles of international law, but are looked on by the authorities as doubtful or disputed articles to be done away with so soon as circumstances will permit. On the Continent for example, it is held that in several points the law of nations does not recognise the extreme claims of maritime power or privilege, which the British Government hold to be legitimate; and on this head it need hardly be pointed out that the claims so advanced are the claims made by the people of England, and not

originating with those of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. For many generations now, Britain has been predominant on the ocean, and as British policy—more especially British maritime policy—is controlled by England, the peculiar English tendency to swagger and to bully, where it has the power, comes out pretty prominently in all matters connected with the sea.

But this is merely by the way, and is simply to show that when the present King goes out of his way and violates the principles of international law for the purpose of venting his spite against the Scottish people, such acts excite no surprise and no comment in England. They are too much in common with the lower and baser feelings of the English people to do so, and they are looked upon as the natural and excusable action of a great national functionary who has the power to give the reins to his animosity; and when he does so, though he may not be applauded, he certainly will not be condemned or be deemed to be acting in an unkingly fashion. Such, we regret to say, is the attitude generally of the English people towards the Scottish people. His present Majesty is shrewd enough to have learnt this trait of his southern subjects long ere this, and, knowing it, he has not scrupled to take advantage of it in his dealing with the question of "Precedence in Scotland."

Fortunately, whatever disadvantages the Scottish people may suffer in their partnership or alliance with the people of England, there is now  
o restriction on their liberty of

speech, whether it be on the platform or through the Press, so long as it deals with constitutional questions. The day has long gone by when a journalist like Leigh Hunt could be thrown into prison for two years and fined £500 for the great crime of dubbing the Prince Regent (George IV.) "as a libertine over head and ears in disgrace, and as a corpulent Adonis of fifty, etc." We, as a humble representative of outraged Scottish feeling, have no hesitation in examining closely and criticising severely, where necessary, the actions of King Edward when they violate the constitution, or are not in accordance with those principles of courtesy and fair play which should characterise a British monarch in his dealings with the four nationalities of the United Kingdom. His moral or personal character is a matter with which we do not interfere.

If, then, the "Scale of Precedence in Scotland" is, as we contend, and have shown to be, contrary to the principles of international law, it must be utterly unconstitutional, and an improper and unjustifiable extension of the Royal prerogative, if it is not based on and justified by the terms of the Treaty of Union of 1706. The only article of that Treaty that bears on this question is the Twenty-third. That article begins by dealing with the powers and the position of the Sixteen Scottish Peers that may be elected to sit in the British House of Lords. It then goes on to say that "All Peers of Scotland and their successors to their honours and dignities shall, from and after the Union, be Peers of Great Britain, and have

rank and precedence next and immediately after the Peers of the like orders and degrees *in* England, at the time of the Union, and before all the Peers of Great Britain, of the like orders and degrees, who may be created after the Union, and shall be tried as Peers of Great Britain, and shall enjoy all privileges of Peers as fully as Peers of England do now, or as they or any other Peers of Great Britain may hereafter enjoy the same, except the right and privilege of sitting in the House of Lords, and the privileges depending thereon, and particularly the right of sitting upon the trials of Peers."

We recommend all true Scots to read very carefully the above quotation from the 23rd article of the famous Treaty, and especially to note the word we have italicised, viz., "in." That little preposition is the crux and kernel of the whole question we are now discussing, and, fortunately, its meaning is as clear to a layman as it is to a lawyer. For it states clearly and distinctly that "all Peers of Scotland and their successors, etc., shall, from and after the Union, have rank and precedence next and immediately after the Peers of the like order and degrees *in* England at the time of the Union, etc." That is to say, the order of precedence of English Peers shall be *in* England and England only, for in such an important matter had the precedence been intended to extend to Scotland it would have been clearly and deliberately stated. But it will be argued or claimed that the words "*in* England" mean and include

Scotland also, in accordance with the modern interpretation of the term "England" by aggressive and insolent Englishmen. This view, we need hardly say, may be suitable enough for an assembly of bumptious and ignorant Englishmen, but from a legal or constitutional point of view it is utterly untenable and worthless. The clear meaning of the clause is, that in England and in England only, the English Peers shall take precedence of the Scottish Peers of the like rank. And it may be said to emphasise the point, not to weaken it, that in Scotland the Peers of Scotland shall take precedence of those of England of like rank, for had it been otherwise, it would have been clearly stated in the article.

It may be said, if the question of precedence is decided by international law, why was it necessary to deal with the matter at all in the Treaty of Union. In answer to this, we say that we must go back and consider the circumstances of the time at and prior to the signing of the Treaty. The Treaty, it must be remembered, had been under the consideration of the Parliaments of the two countries for over a century. The Civil War in the middle of the century, of course, put a stop to all such questions; but that apart, it may be said the question of Union was constantly before the statesmen and Parliaments of the two kingdoms during the seventeenth century, and with the question of Union there was continually cropping up the various conditions applicable to its settlement. One of these was this very question of Precedence.

The Scottish nobles were among the proudest of their class in Europe. In France, to which before the Reformation they went in great numbers, and where they filled some of the highest positions for centuries, their pride and that of their followers was so notorious that it passed into a proverb, "fier comme un Ecossois"—proud as a Scot. When the Union of the Scottish and English Crowns took place the Scottish nobles carried this proud spirit into England, and as the majority of them had titles of older creation than the English nobility owing to the destruction of the old English titles during the Wars of the Roses, there was much jealousy and not a little quarrelling between the Scots and English nobles during the seventeenth century as to the matter of precedence. Thus in the Lords' Journals of 23rd December 1646 an order "that the consideration of *Foreign* nobility of Scotland and Ireland and the creation of Baronets of *Nova Scotia* be referred to the Committee of Privileges," with a memorandum there, subsequently in the same year, that "Mr Attorney General is to inquire of the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas for the Papers and Directions which he received from the Lords' Committees concerning *Foreign* nobility and Baronets of *Nova Scotia* to debar them of any place in this kingdom." This quotation is from "Riddell on Peerage and Consistorial Law," Vol. II., p. 1066. And the same writer goes on to say in the same page, "By the hitherto conceived practice, *e contra*, after the Union of the

Crowns and before that of the kingdoms, Scottish Peers in England ranked *from* those of the same degree, and the English Peers in Scotland *câdem vice*." He also alludes to a duel that took place between an English Lord and a Scottish Lord on a question of Precedence.

It is thus clear from these quotations that the question of Precedence between the two orders of nobility was, in the 17th century, the occasion of serious differences, but that the *conceived practice*, as stated, was that the order of Precedence in each Kingdom should be reciprocal, viz., that in England the Scottish nobles should rank in England *from* English nobles of the same degree, that is, after them; while in Scotland the same rule held as to the inferior position of English nobles. This is true international law, and the wording of the Twenty-Third clause carries out this interpretation; or in other words, embodies in the Treaty the "conceived practice" already alluded to. It may be said why was not the position of the English nobles in Scotland also alluded to and defined. To this we reply because it was not necessary. The precedence of English Peers in England over those of Scotland it was perhaps necessary to define with precision, because the majority of the Scottish nobility being older in the creation of their titles had been trying to take precedence *in* England of English nobles of the same rank, but of later creation. This claim was effectually debarred by the Twenty-Third clause which made the question of Precedence one of rank and not of creation.

In fact, it is pretty clear that this said clause was intended to defend the status of the English Peers in England against any claim or attack that might be made by the Scottish Peers, and had nothing whatever to do with any claim of Precedence for English Peers *in* Scotland. Had that been intended it would have been clearly stated; and had it been advanced and demanded by the English Peers, there would have been no Treaty of Union. That we hold to be certain. We hold then that neither by international law, nor by the terms of the Treaty of Union can the right of Precedence in Scotland be accorded to English Peers; and that the "Scale of Precedence of 1905," which His present Majesty ordained by his "Princely Grace and Mere Motion," is a direct infringement of the Constitution of these Realms. Why then did His Majesty try by this unwarrantable "Scale of Precedence" to degrade the historic position of Scotland and advance that of England? An answer to this we must reserve for our next issue.

—o—

### SCOTTISH PATRIOTISM AND SCOTSMEN IN ENGLAND

There are various phases of patriotism, but so far as Scotland is concerned, it may be said that some of the most ardent patriots are those whose lot it is to live in England, especially if they have to live in Central or Southern England. As a rule, the further south a Scotsman is in Great Britain the more unpleasant nationally is his position. In the four northern counties of England the inhabitants are manly and of

an independent spirit; and they generally respect those Scotsmen living among them who stand up for their country. If they differ from them they do so in a manly way, and unlike the southern English are not disposed to play "the bully," though, no doubt, occasionally specimens of that class are to be found among them. In Central England, and further south, the Scots there resident, if their lot be cast among the working classes, have a very unpleasant time, unless they are craven-hearted, and try to pass themselves off as Englishmen, when they are treated with a contemptuous toleration. But the Scottish stalwart—the Scot who is proud of his country, and is not ashamed or afraid to own it—has often there a difficult part to play. To such men *The Thistle* is a support and a comfort, for it lets them know and feel that they belong to a kingdom that still possesses its own individuality, and to a people that, though outnumbered in Great Britain by seven to one, still proudly maintain their separate and independent position, and refuse to be classed as Englishmen. They boldly say, "we are British men, but not Englishmen; and to all attempts to Anglicise us we will offer an uncompromising resistance." It is for such Scotsmen that we write, and for whom we work. That our labours are appreciated by those countrymen of ours, whose lot it is to live in an antagonistic English atmosphere, is we think happily shown by the two following letters which have been forwarded to us for publication; the first by one of

the leading members of the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow, and the second one from Christchurch, New Zealand.

The first letter is as follows:— During the past few weeks I have been in correspondence with a very enthusiastic patriot in Leeds. He is in closest touch with the national movement, has "Bars to British Unity," has seen all the S.P.A. literature, and takes both *Scotia* and *The Thistle*. He is a very warm admirer of the latter. In one letter he writes me as follows: "I got 'Bars to British Unity,' which I prize very much, shortly after it was published. I also get *The Thistle*, an Edinburgh publication, which no doubt you have seen. I think it capital, as it is not afraid to speak out and pay back the 'English' crank in his own coin. After twenty years' residence in various parts of England, and knowing as I do that a great many of the English people are simply John Bullies, I consider some of the protests made on behalf of Scottish rights far too mild, considering the offensive attitude taken up by the 'English' cranks. I know for a positive fact that a certain section of English writers, journalists and newspaper editors deliberately lay themselves out to be offensive to the Scottish people. Again, we have a number of degenerate Scots, who to curry favour with the English pander to their vanity. So long as they are 'getting on,' they don't seem to care a fig for the honour of their country."

In another letter he writes: "The editor of *The Thistle* has a splendid

article in the January number. What he says about the patriotic Scots in South Britain is quite true, as I have known from experience. He hits the situation off to a T, and I take my hat off to him for the pleasure he has given me in reading the article. It is quite true the Scottish working man, if he be a true Scot, has his patience and his temper severely tried by the 'English' crank. Scottish people who have never lived in England—coming for a holiday is nothing—have no idea of the nasty and unfriendly attitude taken up by a good proportion of the English people towards their Scottish neighbours. In the Christmas number of *The Weekly Scotsman* there appears a slanderous article entitled 'Oor Ain Folks,' by a Returned Native,' which in my opinion merits a reply."

The New Zealand letter, which is addressed to our publishers, is as follows:—

Christchurch, 16th December 1908.

Dear Sirs,—I have been instructed to ask you to enrol this Society as subscribers to *The Thistle* for twenty-four copies of each issue for a year. If you can send the complete back numbers—please do so. Otherwise commence with January number, and address to me as undernoted. . . . *The Thistle* is doing good work, and we believe it will become popular. We wish it every success.—Yours faithfully,

JAMES MACKINTOSH,

Hon. Secy. for British correspondence  
of *The Scottish Society of New Zealand*.

## A SCOTSMAN'S EXPERIENCE IN LONDON

(To the Editor of "THE THISTLE")

SIR,—Just a line to congratulate you on your patriotic effort to arouse apathetic Scots to a sense of their independent heritage. You have fearlessly exposed the vindictiveness our nation is subjected to in royal places; you have denounced the "provincial" arrogance of the London daily scribes; and you have trounced the man who "would not be coerced" in military matters as he deserves to be. Your "Saxon Englishman's Deep-Thinking" joke, however, was delightful. It is the real cause of the "John Bullyism" which makes the Saxon so detested outside of his own country.

I am a compositor by trade, and have had some experience of the intelligence of the Cockney and his brethren of the Metropolitan shires. I was amazed at their ignorance outside of the location of the "village pub" and their Sunday's dinner. One gaped when I mentioned Fife as a Scottish county—I leave it to you to imagine if I had said "Kingdom!"—but when I added it was in Scotland, he drew a sigh of relief, and exclaimed, "Oh, Scotland! I knows Scotland! *I've 'eard o' Scotland!*" One more "advanced" than his fellows insisted that Edinburgh and Glasgow were North Country towns like Sunderland and Newcastle; Fife, however, was in the Highlands, and natives of it were therefore Scotsmen! Refusing to be drawn into a boat-race argument, I was asked if there was no rowing in Scotland—

hadn't we a place in it as big as the Serpentine of Hyde Park! I replied that the Firth of Forth was at my door, but it had never been heard of, and because I refused to say any more when I was asked if there were no boats on it, I was supposed to retire discomfited. One man who boasted forty-five years' experience of the Metropolis, objected to me crooning my favourite Scottish songs, so I told him he could retaliate with his own country's, and asked him to name his favourite old English song. He replied they were all favourites of his, but when pressed for something more definite, he added, after about ten minutes' "deep thinking," that he "reckoned 'Are we to part like this, Bill? Are we to part this wy?' was as good as any!" His choice was a low sentimental music-hall song then popular (1900). The foregoing are only samples of the egregious Englishman.

Scotsmen may have lived, fought and thought hard in the past, but they never glorified their belly over their minds—never made gluttony the Alpha and Omega of their being.—Yours, etc.,


R. S.,

LEITH.

—o—


THE NATIONALITY OF SIR JOHN MOORE.—In *The Times* of 16th January a Mr H. C. Fanshawe of 72 Philbeach Gardens, London, has a letter, in which he expresses a hope that "the centenary of the death of Sir John Moore will be marked by the erection of a worthy but simple memorial over the grave of this great 'Englishman.'" Is this blunder due to ignorance or to arrogance? Sir

John Moore was born in Glasgow, of Scottish parents, and no doubt this fact was known to *The Times*, but that journal coolly prints and publishes the blundering statement without correction.



THE TER-JUBILEE OF BURNS' BIRTH.—The Burns' Birthday Concerts were held this year with even greater fervour than ever in Edinburgh, Glasgow and other Scottish cities. It is not part of the objects of *The Thistle* to record in detail such events. The daily and weekly Press do that more or less thoroughly. There is one point, however, that we would like to impress on the conductors of such concerts, viz., the desirability of writing their programs more correctly. For instance, not only on this occasion but on several previous occasions, the beautiful Scots song, "When the kye come hame," is very often printed "When the kye *comes* hame," which is absurd, and shows that the conductor does not know the Scots language. In Scots "kye" is the plural of "coo." Then again, in an Edinburgh program, now before us for the 23rd January, we see Lady Nairne's exquisite song, "The Auld Hoose," is printed "The Auld House," which is like giving us sour milk for sweet cream; and "Ca' the ewes to the knowes" deprives the beautiful pastoral lyric, "Ca' the yowes to the knowes," of one of its most delicate touches. Yet this is how it appears in an Edinburgh program. Even those of the Scottish National Song Society

sometimes blunder in this matter. We hope the able and patriotic honorary secretary, Mr John Wilson, will see to it in future. The purity of Scottish songs as regards the language should be dear to every Scottish heart.



THE SCOTTISH STALWARTS.—Our stalwart countrymen are gradually finding out *The Thistle*, and sending us notice of their appreciation of its contents and of its policy. Especially so from those living abroad in a predominantly English community, or in England itself. For as we point out in our article in this issue on "The Alleged Meanness of the Scots," it is there that our countrymen come so largely into contact with the overweening conceit and personal insolence and injustice of Englishmen. One correspondent writing from Carlisle says: "Send me three copies of your December issue. I am delighted with the contents of the previous numbers, and heartily wish you success." From Petersburg, South Australia, a correspondent (J. R.) writes: "A few weeks ago a friend sent me a copy of *The Thistle*. I have been hoping to see such a paper for the last thirty-one years. I am glad to know that there are still patriots in dear old Scotland bold enough to uphold her national rights and national honour. I wish you every success." From New York also we have a most encouraging letter from a lady who wishes to know if we can supply her with 142 copies of the first issue, etc.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 8.

March 1909

Price 1d.

## CONTENTS

PAGE

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—

„ 27.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . 114

„ 28.—THE KING RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SCOT-  
TISH "SCALE OF PRECEDENCE" . 117

„ 29.—KING EDWARD'S VISIT TO BERLIN . 120

SCOTTISH JOULARITY AND THE SURGICAL OPERATION 122

THE DECADENCE OF THE SAXON-ENGLISH . . . 124

CROFTERS AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS . . . 126

THE HIGHLAND CHIEFS AND HIGHLAND CLANSMEN . 127

THE CLAN COMBAT ON THE NORTH INCH OF PERTH . 128



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



# The Thistle

No. 8.

MARCH 1909.

MONTHLY 1D

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 27.

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

WALLACE COMES INTO VIEW

**E**DWARD crossed the Tweed in the last week of March 1296, at the head of a powerful army, consisting of 5000 horsemen and 30,000 footmen, which was afterwards added to by some of the

### PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow; also at Robt. Graham, 108-112 Eglinton St., and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle St., 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 Publisher, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.*

Northern levies. He laid siege to Berwick, then the second wealthiest city in Britain, and after a short resistance, took it by storm. Then the innate savagery of the man showed itself in a ruthless massacre of the inhabitants, who “were butchered without distinction of age, sex or condition; those who fled to the churches being slain within the sanctuary. \* \* \*” Contemporary accounts differ as to the numbers who perished. Langtoft says 4000; Hemingford, 8000; Knighton, 17,000.” These are English chroniclers. Fordun, a Scottish one, says 8000 were massacred. Burns writes that the details are referred to “with savage exultation” by the English annalists of the period; *le bon roi Edward*—the good King Edward is represented as roused into fury “like a wild boar,” and issuing direct orders that “none should be spared.”

Such spirit as there was in the Scottish king and the Scottish nobles was now roused and brought into action. Baliol formally renounced his allegiance to Edward, while the latter was at Berwick; and at the same time the Scots

made raids into Northumberland and Cumberland, laying waste the country, and vying with Edward, say the English authorities, in acts of merciless devastation and cruelty. As illustrative of the mixed and mercenary character of the Scottish nobles of the period, Patrick, Earl of Dunbar, was with Edward, and in his absence his patriotic wife gave up the Castle of Dunbar to the Scots. It was besieged and taken by the English. Edward, having been joined by 15,000 Welsh, and soon after by 30,000 Irish, under the Earl of Ulster, advanced through Scotland, getting possession of Jedburgh, Dumbarton, Edinburgh, Stirling and Perth. There the wretched Baliol made complete submission, and practically passed out of history, going to France after a few years' imprisonment, and ending his days there.

Meanwhile the chief members of the Church, and all or nearly all the nobles, submitted to Edward. A list of the land holders in Scotland was drawn up, and all of them were compelled to sign a document acknowledging Edward as their king, or have their lands forfeited. Nearly all did so, and their names are still preserved in the deed of submission, which is known by the name of the Ragmans Roll.

The famous Stone of Destiny was taken from Scone to Westminster; and appointing a Governor, a Treasurer, and a Justiciary of Scotland, Edward went south to London in the full belief that Scotland was now utterly subdued, and would for the future be submissive to his power. Thus ended 1296.

A broken and mountainous country almost invariably breeds a spirited and liberty-loving people, and Scotland was now to show, that despite her craven and selfish nobles, she was peopled by a race that valued liberty above property and above life. The strongholds and the fortified cities were held by the English, and there was no part of the country—some districts in the Highlands and the Islands excepted—where they did not apparently reign with as much security as they did in England. But this calmness did not last long. Small detachments of English troops passing from castle to castle, or from fortress to fortress, were waylaid, and sometimes destroyed. Success in these movements encouraged further efforts, and in a few months the more spirited of the smaller gentry began to take part in these attacks, and to form patriotic bands which rapidly became formidable. Burns writes, "Lands in possession of the English were laid waste; houses in their occupation were plundered and burnt; convoys and detachments of English troops were intercepted and cut off. Even castles and places of strength were assaulted by force, or captured by stratagem, and their garrisons slain or made prisoners." This was in the winter and spring of 1296-7. Each district had its band or bands of brave men who were thus harassing the common enemy, and for a time there was little or no union among them. But ere long there came to the front a young warrior, whose daring, whose continuous success in his numerous attacks,

and whose magnetic personality gave him the most prominent place in the fight for liberty, and apparently with common consent he was chosen as the leader of the Patriots. This was the famous Wallace, the future Hero of Scotland.

To the great majority of Scotsmen the history of their country begins with Wallace. He is the first Scot whose career is accepted throughout the civilised world as that of a representative man—the great protagonist of unswerving and undying patriotism. No civilised people struggling and contending desperately for liberty, but turn to the career of the great Scottish hero, and regard him as the lodestar of their aims and hopes. Brief as was his course of action, and tragic as was his end, he fills a place unique in the history of Britain. If at any portion of its history the soul of a people can be said to be embodied in one man, that of Scotland will be found in the life history of the immortal Wallace. Of him a noble minded Englishman writes truly and fittingly:—

“How Wallace fought for Scotland, left  
the name  
Of Wallace to be found, like a wild flower,  
All over his dear Country; left the deeds  
Of Wallace, like a family of ghosts,  
To people the steep rocks and river banks,  
Her natural sanctuaries, with a local soul  
Of Independence and stern liberty.”

These lines are the tribute of Wordsworth to the memory of our immortal hero, and simple as they are, they are noble words on a noble theme.

William Wallace was born at Elderslie, near Paisley, in Renfrewshire, the second son of Sir Malcolm Wallace and Margaret Crawford,

daughter of Sir Reginald (or Hew) Crawford, Hereditary Sheriff of Ayr. Thus he was of gentle blood by father and mother. The date of his birth is uncertain. The late Marquess of Bute conjectures that he was born in 1273, but more probably 1270 or 1271 is nearer the mark. Of his descent, or of the descent of his family, a great deal has been written, and most of it not much to the point. According to the Marquess of Bute (The early days of Sir William Wallace) he was of Welsh descent, basing this statement on the name. “His family,” says the Marquess, “was neither Saxon nor Norman. They were Kelts. The name Wallace was simply ‘Welsh.’” But this, we think, is an incorrect interpretation of the name. There are a great many variations of the name Wallace, viz.:—Waleys, Wallas, Welles, Galeis, Galeys, Vallibus, Wallenses, etc., but all have the same meaning, namely:—“foreign” or “strange.” There were many hundreds of the name of Waleys, and its different variations in the army that Edward I. brought into Scotland in 1298. To suppose, then, that a family bearing that name, and which had lived in Renfrewshire or Ayrshire for generations was of Welsh origin, is a straining of a genealogy to the point of absurdity. For originally, and it probably may have been two or three centuries before 1270, the name of stranger or foreigner had been bestowed by the Celtic natives of Strathclyde on the invaders who landed on the shores of the Firth of Clyde, and gradually acquired lands and a firm footing in the West of

Scotland, from the Clyde to the Solway. Who these strangers were is well known. They were not Welshmen from the country or principality now known as Wales. These were kindred Celts, and were the most unlikely people to invade the territory of their kindred in the North. No, the invaders that overran the country from the Clyde to the Lune, and changed the character of its people from a purely Celtic to a Teuto-Celtic character, were the Norsemen. These were, to the original inhabitants, strangers or foreigners, hence the appellation, *Waleys* or *Wallace*, with its numerous variations, imply a Norse, not a Welsh or Cymric origin. This we hold to be a reasonable view to take of the origin of the family of our hero. He was a Celto-Norseman, with the fire and the alertness of the one race, combined with the powerful frame and the undaunted and indomitable spirit of the other.

— 0 —

No. 28

### THE KING RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SCOTTISH "SCALE OF PRECEDENCE"

THAT these repeated insults and slights to the national honour of Scotland, which we have pointed out and dealt with in our previous issues, have their origin in the extremely vindictive character of King Edward the Seventh and First, must be clear to every unprejudiced mind who takes the trouble to go into the details of the question. If the matter of the Title stood alone, or if that of the "Scale of Precedence" stood alone, it would

be open to the royal admirers of His Majesty to point to what they call his wonderful tact in State functions and in private life, and affirm that in either one or the other of these offences against Scottish feeling he had simply received bad advice, and had erred in judgment. But two gross blunders inflicted on and affecting the national honour of a loyal people cannot be defended or pooh-poohed in this light and airy fashion, and when to these two deliberate acts of State we see His Majesty displaying his vindictiveness in two such petty matters as in the Garden Party of last summer and in the refusal to see the Lord Provost of Edinburgh at the Waverley Station last autumn, we hold that the evidence as to the vindictive character of His Majesty is conclusive and irrefutable.

The assumption of the royal title is clearly a personal act, and one for which His Majesty must be held personally responsible. No Prime Minister could have dared to say to him on the eve of his accession—you must change your name of Albert Edward to that of Edward only, and ascend the throne as Edward the Seventh of Great Britain. To a young king in his early twenties such advice would most probably be regarded as presumptuous, to a sovereign over sixty years of age on his accession it would be inconceivable. On this point, then, His Majesty must be held personally responsible. In the matter of the Scottish Scale of Precedence, the only point on which there can be any doubt is as to that of the initiative.

It has been stated that the responsibility of altering the order of Precedence in Scotland in favour of the English nobility is due to Lord Dunedin, and we have heard of another Scottish lord on whom the blame is laid. But in such a charge there is no probability whatever. Is it likely that any Scottish lord, whether of the law or otherwise, would deliberately, without rhyme or reason, take action to insult the whole body of the Scottish peerage? The notion is utterly improbable. Besides, even if such a suggestion were made by Lord Dunedin, or any other high official, how could he expect that such an important change would be carried out merely at his suggestion? It would have to be adopted and given effect to by His Majesty, and it may be regarded as certain that such a recommendation, if made only by any one of the high officials, would quickly be made known to some of the members of the Scottish peerage, and would be bitterly and successfully opposed by the majority of that body, if it were thought to emanate from a Lord of the Court of Session and not strongly supported or initiated by the King in person. It may be regarded as a certainty, then, that the suggestion or initiative in the matter of the Precedence did not come from below but from above, viz., from the King himself. And the procedure was most probably this, as was hinted in our last issue, that Lord Dunedin finding that, as stated, "doubts and a diversity of practice having arisen" as to the question of precedence in Scottish, and especially in Edin-

burgh social circles, took steps to have it remedied, and, after consultation, prepared what he deemed to be a proper "Scale of Precedence," which in due course was brought before His Majesty. King Edward then saw an opening for inflicting another slight or insult on the Scottish nation, and at once, of his own "princely grace and mere motion," added to the document thus brought before him the cowardly and treacherous stab at Scottish national honour, which is now before the world. This precedence given to the English peerage in Scotland was not in accordance with the usage observed before His Majesty's proclamation. According to all the information we have been able to get on the subject, the Scottish peers in Scotland took precedence of English peers of like rank. This is or was the usage formerly laid down in Oliver & Boyd's Edinburgh Almanack, which has always been regarded as a good authority in such matters. And, moreover, this view of the question was generally held throughout Scotland to be the correct one. It is true that the late Marquess of Bute was under the impression that by the Treaty of Union the English peers had precedence even in Scotland over Scottish peers of like rank; he evidently, like some other Scotsmen, having misunderstood the purport of the 23rd Article of the Treaty; but in our article (No. 26) in our last issue we showed, we think conclusively, that this view is a wrong one. The 23rd Article of the Treaty of Union only deals with the question of Precedence *in*

England, for certain reasons which we have already set forth. If we go back to the debates on the question of The Union, which took place in the Scottish Parliament, we find that the Duke of Athol in speaking against it said :—" It is dishonourable and disgraceful for this kingdom that the peers thereof shall only have rank and precedence next after the peers of the like order and degree *in* England [italics are ours] without regard to antiquity or the dates of their patents as is stipulated by the following Articles of this Treaty." (The History of the Union, by Reverend Ebenezer Marshall, p. 130.) It will be seen from this quotation that the Duke of Athol strongly objected to the English peers taking precedence even *in* England over Scottish peers of like rank, whose patents of nobility were of older date. This is exactly the contention made by us in our last issue, that the question of precedence dealt with in the 23rd Article of the Treaty had no reference whatever to Scotland, but was simply designed to protect English peers and prevent Scottish peers of an older creation than English peers of like rank from taking precedence of such English peers *in* England. Such a monstrous assumption of superiority as English peers taking precedence of Scottish peers of like rank *in* Scotland seems never to have been thought of by the objecting nobleman, or, indeed, by anyone else, the principles of international law being so utterly opposed to such an unwarranted and arrogant invasion of Scottish national rights.

This question has not been treated by the Scottish people with the earnestness and the firmness that it deserves. The nobility, on whom the slight and the insult was inflicted, are either thoroughly Anglicised, or, are as a rule, so supine and so spiritless as to be unable to say "Bo to a goose;" the middle-classes are at present devoted to money-making; and the working-classes apparently have taken the narrow view that a slight or an insult to the Scots nobility is not a matter of much concern to them, or to the Scottish commonalty generally, inasmuch as the interests and the feelings of the two bodies are utterly antagonistic. But this is not the correct view to take of this question. The insult is and was intended to humiliate and degrade the Scottish nation, simply because, on the 12th and 13th of October 1870, His Majesty, then Prince of Wales, was hissed and hooted when he was in Edinburgh for the purpose of laying the foundation stone of the New Royal Infirmary. The hissing and hooting was the action of a portion only of the crowds who filled the streets, and no doubt was the act chiefly of men of the working-classes. It was an event, therefore, that directly concerns the working-classes of Scotland, and it is well and proper for them to show their resentment and their disdain of a Monarch, who, even after the lapse of thirty years, tried to humiliate a nation for an outburst of unpleasant feeling on the part of a small portion of a great mob. An outburst, it must also be remembered, not altogether without justification. We hear almost every

day of the great tact of His Majesty, and unthinking people constantly repeat the statement that His Majesty could not have meant any insult to Scotland, either by the false title of Edward the Seventh, or by this unconstitutional "Order of Precedence." To such people we say—there, staring us in the face, are these two Acts of State, which undoubtedly are slights and insults to the national honour of Scotland. If the King had a full understanding of the character of these acts, then he is clearly convicted of a desire by right or by wrong, to insult the people of his ancient kingdom of Scotland because a few unruly members of an Edinburgh mob hooted and hissed him on a certain day thirty-nine years ago. If, as his defenders and apologists say, he did not do these deeds of his "own princely grace and mere motion," but that they were conceived by others, and that he unwittingly and innocently gave them his signature and his sanction, then we can only conclude that His Majesty is a brainless figure-head, and a mere puppet in the hands of reckless and stupid advisers. Which of these views of His Majesty's actions do the fawning herd of royal flatterers and flunkeys take? There is no getting away from either one conclusion or the other, and we give them, with a great deal of satisfaction, the most ample liberty to take their unsavoury choice.

## No. 29

**KING EDWARD'S VISIT TO BERLIN**

THE visit of King Edward and his Consort to Berlin, and the hearty reception they met there both from the Kaiser and the citizens, are satisfactory enough so far as they go, but he would be an unwise optimist that would begin to build on such an insecure and shadowy basis a palace of peace and concord. So far as the two principal personages in the great international function are concerned, it may be truly said that it is simply a question of "as you were," for no one who knows anything of State politics will attach much importance to the apparently loving embraces and the kissing of cheeks of the two potent monarchs. These effusive displays of friendship and of affection are easily got up by great personages when it is desirable to impress and to humbug the public, while meantime underneath the uniforms the hearts beat as coldly and as irresponsively as before. It is well and prudent, therefore, to attach the smallest possible importance to these superficial displays of feeling, and to go further and deeper, and to try and learn how the people in the German capital comported themselves during the great historic visit. On that point we think a great success was scored. The Berliners and the visitors from the provinces seem to have been thoroughly pleased and gratified with the British royal visit, and to have accepted it as a token of peace and goodwill. It is hard, if not impossible, to restrain, at least in

the southern part of this island, royal flattery and royal adulation, and, as a matter of course, King Edward, in consequence of this gratifying reception at Berlin, is being acclaimed as a great peace-maker, and we are now told that he has gained the confidence of the people of Germany as he previously had gained that of the people of France.

Alas for public credulity and for royal "humbuggery"! The sixty millions of Germans whom King Edward is supposed to have changed from being the enemies to being the friends of Britain, in reality never were, as a people, the foes of the British people. They always have been the allies of this country, and still are, if left to themselves, disposed to be friendly to us and to be at peace with us. One has only to go among the German people, to visit them in their homes, to do business with them, to talk privately but openly with them, to learn that war with us is about the last thing they desire. It is not the German people who have brought about the strained relations that have existed between the two countries for the last ten years. Unfortunately the initiative in the question of war lies not with them but with their War Lord, as he grandiloquently terms himself, and with their governing classes. The Kaiser and his ambitious courtiers and followers have conceived the idea that the future is with them and for them if only Britain were out of the way, and to effect this and make Germany the great World Power the policy of the Kaiser has

been mainly devoted for the last fifteen years, and not without a large measure of success. He has succeeded, after overcoming a good deal of opposition, in inducing the German people to vote an immense sum to make their navy as powerful as that of Britain, on the plea that the enlargement of the foreign commerce of Germany requires a great navy to protect it and render it safe from attack. As the British people have no desire to interfere with or to attack German trade, but on the contrary give it the most complete freedom in all their ports throughout the world, it has become fairly obvious that the use of the powerful German fleet of the future is not for defence but for attack. And to meet this policy, not, be it understood, the policy of the German people but of its Kaiser and his followers, the British government has to strain its power to the uttermost to build a fleet which will enable this country to maintain her supremacy at sea.

Unfortunately the course of events in Britain has played into the hands of the ambitious Kaiser. The great difficulty of that monarch was to carry his people with him in his great scheme for placing Germany at the head of the world. To do that, and to get their consent to make the German fleet powerful enough to contend with that of Britain, he had to create among his people a dislike to British policy and a jealousy of the action of its government. And here the ambition of his uncle, King Edward, to pose as a great Diplomatist, came in to fulfil his desire. As head of the

great Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy, the Kaiser occupied the leading position among European Monarchs. This position King Edward, shortly after his accession, tried to dispute and to undermine. With the coming into power of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's ministry, his opportunity came, and he took a full and able advantage of it. He gradually worked himself into the position, as we have pointed out in a previous issue, of a *quasi* British Minister for Foreign Affairs, and by missions to nearly all the capitals of the Continent, other than Berlin, in which he tried to minimise and to counteract the policy of Germany, he gave the Kaiser just the lever that he required to convert his people to his policy of naval development and aggrandisement. See how King Edward is interfering with German policy! the Kaiser's organs in the Press have, for the last few years, been exclaiming. See how he is trying to break up the Triple Alliance! This charge against King Edward's unwise action in foreign politics had a large measure of truth behind it, and the effect it had upon the public mind of Germany was calamitous. With all the goodwill possible towards the British people, the Germans saw the British Monarch acting against their interest in public mission after public mission, and seeing this, and his action backed by the British Ministry and applauded to the skies by the Jingo British Press, they began to think that British policy was bent upon opposing them to the uttermost.

The moral to be drawn from this

is plain—that the entrusting of the guidance of the foreign policy of Britain to its Monarch is an error of the first magnitude. In the first place, every move on the political board, if carried out by the King, is made glaringly public instead of being discreetly secret; in the second, personal vanity and personal antagonism, which are not absent from the breasts either of the Kaiser or of King Edward, are given an opportunity of action, and perchance of conflict in a way that may easily lead to a strained and perilous position of affairs. Why should the interests of a great Empire be subjected to such a danger to gratify the vanity or the ambition of a constitutional monarch? The present Cabinet is highly blameable for such a laxity in the administration of its foreign policy, and we trust that some spirited members of Parliament will, ere long, direct attention to the matter and insist upon the conduct of foreign politics being left in the hands of the Ministry and not of the Monarch. If any blunder is made, Parliament can easily bring a Cabinet to book, but it must either allow the mistakes and stupidities of a monarch to pass unchecked, or it must take such action as may convulse the Snobdom of Britain, and what a terrible calamity that would be!

---

#### SCOTTISH JOCULARITY AND THE SURGICAL OPERATION

FOR nearly a century back the Saxon-English have brought forth and retailed at countless convivial parties, and in innumerable paragraphs, the well-known jibe at

Scottish intelligence, that to get a joke into a Scotsman's head you have to perform a surgical operation. And they give for their authority as to the jibe, the honoured name of Sydney Smith. So ingrained in the Saxon-English mind is this libel on Scottish intelligence, that even when a fair-minded Englishman wishes to speak in a friendly way of Scotsmen, he deprecates this sneering attitude of his countrymen towards the Scots by saying that they are not so devoid of humour as is generally supposed. This was the remark made a week or two ago in an English paper by a well-known English golfer and writer on golf—Mr Horace Hutchinson—when dealing with the sayings of Scottish "caddies." With all his friendliness to the Scots, he evidently considered that the charge against them in this respect was, in a general way, well founded. And yet this gentleman is a highly-cultured Englishman. Well, let it be stated plainly that Sydney Smith never made the accusation against Scottish intelligence that is generally attributed to him by his stupid fellow-countrymen. He lived in Edinburgh for three or four years at the beginning of last century, and being well accredited, mixed among and was made welcome by the best society of the city. In legal circles he was a great favourite, and it was in conjunction with Jeffrey, Brougham, Horner and others, that he became one of the founders and one of the chief contributors to the *Edinburgh Review*. He quickly found out one of the chief phases of the Scottish character, viz.—its

earnestness. When he met his legal and other friends in the day-time—during business hours—he found them grave and serious in their manner, and his quips and cranks fell lightly on their pre-occupied minds. But when he was in the company of these men in the evening, at dinner or at the convivial suppers then so common, a different spirit prevailed. Jocularly took the place of gravity, and humour that of seriousness; and Smith found that in the Edinburgh society of that day there were not a few that could "set the table in a roar" just as freely as he himself could. But this, of course, meant that wine and punch were flowing freely as well as strokes of humour and flashes of wit. The contrasts of the situation—of the grave period of business at the Courts during the day, and of the overflowing fun and humour at the evening convivial meetings, of course struck the mind of so acute an observer as Sydney Smith; and he gave point to it in his own peculiar way by the remark that Scottish fun and humour flowed most freely when a surgical operation had taken place on a bottle, and a cork had been drawn from it. It is one of the peculiarities of the position that the density of the average Saxon-English mind was unable to appreciate the delicacy of Sydney Smith's wit, and with characteristic stupidity and prejudice transformed a clever joke into a stupid and unmeaning jibe. With these remarks we reprint the following letter which appeared in a late issue of *The Age* (Melbourne), and which deals

with the question in a reasonable and convincing manner:—

(To the Editor of "The Age.")

Sir,—In *The Age* of Saturday last, there was reference at the Manufacturers' dinner to the ancient "joke" about a "surgical operation and the Scotsman," the saying having been imputed, as usual, to Sydney Smith, who knew better, and never said such a thing. What he did say was quite the reverse. In the *Memoirs of Robert Chambers*, written by his brother William, there occurs an account by the former of an interview he had with Sydney Smith, which was printed in the *Weekly Scotsman* of 22nd November, 1902. Adverting to the industry of Scotsmen, "Ah, labora, labora," he (Sydney Smith) said sententiously, "how that word expresses the character of your country!" "Well, we do work sometimes pretty hard," I observed, "but for all that, we can relish a pleasantries as much as our neighbours. You must have seen that the Scots have a considerable fund of humour." "Oh, by all means," replied my visitor. "You are an immensely funny people, but you need a little operating upon to let the fun out, and I know of no instrument so effective as a cork-screw!" Such is the original version, which has been perverted by some unholy Saxon, who did not hesitate to lie on Sydney Smith, so that he might have a hit at the Scots, who can very well afford to laugh at it. But why should Englishmen persist in traducing the good name of the most genial English wit of modern

times? No other nationality would elevate such a lie into a "joke." Mr Choate, late American Ambassador to London, has been amusing his fellow countrymen ever since his return by showing how impossible it is for an Englishman to comprehend or see the point of a joke. Almost as bad is that English bishop who had been away among the Northerns last year. When he returned he told the Southerns that the northern people had been sadly maligned, for the Scots were the jolliest people in the world! So "the whirligig of time brings about its revenges," and the Englishman may now apply to the American for that "surgical operation" of which he stands in need. Americans well know that Scotsmen require no assistance.—  
Yours, etc., ST. KILDA.

3rd December, 1908.

### THE DECADENCE OF THE SAXON-ENGLISH

SOME of our home-staying critics have expressed an opinion that we are too hard and too severe in our criticisms of the unfairness and the weakness of the Southern or Saxon-English. As to the charge of unfairness, what can be more unfair than the continuous, unjustifiable attempt of the Saxon-English Press and people to dishonour Scotland and treat her as a conquered country, by perpetually using the terms "England" and "English" in an Imperial sense, instead of "Britain" and "British." And yet this is the almost universal practice of the London Press, day after day, month after month, and year after year.

No Scottish condemnation of such conduct can be too severe. Then as to the racial weakness of the Saxon-English, is it not true? Their strength in the government of Britain lies only in their numbers, not in their enterprise or mental activity. But this is only declamation, say our critics. Well, what do they say to the following criticism of the Southern or Saxon-English by an able Australian man of business? Let our critics read the following, and say whether it is not almost on a line with our criticisms. And this is only the sayings of one critic. In our next issue we hope to back it up by the opinion of even a weightier critic. The following is from *The Argus* (Melbourne, Australia) of the 11th January 1909:—

THE ENGLISH CRITICISED—MR TEECE OUTSPOKEN — “LAZY AND AMBITIONLESS.”

*Sydney, Sunday.*—Mr R. Teece, general manager and actuary of the Australian Mutual Provident Society, who has just returned from a business trip to England, gave expression to some remarkable views concerning England and things English.

“It is their inordinate conceit that is the matter with the English,” said Mr Teece. “Because the English had their own way in the world fifty years ago, they think that they can have it still. They will not take the trouble to find out the likes and dislikes, and the wants and peculiarities of other people. Unless she alters considerably, England will sink to be a country of the rank of Switzerland—a hunting-ground for American tourists. I know it is bad

hearing, but that is how I found it. The outlook seems to me to be a black one. English methods are quite out of date, and they will not adopt new ones. Take the big Australian businesses—the Sugar Company, or the A.M.P., or the Australian shipping companies, or any of the big shops in Sydney. There is no comparison between English methods and theirs. An Australian business is carried on with infinitely more intelligence than an English concern. But they don't want to change. They are utterly ignorant of matters outside of England, and they don't seem to me to want to know of them—the majority, at least. They have no conception, for instance, that we have life insurance businesses such as that we have here. They nearly tumbled off their chairs backwards when I told them that a business of the size of the A.M.P. existed in Australia. I do not know what is coming to England. The older generation will not move; the younger generation is worse. I should say the English are lazy. They are ambitionless, and the younger generation is the most ambitionless of the lot. If only the English would accommodate themselves to other people, and other methods, as the Germans do, there would be no depression in England.”

“What will be the end of it?” asked Mr Teece. Replying to his own question, he said:—“The English will wake up in the end, when most of the damage is done. The English have always managed it so far, and I honestly think they will wake up some day. But it means that their methods will have to change, and that

means, I suppose, that their character will have to change. They seemed to me not merely not enthusiastic about the colonies, but actually hostile to them. I had things like the six hatters thrown up at me again and again. Then the average run of politicians sent to England do not do us any good. It is different, of course, with men like Mr Deakin and Mr Reid. They make a good impression, but the people forget them as soon as they're gone, and they remember us by certain others, who have been continually publicly speaking in a way that has done our reputation no good. However, they are coming to respect Australia a little, I think. They cannot help respecting our business methods. I saw a good deal of their methods in connection with the starting of the A.M.P. over there, and I found their moral tone low compared with ours."

—o—

### CROFTERS AND OLD-AGE PENSIONS

UNDER this heading, *The Times* of the 12th of January published the following able and interesting letter. It states the case for the long-suffering and grossly ill-treated population of the Highlands so clearly and so temperately, that we are glad to reprint it for the benefit of our readers, to many of whom *The Times* is comparatively a closed book:—

Sir,—As one who all his life has taken a considerable interest in the crofter question in the Highlands and has had considerable opportunities of studying that question will you allow me a word or two in

reply to Mr Charles Stewart, Appin?

First, as to the failure of the croft to provide a living for the family of the crofter. Most of us except the landlords knew this all along. The roof was there, and when the landlord received what he claimed for its scanty proportions there was little over. A daughter in service in Edinburgh or Glasgow or other city of the south had the most of the rest to do, or it might be a son who adorned the police force in London or Liverpool. In many cases the same daughter or son looked forward with anxiety to the day when the southern employment would be left to go home to care for these aged parents, now too frail for the incessant barren toil. No class of the community in Britain has lived so frugally as the crofters. Withal, no class has furnished outstanding citizens in naval, military and administrative posts to a greater extent, and in proportion to their opportunity. No class deserves these pensions better, and by no class will they be more appreciated. In the past the only person in the Highlands during the last hundred years who looked forward to old age without anxiety was the landlord. He toiled not, neither did he spin. The thankless efforts of a much-maligned peasantry supplied him with more than he needed. Better late than never, but it is satisfactory that now at last the landlords see how in the past they were able to eat of the fat of the land.

Secondly, as to Mr Stewart's deductions. There are millions of acres of land in the Highlands suit-

able for holdings. No new holdings insufficient to support families in comfort should be created. It is not such holdings that are wanted. There are hundreds of farmers small and large prospering to-day in the Highlands. Add to their number by annexing the best waste land in the forests and sheep farms too large for efficient management. Let the land in the Highlands to-day be apportioned on a patriotic and business-like basis, and Mr Stewart's deduction will melt like ice in midsummer; and, further, fewer old-age pensions will be needed in the future in the Highlands.

Next as to the crofterisation of Scotland, I am surprised at one bearing a Highland name using such language. An Englishman ignorant of our history could be excused. The present crofter system is an abnormal growth, following the Stuart rising of 1745. Formerly chiefs held the whole land in trust for their clans. His clansmen were the chief's tenants. The chief was largely responsible for the order and good government of his clansmen and for military service. The land was not his for personal enjoyment. After 1745 unscrupulous landlords had the land registered in their own name as private owners. I do not know of a case in which clansmen were consulted. Soon after began the segregation that is now the bane of the Highlands. "Crofter," "landlord," "factor" are terms unknown in Gaelic, the ancient language of the Highlander. "Big tenants" and "small tenants" were the terms used for the tenantry. All honour to Mr Sinclair for his attempt to remove the offensive term "crofter," and once more restore to Scotland its "big tenants" and "small tenants." He has failed through the opposition of such as Mr Stewart, but a brighter day for rural Scotland is surely in

sight. When it comes we need not thank the opponents of its dawn.—I am, yours faithfully,

DON. MACKINTOSH.

Manse of Ardeonaig, Loch Tay, Killin.

## THE HIGHLAND CHIEFS AND THE HIGHLAND CLASMEN

A HIGHLANDER resident in England has sent us the following letter for publication, and as it gives a view of the question from the side of the chiefs, it is only fair that it should also receive publicity:—

THORNTON GROVE,

MARKINGTON, YORKSHIRE.

28th January 1909.

Sir,—As a supporter and reader of your paper, may I say a word on the concluding clause touching the nobility of France in 1795 in your article, No. 23, January 1909? It is perfectly true that some of the French nobility were teaching dancing and deportment in 1795, but this was rather the result of their own compassion, which might even be said to have been weakness, in regard to the infamous leaders of the great Revolution, and *not* to their desire in any way to hinder the "benefit of the masses"; that this latter does not lie and never will be found in democracy is attested by history. *A propos* again of the French nobility, it is time that the falsehoods of Carlyle and other democratic writers, too popular in Scotland, should be exposed, and that writers such as Marmontel, De Maistre and others, who speak the truth, should be studied instead. Again, in a previous passage, you say if ever landlords should have

been kindly and fatherly it should have been the Highland Chiefs. As a member of one of the oldest clans in the Highlands, allow me to say this is most grossly unfair to the Scottish Chiefs. Surely I need not inform so patriotic a paper as *The Thistle* that most of the Highland estates are owned by English or other foreign aliens, and that most of the unfortunate Chiefs have been or are now obliged to sell and let their lands owing to absolute inability to retain them under present conditions. These miserable conditions have prevailed ever since the German usurpation, and many, many Chiefs (like my own at that time) lost their all in the gallant endeavour to replace the Rightful Race upon the Throne, and have never held up their heads again; their descendants are consequently exiles through no fault of their own. Though on the unpopular side, I trust you will give publicity to this most inadequate plea for the other side of the question in your most valuable paper.—I remain, Sir, faithfully yours,

F. M. A. MACKINNON.

A most convinced supporter of Home Rule for Scotland and a descendant of her Kings.


—o—

### THE CLAN COMBAT ON THE NORTH INCH OF PERTH

A MELBOURNE correspondent some time ago sent us the following remarks on this affair. They will interest some of our Highland readers:—"The famous Combat on the North Inch is reproduced (in *Scotia*) by a W. C. MacKenzie, chiefly, it would appear, to show

that the MacAys are now represented by a Mackenzie, but there must have been greater interests at stake than the two small clans of M' Ay or Adamsons, and the other small clan M'Queill of Moulins. It has always been associated with the battle of Invernahavon, in the Davidson's country, when the Camerons attacked Clan Chattan, and caused trouble between the Macphersons and Davidsons for the leadership of the Clan. This was explained in a letter to the *Weekly Scotsman*, March 12/04, from James L. Hume, who states that in the subsequent fight at Perth in 1396, "twenty-nine Davidsons were killed, the last one remaining saving his life by swimming the Tay, leaving Henry (Hal o' the Wynd) and ten desperately wounded Macphersons masters of the field." Another letter in same paper—dated February 27/04—states, "In Answer to *Historicus*," Essex, the following inscription from a tombstone in Rothiemurchus Churchyard may be interesting:—"In memory of Farquhar Shaw, who led and was one of the thirty of his Clan who defeated the thirty Davidsons of Invernahavon in the famous combat on the North Inch of Perth in 1396: he died 1405, and was buried here."

How do the MacIntoshes and Shaws come in? Lang mixes up the Mackenzies with it—apparently mistaking them for Macphersons. It was an interesting circumstance, but there does not seem much chance of getting more accurate information than Scott gives us in *The Fair Maid*.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 9.

April 1909


Price 1d

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
NO. 30.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—THE TIME OF WALLACE . . . . .	130
„ 31.—THE DECADENCE OF THE SAXON- ENGLISH . . . . .	133
„ 32.—THE SOUTHERN ENGLISH IN CANADA .	136
THE OBVIOUS DUTY OF THE SCOTTISH PEOPLE .	141
SCOTLAND: BY WILL H. OGILVIE (FROM "SCOTIA") .	142
BRITAIN VERSUS GERMANY . . . . .	142
THE PURCHASE OF VATERSAY . . . . .	143
THE SCOTTISH LANGUAGE . . . . .	143
SOUTH ENGLISH WEAKNESS . . . . .	143
THE THREEFOLD BATTLE OF ROSLIN . . . . .	144
THE CANDLEMAS NUMBER OF "SCOTIA" . . . . .	144



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

No. 9.

APRIL 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 30.

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE TIME OF WALLACE

THERE is an air of mystery or uncertainty about the earlier and the later years of the career of Wallace, which no amount of research has been able to make clear. His life by Henry the Minstrel, so

### PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow; also at Robt. Graham, 108-112 Eglinton St., and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle St., 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 Publisher, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

dear to Scotsmen, under the name of “Blind Harry,” was for centuries the Iliad of Scotland. During the last half century attempts have been made to discredit the main course of his narrative, and to make out that it is quite untrustworthy, unless it is supported by the English Chronicles of the period. Lord Hailes—who wrote in the latter half of the 18th century—was the first, or at least the most important of the critics of “Blind Harry,” and being a Scotsman, his work, “Annals of Scotland,” had, when published, a great vogue in England, where at the time everything Scottish was regarded with contempt and hatred. But to utterly discredit Scottish national traditions, and to regard them as worthless, unless supported by the chronicles of the time—especially those of England—is as foolish as it is unfair. In the middle ages, when the minds of the common people had little to dwell upon, except the festivals and functions of the church and the wars of the kingdom, or the forays and quarrels of its nobles, every event that was daring and hazardous, or had in it the element of romance,

became the subject of popular interest, and was handed down from father to son, or from mother to daughter, either in ballads of rough but racy metre, or in tales and stories of rude prose. That such recollections or reminiscences of the past should become imbued with fantastic or improbable statements, savouring of gross superstition, or of fantastic embellishments favouring national sentiment, or expressing national hate and antipathy, by no means renders them unworthy of credence. On the contrary, they to some extent tend to strengthen their veracity, by showing that they are racy of the period of their birth. The discredit then that for a time was thrown upon the work of "Blind Harry," and the attempt made by some English as well as by some Scottish writers to treat it as utterly worthless, unless where it is supported by contemporary chronicles, is unjustifiable. Though he wrote about 170 years after the time of Wallace, he avers that his work is based on a life of the hero, written by Blair, who was the companion of Wallace in many of his campaigns. This greatly strengthens the authority of the book, and whatever may be its defects, it certainly ought to be preferred by Scotsmen to the accounts of the period given by English chroniclers, who must not only have written at second or third hand, but whose judgment was vitiated by national bigotry and national hate.

We pass over the romantic incidents in the early career of Wallace, which interesting as they are, as showing the high spirit and the

wonderful prowess of the young hero, can hardly be regarded as events worthy of record in such a brief space as we here have at command. They are, however, to be regarded as not without importance in this respect, that they made the name of Wallace known to his countrymen as the most daring and most successful leader that had taken the field against the hated Southrons. Few of the nobles joined him, but the lesser gentry and the hardy commoners soon flocked to his standard in such numbers that he, in company with Sir William Douglas, attempted to surprise and capture Ormsby, King Edward's Justiciary, who was holding his Court at Scone. He, however, had received timely warning, and fled. This success gave great encouragement to the patriots, and several important nobles joined them. With this accession to their strength they marched to the West of Scotland, and taking up a strong position near Irvine, determined to meet there the English attack. But here began the dissensions which were to prove so disastrous in the future to the Scottish cause and to the career of Wallace. The nobles who were in arms at Irvine included the Steward of Scotland and his brother, Alexander de Lindesay, Sir Richard Lundin, Sir Andrew Moray and others. Lord Hailes says Wallace was there, and that the other nobles were jealous of him and of each other, and so disunited and disorganised that there was no one amongst them who had the ability or the power to command the general confidence. These dissensions

were fatal. Other authorities say Wallace was not present, but was engaged in the North-East beyond the Tay, rallying the patriots in that important district. However this may be, nearly all the nobles at Irvine, afraid of the forfeiture of their lands, made overtures to the English leaders, and their submission was accepted. Wallace, if he were among them, then as always, the indomitable patriot, scorned to submit, and withdrew with his followers. We shortly afterwards hear of him at the head of a large force which he had raised in the North, laying siege to the Castle of Dundee. While there, the English leaders advanced with a great army towards Stirling, with the intention of crossing the Forth there and subduing the country beyond. Wallace, with the prescience of a great general, saw the importance of that point of passage, and hastened to dispute it. Leaving a small force at Dundee, he charged the citizens on pain of death to help it in continuing the siege, and marched to Cambuskenneth, opposite Stirling, where he took up a strong position commanding the bridge, then the only one on the Forth, and therefore the key to the North of Scotland.

The English were under the command of Warrenne, Earl of Surrey, and of Cressingham, an ambitious churchman—their number was said to be fifty thousand, and the Scots under Wallace to be forty thousand. So says Hill Burton, quoting from an English Chronicler; but whatever may have been the English numbers, it is certain that

Wallace could not have had under him much more than twenty thousand, if so many.

The battle of Stirling Brig, as it is called, took place on the 11th of September 1297. It is one of the most important battles that has been fought in Scotland; for the crushing defeat that the English sustained there, fixed and established forever in the breasts of Scotsmen that spirit of patriotism, which has made them famous throughout the world, and which animated them in their prolonged struggle for nearly three centuries against the mighty power of England. The bridge across the Forth was of wood, and was very narrow. Blind Harry states that Wallace had sawn through or nearly through, some of the supporting beams, which were only sustained by pins or wedges, and that when half of the English force had crossed, these were withdrawn by Scotsmen concealed under the bridge, and one half of the English army was thus cut off from the other. However this may be, when a large body of the English had crossed to the north side of the river, Wallace attacked them with great fury, threw them into disorder, and following up his success, drove them into the river, where thousands were drowned, and the rest were destroyed. Cressingham, who had crossed the bridge, was among the killed. Warrenne, with the force left on the south side, took to flight, and never rested till he got to Dunbar. The loss on the English side is stated to have been twenty thousand men, including many of rank

and note. The loss on the side of the Scots was small, but among the slain was Sir Andrew Murray of Bothwell, one of the chief supporters of Wallace among the Scottish nobility.

The Scots' leaders (writes Paterson in his excellent "Life of Wallace"), with what forces they had (having pursued the retreating English to Haddington), "remained there all night, and next day returned to Stirling. Soon after, Wallace caused the barons of Scotland to make their allegiance to him for the protection of the kingdom. Those who did not do so of their free will, he punished.

\* \* \* Dundee surrendered by treaty; and in ten days afterwards, says the Minstrel, the English had not a castle in Scotland, save those of Roxburgh and Berwick. \* \* \* Scotland was free, Wallace himself acting as Governor until the Crown should be settled on the righteous heir."

## THE DECADENCE OF THE SAXON-ENGLISH

No. 31

IN our last issue (p. 124) we published an interesting extract from a Melbourne paper giving the views held by one of the leading business men in Sydney as to the lack of enterprise and of intelligence of the business people he met in London. "The older generation will not move; the younger generation is worse. They are ambitionless, and the younger generation is the most ambitionless of the lot. \* \* \* It is their inordinate conceit that is the matter with the English."

So said Mr Teece, the general manager of the Australian Mutual Provident Society, one of the most successful institutions of the kind in the Empire. A few months ago we observed in one of the London papers a statement which supported the views of Mr Teece. It was to the effect that a firm in a considerable way of business was asked to pack one of its products—needles—in a different manner from what it generally did; as the colour of the packets, which was yellow, was highly objected to in China—yellow being there regarded as a sacred colour, and consequently all articles packed in yellow for exportation to China had to be re-packed in papers of another colour. The firm objected to change the colour of their paper packets; they had always packed them in that fashion they said, and they were not going to change now. As a consequence, the exporting firm placed the order in Germany, and it was there carried out according to instructions. The order, it was stated, was to the value of from two to three thousand pounds sterling, which was lost to the country through "the inordinate conceit" of the English firm.

This is bad enough, but it is only one of many testimonies to the stupid conservatism of certain English manufacturers and business men. So engrained are many of them in the belief that foreign customers must submit to their views of business, that they will not alter their ways, even though their obstinacy may cause their customers to go elsewhere. As Mr Teece remarks, this may have been all

very well half-a-century ago ; but now it is simply disastrous, and plays into the hands of the more flexible and go-a-head Germans. The same tale comes from America. A special correspondent of *The Times* was lately in Canada, and he gave in that journal of the 5th of December last a most deplorable account of the laziness and want of enterprise of many of the London emigrants to the Dominion. When he got to New York he called on Mr Edison, the famous inventor and electrical engineer. "Say, what's the matter with your people over there," he exclaimed, almost as soon as we had shaken hands. "Here, I've had to close down my phonograph factory in England—what's the name of the place, I've forgotten; somewhere near London. All the others in Europe paying, but we couldn't make that one pay. We got good work out of the French and the Belgians and the Germans and the Austrians, but the English—no good. Belgians, 85 per cent.; English, 30 per cent. Mr Edison meant ratio of productive capacity. He went on—"Mind, I'm not speaking of the English mechanic. He's all right; none better in the world. I'm talking of the common labourer—men you pick up on the streets. What is it? Too much booze? Or general deterioration? Or what?" *The Times* correspondent then goes on to say that he thought he could reply to that question. He continues, "It was a belief that had been growing in me ever since I began to travel, and to observe the successes and failures among Eng-

lishmen who emigrate to the British possessions and to foreign countries, particularly the United States. For one hears the same thing everywhere—the Englishman who succeeds is hardly ever a Londoner; the Englishman who fails completely is almost always a Londoner."

Now this is a most melancholy statement as to the decadence of a large section of the English people—those of the South of England, or, as we term them, the Saxon-English. Our readers will have noticed that we have from our first issue expressed more or less definitely the self-same views; and here we may say that our experience and observation of the racial characteristics of the various divisions of the British Isles have, we think, been of a longer date, and over a more wide-spread area than have been those of the special correspondent of *The Times*. We do not in this paper intend entering upon a discussion of the causes, or the probable causes, of this degeneration of the Southern English; but we must now point out how it bears on the great national question that the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh have so much at heart—viz., the carrying out of Home Rule, which, of course, means Home Rule All Round. It is the Tory party that is the most bigoted, the most determined, and at the same time the most ignorant antagonist of this great political movement, and it is in Southern England that it has its chief stronghold. From these degenerate Englishmen, whose weakness we have been exposing in this article, the Tory party derives its

chief strength. We think it was in the general election before the last, that the return of Tory members from the Southern half of England was almost a compact and solid mass, which was fittingly represented on the Liberal Electoral maps of the time in an almost unvaried and monotonous field of black. Here then we have the reasonable and just national demand of the Scots, Irish and Welsh peoples for liberty to manage their own domestic affairs, thwarted and denied from year to year, and from decade to decade, not by the intelligent and liberal-minded people of the Northern half of England, but by these decadent and squire and parson-ridden inhabitants of the South, whose ignorance and whose racial weakness are making the English name a reproach and a bye-word of degradation throughout the Empire. But it may be said the House of Lords is also strongly against the Home Rule movement, and surely it is a chamber in which there is plenty of ability and plenty of intelligence. Granted. The House of Lords is full of men of ability and of intelligence, but the dominating influence there is land and money. These two interests completely control the policy of the House of Lords, unless it is made timorous by a fierce and determined agitation for some great popular measure. Then the House of Lords reluctantly gives way. This has been the policy of the House of Lords for many generations. It is here then that the evil influence of the degenerate and servile people of the South comes in. They vote for

the Tory party just as steadily and as fully as the people of Scotland vote for the Liberal party; and thus it comes that not seldom they hold, if not the balance of political power, at least a very important influence, and thus enable the party leaders of the House of Lords to say the country is not strongly with the Liberal party. It was so lately in the two great national questions of Education and of Temperance. The one touched the influence of the English Church; the other the interests of the Brewers, and of an important section of the monied class. Had it not been for the support of the people of Southern England, the House of Lords would have given way on these two questions. But the attitude of the Southern people, though far from sufficient to place the Tories in power had there been an appeal to the country, was quite enough to induce the too willing Tory House of Lords to reject these two important measures; knowing, or presuming, that the Ministry would not resort to a General Election so early in the life of the present Parliament. Here then we have great national reforms affecting the welfare of the people of England; and great constitutional reforms affecting the national life of the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh peoples completely blocked by a hereditary chamber of legislation—an out-of-date institution which would not be tolerated for a day in any portion of the Empire outside of India—but which defends its policy of continuous veto of Liberal measures by pointing to the support such policy receives from

the degenerate, corrupt and servile population of Southern England.

— 0 —  
No. 32

### THE SOUTHERN ENGLISH IN CANADA

[T will be seen from the concluding portion of our previous article that the racial degeneration of the Southern or Saxon-English has an important bearing on the demand of the Scottish people for Home Rule, and for the maintenance of their national rights and national honour. The two questions naturally bear closely one on the other, for it is clear that if we had in Scotland a national organisation, such as would be required to carry out the working of Home Rule, that body would, ere long, decisively put an end to the slights and insults that the Scottish people have now to put up with from the ignorant and the arrogant portion of the people of England, and we need hardly say that under these terms are included much more than a majority of our southern fellow-subjects. We have, in our remarks on this question, repeatedly discriminated between the people of the North and the people of the South of England, for we are of opinion that while the people of the North of England are very far from blameless in this matter, they are much more disposed to be fair and just than are their brethren in the South. "Fair play is bonny play" is the well-known cry in the wrestling rings in the "North Country," and it is really a cry emanating from the heart of the people, and would be fairly well responded to by them on behalf of Scottish rights if the appeal could

be made to them by an organisation representing the Scottish people. But in the South, where Toryism and popular ignorance are the characteristics of the people, quite a different tale has to be told. There, if they think of Scotland at all, it is only as a part or a province of England, and any thought of giving the slightest consideration to Scottish national rights, or Scottish national feeling, is a thing undreamt of by probably nineteen-twentieths, or perchance, ninety-nine hundredths of the population. There is this excuse for them, however, that even as regards their own affairs and interests they do not think; they are led. They depend for guidance on the landed and monied classes, and the clergy; the chief exception, as a rule, to this servility, being the Non-conformist portion of the population. It is a natural consequence of this state of affairs that when the Saxon-English go abroad and mix in the British colonies with the more virile and independent minded populations of the North of England, of Scotland, of Ireland and Wales, they make a very miserable appearance in the battle of life. It is they who bring discredit on the English name in Canada and the United States by their ignorance, their helplessness and their sodden and sensual characteristics. Let us cite some of the statements which, during the last few years, have been published regarding these degenerate people.

Take the following remarks of the special correspondent of *The Times* (of 5th December last) in Canada. He had called at the office of one of the chief newspapers in

Toronto just as the paper was going to press. "In the street below," he writes, "there was a crowd of between 200 and 300 men, practically every one of them an obvious Englishman. They were all waiting for the paper to 'come out' in order that they might examine the advertisements of 'Situations vacant.'" There was a similar crowd, said the veteran journalist with whom I was talking, every day his newspaper was printed.

I expressed my pity for the poor wretches who, in a strange country, a country to which they had emigrated in the hope of escaping from the curse of non-employment, had found that this curse had followed them across the sea. "Yes," said the newspaper owner, "it is sad, terribly sad; but what can we do? There is generally work in Canada for all who are able to work; there is work for these men at the present time if they were capable of anything. But they are helpless, hopeless. Why do you send such wretched creatures to us? They can do no good here; I believe they are worse off in Canada than they were in England."

"A few weeks ago," he continued, "I wanted a night watchman, and I sent my manager down to see if he could not get a good man out of the hundreds in the street. The man, of course, would have to show references; but no skill was required, the work was easy, and the wages were pretty good. You notice how all those men there are formed into groups? That is always the way, and my manager went to every group. 'Boys,' he said, 'there's a good job waiting for one of you. We want a night watchman—fifteen

dollars a week. Nothing to do but attend to the furnace and wind up the time-clocks. The first man who can prove he's sober and trustworthy gets it.'"

"And not a single man out of all those hundreds would take the place. They 'wanted their nights to themselves.' Can you blame us Canadians if we get sick of trying to help the out-of-work Englishman?"

Perhaps had I been newly arrived in Canada I should, in spite of the high authority from which I obtained this story, have been disposed to doubt it, or at any rate to argue that the men concerned could not have been representative, that by some extraordinary chance it was a crowd of hopeless derelicts which had collected outside the newspaper office that particular afternoon. But, I regret to say, what I myself had seen and heard had all gone to corroborate this indictment of the English immigrant. Only a few days before, in travelling eastward from Winnipeg, my companions in the smoke-room had been comparing their experiences of the English out-of-work. One gentleman, a Winnipeg business man, had recently required a stenographer and typewriter. A young Englishman, who had just arrived with his wife, presented himself, showed himself capable, and was engaged. He was to travel in Alberta with his employer for a month, and then settle down permanently in Winnipeg. He failed either to appear or to write any explanation, and when he was found he declared that he had decided not to leave his wife for a month. And the pair of them were starving!

Another traveller told how he had become interested in a young English couple, had given the man two dollars, and had later called at the address given. One dollar of the two had been spent on bottled beer, in spite of the fact that there were a starving wife and child. "My husband always 'as to 'ave his beer," the woman had remarked with pride.

But it is useless to give further instances. It was a dreadful thing to hear these keen-faced, clear-eyed, smartly-dressed Canadians, prosperous, happy, vigorous, discussing the "Old Country" as though it were a land of imbeciles, "played out," to use their own expression. I asked them if they did not know of other cases in which Englishmen had "made good." "Lots of them," one of the travellers replied. "It's the kind you're sending over now that we're talking about. What's the matter? Seems to me there's a sort of dry-rot come over the people."

Everywhere it was the same story—at Vancouver, Banff, Calgary, San Francisco, Seattle, Chicago."

At a meeting of the Edinburgh Galloway Association, held in Edinburgh on the 9th of March, and presided over by Sir Mark MacTaggart Stewart, he said Galloway men were well known all over the world, and there was no one like them to do work. He concluded his remarks by saying:—

"He had been talking with a young friend the other day who had gone out to Canada and succeeded, and who, after his visit home, was shortly returning. He told him that he went out in the company of an Englishman. They

asked him if he was a Scotsman, and when he said he was, and that he came from Galloway, they gave him work at once. His English friend did not get work for two months, and then he had to say he was a Scotsman."

Then here is what *The Saturday Review* says of the young men of London. There may be a little of political spite in it, for it forms part of a sneering paragraph at Mr Haldane and the recent movement in London in favour of the Territorial force. But here it is:—"Possibly," says *The Review*, "a hundred of these Territorials, if they were there, could account for one good German soldier." This is the dictum of an influential London weekly newspaper as to the degeneracy and worthlessness of the London young men as "Territorials," as compared with "a good German soldier." One hundred of them required to account for one good German! Gracious heavens, what has London—what have the Saxon-English come to? One good German equal to a hundred of them!

What is the result of these wretched exhibitions of racial degeneracy of the Southern English in Canada, the United States and elsewhere? Simply that the term "English" has become a byword for inefficiency, for helplessness and for self-indulgence. "No English need apply" is now a standing order among many North American employers of labour. What a reproach to those arrogant and bumptious Englishmen here, who sneer at their Scots, Irish and Welsh fellow-subjects, and look

upon foreigners generally as members of inferior races, whose feelings are not worthy of any consideration. We often hear of the dislike and detestation felt towards Englishmen in France and Germany, while on the contrary the Scots are treated with respect and with kindness so soon as they make their nationality known. Even the boys in Canada sneer at the helplessness of Englishmen. An Oxford Professor lately delivered a lecture before the members of the Royal Colonial Institute in London on "Oxford and the Empire." In the course of his remarks he alluded to the alienation of feeling that now exists among many Canadians towards Englishmen, and seemed to think that it proceeded from ignorance—from ignorance of England and its people. He said, "On the steamer on which I returned from Canada this summer there was a little Canadian boy consumed with a holy horror and contempt for England and Englishmen. \* \* \* My friend was, I think, going to an English private school, and we may be quite at our ease with regard to his future state of mind on Imperial questions." It may prove to be so, but that will entirely depend on the strength of character of the young Canadian. That he will be bullied and insulted at his English school if he ventures to assert his juvenile Canadian sentiments is a certainty, but all boys are not converted to English ways of thinking by bullying. We know that the effect of the education entirely at English schools and under English tutors, and a four years' course at Magdalene College,

Cambridge, did not Anglicise the character of the late Mr Parnell, but, on the contrary, embittered his antagonism to England. No doubt he had been bullied and insulted in the usual English way when at school, and this had strengthened his enmity to a people that for centuries had insulted and degraded his country. The sentiments of the youthful Canadian at all events illustrate how deeply the contempt for Englishmen has sunk into the minds of the people of Canada.

To Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen at home and abroad there is a moral to be drawn from the facts that we here publish as to the state of helplessness and degradation into which a large section of the English people has fallen. In the contest which goes on in Britain, as it also goes on in every country in Europe, for the enlightenment of the people and for the advancement of popular rights, for the lifting up of the masses from the state of class and social injustice to which they are still subjected in almost every country in Europe—France alone among the great Powers excepted—many obstacles have to be removed and many difficulties overcome. While it may be truly said that now in Europe progress is the order of the day, yet it must be remembered that popular progress is the result of effort and of labour on the part of thoughtful, public-spirited and energetic men. These have to contend with the large element of sluggishness and indifference—in other words of Toryism—which we find implanted in human nature, and doubtless wisely so, for


constant and ceaseless change without due deliberation would be as fatal to a people as is the deadly torpor that till now has enslaved the races of the East. In the people of Britain this fight for progress may be said to be placed under proper conditions, with one great and unhappy exception. The people of Scotland, Ireland and Wales are progressive, in the present position of politics indeed almost wholly progressive, and deprived to some extent of those Conservative influences which go to steady popular government in a well-ordered State; but this undue proportion of progressiveness—of Radicalism, if you will—is due to the denial to them of self-government in that which concerns them and them alone—in other words, in the refusal to them of Home Rule. The people of England having the control of British legislation in their own hands by the overwhelming majority of votes they have in the House of Commons, are much more evenly balanced as regards the progressive and the Conservative tendencies, and if left to themselves and unhampered by that monstrous abortion of the Constitution—the House of Lords—would have a pretty fair fight as between Liberalism and Toryism. In the Northern half, Liberal principles predominate; in the Southern half, Toryism rules, and in this state of things the House of Lords, the stronghold of the landed and monied classes, holds a position which is all but fatal to progress. Its power, as exercised, is not that of regulating but of merely blocking, and it only ceases

to block when, by popular indignation, it becomes terrorised into submission.

This political servility, then, of Southern England and the consequent decadence of its population is a canker on the body politic of Britain. Conjoined with the aristocratic and plutocratic House of Lords, it presents an almost insuperable obstacle to the advancement of popular rights, and especially to the concession of true popular government to the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Were the people of Southern England converted from Toryism and placed in the same political line as the people of Northern England, the despotic power of the House of Lords would quickly be ended. Or, on the other hand, were the House of Lords “ended or mended,” the deadly political torpor that now overspreads the South of England would ere long give way before the fresh and invigorating popular influences that would sweep down on it from the North; for there is nothing more certain than that the political life of Britain would become a living homogeneous entity, ebbing and flowing, no doubt, in its Liberalism and in its Conservatism, but still animated with a vivid spirit of corporate unity and of Imperial working towards a great common end. This is the grand political life that is springing up in Canada, in Australia and in New Zealand, and is promising also to take root in South Africa. In these younger Britains there is no cankerous anachronism such as the House of Lords, and no decadent and men-

tally sodden population, such as that of Saxon-England, which now, like a stagnant organism, pollutes and renders inert the political action of the British people. There, beyond, the British peoples go marching on towards their grand national ideal of the greatest good for the greatest number, sometimes going too fast and sometimes making blunders through ignorance and excess of zeal, but always being enlightened by their experience, and by giving free play to the Conservative force, which is always to be found in every free and well-ordered British community. That such progress is not at present possible in Britain is certain, nor can it ever be possible till the British people cease to bow down before and hold sacred that monstrous political fetish, the House of Lords. We have said that there is a moral to be drawn by Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen from the melancholy picture of the prostration of the English name, which we have laid before our readers. Do these three peoples like the picture of English degradation, which is here presented to them, and do they think it a high honour to sink their own national names, not in favour of that of Britain—one of the proudest and most unsullied of all national names—but in favour of that of England? If they do, and if they should find fortune unfavourable to them in this country and they wish to better their condition, let them avoid France, where the arrogance of the English is resented, and Germany, where their idleness and helplessness are despised; but,


above all, let them avoid Canada, where they will find flaunted in their faces the ominous and shame-bringing warning—"No English need apply."



### THE OBVIOUS DUTY OF THE SCOTTISH PEOPLE

THE importance of these facts as to the moral deterioration of a large section of the English people must be patent to all true Scots throughout the world. There is plenty of grit still left in the English people, especially in the northern half of England, and no doubt they will take steps to try and regenerate their southern compatriots, and shame them into more manly ways, and into a more vigorous public life; but the Scottish people have also a duty before them, and that is that they must now, more than ever, oppose any and every attempt on the part of Englishmen to degrade them and their country by calling them Englishmen, and by treating their country as a part of England. Let them regard all such attempts as insults to their national life, to which a tame submission is a disgrace. It is a fact now patent to every thoughtful man within the Empire, that as workers for the welfare and advancement of the Empire, the Scots are not merely superior, but greatly superior to the English. Why then degrade not only the Scots but the Empire, as a whole, by using for the whole the inferior term "English," instead of the unsullied and more noble term "British"? Let all true Scots then defend their national honour and

their national rights, as their noble forefathers did for centuries against apparently overwhelming odds. Now they have on their side the law of the land ; against them only English ignorance and English arrogance. Firmly opposed, these must fail.




### SCOTLAND

UNDER this heading Mr Will H. Ogilvie contributes to the Candlemas number of *Scotia* the following charming patriotic sonnet :

All's well with thee, my Scotland, all is well !  
 Though mean souls clutch for ever at thy bays,  
 Thy breed belittle, and thy deeds dispraise,  
 Forgetful of thy best who fought and fell  
 To guard their banners and their foes repel,  
 And set them firmly on their laurelled ways,  
 They cannot steal the pride and glory of days  
 That Time remembers, and thy records tell !

No slur can stain thy purple, and no scorn  
 Can make thee less amid the Courts of men,  
 Nation of masters of the sword and pen,  
 Kings in the wider world that ye adorn !  
 Let them take all, dear land of hill and lake,  
 Thy pride among Earth's nations none can take !

WILL H. OGILVIE.




### BRITAIN versus GERMANY

THE debate in the House of Commons on the 16th of March on the relative prospective strength of the British and German fleets somewhat startled the country. It would appear that Germany is adding to her naval strength with feverish haste, and that if the British Government is not careful, the German navy is likely to out-

strip the British in the number of ships of the Dreadnought class in two or three years' time. Then the all-important fact remains, that despite several advances on the part of this country to Germany to limit the outlay for naval purposes, she has steadfastly refused to do so. There is no blinking the fact that the position is a serious one. The Kaiser evidently means mischief—and mischief of the most dangerous kind to this country. He is preparing Germany apparently for a life and death struggle with this country for the mastery of the seas ; and if he, through the supineness of our Government gains it, then farewell to British liberty, to British greatness, and to the well-being of the British people. For our complete defeat by Germany means, of course, the surrender of all our ships of war ; an undertaking not to arm our land forces under heavy penalties ; and a payment of a war indemnity, probably of not less than five hundred millions sterling. We observe that the chief opposition to the increase of our naval strength ; as also of our military force to a point sufficient to frustrate the ambitious design of Germany, proceeds chiefly from the extreme Radical and Socialist members of the House of Commons. Do these gentlemen realise what would be the position of the British people if Germany, by our apathy and by economy carried out to the bounds of treason to the country, is allowed to get the upper hand, and is able to strike us to the ground. Where would our population be—the working classes more especially—if Germany mas-

tered us? Why, they would be involved in a hopeless struggle for a miserable existence for some generations to come; and all hope of social improvement would be utterly gone. We make no apology for entering into a discussion in these pages of this momentous question. It is clear that in this matter we in Scotland stand or fall with the rest of the British peoples; and the conquest of Britain by a foreign foe would be the end of the unique position that Scotland at present holds in history—*Scotia Invicta*. We feel quite sure that the Scottish people will not be found wanting in the determination to spare no outlay to render our position impregnable against the selfish ambition of the German Kaiser. If some of our short-sighted politicians and members of Parliament be inclined by false ideas of economy to further his designs, let their views and their votes be treated with the contempt they deserve. We know what their fate would be, if their folly rendered an invasion successful. The women of the country would give them a short shrift; their wretched lives would quickly be made unbearable.



#### THE PURCHASE OF VATERSAY.

—The purchase during the month of March of the Island of Vatersay, by the Scottish Congestion Districts Board, on behalf of the Government, is a very important fact. But it is a mere “nibbling,” as it were, at a settlement of the Highland land question. At least a quarter of a million sterling per annum should be allocated by the Government for

the purchase of the Highland land now given up to deer forests and sports. We will recur to this all-important subject in some future number.


THE SCOTTISH LANGUAGE.—Mr A. Stodart Walker in Chambers Journal, for December 1908 or January 1909, wrote as follows:—“Ruskin said—in reply to a question.—“For a Scotsman, next to his bible there is but one book, his native land—but one language—his native tongue—the sweetest, richest, subtlest, most musical of all the living dialects of Europe. Study your Burns, Scott and Carlyle. Scott in his Scottish novels only.”

SOUTH ENGLISH WEAKNESS.—“In the Midlands and the North, now as formerly, there is a serious sense of responsibility among the people, and no special inducements have been needed to attract recruits. \* \* \* But London and the Home Counties have hitherto figured conspicuously at the bottom of the list in every return of strength issued by Army Headquarters. London has done worst of all. \* \* \* The old methods of recruiting were plainly out of date, and if London was not to become the laughing-stock of the rest of the country, some new impetus had to be given to recruiting. \* \* \* No more scathing indictment of the debilitating literature, the frivolous occupations, and the debasing pleasures which have become the gods of modern middle-class England could well have been penned. (This refers to the production of Major du Maurier’s play, “An Englishman’s Home.”) \* \* \* Now the Yeomanry are full; the London Scottish are more than full; the Heavy Artillery and the London Brigade of Field Artillery also are recruiting over their strength, etc.”—*From the Military Correspondent of “The Times,” Feb. 15, 1909.*

THE THREEFOLD BATTLE OF ROSLIN.—Those of our readers who have not seen *Chambers' Journal* for March, will do well to get a copy. It contains a description, by Mr Bruce-Low, M.A., of the three battles fought in one day by the Scots against the English in 1303, and is notable for the vivid way in which the writer brings before the reader the details of the famous struggle. Generally speaking, the old chronicles are dry and uninteresting in dealing with the many fights of that period; but Mr Low, who has evidently ransacked them thoroughly, gives so vivid a description of the three battles, and of the events that led up to them, as to bring them in a life-like way before the reader. It is to be hoped that we shall have more of the same material from Mr Low's graphic pen. He is evidently a master of picturesque historical narrative.

THE CANDLEMAS NUMBER OF "SCOTIA."—The Union Flag of Britain is the subject of an interesting article by Mr John A. Stewart of Glasgow. Heraldry, to the general reader, is like caviare to the multitude, but when it deals with such broad issues as national flags, and the proper quarterings and emblazonments peculiar to the national divisions of the United Kingdom, it may prove to be not only interesting to the general public, but important as involving points of national honour and national sentiment. Mr Stewart shows clearly in his paper how unfairly Scotland has been and is being treated in the matter of the national flags of Britain, chiefly through the assumption by the English College of Arms of power to deal with such a question without reference in any way to the Lord Lyon King of Arms of Scotland, and Ulster King of Arms of Ireland. The Scottish Members of Parliament,

no doubt, are also largely to blame for this ill-treatment of Scotland, but with the reviving interest in Scottish national rights among the Scottish people, it is to be hoped that their members will take a hint, and bring before Parliament the contemptuous way in which Scotland is treated in the field of British Heraldry. The naval flags, Mr Stewart points out, offend largely. He says, "The St George's Cross, with a small Union in the first canton, is now the ensign of the Royal Navy, but before 1864 it distinguished the white squadron only of the Navy and the Admirals of that squadron. This is a palpable violation of the heraldic rights of Scotland, for the white ensign is simply the Red Cross of England, with a diminutive Union flag in the canton. Mr Stewart winds up an interesting article—for such a dry subject—by saying "That there should be any dubiety as to the correct form of the Union flag is largely due to the fact that the United Kingdom has no United Court of Kings of Arms. The Crown frequently remits matters of Imperial Heraldry to the local English Heralds' College, and much indignation has been expressed in Scotland regarding such absurdities as the proposed flag for the Lord-Lieutenants of Scotland, and the Coat of Arms prepared for the Australian Commonwealth by the London officials, and approved by Garter King of Arms for England. Of course, the English College of Arms has no jurisdiction out of England." So writes Mr Stewart, but it assumes jurisdiction notwithstanding, and it is carried out largely through the supineness of Scottish Members of Parliament. Will not some spirited Scottish member take up the question and insist on Scottish rights being respected? There can be no defence to such injustice.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 10.

May 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 33.—RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE IN THE BRITISH NAVY . . . . .	. 146
„ 34.—THE BEFOOLING OF KING EDWARD	. 148
SCOTTISH TRUE LIBERALS AND SCOTTISH SHAM LIBERALS . . . . .	. 152
SCOTTISH HISTORY IN SCOTTISH SCHOOLS . . . . .	. 156
UNJUST TREATMENT OF SCOTTISH TAXPAYERS . . . . .	. 157
ENGLAND V. BRITAIN . . . . .	. 158
PRESENTATION TO THE EARL OF WEMYSS . . . . .	. 159
HOW SCOTLAND IS DONE BY THE TREASURY . . . . .	. 159
CULLODEN . . . . .	. 160
A SCOTTISH EXHIBITION . . . . .	. 160
SCOTTISH REGIMENTAL FLAGS . . . . .	. 160



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

No. 10.

MAY 1909.

MONTHLY 1P

## “ THE THISTLE ” PAPERS

[Our “ *Headlines of Scottish History* ” article is unavoidably held over until next month. —Ed.]

No. 33

### RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE IN THE BRITISH NAVY

ENGLISH unfairness to the Scots, Irish and Welsh in the administration of the public business of Britain is so general and all-pervading that the critic looking out for a subject for censure is hardly ever at a loss. In one of our earlier issues

(No. 2, p. 24) we had to comment on the religious intolerance exhibited by the Anglican Church towards Presbyterian soldiers in India. Now the venue is changed to the British Navy. Ordinary readers of the newspapers of the day would hardly expect that here in Britain, in the full front of public criticism, there could, at the present day, exist a religious grievance of a very gross kind, utterly indefensible in its character, and yet still persisted in and defended by official spokesmen as if it were most natural and proper. It would seem, indeed, that even in these days, after three-quarters of a century of supposed popular government, gross acts of administrative injustice only require to be in favour of some English institution or class interest to be regarded as not only defensible, but quite correct and “to the manner born.” National rights, not merely those relating to ordinary politics, but even those relating to religion, seem to be ruthlessly disregarded by the predominant English majority when they have to deal with the peoples of Scotland, Ireland and Wales. The following is a para-

### PUBLISHERS' NOTICE

READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow; also at Robt. Graham, 108-112 Eglinton St., and William Love, 219A and 221 Argyle St., 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 Publisher, 8 North Bridge, Edinburgh.

graph which appears in the parliamentary reports of the Press of the 2nd of April:—

PRESBYTERIANS IN THE NAVY

Mr Hugh Barrie (U., N. Londonderry) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty whether, seeing there were over 4000 seamen in the Navy registered as Presbyterians, and no chaplains of that religious persuasion, he was prepared to consider the desirableness of appointing one commissioned Presbyterian chaplain for each fleet.

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr M'Kenna)—Every possible facility is given for affording religious ministrations to persons of the fleet belonging to any denomination, but in accordance with ancient and unvaried custom, the only chaplains appointed as commissioned officers in His Majesty's Navy are those of the Church of England.

Mr Barrie—Is the right hon. gentleman aware that that ancient custom has been to some extent departed from in favour of another denomination?

The First Lord of the Admiralty—No, I am quite unaware of it. My information is that it is not so.

We are pretty well acquainted with the long and bitter record of English injustice to the minor nationalities of Britain, but we must own that this latest instance of it came upon us as a surprise. And the surprise is not lessened by the cynical indifference with which the intelligence of the grievous wrong is conveyed to the public mind. Not an expression of regret on the part of a Liberal Minister of the Crown that such a gross religious grievance should exist, but simply the cold and unblushing statement that in accordance with ancient and unvaried custom, the *only* chaplains appointed as commissioned officers in His Majesty's Navy are those of

the Church of England. Were such a statement made by an official representative of the Russian Navy or of the Spanish Navy, such a monstrously intolerant declaration might seem characteristic and natural, but it is made by a Liberal Government, and is applicable to the British Navy in this the twentieth century, and, moreover, seems to be regarded as a proper and natural condition of things.

Let us examine the situation and see what comes of it. It is apparently admitted that there are 4000 Presbyterians in the British Navy, and it is also stated officially that "in accordance with ancient and unvaried custom, the only chaplains appointed as commissioned officers in the Navy are those of the Church of England." It is clear then that the injustice and the religious intolerance is not limited to the Presbyterian sailors, but extend also to Roman Catholics, to Wesleyans, Congregationalists and Baptists; in fact, to all outside of the Church of England. We are not aware of the number of men and officers in the Navy belonging to these religious bodies; but we cannot be far wrong in assuming that along with the Presbyterians they number not less than twenty thousand—about one-fifth of the embodied force. These men then have no recognised religious guides or clergymen to whom they may resort for instruction or spiritual comfort in case of illness or of approaching death. They must accept the ministrations of the official chaplains of the Church of England, or go without, or trust to

such spiritual consolation as they may receive from some kindly laymen, or some stray clergymen—other than Anglican—that may happen to be near. If this treatment of the non-Anglican sailors of the Navy is not a glaring instance of religious intolerance we should like to know what it can be termed. For be it noted that the system here admitted and officially defended is not a mere chance or temporary defect of naval administration, but is a standing order so to speak of the system. Moreover, it utterly ignores the important fact that the Church of England is not the only Church established by the law in the United Kingdom, for the Church of Scotland is also a National Church, and has a constitutional right to have her chaplains in the British Fleet as well as the Church of England.

We commend this very important matter to the earnest attention of all lovers of religious liberty. There must be many Anglican members of Parliament who must feel thoroughly ashamed of this disclosure of the unfairness with which the men and officers in the Navy, who are not Anglicans, are treated, and to other legislators who are not Anglicans, lasting shame will attach if they do not promptly compel the Government to do justice in the matter. In the great self-governing British possessions abroad, such glaring injustice, and such intolerant ecclesiastical arrogance as is here exhibited would not long be tolerated; in fact, there, perfect and complete religious equality and religious toleration have long been established.

Let the good example then be followed in Britain. There is an overwhelming Liberal majority in the present Parliament, and if they are not capable of remedying this disgraceful ecclesiastical wrong, they must be a body of incapable and spiritless representatives of public opinion. This is a question on which even the most bigoted Tory members would have to give way, if it were brought before Parliament in a temperate and able way. We hope soon to see legislative action taken in the matter, and the question settled once and for all. Political Toryism is bad enough to bear by men of intelligence and spirit, but ecclesiastical Toryism is infinitely worse; for it is as it were calling in the assistance of the powers above to bolster up religious bigotry and religious injustice.

---

No. 34.

### THE BEFOOLING OF KING EDWARD

RECENT events have brought out very clearly and emphatically the unwisdom of British monarchs taking a prominent part in, and openly interfering in foreign politics. For several years past King Edward has assumed the rôle of a leading Diplomatist, and has gone from one part of the Continent to another, ostensibly and avowedly as the diplomatic representative of Britain, with the result that some of the servile applauders of monarchy have hailed him as the leading statesman in Europe, and acclaimed him as the greatest of British kings. It is easy for a monarch of fair ability to attain a pinchbeck reputation of this kind during at least a

portion of his career, but few, indeed, stand the strain of historical criticism, and it is certain that King Edward is not likely to do so. Take the latest fiasco in which he has figured so prominently in Continental politics. When the King visited Berlin a few months ago his nephew, the Kaiser, of course received him with every demonstration of cordiality and affection, and the British public were bidden to applaud the King, as having by his visit and his personal graciousness and tact added another diplomatic success to the many which he had already placed to his credit. It did not need much penetration to perceive the utter hollowness of such an assumption. Diplomacy, to be successful, as we pointed out some months ago, is not a game to be carried on in the face of city crowds, but is essentially a contest of great wits and great forces operating in secret. It is a penalty which this country is paying for the indiscreet meddling of its monarch with high politics that we are now and then treated to open and glaring slights and rebuffs in our foreign policy by the astute ruler of Germany. He well knows his business, and does not go fussing about among the Powers pointing out what a fine hand he holds. That part of the game he leaves to his elderly relative, who seems to think because he has the power of the British people behind him, therefore he must be accepted as a great diplomatist and a great statesman. What, then, is the latest development of King Edward's intermeddling in foreign policy? Simply that Britain and

her allies, Russia and France, have received a diplomatic slap in the face from the able and astute Kaiser. King Edward evidently thought that with Russia and France co-operating with this country in an endeavour to get the Balkan difficulty settled by a reference to the Great Powers he would score a great success, and that Austria, with her ally Germany, would have to acknowledge a diplomatic repulse. Alas, what has been the result? That the Kaiser, acting like a great statesman, as he undoubtedly is, secretly massed a strong force on the Russian frontier, and then delivered his ultimatum to the Czar, that he must abandon the cause of Serbia, and accept the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria as a settled affair. The Czar yielded—had to yield—for he was helpless; and King Edward has, with a wry face, been compelled to undergo the humiliation of seeing his able and masterful nephew score a great success in spite of his diplomatic interference.

Mr Swift MacNeill lately brought before the House of Commons this question of the King publicly interfering in foreign politics, but he did not put his case in the proper light. He said that "on four occasions since the present government came into power the King had, without the Foreign Minister, gone abroad on formal missions." To this charge Sir Edward Grey had little difficulty in replying. It was not possible or desirable, he said, that when the King went abroad on diplomatic business he should be accompanied by the Minister for

Foreign Affairs. Quite true. But the point is, that the King, when abroad, should not appear in person as the representative of the Foreign Office. As was pointed out some months ago in the leading columns of *The Spectator* and of *The Nation*, and also by influential writers in *The Times*, it is a dangerous practice for the Crown to take an open and active part in the transaction of foreign politics; for if the policy is unsuccessful, then the prestige of the Crown suffers; while if the business were left to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, then only he or his Cabinet would be blamed. Besides this, it is clear that when the King openly takes a hand in foreign business, his actions cannot be concealed; and if a rebuff is met with, it becomes patent to the world, and the Country and the Crown are discredited accordingly; whereas, if the Foreign Office only had been concerned, the defeat can more easily be hushed up, or quietly minimised into insignificance. Sir Edward Grey avoided this aspect of the question; and, in fact, apparently approved of royal action in such matters. Perhaps it was difficult for him to have done otherwise, seeing that theoretically he is the servant of the King. But though thus technically correct, practically he was quite wrong; for behind the King, and over him is the Constitution, which holds that the government of the kingdom, alike in foreign as in domestic affairs, is in the hands of the Ministry of the day. There is no getting away from this; and we hold that the King in his travelling

abroad, and acting to all intents and purposes in the eyes of the world as his own Foreign Minister, is not keeping within the limits of the Constitution.

So much has been, and is being made of the wonderful results of the King's diplomacy during the last few years, that it is worth while reviewing it. The *entente cordiale* with France is claimed as the work of the King. In reality, that good understanding has come about by the working of great national movements, with which, and over which, the King has had as much influence as the proverbial fly on the wheel. The French people, since the establishment of the Republic, have conducted their foreign policy with a forbearance and a sagacity which have been the admiration of all competent judges of European Politics. They forebore to act against Britain in the Fashoda question, and during the Boer War they also held their hands. They saw clearly that a rupture with Britain would be simply playing into the hands of their great enemy, Germany, and they acted accordingly. It is true that King Edward, when Prince of Wales, spent a great deal of his leisure time in Paris; but it is also true that his time there was not spent in the cultivation of High Politics, but in the more mundane indulgence of what may be charitably termed the *petits plaisirs* of Parisian life. No! The friendship between the French people and the British people has been gained and firmly soldered, not by any royal, or even by ministerial diplomacy, but simply by

the fact that the interests of the two great nations, France and Britain, have become identical. The dynastic alliance with Spain, King Edward may have had something to do with; but those who place much value on that, rely on a broken reed. With Italy, the King has also been coquetting for some years back, to no permanent advantage whatever, but greatly to the annoyance and the irritation of the Kaiser. It was, if we remember rightly, due to the King's ill-judged mission to Rome that brought out the ominous warning from the Kaiser. "He is trying to hem us in, is he? Ah, well, etc., etc." And hence, perhaps, the acceleration of the building of German Dreadnoughts. But then there is Russia. The King met the Czar at Reval, and great was the acclamation he received from his adulators for the supposed masterly move, and for the understanding supposed then to have been arranged between the two monarchs. What is the result of that great stroke of the Edwardian diplomacy; of that striking instance of what Bismarck contemptuously termed *Reise-politik*, "bagman's politics." The Kaiser kept silent; he does not fuss about when he has a big political game on hand, but like his great ancestor, Frederick the Great, kept quiet till he could strike, and strike effectually. His time came the other day on the Balkan difficulty. Serbia looked to Russia, and the Czar—King Edward's great ally—was supposed to hold the key of the situation; and by his action he would justify Edward's diplomacy. But alas, what

a disappointment. The Kaiser quietly sent an ultimatum to the Czar to give up the cause of Serbia at once, or he would cross the Russian frontier with his army—a move for which he had quietly and thoroughly prepared. The Russian Ministry was unprepared and helpless, and the Czar gave way. The result was the triumph of the Kaiser, and the lamentable "Be-fooling of King Edward." In other words, British policy has suffered a discreditable rebuff through the improper interference of our fussy and meddling monarch. Our British patriotism may regret the rebuff, but our Scottish patriotism is gratified by the fact that the vindictive spirit which His Majesty has displayed in his insulting treatment of Scotland, when tried against his nephew the Kaiser, has brought him to well-deserved grief. He thought to humiliate the Kaiser, but that able and ambitious Ruler has turned the tables with a vengeance, and has befooled King Edward to the top of his bent. We must own that it is with a spice of cynical satisfaction we tell the tale to our Scottish stalwarts. They know well by this time that King Edward, to his eternal disgrace, is the greatest living enemy of Scotland, and that he has done his best, or worst, to degrade her people, and to discredit her glorious history. He acted thus against Scotland because he thought she was helpless against his malice; in this, no doubt, displaying what his admirers term his wonderful tact. What, then, can they say of his late policy, when giving rein to his vindictive

feeling against the Kaiser he tried to humiliate him, and in so doing met with an inglorious and shameful rebuff. When a meddlesome and malicious-minded monarch is allowed to guide or to interfere with the foreign policy of a nation, it is sure to come to grief and to humiliation, and it is high time the British people realised this important truth.

### SCOTTISH TRUE LIBERALS AND SCOTTISH SHAM LIBERALS

SCOTTISH Liberals who not only subordinate, but actually sacrifice the national interests of Scotland to the Party interests of England, have no right to be called true Scottish Liberals. In reality, they are sham Scottish Liberals who act in the interest of and for the behoof of the English Liberal party; just as the Scottish Tories do for the English Tory party. The following manifesto of the Scottish Home Rule Association, and the correspondence connected therewith, show this aspect of the political situation very clearly. Mr Charles Waddie, now as always a Scottish stalwart, does not mince matters, but goes straight to the point. We will have something to say on this all-important subject in our next issue. Meanwhile, we commend the following to the most earnest attention of our readers:—

#### Scottish Liberal Association and Scottish Home Rule

EDINBURGH, 1st May 1909.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN, — The undernoted correspondence requires some explanation to enable you to

understand its full significance, but I will be as brief as possible. When Mr Gladstone sprang upon the country in 1886 his first Irish Home Rule Bill, a few earnest Scottish Nationalists, who for years had advocated the rights of Scotland, assembled at 5 St Andrew Square, and formed the Scottish Home Rule Association, to which the late Professor Blackie acted as Chairman up to the day of his death. The Constitution of this Association was Home Rule for each division of the United Kingdom, and one Imperial Parliament over all, and gave birth to the phrase, "Home Rule All Round," which has since become a household word. We were surprised to find that the Liberal Government, headed by Mr Gladstone, were bitterly opposed to the claims of Scotland to National recognition, and only found out the real reason from a speech of Mr John Morley's at Edinburgh on December 1886. He said:—"*I cannot agree that Home Rule for Scotland is on all fours, or on three legs out of the four, with Home Rule for Ireland.*" The reason for this extraordinary declaration was then given:—"*I only ask myself supposing that the Scottish Liberals were to be by any calamity withdrawn from the Legislative body when the affairs of England—poor England—are transacted, I ask myself how we should fare without you, and I for one am not at all willing to lose the advantage of the noble Liberalism of Scotland.*" Which means in plain English that the National life of Scotland was to be sacrificed in the interest of the English Liberal

Party. The Scottish Nationalists were neither to be intimidated or bribed, but proceeded to rouse the people of Scotland, and with a large measure of success. Conferences were held in all the large cities, and resolutions passed demanding Home Rule for Scotland. Among these two are notable, because of the speakers at the Public Meeting. At Dumfries the present Lord Chancellor of England and the present Chief Secretary of Ireland, along with Professor Blackie, demanded Home Rule for Scotland, and at Aberdeen the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr Lloyd George, did the same. Three times a resolution was passed in the House of Commons by large majorities of the Scottish members, and twice by a majority of the whole House. All this had been achieved in spite of the secret opposition of the Scottish Liberal Association, who submitted to be dictated to from London, the English Liberals desiring to make a catspaw of Scotland.

The movement in Scotland could no longer be ignored, so the tune was changed. Home Rule for Scotland became a plank in the programme of the Scottish Liberal Association, and as all the members of the Scottish Home Rule Association were Liberals, it was declared there was no further use for it. Those who had piloted the movement knew different, but the rank and file ceased to take any interest in the Association, and although it has never been dissolved, it has for years past been lost sight of. The events which followed showed that

the fears of the leaders of the movement were well founded—the collapse of the second Irish Home Rule Bill, the quarrel among the English Liberals gave us English Tory Rule, the long night of the Boer War, a mass of debt and stagnation of political progress. But the Liberals again returned to power stronger than they had ever been in the history of the party. The Government called to power had a large leaven of Scottish blood; the Prime Minister was a Scotsman, but because some English Statesmen refused to take office if Home Rule was to be a part of the programme, it was indefinitely shelved, thus showing how little the claims of Scotland had upon the affections of the Prime Minister, in spite of his open declaration, which I now give:—

*Extract from Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman's Address to the Electors of the Stirling District of Burghs, issued 3rd July 1895.*

“The excessive burden of work now imposed upon Parliament can only be relieved by a large system of devolution. It is for this reason, as well as from a sense of right and justice to the nationalities concerned, that I regard as urgently necessary the creation for the three Kingdoms of subordinate legislative assemblies dealing with the distinctive affairs of each.”

I now come to the present political situation, and ask what hope has any of the three smaller nations of the United Kingdom from the present Government. Wales is being seduced from asserting her nationhood by a promise to disestablish the English Church in Wales. If the English Parliament (*i.e.* British Parliament?) ever disestablishes

their Church in Wales, it will be by robbing the Welsh people as they robbed the Irish people when their Church was disestablished. It will only be abolished in name, but fastened like a mill-stone upon their neck for ever. The Church question is for the Welsh people themselves to settle in their own Parliament. Again, the Irish dream of Home Rule for themselves alone, which is impossible. English parties play one nation against the other, and laugh at their national aspirations. There is but one hope. United action to compel justice ; no other measure but Home Rule All Round should be permitted to be discussed in the British Parliament.

Need I remind my Countrymen that the House of Lords is an English Institution. There was no House of Lords in the Scottish Parliament, and when it is restored to us we will follow the old model with such modification as the changes in modern life makes imperative.—I am, your obedient servant,  
CHARLES WADDIE.

NEWTONGRANGE,  
NEWBATTLE, *1st May 1909.*

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN,—As I was at the birth of the Scottish Home Rule Association, and had the honour to succeed the late Professor Blackie as Chairman, I can endorse all that our Secretary has written. I have stood up all my life for the rights of Scotland. I was a member of the Scottish Rights Association in 1852. I marched from the Assembly Hall to Tanfield at the Disruption of the Church of Scotland. I am now

ninety years of age, and during my long life all the evils that have fallen upon Scotland in Church and State have been brought about by the malicious or ignorant interference of Englishmen in our affairs. It is high time Scotsmen awoke from their day dream of importance, and put an end once and for ever to such a disgraceful state of affairs.—I am, your obedient servant,

JOHN ROMANS, J.P.

GLENIFFER HOUSE,  
EDINBURGH, *17th March 1909.*

DEAR MR WOOD,—In supplement to the remarks I made at the last meeting of Council, I would like you to lay before your Executive what I think is absolutely necessary to be done if Scotland's position as an important unit of the Empire is not to be lost. The least reflecting politicians must see clearly that we have nothing to hope for from the two parties in England. We need not appeal to their sense of justice, for they have none ; their only rule of life is self interest. It pays the English Liberal Party to keep Scotland in bondage. As John Morley said more than twenty years ago, "the English Liberal Party can't afford to lose the noble Liberalism of Scotland." It is a convenient "House of Refuge" for their discarded members, John Morley himself being a notable example.

As we need not expect justice from English parties, and Scotland is too weak herself to force attention, we must seek allies, and the natural friends are Ireland and Wales. Now, my proposal is to invite Irish, Welsh and Scots members to a Conference in Edinburgh during the Easter recess, that we may form a united party to force England to relinquish her usurped authority over the three smaller nations of the Union. It will become Scotland to take up this position as the oldest nation of the four. No fitter time than the present could be found. It needs no great insight into political affairs to see that at the next General Election England will

turn again to the Tories, and if the Liberals have any majority in that country, it will be a small one. In that event the Liberal Party can only retain power by the votes of the smaller nations of the Union, we can then compel justice to the respective countries. But will England turn Tory? My experience of them, which goes back for fifty years, is that "turn about" is their habit. Englishmen, like the fair sex, have good instincts, but steady logical thinking and adherence to principles is not a strong part of their character. We have nothing to fear from the ill-will of the English people; it is the party politicians who are our enemies.

Permit me to remind your Executive that they took over the work of the Scottish Home Rule Association, and that year after year they passed resolutions in favour of Home Rule for Scotland. These resolutions were received by the leaders of the English Liberal Party with a bland smile and an offer of a Grand Committee. A grosser piece of insolent contempt could not be well conceived, and might well stir the ire of the meekest of Scots. Yes, they say, we must have a large measure of devolution to relieve the congestion of business at Westminster. Now, devolution may be either a good thing or a bad thing; let us mistrust the gift of the Greeks!! The devolution which the English Liberals wish to give us is to devolve upon local bodies, larger measures of administrative powers, and to create new Boards. Such devolution would be a curse. We have too many of these already; we need a central body to control them, so the devolution needed is a Parliament and Executive Government sitting in Edinburgh with full control over all Scottish affairs, and amenable to the Scottish Electors only.

I think I have said enough, for I address intelligent Scotsmen, who I believe have as much the interest and honour of their country at heart as I have, but if I can be of any service to them I will be happy to attend their meeting and give them the benefit of my long years of work with London politicians.—Yours truly,

CHARLES WADDIE.

P.S.—I send you a few copies of my Bi-Century pamphlet that the Executive

may be reminded of the worth of the old Scottish Parliament.

*Scottish Liberal Association*

95 PRINCES STREET,  
EDINBURGH, 26th March 1909.

Charles Waddie, Esq.,  
Gleniffer House, Edinburgh.

DEAR MR WADDIE,—I had the pleasure of submitting your favour of 17th inst. to a meeting of my Organising Committee, which was held here this afternoon, when I was instructed to thank you very cordially for your very interesting letter, and to say that they sympathise very much with the views you have set forth therein.

I was, however, instructed to say that they do not see how it would be possible to arrange a Conference of the character you suggest in the short interval between now and the Easter recess. If a Conference of the character you suggest is to be arranged, we must make sure that we will be able to make it such a success as will give it a character thoroughly representative of all the three nationalities in whose name it is to speak, and my Committee does not see how we could call such a Meeting together in the short interval between now and Easter.

I was further instructed to say that for many years at our Annual Meetings this Association has declared in favour of the principle of Home Rule. For a long time it was the custom at our Conferences to declare in favour of the general principle of Home Rule, but in recent years, and especially at the Dundee Conference, you will recollect that our declaration was in favour of Home Rule for Scotland. It would therefore be incumbent upon us to take the opinion of the General Council again before we departed from that attitude and went in for a general system of Home Rule all round.

If you will get a Resolution suggesting such a Conference sent in from an affiliated Liberal Association before our next General Council Meeting, it will there receive due consideration and full discussion.—Yours faithfully,

A. D. WOOD,  
*Secretary.*

GLENIFFER HOUSE,  
EDINBURGH, 31st March 1909.

DEAR MR WOOD,—I have duly considered your favour of the 26th curt., but regret to say I can extract no good from the action of the Executive of the Scottish Liberal Association; their policy is fatal to the best interests of Scotland. You are aware that I wrote you that Easter coming so soon this year, the proposed triple National Conference might have to be postponed to Whitsuntide, when ample time would be found for its arrangement. I am now told that resolutions have been passed in favour of the general principle of Home Rule, and latterly in favour of Home Rule for Scotland—as if that was enough. I am perfectly aware of all this; hundreds of such resolutions have been passed in Scotland during the past twenty-five years, and have been received by our English masters with a bland, contemptuous smile. I have more respect for myself and my country than to be an actor in such a disgraceful farce. The time for resolutions is past; it is action that is needed.

It requires no great insight into political affairs to see that the days of the present Parliament are numbered, and what will be the cry of the Liberals at the General Election is also transparent. It will not be "Home Rule," but "Free Trade" versus "Tariff Reform," and the curtailment of the powers of the House of Lords. Neither of these questions are of paramount importance to the three smaller nations of the Union. It is constitutional liberty they require; all other questions are as nothing in comparison to this supreme need.

The question of Home Rule for all the nations of the Union is of such vital importance, that if the Executive have not power to arrange the proposed conference, then an Extraordinary Meeting of the General Council to receive the desired powers should be called. Need I reiterate that Scottish Liberals will receive no attention so long as they make themselves the tools of the English Liberal Party. This year is all but certain to see the end of this Parliament, and a General Election in the autumn will follow. If the Scottish Liberal Association do not take immediate action to prepare for such an event, they will

betray the trust confided to them by the people of Scotland.

May I ask you to bring this letter before your chairman, and let me have an answer at an early date.—Yours truly,

CHARLES WADDIE.

*P.S.*—1st May 1909.—No reply to this letter has been received by me, which only goes to prove that the Scottish Liberal Association is not a free agent, but simply a wing of the English Liberal Party.

C. W.

## SCOTTISH HISTORY IN SCOTTISH SCHOOLS

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the following contribution on this important subject:—The important movement for the proper teaching of Scottish and British history in Scottish schools, which was inaugurated several years ago by the Scottish Patriotic Association, Glasgow, under the leadership of the late Rev. David Macrae, has recently been making excellent headway. A year or two ago the Convention of Royal Burghs gave it strong support by making a representation to the Government on the subject, and since then the Scottish Education Department itself has given practical evidence of its sympathy with the movement. All this, combined with the force of enlightened public opinion, has been the means of causing several publishing houses of repute to issue new and improved historical textbooks and readers, written from a properly Scottish standpoint, and free from the objectionable misuse of the sectional terms "England," "English" and "Anglo," which was so reprehensible a feature of the old type of so-called histories. The

important thing now is to get School Boards and teachers to do their obvious duty in the matter. Every class book of the objectionable type, which unfairly glorifies England at the expense of Scotland, or which ignores or belittles Scotland and her constitutional position in the United Kingdom, must be rooted out of our Scottish schools. With that end in view, the Scottish Patriotic Association, the Scottish Rights Association and the St Andrew Society recently sent the following questions to candidates for the School Board :—

1. Would you if elected a member of the Board undertake to see that the recommendations and suggestions of the Scotch Education Department's Memorandum of December 1907, on "The Study of History in Scottish Schools," and especially those contained in the annexed extracts therefrom relating to the teaching of Scottish History, be given effect to in the schools under the jurisdiction of the Board?

2. If so, would you further see that all history books and historical readers which deal inaccurately or inadequately with Scottish History, or which misrepresent Scotland's constitutional position in the United Kingdom by the use of the sectional terms "England," "English," and "Anglo," instead of the proper imperial terms, "Britain," "British," and "Brito," are promptly withdrawn from the schools and replaced by others which are written from a properly Scottish or at least an independent point of view, with accurate terminology, of which there are several now available as a result of the representations and efforts of the Convention of Royal Burghs and other bodies?

The replies received by the three societies were most favourable. We would recommend the Scottish societies in "the Britains beyond the seas" to adopt similar tactics in

order to influence the educational authorities there to act fairly to Scotland in the matter of historical school books.

—o—

### UNJUST TREATMENT OF SCOTTISH TAX-PAYERS

A YEAR or more ago strong complaints were made in Scotland, that while the income tax was vigorously exacted in Scotland as soon as it was due in January of each year, in England much greater laxity existed, and payments were largely allowed to stand over for a month or two. Mr Asquith, who was then Chancellor of the Exchequer, listened to the complaints, acknowledged their justice, and said he could not grant any immunity to the Scottish tax-payers, but he would bring the English payments up to the Scottish standard. Well, let us see how the promise has been kept. Sir George Macrae, formerly M.P. for East Edinburgh, moved for a parliamentary return on the question, and the details were given last month. From these we find that Mr Asquith's promise was a worthless one, and that the unjust treatment of Scotland, or the unjust favouritism of England has been continued without a break. The tax seems to be payable in the beginning of the year—say on the 1st of January—and we find the percentage of payments on the 31st of January to be as follows :—For 1906-7, England 36.6 per cent., Scotland 60.5 per cent. For 1907-8, England 36.3 per cent., Scotland 58.3. For 1908-9, England 35.7 per cent., Scotland 59.5 For payments

to the last day of February for the three same periods, we find England stands with percentages of 62.5, 63.3 and 63.7, while Scotland shows percentages of 94, 94 and 93.7. Thus Scotland is held closely up to the mark by the Treasury, while wealthy, favoured England is allowed to lag behind in her payments, so that practically she is allowed a month longer to pay her national dues. This seems to be the invariable rule, where it is possible to discriminate in the treatment of the two countries. No favour is shown to Scotland, and no favours are ever granted to her, if it is possible to avoid so doing, and it matters not what government is in power, whether Liberal or Tory. Mr Asquith treats Scotland with as little consideration as Lord Salisbury did. When will the Scottish members act as the Irish do? When they do, they will get justice done to Scotland, but not before.

—o—

### ENGLAND v. BRITAIN

(To the Editor of "The Nation.")

THE following letter appeared in *The Nation* (London), a leading Liberal weekly paper:—

Sir,—As a constant and appreciative reader of your valuable paper, will you kindly allow me to draw your attention to an important mistake of frequent recurrence in your present issue.

On page 734 you say the Franco-German agreement apparently "gives Germany a special advantage not conceded to *England*, etc."; it makes the task of bringing 'England' and Germany together

much easier." On page 735, we read of a play which describes the invasion of "England" by a German army. On page 737 the same reference to Germany and "England" occurs.

From the context I gather that the term "England" means the "British Isles."

Now, sir, do you consider it fair to apply the term "England" in this fashion? It is a point on which we Scots people feel very strongly; not because of any ill-will towards you English people, but from the sense of justice; for did not the first clause of the Treaty of Union of 1707 declare that the name of the two united countries was to be "Great Britain," a term which, since Ireland was united in 1801, must in all justice be "Britain." \* \* \*—  
Yours, etc., WM. M'PIEAT.

LOCKHART STREET,  
STONEHOUSE, SCOTLAND,  
15th February 1909.

The editor, in a footnote to the above, says: "We apologise, and will do better another time."

In the following week the betterment appeared as follows:—  
(From "The Nation," 27th Feb. 1909.)

"France \* \* \* suggested, for the second time in this crisis, a joint mediation by the three disinterested powers—England, France and Germany—at Vienna \* \* \* Belgrade."

p. 809—(The mention of England in this connection is not in inverted commas, showing that the rendering is that of *The Nation*.)

Again p. 810—referring to the question of the Near East, is the following:—"There can be no Europe from which she (Germany)

is excluded. To restore the concert by conciliating Germany is for England and France an interest more vital than the rehabilitation of Russia."

Again in a review, entitled the "Life of a Roman Citizen," we have (p. 814): "So, indeed, appear the populace in all ages—Nineveh, Jerusalem, Rome, England of the 'forties,' Chicago of to-day."

Under the heading of "The Imperial Press Conference," *The Spectator* of 27th February (p. 333) has the following:—

"All 'Englishmen' who are familiar with the Colonial Press and its circumstances are proud of it."

"We shall not feel that the visitors have really begun to digest England till they have seen Manchester and Birmingham, and *Glasgow* and The Potteries, etc."

"Again they will perceive that there is no truth in the assertion that 'Englishmen' do not care about the Empire." There is no section of "Englishmen" that we have ever met who are indifferent to what may happen to any part of the Empire." \* \* \* "Englishmen—we are sure the Englishmen of the Colonies resemble them—do not talk very much on matters which engage their feelings deeply."

[The above is a fair specimen of the way of the English Press. Not a member of it, so far as we know, has the fairness or the manliness to give instructions to the members of its staff and its employees, to take care and see to it that on no occasion shall the terms "England" and "English" be used unfairly for

"Britain" and "British." Such is English fair play.—Editor of *The Thistle*.]

PRESENTATION TO THE EARL OF WEMYSS.—A correspondent draws our attention to a paragraph which appeared in the *Evening News*, Edinburgh, relative to the portrait which was presented to the Earl of Wemyss by Lord Rosebery, on behalf of a large number of the Earl's admirers. The ceremony took place in London, and the *News* very properly remarks that this was a mistake; it should have taken place in Edinburgh, and not "in that overgrown monstrosity of bricks and mortar," as the *News* terms London. The remonstrance is well timed. London is the capital of the British Empire; but Edinburgh is the Capital of Scotland, and every movement which is essentially Scottish should have Edinburgh for the scene of its action, and not London.

HOW SCOTLAND IS DONE BY THE TREASURY.—Mr Gulland, M.P., has obtained a parliamentary return of the sums expended by the Government for the ten years ending 31st March 1908 on purchase of sites, erection of buildings, and extension of existing buildings for National Museums in Britain. The total sum expended for these purposes in England and Wales during the time mentioned has been £550,597; for Ireland, £7837, and for Scotland, £1274. As Wales is not likely to have had any portion of the sum credited to England, we can form some idea how the latter

country continues to unjustly grab for herself the more than lion's share of this form of public expenditure. As the Edinburgh *Evening News* remarks, out of every pound sterling devoted to National Museum, etc., purposes, Scotland gets a fraction over a halfpenny; Ireland comes a little better off with a few pence, while England greedily appropriates to herself about 19s. 6d. or over out of every pound voted by the Treasury. And so the unholy game of greed goes on from year to year and from decade to decade. And yet Scotsmen seem to think that Home Rule All Round is unnecessary!

—o—

CULLODEN.—The anniversary of the battle of Culloden, the 16th of April, was celebrated with appropriate solemnity this year by Mr Theodore Napier and a number of other enthusiasts, by the placing of wreaths on the cairn erected to the memory of the gallant men who fell there, fighting for what they deemed a noble and righteous cause. Every Scot—whether Jacobite or Hanoverian—who has a love for his country, must feel a glow of pride when he thinks of the way in which his gallant countrymen gathered round the standard raised by Prince Charlie, and followed him even unto death. The romantic episode of the Rising of *The Forty-Five* is one of the most memorable historic incidents in the history of Britain, and Mr Napier deserves the thanks of his countrymen for the care he annually takes, not to let it, or the anniversary of the cruel murder of Queen Mary at Fotheringhay, be forgotten.

—o—

A SCOTTISH EXHIBITION.—A project that ought to commend itself to every patriotic Scot is being

actively pushed forward by an influential and representative committee in Glasgow. The proposal is that a Scottish Exhibition of National History, Art and Industry be held in Glasgow in the summer of 1910, any surplus to be devoted to the endowment of the proposed Chair of Scottish History and Literature in Glasgow University. Many of the leaders of the patriotic societies have joined the Preliminary Committee, of which the honorary secretary is Mr D. D. Binnie, LL.B., 183 West George Street, Glasgow. It is to be hoped that an Exhibition, which is designed to create greater public interest in Scottish History and Literature, and to celebrate the memory of distinguished Scotsmen, will prove the great success which it deserves to be. A meeting is to be held at an early date, when the project will be definitely launched.

—o—

SCOTTISH REGIMENTAL FLAGS.—A correspondent sends us the following:—As has been announced in the daily press, the King is shortly to present colours to the Territorial Army. The patriots of Scotland have seized the opportunity to bring before the Army Council the lamentable state of matters prevailing in the Scottish Regiments, as regards the heraldic designs on the flags, drums, etc. In many cases the mix-up of emblem is ludicrous, e.g., the King's Own Scottish Borderers carry as a badge the St Andrew's Cross with the Crest of *England* immediately above! The letter in question is signed on behalf of the Scottish Patriotic Association, the St Andrew Society and the British Unity Association, and calls upon the authorities to use the *Scottish* quartering of the *British* Royal Arms upon all drums, buttons, belts, etc., and generally to give Scotland the place to which she is entitled in joint emblems.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. II.

June 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

PAGE

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—

No. 35.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY . 162

„ 36.—THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE MANIFESTO 165

„ 37.—HOPE FOR HOME RULE ALL ROUND . 169

"THE DREARIEST SCOTCH DEBATE" . . . . . 171

MR HALDANE AND NATIONAL SENTIMENT . . . . . 173

A DESCRIPTION OF SIR WILLIAM WALLACE . . . . . 174

SIR HERBERT MAXWELL'S ATTACK ON THE CHARACTER  
OF WALLACE . . . . . 174



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

No. 11.

JUNE 1909.

MONTHLY 1P

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 35

### HEAD LINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE TIME OF WALLACE

WALLACE was now the acknowledged leader of Scotland. Many of the nobility were against him, either secretly or openly, but the people were with him and looked on him as the national hero. At the head of a large army he crossed the Border in the autumn, and ravaged the country between Newcastle and Carlisle. Hardly any resistance

was offered, so discomfited and so despondent were the English after their great defeat. The people in the two northern counties of Northumberland and Cumberland suffered dreadfully, and the English chroniclers bitterly reproach Wallace for his rapine and his cruelty. But what could the invaded people expect? For several years they had been the invaders, and had inflicted on the Scots losses cruel and innumerable, and had so ravaged Scotland that there was a grievous famine in the land. This invasion was largely a movement of the Scots to live upon the country of their enemy, their own being unable to afford them support. That Wallace was a man imbued with a respect for religion, and also with humane and kindly feeling, when consistent with his duty to his country, is shown by the protection he gave to some of the monks of Hexham Abbey. The story is related by Tytler, on the authority of two of the English chroniclers. "On returning to Hexham," writes Tytler, "where there was a rich monastery, which had already been plundered in the advance, a striking scene occurred.

### EDITORIAL NOTICE

*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' NOTICE

*READERS will find THE THISTLE in future on sale at the book-stalls in the Waverley Station and Princes Street Station, Edinburgh, and the Central Station, Glasgow; and William Lowe, 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.*

Three monks were seen in the solitary monastery. Thinking that the tide of war had passed over they had crept back to repair the ravages it had left, when suddenly they saw the army returning, and fled in terror into a little chapel. In a moment the Scottish soldiers were upon them, calling them, on the peril of their lives, to show them the treasures of their monastery. 'Alas,' said one of the monks, 'it is but a short time since you yourselves have seized our whole property, and you know best where it now is.' At this moment Wallace himself came into the chapel, and commanding his soldiers to be silent, requested one of the canons to celebrate mass. The monk obeyed, and Wallace, all armed as he was, and surrounded by his soldiers, reverently attended. When it came to the elevation of the host, he stepped out of the chapel to cast off his helmet and lay aside his arms, but in this short absence the fury and avarice of his soldiers broke out. They pressed on the priest, snatched the chalice from the altar, \* \* \* even stole the missal in which the service had been begun. When their master returned he found the priest in horror and dismay, and gave orders that the sacrilegious wretches who had committed the outrage should be sought for and put to death. Meanwhile, he took the canons under his protection. 'Remain with me,' he said, 'it is that alone which can secure you. My soldiers are evil disposed. I cannot justify, and I dare not punish them.' Wallace, to atone for the outrage, granted a charter of

protection to the priory and convent, by which its lands, men and moveables were admitted under the peace of the king, and all persons interdicted from doing them injury." We have quoted this narrative at some length, but it is worthy of it. The authorities quoted by Tytler are English, viz., Hemingford and Knighton, and therefore the incident may be regarded as unimpeachable. What a light this casts upon the character of the noble Wallace, who, amid all the wild savagery of the times, and the terrible thirst for vengeance felt by his motley army for the long years of desolation, rapine and murder inflicted on Scotland by the cruel character and the unscrupulous ambition of Edward, yet at once came forward to protect the helpless monks from plunder and outrage. Such an incident shows that Wallace was a long way ahead of his time in those instincts of humanity that the Supreme Being has implanted in us for the amelioration of the human race; just as Edward, his great opponent, was from his savagery and unrelenting cruelty, a long way behind it. Wallace tried to mitigate the human suffering of the time; Edward never hesitated to intensify and augment its horrid scope. Yet even in these days, in English literature and, sad to say, even in the history books of English schools, the ruffianly Edward is held to be a great king and a great statesman, and one to be regarded with respect and with admiration by all of English birth, while Wallace is described as a rebel, a murderer, and a common thief. And yet, we Scots are held

to be unfriendly and unpatriotic because we refuse to allow ourselves to be classed socially and nationally under the English name.

Wallace, by his great victory at Stirling Brig, had shown himself to be a great general, and by his efforts and plans to get together a powerful force of Scotsmen, had also shown himself to be a great national leader. He was now to show to the world that he was also a great statesman. Despite the pitiful and treacherous manoeuvres of the greater nobles to undermine his influence and destroy his power, he was appointed Governor of the Kingdom at a great assembly held in the Forest of Selkirk. This high appointment was subject to the titular sovereignty of the wretched Baliol, who was still held to be the King of Scotland. Wallace at once began to exercise his power in a manner that stamp him as a great administrator as well as a great soldier. "He divided the kingdom into military districts," says Tytler. "In each shire, barony, lordship, town and burgh, he appointed a muster-book to be made of the number of fighting men which they contained between the age of sixteen and sixty, and from these he drew at pleasure, and in case of refusal, under pain of life and limb, as many recruits as he thought requisite. In a short time such were the effects of his firm and courageous dealing in the government that the most powerful of the nobility were compelled by the fear of imprisonment to submit to his authority, although they envied him his high elevation, and when-

ever an opportunity presented itself took part with the King of England. But although few of the earls had joined him, the lesser barons and gentry repaired in great numbers to the banner of the Governor, and willingly supported him with all their forces."

But Wallace did not confine his work to the internal administration of the kingdom. He looked abroad and endeavoured to add to its resources by the encouragement of trade with friendly foreign countries. Some time in the first half of last century there was discovered among the municipal records of the great Hanse cities, Lubeck and Hamburg, a most interesting document, bearing the date of the 11th of October 1297. The following is the translation of it:—"Andrew Murray and William Wallace, Commanders of the Army of the King of Scotland, and the Community of the same kingdom—to the prudent and discreet men and well-beloved friends, the Mayors and Commonwealths of Lubeck and of Hamburg, greeting, and perpetual increase of sincere friendship. To us it has been intimated by trustworthy merchants of the said kingdom of Scotland that, as a mark of your regard, you have been favourable to, counselling and assisting in all matters and transactions relating to us and said merchants, though (such good offices) may not have been preceded by our deserts, and on that account we are the more bound to tender you our thanks and a suitable return. This we have willingly engaged ourselves to (perform towards) you, requesting that in so far you would

cause your merchants to be informed that they will now have safe access to all the ports of the kingdom of Scotland with their merchandise, as the kingdom of Scotland, thanks to God, has, during the war, been recovered from the power of the English. Farewell. Given at Haddington in Scotland, this eleventh day of October, in the year of grace, one thousand two hundred and ninety-seven. We have, moreover, to request that you would condescend to forward the interests of our merchants, John Burnet and John Frere, in their business, in like manner as you may wish us to act towards your merchants in their commercial transactions. Farewell."

No apology is due for our quotation in full of this significant document, as well as for the incident at Hexham Priory. They justify the heroic Wallace in the eyes of the world as at once a man of sterling humanity and imbued with a deeply religious feeling, and also as a great and far-seeing national leader. These are great qualities, but there is here also brought to light the high moral quality of the illustrious hero. No petty vanity or unscrupulous ambition lurked in the recesses of his noble soul. It was necessary for the sake of his beloved country that he should come to the front and take the lead in the terrible fight for freedom that had been imposed upon Scotland by the cruel Edward; but mark at once the modesty and the patriotism of the position he takes up in these two remarkable incidents. It was not William Wallace and Andrew Murray that prefaced the national formula in

which the great leader appeared before the world, but Andrew Murray and William Wallace; and this, although his co-adjutor must have been a young knight, comparatively unknown and untried. But his father had been Wallace's most trusted follower at the battle of Stirling Brig, and had there lost his life; and true to his country, Wallace at once placed the young knight in the front of the national administration to show that pure patriotism and not personal ambition was the guiding star of all his actions.

—o—  
No. 36.

### THE SCOTTISH HOME RULE MANIFESTO

THE manifesto of the Scottish Home Rule Association, published by Mr Charles Waddie in our last issue, must have been unpleasant reading to all true and honest Scottish Liberals; for it shows them plainly and conclusively that their steady adherence to the principles of British Liberalism has been used for the base purpose of making them the abject tools of the bigoted and selfish English Liberal Party. It is clear from the statements made by Mr Waddie, that despite the passing of resolutions in the House of Commons in favour of Home Rule for Scotland when the Liberal party was in office in Mr Gladstone's time, and also the declaration by the late Premier, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in his election address in 1895 in favour of Home Rule All Round, that the deliberate intention of the leaders of the English Liberals is not to grant Home Rule to Scotland, but to

hold it in bondage to England, for the purpose of keeping the Liberal party there in power. Can anything be more contrary to, or more subversive of the true principles of Liberalism than the cool and heartless statement of Mr John Morley in 1866, that Home Rule should not be given to Scotland, because the withdrawal of the Scottish Liberals from the House of Commons would be a calamity to the English Liberal party. That selfish English politician has now fittingly taken his seat in the House of Lords—where he must feel quite at home—and as Secretary of State for India has been formulating some measures of self-government for the backward and ignorant masses of Hindustan. He has moved strongly in this matter—whether rightly or wrongly as yet remains to be proved—and for what reason? Not because the natives of Hindustan have shown themselves to be fit for self-government, even to the limited extent advocated by Lord Morley, and carried out by the Cabinet of which he is a member, but because certain wild and dangerous members of the Hindoo community have learned how to manufacture bombs, and make use of them for the purpose of frightening and coercing English opinion. This is the discreditable and ghastly lesson that the callous and cold-blooded selfishness of English politicians—whether Liberals or Tories—forces upon all the peoples who are subject to their power. In the latter half of the eighteenth century the people of the now United States found it out, and after years of bloody conflict

gained their liberty, and were allowed to govern themselves. Then in the first half of the next century their neighbours in Canada followed suit, and after a couple of rebellions, managed to impress and convince the dull and selfish English mind that it would be well to give them also the power of self-government, or they would take the liberty of joining their Southern Republican neighbours of the United States. Even so late as the middle of the last century, Australia had to try a rising in arms, and to kill a dozen or so of British soldiers before it could get anything like a fair and proper management of its own affairs. We need say little about Ireland, for its history is patent to even the most thoughtless politician and that is, that any measure of relief it has ever got from English misrule and English oppression has been secured by wild and desperate defiance of and resistance to English law.

The people of Scotland have a history of their own, and one of which they are justly proud. They have their own system of law, their own form of religion, and their own style of education secured, or supposed to have been secured by the Treaty of Union. How have these national institutions been treated by the brutal and selfish majority of English legislators? Let the answer be given in the pithy and pregnant words of Mr John Romans of Newtongrange, the venerable President of the Scottish Home Rule Association. He writes, "I have stood up all my life for the rights of Scotland. I am

now ninety years of age, and during my long life all the evils that have fallen upon Scotland in Church and State have been brought about by the malicious or ignorant interference of Englishmen in our affairs."

And who can gainsay the truth of this terrible indictment against England? Our national Church was violently disturbed, and one of its most vital principles altered by the jealousy of English churchmen a few years after the Union. Near the middle of last century it was rent in two, and almost destroyed by "the malicious or ignorant interference of Englishmen." Then a few years ago, again one of our great Churches was almost destroyed by the ignorant interference of an English Lord Chancellor, who well illustrated the saying that a certain class of persons rush in and interfere "where angels fear to tread." Our Educational System, when founded, was the first in point of time, and in excellence was the best in Europe, so long as Scotland had control of her own affairs. When Scotland ceased to have control of her own affairs, that excellence gradually departed, owing to the Scottish people being unable to keep it in touch with the growth of population, and the pressing demands for new and advanced forms of instruction. These requirements the ignorant and brutal English parliamentary majority refused for generation after generation to take heed of, and thus the lead in educational affairs in Europe, which at one time belonged to Scotland, went to Prussia, and through her to the rest of Germany,

greatly to the detriment of the British people. It is not overstating the case when we say that had Scotland had the management of her own affairs—in other words, had had Home Rule—she would have kept the lead in Europe in the national development of education; and this being the case, she would, by her example, have compelled England to follow in her steps, as Prussia has compelled the rest of Germany to do; and has thus placed her at the head of civilised nations, in all forms of scientific and industrial developments. The decadence of British Trade supremacy may thus be fairly traceable to the interference of England in Scottish affairs; or to her refusal to allow those affairs to be conducted according to Scottish ideas and Scottish requirements.

Even now, despite the bitter experience of the past, there seems to be no prospect of these evils being brought to an end, for the simple reason that the record of centuries tells us that nothing can be got by oppressed minorities who are being misgoverned and plundered by the English ruling class; no form of redress or of justice can be expected, unless and until violence and resistance to the law is resorted to by the sufferers. And this is the weak point of the case for Scotland. The Scottish people as a rule are so God-fearing and so law-abiding, that a resort to such extremes is to them more a matter of difficulty than perhaps to any other European people. It may indeed be said of them that they carry their respect for law and order to an extreme;

and the combined callousness and selfishness of the English governing classes take full advantage of this virtuous weakness of the Scottish character. Is there any country in Europe where a noble race like the Scottish Highlanders, whose gallantry and whose bravery have contributed so largely to the building up of the British Empire, would have been turned out like worn-out animals from the lands of their fathers to make room for deer? And not a protest is ever heard from an English mouth, or an English pen against this crowning iniquity of English misgovernment and English selfishness. The flagrant wrong is conducive to English sport, and to English pleasures and pastimes; and against these what are the interests of the Highland people; what even is the very existence of the Highland race? The vast majority of the English people regard the Scots as a subject race, and their country as a pleasant place of sojourn in summer, and as a sporting ground for their men of wealth and of leisure. Do the Scottish democracy wish to see a further perpetuation of this degradation of their country? If they do, they have only to continue to follow the lead of the selfish English Liberals. If they don't, they will join hand in hand with the Irish and Welsh members of Parliament, and make legislation by the House of Commons impossible, unless and until there is granted to their united demand a measure of Home Rule All Round.

It may be said, what comparison can be made between the case of

Scotland, and that of Ireland, of the United Colonies, or of India; and further, that the wrongs of these three peoples were and are infinitely greater than those under which Scotland now suffers. But the incidence of wrongs is a relative matter. The wrongs suffered by the American Colonists when they took up arms against George the Third were really less than those now endured by the Scottish people under the present domination of England; and certainly the comparison between the political wrongs suffered by the natives of India and those endured by the Scots, cannot be judged by a mere matter of political arithmetic. In all probability—nay, it may be regarded as a certainty—that were British power removed from India at the present time, the fate of the inhabitants would be disastrous in the extreme. There, it is a highly-civilised and superior race governing an inferior race for its immediate as well as ultimate benefit. But as between Scotland and England the case is quite otherwise. The Scots are not an inferior race to the English, but a superior; and in all matters of self government they show themselves to be greatly in advance of their southern neighbours. English interference and English domination in Scottish affairs, then, is like mixing English water—and much of that ditch-water—with Scottish wine; and yet we Scottish democrats are asked to be satisfied with the adulteration, because water is the more abundant. Surely it were wise and proper statesmanship to allow the superior race to manage

its own affairs, and set a notable example, which the inferior race might follow, and by which they might greatly profit.

—o—  
No. 37.

### HOPE FOR HOME RULE ALL ROUND

IT will be gathered from our previous article that we have no hope of obtaining Home Rule for Scotland from any sense of fairness or justice on the part of our English fellow-subjects. They have got the upper hand of us in the immense majority they possess in both Houses of Parliament, and nothing but self-interest or the force of circumstances which are beyond their control will ever induce them to relax the oppressive grip they hold over the destiny of the Scottish people. If, as a people, Englishmen had the brains to see it, they would, as a matter of national policy, give the power of self-government to Scotland for this obvious reason, that the Scots, if they had the control of their own affairs, would so rapidly take the lead of European nations in the full development of all educational and social reforms, and in the advancement of science, of agriculture, and of other forms of national wealth, that England, as the nearest neighbour, would quickly be compelled to follow the example, greatly to her moral and material benefit. But, as a late Chief Justice of Ireland said, the English, though a very honest people, are also a very stupid people, and he might have added, a very selfish people, and hence the rampant and ignorant Toryism which dominates their policy. For

example, it would greatly strengthen the power of the English Tory party if they would grant Home Rule to Scotland, for then they would have a much better chance of controlling English policy when Scottish radicalism was confined to Scotland. But this is an enlargement of political insight that is denied to English Toryism, and they go on denying and refusing Home Rule to Scotland from pure indisposition to change, and from a senseless and craven fear of the result of having to extend a similar boon to Ireland. It is not, however, from stupidity that the English Liberals refuse to carry out the principles of Liberalism and give Home Rule to Scotland, but from pure selfishness. Lord Morley has made that quite clear, and the policy of the Party has been based for the last generation on the lines laid down by him some twenty-three years ago, and closely acted upon ever since. On certain occasions, as for instance when the Scottish Home Rule movement became powerful and threatened danger to the English Liberal party, then the Morley dictum was kept in the background, and the Scots Home Rulers were told: "Oh yes, we are quite with you. Home Rule is one of the principal planks of our platform, and if you support us you will get what you want ere long." Thus were the trusting Scots bluffed off and deceived, and thus they will continue to be deceived by the English Liberals, as a whole, and by the Scottish Liberal office-seekers who hang on to their skirts in the hope of obtain-

ing some of the rewards that the Party in power are able to give now and then to their servile followers.

How long is this wretched game of deception and of humbug to continue? The Scottish people are so slow-moving, and are—unlike the Irish—so destitute of popular leaders that it might continue for another decade with little hope of amendment, so far as Scottish politics alone are concerned. But more hopeful signs are visible in the south, and, if we mistake not, the trend of English politics is going, within the next few years, to give to the cause of Home Rule All Round a chance of success such as has not hitherto been its good luck to see. A large number, probably a fair majority of the English constituencies, will apparently at the next general election return Conservatives, or Tariff Reformers so called, and the present Ministry will either be in a minority in England or will have its present huge majority so largely reduced as to make it quite dependent on the votes of the non-English constituencies. A large number of the Scottish Liberal party will regard this as a great blow to British Liberalism, but in this view of the matter they will be quite wrong. In reality, it will compel English Liberals to abandon the selfish and narrow policy which they have adopted and adhered to for the last quarter of a century of looking at the interests of England only, and will force them to adopt the wider and truer principles of Liberalism, viz., the carrying out of a policy by which

each of the four nationalities of the United Kingdom shall have the control of their own affairs—in other words, Home Rule All Round, while all purely Imperial affairs shall be subject to the control of the Imperial Parliament. This, and this only, is true Liberalism, for it is the due recognition by the Central authority of the United Kingdom of the right of all its four differing and different but united nationalities to manage their own domestic or national affairs in their own national way, and not according to the way or subject to the whim or the interference of another nationality or other nationalities with whom, in a vast variety of questions, they do not think in common, though as regards Imperial matters they have little or no difference either of sentiment or of interest.

The defeats sustained by the Ministry, then, in so many of the recent bye-elections in England cause us no uneasiness or make us dubious as to the future of true Liberalism. On the contrary, we hail the change in the English constituencies with satisfaction, for it will force the English Liberal party to abandon the false position which it has taken up during the last quarter of a century of trying to force the Scots, the Irish and the Welsh into a union in which their dearest national interests are set aside year after year, and Parliament after Parliament as if they were of no account, while measures either purely or chiefly of English importance are kept in the foreground and debated and fought out to the bitter end. It is high time

that this unfair and unprincipled policy of English Liberal selfishness and narrow mindedness should be brought to a finish. And as there seems to be little likelihood of it being ended, except by the balancing in Parliament of the English Tories and the English Liberals, we hail with much satisfaction the strong tendency to that end that the late bye-elections disclose. It is often the case that a repulse or a defeat brings out the better principles of a party, or the higher and more noble qualities of a people, and leads them to take the true path of duty instead of the selfish or narrow path of expediency. And it is because we think the English Liberals strongly and decidedly require a salutary lesson of this kind that we hail with unmixed satisfaction the change of feeling, on grounds however mistaken, that has lately been exhibited by the constituencies in England. If Lord Morley's policy is to be the continuous policy of English Liberalism, it will be necessary for Scotsmen to consider seriously and earnestly whether their policy of extreme and simple law-abiding is not a national mistake, if not a national crime. The depopulation of the Highlands for the sake of English sport ought to be stricken down and ended, even if the peace for a time be broken and the unjust laws defied by some of the more extreme and daring of the crofter class. A persistent and determined trial of the policy of what in Scottish law is termed "deforcement" may be found effectual when a quieter policy is found to be ineffectual.

The rich who have made the law to suit *their* interest are very ready to regard it as a fetish before which all must bow down and worship. The poor, deprived of their rights and of their homes in the land of their fathers by the law, may surely be excused if they look upon the rich man's idol, viz., "the law," as the object, not of reverence, but of fear and of aversion. Such, we say, is the result of English selfishness and the fruit of English misgovernment of Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

—o—

### "THE DREARIEST SCOTCH DEBATE"

SCOTTISH people have for the last two centuries been pretty well accustomed to English sneers at their meanness, their "canniness," their greed, and their dullness, etc., but perhaps those of them who have the high privilege of reading *The Scotsman* may have been inclined to wonder whether that title is a fitting one to a newspaper, which gave currency to such a sneer at Scotland as appeared in its columns on the 14th of May. Its London parliamentary correspondent in describing the debate in the House of Commons on the enquiry into the working of the Old Age Pensions Act in Ireland, wrote of it, "This Act," said the Irish Secretary, "was about the first good thing the Irish people had got from the Union. The Nationalists cheered, but having the whole sitting at their disposal, they kept the discussion going. It touched depths of dullness which *the dreariest Scottish debate had never sounded.*" The concluding words

which we have italicised are quite in the usual silly style, which characterises many, if not the most of *English* references to Scottish ways and Scottish doings, though it is seldom we see such published in a high-class Scottish newspaper. Let us subject the statement to a critical examination and see what truth there is in it. The sneer of course is intended to mean that the mere fact of a debate being Scottish makes it essentially dreary, and implies that the Scots are a dull and dreary race as compared with the English, the Irish, the French, or possibly any other race under the sun; for it is difficult to give limits to the English comprehension of Scottish failing in the way of brightness of intellect. Well, then, let us go into the matter and suppose that a Scottish debate, on say the question of the higher forms of education is being carried on in the House of Commons, or in one of the Grand Committees of the House, and that it is being shared in or listened to by some of the English members, graduates, let us say, of Oxford, or of Cambridge. These members have little or no interest in the matter, and looking at it from an Oxford or High Anglican point of view, regard it as dreary in the extreme. It has no interest whatever for them; it deals with aspects of the educational question of which they know little, and care less, and oh they say, this is like everything Scottish, terribly dreary and terribly dull. Now let us change the scene. There is a meeting of the Church of England dignitaries and representatives in what we believe is termed

“The Convocation of the English Church,” and a debate is started on the great question, of say Vestments, or of the Eastern Position, or of the use or the abuse of incense, of the dress of choristers, or some other of the wonderful minutiae connected with the worship of the Almighty, which grave, reverend and thoughtful Englishmen somehow or other manage to consider of the highest importance. Let us imagine that the meeting of this august body is held where nine-tenths of the audience are not Anglicans or Englishmen, but are Scots or Australian or American Presbyterians. These perchance are listeners of great intelligence, accustomed to deal with world-wide questions of politics, or with matters of social reform affecting the higher interests of the human race. They listen, they think, they ponder within themselves and say what are these grave and reverend men—these leaders of English religious thought debating about? They seem to have on their minds as their highest consideration, mere matters of colour, of form, or of millinery—as if indeed there were a millinery department in Heaven above—matters we need hardly say which can have no vital effect on the welfare of the smallest portion of the human race. These listeners depart, and all are of the opinion that the debate or discussion of these matters by the grave and reverend fathers of the Anglican Church was dull and dismal in the extreme. But change the listeners from foreign Presbyterians, or non-conformists to South-English Anglicans bred in Cathedral cities and educated in

English public schools, and English Universities. Then you have an enthusiastic and appreciative audience, and what seemed trifles to the non-conformist or foreign eyes, now become matters of the highest and most sacred import. In a word, then, the interest of the proceedings depends on the audience, and "the dreariest Scottish debate" is dreary, simply because the listener who styles it so has no vital or national interest in the subject debated. In other words, the discussion of purely Scottish subjects is dull and dreary to the English mind, as the discussion of purely English subjects are dull and dreary to the French, the German or the American mind. Thus the vitality of the English sneer at Scottish debates, or Scottish subjects, becomes simply a question of a majority, and of the character of the majority. An English majority will vote almost unanimously, and with a most self-satisfied idea of the absolute correctness of their view, that the discussion of any or every Scottish question is dull and dreary in the extreme; not merely to English minds, but even to right thinking Scottish minds; for whatever conclusion seems satisfactory to the English mind, must as a matter of course be right and true. And if the Scotsmen cannot see the matter in the same light, then that is owing to their natural denseness of intellect. The moral of course is, that it is a great and consoling satisfaction to have a big majority on your side. Then if you be English, you can call black white, or say two and two make half a dozen with the utmost satisfaction, if to say so happens to

be to the material interest of English folks, or in any way conducive to their national antipathy or their national vanity.

—o—

### MR HALDANE AND NATIONAL SENTIMENT

THE following question and answer took place in the House of Commons on the 10th of May:—

Mr Ashley—Will the right hon. gentleman state why he still persists in boycotting Empire Day in this way?

The Secretary for War—We do not think the Empire is held together by the flying of flags. (Ministerial cheers.)

Mr Ashley—Does the right hon. gentleman attach no importance to sentiment? (Opposition cheers.)

The Secretary for War—I do not say I attach no value to it, but there are many more important things to be done first before we get to these subsidiary and minor matters.

Mr R. Duncan (U., Lanark, Govan)—Has there not been a vast change in public opinion during this last year?

The Speaker—Order, order; everybody can form his own opinion on that.

In the above dialogue Mr Haldane displays his old defect of character, through which he made himself so ridiculous, and showed himself to be so incompetent three years ago, when, allowing himself to be led by the nose by the officials of the War Office, he removed the Scots Greys from Scotland. Had he had a spark of national sentiment he could never have made that stupid blunder, which, since then, the better judgment of the Army Council have compelled him to amend. In the above questioning he again displays this striking defect in his character. How need the order to hoist the National Flag on Empire Day interfere with other and more important matters. To hoist a flag or flags surely does not require the

interposition of the members of the Cabinet. The fact is that Mr Haldane's refusal to move in this matter is owing to the influence of national sentiment on his somewhat defective mind. He is afraid of the Irish Nationalists on this point, and it is well known that their importance in the House of Commons is due to the strength of their national sentiment.

### A DESCRIPTION OF SIR WILLIAM WALLACE

A LETTER under the heading of "The Scots Dialects," appeared in the *The Scotsman* of the 10th of May. In discussing the meaning of the word "tret," which the writer points out is used in the ninth book of "Blind Harry's Wallace," he says:—

"Possibly 'tret' and 'tretis' may be but contractions of *teretis*, which in the genitive case of the Latin adjective *teres*, and which means polished, elegant, well-made, etc. In that case, then, Blind Harry's phrase should be construed thus:—'His nose was square and well-formed,' instead of, 'His nose was square, long, and well-formed,' as had been customary hitherto.

There is another phrase of the minstrel's which seems to me to have been erroneously interpreted. He says Wallace was 'rycht sad off spech,' and it has been usual to construe that remark in the sense that Wallace had a sorrowful or mournful tone of voice, and an aspect of the same cast. But I feel convinced that the phrase referred to should be taken as 'right fluent of speech;' because Fordun describes Wallace as being ready-witted, and a rousing and eloquent orator. Moreover, even to this day, it is still a custom in some parts of Fife, to characterise anyone who is particularly ready-witted, or who is good at making a joke, or who is clever at turning the laugh against the opponent in a dispute, as 'a sad ane;' meaning, thereby, that the said person is 'a merry one;' or 'a clever one;' or, in short, anything but a *sad* one in reality.

It was in that sense, I believe, that Blind Harry intended his remark to be construed. Unfortunately, however, for historical accuracy, all those artists who have attempted

to depict for us the features of Wallace, on canvas or in statue, appear to have interpreted the minstrel's phrase literally; and the consequence is that our national hero has always been portrayed with a long, sad face, and a long, characterless nose, which give him an unwarlike, and an unchieftain-like appearance. The *real* Wallace appears to have been something very different.

The living Wallace must have looked exceedingly noble and chieftain-like, with his tall, powerful, and well-knit figure; with his curly auburn hair, and beard of the same hue; with his yellow eyebrows, prominent and hard-set; with his war-like nose; and with his ruddy, handsome, and agreeable countenance, out of which shone, 'like dyamondis brycht,' his dark blue, sparkling eyes.—I am, etc. A. R."

### SIR HERBERT MAXWELL'S ATTACK ON THE CHARACTER OF WALLACE

IN an early number of *The Thistle* (No. 4, p. 64) we quoted from M'Kerlie's History of Galloway the accusation made by Sir Herbert Maxwell against the patriot Wallace, that "At the gaol delivery of Perth, on 8th August 1296, one Matthew of York was accused of entering the house of a common woman in company with a thief, one William le Waleys, and robbing her of threepence worth of beer." Sir Herbert then goes on to say—"It is not possible to affirm to the identity of this le Waleys with the patriot, but it is highly probable, and his escapade at Perth may account for the known fact that William Wallace was an outlaw when he made his appearance in the national cause." A baser and more improbable accusation against the character of a great national hero it would be difficult to find in the dirty and slanderous literature of any nation. That it should be placed on record against Sir William Wallace, not by an ignorant and filthy-minded low-class Englishman, but by an able and intelligent Scottish gentleman of an ancient family, surely places this infamous charge among the

vilest of the vile curiosities of British literature. Our learned correspondent, "St A.," has sent us the following contribution on the question, and we think that many of our readers will find it interesting. His allusion to Mr Andrew Lang arises from the fact that that writer alludes to the slander in his history of Scotland, but with the remark that it is highly improbable. It would have been more fitting that Mr Lang, if he referred to the matter at all, should have characterised such an attack on the character of Wallace as a disgraceful slander:—

"Regarding Lang's beer story, I will give such evidence that the 'onus of proof' should rest entirely with the extraordinary cads who asserted that the *le Waleys* of the beer story was the Hero of Scotland, and you will find enclosed some of the results of an examination of the work, 'Scotland in 1298,' by which you will see that in 'The Rolls of the Horses' of the leaders of the expedition there are six grooms of the name *le Waleys* or *le Galeys*, two of these being William. If there were six *le Waleys* in 1240 names, how many in 50,000? Or take the two Williams and count up. The proportion would be the same in the campaigns of 1296 as in 1298; perhaps *greater* in 1296, as there were fewer Irish in that year. So you may tot up two or three hundred, with a considerable part of these being *William*.

I am quite sure that such facts will convince any ordinary and reasonable man of the absurdity of the Perth beer story, but it is quite impossible to convince the 'pure cussedness' of the 'Creeping Saxon'; he is not to be moved unless he chooses to move.

#### TITLE OF VOLUME WHENCE TAKEN

*Scotland in 1298. Documents relating to the campaign of King Edward the First in that year, and especially to the Battle of Falkirk. Edited by Henry Gough of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Alexander Gardner, Publisher to Her Majesty the Queen, Paisley, and 12 Paternoster Row, London, 1888. To John, Marquess of Bute, R.I., etc.*

And Gough refers to the 'Calendar of documents relating to Scotland,' preserved

in His Majesty's Public Record Office, London. Edited by Joseph Bain, F.S.A.-Scot. 1st Volume, 1881; 2nd (Falkirk), 1884.

I suppose the 2nd (Falkirk) will be the same as Gough's, from which I quote, and may contain a great deal more than Gough could get, as he seems to have been obstructed. The names given here are all taken from 'The Rolls of the Horses,' numbering about 1240, all accurately described and priced, with the names of all the riders. This is not the *cavalry*, but a list of the leaders, their followers, grooms and horses.

The name *le Waleys* appears about twenty times through the book under the various forms of Walays, Waleys, Wales, Valeis, Galeis, Galeys and de Wallia, but I shall confine myself to the names of the riders of the 1240 horses of the leaders and their followers, simply promising that the editor treats these names as one and the same thing.

Amongst the followers of Dās Radulphus Piparde (p. 220), we have—

1. Willelmus le Waleys, vallettus ejusdem, habet runsinum vairon precii CS.

Amongst the followers of Dās Hugo le Despenser (p. 188)—

2. Willelmus le Galeis, vallettus ejusdem, habet j runsinum powis pomele precii X mar.

3. Then Johannes le Galeis, vallettus (groom), p. 188.

4. In le Galeys, vallettus (groom), p. 202.

5. Another Johannes le Galeis, vallettus (groom), p. 204.

6. Henricus le Galeys, vallettus (groom), p. 234.

There are six grooms called *le Galeys* or *le Waleys* in the 1240 people named, and two of these are called William. How many might there be in the whole English Army? It was a common name over all the west of England and in Wales.

Of course, the Battle of Falkirk took place two years after the 'beer story,' but the name would be in the same proportion. Wallace—*The Wallace*—spelt his name *Wallensis*, a variant applied to the Britons of Strathclyde, whereas the south Britons were simply *Welsh*, or strangers, to the Saxons. The man who was taken and tried on that occasion was Matthew of York, an Englishman, and even half-hearted Lang allows that 'it is most improbable that the heroic Wallace bilked a tavern-keeper with an Englishman for an accomplice.' But the companion of Matthew was neither taken nor tried, and *any name* might be put down for him, whoever he was, even to the extent of

applying the name of their enemy, as a witticism, to a man they couldn't find. Such a thing has been done before, but we need not suppose it in this case when we have such an array of the name in the English Army itself.

The fact is that the name of le Galeys or le Waleys was common in the English Army by the hundred—while Lang gave only the solitary instance of Adam Waleys as known in the time of Edward I. Le Waleys was not the name of a family, but was applied to the whole remnant of the Britons, and to the Welsh, so that it must have been “as common as blackberries,” especially in the West of England and Wales, and the different spellings of the name are no more than was to be expected, considering the fact that a word is often spelled two different ways in the same line, as we see in Barbour, and that even three centuries later we find great Shakespeare's name with some two or three dozen variations—and not settled yet.

Following up Lang's History, I find the following sentence (Vol. I. p. 187), which I had not previously noted, *re* Faulkirke, “Though many horses were slain by the Scottish spears (*we even know the value of the steeds*), only one Englishman of note fell, the Master of the Temple.” Now, he could only have known “the value of the steeds” by seeing the “Rolls of the Horses” in Gough, or in the large authorised work by Bain. On looking up his notes, I find that he is quoting from Bain all along, in this instance from Bain's second (Faulkirke) volume, and continuing up to Bain's fourth volume. How, therefore, with such information at his command could he only give a single instance of the name *le Waleys* as that of Adam, aforesaid, when a look at Bain's volume could show that they must have been in the English Army in hundreds.

I send you this in order to point out Lang's very peculiar way of writing history, whereby he suppresses or ignores facts which would tell very largely in favour of the Scottish side of the argument, and even perverts the common sense reading—as in the Stirling Seal—so that “the interpretation thereof is to our enemies.” He laboriously quotes “Blind Harry,” to show that Wallace must have been about Perth at that time, and as the months don't fit, he says “Harry is not good at dates,” then he passes over all these *Englishmen* of the le Waleys name. It is much like his defence of Queen Mary. After demolishing the charges as of no value, he considered her guilty! In the great dis-

cussion over Alexander's fealty, he only quotes “Robertson.” Why did he not say that Allen saw the “document,” and found that the English version was *written on an erasure!* A fact like that is worth a whole volume, but it would have been too effective for Lang's cult. Lang has too many irons in the fire, and makes mistakes. Here is one in his history, like the Stirling Seal.

He refers to the generally received idea that king Robert said in answer to his magnates—“I have broken my gude battle axe”—and says, “but it is not in Barbour,” and gives his version.

#### Lang

The king has answer made them none  
\* But *turned about* the axe shaft, wha  
Was with *the stroke broken in twa*.

#### Ogle's reprint

The king answer has maid them nane ;  
Bot *menyt* his hand-ax schaft, sua  
Was with *the strak brokyn in twa*.

#### Skeate


The kyng, thame answer maid he nane ;  
Bot *menyt* his hand-ax-schaft, that sua  
Was with *ane strak brokyn in twa*.

Skeate and Ogle are nearly alike, so Lang has mis-translated *menyt* into “turned about.” When every Scotsman should know that *menyt* means bemoaned, lamented! The king gave no answer to his generals about the question of his personal danger, but bemoaned the loss of his favourite weapon, so that the words to which Lang objects were very probably said by him, in any case the words must have been similar. *Menyt* or *meenit* is in common use by country people in Fife to this day. Should an accident happen to a horse's foot, sprain, nail driven wrong, or anything of that sort, his driver finds out by the horse's motion where it is ; he *meens* in the right (or left) fore foot—making it “aff” or “near,” when the horse goes lame he *meens* or *complains* at that point.

Curious how Lang should make such a mistake, but it is quite of a piece with the Stirling Seal.

I think it necessary that you should see how Lang occasionally forgets to advocate the Scottish side of the question, and you will see how different is the position with only *one* le Waleys on the English side called *Adam*, and several hundreds of that name, many of whom would be called *William*—*two* actually specified.

\* How could the king “turn about” an “ax schaft” that was “brokyn in twa”?



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 12.

July 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

PAGE

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—

No. 38.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—  
THE TIME OF WALLACE . . . . . 178

„ 39.—WHY WE CELEBRATE BANNOCKBURN  
DAY . . . . . 181

BANNOCKBURN CELEBRATION . . . . . 183

THE PLUNDERING OF SCOTLAND: BY CHARLES WADDIE 185

THE COLOURS OF THE TERRITORIAL REGIMENTS . . 188

MR BALFOUR ON ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF SCOTLAND. 189

MR WADDIE AND THE WRONGS OF SCOTLAND . . 190

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR . . . . . 191

MR ASQUITH AND "BRITISH" OR "IRISH" . . . 192



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

No. 12.

JULY 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 38

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE TIME OF WALLACE

THE success which attended Wallace after the battle of Stirling Brig was great, but did not last long, as it ended with the defeat of the Scots at the battle of Falkirk in the following July 1298. But what he did was enough to place him in the foremost rank of

the world's patriots. He drove the English entirely out of Scotland in the latter part of 1297, and after organising the strength of the country, laid waste, as we have already shown, the northern provinces of England. This was done not with the help or vigorous assistance of the great nobles of Scotland, but in spite of their jealous interference and their covert resistance. And herein lies the secret of the great hold the memory of Wallace has on the Scottish people. He was *their* champion—the great leader who first brought them to the front of Scottish affairs, and let them see that in their hands, and not in those of the alien and selfish nobles, lay the destinies of their country. The great lesson has never been forgot from that day to this, either by the Scottish commonalty, who esteem his character and revere his memory as that of their greatest political force and world-renowned champion; or by the unpatriotic and alien-minded nobles and their followers, who, even in these latter days, try to defame his character by foul and baseless slanders.

During the campaign in Scotland

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

*THIS issue completes the twelve months' publication of THE THISTLE. We would recommend those of our subscribers who intend binding their copies to wait to the end of the year and make the first volume one of seventeen issues instead of twelve. This will allow the future volumes to begin and end in the same year.*

*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' NOTICE

*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.*

in 1297 Edward had been fighting in Flanders against the King of France and his allies. Greatly annoyed and enraged at the success of the Scots, he patched up a peace with the French King and returned to England; he found some of his leading nobles discontented with the great exactions he made to carry on his wars, and with the faithlessness he had exhibited in the fulfilment of his promises to the nobility. But he gave way to them for the time, and having quieted them, proceeded to summon the whole force of his kingdom to march against the Scots. At the head of about a hundred thousand men—probably the most formidable army ever embodied in Britain—he entered Scotland, and in the latter half of July reached the Lothians. Wallace had laid waste the country, so that Edward's army was greatly distressed for provisions, and it was brought to a standstill for some days in the country to the west of Edinburgh, Edward hoping to have there a supply from his fleet, which he had ordered to proceed to the Forth. Disappointed in this, he was in great straits, and began to fear he would have to withdraw towards his resources in the north of England, for he had been unable to learn the position of the Scottish army. But the traitorous feelings of some of the Scottish nobility came to his aid. They sent messengers to him telling him of the position of the Scottish army near Falkirk, and probably also gave him assurance that the strength of that army would be greatly lessened by dissension and by treason. Edward conse-

quently advanced, and found the Scots drawn up in a position close to Falkirk. In numbers they were not much more than a third of the English force, if so many; but had there been no traitors among the nobles the issue of the battle might have been that of Bannockburn. The Scottish cavalry, which was under the command of Comyn and others, fled on the first advance of the enemy, thus apparently showing that their defection had been arranged between their leaders and Edward. Deprived of the support of their cavalry the Scottish infantry had a poor chance of success, as though they were able to withstand the attacks of the English men-at-arms, who were unable to break through the forest of spears, they were helpless against the English archers. These being safe from molestation by the Scottish cavalry who had fled, plied their deadly shafts, and after a time so weakened the schiltrons or circles of the spearmen as to make gaps in them, through which the English men-at-arms entered, and soon overcame the resistance of the Scots. Even then the generalship of Wallace was not wanting. He managed to withdraw from the field with a considerable portion of his army unbroken. Retreating to the north, he hung on the skirts of Edward's army as it advanced to Perth, and so harassed it that it was compelled to retreat through Fife and then to the west. Following the English army Wallace rendered it so helpless in the wasted country from which supplies could not be gathered that Edward was compelled to

retreat to the south-west of Scotland and cross the Solway to Carlisle, which he reached in September, and there disbanded the greater portion of his army.

We gather then from these facts that the defeat of the Scots at Falkirk was by no means a crushing one. And here also, if we read between the lines, we may see how great was the military ability of Wallace. Though defeated, and defeated apparently more by the treachery of the Scottish nobles than by the power of the English army, he still so much retained the confidence of the Scottish commonalty, as to be able to keep with him and under his immediate command, a force that checked the advance of Edward, and compelled him to withdraw to England. It is pretty clear from this, that had the greater nobles of Scotland been patriotic enough to rally round and support Wallace, the independence of Scotland would have been secured by him, as completely and as effectually as it was afterwards secured by Robert the Bruce. But the fates were against the national hero. The feudal system, then in the height of its power, was strong enough to render the exertions of Wallace and the Scottish commonalty to maintain the independence of the kingdom against Edward insufficient, unless with the greater nobles. And these men had evidently made up their minds that they would rather see their country ruled by a great king like Edward, though a foreigner, than saved and governed by Wallace whom they looked upon as an upstart. It was

a sad position for the great national hero to be placed in; but he had to face it. As Burns in "The War of Independence" (Vol. II. pp. 70-71), writes:—"He (Wallace) had seen the evil effects of divided councils: he had found that the haughty magnates would sacrifice their country rather than submit to be commanded by him, a plebeian; and he resolved to remove all cause of offence by resigning that command. So assembling all whom it might concern, he solemnly carried out this resolution. By some historians the occurrence is ignored or denied, but it seems to be unquestionable."

Wallace, having thus for patriotic reasons given up his office of Governor or Guardian of the kingdom, the barons into whose hands then fell the chief power, selected Comyn and Soulis as guardians. They soon had to face another invasion. Edward, who had married the sister of the King of France, and had made peace with him, collected another great army, and in the latter part of November 1298, advanced to Berwick. But there his advance was stopped. His great feudal followers had found a campaign in Scotland in summer a great trial of their strength and endurance; and the prospect of a winter one was too much for them. They refused, many of them, to advance. Edward went on without them, but the opposition of the Scots was too strong, and he was compelled to retreat. So determined, however, was he to subdue Scotland, that in the following summer he assembled a large army at Carlisle, and cross-

ing the border laid siege to the great stronghold of the Maxwells, Carlawerock Castle, near Dumfries. After a spirited defence the castle was surrendered. Then Edward advanced to Irvine, in Ayrshire, but the Scots now had learned to avoid pitched battles, and continued to harass his army and prevent it getting supplies; so he was compelled to retreat, first to Dumfries, and then to Carlisle, where he disbanded his army. This was in the close of the year 1300.

In the following year Edward again crossed the Border, and advanced to the Forth, the Scots harassing his movements, and compelling him to take up a position at Linlithgow, where he was able to obtain supplies from his shipping which had reached the Forth. He found himself unable to penetrate further north, but held his position during the winter, and having made a truce till the end of November 1302, he himself withdrew to London. Of Wallace during this period we hear little. He seems to have visited France for a short time, but after King Philip made peace with Edward, he found it desirable to return to Scotland, where no doubt he continued to harass and attack the English troops on every favourable opportunity.

—o—  
No. 39

### WHY WE CELEBRATE BANNOCK- BURN DAY

IT is only within the last two generations or so that there has arisen in Scotland a desire to celebrate the anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn, and though it may

seem somewhat paradoxical to say it, yet we believe the original *causa causans* of this resurrection of Scottish patriotism is to be found in England and in the action of the English people. The celebration of Bannockburn Day is, in fact, a protest against the unfair aggressions by Englishmen on Scottish rights and Scottish national honour, and the arrogant attempt so insolently made by them during the last half century to regard the Scots as a conquered people and Scotland simply as a northern province of England. It is idle to say that there is no intention on the part of the English people thus to regard Scotland. The intention, of course, is not openly avowed or declared to be a fixed and deliberate intention of prominent English public men, or of either of the two great English political parties, but it is there all the same, and is acted upon with a persistency which never fails. In parliament, in the press, on the platform, the ordinary language of the ordinary Englishman is nearly always based on the assumption that the United Kingdom is English, and that the Empire from Canada to New Zealand is all English, and entirely the creation of England. Thirty years or so ago this partly ignorant and partly arrogant assumption was perhaps more general than it is now, and may be said to have reached its apogee when in 1882 the then Poet Laureate, Tennyson, wrote what he termed a national anthem or patriotic ode to be sung on the Queen's Birthday of that year. He desired to unite in one common bond of patriotism not

only the peoples of the United Kingdom—of Britain—but also of the self-governing States and Colonies beyond the seas.

“He best will serve the race of men  
Who loves his native country best.”

wrote the Laureate, and then among the other verses came the following—

“To all the loyal hearts who long  
To keep our *English* empire whole.  
To all our noble sons, the strong  
*New England* of the Southern Pole.  
To *England* under Indian skies,  
To those dark millions of her realm.”

Surely of all the foolish outbursts of complacent and self-satisfied John Bullism this must be regarded as one of the most notable, coming as it did from one of the leading Englishmen of the time. But Tennyson, in writing thus, did not write from arrogance, but from ignorance—like his friend and great political contemporary, Gladstone, who at one time thought that Scotsmen rather liked to be called Englishmen. Tennyson evidently thought that in calling on Scotsmen, Irishmen and Welshmen “to join hands all round” with Englishmen in singing that absurd ode he was asking them to join in what he thought they would regard as a proud and pleasant duty. But Tennyson was a British gentleman as well as an Englishman, and when he was taken to task for his ignorant unfairness he was not long in making an honourable amendment. Within a few years after writing the foregoing he published a patriotic ode thoroughly undoing the slight offered to the minor British peoples. In the second ode Britain formed the keynote in the whole appeal,

and the terms “England” and “English” were noticeably absent.

But, sad to say, the notable example in international courtesy and fair play here set by Lord Tennyson was not and has not been followed in England or by Englishmen generally. We will not go so far as to say that there has been no improvement from the decade of say 1870 to 1880, but it has been slight, and it is not too much to say that the general tendency in the English press and among English public men is to treat Scotland, Ireland and Wales as merely provinces of England. If there be any exception, it is reserved for Ireland, owing to the activity and the unanimity of the Irish Nationalist Members of Parliament. There is, unfortunately, nothing like the same exhibition of national spirit in Scotland, but there is enough patriotism left to seize upon such a day as that of the anniversary of the battle of Bannockburn, and celebrate it as a notable historic symbol of the unconquered nationality of Scotland. This is why, year after year, we Scots, who are still proud of our independence and of our nationality, celebrate the 24th of June as a great national anniversary. If Englishmen deem such a celebration unbrotherly and unfair to them as fellow-subjects of Scotsmen, they have the remedy entirely in their own hands. They have only, as a people, to have the manliness to recognise the facts of the case, to acknowledge the independent nationality of Scotland, and in future to cease inflicting slights and insults on that nation-

ality by using the terms "England" and "English" in an Imperial sense. Let them do that simple act of international justice and courtesy thoroughly and unreservedly, and treat the Scots, not as a subject people, but as a people who have maintained their independence against all attempts to conquer them, and who have become united with England as one independent country unites with another independent country, on terms at least of honour if not of political fair play. Let them recognise all this, and gradually the celebration of Bannockburn Day will cease to be regarded by Scotsmen as a day to be kept annually in proud remembrance. Such a consummation is much to be desired by all thoughtful and patriotic men of both nationalities. But the advance must come from England. Scotland has been forgetful of her national dignity even to the point of weakness, for the purpose of living on friendly terms with her powerful southern neighbour and partner, and this strong predisposition to national friendliness has been abused and taken advantage of by the arrogant and bullying portion of the English people to treat Scotland as a province only, and not as a kingdom. "We have absorbed Scotland," was the statement of the English historian, Green, and the vast mass of Englishmen have acted on that false and dishonourable assumption. Until Englishmen withdraw from that untrue and insulting position there can never be any true union between the two peoples, and the first duty of every

honest and patriotic Englishman is to recognise this great fact and act accordingly. When that is done, there will be one great and united people, but its name cannot and will not be "English."

---

### BANNOCKBURN CELEBRATION

LAST year the Scottish Patriotic Association did not publicly celebrate Bannockburn Day, but this year they resumed the series of demonstrations which have annually been held at the Borestone for several years past. Whether it was due to this break in the continuity of the gatherings, or to the threatening character of the weather, the muster of patriotic Scots from various parts of the country on the afternoon of Saturday, 26th June, was not up to the usual. The opening of the proceedings had to be delayed till the conclusion of the speeches of a small party of Nationalists from Edinburgh, for whom the Patriotic Association considerably waited some time. To avoid all appearance of the clashing of patriotic parties, it would be most desirable that in future they should communicate beforehand as to the day's arrangements. It seems rather unfair for any second or third parties to take advantage of the audience brought together by the announcement of the Scottish Patriotic Association's annual gathering.

The chairman, Mr George Eyre-Todd, began by explaining the objects of the Association, and, in referring to the misuse of national names, effectively quoted a Canadian poet's rejoinder to one of Mr Kipling's recent effusions. After

this Mr W. M. Mackenzie, M.A. (editor of a recent edition of Barbour's "Bruce") gave a very interesting account of the historic battle, going into geographical and strategic details. He contended that at Bannockburn Bruce proved himself one of the greatest military geniuses of any age or country. Of the English army King Edward himself, he stated, was one of the first to turn and flee. Mr Charles W. Thomson, M.A., F.E.I.S., Larkhall, the next speaker, moved a resolution as follows:—

"This gathering urges upon Educational authorities the importance of seeing that all history books still in use in Scottish schools, which deal inaccurately or inadequately with Scottish history, or which misrepresent Scotland's constitutional position in the United Kingdom by the use of the sectional terms, 'England,' 'English' or 'Anglo,' instead of the proper imperial terms Britain, British and Brito, are withdrawn from the schools and replaced by others in which our history is correctly dealt with and the proper national names are used."

From his experience as a teacher, Mr Thomson stated that there had been a distinct change of attitude for the good on the part of the Scottish educational authorities, but much was still to be desired, especially with respect to some of the historical text books in use. Dr John Bell, Glasgow, seconded the resolution, which was unanimously adopted by the gathering. A second resolution

was then submitted by the chairman to this effect:—

"That in view of the value of Scottish history and literature as educative media, and also of the recent neglect of the teaching of the subject in Scottish schools and colleges, this gathering welcomes most heartily the movement to establish a Chair of Scottish History in Glasgow University, and urges everyone to give support to this object."

Having been seconded by Mr A. P. Macdonald, Librarian, Dumbarton, this resolution was also adopted with acclamation, and the proceedings closed with a collection on behalf of the scheme for a Chair of History in Glasgow. A. C. W.

—o—

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON ON BRITISH NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.—The national character of the three kingdoms was strongly marked in my army. I found the English regiments always in the best humour when we were well supplied with beef, the Irish when we were in the wine countries, and the Scots when the dollars for pay came up. This looks like an epigram, but I assure you it was a fact, and quite perceptible.—*The Croker Papers*.

CURIOUS JACOBITE FEELING IN THE ROYAL FAMILY.—Princess Augusta (daughter of George III.) said lately (1828) to a private friend, "I was ashamed to hear myself called Princess Augusta, and never could persuade myself that I was so as long as any of the Stewart family were alive. But after the death of Cardinal York I felt myself to be really Princess Augusta.—*The Croker Papers*, vol. i., p. 406.

**THE PLUNDERING OF SCOTLAND.**

*An Historical Sketch and Criticism of  
England's Actings towards Scotland,*

By CHARLES WADDIE,

*Author of "Modern Political Economy."*

WHEN the last of our Celtic kings died, Scotland was one of the most prosperous countries in Europe, and intellectually took a foremost place. Two of her sons had a European reputation, the philosopher, Michael Scott, and the romancer, Thomas of Ercildoune. These two men of genius held a position in their day much the same as Charles Darwin and Walter Scott do in ours. All this prosperity and fame came to an end when the Edwards of England and their successors invaded our country, and for three hundred years laid it waste by fire and sword, carrying back as much plunder as they were able to lay their hands on. This settled policy of England came to an end when the same king ruled over both nations, but Scotland was not yet at the end of her troubles. The people of Scotland would never tolerate a despot, so the aspirations of James after absolute rule while in his native country was kept in check. When he went to London he eagerly embraced the principles of the kings of England, especially Henry the Eighth, and Elizabeth, the murderess of his mother. The Presbyterian Church of Scotland was his particular aversion, its democratic government and fearless assertion of the rights of the people grated upon his nerves, and he determined to establish the Church of England in Scotland. The Ministers of the Church were ex-

pelled from their manses, and English curates installed in their place. This was not done all at once; the work was begun by James, the Scottish Solomon, carried on by his son and grandson, and for a time completed the ruin of the Church of Scotland. The monument in Greyfriars Churchyard to the martyrs of the Covenant tells what the people of Scotland suffered in their defence of civil and religious liberty, but takes no note of the poverty brought upon the country by the action of the English Government. A temporary stop was put to the plundering of Scotland by the revolution settlement, but it soon began again in another form, so that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, although intellectually at the head of Europe, financially she was the poorest civilised country in the world. The work of England was thorough, and the very people that had produced this state of things turned round and reviled the Scots for their poverty, a notable picture of which is shown in "The Fortunes of Nigel." This spirit of reviling is not yet dead. A few years ago a book was published, "The Unspeakable Scot," which had an immense sale in England, and which fairly represents the sentiments of a considerable number of the lower orders of that country. The educated English know better, and look with great favour upon Scotland—not as a nation equal to England, but a useful servant to her.

After the fraudulent Union of 1707, it dawned upon the English Government that it was a mistake to kill the goose that laid the golden

eggs, so, instead of fire and sword, an army of tax gatherers was let loose upon Scotland. They, however, could only get scanty pickings, for, as the saying goes, "You canna take the breeks aff a Highlandman." Samuel Johnson knew his countrymen well when he said to the Irish, "Do not enter into a Union with us; we will only rob you if you do so; we would have robbed the Scots if they had had anything we could rob them of." We quote from memory, but the above is the sense of the words used. The eighteenth century dragged on to its close without any material advance in the fortunes of the Scottish people. With the dawn of the nineteenth century began that marvellous development of the genius of Scotland, the fruits of the national education bestowed upon her by the Scottish Parliament. The mineral wealth of the land was tapped; the inventive genius of the people showed itself in a hundred different ways, Watt, Murdoch and Napier being outstanding figures of this busy time. Scotland was becoming wealthy, the goose was ready to lay the golden eggs for England, but it was the middle of the century before she reaped a plentiful harvest. In 1851 £6,185,770 was gathered in Scotland, and magnanimous England allowed her to retain £570,923 for the whole business of Scotland. She thus kept £5,614,847 as the tribute due to herself. The goose had begun to lay some golden eggs, but not yet a full nest. In 1907-8 she netted £9,853,000 from Scotland. Poor Ireland was not laying so many golden eggs, so only £1,811,000 was gathered from her.

The above historical sketch is only of value as showing the settled policy of England in plundering the Scots. We know it will be said the sums transmitted to England were the just proportion due for the maintenance of the Imperial Government. If that were so, and Englishmen were taxed as heavily as Scotsmen, relative to their population and wealth, the complaint would not be just, more especially if a fair proportion of Imperial expenditure were in Scotland; but it is because none of these things prevail that we are justified in describing Scotland as a plundered nation. In thirty years from 1861 Scotland contributed no less a sum than £25,668,010 more than she was bound to contribute according to the standard of England. It is because this plundering still goes on that we wish particularly to draw the attention of our readers to the Budget in this year of grace 1909.

Some considerable skill was required to enable the government of the day to save England and plunder Scotland without appearing flagrantly unjust. Taxes being put upon commodities, the same must be levied alike in both countries; so some articles of consumption must be found which England bought sparingly and Scotland largely. This was ready to their hand. England is a beer-drinking country, Scotland drinks whisky. Alcohol is the stimulating ingredient in both, and in point of fact England consumes more alcohol than Scotland, and spends a great deal more money in drink per head of population. On the late basis of 11s. per

gallon on proof spirits, Scotland is made to pay 9s. 6d. per head of population more than England does, which in a population of 4,250,000 comes to the grand total of £2,018,750. The extra tax now to be imposed upon whisky will add 5s. 5½d. per head of the population of Scotland, thus adding more than an extra million to the already heavy tax paid by the Scots. We have taken the spirit duties as the most flagrant case of the plundering of Scotland. Englishmen spend more per head on drink than Scotsmen, because they are richer, and if their national drink was taxed in the same degree as the Scots drink, according to its alcoholic strength, which is the only just mode of taxation, there would be no need to increase the spirit duties. The extra sum gathered would be all that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would need. But the government dare not tax the Englishman as heavily as the Scotsman, for he has 465 votes in the House of Commons, and would not allow any government twenty-four hours of office who dared to tax him at the same rate as the Scot. They can and do plunder Scotland with impunity, for she has only 72 votes in the House of Commons.

In protesting against the above injustice to our country, we are handicapped by a noisy fanatical crew called teetotalers; they cry, double, treble, quadruple the tax, and stop the disgrace of Scotland; her army of drunkards. We are all of one mind as to the sin of the drunkard, but Scotland is not a nation of drunkards, they are a mere

fraction of the population; like a stage army they come upon the scene time after time, and so give the appearance of a vast multitude. It is poverty that creates the drunkard, as was shown more than 3000 years ago in a book the authority of which none can gainsay:—

“Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be heavy of heart. *Let him drink and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more.*”

The teetotalers for over sixty years have been crying for more taxes on whisky, and the suppression of more public houses. Edinburgh during that period has doubled her population, but has fewer public houses now than at any former period of her history, yet the drunkards are more numerous than ever. All their plans have turned out failures, for, without knowing it, they have been the greatest friends of the retail drink trade. By creating a monopoly they have made the fortunes of those hardy enough to go through the campaign of abuse heaped upon them. This requires serious consideration, for the clamour of these fanatics has brought untold misery upon Scotland, as any one can see who visits the slums of our large cities. Let any one consider what would be the expenditure of a poor family on drink, if it was sold at its natural price, same as in Italy. The best full proof whisky can be bought at 3s. per gallon, and if the publican got 100 per cent. profit, he would nett 3s., but add the duty of 14s. 9d. per gallon, and the price is 17s. 9d., the profit of the publican.

is no longer 3s., it is 17s. 9d. To the rich man this extra cost is of no moment, but to the poor family it spells ruin. The distiller is the only one engaged in the trade who suffers. He has to provide a larger capital, and has a smaller output; in fact, to many it spells ruin, but the extra profit recoups the publican for the smaller consumpt. It is the consumer who pays for all, and as the majority is the very poor, the unjust tax adds to their misery. The unthinking hold up their hands in horror at the thought of whisky being retailed at 6s. per gallon, and conjure up a vision of the whole population reeling in drink, but that is not the experience of people who observe the habits of foreign peoples who drink far more than we do. It is because it is so cheap that it becomes part of their daily food; so they never get drunk.

We have been tempted to enlarge upon the drink question because of the terrible evils that have fallen upon the poor of Scotland through the mistaken policy of the temperance party, but the subject we have on hand is the plundering of Scotland, and we have shown that it is mainly through the unjust taxation of the national beverage that this is brought about. There are other ways in which Scotland suffers; the gathering of the Income Tax for example. England is favoured; Scotland is made to pay the uttermost farthing; we need say no more, but point to the moral of the story. The plundering of Scotland is brought about by her impotence in the House of Commons. The present form of the Union of the United Kingdom

is flagrantly unjust, brought about by hypocritical pretence of being equally represented according to population, which means the swamping of the National life of Scotland, Ireland and Wales—the members for England being more than two to one of the united strength of the three other countries. It is not a Union; it is extinction. The seventy-two members sent up by Scotland are powerless to protect the interests of their country, and she can be and is plundered with impunity. Now, although the seventy-two Scots members cannot prevail against the 465 English, yet by uniting as one party, and voting against every Government that perpetrates injustice upon Scotland, they would awaken the dormant conscience of Englishmen, who would stop his Government acting with gross injustice. The Scottish members should attach themselves to no English party. Their own differences on political questions should be sunk in the paramount duty of protecting their country from injustice. While the duty of the members is clear, the duty of the electors is also clear. They must see that they send up good men and true to represent them at Westminster, and having got such men, that they support them. A general election is not far off; see that they awake to the true position of things in time.

---

### THE COLOURS FOR THE TERRITORIAL REGIMENTS

**A**N interesting correspondence has taken place between several of the Scottish Patriotic Societies and

the War Office, respecting the character of colours and armorial devices to be borne by Territorial regiments. The honorary Secretary acting for the Patriotic Societies (Mr John A. Stewart of Glasgow) requested that those for the Scottish regiments should be designed in accordance with the rules of Scottish Heraldry, and not of English Heraldry, and that the national honour of Scotland as laid down by the Treaty of Union should not be infringed. The War Office has turned a deaf ear to this very proper request, and refuses to comply with it. It falls back on the forms and regulations already in force in the Army, and says that those of the Territorial Regiments must be in accordance with them. "It is important," says the War Office, "that no variations should be permitted in the manner of depicting such emblems which are borne by the soldiers of our regular army in all parts of the world." This is all very well from an official standpoint; but it is very unsatisfactory and very unfair from a national one. The Territorials are a purely volunteer national force, and national emblems in their embodiment should be in accordance with national sentiment. It is greatly to the interest of the British nation that those patriotic men in Scotland and Wales who come forward to aid in the defence of the country by joining the Territorial force, should have their national sentiment encouraged, and not slighted or treated with indifference as the War Office is now doing. If Territorial regiments were raised in Ireland, the War Office would

not dare to treat such Irish regiments as they now propose to treat the Scots and the Welsh, and give them emblems and devices arranged by the English Herald Office, instead of the Irish one. It is the old story of injustice and indifference to the national rights and sentiments of the peoples of Scotland and Wales, and it is evident that this policy will be continued so long as Scottish and Welsh members of Parliament sit quietly under such treatment and neglect to bring their government face to face with their remonstrances and complaints in the House of Commons. A few Scottish and Welsh patriotic "hecklers" of the War Office, and of the government generally, are greatly wanted in Parliament, and it is strange that members do not rise to the occasion and see how such action would be appreciated by their constituents.

---

#### MR BALFOUR ON ENGLISH IGNORANCE OF SCOTLAND

AT a meeting of the Imperial Press Conference in London on the 10th ult., Mr Balfour said:—

"I have heard it said by many gentlemen who have come from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the Cape that they are sometimes pained by the ignorance shown by the dwellers in this part of the Empire with regard even to the largest of their own domestic necessities. They need not be pained that ignorance is to be found within these small islands, and you will find illustrations of it as regards centres of population which occupy two or three hours or half a dozen hours in a railway carriage. I am a Scotsman—(hear, hear)—and have suffered, if suffering it be called at all, from the ignorance of some of my southern friends. By ignorance I mean on strictly Scottish

matters. I believe that the majority of the audience I am now addressing belong to the southern and inferior portion of the island—(laughter)—and I will venture to say, if I could take them one by one into a room apart and examine them with regard to the ecclesiastical history and constitution of Scotland—(laughter)—and ask them, that is to say, matters which not only affected the whole history of my particular end of the island for centuries, but which still affect it in a most profound manner, I should find ignorance more crass, more profound, more impenetrable than any which a citizen of Great Britain could possibly have of the affairs of Canada, New Zealand or of the Cape.” (Hear, hear.)

Mr Balfour need not have confined his statement to the ecclesiastical history of Scotland. English ignorance on that head is dense enough in all conscience, but on the more important matter of general history he might have gone quite as far, and have not got beyond the facts of the case. Why? Did not his own uncle, the late Marquis of Salisbury, state publicly that the English conquered Scotland at Culloden? And this “crass ignorance” was from the Premier of Britain and the leading Englishman of his time! It is idle to talk of English intelligence as a general matter. There are some as learned and intelligent men in England as there are in the world, but the average Englishman is one of the least informed and least intelligent men in Northern or Western Europe. An ordinary Scots peasant is more intelligent than nine out of ten of the English middle-class engaged in trade or manufactures. And even the clerical profession need not be excluded from this ignoble category.

## MR WADDIE AND THE WRONGS OF SCOTLAND

IN another part of this issue will be found an article by Mr Charles Waddie, entitled “The Plundering of Scotland,” which is the first of a series which that gentleman proposes to contribute to our columns on the wrongs under which Scotland now suffers from the selfishness and the injustice of the English majority in the British Parliament. Mr Waddie is well entitled to write or to speak on this subject, for during the last thirty years he has almost made it his own, and we are sure that many of our readers will read with pleasure what he has got to say on this, to Scotsmen, all-important question. Some, probably many, will differ from Mr Waddie on one or two of the public questions he deals with in the course of his remarks, but no patriotic Scot can differ from him in the great question for which he so ably contends, viz., the right of Scotland to manage her own affairs. We can quite understand, for example, that many patriotic Scots will stand aghast at Mr Waddie’s views as to cheap whisky, but let those who do so remember that if Mr Waddie’s national policy is carried to a successful issue, it is Scotsmen and Scotsmen only who will have the settlement of the whisky question, whether that settlement be cheap whisky or its prohibition altogether as a national beverage. If, then, Scottish temperance advocates are of opinion that Mr Waddie is not in accord with the Scottish people on this question, but is in a hopeless minority, let them back Mr Waddie’s

Home Rule policy to the uttermost, and they will get what they so much desire, if they rightly interpret the views and the wishes of the Scottish people.

---

### LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

SCOTTISH HOME RULE ASSOCIATION,  
EDINBURGH, 17th June 1909.

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")

SIR,—In my letter to Mr Wood, Secretary to the Scottish Liberal Association, of 17th March last, and which appeared in your May number, I drew attention to the kind of devolution which the English Liberals wished to give us, which would be an insult and a curse to Scotland. That I did not misjudge them you will see from the following extract from a speech of the Master of Elibank delivered to the "Young Scots" at Perth:—

#### HOME RULE FOR SCOTLAND

If they Liberals received the confidence of the country at next election they hoped to proceed on the same lines, as a great deal had to be done. The Poor-law and other matters had to be dealt with. He had fought five elections as a Scottish Home Ruler, and Home Rule was bound to come. Parliament was now loading her responsibilities on to County Councils, and County Councils when in a difficulty put it on to local authorities, who were never constituted to carry out this extra work. The solution seemed to be perfectly easy. Let them increase the responsibility of the present local authorities in a constitutional manner by enlarging their powers and bringing them more into the form of local Parliaments.

A pretty kind of Home Rule this would be. A Gas-and-Sewage Home Rule, such as Lord Morley treated with ridicule and contempt if ap-

plied to Ireland, but anything is thought good enough for Scotland, and oh! the shame of it; the official Liberal Association of Scotland and the Liberal Whip for Scotland think it is the proper way to treat their country. When will the electors put a stop to such infamy?—I am, etc.,

CHARLES WADDIE.

---

LEITH, 14th June 1909.

### "English" Statesmen

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")

SIR,—I wonder how long we, as Scotsman, are to allow English men and English newspapers to ignore our nationality? The following extract is from the leading article of the "London Daily Telegraph," of the 7th inst., on Lord Rosebery's magnificent oration to the Imperial Press Conference representatives:—  
"Again and again his utterances were like the spirit of *England* itself, thinking aloud." Further on it speaks about the Colonial delegates' "English forebears," but a glance at their names readily dissipates the idea of such. Then on Friday last (11th inst.) the Prime Minister referred to the speeches they (the delegates) had listened to from "English" statesmen during the week. As the chief speakers were Lord Rosebery and Mr A. J. Balfour, comment is needless, to say nothing of the fact that these same Colonials are a great deal prouder of the land of their fathers, and know more about its history than those who have never left its shores.—I am, yours, etc.,  
R. S.

MR ASQUITH AND "BRITISH" OR "IRISH."—In replying to a deputation that waited on him on the 13th May with reference to the registration of British nurses, Mr Asquith said every step which tended in the direction of keeping the nursing profession up to the highest standard possible, "commanded the sympathy of every member of the Government, and of every *British* or *Irish* citizen who cared for the welfare of his country." In the words which we have here italicised Mr Asquith draws a distinction between British and Irish, and seems to hold the opinion that an Irishman is not a Britishman, and that Ireland is not a part of Britain. We do not know whether Mr Asquith's ignorance on this subject goes quite so far as the majority of his countrymen, who are of opinion that though British may not include Irish, the term English certainly does. Mr Asquith has a great reputation for lucidity of speech. In the matter of law he may have this important quality, but in politics or history, if we may judge from the above quoted remarks, he is hazy in the extreme. What a howl of derision would be heard over Germany if Prince von Buelow, the German Premier, were to speak of "German (Deutsch) and Bavarian" citizens; or make a distinction between Germany (Deutschland) and any of its minor kingdoms or States, such as Bavaria, Saxony, Wurtemberg, or Baden-Baden, as if they were not German. Yet this is such a blunder as Mr Asquith has made in the remarks above quoted. The terms "Great

Britain and Ireland," which were stupidly chosen at the time of the Union of 1801 to represent the United Kingdom, do not differentiate Ireland from Britain, but only from Great Britain—a very different matter. Ireland is as much a portion of Britain as are England and Scotland, and as contrasted with Great Britain, is properly Little Britain; or as with South Britain and North Britain—England and Scotland respectively—it is West Britain. That portion of the Irish people who wish to have Ireland a separate nation, quite dissociated from England and Scotland, object to that view of the question, and object to and reject the term of West Britain as being inapplicable to Ireland. But true geographical terms cannot thus be brushed aside by political or national hatred. Ireland always has been from the Roman period, one of the British Isles, and though the infamous treatment she has received from England and the English governing classes since the time of Strongbow has naturally left a strong feeling of repulsion in the Irish mind to everything English—except English cash—still that does not and cannot alter geographical position. Mr Asquith, then, in the inaccurate and illchosen terms he used as above, is not merely glaringly wrong, but like the majority of his countrymen, he plays into the hands of those extreme Irishmen who repudiate all connection with England and Scotland, and demand that Ireland be independent of both. In other words, he lends his countenance to the spirit and the cause of out-and-out Irish rebels.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 13.

August 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—

PAGE

NO. 40.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—

THE THREE-FOLD BATTLE OF ROSLIN . 194

„ 41.—"THE TIMES" ON CALVIN AND CALVINISM 197

„ 42.—PRESBYTERIAN SERVICES IN THE NAVY 199

THE DECAY OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION: BY CHARLES  
WADDIE . . . . . 201

CENTENARY OF A PATRIOTIC SCOT: PROFESSOR  
BLACKIE . . . . . 203

THE LAND QUESTION IN THE HIGHLANDS . . . . . 205

A BIT OF EDWARD THE FIRST'S FAMILY HISTORY . 206

CORRESPONDENCE . . . . . 207

OXFORD AND THE EMPIRE . . . . . 207



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

No. 13.

AUGUST 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 40

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE THREE-FOLD BATTLE OF  
ROSLIN

THE Scottish nobles—the magnates, as they were called—had now the control of affairs in Scotland. Baliol had disappeared from the scene of conflict. Bruce had not yet made up his mind to become a candidate for the throne

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

*LAST issue completed the twelve months' publication of THE THISTLE. We would recommend those of our subscribers who intend binding their copies to wait to the end of the year and make the first volume one of seventeen issues instead of twelve. This will allow the future volumes to begin and end in the same year.*

*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.*

against the mighty power of Edward; and Wallace, as we have seen, finding the jealousy and the power of the great nobles were too strong for him and for the commonalty upon whose support he relied, had for a time withdrawn to France, and it is stated had even gone to Rome to induce the Pope to intervene on behalf of Scotland. A great success fell to the Scottish army in February 1302, the last of Scottish victories until Bruce took the field against Edward. Sir John de Segrave had been appointed Governor of Scotland by Edward, and Sir John Comyn and Sir Simon Fraser were the leaders of the Scottish forces. Segrave, at the head of twenty thousand, took up his quarters near Edinburgh, and rather unwisely disposed of his army in three divisions, probably for the sake of obtaining forage for his cavalry, of which his army was chiefly composed. The Scottish army, which was stationed in Clydesdale, near Biggar, only numbered about eight thousand men, but they were, for a wonder, considering the distracted state of the country, well led, and untroubled

by dissension or by treachery. They seem also to have been well informed of the position of their enemy, the first division of whom, under Segrave, had advanced to Roslin, leaving the other two divisions under the command of Manton the Cofferer and Neville some distance further to the east. Segrave, the leader, seems to have been quite incompetent, and utterly unaware that there was a Scottish force anywhere near him. He seems also to have separated his three divisions so completely and so carelessly that there was an interval of three or four hours between the three, without any connecting supports or even scouts. The result was one of the most striking successes obtained by the Scots during the war against the two Edwards, and only surpassed in importance by the battle of Stirling Brig and the crowning victory of Bannockburn. "Early in the morning of the 24th February," says Tytler, "Segrave and his soldiers were slumbering in their tents in careless security when a boy rushed in and called out that the enemy were upon them. The news proved true. Sir John Comyn, the Governor, and Sir Simon Fraser \* \* \* marching in the night from Biggar to Roslin, surprised the enemy. Segrave's division was entirely routed, he himself, after a severe wound, was made prisoner along with sixteen knights and thirty esquires. and the Scots had begun to collect the booty when the second division of the English army appeared. A cruel but necessary order was given to slay the prisoners,

and this having been done, the Scots immediately attacked the enemy, who, after an obstinate defence, were put to flight with much slaughter. \* \* \* This second attack had scarcely concluded when the third division under Neville was seen in the distance. Worn out by their night march and fatigued by two successive attacks, the little army of the Scots thought of an immediate retreat. But this probably the proximity of Neville's division rendered impossible \* \* \* and an obstinate conflict began, which terminated in the death of Neville and the total defeat of his division." Thus ended what has been called "the three-fold victory of Roslin," one of the most notable and romantic conflicts that ever took place between the Scots and the English. Tytler, following Hailes, gives the date of the battles as the 24th February 1302, but Burns points out that this is not the proper date. He says in a note to the account of the battle (vol. ii., p. 100), "On 5th August Sir John Segrave was appointed warden of the Castle of Berwick-on-Tweed. On 18th September letters were addressed by the King to Segrave and Ralph the Cofferer (Manton) upon 'Affairs in Scotland,' and on 29th September Segrave is instructed to carry into effect 'the expedition which was lately arranged between you and Ralph de Manton, our Cofferer.' This must have been the expedition which terminated so disastrously at Roslin." This seems conclusive as to the date of the battle not being in February.

This was the last of the important

successes in battle that the Scots were to have for many years. Their fighting strength was by this time greatly exhausted, and the country was so wasted of food and other resources that the inhabitants were reduced almost to a state of destitution. We have seen that the army which fought and won at Roslin under Comyn and Fraser numbered only eight thousand, showing that the feudal magnates did not command the support of the commonalty as Wallace had done. Nor is this to be wondered at, for of all the great barons who at this time took a prominent part in public affairs not one but seems to have been some time or other in the ranks of the English. Deprived, then, of the services of their patriot hero, distrustful of their feudal lords and dispirited by the dissensions that prevailed among them, the spirit of the Scottish people for a time seemed to be broken, and when Edward in person, enraged at the defeat of his armies at Roslin, advanced with a great army into Scotland in the early summer of 1303, he met with little resistance.

This campaign seems to have been the most successful of Edward's later inroads into Scotland. He advanced from Edinburgh to Perth, Dundee and Aberdeen, and thence went on to the county of Moray, meeting with no effective resistance. This may well have been the case, for he is said to have crossed the Borders with two divisions, the number under his banners being eighty thousand men. Against such a force Scotland was helpless, and the sufferings she endured from the

rage and the cruelty of the ruffianly Edward seems to have exceeded those of any previous invasion. The account of the outrages, as quoted by Burns (vol. ii., p. 114) from the declaration of the united "barons, free tenants and community of the Kingdom of Scotland," and subsequently sent to the Pope in 1320, is terrible to read. "Injuries, slaughters and deeds of violence, plunderings, burnings, imprisonments of prelates, fring of monasteries, spoliations and murders of men of religion, as well as other outrages, sparing no age or sex or religious order, such as no one could fully describe or understand but he who has learned it from experience." Such was the treatment meted out to Scotland by a King who is termed by a modern English author "the greatest of the Plantagenets," and who is held up to the British people of these days by English historians generally as a great king and a great statesman. Scotsmen may well hesitate in joining in a friendly union or in looking with a kindly eye upon a people who make a point of praising the career of a ruffianly monarch like Edward, to whom the desolation and destruction of a whole kingdom was a mere incident when it opposed his will or interfered with his ambition. If the English people wish to be regarded as sincere friends of their Scottish fellow-subjects they had better cease to regard Edward the First as a monarch whose memory is to be cherished and whose career is to be admired. Without doubt he was the cause of more injury and more

loss of life and property to the people of Britain than any other man or monarch who ever lived. His career was not that of a great statesman or a great king, but that of a cruel and unscrupulous despot who allowed nothing to hinder his schemes of ambition and of conquest. He is undoubtedly the greatest of British ruffians—crowned or uncrowned—if wanton infliction of cruelty and misery on the human race be the true text of ruffianism.

—o—

No. 41

### "THE TIMES" ON CALVIN AND CALVINISM

TO sneer at anything and everything peculiarly Scottish, is now, and for a long time back has been so prevalent in England, that it is quite refreshing to find a different tone adopted by the London *Times* in the matter of that form of religion—Calvinism—which the Scottish people have made peculiarly their own. We do not profess in this magazine to deal with religious matters, except in a very general way, and as they affect the national character, and are connected with national rights and national honour. For instance, we hold that the British Parliament has no right whatever to legislate against the existence of the Church of Scotland. In our opinion that Church can only be disestablished by a purely Scottish Parliament, or by a Convention of the Scottish people specially elected to deal with the question. Those Scotsmen who agitate against the existence of the Scottish Church, and call upon the British Parliament

to disestablish it, may be right as regards the end they have in view, but are utterly wrong in the way they try to attain it. They appeal to a legislative body in which Scotland is represented by a minority, composed of about a ninth of the whole body of members, and to a public opinion—that of England—notoriously hostile, not merely to the doctrines of the Church of Scotland, but to the Presbyterian polity on which that Church is founded. They also advocate a policy which proposes to destroy one of the chief historical bulwarks of Scotland, and thus to lower the position of the country in its relation to its powerful neighbour on the south. Such a policy is narrow in the extreme, and is based largely on envy, and not on patriotism. The question of principle—that of the connection of a Church with the State—may be right or may be wrong, but whether right or wrong, it certainly cannot be right from a Scottish point of view to call in the aid of the members of a foreign and antagonistic Church to destroy the Church of Scotland while leaving the foreign and antagonistic Church—the Anglican—to remain as the only national Church within the confines of Britain. If disestablishment is right in principle, it should begin with the greater evil, not with the less. The Church of Scotland is based, alike in its doctrine and in its polity, on principles which are accepted by and are acceptable to seven-eighths of the Scottish people, while the doctrine and the polity of the Anglican Church are strongly repudiated by at least three-eighths

of the English people. If, then, reform is asked for, and abolition of an ecclesiastical wrong is desirable, surely the greater evil should be removed before the less.

This view of a great Scottish national question is so generally ignored by a very lively and active portion of the Scottish people, that we have gone somewhat out of our way to place it before our readers, and having done so, we now recur to the subject indicated by the heading of this paper. Calvinism has been the whipping horse of what may be termed "smart" writers on religious subjects for several generations back, but now there seems to be signs of a reaction. If the article headed "John Calvin" in *The Times* of the 8th of July be a fair reflex of the higher opinion of able English thinkers, then certainly there is a great change on this question coming in England. The paper is a most able and appreciative one, and if the writer be an Englishman, and, moreover, an Anglican, he is by his impartiality and breadth of view a credit to his country and an honour to his Church. He points out the high estimation in which Calvin was held by eminent members of the English Church. The opening lines of the article are: "'A founder it had, whom for my part I think incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy since the hour it enjoyed him.' Such was the generous tribute of Hooker to the man who founded the great Presbyterian system against which he was defending the Ecclesiastical polity of England." The writer goes on to say, "Whatever the

future may bring, it will remain Calvin's great glory that at a time when there was great danger of independent Church life being lost, he revived the sense that the Church has an independent commission and authority, and thus prevented the Roman Church from standing before the world as the sole representative of this vital principle." Then as to the doctrine of predestination which, or a travesty of which, is so severely denounced by Anglicans, the writer says, "Calvin's doctrine of predestination was not originated by him; it started from Augustine, and it was represented by great divines in the Middle Ages, such as Bradwardine, and his view of the absolute and supreme authority of the will of God was similar to that of the Scotists. Its logical form and consequent exaggeration constitute its weakness." Religious ideas in their development are largely dependent upon the character of the people who adopt them, and the principles of Calvinism are only suitable for a strong and stern and deep-thinking people. In times of stress and of danger such a people are apt to carry to extremes their religious tenets, and hence, doubtless, much of the odium that has become associated with the extreme and rigorous views held and carried out by the Scottish people and by the Huguenots and the English and Dutch Puritans. As the writer in *The Times* says, with a wise Catholicity of spirit, "The man who was assured of his election saw the predestinating hand of God in all the duties imposed upon him, and felt himself the honoured instrument

of the Divine Will. Perhaps no less a conviction was needed to enable the French and Dutch Protestants to endure the awful persecutions through which they had to pass; *and the Scottish nation is a witness to all time, that, notwithstanding some narrowness in detail, the true Calvinistic faith can breed as strong, independent, manly, God-fearing a race as the world has ever seen.*" We have italicised this high testimony to the character of our people which this able and interesting writer has given, and only regret that his spirit of fairness and of good brotherhood is not oftener exhibited in the English press, and by Englishmen generally.

—o—  
No. 42

### PRESBYTERIAN SERVICES IN THE NAVY

IN our May issue we drew attention to the fact that no regular provision is made for Presbyterian chaplains in the Navy, and that religious ministrations for men and officers of that religious belief serving in the British Navy are unprovided for or left to chance—the official reply of the First Lord of the Admiralty to an enquiry made by Mr Hugh Barrie, M.P. for North Londonderry, being that "in accordance with ancient and unvaried custom, the only chaplains appointed as commissioned officers in His Majesty's Navy are those of the Church of England." We pointed out that this is a clear case of religious intolerance which should not be allowed to continue. The number of officers and men serving in the Navy *not* belonging to the

Church of England, it is reasonable to suppose cannot be less than one-fifth of the force; or say twenty thousand; and these, owing to Anglican bigotry and official indifference, are either compelled to attend Anglican services, to go without any religious service, or to trust to any chance ministrations of clergymen not Anglicans, which may now and then be available. If this is not a disgraceful instance of religious intolerance, we should be glad to know what other term is applicable.

The matter was again brought up in the House of Commons on the 30th of June by

Mr J. W. Gulland, who asked the First Lord of the Admiralty why, under Vote II, Sub-section U. of the Navy Estimates, Scotland was the only part of the Empire where allowances were not given to ministers of religion for services to seamen and marines of His Majesty's ships, and for accommodation in churches; and whether, in view of the increasing visits of the Fleet to Scottish waters, the work done amongst the sailors by ministers in Scotland, the accommodation in churches in Scotland made use of by the sailors, and the fact that there were no Presbyterian chaplains in the Navy, he would consider whether Scotland could be treated as favourably as other parts of the Empire.

The First Lord of the Admiralty (Mr M'Kenna) replied that the fixed allowances were granted only when the ministrations required were practically continuous. No such conditions at present applied to any parts of Scotland. The regulations governing the payment of allowances for casual religious ministrations to seamen and marines of His Majesty's ships applied equally to all parts of the British Isles. In the case of ministration to coastguard men in Scotland, no payment was made to clergymen of the Established Church, but that condition also obtained with regard to services rendered to coastguard men in England by clergymen of the Church of England.

Mr Watt (L., Glasgow, College)—Would the right hon. gentleman say how this injustice to Scotland has arisen?

The First Lord of the Admiralty—I have carefully explained that Scotland is suffering under no injustice. (Laughter.)

This is the usual stereotyped fashion in which Scottish grievances are dealt with; the main point is carefully left in the background, and some unimportant matters are dealt with which gloss over the complaint, and cause it to evoke laughter from the unsympathetic majority. Why are there not Presbyterian chaplains in the British Navy as well as in the British Army? That is the question which should be pressed upon the Government again and again, and we venture to say that if it is persisted in, it will not be treated in the cavalier fashion that Mr M'Kenna now indulges in, and will not be received with "laughter." We can hardly believe that no proper provision is made for religious service to Roman Catholics in the Navy; for the Irish members of that Church would, we think, take care that such a grievance would not be allowed to continue. But a Scottish Presbyterian and English Nonconformist grievance is quite of another stamp, and is one which English officialdom is in the habit of treating with indifference. Now let us inquire into and properly understand the present condition of service in the Navy. Formerly, nearly all British ships of war, except the Channel Fleet, when in commission, served abroad, either in the Mediterranean or on the Indian, China, Australian or North American stations. Under such conditions, and with Presbyterians and English Nonconformists scattered among the various ships, there

might have been some difficulty in the appointment of chaplains for such men and of getting effective religious services for them. But these conditions are now quite changed. The British warships are now concentrated almost entirely in British waters, and though the greater portion of their time may be spent in the South of England, yet for many weeks, if not months, they are in Scottish or Irish harbours or off the coast of these two countries. But more than this, the fleets are now concentrated or embodied in such a way that Presbyterian or English Nonconformist chaplains stationed in the flag ships, or in some of the smaller and more active scouting vessels, could be made serviceable to their co-religionists in a manner that formerly was not possible. Mr M'Kenna seems to think, speaking no doubt from the official and Anglican cue given to him, that "casual religious ministrations" to British seamen and marines are quite sufficient, if such men are not Anglicans, and further, that such "casual religious ministrations" are not entitled to the payment of fixed allowances, unless they are practically continuous. In other words, if they are non-Anglican, they are not entitled to payment, for that, practically, is the outcome of such a regulation. The whole question affords a striking instance of religious intolerance, which should not be allowed to continue. The Presbyterians and English Nonconformists serving in the British Navy have a right, according to their numbers, to the provision and payment of chaplains to attend to

their spiritual wants, just as much as the men belonging to the Anglican Church. Let the question be brought up in the House of Commons again and again, and the question will be settled once and for all. The day of Anglican bigotry and intolerance has gone by, if it is only firmly and persistently attacked; and this should be seen to, not only by members of Parliament, but by the various Presbyterian and Non-conformist Churches.

### THE DECAY OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION

BY CHARLES WADDIE.

(Author of "Modern Political Economy")

THE King, Nobles and Parliament of Scotland at a very early date in our history realised the importance of educating the people, and long before the Reformation large sums of money and lands had been given to the Church burdened with obligations to the people; and at the Reformation a moiety of these possessions were hypothecated for the spiritual and secular education of Scotsmen. It is not our intention to dwell upon this part of our subject; it is a matter of history, testimony being borne by the learned of all peoples to the proud position Scotsmen hold in the civilised world, the fruits of that education. Our present object is to draw attention to the position held in our time and the causes of the decay of the once proud position held by Scotland.

In 1872 it was found that the old Parish schools were not sufficient for the educational wants of Scotland. Great changes had come

upon the old simple life of the people. Mighty cities rose in the land, small towns fell into decay, and a large part of the rural population migrated to the large centres of industry. How this new kind of population was to be educated became the problem of the day. A bill was laid before Parliament establishing School Boards. The Heritors took alarm. We will be made to pay toll; for is not the education of the people of Scotland a burden upon the land? The Government bought off opposition by freeing them of that burden, a very bad bargain for Scotland. The taxpayers next took alarm. They said, take care what you do; the tax for education will double the Poor Rates. Such fears were held up to ridicule and contempt. The rate, it was said, will never exceed twopence in the £1. We have looked up our last year's School Board and Poor Rate, and find the first  $1/6$  in the £1, and the latter  $1/1$  in the £1. So the fear expressed in 1872 is more than justified. We believe in many parts of Scotland the rate is much higher than we have stated, but each householder can verify this for himself. Away with sordid notions was the cry in 1872. Your money will be returned to you a hundred fold by the improvement in the morals and character of the people. Your jails will be empty. Juvenile crime will disappear, and the whole character of the people will be elevated to such a height as the world has never seen before.

To attain the above paradise, palatial buildings rose up all over

the country ; money was poured out like water ; no crotchet of the scholar was denied him. Science, art, literature, all were to be crammed into the head of the boys and girls of Scotland. We have had thirty-five years of this costly experiment, and what is the result ? Our jails are not empty, but crammed to the doors with criminals ; and saddest of all, by juvenile criminals. Let anyone take a walk in the streets where the lower orders reside and listen to the conversation of the passers by. Every sentence is garnished with an oath, vulgar, indecent, or profane. Look at their persons ; they are filthy and repulsive. Yet all these men and women have been through the School Board. Can we help saying that the millions that have been spent on their education has been thrown away ? Is the present generation of Scotsmen inferior to what went before ? Not a bit of it. The good stuff is there ; let us then consider what it is that has brought this great calamity upon our country. We have no hesitation in saying it is the alien rule of England.

It might have been thought that the proud position held by Scotland in the educational world would entitle her to continue the direction of that education ; but the desire for centralisation cast that claim to the wind. Scottish education must be directed from London, so it was removed from Edinburgh to that sink of corruption and folly ; and for this grievous wrong we have to thank William Ewart Gladstone, so much idolised by the Scottish people. A set of officials which no

one could touch sat in London and issued their orders to the School Boards of Scotland. The school-master was tied hand and foot. Codes of instruction were dictated to him, and to secure obedience to their senseless orders grants of money were given for turning out the largest number of blockheads. They were crammed with a jargon of words they did not understand, and ranged like so many parrots before the Inspector to repeat the lessons of the day. Let any one who has the slightest knowledge of children reflect upon the certain result of such a process. The variety of minds is as great as the diversity of features. Some have a good memory, and like a sponge, can absorb any amount of lessons, so when they are squeezed, out it comes like the water from the sponge. A wise teacher gives such a child few lessons to be a burden to the mind ; but only a few general principles to stimulate the mind to original thought. Again some intellects are so feeble that nothing but the barest rudiments of learning are possible for them. What is the use of trying to teach a boy algebra when it is certain that his destiny is to be a carter. We hope we have made our meaning clear. The cause of failure is the arbitrary rules sent down from London. The head-master of a school ought to have a free hand to adapt his teaching to the capacity of the pupil.


Mere literary excellence is not the whole of education. We are tempted to say it is the smallest part. The formation of character is of more importance than mere book learning. Sound moral prin-

ciples should be taught the pupil—a love of truth, a love of honesty, a love of country and a love of God will make a better citizen than if he possessed all the learning of the world. But even in mere book learning, how lamentably has the School Board failed. Take the average boy or girl, and what do they read—simply literary trash. Go to places of amusement and listen to the inane rubbish that is applauded to the echo.

To return to the financial aspect of this hideous farce. If the funds at the command of the Scottish people had been husbanded, it is doubtful if any School Board rate would have been needed to give a sound education to all who were unable to pay for it themselves. Let us take Edinburgh, for example. George Heriot was the first to leave large sums for the education of the sons of Edinburgh citizens. He was followed by many more, so that neither the sons nor daughters of Edinburgh need want a good serviceable education for want of the means to pay for it; and this was their birthright, and brought not upon them the ignominy of being paupers, as the present School Board rate has inflicted upon the lower orders of Edinburgh. Scotsmen so loved education that similar bequests can be found all over Scotland, so that the extravagant rule of the School Board was not needed. On the contrary, a sounder and better education would have been given to the people of Scotland if they had been left to manage this mine of wealth from their own capital, and under their own Parlia-

ment by a Minister of Education who would hold office because of his fitness for the post.

The subject of education is of such vast consequence that we will refer to it again in a future number.



### CENTENARY OF A PATRIOTIC SCOT: PROFESSOR BLACKIE

TIME has brought round the birth centenary of that "Grand Old Man of Scotland," John Stuart Blackie, who was born at Glasgow on 28th July, 1809, and died at Edinburgh on 22nd March, 1895. At the time of his death the following were some of the things spoken and written of him:—

"It is perhaps not too much to say that Professor Blackie was the most popular and well-known Scotsman of his day. His fervid patriotism—his ardent love of everything Scottish—combined with his perennial good humour, his high spirits, his love of fun, made him everywhere a favourite with all classes of his countrymen. He was the constant advocate of all good and noble causes, and during a long life did his best by precept and example to make the world better and brighter than he found it."

"In Professor Blackie Scotland has lost her Grand Old Man, and a type which she will probably never replace. He was the only Scot of any eminence who, living in the Scottish capital with all its provincialism and its silly affectation of things English, kept in heart the true patriotism, and counted the

Modern Athens still a metropolis as truly as when our Kings held court at Holyrood. He was boyish and *bizarre*; and the unthinking who know not what Attic salt is, and how great a thing it is to be free from cynicism, were apt to laugh at him with an amusing affectation of tolerance. Rather should they take pride that their country produced a man with such a clean soul, such a cultured and gentlemanly spirit, such catholicity of thought and such wide human sympathy. He and his utterances, often whimsical, always genial, were the best antidotes to the poison of London and its centralisation and all that it implies."—Rev. John G. Duncan, Springburn, Glasgow.

*Punch* paid the following tribute to our perfervid countryman :—

"Thou brave old Scot ! and art thou gone?  
 How much of light with thee's departed,  
 Philosopher—yet full of fun,  
 Great humourist—yet human-hearted ;  
 A Caledonian—yet not dour,  
 A scholar—yet not dry-as-dusty ;  
 A pietist—yet never sour !  
 O, stout and tender, true and trusty

"Octogenarian optimist,  
 The world to thee seemed aye more sunny.  
 We loved them better for each twist  
 Which streaked a soul with honey,  
 We shall not see thy like again !  
 We've fallen on times most queer and  
 quacky,  
 And oft shall miss the healthy brain  
 And manly heart of brave old  
 BLACKIE."

The "Glasgow Herald" said :—  
 "John Stuart Blackie may have a  
 meed of fame for certain of his  
 writings alike in prose and verse—  
 for some of his books are well

worth reading—but what posterity will chiefly cherish his memory for, will be the fact that he was a great Scotsman. Scotland to him was in all her aspects a thing of beauty and a joy for ever ! It may be said that he had about him too much of the *perfervidum ingenium*, but it was the very excess in him of that element which largely exalted him above his fellows. The Professor was the last prominent Scottish Nationalist. His name always recalls that of Fletcher of Saltoun. Everything Scottish he loved. But at the same time he was not a narrow bigot ; but entertained a rational and large admiration and love of England and the Union. He was a proper sort of patriot—teaching us that while duly appreciating our position in the United Kingdom, we must not forget that we are Scots. Peace and honour to his name ! In all reverence it may be said 'He was a man, take him for all in all, we may not look upon his like again.'

A COMPLIMENT TO "THE THISTLE."—"The Western Scot," published at Omaha, Nebraska, U.S., pays us the following compliment :—  
 "*The Thistle*, a Scottish patriotic magazine, published in Edinburgh, in its June issue has some very fine articles upon Scottish Home Rule. It seems a pity this question is not taken up more in general ; if it were better understood the time might not be so far distant when Scotland would again have power to govern its own affairs."

## THE LAND QUESTION IN THE HIGHLANDS

WE take the following most important paper from *The Scotsman* of the 17th July. If these twelve men whose names are appended to it are thoroughly in earnest, and are strongly supported by their fellow crofters, then we may hope to see an agitation begun which will not end until this all-important question is settled. We defer further expression of opinion to a future issue:—

### “THE PARTING OF THE WAYS” IN LEWIS

#### COTTARS' ULTIMATUM TO THE SCOTTISH SECRETARY

THE land question is daily assuming a more critical aspect in the Hebrides, and the latest news from the Lews is (says the *Oban Times* of to-day) of a disquieting character. The cottars of Back, Vatiskir, and Coll townships, following the example of the Vatersay and Dalbeg raiders, are now threatening to give serious trouble. They have been considering for some time back the necessity of taking drastic measures to relieve the congestion among them; and they have now resolved to take possession of the lands in their neighbourhood, from which their forefathers were evicted many years ago. A representative Committee has been appointed by them, and this Committee has shown its determination to bring matters to a point, by forwarding a statement to the Scottish Secretary to the effect that, unless measures are taken by the Government to give them land, they will, in October first, seize and occupy the available land in their neighbourhood. The following is an excerpt from their letter to Lord Pentland:—

Your Lordship was duly informed of the desperate struggle of the landless cottars

of our townships to escape from the awful fate overwhelming them in this congested area, where there are some four families squatting on every croft. These townships are merely concentration camps where very many families sought shelter in former years when evicted from small holdings elsewhere. Lands that were thus desolated and cleared of the small holders at Gress, Coll, and elsewhere, are now absolutely necessary to save us from starvation. Our families cannot exist under the awful circumstances referred to, and although the cottars were restrained last year from going back to the desolated sheep farms, where they intended to have formed new holdings, they have now come to the conclusion that further appeals are of no use. They desire to inform your Lordship that, however much their action may be misconstrued, it is their intention to colonise these desolated lands, from which their fathers were evicted in the most cold-blooded, savage manner, and they accordingly beg to intimate that they are to measure out small holdings for themselves in Gress and Coll, and lay down their crops there in the same manner as was done at Vatersay. If H.M. Government is to punish them for their loyalty all these years, then the civilised world can bear testimony to the fact that the poor cottars have only been too long silent under such a brutal system of oppression. We have the greatest respect for your Lordship, and fully appreciate all that has been attempted on our behalf, although never carried through, but we have now come to the parting of the ways. If we remain passive and permit ourselves and our families to be starved out, then the sin and the crime of doing so rests with us. And if we go back again to the lands that our fathers possessed, and save ourselves and our families from starvation, this is the only method open for us, and we mean to do so next October. We have no desire to defy the law nor resort to lawless methods. We are fulfilling the law, and we are quite agreeable to pay a fair rent for the holding, and do our duty to the State as defenders of the Empire.— We have the honour to remain your Lordship's most humble and obedient servants,

For and on behalf of the landless cottars of our respective townships.

(Signed)

ALLAN MARTIN, Member of Committee.	
MURDO NICHOLSON,	do.
JOHN GRAHAM,	do.
ALEXANDER MARTIN,	do.
ANGUS MACKENZIE,	do.
MURDO MACLEOD,	do.
ANGUS MACDONALD,	do.
ALEX. STEWART,	do.
ALEX. MORISON,	do.
DON. MACLEOD,	do.
MURDO MACKENZIE,	do.
DONALD MARTIN,	do.

—o—

## A BIT OF EDWARD THE FIRST'S FAMILY HISTORY

OUR correspondent, "St A.," sends us the following excerpt from some of the old chronicles, in the knowledge of which he is quite a master:—

On looking over "The Book of Fowkirke" I found a genealogical table which seems to throw light of some kind on some of the prominent actors in that stirring time—*le roy Coneytons*, Aymer de Valence and John Comyn.

It shows that Edward I. and Aymer de Valence were half cousins, and that John Comyn—the "Red Comyn"—was married to Joan, Aymer's sister, and half cousin to Edward, so that Bruce had a nice family party to contend against from the beginning, and, after Dumfries, there was the blood feud. One begins to understand the fury of the "old dodger" when he found that his kinsman had been slain, and the schemes for which he had "sinned his soul" were likely to dissolve before his eyes. Perhaps it also accounts for Aymer breaking his knightly word to Bruce at Perth, and taking every mean advantage he could. Barbour treats Aymer very gently, and never has anything harsh to say against him; but Blind Harry opens the vials of his wrath upon the man who was principal instigator of that horrible

massacre of the western baronage at the Barns of Ayr, and no name is too hard for "Schir Aymer that traytour was offlad." He was "a fals traytour strange," "a suttell terand knycht," "a fals knycht," "a tyrand knycht and fals," "a tratour," and everything that was bad in Blind Harry's estimation; and Harry was the recipient of all the traditions. After his defeat at Loudoun Hill, Aymer resigned and went to England, nor did he return to Scotland till he came with Edward II. to Bannockburn; but never again, although he was still working against Scotland, being Edward's accredited messenger to the Pope in order to prevent any papal sympathy for the Scots. A State paper tells us (10th May 1317) that when returning from the papal Court in that year he was seized near Etampes by a certain John la Moiliere and carried off into Germany, where he was held to ransom, and a letter of above date from Edward II. to Philip of France requests that potentate to arrange matters with the said John la Moiliere. Aymer de Valence died in 1324. His connection with the Red Comyn may be one reason why Comyn left Falkirk in 1297. Relationships seem tangled, and Edward played one against the other.

—o—

HOW AN ENGLISH CLERGYMAN FILLED HIS CHURCH.—I know a parish in another part of England where the attendance at church was very thin, till the incumbent one day, accidentally I believe, was overtaken with drink and was had up before the magistrates. After that his church filled, and he became a popular man. He had come down to the level of his people.—("Old Country Life," by Baring Gould pp. 171-2.) [The author does not say where this parish was, but we venture to say it was in the southern half of England, and in a Tory county.

Editor of *The Thistle*.]

**CORRESPONDENCE**

[WE have received two letters from Miss F. M. A. Mackinnon, of Thornton Grove, Markington, Yorkshire. In the first she objects to Mr Waddie's letter in so far as "he speaks of Presbyterianism as the Church of Scotland. The Church of Scotland," she writes, "is the Episcopal Church, not the Presbyterian Establishment. . . . Presbyterianism is a man-made sect, not a branch of the Catholic Church." In her second letter, she states that the daughter of George the Third, who, after the death of Cardinal York, thought she was then a Princess, was under a delusion. "King Henry the First and Ninth was succeeded by the King of Sardinia," she states, "and his successor now is Queen Mary of Bavaria."—ED.]

58 BATH STREET,  
Glasgow, 5th July 1909.

**Teetotallers and Mr Waddie**

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")

I have read all the contents of this month's edition of *The Thistle* with very great pleasure, excepting the article, "The Plundering of Scotland," by Mr Charles Waddie, where he goes out of his way to slander a goodly section of the nation by referring to them as a "noisy fanatical crew called teetotallers." If this is the way Mr Waddie thinks that he will gain adherents to the cause of Home Rule for Scotland, I must beg to differ with him.

I am a teetotaller and have as much sympathy with Scotland as Mr Waddie can possibly have; so

much so, that I am vexed to see so many Scots fall under the influence of that liquid commonly known as whisky, but which nomenclature is still doubtful. Mr Waddie thinks it is too highly taxed. Personally I would like to see it taxed off the face of the globe, as it has been the ruination and damnation of millions of Scots, who otherwise might have been creditable members of the nation.

I agree with you, Mr Editor, in saying that "many patriotic Scots will stand aghast at Mr Waddie's views as to cheap whisky," etc. I trust that when "Home Rule" is granted to Scotland, Mr Waddie's followers on the liquor question will be in the minority, and I on the other side.—Yours truly,

JOHN BELL.

**OXFORD AND THE EMPIRE.—**

There is a great deal of nonsense talked and written in London about Oxford and The Empire. One would think from the opinions published in the London press, that Oxford influence and Oxford opinions are as powerful in the British self-growing dominions beyond the seas as they are in Pall Mall and the House of Lords—to say nothing of the House of Commons. In the latter they are rapidly losing their influence. In the dominions beyond the seas, Oxford opinions not only have no power and no influence, but it would be more correct to say that to hold them would be fatal to any politician who aspired to power. Lord Curzon, Chancellor of the University, struck an utterly false note the other day,

when at the luncheon given by the University to the members of the Imperial Press Conference, he concluded his speech by saying that "he hoped there might be a perpetual stream circulating between the dominions and England, from the Empire to Oxford, and from Oxford back to the Empire, carrying to and fro upon its bosom the best of the character and intelligence, and the best of loyalty and patriotism that either can give." The fact is that Oxford and its ideas and ways are utterly antagonistic to Australasian and Canadian views and thought, and the voters and toilers in those British beyond-sea dominions care no more for Oxford than English Methodists or Scottish Presbyterians care for the decrees of the Vatican. Oxford as a Tory stronghold may still be a power in Southern England, but as regards Britain beyond the seas it is a spent force.

SCOTTISH M.P.'S AND THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.—A statement has lately been published that forty-two of the Scottish Members of Parliament have signed an appeal to the Premier, asking that the Scottish Education Department should be transferred to Scotland. If these members mean business, and wish to have their request complied with, they should quietly let Mr Asquith know, that if he will not comply with their request, they will be compelled to refrain from voting in favour of the Government on some of the more important divisions that may take place during the session. If they would go a little further, and say that unless the Scottish demand in

this matter is granted, they will vote *against* the Government on some important division, they would very quickly find that their demand would be acceded to. This is the way the Irish members act, and this is why the various Ministries, Liberal or Tory, are so submissive to them. English politicians do not understand justice. It is not in their vocabulary. They only understand and bow to brute force.

QUEEN VICTORIA ON CULLODEN —We live now in a reign and under a monarch who, to gratify a petty spite and a low vindictiveness, has inflicted on Scotland two great national insults, the wrong and false title of Edward the Seventh of the United Kingdom, etc., and the unconstitutional Scale of Precedence, by which Scottish noblemen in Scotland are made to rank after English noblemen of the same rank. How differently the late Queen Victoria, of noble and illustrious memory, viewed such matters may be gathered from some of her remarks in her "Journal of a Life in the Highlands." Thus (p. 180) she says, "We passed Culloden and the moor where that bloody battle, the recollection of which I cannot bear, was fought." Again (p. 255) in a visit to Lochiel's country, she writes, "Yes, and I feel a sort of reverence in going over these scenes in this most beautiful country, which I am proud to call my own, where there was such devoted loyalty to the family of my ancestors—for Stewart blood is in my veins, and I am *now* their representative, and the people are as loyal and devoted to me as they were to that unhappy race."



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 14.

September 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
NO. 43.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—	
THE FATE OF WALLACE . . . . .	210
„ 44.—THE PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICS . . . . .	213
„ 45.—THE BUDGET! WHAT IT MEANS . . . . .	216
THE TRANSFERENCE OF THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT . . . . .	217
THE DECAY OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION . . . . .	219
THE SINS OF THE BUDGET . . . . .	221
AN OXFORDIZED SCOT . . . . .	223
LETTER TO THE EDITOR . . . . .	223



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

No. 14.

SEPTEMBER 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 43

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

THE FATE OF WALLACE

WHEN Edward returned from the north of Scotland all the chief strongholds except Stirling Castle were in his hands, and after a resolute and skilful defence even it had to be surrendered about the middle of the summer of 1304. Edward then placed the government

of the country in the hands of Segrave, and went south to Lincoln, where he spent Christmas amid much festivity and rejoicing, thinking that now he had at last completed the conquest of the northern kingdom. All or nearly all of the Scottish nobles had either been captured or had surrendered themselves to his power. But the heroic Wallace was still at large, and Edward in consequence could not help feeling uneasy. The great patriot, despite the insinuations to the contrary of some of the English chroniclers, steadily refused to surrender or to acknowledge in any way the supremacy of Edward, and though no longer at the head of any organised or formidable force, he still, with some faithful followers, roamed in comparative freedom through the wilds of central and western Scotland. It has been stated by some writers that Wallace had also made overtures to Edward for submission on certain conditions, but there is no proper authority for the statement. One English chronicler, Langtoft, makes the assertion, but it seems to be without foundation, and is merely a statement of

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

OUR July issue completed the twelve months' publication of THE THISTLE. We would recommend those of our subscribers who intend binding their copies to wait to the end of the year and make the first volume one of seventeen issues instead of twelve. This will allow the future volumes to begin and end in the same year.

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.

what Englishmen of his class thought would be a probable course of action on the part of a so-called Scottish rebel or insurgent, now that Scotland was, as was generally believed, thoroughly subdued. Tytler says of this period, 1305, "The only man in Scotland who had steadily refused submission was Wallace." If this statement be modified in the sense that the only prominent or leading man who refused submission was Wallace, it may be accepted as substantially correct. But that there must have been thousands and tens of thousands of the commonalty who also refused to submit, everyone who is acquainted with the sturdy independence of the Scottish peasantry will be ready to uphold. Edward, whose base and vindictive nature had an instinctive aversion to the high and noble character of the patriot, then set his emissaries to work to get him captured and sent to England.

He was only too successful. Large rewards were offered for the betrayal and the capture of Wallace, and then, as now, the wretched men who were willing to betray their country were found in the ranks of the upper classes. Sir John Menteith, as he was termed, was the infamous traitor who was successful in capturing Wallace at Robroyston near Glasgow, but M'Kerlie, in his history of Galloway, points out that Menteith was really a Stewart, and it is well that the fact should be noted. He says (p. 157, vol. I), "The disposition of King Edward seems to have pertained to the Norman races, as largely developed in the perfidy which existed among

such settlers in Scotland, who were full of perfidy and cunning intrigue. John Stewart of Ruskie was a worthy example of the race. He was the second son of Walter Stewart, Earl of Menteith (who robbed his wife's sister of the earldom), and grandson of the then Hereditary Steward, a family which is believed to have sprung from a low origin (as with most of the other settlers in Scotland), the first of note from being a kitchen page in the establishment of King David the First, having risen to be Steward of the kingdom. \* \* \* The blood money received by this despicable being from King Edward for his villainous conduct was land valued at £100. To the attendant who watched Wallace, forty marks, and to others who were present at the capture, sixty were to be divided amongst them." Wallace was hurried off to London under a strong escort of sixty mounted men, and was lodged in Fenchurch Street. Next day, on the eve of St Bartholomew (24th August), he was taken to Westminster and impeached by the King's Justice as a traitor. To this he replied that "he was never traitor to the King of England, as he had never sworn fealty to him." He was condemned to death for treason, and the sentence was carried out, to the eternal infamy of Edward, with the utmost barbarities of the law, as it then existed.

English historians take care to pass over the details of these barbarities; and well they may, for next perhaps to the record of the "Massacre of St Brice's day in

1001 (?)” there has been no more infamous act committed by the head of the English people than the cruelties and horrors connected with the death of the great Scottish patriot. Let us turn then to the pages of the patriotic and faithful Scottish historian, William Burns, for a detailed record of the last day of Wallace. That writer in the second volume of his history (The Scottish War of Independence, pp. 145-47) says :—

“Had English writers of the present day concurred in condemning it (the execution of Wallace), the reader might have been spared any recapitulation of the revolting details. But it so happens, that the same evidence which proves that the sentence was carried out to the letter, if not beyond it, exhibits also the spectacle of men, not engaged in the heat of the conflict, but professing to write history, yet holding up that sentence and its execution as something for Englishmen to rejoice over and be proud of; and unfortunately, as we have seen, there are writers in our own day who do not scruple to adopt a similar style.” . . . Burns then goes on (quoting from Matthew of Westminster, a contemporary chronicle) to say—“He was drawn through the streets of London at the tails of horses until he reached a gallows of unusual height, specially prepared for him; there he was suspended by a halter, but taken down while yet alive (*semivivus*); he was mutilated (*abscissis genitalibus*); his bowels torn out and burned in a fire, his head then cut off, his body divided into four, his head impaled on London Bridge, and his quarters transmitted to four principal parts of Scotland.”

This was the end of the Immortal Wallace, one of the greatest patriots, and one of the most illustrious heroes that history bears on its records. It will be seen that there was hardly any form of cruelty or of infamy omitted in the manner of his death. He was dragged at the tails of horses to the place of execution; he was hanged, but not to the

point of death; while still alive, he was mutilated in the manner that is considered to be most degrading to man; and which now, when perpetrated in the East on the bodies of our dead soldiers, drives their comrades to madness, and leads them to commit most awful acts of retaliation. Then—but why write more of the methods and manner of vengeance of the ruffianly Edward! He is held up to us, even in these days, as one of the greatest of English monarchs, and one of the greatest of English statesmen. We say that a people who can hold up to the admiration of the modern world such a monster of savagery and of cruelty have no right to condemn the wildest and worst deeds committed by Russians, Turks, or the most barbarous nations of the Orient. To praise in the present day, and to hold up to public admiration the public career of Edward the First, and to be silent as to his savage and ferocious treatment of Wallace—even to the attempted refusal to him of the last sacrament of the Church—is surely as bad as to applaud the atrocities committed by the late Sultan, Abdul Hamid, on the Bulgarians and the Armenians. Yet the same English publicists who vehemently condemn these latter-day atrocities, will be found either silent as to, or openly approving of, worse atrocities committed in former days by a man whom they are base enough to acclaim as the greatest of their kings. Such is the cant of English so-called patriotism, in this, the twentieth century.

No. 44

**THE PHILOSOPHY OF POLITICS**

IN the turmoil of everyday life, with class fighting against class, and interest against interest, and with the great body of the people either quietly looking on, or actively taking part in the contest of political parties, with only a dim and hazy idea of the vital principle or principles involved in the issue, it is well to go a little deeper into the character of the popular struggle, and see if we cannot bring out of it a clearer and more definite view of the situation by a short statement of what we have ventured to term the "Philosophy of Politics." Great philosophers, both of the ancient and the modern world, have no doubt dealt with this subject in various aspects, but they have written theoretically and not practically; or at least have not had in view the particular phase of political life which now confronts not only our own country, but all the more advanced nations of central and western Europe. In Britain and Germany, for example, it is obvious to every keen observer that the great struggle of parties is between the landed class and the landless class; or the privileged and the unprivileged. In France, that contest was decided in blood and flame in the last decade of the eighteenth century; but even there, there was still left a stronghold of privilege in the shape of the Church, which has not ceased to maintain the contest—though with bedraggled plumage—down even to these days.

We shall be better able to understand the course of modern politics

if we go back to first principles. Politics then, in its wider sense, as we view it in these days, is the struggle for power over the mind of man; as war, which may be regarded as its complement, is a struggle for power over his person and his personal effects. The one seeks to obtain its end by force; the other by influencing, and in many cases by coercing opinion. And in extreme cases, the game or the action of politics often verges on and ends in the same objects as those of war. Probably the earliest display of political action may be found in the working of the tribal system. The chief governing influence of the human race in its earliest stages of existence must have been the parental power; and this again led up to the establishment of what may be termed chiefship, or the power of leaders. This may be looked on as political power in its earliest and most primitive form; for as we find, animals first follow and are guided by their parents; and then as the parental tie weakens, look out for the stronger or the more sagacious members, and follow or are controlled by them; so primitive man after the family stage, came under as we have said, the sway of chiefship or leadership. Then would follow the influence of religion, when man feeling the power of the Great Unknown pressing upon him in all the actions of his daily life, surrendered himself to the power of the priesthood; in other words, to the political influence of those of his fellows who were either innately of a religious turn of mind, and as such were

looked up to with reverence by the rude tribesmen; or were natural leaders, and took advantage of their fellows by professing religious feeling, and playing on the fears and the superstitions of the commoner sort. It is not too much to say that this form of political influence—viz., that which is based on religion—has been found in the long run to be the most powerful and the most enduring of all those phases of opinion which have controlled the actions of the human race. Going further down the stream of history, we find that kingship or monarchy becomes the most prominent form of politics, and in its earliest phases such power was exhibited in its baldest and most cruel shape by pure personal despotism. But the inevitable tendency of the human mind is to check, so far as possible, the exercise of unrestrained personal power by any monarch or emperor, and hence arose the aristocratic system, which may be said to be the exercise of power by a narrow class. The possession of land gave power to its owners, and naturally these associated themselves, and combined to lessen and restrict the power of kings and emperors; and when possible, made it their aim to keep them in the background altogether, and assume to themselves the chief power in the State. Thus when the political power of the British monarchy was broken by the execution of Charles the First, and completely minimised by the Revolution of 1688, when the prerogatives of the new King, William the Third, were so curtailed that he threatened to go back to Holland

rather than reign under such embarrassing conditions, the landed class found themselves to be in possession of the chief power of the State, and they quickly began to entrench themselves in their new political citadel. Thenceforward the kingly power waned almost to extinction; the yeoman class or the body of small freeholders which in the time of the first Charles had been very powerful, gradually lessened in numbers, till about the middle of the eighteenth century they ceased to be of great political importance, and Britain practically was in the hands of a powerful section of the great nobles, who under the name of Whigs professed to be Liberals or friends of popular liberty, but in reality established an aristocratic despotism based on the possession of land. George the Third tried to break down the power of these great landowners, and partially succeeded, but though their power as a class was shaken, their principles of political action retained their vitality, and the privileges belonging to the possession of land practically remained undisturbed, and indeed were gradually increased. As a result of this position of affairs, the landed class in Britain monopolised all power; the Church was their humble servant, the two great Universities were obedient to their influence; all patronage in the army, navy and civil service and in the colonies was at their disposal; taxation for the public services, which at one time was all or nearly all borne by the land, was largely taken off it and placed on the shoulders of the general public—on the poor and the

needy and those least able to bear it, but who, being politically powerless, were unable to resist the injustice. Driven at last to desperation, the British people by the Reform Bill of 1832 took the first great step to break down the domination of the landed class, but the process of reform has been slow, and is yet by no means consummated.

The lesson to be drawn from this brief survey of the history of political parties or political power, using the term "political" in its broadest sense, is, that every person or party, whether monarchs, priests or nobles, that obtain the possession of uncontrolled power, are certain to abuse it. Monarchs or despots perhaps present the most striking instances of the abuse of power, because in them the monstrosity of tyranny is concentrated in a single person. But man is mortal, even though he be on the throne of the Cæsars, and the fear of the assassin is often a corrective to despotism. As a witty Frenchman put it half a century ago, the form of government in Russia is despotism tempered by assassination. The rule of the priesthood has been said to be the worst of all forms of government, but it cannot long exist, at least in an extreme form, unless a people is steeped in ignorance and superstition. But the tyranny of a landed class may exist for centuries in a state where the people are not only intelligent, but are fond of liberty, as the history of our own nation well illustrates. The existence of the people in every country is based on land, and when the ruling caste is the landed class, they soon learn

to bend all the powers of government and all the forms of legislation to the aggrandisement of themselves and their political followers. Their power, like that of despots, cannot be destroyed by assassination; and even terrorism can only act slowly and hesitatingly, as the history of the land fight in Ireland has shown; while among a law-abiding people, like the Scots and English, such a remedy is hardly possible. We thus are irresistibly driven to the conclusion that in politics, that is, in the various forms of government that mankind may choose for the regulation and the guidance of its worldly affairs, there is no safety for the people but in the establishment of democracy. Democracy plainly and undoubtedly has its faults and failings, and even its dangers; but it has this supreme safeguard; its rule is not based on selfishness—for legislation by the whole body of the people, for the whole body of the people cannot long be exercised to the detriment of the people without bringing about a re-action. Democratic power is thus of a fluid and changeable character, and though it is liable to great blunders through ignorance of economic laws, it is bound to learn by experience. If any great mistake is made, or if any system of malversation of public property or public funds is carried out, such cannot long continue, for under democratic rule power is in the hands of the people generally, and not of a class, and amendment, reparation and reform are sure quickly to follow, unless the people are steeped in ignorance and superstition. How different it

is when power is in the hands of a priestly class or a landed class is, as we have said, patent to every student of history. The power of the former is the more difficult to break down because it is based, not on material, but on spiritual grounds; but that of the latter is hardly less difficult, as the history of the last hundred years in Britain unmistakably shows. Every measure that has been brought forward in Parliament to make the owners of land contribute their proper share of taxation; or that has been designed to lessen those extreme powers that have come down to them from the feudal times, has been opposed to the uttermost; and loud cries of robbery, confiscation, and socialism have been raised to frighten and alarm the unthinking and conservative-minded portion of the public. But let not such cries frighten the liberal-minded portion of the British people. If there is any truth whatever in the cries of robbery and of confiscation, it is simply that the people are trying to undo the processes of robbery and of confiscation that the landed and privileged classes in their days of power have perpetrated on the helpless people of Britain. If a concrete illustration of such political robbery be wanted, we point to the deer forests in the Scottish Highlands, where nearly four million of acres have been depopulated, and the inhabitants driven to the Colonies or to the slums of the great cities to make room for deer; and if an illustration of confiscation of public property be required, we point to the Church lands that were

seized at the Reformation by the men who then had power. And seized for their own personal use, and not as property for the State. The descendants of these men are now the loudest and most vigorous screechers of confiscation, when a Liberal ministry is trying to redress the balance of national injustice.

—o—  
No. 45.

### THE BUDGET! WHAT IT MEANS

ALL Torydom is in a wild ferment over the Budget, and not without reason. For its meaning is plain enough to the astute leaders of the landed class. They see clearly that the question at issue is not the paltry tax on the unearned increment of land. If that were the be-all and end-all of the Budget, there would be some wailing and lamentation, no doubt, but it would not be of a serious character. The Tory leaders, however, see clearly that the present attack on the land privileges of the great nobles and their supporters and followers is but the thin end of the wedge which the British democracy has at last made up its mind to drive into the infamous land monopoly of this country, with the intent to rend it and make it harmless. Hence the determined opposition the Budget is receiving, and hence the attempt to lead the public mind away from this supreme object by outcries of socialism and of robbery, and of confiscation and destruction of private rights. That there will be interference with vested interests, even in the beginning, however mild, of this great fight against the landed monopoly of this country is

certain ; and that before the monopoly is thoroughly broken down, and the right of the public to have the control of the land in its own hands, and not in those of a narrow and privileged class, there will be very serious interference with and disturbance of vested interests, is equally certain. But all these difficulties and all these dangers will have to be, and must be faced, to secure the control of the land of Britain for the people of Britain. To hold that property in land is the same as property in bank shares, or in Consols, is an obvious fallacy. The Tory philosopher Coleridge, pointed this out clearly enough three-quarters of a century ago, but the hint and the warning fell on unwilling ears ; and the doctrine that no property is more untouchable in the eye of the law than that of land has been held to be unassailable. As the *Investor's Review* stated some two years ago, with the greatest complacency :—“ Land-owning is now in this country a monopoly more completely hedged in and protected from assault than any other monopoly in the world. All laws tend to the maintenance of the landowners' rights.” Yes, that is a bare statement of the fact. Just as before the Reformation all land vested in the Church was held to be sacred, and to touch or interfere with it was *anathema maranatha*, so has it been since in the interest of the aristocracy. In our preceding article (No. 44) we have pointed out how every governing body—whether kings, priests, or nobles—when uncontrolled, has built up its power, and fenced it in,

and guarded it, to the detriment and the misery of the people ; and we have now to point out that the British people have come to a great crisis in their history. They have now before them a Government measure which aims at the destruction of the landed monopoly of the country, with all the manifold injuries and widespread misery that it entails on them ; and we trust that every man who has the welfare of his country at heart will disregard all minor considerations of unfair taxation on this point and on that—doubtless bad enough in their way—and go in for a wholehearted support of the Budget. It behoves the Scottish people especially to do so, for the land monopoly presses on them much more severely and much more calamitously than it does on the English people—as witness the four millions of acres of Highland deer forests. *There* lies facing us—the people of Scotland—an infamy which cries loudly to heaven for abolition. The Budget forms one step towards it. Let us, then, not hesitate in our action, but do our best to help on the great and noble work.

—o—

#### THE TRANSFERENCE OF THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

MR PIRIE, M.P., deserves the thanks of every Scot for his persistent efforts to get the Scottish Education Department transferred from London to Edinburgh. He has not yet met with success ; but that cannot long be deferred. On the 11th of August he, with a number of other Scottish members, had an interview with Lord Pent-

land on the subject, and the case for the removal from London was put most forcibly by Mr Pirie and some of the other members. It was, he truly said, "a question between the welfare of the administration and the supposed convenience of the administrators. \* \* \* He repudiated the doctrine that the Department should be in Whitehall because the Treasury officials were there. What they got as Scottish members should come through Parliament." Lord Pentland's reply was in the usual official style when Scottish affairs are dealt with by London officials; for it is pretty evident that in this question the Secretary for Scotland is voicing the opinion of these gentry more than his own. He said, "the legislative authority was not in Scotland." Well what about Ireland? Is the legislative authority for Irish Education in Dublin? Surely Scotland, which of all countries in the world has been the strongest supporter of, and a leader in the education of the people, should have the control of its system of education in its own capital, and not in the indifferent, if not hostile atmosphere of London, where the tendency is to make everything Scottish subservient to English opinion. Of the forty-two Scottish members of parliament who had signed the memorial for the transfer, it appears that fourteen were members of the Scottish Grand Committee, which had opposed the transference by a vote of two to one; and Lord Pentland made adroit use of this fact; but there are a number of English members on the Scottish Grand

Committee, and it need hardly be doubted that their votes would be against the transference; while also there are always some time-servers and office-seeking members who chime in with the official view, and go with the Government against the interests of their country. Two or three of these have since had their reward by place or title. Mr Pirie gave an effective reply to this argument of Lord Pentland, when he said, "the fourteen members who placed Liberalism before Nationalism by voting against my proposal were unwilling to oppose the expressed wish of the Government not to complicate the (Education) Bill. They have signed the memorial (for transfer) in full recollection of their vote." It would thus appear that the Ministry—assuming Lord Pentland to represent the views or the indifference of the Cabinet—ungenerously has used or abused the generosity of these members to frustrate the desire of the Scottish people to have the transference of the department to Edinburgh. The way in which this question has been treated by Lord Pentland and the Cabinet furnishes another urgent argument for the necessity of Scottish Home Rule; and it is to be hoped that all Scottish Radical voters will bear this question in mind, and take care to pledge their parliamentary candidates at the next general election clearly and decidedly in favour of Scottish Education being made a purely Scottish question, and not a hybrid bastard English one. England can teach us nothing in the matter of education; it is Scotland which can teach England.

## THE DECAY OF SCOTTISH EDUCATION

BY CHARLES WADDIE

(*Author of Modern Political Economy*)

IN our last issue we drew attention to the enormous waste of money in the School Board system; the lamentable result of thirty years of cram upon the intellect of Scotland. Never in the memory of man has there been such a blare of trumpets over our system of education. It is a repetition of the old saying:—

“The mountains labour with prodigious throes,  
And lo! ridiculous a mouse arose.”

We owe this curse upon our country to the high-handed officials of London. What these officials are capable of may be learned from the report of the deputation to the Secretary of Scotland (Lord Pentland) on the 11th ult. A substantial majority of Scottish members, viz. 42, demanded that the Scottish Education Department should be removed to Edinburgh. Their request was rejected with scarcely veiled contempt, the only reason assigned being that the legislative body was not in Scotland but in England, so Scottish Education must be directed from London, not Edinburgh. We trust the Scottish people will take away this obstacle by removing the Legislative body for Scotland from London to Edinburgh. By the way, is this Lord Pentland the Captain Sinclair who was returned for Forfarshire as a pledged Scottish Home Ruler? Now, unfortunately, the majority of mankind are incapable of thinking for themselves; they must have leaders of authority to guide them;

they desire the right, but cannot distinguish it from the wrong. The glib-tongued mob orator, the bold assertor of fallacies which have been confuted over and over again, bewilders the average man. In these circumstances it is most fortunate when he comes upon an authority which none can deny has the stamp of genius. We referred in our last article to the system of trying to stuff the mind with a part of all learning, and the disastrous results of such a system. Here, then, is what Locke says on this subject:—

### THE MOST NECESSARY EDUCATION

“Since it cannot be hoped that a boy should have time and strength to learn all things, most pains should be taken with that which is most necessary, and that principally looked after which will be of most and frequentest use to him in the world. Reason, if consulted, would advise parents that their children’s time should be spent in acquiring what might be useful to them when they come to be men rather than to have their heads stuffed with a deal of trash, a great part whereof they usually never do (it is certain they never need to) think on again as long as they live, and so much of it as does stick to them they are only the worse for.”

There is another sore evil cropped up of late, and that is the specious cry that it is the business of the State to free parents of their natural obligations to their offspring. The Demagogue cries, the children are the most valuable asset of the nation. The preservation of wastrels, and the multiplication of imbeciles is not an asset, but a heavy burden.

Here, again, we have the advantage of an undoubted authority on this subject, viz., Herbert Spencer.

#### THE CHIEF END OF EDUCATION

"The chief end of education is not merely the acquisition of information, it is not even the development of the faculties; it is, or ought to be, the awakening of certain desires that will serve to the pupil as a sort of perpetual inspiration through life.

We have fallen upon evil times in which it has come to be an accepted doctrine that part of the responsibilities of parenthood are to be discharged by the public—a part which is gradually becoming a larger part, and threatens to become the whole. Agitators and legislators have united in spreading a theory which logically followed out ends in the monstrous conclusion that it is for parents to beget children, and for Society to take care of them. The political ethics now in fashion makes the unhesitating assumption that while each man as a parent is not responsible for the mental culture of his own offspring, he is, as a citizen, along with other citizens, responsible for the mental culture of all other men's offspring. And this absurd doctrine has now become so well established that people raise their eyebrows in astonishment if you deny it. A self-evident falsehood has been transformed into a self-evident truth. But this ignoring of the truth that only by the due discharge of parental responsibilities has all life on earth arisen, and that only through the better discharge of them have there gradually been made

possible better types of life, is, in the long run, fatal. Breaches of natural law will, in this case as in all cases, be followed in due time by nature's revenge—a revenge which will be terrible in proportion, as the breach has been great. A system under which parental responsibilities are performed wholesale by those who are not the parents under the plea that many parents cannot or will not perform their duties—a system which thus fosters the inferior children of inferior parents at the necessary cost of superior parents and consequent injury of superior children—a system which thus helps incapables to multiply, and hinders the multiplication of capables or diminishes their capability, must bring decay and eventual extinction. A society which persists in such a system must, other things being equal, go to the wall in the competition with a society which does not commit the folly of nurturing its worst at the expense of its best."

The education of a boy does not stop when he leaves school; the better part comes after; it is the years spent in learning some useful occupation by which he earns his bread. Here we think the State should extend its compulsory powers and insist that every boy shall be taught a trade or profession. There are very serious obstacles in the way of this most essential branch of education, but it is here where the shoe pinches most grievously. The greed of employers and the selfishness of Trade Unions prevents the boy getting a chance to earn his bread. This lack of training is the

breeding ground of the unemployed ; they have nothing but physical strength to offer, and many of them very little of that. There is little employment for such men ; despair turns them into loafers, or worse, if they have quick parts into criminals. Now we said the greed of employers is responsible for some of this. Instead of learning a boy his business they keep him at some small part all the time of his apprenticeship, and so turn him into a human machine. The State should insist that a boy shall be taught his whole business, and not a part only. The Trade Unions again, to create a scarcity of skilled labour, restricts the number of apprentices, in some cases one to five journeymen, a process that spells ruin to the country, and to their own sons in particular.

What need we say more. The present generation of Scotsmen seem to have lost their soul. Like Casandra, we cry out in vain. God grant that the same result of the neglect of Casandra's warning may not ensue.

#### FRENCH OPINION OF SCOTSMEN.

—M. de Circourt called, and it was on this occasion that he made a remark which I have often quoted, and which has become pretty familiar in the North. If it had pleased the Almighty to create, not two, but twenty millions of Scotsmen, they would have conquered the world. And uncommonly hardly they would have used it too. (*Grant Duff's Diary*, vol. i. p. 126.)

## THE SINS OF THE BUDGET

GLENIFFER HOUSE,  
EDINBURGH, *August 7th*, 1909.

Sir,—Never in the memory of the oldest inhabitant has there been such an outcry over any Budget as there is over the proposals of the present Government. There is good reason for this outcry. The expenses of government are going up by leaps and bounds, and both parties in the State are sinners alike. As I can recollect when this country was better governed than it is at present for sixty millions the wasteful extravagance now might make the most careless think. The country has cried for Dreadnoughts and old age pensions ; they have called for the tune, and must pay the piper. Now, if the payment had been equitably distributed, I for one would never have said a word against it ; but as it is vindictive, partial and unjust, I claim the right of protest. One side cries that it is a Democratic Budget ; another says it is a Socialist Budget, but neither say it is a just Budget.

The Government in a free State is the servant of the people, the taxes gathered being for duties rendered, and should be in proportion to the service required by the citizen, and in exact proportion to the wealth of the taxpayer. It is because the Budget violates that sound principle of finance that there is such a revolt in the country over the Government proposals. I will now as briefly as possible state my objections to the Budget. First, there is the Income-tax, although in point of equity all should pay on their income, be it large or small. For the sake of argument, let me take this at £160 a year at 9d. in the pound. Well there should be no abatement, and it should be the same on all incomes. To charge 1s. when an income reaches £2000 and a further impost when it reaches £5000 is unjust in principle, and ministers to the basest of all human passions, envy. To penalise any man because he has been eminently successful in business is a monstrous piece of tyranny. It is by the genius of these men, and the large industries they have created, that the greatness of this country has been achieved. To free co-operative stores from Income-tax is grossly unjust ; the shopkeepers have a hard struggle against these stores—in point of fact they have ruined thousands of them. To tax the tradesman to the last farthing and let the stores go free can only be accounted for by the Government catering for votes. There is another most estimable class that is unjustly treated, and that is private limited

liability companies, of which there are thousands in the country. The history of these concerns is that several partners having conducted private businesses for many years, and growing old, and their grown-up families being actively concerned in the work of the business, they turn it into a private company to prevent disputes by distributing the shares among them. It may be as many as six or eight families get their living from the business, but none have an income of £2000 a year. Cumulatively it may exceed £5000. Now, instead of being charged 9d., which is just, they are charged 1s. or more as proposed now. Well-doing seems to be a crime in the eyes of the Government! Then, as regards earned and unearned incomes, in the majority of cases these are so closely interwoven it is impossible to discriminate between them, but most undoubtedly the Collector of Inland Revenue will take the view most adverse to the taxpayer. For example, there are many private pensions to widows and spinster ladies of well-to-do families. Is this unearned income? These pensions cost the State not one farthing, but the virtue of these families is penalised.

Let me pass to the death duties. They cannot be defended on any principle of equity. In many cases they are cruelly unjust. There is some shadow of right in strangers or remote relatives falling heir to property, but none in the immediate descendants of the deceased. With reference to the land tax, abler pens than mine have tackled that subject. All I have to say is land, like every other property, has its rights as well as its duties, and it seems to me the Budget violates the rights and overstrains the duties. And here again the Government pander to the base passion of envy.

When I come to indirect taxes, the unjust proposals of the Government stand out in giant proportions. All consumers of commodities on which taxes are imposed should be treated alike. By the wisdom of our rulers, alcoholic beverages and tobacco are heavily taxed on what they call moral principles, a pernicious frame of mind encouraging self-righteousness, and sitting in judgment on their neighbour. Taxes should be imposed for revenue purposes only. But let me take alcoholic beverages as they stand. Surely all should be taxed alike, but this is not so; the beer drinker is favoured, the spirit drinker is persecuted. The reason for this is obvious. England, a beer-drinking country, would not give the Government a lease of twenty-four hours if they taxed beer as heavily as

spirits. The Government standard of ethics is votes! If it is politic to raise such an immense revenue from drink, then let alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages be taxed alike. The Government is partial and unjust when it lets the teetotaler escape his fair share of the burden of the State. The persecution of the liquor trade is vindictive, and ought to bring disgrace upon any Government that indulges in it.

The above sins of the Budget are black enough, but worse remains behind. It is proposed to set aside the protection given by the Law Courts of the country, and endow the officials of Somerset House with despotic powers over our fortune and our honour. You have to go back to the reign of Charles the First before you find an equally arbitrary proposal. At present we are too much subjected to acts of injustice at the hands of the servants of the Crown, and have in some cases to endure "the insolence of office." A much-needed reform is for all the expenses in Exchequer cases being paid by the Treasury. Prudent men hesitate to go to law with the Government, and so endure much wrong, and that fosters arrogance in officials.

The Government may say we have to find the money. The roll of the critic is an easy, yea, a pleasant one. Destruction is simple. Construction is more difficult. What do you propose? Now, I have always been in favour of direct taxes as the only way in which everyone will bear their fair share in the burden of the State, and this can only be done by a percentage on the accumulated wealth of the country. This wealth has been estimated at £300 per head of the population—that is, twelve thousand four hundred and fifty millions. An assessment of one and a quarter per cent.—*i.e.*, 3d. in the pound—would yield a revenue of £155,625,000, but I believe one per cent. would be sufficient, for the saving in collection would be enormous, Excise, Customs, stamps, Income-tax, &c., being abolished. In point of fact, a property tax, the poorest and richest man paying exactly in proportion to the services rendered him by the State and his ability to bear the burden.

A reform so far-reaching cannot be expected to be applied this year, but let the Government drop their fantastic attempt to rob the rich on the supposed interest of the poor, revert to the Budget as it was last year, even if it should result in a deficit, and set about a census of the wealth of the country for next year's Budget. Then, and then only, will all get justice, rich and poor alike.—I am, &c.,

CHARLES WADDIE.

## AN OXFORDIZED SCOT

IN the debate in the House of Commons on the Foreign Office Vote, on the 22nd July,

Sir H. CRAIK said his deliberate intention was no longer to continue what was a hurtful and pernicious subject, but to turn to other subjects with which the English name and honour were more immediately concerned.

Mr ROBERT DUNCAN (U., Govan) asked whether the hon. member was in order in speaking of our nation as the English nation. (Renewed Laughter.)

No answer was given by the Chairman, and Mr M'NEILL shouted, "Let the poor man off."

Sir H. CRAIK, continuing, said he thought the whole country might be adequately described by the name of the language which was spoken.

Here we have a Scotsman; a member in the House of Commons for two of the Scottish Universities, and lately the chief official of the Scottish (or Scotch) Education Department, betraying such utter ignorance of public matters as to lay down the doctrine that "the whole country might be adequately described by the name of the language which was spoken." According to this sapient dictum, Belgium is part of France; the United States as a country is part of England; and Scotland and Ireland are provinces of the same belauded country. To such a depth of puerility and of ignorance do some weak-kneed Scots descend when they go to Oxford, become Anglicised, and begin to gape for the tit-bits of office that are contemptuously thrown to renegade Scots who betray the honour of their country.

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

### The Lyon King of Arms and Highland Usage

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")

Woodland, Butterknowle,  
Co. Durham, 24th July 1909.

SIR,—Permit me to congratulate you on your staunch fight to uphold Scottish rights against English aggression. But, whilst we are glancing askance at our neighbours in the south, it would be just as well for us to look more closely into matters nearer home. Much of our trouble is due to our own failure to check the Anglophile tendencies of our own M.P.'s and Scottish officials. Whilst the process of centralisation goes on in London to the detriment of Scotland, we find that a similar policy is being carried on in a smaller way in Scotland. I shall esteem it a favour if you will kindly grant me an opportunity of drawing the attention of your readers to a case in point.

Our Lyon King, in the course of his remarks in a recent decision, arrogates to himself and to his office, certain powers which the older generations of Scottish users of arms held to be non-inherent, either in his predecessors or in the Lyon Office. The various acts of the Scots Parliament which refer to the regulations of heraldry, prove conclusively that the Scots adhered to their old customs in defiance of Lyon and Parliament.

Sir James Balfour Paul shows in the Macrae case that he is either ignorant of, or hostile to the well-known fact that arms were in use in

our own country at a time long before the creation of his office, and so were not subject to the rules and red tape of that office.

His theory that "there is no such thing, strictly speaking, in Scottish heraldry as a family coat-of-arms," etc., may pass muster with the followers of the Anglo-Norman-Gothic system of heraldry, but it cannot be entertained by the descendants of the Caledonians. The Caledonian system was of the patriarchal order of things, and so, too, were the early Scottish arms. The arms were the insignia of families and not the exclusive emblems of the individual.

Sir James Balfour Paul's evident disregard for tradition comes badly from a Scotsman, for Scotland is the homeland of tradition.

I do not enter into the merits of the Macrae case, but I do hold that it is not within the scope of the Lyon King's power to adjudicate on the question of Highland chiefship. This chieftainship of a Highland clan is a matter for the consideration of the clan—and chief—and with the decision of the clan neither the King nor Lyon King has any right to interfere. A cursory study of the history of the Highlands will bear out these contentions.

In conclusion, I trust that we shall hear less of restrictions at home, and more of the enforcing of our rights in the heraldry of the Empire. The effacement of Scotland in the arms of the Australian Commonwealth was bad enough; and equally disgraceful was the slight put upon our country in the

instance of the colours of the Scottish regiments; but far less excusable was the case of our Scottish heralds who appeared in tabards which showed the quarterings of England instead of those of Scotland. Truly our herald requires admonishing.—I am, yours faithfully,  
JOHN MACNAB.

—o—

THE NORSE TONGUE IN SCOTLAND.—Clearly the language of Arranmen 2000 years ago was a Celtic one, and as clearly does it appear that a Norse or Danish tongue was introduced into the island about eight centuries ago. \* \* \* The men of Arran speak very intelligently on this point. They notice particularly two markedly distinct races of men in the island, the representatives of the one tall, strong, blue eyed and fair, while those of the other are more lightly built, but wiry, agile and keen, with dark hair and swarthy complexion.—W. LYTTEIL

THE BRITISH NATIONALITIES IN CANADA.—When in 1891 the census was taken in Canada, the population was given as 5,248,315, of whom 22 per cent. were Irish 20 per cent. English, and 16 per cent. Scots. The English race were thus not much more than half of the combined Irish and Scots. These facts give an excellent illustration of the unenterprising character of the English people. In the building up of the British Empire, so far at least as Canada is concerned, it takes about half a dozen Englishmen to come up to the colonising work of one Irishman or one Scotsman.



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 15.

October 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

PAGE

“THE THISTLE” PAPERS—

- NO. 46.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—  
EDWARD’S TWELVE INVASIONS OF SCOT-  
LAND—1296-1306 . . . . . 226
- „ 47.—THE ATHOLL DEER FOREST EXCURSION  
—TULLIBARDINE’S ATTEMPTED BLUFF . 228
- „ 48.—KING EDWARD STILL IN THE SULKS  
WITH EDINBURGH . . . . . 231

THE UNEMPLOYED. By CHARLES WADDIE . . . . . 233

SCOTLAND AND THE DEVELOPMENT FUND . . . . . 235

PROFESSOR HUME BROWN’S HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.  
By “DEVA” . . . . . 236

BRITAIN *versus* ENGLAND: A SENSIBLE ENGLISHMAN  
AT LAST . . . . . 237

SOUND THE CLARION (A Poem). By H. L. PEVERIL  
TURNBULL . . . . . 239

CORRESPONDENCE—SPORT *versus* PEOPLE . . . . . 239

Dr SAMUEL JOHNSON . . . . . 240



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

No. 15.

OCTOBER 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## “THE THISTLE” PAPERS

No. 46

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

EDWARD'S TWELVE INVASIONS OF  
SCOTLAND—1296-1306

WITH the death of Wallace, the tyrant Edward thought that his great work, the subjugation of Scotland, had at last been accomplished. And to all appearance he was justified in taking such a view of the situation. But there is a

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

*OUR July issue completed the twelve months' publication of THE THISTLE. We would recommend those of our subscribers who intend binding their copies to wait to the end of the year and make the first volume one of seventeen issues instead of twelve. This will allow the future volumes to begin and end in the same year.*

*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 Leve, 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.*

great deal of irony in the course of history; and events that seem to lead forward to a great and fixed conclusion, somehow or other, have a totally different ending. During the period that Wallace was the leader of the Scottish Commons, and was the accepted Guardian and Governor of the Country, in trust as he put it, for the king—Baliol—Robert the Bruce was to all intents and purposes a follower, and apparently a trusted follower of Edward, the great enemy of his country. But hardly had Wallace been done to death before a great change seems to have come over the views and thoughts of Bruce. He was now, if not the heir to the Scottish throne, at least co-heir with Comyn, the other claimant. Young, able, and with no doubt a high confidence in his powers, he is said to have approached his rival claimant, Comyn, with a proposal that whichever of the two should succeed in gaining the crown, should surrender to the other all his lands and property. If this agreement was made, it was no doubt intended by Bruce that the Crown should be his share in the bargain, whatever

might happen to his lands. For his after career proves that his ambition was great and lofty; and that his abilities as a statesman and a leader of men were equal to the greatest strain that might be put upon them. Apparently, during the closing months of 1305, after the death of Wallace, this intrigue between Bruce and Comyn seems to have been begun and settled; but with the close of the year Comyn seems to have become faint-hearted and timorous; and it is said made known to Edward the bargain with Bruce. The latter, who was a favourite with several of the leading nobles of Edward's court, got a hint that he was suspected by the king, and would soon be arrested. He at once left the court, and in the end of January made his way to Scotland, where Comyn already was. They met at Dumfries on the 10th of February, and as the result of a violent quarrel between the two in one of the Dumfries churches, Comyn was attacked by Bruce and left for dead. One of Bruce's followers, Kirkpatrick of Closeburn, learning from Bruce that he doubted he had slain Comyn, said he would "mak' siccar" of the work, and went in and finished Comyn. Bruce, by this act, threw down the gauntlet to Edward, and boldly asserted his claim to the throne of Scotland. Thus the death of Wallace, which Edward fondly imagined had removed from the scene the only man who could prevent him from thoroughly conquering Scotland, in reality made way for a national champion, who though inferior to Wallace in greatness of mind and

of soul, and above all as a leader of men, yet by the strength of his dynastic claim, and his hold on some of the more powerful feudal magnates, proved in reality to be more successful as the champion of Scottish independence.

But before entering on the career of Bruce—a career, which though successful in the end, was one of almost unparalleled storm and stress—we must place before our readers a summary of the many and terrible invasions that the unscrupulous ambition of the ruthless Edward inflicted on Scotland in the short space of eleven years. At the death of Alexander the Third, Scotland, considering the restricted character of her resources, was a prosperous country. Berwick, her chief port and chief city, was said to be in Britain second only to London for wealth and trade. Her people, substantially the same race then as now, seemed to have shown in the period of comparative peace that they enjoyed under the long reigns of the two later Alexanders, that power for industrial advance and development, which during the last century has made them so notable in Europe. Alexander the Third died in 1285 by a fall from his horse near Kinghorn. In 1296, Edward to support his claim to the throne of Scotland began his series of invasions which only ended with his death in 1307. William Burns, in his history of "The Scottish War of Independence" (vol. ii. p. 156), says:—

"During those ten years, not to speak of mere detachments, convoys, escorts, reinforcements, or garrisons, no fewer than

twelve invading armies consisting of Normans, Saxons, Welsh, and Irish, aided by Gascons from the south of France, and even Savoyards from the marches of Italy, have been poured across the Scottish border. 1. First came the army of 30,000 foot-soldiers and 4000 horsemen, under Edward personally, reinforced by 1000 foot and 500 horse under Bishop Beck, making 35,500 in all, by which the town of Berwick was sacked, and Baliol's troops routed at Dunbar. 2. These were followed by 15,000 men from Wales, and 30,400 under the Earl of Ulster, 45,400 in all, that joined Edward after the capture of Dumbarton and other fortresses. 3. Next came the army of 40,000 foot and 300 horse, under Percy, to which Bruce and others surrendered at Irvine. 4. In the course of the same season, came the array of 50,000 foot and 1000 horsemen under Surrey and Cressingham, reinforced by 8,300 under Percy, defeated by Wallace at Stirling. 5. During the following winter, 20,000 infantry and 200 cavalry, under Clifford, twice ravaged Annandale. 6. Then came the army under the barons, at a moderate computation, 40,000 strong, that advanced to Kelso. 7. The army commanded by Edward himself, by which the Scots were crushed at Falkirk, amounted to no fewer than 80,000 infantry and 7,000 cavalry. 8. The one we have seen, also under Edward, advancing as far as the Torwood, near Stirling, and to which, according to Langtoft, the Scots 'showed a visage full grim,' could scarcely fall short of other 40,000 men. 9. The splendid array we have witnessed besieging Carlaverock Castle, and penetrating to Irvine, represents another 60,000 to 80,000 warriors. 10. The army again commanded by Edward personally, with which he held his winter quarters at Linlithgow, could not be fewer than 40,000. 11. That commanded by Sir John Segrave, defeated at Roslin, numbered 20,000 or 30,000 men. And 12. The army with which Edward again entered Scotland in 1303, is described as '*exercitum copiosum*,' 'a power great beyond measure,' consisting of English, Welsh, Irish, Gascons, Savoyards and others. Several of these armies exceeded in numbers that which William of Normandy conquered Saxon England."

Such is an epitome of the overwhelming forces, which Edward, to gratify his unscrupulous ambition, poured into Scotland from 1296 to 1306. In eleven years, no less than twelve great armies; and yet at the end of the term the cruel work had to be begun anew. Wallace was dead, but the heroic example he had set his countrymen was fresh in their minds, and when Bruce took the field against Edward, and got himself crowned at Scone as King of Scotland, they rallied round him, and made such a show of resistance, that the old tyrant felt himself obliged to summon the whole strength of his kingdom to arms, and himself to take the command. "But," says Burns, "his career of ambition and conquest was at an end, and having occupied four days in a journey of six miles, he expired at the village of Burgh-on-the-Sands (on the banks of the Solway Firth), on the 6th day of July, 1307."

—o—

No. 47.

### THE ATHOLL DEER FOREST EXCURSION

TULLIBARDINE'S ATTEMPTED  
BLUFF

**I**N the latter half of August the Marquis of Tullibardine made a bold attempt to set the public mind at rest regarding the merits or demerits of deer forests. He invited six representatives of the working classes from Edinburgh, Glasgow and Dundee to come to Blair-Atholl, and with him go over the Atholl deer forest, and give their opinion whether it, or any portion of it, is fit for human settlement. The delegates were to be

selected from the liberal and unionist parties of the three cities. This was done; and to the six were added two working men from the burgh of Crieff, "which is in the division of Perthshire for which the Marquis is prospective Unionist candidate." Two English barristers, Liberals, residing at Blair-Atholl, were asked to join the party, to collate the evidence, and to prepare a report in connection therewith. We need not go into details concerning the visit of the delegates. Suffice it to say that they were satisfied that on the area which was described to them as being the deer forest of Atholl, they saw no ground suitable for the settlement of crofters, or of an agricultural population of any sort. One of them said, "The forest is composed of heather and stones, moss and bog and swamps, and to speak of using it for small holdings or any other purpose than that to which it is put is utter folly." Another delegate said, "A more barren region I never saw in my life."

On the strength of this report, the Tory press point out how completely the Marquis of Tullibardine has disproved the statements of those who allege that the deer forest system in the Highlands is a great public wrong, and should be done away with by the British Parliament. "The hollowness of this pretension," says *The Scotsman*, "upon which has been based many bitter and groundless attacks upon large owners of uncultivated land, has frequently been exposed; but probably never before in the striking way devised by the Marquis of

Tullibardine. \* \* \* It can hardly be doubted that if a similar test were applied to other deer forests, the judgment of the investigators would be similar." Such is the pronouncement of *The Scotsman* on the subject, and we think we are not far wrong in assuming that the Tory press generally, and indeed all organs of opinion that are influenced by the landed class and by men of wealth, are of the same opinion; and that the land now used as deer forests cannot be applied to a more beneficial purpose.

A very little consideration will show that this test of the Deer Forest question, as carried out by the Marquis of Tullibardine, is a very superficial one, and touches merely the fringe of the dispute. In fact, the whole case is given away by the statement of facts as published by *The Scotsman* from the lips of the Marquis. "This part of the ducal property," he said, "comprised 106,000 acres, and of that only 4000 acres were cultivable. The rest was in permanent pasture, woods, and deer forest; chiefly deer forest. The Atholl deer forest, which was the oldest in Scotland, was part of the ancient royal hunting grounds of the Scottish kings. It had never been anything but a forest; *it was all 1000 feet above sea level.*" We have italicised the important part of the above statement, and from it we learn that the area of which the delegates expressed opinions so favourable to the views of the Marquis, was all a thousand feet above sea level. From this crude expression of opinion, it is sought to draw the conclusion that

the whole of the area of the deer forests in Scotland, amounting to nearly four millions of acres is practically of the same character. "It can hardly be doubted," says *The Scotsman*, "that if a similar test were applied to other deer forests, the judgment of the investigators would be similar." If the area to be judged is only mountainous tracts one thousand feet above the sea-level, the assertion might be granted. But the important fact is here left out, that the reservation of the mountainous land one thousand feet above sea-level, means that all the land in the glens and straths and tablelands adjacent, however suitable for cultivation and for supporting a Highland population, is ruthlessly depopulated, so that the deer on the adjacent mountains may not be disturbed. This is the crux of the whole question, and it is carefully evaded by the plan adopted by the Marquis of Tullibardine, and of course it is not opened up or alluded to by his advocates in the Press, or his supporters in the realm of sport. The great upstanding and historical fact exists, that in the 18th, and beginning of the 19th centuries, the land now under deer forests in the Highlands furnished scores of thousands of the finest soldiers Britain ever had. Without their aid in North America, in the West Indies, in Hindustan, and in Europe the Empire could not have been won, or held when won; and now the glens and straths and moors that produced these gallant men are unpeopled wastes given up to grouse and to deer. It is useless to say that the Highlands now are incap-

able of breeding, or of supporting such men. There is still the same soil and the same climate which bred them a century and a half ago, and only give the inhabitants of the soil fair play, and they would still turn out year by year a hardy and resolute progeny that in every rank of life—even to the highest—would do good service for the State. It is true that certain of the vile and sordid conditions of modern British life would have to be altered. Sport as a source of rent, so far as it interferes with the welfare of the Highland people, would have to be put down and regarded as contrary to public polity. The fish in the streams, and the grazing on the mountains should belong to the inhabitants, as they did under the old clan system from time immemorial, and the value of the water power, now by the progress of science discovered to be of great importance, as affording a new field for industry, should be held as public property, and be used by the State for the benefit of the inhabitants. Now, like everything else connected with the land, it is seized as a new form of property by the landholder of the day. Fortunately, he has not yet been able to put metes and bounds to the dominion of the air, otherwise we landless people should have seen ere this, limits placed on and value demanded for the amount of air we breathe, as well as on the water we use in our villages, towns and cities. The land of a country must be used for the benefit of the people of the country. When or where it is used otherwise, such misuse and abuse of power should be checked

and frustrated by the State, as being against public policy. And if found necessary, the power of taxation should be used to the uttermost to prevent private interest from overpowering public needs and destroying the public welfare. The land was made for the service of man—not for deer and sport.

—o—  
No. 48

### KING EDWARD STILL IN THE SULK WITH EDINBURGH

HIS MAJESTY evidently has a very long memory for slights, and it is well for his subjects that they do not live in feudal times, when a king's wrath, however unjustifiable, had often very rough ways of showing his displeasure to his subjects. On the occasion of the Porteous mob, when the Edinburgh populace took the law into their own hands, and did somewhat rough justice on the person of Captain Porteous, Queen Caroline, the wife of George the Second, threatened to punish the citizens of Edinburgh by sending down troops to Scotland, to lay it waste, and turn it, as she said, into a hunting ground. We have got a long way from those times; and the ways of monarchs, in this Isle at least, have to be more suave and more politic. But human nature remains the same, though times and manners may change, and though kings may have to restrain the violence of their passions or their resentment against offending subjects. Our present ruler, for instance, seems to be unable to forget or to forgive some petty slights or insults he received from some turbulent members of an

Edinburgh mob, when as Prince of Wales he came to Edinburgh in October 1870, to lay the foundation stone of the new Royal Infirmary; although, on the whole, the reception given him was warm and enthusiastic. We have taken the trouble to look up the report of the proceedings of that day in *The Scotsman* (14th October, 1870), and we find that about 200 Masonic Lodges and 4138 members were present.

"Everywhere," says *The Scotsman*, "the Prince and Princess were eagerly looked for, and their appearance was the signal for an outburst of cheering, with waving of hats and handkerchiefs. His Royal Highness kept constantly raising his hat, and bowing in acknowledgement of the cheers with which he was greeted at every step of his progress" (through the streets to the Infirmary). When the carriages arrived near the place of the ceremony "the Band struck up the National Anthem, and the cheers which had hailed the Prince were renewed, with if possible greater enthusiasm than before, and were re-echoed by the multitudes who crowded round the barricades, and swarmed upon the platforms in the immediate vicinity." After the ceremony the Prince spoke, and concluded by saying, "I beg to thank you very sincerely for the very kind and cordial reception you have given me." The Grand Master (Earl of Dalhousie) then called for three cheers for the Queen, which were given with right good will. Hearty cheers were also given for the Princess of Wales, for His Royal Highness, and Lord Dalhousie.

On their return to their hotel, "their Royal Highnesses were greeted along the entire line by renewed and continuous acclamations." "The Prince of Wales left Edinburgh in the evening with the ordinary train for the North. \* \* \* On arriving at the station, the Prince was received by the crowd with a general cheer." A Masonic banquet was held in the evening, the Earl of Rosslyn in the chair. He

said, in the course of the evening, that "he was charged by His Royal Highness to tell the Brethren that in all his life he had never met with such a hearty reception."

This was the reception given to His Majesty (then Prince of Wales) according to *The Scotsman*. That paper says nothing of any counter demonstration in the shape of hootings or unpleasant references to a celebrated divorce case with which the name of the Prince had been connected a year or two before. But there is no doubt whatever, we believe, that the Prince was subjected to annoyance of this kind. Well, if he was, surely after he came to the throne, or indeed long before that, the unpleasantness ought to have departed from his mind, seeing that it was a very small ebullition of unpleasantness, compared with the very general and hearty enthusiasm which he received from the great body of the people of Edinburgh. But this is not His Majesty's way. He is evidently vindictive in the extreme; and what is worse, he vents his vindictiveness in the most reckless fashion against the whole people of Scotland. We have dealt with this view of the matter in previous issues—notably in numbers 7 and 8. In the wrath of kings, or of men in high offices of State, there is presumably, generally an element of importance, owing to their position and their power; but it is a peculiarity of King Edward, that when he has exhausted the resources of his wrath in great things, he takes care that it shall not fail even in petty things. He began to revenge him-

self on Scotland by his false and unconstitutional title; he continued to do so by establishing an unconstitutional scale of precedence whereby Scottish noblemen were placed below English noblemen of the same rank, even in Scotland. He thus exhausted his powers of insult against the Scottish nation, and had to find other means of gratifying his vindictiveness. Last year he got his chance of doing so, when passing through Edinburgh, by refusing to see the Lord Provost of the City when he went to pay his respects to him at the Waverley Station. This year he apparently found that this opportunity of venting his spleen would not be accorded to him, owing to the likely determination of the civic authorities to take no notice of his passage through the city. But the royal resources of vindictiveness were not exhausted. If he were not allowed the opportunity of again snubbing the Lord Provost by refusing to see him, why then he would not pass *through* the City at all; he would go round it. And this was what His Majesty did on the 17th of September. He had his train stopped at Niddrie West Junction, on the outskirts of the City, says *The Scotsman*, and thence he went round by the Suburban line to the Haymarket West Junction; from which he proceeded on his journey to Blanefield in Stirlingshire. And all this continued exhibition of petty spite and vindictiveness because he was hooted by a portion of an Edinburgh mob thirty-nine years ago.

When we consider the high posi-

tion that King Edward occupies as the titular head of the British Empire, with its three hundred and fifty millions of subjects and dependants, and that within the last few months this British monarch had under his review in the lower Thames not less than forty miles of warships, headed by an array of "Dreadnoughts," capable of overpowering the fleets of any other nation in the world. When we ponder over these facts, and on the high position this son of man occupies, and then reflect that one of the most unchanging resolves of his intellect, and one of the most determined features of his character, seems to be his desire to slight and to humiliate the civic dignitaries of Edinburgh, because he was hooted and annoyed by some unruly members of a mob thirty-nine years ago. We pause and say, can this be possible? Well, there are the facts staring us in the face; and if an inference more favourable to the character of His Majesty than the one we have drawn can be put forward, we should like to see it.

---

### THE UNEMPLOYED

BY CHARLES WADDIE

(Author of "Modern Political Economy")

ONE of the most serious questions in Scotland to-day is how to deal with the unemployed. Before we can solve the problem we must know the nature of the disease. It is no new phase of domestic life. In the time of Andrew Fletcher there were thousands of vagrants, but the rise of new industries in Scotland has changed the complexion of things,

so it will serve no good purpose to hark back upon the past. Historical precedents give us no help to understand how to deal with the difficulties of the times. Let us clearly understand that the trained artisan is not in the problem, although he is face to face with unemployment for short periods; he is well able to look after himself, and only wants the State to let him alone. This it is wisdom to do unless he trespasses upon the liberty of his fellows, which he sometimes does; then such action should be sternly repressed.

The unemployed are generally those which no man in his senses would ever take into his place of business. They are the waste products of humanity; they never have been self-supporting and never will; all that can be made of them is to make them a less intolerable burden than they are at present. To go to the root of the matter they are the result, for the most part, of imprudent marriages. Boys and girls of the lower orders get married and produce a progeny which they are unable to maintain. Their necessities compel them to send their children to work at casual employment at an early stage to earn bread for the family. The sacrifice needed for a regular apprenticeship at a trade they are unable to make; it is a constant struggle to keep the wolf from the door. It is not easy to find a remedy for this state of things. There is no law to forbid early marriages, and if there were such a law, it would only lead to a worse form of immorality. Our clergy, instead of wasting their time

over effete doctrines, might do much to awaken the conscience of the young as to their duty in this respect, but we fear they are a hopeless crew. Let us now try and classify the unemployed, and see what can be done.

The country loafer is generally a tramp; in passing along the roads of our country we meet him everywhere—Weary Willie, filthy, repulsive, and generally in pairs; but the saddest sight of all is when he has a woman and a train of helpless children at his heels. He is an idle, worthless scoundrel, able to work, but will never do it till he is compelled. These are not the tinker class who live in tents, but not removed from them in worthlessness. The town loafer is of a different stamp; he is generally married and works now and then, but on the whole is maintained by his wife, who goes out charing. What is to be done with this hopeless crew is the great problem of the day. You cannot teach them a trade. They are too old and too dull of intellect to acquire the knowledge fitted for this keen competitive age. Simple labour such as their strength of body is capable of, is all that can be expected of them; but this they should be compelled to do. To get this kind of labour for them is not easy, but it ought to be faced in the interest of the community, and in the interest of the unhappy wretches themselves. We will not put down any dogmatic opinion on the subject, but it seems to us the only feasible plan is to employ them in reclaiming waste land. There are many thousands

of acres of land lying waste in Scotland, but it will not pay the proprietors to bring them into cultivation, as no adequate return can be got for the outlay. The State alone can perform this work. In the first place, it will be a dead loss from a money point of view, but from the higher status of humanity, a great gain.

A little experiment, which was made not far from Edinburgh, opened a new chapter in the dealings with the unemployed. A small estate, Murieston, was purchased by the Distress Committee of the city; it was a sour, water-logged place; but by the application of town waste, the land has become valuable through the labour of a section of the unemployed. Some fifteen miles from Edinburgh there is a barren waste of many thousand acres near Carnwath, which might be treated in the same way. Nature has a use for all matter; its wonderful chemistry turns vile, slimy manure into the sweet-smelling moss rose. The refuse of the city might well, then, fertilise this barren waste. Even if the experiment failed to make fertile what is now waste, it could not but improve the country in some way. It is the elevation of the moral character of the men employed that would give the most precious reward for the outlay. No idle sentiment in relation to the liberty of such subjects should be entertained. If a man will not work, neither shall he eat; if he is unfit for liberty, he must endure slavery.

Now, all the above may be very fine, but how are we to attain our object? Scotland has no power over

her destiny. She must go hat in hand to Westminster, and wait there for thirty years to get the smallest crumb of satisfaction. While this dismal farce goes on, thousands of souls are living in misery—a disgrace to themselves and to their country. Let Scotsmen ponder over these things, and seek the natural remedy—a Parliament and Government of their own.

—o—

### SCOTLAND and THE DEVELOPMENT FUND

THE discussion that took place in the Standing Committee of the House of Commons on the 21st ult. on the proportion of the fund that should be allocated to Scotland, merits some attention on the part of the Scottish public. Mr Falconer, member for Forfarshire, moved an amendment that Scotland's share should on the average be not less than an eleventh of the sum voted; and he said this proportion was originally fixed by Mr Goschen with reference to the population and valuation of the three countries. This proportion seemed to have been taken for granted as a fair one. Now, there are several reasons why this proportion must now be regarded as unfair to Scotland; and with regard to this Development Fund, glaringly unfair. First, the position of Scotland as regards population has altered since Mr Goschen's time. The population of Britain in 1908 is given as 44,500,000 in round numbers, and that of Scotland as 4,800,000. This gives Scotland a proportion of nearly a ninth, instead of an eleventh. Second, as regards valuation, it must be remembered

that the valuation of London should not properly be all credited to England. London is not merely the capital of England; it is, especially from a financial point of view, the capital of the empire; and a large proportion of the wealth of the empire, not connected directly with England, is fixed or placed in London, and regarded as part of London wealth; while in reality it belongs partially to Scotland, Ireland and the outlying dominions of Britain, which are not English. But the most serious objection to the proposed proportion of an eleventh for Scotland is this. The Development Fund is intended to develop, not population or persons *per-se*, but land, and industries connected with land or sea. From this point of view, and though it may not be the only point of view, it certainly is one of the main points, the allocation of the Fund should be, not with regard to population or valuation, but to territorial area. The area of the United Kingdom is roundly 121,000 square miles, and that of Scotland is about 30,000, or one fourth of the whole. When it is considered that a large portion of this 30,000 square miles is in the Highlands, which probably more than any other part of the United Kingdom requires development, both on land and along its lochs and bays; and, moreover, would well repay the outlay on it, owing to the hardy and honest character of its people, there is a strong claim for a much larger share for Scotland than an eleventh. A fifth or a sixth seems to us a much more fair and reasonable proportion to Scotland.

As the matter, at the time we now write, is still open, and may be left open till the first weeks of October, we commend the remarks we have here made to the attention of the Scottish members of Parliament and to the Scottish Press generally.

—o—

### PROFESSOR HUME BROWN'S HISTORY OF SCOTLAND \*

AFTER ten years the author has completed his work begun in 1899. Its excellence was at once recognised, and the same qualities reappear in the concluding volume issued this week. In reviewing the second volume dealing with the period from 1560 to 1688, the Reformation to the Revolution, *The Athenæum* said:—

“The promise of Professor Hume Brown’s first volume is more than fulfilled in the second. The author’s thorough knowledge of the sources, his gift of lucid condensation and fine sense of proportion, have made of this comparatively short work the most complete and satisfactory history of Scotland which we possess. His pages are not overcrowded with details, and the reader’s interest is secured by the admirable way in which he is led to find, in the conflict of political and social forces, the gradual evolution of the national destiny.”

The third volume deals with the part of Scottish History that is, perhaps, least familiar to the general reader, who, apart from some hazy recollections of the *Tales of a Grandfather*, has no grasp of the events in the political and economic

development of the country. Yet it must be confessed that, setting aside scientific considerations, much of the century and a half here in review has little interest for the merely general reader in search of the picturesque. What does he know, or even care to know, about the intrigues for place and power between Argathelians and the Squadrone, hungry and inane Hamiltons, Queensberrys, Tweeddales, Stairs and Dundases?

“It is noteworthy,” Carlyle said, “that the nobles of Scotland have maintained a quite despicable behaviour from the days of Wallace downwards—a selfish, ferocious, unprincipled set of hyenas, from whom at no time and in no way has the country derived any benefit whatever.”

Yet the history of Scotland today is the outcome of all these events. Nor is the mere narrative without an interest of its own—the Union, the Religious Settlement, the Rebellions, Moderatism and the rise of the Burghs. The fifty years after the ’45, as Prof. Masson said, are “the period of her most energetic, peculiar and most various life.” It is the period that saw her greatest philosophical and economical contributions to the world in Hume, Adam Smith, Reid, Robertson and Burns. And in the first half of the nineteenth century

“two of her sons spoke to the world as no other writers of the time spoke. Of Sir Walter Scott it has been said that his work has given more wholesome pleasure to a greater number of readers than the work of any other writer, and within the same age the most inspiring word uttered to his generation was that of another Scot, Thomas Carlyle.”

Of recent years we hear less talked about the Pretender than about the

\* *History of Scotland*. Vol. III. From the Revolution of 1689 to the Disruption, 1843. By Prof. P. HUME BROWN, M.A., LL.D. Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Burghs, more about the state of trade and education than about Flora Macdonald and Culloden. Too many tears have been shed over the last Jacobite and the last noble Red Man. Prof. Hume Brown has acted wisely in attempting a sketch of the whole operating causes, though space prevents him giving a full discussion of any. But the material is carefully sifted, well balanced, and clearly presented. Some may regret the absence of the merely incidental and picturesque, yet the true history of Scotland is to be sought, not in accidental eddies of tide like the '15 and '45, but in the Dundas despotism begun in 1783, by which, as Lord Cockburn said, "Scotland became not unlike a village a at great man's gate." Here and there throughout the book the wind may seem to die away from the sails, but this is due rather to the somewhat severe and restrained style of the writer than to any want of insight and sympathy, and the national attitude leaves nothing to be desired.

Of late years the study of Scottish History has been increasingly emphasized in the schools. We happen to know from official information that this is due to the patriotic spirit and influence of the late Lord Linlithgow. For long the weary blight of official snobbery and callous unpatriotic feeling lay on the Scottish Education Department, and still lies. But in the country the tide has turned, and it is now beyond the power of ignorant school inspectors to discourage its place in schools. We hope to see Prof. Hume Brown's book officially prescribed by the

Universities for the Entrance Examinations, and used by teachers for giving a broader and more philosophic insight into causes than can be given by mere compilations. We have been drugged far too long with rigmarole about the English Heptarchy, the Wars of the Roses, the wives of Henry VIII., the Eternal Peace of Utrecht, and all the paraphernalia and phantoms so dear to the ignorant teacher and the unpatriotic snob. DEVA.

---

### BRITAIN versus ENGLAND

A SENSIBLE ENGLISHMAN AT LAST

**I**N *The Publishers' Circular* of 31st July there is a letter from Mr John Wilson of 83 Jamaica Street, Glasgow, the patriotic Honorary Secretary of the Scottish National Song Society, drawing attention to the use of the offensive word, "England," being used instead of "Britain" in a pamphlet entitled "Song for the Boys of Britain." In a footnote to Mr Wilson's letter, the editor of *The Circular* says:—

("No offence and no encroachment on Scottish glory is intended. The word "England" is used to represent the whole United Kingdom.—"Great Britain" will not include Ireland. We admit our Scottish friends have a right to protest, but even Scottish writers, like Carlyle, used "England," meaning the whole boiling—Welsh, Scottish, Irish and English.—Ed.")

To this Mr Wilson replied at some length. "You say no offence is intended," he writes. "You might as well call a man by any offensive phrase you choose, and


then say you did not mean any offence. The fact is, that to call a Scotsman an Englishman, or any other nationality than his own, is an offence. You repeat the offence by saying 'the word "England" is used to represent the whole United Kingdom.' By what right do you assume to call the whole United Kingdom 'England.' It is absolutely wrong historically. . . . The fact that Britain does not include Ireland is no part of the argument. . . . Certainly the word 'England' will not by any kind of inference include Ireland, although 'Great Britain' might include it by inference." In this latter paragraph Mr Wilson underrated the strength of his position. The term, "Britain," does include Ireland, though "Great Britain" does not. For Ireland is "Little Britain," being known to the Romans as *Britannia Parva*, while the larger isle of England and Scotland was termed *Britannia Magna*. O'Connell, the great Irish patriot, used the term, "West Britain," for Ireland. Britain, in fact, is the generic name of the United Kingdom, and to substitute the word England for it is a pure bit of vulgar bumptiousness on the part of Englishmen. The editor in a footnote to Mr Wilson's letter, wrote:—"The ancient Picts who inhabited the Lowlands of Scotland were described by the Romans as rather a rude people. Mr Wilson's letter offers confirmatory evidence of the truth of this description." Then in the same issue followed a silly letter by a Mr Naylor in support of the editor. His intelligence may be gauged by this statement:—

"There are at least fifty reasons why Yorkshiremen are as entitled to be counted in as a separate people as are the Welsh, Irish, or Scottish." In the following number of *The Circular* another foolish letter by a Scotsman, Donald Grant of Glasgow, followed; and this was succeeded in the issue of the 14th August by a letter from a Mr Norman Murray of Montreal, who wrote: "It is to be hoped that this exasperating dispute will be settled sometime. It is becoming a very serious question in the Colonies. . . . Why make so much fuss about the Angles more than the Saxons, Jutes and Normans? . . . Would it not be better to adopt the old original name of 'Britain' when speaking of the whole island and its people, than to try to force the name of a section of the population on the whole. . . . This effort of Englishmen to classify Scotsmen as Englishmen, and Scotland as part of England, does them no good at home or abroad, and only turns friends into enemies."

This forcible letter at last brought to the fore a sensible and fairminded Englishman—a class on this subject "few and far between." He appended to this letter a few remarks which sufficiently rebuked the petulant unfairness and insolence of the editor of *The Circular*, and as he gives no name or evidence of his position, other than that of an authoritative pronouncement, it may be assumed that he writes as proprietor. However this may be, he sums up the position quite fairly and intelligently, and like an honest English gentleman—would that they were more plentiful. If they were

in the majority—or even in a respectable minority—they would soon shame the bullying and insolent portion of their fellow-countrymen into silence, and thus conduce more to the strength and the solidarity of the British people, than a fleet of battleships, or an army corps. Here is a part of what he writes:—

“We think this question has now been sufficiently discussed. It will do good, because if the Englishman uses the word England or English when the whole kingdom is intended, it is manifestly wrong, and gives offence, though he may not give the matter a thought. . . . We English must try to remember the perfectly legitimate claims of the other members of the National Round Table.”



### SOUND THE CLARION

Sound the Clarion! Call to arms!  
 Raise the Liberal battle cry.  
*We* are Freedom's bold gendarmes,  
 Onward, lads, for Liberty.

Take the Peers and lay them low,  
*Who* are they to thwart *our* will!  
 Britons! Strike the final blow,  
 If ye would be Freemen still.

Let us with one voice declare,  
*We* will govern, *We* will rule;  
 Purse-proud peerage have a care  
 Cease! No longer play the fool.

Blow the bugle! Call to arms!  
 Freedom for the toiling mass!  
 Pass the Budget, bold gendarmes,  
 Down with Privilege and Class.

H. L. PEVERIL TURNBULL,  
 17 Castle Street.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### Sport versus People

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")


Sir,—My holiday is finished again for this season. I am fond of going to my native Borderland, where I know of so many interesting historical spots. But I thought I would make a change this year, and so set out for the North. Boarding a train at the Waverley, at 4 a.m., in August, a friend and I after a long ride came out at Aberlour, and wended our way up a glen towards the base of Ben Rinnes. A small stream runs down each side of the glen, as likewise a road. Seeing a number of ruins scattered about, I learned that they had been crofts; one of them, by the way, was called Tamnafoychen, rather an awkward name for a border tongue. After some inquiries about the crofts I learned that a Mr Findlay, connected with *The Scotsman* newspaper, had bought this estate some years ago, and had turned out thirty-two of these crofters. I was told they paid small rents; many of them kept a cow, and some two, and even a horse with poultry and a pig; and that they all seemed to make a decent living. What more could a crofter expect to do? But the time came when these poor Scotsmen had to bid farewell to their native homes in the glen. Before they finally left, many a tear no doubt fell, for they would never believe that God had created the bens and glens for a few tyrannical landlords to possess for the mere shooting at game. I was told that before the

eviction of the crofters it was a sight to see so many healthy, rosy-cheeked children come down the glen from the heathery sheilings to school. All were plainly dressed; a good few in kilts, and all were tidy and clean. We may say now "The Floo'rs o' the Forest are a' wede awa'." Where are they now? Perhaps some in foreign lands, some forced into the slums of a big city.—I am, sir, yours, etc., ALEX. LAIDLAW.

DR SAMUEL JOHNSON. — The English (or rather the Saxon, or southern English, for the northern English do not seem to have had much to do with it) have lately been celebrating the bi-centenary of Dr Johnson, and have been acclaiming him as one of the great ones of their race, whom they most delight to honour. There is no accounting for taste, or, to go a little further, for racial judgment in such a matter; but we must own that to other peoples than the people to whom Dr Johnson racially belongs, viz., the Saxon-English, the placing of Dr Johnson amongst the great ones of the kingdom is a choice that seems strange and difficult to understand. He was not a man of genius; he has left no work that has now any influence on men's thoughts, or minds; he was coarse in his intercourse with his fellows; he ate in a rude and hoggish manner; he was boorish and insolent to strangers; he was childishly superstitious, was bigoted in the extreme, was utterly inconsistent in his political principles, and was an out-and-out hater of all the neighbouring nations of England — Scots, Irish, Dutch,

French, etc. A man with such a record is surely a queer choice for a national hero, or great man. We suppose the explanation is to be found in the fact that he is fairly representative of the leading bad, as well as the leading good traits in the Saxon-English character; and, as such, they overlook his weak and offensive points, and magnify his strong ones—his great industry, his powerful understanding, his pointed though brutal wit, and his charity and his tenderness in his family relations. There was probably not one of the great men of Johnson's time who was more gentle and in-offensive, and more entitled to courtesy and kindness from his fellows, than Adam Smith, the author of "The Wealth of Nations." Yet the rude and brutal Johnson treated Smith, when he met him, with the greatest insolence. They met at Glasgow, where they had an unpleasant interview. According to Sir Walter Scott, Adam Smith was asked after the interview, when he seemed much ruffled in his manner, what had happened. Smith would only answer, "He's a brute; he's a brute." And, no doubt, Adam Smith had good reason for his remark.

THE ENGLISH RULING PASSION "STRONG IN DEATH."—The conversation turned upon Pitt's dying words, and I mentioned Lord Brougham's version of them. Nassau Senior said "I know what Wilberforce's dying words were." "What were they?" we eagerly asked. "I think I would like some more of that gravy out of that pie."—(*Grant Duff's Diary*, pp. 193-4, vol. i.)



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 16.

November 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—	
No. 49.—THE POLITICAL CRISIS AND SOCIALISM	242
„ 50.—THE YOUNG SCOTS SOCIETY AND HOME RULE . . . . .	244
THE SCOTTISH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION: ITS CLAIM FOR A GOVERNMENT GRANT . . . . .	246
NOTES ON SCOTTISH SONGS. By W. KEITH LEASK . . . . .	249
SCOTLAND'S WORK AND WORTH. By D. G. M'K. . . . .	252
CORRESPONDENCE—SCOTTISH HERALDRY AND HISTORY	255
THE UNION FLAG: ITS HISTORY AND DESIGN . . . . .	256



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

No. 16.

NOVEMBER 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 49

### THE POLITICAL CRISIS AND SOCIALISM

IF we are to believe the Tory press and a large number of men who formerly professed Liberal principles, but have now renounced them, the present Ministry, by means of its Budget, is giving the country over to Socialism. It is pretty evident that the immense majority

of those who join in this cry do not know what is meant by Socialism, and simply adopt the cry because it is for the time the Tory party bogie. So far as we can see, the British people are at the present as little disposed to join in a Socialist propaganda as any people in Europe, and so far from the principles of taxation embodied in the Budget being Socialistic, they are more likely to check any public tendency that way than to foster it. As we understand Socialism, it is the endeavour to make the State the sole creator of wealth and the sole employer of labour as against the present system of individual enterprise and private industrial organisation. In what respect does the Budget discourage the latter and encourage the former? It taxes the surplus wealth, and takes a small portion of the unearned increment of land for the benefit of the community. If money must be raised for national defence or for the amelioration of the lot of the poor, it is evident that if it is taken from the surplus wealth of the well-to-do, instead of from the scanty incomes of the lower middle class and the ordinary work-

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

*OUR July issue completed the twelve months' publication of THE THISTLE. We would recommend those of our subscribers who intend binding their copies to wait to the end of the year and make the first volume one of seventeen issues instead of twelve. This will allow the future volumes to begin and end in the same year.*

*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.*

ing class, that such action involves the least possible interference with the welfare of the great mass of the people. But it is said, if you interfere with the accumulation of capital you lessen the amount of the fund out of which wages are paid, and so lessen employment. This cry does not come from the great employers of labour, but from the idle rich, from the great landholders who have become wealthy through the monopoly of land which has been established during the last two centuries, and from the great financiers who have made immense fortunes, not by large employment of labour, but by bold and daring speculations. In a country where public order is likely to be disturbed by the discontent of the masses, as we see is the case in Russia through extreme poverty, or as is the case in Germany, Spain and Italy from the restriction of popular freedom, then the possession of great wealth is precarious because it is not made to pay its fair share of the burdens of the State. But where it is made to do so it is safe to say that in such a country wealth is safe from public disorder, because it is made subject to the public welfare, and is not allowed to oppress and over-ride the interests of the mass of the people to the benefit of the classes who possess it.

But Socialism is growing, exclaim the Tory press, and the measures of the present Ministry are encouraging its growth. Socialism may be growing, undoubtedly is slowly growing, but in Britain, so far as we can see, it is not growing a whit faster than is proper and natural, for, let it be

well understood, the principles of Socialism are up to a certain point beneficial to Society, and so long as they are beneficial they will gradually be adopted by the State, and where they are not beneficial they will on the contrary be opposed and resisted by the public good sense of the community. What, for instance, is the British Post Office but a great bit of national Socialism? What—to go to the root of things—is the Police System but another bit of Socialism, or, for that matter, the Army and the Navy? These are establishments created by the State for the establishment of internal order, and for the maintenance of the national safety against foreign enemies, and though they do not create wealth they are protective of it, and therefore necessary to its existence. In Australia all the railways are the property of the various States, and a most advantageous and profitable adoption of the principle of Socialism have they proved to be for the benefit of the people of Australia. Had the system of railways in Australia been left to private enterprise, it is safe to say that the Commonwealth would not, by a long way, have been so populous or so prosperous as it now is. Socialism, then, is not a public danger, so long as it is kept within reasonable limits and is restricted to national enterprises which the State can conduct with advantage and with profit to the public. We see no great desire in this country to extend the working of Socialism beyond these safe limits, and therefore we regard the cry of the Tory party that the Liberal party is pre-

cipitating the country into the dangers of extreme Socialism as an unworthy attempt to mislead the public. On the contrary, it may be truly said that the principles on which the present Budget is based, viz. (1) the throwing of the burden of taxation on surplus wealth, and (2) the plan of breaking down the unjust and iniquitous monopoly of land which the privileged classes have built up so securely and so carefully since the downfall of the monarchic power—we say that the carrying out of these two great measures by means of the Budget is the best safeguard against the extension of Socialism to that wild and visionary extent which we see advocated by the oppressed and therefore reckless democracies of the Continent. For us Scottish patriots, of course, the Budget has this further advantage, that by it and through it the deadening influence of the House of Lords on progressive legislation, and especially on the carrying out of a great measure of *Home Rule All Round*, is almost certain to be destroyed. Scottish Liberals and Scottish patriots have thus two most powerful reasons for rallying in all their strength to the support of the Budget. They will help to free the land of Britain from the evils of an injurious and class monopoly, and they will also help to secure for their country the privilege and the power of having their own national affairs controlled and administered in accordance with Scottish interests and with Scottish ways of thought. We have been far too long under the thralldom of English ignorance and English

arrogance, and it is high time that Scottish work and Scottish needs should be carried out by Scottish hands and by Scottish heads. Is there any country in the world more fitted to govern itself than Scotland? There is only one country that will say nay to this, and that is England when under a Tory Government! Let us then firmly support the present Budget, and so take a long stride towards *freedom* from English meddling and English domination.

—o—  
No. 50

### THE YOUNG SCOTS SOCIETY AND HOME RULE

THE *Evening News* (Edinburgh) of the 14th October has a report of an interesting meeting of the Edinburgh centre of the Young Scots Society, when the question of the formation of a Scottish National Parliamentary party was the subject of debate. The motion for the establishment of such a party was defeated by a majority of 38—the numbers who voted for and against are not given—but evidently much more will be heard of this question before long. The Young Scots Society is an active organisation full of life and vigour; but hitherto it has been dominated by the parliamentary politicians, who use it to serve their own political ends. If the Society is content to be so guided, it seems to us that it cannot justify its existence; for practically it is now little better than the fifth wheel of a coach, and it may as well merge itself in the larger and more important organisation of the Scottish Liberal party. That body again is practically merged in the

English Liberal party, which consistently and persistently ignores Scottish rights and Scottish ideas, and treats Scotland with less consideration than Lancashire and Yorkshire, to say nothing of Ireland. It is true that the Young Scots Society places Home Rule for Scotland in a prominent part of its programme, but that means practically nothing, so long as it allows its policy to be guided by the Scottish wing of the English Liberal party. Let the facts be plainly looked at, and the futility of expecting any decided action in favour of Scottish Home Rule from the English Liberal party is obvious. Go back and take note of the action of Mr Gladstone when in the heyday of his political power. Consider how he humbugged his faithful Scottish followers, and led them on from one delusion to another, but all the while carefully avoiding doing anything to relieve Scotland from its degrading position of being simply a political annexe to England. Then consider the subserviency and indeed servility of the English Liberal party to the Irish party then and now. What enables the Irish party to dominate English Liberalism? Simply their unanimity as a purely Irish party, and their determination to stand aloof as an Irish party from British politics, and to act and work only to secure Home Rule for Ireland. Scotsmen are supposed to be a race that looks facts in the face; why, then, when the highest interests of their country is concerned, do they shut their eyes and refuse to see that Home Rule for Scotland can

only be got by following the Irish plan of action, and not the English one. The English politicians simply make a tool of those of Scotland. Did not Morley cynically tell the Scottish Home Rule Association that the Liberal party could not grant Home Rule to Scotland, because then the Tory party would be able to govern England? And why should not the Tory party govern England if they have a majority there? Is it not one of the first principles of true Liberalism that the majority of a people should rule that people? Why should Scottish Liberals be called in like a band of political Janissaries to coerce and hold down the English Tories? That is not true Liberalism, and Morley by this utterance of his only showed that he is a hypocritical politician; just as his brother Cabinet Minister, the so-called "Grand Old Man," proved himself to be towards Scotland, a humbugging one. Let the advocates of a Scottish National party in the Young Scots Society then take heart of grace, and go on with their movement. Common sense and the facts of the question are in their favour, and every discussion of the matter by the Society must tend to strengthen and to advance their cause. When there is a Scottish National party in the House of Commons of say twenty-five members, these joined to the seventy Irish and thirty Welsh members could compel the selfish and reluctant English members to do justice to Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Then, and then only, when we get Home Rule All Round, can we have a happy and a United British People!

## THE SCOTTISH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION

### ITS CLAIM FOR A GOVERNMENT GRANT

THANKS to the ineffectiveness of the Scottish representatives in Parliament and the subordination of national to merely party loyalty, the neglect of Scottish interests by successive Governments bids fair to become a permanent grievance. In a moment of "parochial patriotism," Lord Rosebery, not long ago, ventured the opinion that "the time may come when, if this treatment continues, the Scottish nation may be compelled to examine more directly than they have yet into the benefits they have received from the Treaty of Union." Long-continued, persistent violation of both letter and spirit of that international compact has already led many patriots to conduct such an examination with the inevitable result that they are now in some doubt as to whether the much-lauded benefits are not, after all, more than counter-balanced by the disadvantages. Hardly a day passes but brings fresh proof of the shameless manner in which the treaty rights of Scotland are disregarded, and her national sentiment openly flouted by the geographically predominant partner in the Union, aided and abetted—more's the pity!—by a few highly-placed but apostate Scots.

Even in the field of Antarctic exploration and research, Scotland cannot get fairplay. Attention has recently been re-directed to the fact by the announcement of the

Government's intention to recommend Parliament to make a grant of £20,000 towards the cost of Lieutenant Shackleton's South Polar Expedition. As the public memory is proverbially short, it is well that they and their parliamentary representatives should be reminded that when the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition was projected a few years ago by our intrepid countryman, Dr William S. Bruce, F.R.S.E., strenuous efforts were unsuccessfully made to secure assistance from Government. Scottish public spirit had to carry out the project, unaided by a single penny from Imperial funds. Carefully organised and equipped, the expedition, under the expert leadership of Dr Bruce, more than justified by its achievements the support it had received. In practical results of the greatest importance and scientific value, it has been excelled by no other Polar expedition of recent times. Over and above the important scientific records of Dr Bruce and his colleagues on the *Scotia*, the nation has benefited in other ways from the expedition. The finest collection of Antarctic seals and birds in the world has been gifted to the Royal Scottish Museum, while the British Museum, as well as universities and many other public institutions, have also participated in the tangible results. The Admiralty itself is indebted to the expedition for bathymetrical surveys, chartings and soundings of over ten thousand miles of previously unknown seas. But space does not permit of anything like a complete list of the additions to

human knowledge made by the Scottish explorers. Enough has probably been said, however, to indicate that they have worthily upheld the name and fame of Scotland in science, and the prestige of the British Flag in Polar exploration and research. And what has been their reward? Of seven Antarctic expeditions the Scottish is the only one to receive absolutely no recognition from its Government! Belgian, French, German and *two* English expeditions have each been granted financial aid by its Government.

Even assistance in the working up of the scientific material was refused by our Government departments, unless the material gathered with Scottish money was deposited in London—a condition that was rightly not accepted. After three handsome volumes had appeared, Dr Bruce was forced to make an appeal through the press for a sufficient sum of money to enable him to complete the publication of the scientific results of his and his colleagues' three years' arduous and unostentatious labours in the frozen South. Owing, no doubt, to the industrial and commercial depression, the response has been altogether inadequate to the purpose. But why should voluntary subscriptions have to be depended upon in a case of this kind? Contrast the treatment of the Scottish expedition with that accorded to the contemporary English one under Captain Robert F. Scott in the *Discovery*. Although the latter's initial resources were immeasurably greater than Dr Bruce's, it received a grant

of £45,000 from Government, and was lent officers and men from the British Navy. Not only that, it was supplied with large quantities of stores and instruments from Government departments, and was relieved at Government expense. The naval officers and men received promotion on their return, and they and the civilians were made the recipients of medals and decorations from the King. Yet the *Discovery* Expedition was organised and supported in England in exactly the same way as the *Scotia* Expedition was in Scotland. Both were merchant service vessels flying the Blue Ensign of Britain, both undertook similar work, but the Scottish enterprise goes unrewarded, unrecognised and unhonoured, while the English one receives national recognition and financial assistance to the tune of £45,000. And now £20,000 is to be given to another expedition organised in England! Scotsmen grudge neither the one nor the other of the English enterprises its due meed of national recognition, but the glaringly inequitable treatment of the equally deserving claims of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition calls for the most emphatic protest and redress. *The Glasgow Herald*, commenting on Dr Bruce's appeal for funds, said:—

“Dr Bruce rightly insists on the national aspect of his complaint. It is certainly undesirable that Scottish and English interests should be placed in opposition. But the responsibility for mischief-making between nationalities rests with the Government, so clear a case is it of favouring the enterprise of one at the expense of another. The enforced closing of Ben Nevis Obser-

vatory created no little national soreness. This is another hard case. . . . There is no question of the *Scotia* being a mere competitor producing redundant work. Her record stands as a distinct and valuable achievement. Scottish Liberal members rarely lose an opportunity of proclaiming that they stand for nationality. Let them in this matter prove the sincerity of their professions. They have numbers, and they have persistence enough in all conscience—advantages which they might use in reminding the Government that it is not merely the Government of the United Kingdom collectively, but the Government of the nations composing it as well.”

More recently the same paper drew attention in a leading article to the valuable work done by Dr Bruce in his recently returned expedition to Spitzbergen. We quote the following as a deserved tribute to Dr Bruce, and as weighty confirmation of what we have just said regarding the importance of his work:—

“If the Briton felt a little out of it in reading the stories of Dr Cook and Commander Peary, the Scot, at least, must have felt decidedly in it while reading Dr Bruce’s account of the recent survey of Prince Charles Foreland. The *Conqueror* Expedition was as thoroughly Scottish as the *Darien* Expedition of two centuries ago, and it was as fortunate as that lamentable venture was disastrous. The names of those who sailed from Leith with Dr Bruce in July last were representative of the sound and steady progress that Scotland has been quietly and independently making during the last ten years in the various departments of topographical research. Of that progress Dr Bruce’s own career may be taken as the epitome and type. There has been nothing flashy or sensational about it. Its public phase began with a species of scientific martyrdom at Ben Nevis Observatory, where, out of the thistle discouragement, he plucked the fruit of practical results. The closing of Dr Bruce’s

meteorological work in his own country was, indeed, a blessing in disguise, since it threw him definitely into that province of Arctic and Antarctic survey, in which he has achieved a record unexcelled by that of any other European savant. Philosophical instruments have left no room for flags or sealed tubes in Dr Bruce’s outfits, and if he has added no ice-fields or volcanoes to British territory, he has definitely extended the territory of Knowledge. . . . It is cause for national self-complacency that his later and more important enterprises, in which he has acted as organiser and leader, have been carried out under purely Scottish auspices and with Scottish funds. The *Scotia* Expedition of five years ago, which resulted in the discovery and survey of 150 miles of the Antarctic coastline and in the bathymetrical survey of a large area of the South Atlantic ocean, was unquestionably the most scientifically valuable of recent expeditions in that region, and the expedition from which he has just returned has been no less useful.”

We understand that a formal application is being made to Government for financial assistance to complete the publication of the scientific records of the *Scotia* Expedition; and, acting independently, the Scottish Patriotic Association recently resolved to petition the Prime Minister to take into favourable consideration the claims of the Scottish Expedition to the same recognition from the Government as has been accorded to the two English Expeditions. So far, so good; but that is not enough. We submit that the Scottish representatives, jointly and severally, irrespective of party, are in duty bound to voice this palpable national grievance in the House of Commons at the first opportunity, and use their most strenuous endeavours to have it remedied. Let them but spare a

few minutes to investigate the matter for themselves, and we are confident that not a man among them—be he Radical or Tory—but will agree that we have understated the grievance, and that it was his manifest duty, as a Scottish Member, to urge the Government to do justice to the brave and priceless achievements of the Scottish National Antarctic Expedition. It may be objected that it is now too late to render the expedition any assistance. It is not. At the present moment there are in the Scottish Oceanographical Laboratory at Edinburgh numerous large tanks, full of rare and in some cases unique specimens, which have not yet been properly examined and reported on by experts, no funds being available for the purpose. These valuable specimens are only kept from going to waste by the expenditure of a large part of Dr Bruce's private income—a fact as creditable to Dr Bruce as it is discreditable to the Government. And the completion of the scientific results of the expedition is prevented by the lack of the necessary sum of £5000.

\*

THACKERAY ON ENGLISH IN-SOLENCE.—“Many foolish exactions and petty tyrannies, the habitual insolence of Englishmen towards all foreigners, all colonists, all folks who dare to think their rivers as good as our Abana and Pharpar, the natural spirit of men outraged by our imperiousdomineeringspirit, set Britain and her colonies to quarrel.” (*Thackeray in “The Virginians,”* p. 326, vol. ii.)

### NOTES ON SCOTTISH SONGS

WHEN Burns wrote *Afton Water* to Mrs Stewart of Afton Lodge, he had in his head lines that gave him the hint. The thing is significant, and shows him not as the untutored peasant genius of his illiterate admirers, but as the well-read man, working on earlier material sifted by a clear judgment and taste. He read, as we know on his own authority, old volumes of the *Spectator*, and in No. 400, a paper by Steele, he had come across a quotation from the Sixth Pastoral of Ambrose Philips. With most men the hint would have lain dormant, but they afforded a situation to Burns. Philips wrote:—

Breathe soft, ye Winds, ye Waters *gently*  
flow,  
Shield her, ye Trees, ye Flowers around  
her grow,  
Ye Swains, I beg you, pass in Silence by,  
My Love in yonder vale asleep does lie.

Burns took this and made it immortal in

Flow *gently*, sweet Afton, among thy  
green braes,  
Flow gently, I'll sing thee a Song in thy  
praise;  
My Mary's asleep by the murmuring  
stream,  
Flow gently, sweet Afton, disturb not her  
dream.

There is a song whose last line baffles the singers, who are under the delusion that it refers to some subtle form of convivial enchantment, with Highland honours. The song has gone all round the world, yet few are aware that it was the proceeds of the lines, set to music by Peter M'Leod, that went to rail in the statue of Burns on the Calton

Hill. We allude to the well-known song by the Rev. Henry Scott Riddell:—

“Then Scotland’s right and Scotland’s  
might,

And Scotland’s hills for me,—  
I’ll drink a Cup to Scotland yet,  
*Wi’ a’ the honours three.”*

It may be safely asserted that not one in a thousand, at home or in the Colonies, that sing the song, has any conception of its meaning. The lines are not convivial, but pathetic, and recall what Scotsmen of all classes should remember. They are a memorial of our lost nationality and individual existence, which we trust to live to see restored. They refer not to drink, but to the Scottish Regalia, and their discovery in Edinburgh Castle by Sir Walter Scott, in the well-known passage of the *Life* by Lockhart. There was a wave of patriotic feeling excited all over Scotland; and, in the conviction that Scotland was once more a nation, Riddell wrote the song, with reference to “the three honours” of the “crown,” “sword,” and “sceptre.” Read in this light, Riddell’s own explanation, every allusion in the song becomes plain. The lines on *The Regalia*, by Lady Nairne, are of an earlier date, and refer to the feeling of despondency at the time in the nation, and to the belief that at the Treaty of the Union, and in defiance of its express stipulation, the “honours” had been secretly conveyed out of the Kingdom by the English Commissioners.

—  
The tide of the national melodies

reaches its high-water mark in Jean Elliot’s *Flowers of the Forest*. Its reference to Flodden is obvious and confessed, but the song sung to the same name is by Alison Rutherford, Mrs Cockburn, and has nothing to do with the national disaster. Yet everyone believes it has, and so did we years ago, hearing the immortal air sung at the top of the old Waverley Stairs, in the grey morning of the anniversary, with a thunder cloud looming over Holyrood. The late Professor Masson, in his course of lectures to the English Class, used incidentally to refer to the fact that the lines had no connection with the battle, but the remark was always taken with ill-concealed incredulity. It was the third stanza that formed the constant quotation of Scott, and which is the source of the misconception:—

I’ve seen the morning  
With gold the hills adorning,  
And loud tempest storming before the  
mid-day.  
I’ve seen Tweed’s silver streams,  
Shining in the sunny beams,  
Grow drumly and dark as he row’d on  
his way.

Mrs Cockburn’s lines are older than Miss Elliot’s, but they have only to be read in the light of the clue, which Scott well knew, to disclose the true meaning, which refers not to the battle but to the morning of life in the writer overcast by early financial trouble. “I have often heard,” writes Scott to Lord Dalkeith (*Letters* I, 60), “my grandmother talk of the waefu’ year when seven *Lairds of the Forest*, all Scotts, became bankrupt at once.”

What tune has been so familiar to Scots in the streets for the last twenty years as *The Bonnie Banks of Loch Lomond*? What signal charm has attracted the vagrant Teuton and the itinerant organ grinder of the Tyrol to this hackneyed air? Mr Andrew Lang has declared it ancient, and books of repute refer to it as "about 1748," "ancient," "Jacobite." It is all a delusion. No copy has ever been found beyond 1838, and that alone should raise suspicions. It was heard for the first time in the Gallowgate of Aberdeen by John Forbes Robertson, the father of the well-known actor. In a letter, dated 11th December 1901, he said, "even 1838 should be antedated—early in the thirties." It was sung, like the fine old air of *Hunting Tower*, as a duet; and Robertson was so struck with the capabilities of the air that some years after he gave it, with the words heard, to David Kennedy, the Scottish vocalist. By his instrumentality the song was sung all over the Colonies and at home, while Professor Blackie made it a character sketch in his wanderings in hydropathics, Highland hotels, and Edinburgh drawing-rooms. Only *Rothsay Bay* has in the course of the last thirty years rivalled it in popularity.

And the writer of this delusive ancient gem of song? As in the case of *The Flowers of the Forest*, *Auld Robin Gray*, and *Hardicanute*, a woman has been at the bottom of it all! Lady John Scott, who died in 1900, and who is the composer of the immortal air, *Annie Laurie*, never exactly claimed it, but

dropped in her later years hints to show it was her early work. The tune is only a new version of the *Bonnie House o' Airlie*. How dear to the singer is the line about "the high road and the low!" With what unction does the *basso* strike in! Of the meaning they have no conception, or about as little as Mr Micawber had, as he confessed, of the dialect in *Auld Lang Syne*. Her explanation was to the effect that it referred to the plaids strapped up at Carlisle in 1746, after the Jacobite Rebellion, like Evan Maccombich, in *Waverley*. The soul of the lover was to wing its way by "the high road of Heaven," and meet his sweetheart "in Scotland" before she could arrive there by "the low road to Glasgow." The thing has come to stay, but it is about time that the halo of myth and absurdity should be dissipated. She lives for ever in that magnificent air of *Annie Laurie*, and can well afford to forget the cheap popularity of *Loch Lomond*.

W. KEITH-LEASK.

DOUGLAS'S LONDON-SCOTTISH YEAR-BOOK, 1909-10. — We have received from the publisher, Mr John Douglas, Douglas Wharf, Putney, London, a copy of this useful publication. It contains a list of all the Scottish Associations, Clubs, Churches and Institutions in London, with lists of their chief office-bearers, and much other information of interest to London Scotsmen; indeed, to many of them further afield. Mr Douglas has spared no pains to make this year-book correct in its details, and useful and interesting to his fellow-townsmen. The publication is well got up, and its price is only sixpence.

**SCOTLAND'S WORK AND WORTH\***

PROBABLY not even the most optimistic of the little band of despised and ridiculed patriots, who formed the Scottish Patriotic Association in 1901 for the primary object of protesting against the assumption by the King of the unconstitutional and historically false title, "Edward VII.," could have foreseen the far-reaching effects that in eight short years have followed that assertion of Scottish national rights. It was the Association, under the wise leadership of the late Rev. David Macrae, that was responsible for initiating the patriotic movement, to which more than to any other agency is attributable the present notable revival in the teaching of Scottish History in our schools. That this revival is both deep-rooted and widespread is manifest on every hand. From it has sprung the influentially supported project to establish a fully-endowed Chair of Scottish History and Literature in Glasgow University, which will put the copestone to the Association's work by ensuring that many of the teachers themselves receive proper instruction and training in these allied and vital subjects. In furtherance of that project, there is now another to promote a great Scottish Exhibition of National History, Art and Industry in Glasgow during the summer of 1911, the primary purpose in view being to complete from the

surplus the necessary sum of £20,000 for the endowment of the proposed Chair. The success of the Exhibition, for the site of which the Glasgow Corporation has granted the use of a large portion of Kelvingrove Park, is practically assured beforehand. All classes of Scotsmen have accorded the promoters support of the most cordial and practical nature. Thus from humble and despised origins emerge great and universally acclaimed results.

One of the most welcome signs of this re-awakening of the national spirit effected by the work of the Scottish Patriotic Association and its offshoots has been the demand for new and improved historical text-books for Scottish schools. Many such have been published recently, but for teachers and for general reading little or no provision had been made until a week or two ago, when the first part of "Scotland's Work and Worth" made its appearance. This notable work is from the able pen of Mr Charles W. Thomson, M.A., F.E.I.S., Rector of Larkhall Academy. Mr Thomson's name is well known to Scottish patriots as that of one who took a prominent part in founding the Scottish Patriotic Association, of which he is a vice-president. As was to be expected from one occupying that position, his work makes a strong appeal to the lovers of Scotland and her great past. Avowedly it has been his constant aim to trace the unity of purpose running through the entire course of Scottish History, and his earnest desire has been to

\***Scotland's Work and Worth.** By Charles W. Thomson., M.A., F.E.I.S. To be published in fourteen fortnightly parts, at 7d. nett. By Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, Edinburgh.

add some impetus to those recent movements which make for a revival of the better features of Scottish life and character. This in itself should be sufficient recommendation of his work for most patriotic Scots, but in addition it will be found to make an equally strong appeal to many who lay no special claim to that title.

The work is on almost entirely new lines. It epitomises Scotland's story from early times to the twentieth century, and reviews briefly but suggestively the contributions of Scotsmen in peace and in war to the growth of the British Empire and the progress of the world. While the salient features of pre-Reformation times are sufficiently dealt with in bold outline, it is in his treatment of the stirring times of Reformation and Covenants that Mr Thomson begins to be most effective. Indeed no more impartial yet full-blooded and satisfying account of these difficult periods in the evolution of the Scottish nation has been offered in popular form to the reading public. But it is probably in his account of the Union of Scotland and England and his discussion of the constitutional bearing and significance of that truly epoch-making event in British History that Mr Thomson is most conspicuously successful and educative. It is just here that most histories of a popular nature are woefully weak and insipid when they are not deliberately unfair to Scotland. Three lengthy chapters, XIX., XX. and XXI., are devoted respectively to *The Union Negotiations*, *The Treaty of Union—Articles*

i. and iii.—*Britain not England*, and *The Treaty of Union—remaining articles*. From a purely educational as well as a patriotic point of view, these three chapters are in many important respects the most valuable and conclusive in this excellent publication. The Union is very fully considered in all its principal aspects, the point of view being always emphatically but sanely national. As Mr Thomson himself justly remarks, "Nothing could better illustrate both the fairness of the Treaty itself and the extent to which Scottish Treaty rights have been subsequently neglected than a consideration of the First and Third Articles of the Union." The reader is reminded that these two provisions really contain the very essence of the Union, and are of prime importance as showing the equality of status of the two contracting kingdoms. Here there is no question of either party filching the other's honour, but an honourable undertaking to merge the national identity of England and of Scotland in a new and in every sense "united" kingdom. "Now, it does seem strange," Mr Thomson proceeds, "that after the lapse of two hundred years it should be necessary to insist on the very first Article of the Treaty of Union, and to plead for its observance, but 'tis true, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true' that our national names are so constantly misused by people south of the Border, and even by some north of it, as to prove the existence of gross ignorance or carelessness or deliberate dishonesty in quarters where such ought to be least ex-

pected. British monarchs, princes, viceroys, cabinet ministers and members of parliament, historians, novelists, poets, newspaper editors and others in positions of great trust and influence, ought surely to be possessed of at least a rudimentary knowledge of the steps by which the British nation and the British Empire came to be built up, yet we find them repeatedly using the terms 'England' and 'English' when referring to the country and empire as a whole, and when speaking of our army, navy, parliament and monarchy itself. . . . The natural result of all this is to represent England, not as the 'predominant partner' in the empire, but as the sole proprietor; not as a fellow-worker with other parts of these islands in carrying on British history, but as the one and only actor in it all, and as the sole recipient of whatever glory accrues to any part of these isles. Ireland, Wales, and, above all, Scotland, are deliberately bereft of whatever credit is due to them, and are reduced to the level of mere provinces of England." Mr Thomson then gives three conclusive reasons why the proper terms "Britain" and "British" should be undeviatingly used in all matters referring to the United Kingdom or the Empire as a whole. Firstly, Scotland demanded this at the Union, and she demands it today. Secondly, England agreed to the demand, and cannot honestly back out of her agreement. It is pertinently pointed out that anyone who breaks that promise now has to reckon with two questions of conscience, namely, was the pro-

mise of 1707 *genuine*? If so, *when* did it *lapse*? Thirdly, the proper use of the term "British" in relation to matters concerning the whole Kingdom simply brings history and politics into line with geography. So ably and trenchantly is this subject threshed out that the Scottish Patriotic Association would do well to secure their vice-president's permission to reprint these three chapters in pamphlet form for the widest possible distribution. No more educative propagandal literature could be imagined for such an Association.

Space fails in which to deal in particular with the many admirable features of this work, but enough has probably been said to commend it to the readers of *The Thistle*. Besides presenting in a concise, convenient and popular form the outstanding facts of Scottish History, it provides much interesting information regarding the activities of Scotsmen in every sphere of human energy at home and abroad. Scottish Literature (with a special chapter on Burns and Scott), Scottish Music and Song, Scottish Philosophy, Scottish Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, Scottish Regiments in the British Army, Scotsmen as Scientists, Scotsmen in Invention and Engineering, and as Pioneers of Travel and Colonisation are some of the subjects separately and copiously dealt with in the second half of the work.

The author's style is clear, simple and straightforward, unblemished by the slovenliness of thought and expression that too often characterises many publications of a

similarly popular nature. The matter is admirably arranged, and the book undoubtedly is a valuable work of reference on all matters of general Scottish interest. Paper and printing are in every way worthy of the subject. The parts are beautifully illustrated throughout with reproductions of historic Scottish scenes and incidents, pictures of Scotland's heroes and patriots, and portraits of her most eminent sons. Among the illustrations, of which there are over sixty, there are accurate heraldic representations, in colours, of the Flags and Banners of Scotland, England and Ireland, separately and in combination. Pleasure no less than profit is to be derived from the possession of such a book as "Scotland's Work and Worth," which reflects credit on all concerned in its production.

D. G. M'K.

—o—

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

#### Scottish Heraldry and History

(To the Editor of "The Thistle")

GLASGOW, 14th September 1909.

SIR,—Mr John MacNab will find few lovers of heraldry to sympathise with his plea for a return to the customs of the bad old times when, as the Act of 1592 states, "the great abuse that has been amongst the lieges of this Realm in their bearing of arms, usurpand to themselves sik armes as belangis not to them, so that it cannot be distinguished be their arms quha are gentlemen of bluid be their ancestors, nor zit may be discerned quhat gentilmen are descended of noble stock and lineage."

By this Act the King (James VI.)

gave full power to the Lyon King of Arms and his Heralds "to visit the haill armes of Noblemen, Baronnes, and gentlemen borne and used within this realme, to distinguish and discern them with congruant differences, and thereafter to matriculate them in their buiks and registers, and to put inhibitions to all the common sort of people, nocht worthy be the lawe of armes to beare ony signes armorialles."

Penalties were provided for those who should use arms without authority, and by a subsequent Act in 1672 the penalties of escheat and fine were re-enacted, and the Lyon King given power to grant arms to "virtuous and well deserving persons," who had not borne them previously, on their applying to him for a patent. The law of Heraldry in Scotland has been well described by MacKenzie, Nisbet, Seton and other writers, and a return to the days of the promiscuous use of armorial emblems is not to be thought of. It is surely obvious that to bear arms without legal sanction is no sign of gentility, but a piece of vulgar snobbery. Clans (or, rather, clan societies) may meet and elect chiefs, etc., and neither King nor Lyon will interfere; but it is certainly the duty of the Lyon King to examine the pedigree of any claimant to the shield, crest, and supporters belonging to the chief of the clan to which the claimant belongs.

Then, on a question of history, I must join issue with you in the matter of the "false Menteith", the "betrayed of Wallace." It was Lord Hailes, I think, who first rejected Blind Harry's story, and more recent

historians have shown that there is no evidence to connect Menteith with the capture of Wallace. The valet, or varlet, who spied out Wallace was rewarded with English gold; but Sir John Menteith was much too great a man, and I may add too patriotic to be associated with a transaction of that kind. True, Sir John Menteith was governor of Dumbarton Castle, and in that capacity had to guard and transmit Wallace to England; but the garrison and officers of Dumbarton were English, and Menteith could not possibly arrange the escape of Wallace, as it has been suggested he might have done. Menteith's whole life shows him to have been a man of honour, and he was the friend whom Bruce delighted to honour.

The Stewarts are not "a family which is believed to have sprung from a low origin," and as a family they have a patriotic record that is second to none. The extreme statements quoted tend to discredit M'Kerlie as a historian.—I am, etc.,

FESS CHECKY.

---

**The Union Flag: Its History and Design.**

By JOHN A. STEWART. Price 3d.

The Scottish Patriotic Association,  
179 West George Street, Glasgow.


This is a reprint, with additions of the learned treatise on this subject, which appeared in the last Candlemas number of *Scotia*. Mr Stewart has the subject at his finger ends, and deals with it in an able and exhaustive way. It is the fashion with some people to sneer at those who pay attention to such matters, and exclaim, what is the

good of bothering about the colouring or the quartering of a flag. Thus, when Mr Stewart's article appeared in *Scotia*, a very superior personage, writing in the leading columns of the *Dundee Advertiser*, made fun of him, and asked what did it matter if England encroached on Scotland's share of the Union Flag? It was only a flag after all. But flags represent nations and peoples, and no people that is worth anything will allow its flag to be insulted with impunity. An insult to its flag is deemed a just cause of war by every nation if due apology is not given. English encroachments on the Union Flag are, therefore, properly resented by every true Scot, and none but ignorant or Anglicised Scots will or can object to such patriotic action.

---

LORD CURZON'S ADDRESS ON INDIA.—This took place in the Synod Hall, Edinburgh, on the 19th October, as the opening lecture of the session of the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution. Our only object in alluding to it is to draw attention to the numerous slights Lord Curzon inflicted on the national sentiment of Scotsmen, by his improper use on many occasions of the terms "England" and "Englishmen" instead of "Britain" and "Britons" or "Britishmen." Scotsmen especially from 1750 to 1850 did, if not more, at least, as much to build up and consolidate British power in India as Englishmen, and yet Lord Curzon largely ignored their co-operation. This is the usual discourteous and insolent way of many Englishmen, especially "Oxfordised" Englishmen, and perhaps a good deal of the unrest in India may be due to its baneful impact on Indian public policy.

[Note.—Our historical paper and other matter are crowded out.]



# The Thistle

A Scottish Patriotic Magazine

No. 17.

December 1909

Price 1d

## CONTENTS

"THE THISTLE" PAPERS—

PAGE

NO. 51.—HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY—

WALLACE *versus* EDWARD THE FIRST:

A COMPARISON . . . . . 258

„ 52.—MODERN FORMS OF ENGLISH AGGRES-

SION . . . . . 265

„ 53.—BRITAIN *versus* ENGLAND: JOHN BULLY

ON THE RAMPAGE . . . . . 269

NATIONALITY AS AN IMPERIAL FACTOR. By WM. KEITH

LEASK . . . . . 271



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

No. 17.

DECEMBER 1909.

MONTHLY 1D.

## "THE THISTLE" PAPERS

No. 51

### HEADLINES OF SCOTTISH HISTORY

#### Wallace versus Edward the First: A Comparison

OF WALLACE

THE twenty years ending with the close of 1306 form one of the most important, as well as one of the most interesting periods in the history of Britain. Two of the greatest political forces that contend

### EDITORIAL NOTICES

*THIS issue completes our first volume of seventeen numbers. An index is being prepared, which will be given with our January issue. In future each volume will consist of twelve numbers from January to December inclusive.*

*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.*

for supremacy then came face to face—the kingly power of England, backed by all the feudal strength and resources of its great nobles, and the democratic power of Scotland, backed by the spirit, the devotion and the resolute courage of its hardy people. These were the great antagonists during the twenty years of strife and carnage which was ushered in by Edward's unprincipled invasion of Scotland; and it is well, before we go further, to consider the great principles which lay behind each of the contending parties, and also to give an estimate of the characters of the two great protagonists—Wallace, the champion of freedom and of popular and national rights, and Edward the First of England, the representative of kingly tyranny and of cruel and ruthless despotism.

That Wallace was in his day not merely the great patriot, but the great representative of democracy, is indisputable. He was not peasant-born, but was a scion of an ancient and honourable family of country gentry or small landholders. And of these, when their representatives have the good sense

to be content with the fellowship of their own class and of the denizens of the soil around them, and do not become dependents and myrmidons of the great nobles, a nation has generally great reason to be proud. As it has been well said that the most interesting and most attractive part of a country is to be found in the district that lies between the straths or plains and the mountains, so many of the greatest and the most striking leaders of nations have sprung from the class that lie between the peasantry or common people and the privileged class of nobles and feudal superiors who assume that the people and the land of a country exist only for their advantage and their profit.

It was by pure merit—by indubitable force of character—that Wallace became the great leader of the Scottish people. His family had been broken up and separated by the tyranny of the English garrisons in Scotland, his father and brother had been slain, and he and his mother had taken refuge with a maternal relative at Kilspindie in the Braes of the Carse of Gowrie in Perthshire. It was at this time, when he was probably eighteen or nineteen years of age, that he first struck a blow against the enemies of his country. Visiting Dundee, he was grossly insulted by young Selby, the son of the English governor of the place. Wallace replied with some spirit, and was then attacked by Selby and his attendants. He slew Selby with a blow from his staff, and then had to fly for his life. Proscribed as a

public enemy by the English authorities, he had to take to the woods and wilds, and so essentially great was his character that the hitherto unknown and comparatively friendless youth, in the short space of three or four years, became the recognised leader of the Scottish people and the champion of Scotland. His great victory at Stirling Brig in September 1297 freed Scotland for a time, and he was, with Sir Andrew Murray, one of the Scottish nobles, made joint Guardian of the Kingdom. Thus by pure merit alone, by the greatness of his character, he became the leader of the Scottish people. Of his character we will only briefly speak. His humanity was shown by his treatment of the English monks at Hexham; his statesmanship by his organisation of the forces of the Kingdom, with which there can be little doubt he would have successfully repelled the invasion of Edward in 1298 had it not been for the treachery of the great nobles, who were jealous of his ascendancy; his unselfishness and high and pure nobleness of mind were made evident in the latter years of his life by his resignation of his Guardianship when he found it conflicted with the interests of his country. With his deep insight he saw that the day of popular leadership had not yet dawned, and that Baliol being incapable, and Bruce the only claimant for the Crown likely to succeed, he must give him a free and open field. This we take to be the true reason for the withdrawal of Wallace from the leadership of the Scottish people,

and it only adds to the depth of his insight and to the greatness of his character that he retired in favour of Bruce, the only dynastic champion that was likely to succeed. Personal ambition did not exist in the lofty mind of Wallace. With him everything was made subservient to the interest of his country.

If we turn to the English records of the time, we find a very different story. Wallace is described as a low, marauding robber and thief, a rebel, of course, a murderer and slayer of innocent women and children, a man given up to personal ambition, and quite deserving of the cruel fate that finally overtook him. We can understand and overlook such contemporary statements as to the doings and the personality of the great hero, coming as they did from his ignorant and bitter enemies. Such libels were characteristic of the period and of the people. But what shall be said of the statements that we find in the popular histories of England in these days, when the two peoples of Scotland and England have been united under one government for two centuries? Thus in a popular history of England, a book very largely used in English schools, Wallace is described as a murderer and a rebel. In other English books he is termed a thief and a robber, and, generally speaking, there are few terms of opprobrium that are not applied to him by certain English writers.

It is needless to quote the opinions of Scotsmen. These will be held by the ignorant and the arrogant English majority as of no

account, and as springing merely from national vanity and national prejudice. Let us turn, then, to what eminent foreign patriots have said of the illustrious Wallace. In the monument erected to his memory on Abbey Craig opposite Stirling are some testimonials as to his worth from Garibaldi, Kossuth, Karl Blind, Mazzini and Louis Blanc. As many of our readers in distant parts may not have seen these testimonials, we reproduce them here :—

GARIBALDI (*Translation*)

Caprera, 18th May 1868.

“The ashes of the great inspire the great soul to noble deeds. They render holy and loved the land wherein they are cherished.”—FOSCOLO.

And William Wallace, Scotland's noblest hero, sheds as bright a glory upon his valorous nation as ever was shed upon their country by the greatest men of Greece and Rome. — G. GARIBALDI.

LOUIS KOSSUTH

Turin, Italy, 12th May 1868.

Part of that mighty empire, the morning drum beat of whose power keeps the round with the hours of the day, Scotland, free, prosperous and happy, but no longer a distinct State, raised a national monument to the memory of William Wallace, the patriot hero, who, five and a half centuries ago, valorously fought, and with undaunted spirit suffered a martyr's death for the independence of his native country.

This tribute of gratitude is at the same time a testimony borne by a free people to the sanctity of the principle which in all times and in all ages proved and will always prove to be the richest source of the noblest patriotic deeds which illumine the checkered records of humanity.

Doomed myself to the long agony of a sorrowful exile for a cause similar to that for which Wallace laid down his life, akin to him not in merits but in purpose, motive and determination, I feel honoured by being allowed to have my modest share in the tribute of veneration to the memory

of the bravest champion of the independence of that Scotland which, with untiring generosity, has cast such rays of consolation on the dreary path of my desolate life as make me love and honour her to my dying hour like a second home.

LOUIS KOSSUTH.

—  
KARL BLIND (*Translation*)

London, 7th May 1868.

The crime which English kingcraft committed against the Scottish Hero was expiated centuries after through the sentence passed upon a tyrant's head, which broke the chains and slavery. To-day the two nations are united in brotherly union, and the name of Wallace is not a sign of alienation, but a symbol of virtue and of noble devotion, even as are the names of Tell and Winkelried, of Konrad Besserer and Bitwelde.

KARL BLIND.

—  
MAZZINI

12th May 1868.

Noble, disinterested, pure, loving, brave, crowned with the double halo of victory and martyrdom, Wallace shines forth from the dim twilight of the past, the manly teacher of unity between thought and action to Scotland, and among the high prophets of nationality to us all. Honour him; worship his memory; teach his name and deeds through the children of your land. Reverence for the mighty soul of gone times is the safest pledge for future greatness.

JOSEPH MAZZINI.

—  
LOUIS BLANC

May 1868.

"Death makes no conquest of this conqueror,  
For now he lives in fame, though not in life."

To none are these words of Shakespeare more applicable than to William Wallace, whose only ambition was to rescue Scotland from foreign oppression, whose faith in her independence did not waver a single moment, whose patriotic energy never slackened, whose whole career was one of unflinching devotion to his country, whose life was that of a hero, whose death was that of a martyr.

LOUIS BLANC.

These are the testimonies to the character of Wallace from some of the great European patriots of the nineteenth century. What English writers of the same period say of him we have already stated. Which is the truer estimate—the English defilers, or the Continental eulogists?

OF EDWARD THE FIRST

Modern English historians almost invariably give the highest praise to Edward, and affirm that he was one of the greatest, if not the greatest monarch that ever sat on the English throne. They allude occasionally to his faults, to his cruelty, to his faithlessness, and to his reckless disregard of human life, but they say these faults were all outweighed by the greatness of his views as a statesman, by his military skill, and by his excellence as an organiser of the strength and resources of his kingdom. Scotsmen have the best of reasons for differing *in toto* with these views of English historians, for they regard him as a king who brought unparalleled disasters, not only on Scotland, but on the people of Great Britain. To him undoubtedly is chiefly owing all the calamities and loss of property and of life that Scotland and England suffered from 1290 to 1550. That there might have been wars between Scotland and England had Edward never lived is probable, but that the two nations would not have suffered as they did during the period in question but for Edward is certain. And the supreme fact is, that all his aims, which English historians praise so highly, were utterly fruitless. Great usurpers and cruel conquerors or invaders, whose schemes result in

failure, are generally regarded by the verdict of history as unnatural monsters, whose sacrifices scores of thousands of the human race to their unscrupulous ambition. The bigotry and the national vanity of English writers have endeavoured to lift this stigma from the memory of Edward the First. Nay, more, they have endeavoured, as we have said, to place him on a pedestal of traditional greatness, not merely as a monarch, but as a man of just-minded and kindly nature. In our humble opinion he stands out in the history of Britain as one of the most hateful and loathesome figures in the disastrous portion of its record. If ruffianism consists in inflicting on one's fellows wanton injuries and cruelties of the most ruthless and barbarous nature to gratify personal pride, personal vindictiveness, or personal ambition, then in this line Edward stands pre-eminent in British history. He was the *fons et origo mali* of the long wars between Scotland and England, and the consequent loss of an untold amount of property, and the death of—as Defoe says—half a million of the bravest men in Europe. These awful calamities are directly traceable to his unbridled lust for power and his unprincipled ambition. It is not too much to say therefore, that he may be regarded, not as the greatest of British kings, but as the greatest of British ruffians. Not as the constructor or builder-up of British greatness can he be considered, but as its great desolator and retarder for centuries.

It may be said that we are overstating the case against Edward.

It would take a vast amount of Scottish over-statement against him to make up for or counterbalance the English overstatement for him. Even some Scottish historians, for reasons hereafter to be given, have palliated the atrocities of Edward against their country. In our opinion there is no writer on either side who gives a more impartial account of Edward's attacks on the liberties of Scotland than Mr William Burns of Glasgow in his history of "The Scottish War of Independence," which we have often had occasion to quote in these columns. At the same time there is no one who has given a more damaging estimate of his career. Of course, it will be said that Burns, being a Scot, is prejudiced against Edward, but we venture to say that most unprejudiced readers of his history will agree with us that his indictment of Edward's conduct and career as a cruel, ruthless and unprincipled monarch is complete and crushing.

But let us quote, not the testimony of a Scottish but of an English writer, as to the character of Edward. In 1893 Messrs Macmillan & Co. published the "Life of Edward the First," by Professor T. F. Tout of the University of Manchester. Professor Tout is an Englishman, educated at Balliol College, Oxford, and is a fellow of Pembroke College there. His testimony is, therefore, not likely to be tainted with Scottish or any national antipathy to Edward. On the contrary, while on the whole honestly giving many facts that are damnatory of Edward's character, he palliates these in every possible way, and endeavours to present

Edward to the British public as "a high-minded, noble and generous monarch." We will quote pretty fully from his pages, placing in italics the remarks that seem to us either contradictory of the text, or are a flagrantly unfair palliation of the facts as quoted.

Of Edward's youth the Professor writes:—

"Strange tales were told of the lawless deeds wrought by the heir to the throne out of mere love of mischief or wanton cruelty. The progresses of the Lord Edward with his band of 200 horsemen, mostly foreigners, were like the movements of a desolating plague. . . . No common man had any rights that such high-spirited gentlemen could regard as sacred. They stole the horses, the waggons and the provisions that came nearest to their hands. Even monks were spoiled and maltreated by these reckless youths. . . . On another occasion Edward was passing along a road, and out of mere wantonness ordered his followers to cut off an ear and pluck out an eye of a harmless youth who had happened to cross his path. . . . *Yet it is hard to believe that Edward was guilty of anything worse than youthful carelessness and overweening pride in his exalted position*" (pp. 8-9).

This was a pretty beginning for the heir to the throne. The Professor, after alluding to other events in Edward's youthful career, goes on to say:—

"Thus it was, with plans already formed and ambitions already formulated, that Edward in 1272 entered into the great position of an English king. *He was already resolved to make England supreme in Britain, and England the mediator of Europe.* He had already become a national constitutional ruler of a free and high-spirited people" (pp. 59-60).

In other words, he had resolved to burgle his neighbours' houses in

Wales and in Scotland, and to murder the owners if they resisted.

But, continues the Professor:—

"His general instincts were high-minded, noble and generous. . . . His private life was absolutely pure and without reproach. His public action, always able, was, with few exceptions, strictly upright and honourable. *He had almost a passion for truth and justice*" (p. 61).

It will be observed that Professor Tout is an excellent "white-washer." Facts, however hostile, are no impediment to him. Contrast, for instance, his last remark with the following.

"But there was a less noble side to his character. He was, says the song-writer (a hostile one), a panther in inconstancy and changeableness. *When he is in a strait he promises whatever you wish, but as soon as he escapes he repudiates his promise.* In this respect Edward never quite got the better of the evil tendencies of his youth. The violation of his oath after the capture of Gloucester in 1264 is too faithfully paralleled by the treacherous way in which, a few years before his death, he obtained papal absolution from his oath to observe Magna Charta and the Forest Charter as enlarged and developed in 1297" (p. 62).

"He liked power so well that *he grew quite mad at the least opposition or contradiction.* . . . Edward also possessed that strange power often found in temperaments like his of persuading himself that *what he desired was right*, and that the means which he selected to attain a good end were necessarily consecrated by the excellence of his object" (p. 63).

Again—

"Edward never was a very reflective or thoughtful man. Like many great men of action, he took the course that seemed to him the most likely to lead him straight to his end, and *did not ponder too much over its lawfulness*" (p. 64).

Mark the terms of the following treaty between Edward and the

Scottish authorities, and contrast it with the way he treated Scotland, when by his trickery he had it at his mercy.

"The Treaty of Brigham of July 1290, in which the marriage of young Edward, son of Edward I., and Margaret, granddaughter of Alexander the Third, was arranged, and in which King Edward the First pledged himself and his heirs that, in the event of the match being carried out, the laws, customs and liberties of Scotland should be for all time observed, and the realm of Scotland should, under any circumstances, remain 'separate and divided and free in itself without subjection to the realm of England, as has been observed in former times, saving certain rights of Edward over the marches or elsewhere.' The upshot was, that if the Crowns became united in the offspring of the union, the kingdoms were to remain separate, while any vague superiority which Edward was still at liberty to claim over the Scots by the terms of the Treaty was so whittled away that it could have no practical effect. It was a highly statesmanlike and moderate measure" (*pp.* 16-89).

Yes, if it had been faithfully observed. But observe Edward's action afterwards. The Professor goes on to say:—

"The Lady Margaret (the Maid of Norway) having died, the Crown of Scotland became vacant, and there were several claimants. Edward, unfortunately, was chosen as Arbitrator, and an Assembly was called to meet at Norham on 10th May 1291 to decide the matter. When met, Roger Brabazon, Chief Justice of England, declared that the King had come resolved to do justice to all, and to derogate in no case from the ancient liberties of Scotland. Before, however, Edward would act, he insisted on obtaining from the assembled gathering a recognition of the position *which he now asserted had always belonged to him, as Superior Lord of Scotland*. . . . After nearly a month's delay, the competitors (for the Crown) all accepted

Edward's claim, and, further, agreed that he should have *saisin* of the land and castles of Scotland until the suit was decided, and for two months afterwards" (*p.* 173).

Professor Tout, in alluding to Edward's breach of faith with the Scots in allowing appeals from the Scottish Courts to Westminster, says:—

"Edward's reception of the appeals *clearly gave the lie to his constant declaration that he claimed no rights over Scotland, which were not based on ancient custom*" (*p.* 185).

Edward married the sister of Philip, the King of France, and his son Edward was promised to Isabella, Philip's daughter.

"In return for this," writes Professor Tout, "Edward tacitly abandoned his Flemish allies to the vengeance of the French King, though the Flemings declared that in so doing he broke an oath which he had sworn to Count Guy. *But Edward was seldom over-scrupulous, and his real object was to get from Philip a similar abandonment of the Scots*" (*p.* 210).

Edward could not keep faith even with his own subjects. His constant wars led to repeated demands for subsidies, which were only granted on condition of Edward granting liberties which strengthened the nobles and the people against the Crown. Thus the boast of his eulogists that he was a great statesman and laid the foundation of English parliamentary government is untrue, so far as his will and intention were concerned. Nothing was further from his mind than to lessen his kingly powers, and it was only owing to his want of money to carry on his cruel and disgraceful wars that he made any concessions to his

nobles. Writing of the disputes between him and his people, Professor Tout says:—

“A long agitation now broke out (in England) during which neither side showed much temper or forbearance. *Edward's evident reluctance to yield up any tittle of his prerogative, and his strong tendency to interpret any concession he made in the narrowest and most technical spirit, added to the exasperation of his subjects*” (*pp.* 211-12).

We will only add a few more lines to show the uncompromising partisanship of Professor Tout. Writing of the execution of Wallace, and of the terrible cruelties connected with it, he says:—

“*Edward acted as anyone else would have done in his place.*”

If it be necessary to give one more proof of the brutal and ruffianly character of Edward towards those gallant patriots who tried to frustrate his designs on the liberties of their country, let us quote a few lines from a book on North Wales, by S. Baring-Gould, a well-known English writer. He says:—

“Edward ordered that his gallant adversary's body (Llewellyn) should be denied a Christian burial, and forwarded the head to London, where, crowned in mockery with ivy leaves, it was set on the pillory in Cheapside” (*p.* 19).

We have given these quotations from the life of Edward at great length, but we think that patriotic Scots will say they are not too long or out of place. For they prove conclusively, from his biography by an ardent admirer, that Edward was one of the worst monarchs that ever sat on a British throne. No doubt, that as men, many of the kings who have ruled in Britain were as cruel, as unscrupulous, as faithless and as

vindictive, but not one of them with these qualities ever had the power during their lives to do as much mischief as Edward did, and certainly none of them pursued a policy which had such a far-reaching and disastrous effect on the lives and the prosperity of the British peoples. Again we say, that if the worst forms of human misery proceed from a wild and uncontrolled spirit of ruffianism, then Edward the First stands pre-eminent in this respect, and he may fairly be regarded by all patriotic Scotsmen as the greatest and most infamous, not merely of British kings, but, as we have already said, of British ruffians.

---

No. 52

### MODERN FORMS OF ENGLISH AGGRESSION

IN the preceding article we have dealt at considerable length with the iniquities of Edward the First, and have also pointed out the bare-faced white-washing of him by his biographer Professor Tout. But in the course of the biography there is another question opened up which seems to us to require to be dealt with, now that we have on hand the relations between Scotland and England. Edward was as cruel and relentless in his action toward Scotland as an unscrupulous despot possibly could be, but even he had in him some glimmerings of statesmanship. For instance, it is not generally known that in the Treaty agreed to between Alexander the Third of Scotland and Edward, “for the union of the two countries by the marriage of the respective heirs to the two thrones, one of the condi-

tions was, that after the union, the name of the united countries should be Britain. It is clear from this that even in that early period of history the great importance of this question of name was recognised by the two monarchs and their advisers, and if the article was not proposed by Edward, it is clear that he acknowledged its importance and agreed that it should be adopted. An inference that may fairly be drawn from this is, that the nationality of Scotland in Alexander's reign had become so decided and so fixed that her name was not to be given up without England also agreeing to make the sacrifice of her name as well in favour of that of Britain. This was carried out by the Treaty of Union in 1707, and the importance of the first article of that Treaty dealing with this condition is thus emphasised in a very striking manner.

But this by the way only. In dealing with the great struggle of Scotland for her independence against the cunning and unscrupulous designs of Edward, it must be admitted that the period was a crucial one, and in it is involved the key to the relations, past and present, between the two peoples. The English people under Edward's rule, very naturally would regard the war against the Scots as a proper one, and we do not attach much blame to the chroniclers of the period for their one-sided statements, and for their almost universal denunciation of the Scottish people and the Scottish leaders. It is, however, a very different matter when we come to deal with modern English historians,

and with their treatment of events during the reign of Edward the First. Enough now has been made clearly known to show that the attack by Edward on the independence of the Scottish nation was quite unjustifiable, that it was a deep-laid and unscrupulous plot against the liberties of the Scots, having no justification whatever on the grounds of justice or fairplay. On the contrary, the attitude of the Scottish people and their leaders towards Edward seems not only to have been of a most friendly character, but even of a trusting one. He was appealed to to act as an honest and kindly arbitrator, and he acted as a secret, cunning and deadly enemy. Those who have read of the way in which Napoleon hoodwinked and betrayed the King of Spain to his doom, will find that the French despot followed almost step by step the tortuous path by which Baliol and the other claimants to the Scottish throne were led on to their destruction. The ways of the two monarchs were almost identical, and as it turned out, the result to Napoleon was as futile as it was to his predecessor in cruelty and crime, the now much-lauded Edward of English modern history.

Now, let there be no mistake as to the attitude taken by the English people of these days towards the designs and doings of Edward the First with regard to Scotland. If the English people of this generation hold that Edward was right in his invasions of Scotland, and that his failure to conquer it is to be regretted, then we say boldly and unmistakably that there can be no proper union

between the two peoples. There may be, as there is, a political and legislative union, but there can be no true racial union. For it is clear that if Edward was justified in his attempts to subdue the Scots in the end of the thirteenth and in the beginning of the fourteenth centuries, then the attempts that have been openly made during the last half century, and which are still persisted in to submerge the nationality of Scotland in that of England, are simply a perpetuation of the old tactics and the old policy of Edward the First. With this difference, of course, that the policy of conquest is not by force, but by guile and by bare-faced trickery and repudiation of a great and solemn national Treaty.

There are two schools of action at work in this base and dishonest policy towards Scotland. One is the outcome of the low, bullying spirit so inherent in a large section of the English people, especially in the south of England, and which, based on a complete and disgraceful ignorance of the international relations of the two peoples, often assumes a most offensive form towards Scotsmen resident in England. A specimen of this form of insult to Scottish feeling is given in another portion of this issue, under the title of "John Bully on the Rampage." This kind of English offensiveness to Scotsmen is bad enough, but it is so low and so vulgar in its form of expression as largely to defeat its object. But in the productions of English historical writers of the last and the present generation are to be found much more dangerous attacks on the

national honour and the historical independence of the Scottish people. In this kind of literature the late Professor E. A. Freeman was one of the chief offenders, and though his attacks on the national rights of Scotland have been often refuted, and are now pretty well discredited, still, his absurd statements as to the imperial position of England in Britain during the middle ages are still regarded by many English writers as historically true. Thus, in the biography of Edward the First, by Professor Tout, with which we have dealt largely in our preceding article, are to be found some ludicrous specimens of English ignorance of the condition of Scotland in early times, as well as gross and unwarranted assumptions of the extent of English domination in Britain during the same period. Writing of the overlordship of Scotland, claimed by Edward the First and other English kings, Professor Tout says (*p.* 165):—

"The fourfold character of the land—Scotland—British, Gaelic, Norse, English, still remained, but Scotland was fast settling down into its modern divisions of Highlands and Lowlands. The elaborate process by which Highland chieftains, such as the early Scottish kings were, had become English—feudal monarchs had almost been forgotten."

This conversion of Highland chieftains in the period preceding the eleventh century, for this presumably is what the Professor means, is a delightful specimen of English ignorance of the position of Scotland at that period. In the first place there was then no England—that designation had to come later; and, therefore, there could have been then

no English in Scotland. After the Conquest by William in 1066, there was a migration of Saxons to escape his fury, but they came as slaves or refugees, and never got north of the Forth, except in very small numbers. The "English feudal chiefs" in the Highlands exist only in the disordered imagination of English "Jingo" writers, like Professor Freeman and his followers. Then Professor Tout goes on to say:—

"In the old days, before the Norman Conquest, there were countless instances of the Scottish kings acknowledging the English monarch as their father and lord."

This, so far as it refers to kings of Scotland, has been refuted again and again, and is simply another instance of the English attempts of the present day to degrade the ancient position of Scotland, so as to make her submergence in England *now* an easier task.

But enough of the misrepresentations of Professor Tout. Let us resort to the pages of Mr J. R. Green, and we have in "The Conquest of England" equally unwarrantable misrepresentation of the position of Scotland towards England. Thus one of his remarks is, "The free social organisation of the earlier English conquerors of Britain;" but when the early English conquered Britain is one of the mysteries that has not yet been fathomed. The fact is, that when any Englishman before Edward I. crossed the Tweed with an intent to conquer he was soon compelled to cry a halt and take himself and followers back to his own country. That is the important fact to be borne in mind when we are re-

galed with tales from the English chronicles of the conquest of Britain—including Scotland. On such matters the English chronicles were as untrustworthy regarding Scotland as the Continental newspapers were as to the deeds of the British soldiers during the Boer War. Indeed, these were infinitely more trustworthy, as they were only or chiefly distorted by prejudice, but the English chroniclers wrote regarding Scotland in a complete mist of ignorance, as well as being influenced by national hate and enmity. Mr J. R. Green occasionally lifts the veil and unfolds the state of England, or rather what was afterwards called England, during some portion of the period when Scotland is claimed to have been under its power. Thus, writing of the time from 858 to 878, he says:—

"The English realms were still, in fact, far from owning themselves as an English nation. To Northumbria, to Mercia, to East Anglia their conquest by the Dane must have seemed little but a transfer from one foreign overlord to another. . . . Britain seemed on the point of becoming a Scandinavian land. The Orkney Jarls had conquered Caithness. The Scot King had become a tributary of the Northmen. Northumbria and East Anglia lay in Danish hands, while Mid-Britain owned their supremacy (*p* 97).

As usual with English writers, this writer here misrepresents the position of Scotland. He would lead his readers to believe that the Scottish King was tributary to the Northmen for all Scotland, which is untrue. He may have been tributary for a time for some small portion of northern Scotland and

for some of the Isles, but that was the utmost of his tribute.

But these misrepresentations and blunders are nothing to English modern historians. The fact is, that the attempt to conquer Scotland, which is so much lauded as part of the career of Edward I., is continued in these days by an unworthy gang of English historical writers, and are backed up and applauded by an equally unworthy portion of the English people. The work, of course, is not an attempt at conquest by force of arms. That is impossible in these days. But the game is active and vigorous all the same in the way of misrepresentation of ancient history, in the ignoring of the terms of the Treaty of Union of 1706, in the endeavour to twist the laws of Scotland into English forms, and generally by trickery and by injustice to compel Scotsmen to become Anglicised, and to acknowledge themselves to be, not subjects of Britain, but of England. The fact, then, is apparent that the attempt to Anglicise Scotland is still going on, and must be resisted to the uttermost by every true Scot. And if we go to the root of it we shall find that the fight is one between aristocratic England and democratic Scotland. Fortunately the tide of events is with us in Scotland, and the time we hope is near when, despite an Anglicised nobility and a craven set of officials, our ancient Kingdom shall proudly assert itself as an independent but friendly partner in the governing body of the British Empire.

## No. 53

### BRITAIN versus ENGLAND

JOHN BULLY ON THE RAMPAGE

IN our October issue we had an article on this never-ending question, in which we were able to quote the dictum of the proprietor—presumably—of *The Publishers' Circular* in favour of the Scottish contention, that to use the term "England" in an Imperial sense is offensive and unfair to the national sentiment of the Scottish people. Such an expression of opinion by Englishmen is so rare as to be almost unexampled, and we gave expression to this view by the heading of our article, viz.—"A Sensible Englishman at Last." For on this subject, while we can find plenty of examples of unfairness, of insolence, and of arrogance on the part of English writers, we seldom, if ever, find an Englishman come forward and openly rebuke his countrymen when they offend in this respect. We have had a long and varied experience in this matter of national controversy, and we cannot now recall another instance in which English insolence in this respect has been openly and pointedly condemned by an Englishman. This is the more to be regretted, as it is certain that until fair-minded Englishmen openly come forward to check and rebuke their insolent and vulgar-minded fellow-countrymen in this important matter of international courtesy and fairplay, there never will be a cessation of the offence. It is by no means to the credit of the English people that it is so; but so it is—whatever the reason may be—whether it is

that Englishmen generally are jealous of Scotsmen, and of the success that the Scots attain over Englishmen in the battle of life; or whether it be that Englishmen cannot forget or forgive Bannockburn—or whatever the reason may be—it is certain that John Bull seldom or never lifts a finger or utters a word to restrain John Bully when the latter has a Scot for his victim. This is a matter for more than regret; for it is obvious that until this insolent and insulting relation between the two races is ended, there never can be that unity of mind and of national action which is so important an element of Imperial power.

Scotsmen in Scotland know very little of the annoyance and soreness of heart that their countrymen are subjected to when resident in a purely, or a largely predominant English community. Many so situated, of course, are indifferent, and a few become quite Anglicised, and cast ridicule on the objections raised by their patriotic fellow-countrymen. But the feeling and attitude of a country must not be taken from the part taken by such cravens as the latter shameless breed. Such spiritless creatures and such renegades are to be found among the people of all nations; and they are to be regarded as the most worthless of their kind, so far as regards national spirit and national strength. It is those who have grit enough to speak out and protest when their national sentiment is treated with disrespect that after all are the best citizens; for those who are spiritless enough to

submit tamely to contumelious treatment from insolent Englishmen would be the first to tamely submit if Britain were likely to be subjugated by a foreign power. All true and patriotic Englishmen, then, should sympathise with and support patriotic Scotsmen when they stand up for their national rights. But as we have said, this is seldom or hardly ever done.

Let us give a case in point. A few months ago the Scottish Patriotic Association of Glasgow sent a respectfully-worded protest to the editor of *The Yorkshire Evening News*, published at Leeds, complaining of the misuse of the term "England" for Britain. To this protest there appeared the following reply under date of 21st April.

LEEDS,

*Wednesday Morning, 21st April.*

I have received a lengthy protest—in the form of a printed circular—from the Scottish Patriotic Association, against the use of "England" instead of the proper term 'Britain.' It is really amazing that people outside Bedlam should so misuse the "British language"—(laughter)—as to talk of "English" as an offensive term. Fancy Shakespeare as a British poet—or, for that matter, Burns either!

The fact is these Scots, if we do not take care, will push us from our stools. Perhaps I should say "some of them." . . .

To this a temperate reply was sent by a correspondent—evidently a Scot—over the signature of "Britain for the British." The writer closed his letter with the remark, "We object to be called 'English,' out of no animosity to England or to Englishmen, but simply out of self-respect." This letter the editor published with the insulting headings—"SCOT RAMPANT"; "RIDICULOUS OUTCRY FOR 'BRITISH versus ENGLISH'";

"AMUSING RAGE." Other insults followed in subsequent issues.

Such then was the treatment accorded to patriotic Scotsmen, who simply entered a temperate and respectful protest against their country being treated as an English province, and against them being regarded not as "British," but as "English" subjects. Surely on no point of difference between the two peoples—the Scots and English—could there be more natural or more reasonable ground for protest or objection; for the position and the right of Scotland and the Scots in this matter is clearly defined by the first article of the Treaty of Union between England and Scotland. And yet this undoubted right and this respectful claim to fairplay is treated with jeers and contumely by one of the editorial writers, in what we presume is an important newspaper in one of the largest cities in England. Nor is this the worst feature of the case. There are shallow-pated fools in the ranks of journalism as in other professions; but in journalism, blatant folly and rank injustice must come before the public eye; and if the public has a sense of fairness, such qualities, especially when exhibited towards a brother-nation acting strictly within its rights, ought promptly to be rebuked and denounced as an international offence. In this case, not an Englishman used his pen to defend the Scots against the insolence and the unfairness of the writer in the Leeds *Evening News*. So our Leeds correspondent assures us. And yet we hear constant boasts of English fairplay, and of

the manliness of Englishmen. It would appear that as regards the Scots, "Bullyism" and insolence are the qualities that Englishmen prefer to display, the reason apparently being that in Great Britain the Scots are to the English only as seven to one. Quite a sufficient and convincing reason for "John Bully" to go "on the Rampage."

### NATIONALITY AS AN IMPERIAL FACTOR\*

WALLACE AND BRUCE IN INDIA

THE author of this book has done excellent service to his country. What most people know of Barbour is the account given by Scott in his *Tales of a Grandfather*, and now the worthy old Archdeacon of Aberdeen appears in a form within the reach of all. He can be read much easier than the garrulous and over-estimated Chaucer, that merely modern creation of the Early Text men and the credulous schoolmaster, and we rejoice to see that a school edition of the book in a smaller form has been issued. Patriotic and ambitious teachers have here an excellent opportunity for higher work. The general reader will be surprised to see how closely Barbour adheres to facts, and how often he is confirmed in detail by the State Papers. His history of Bannockburn is the only correct one, and yet nearly all the historians confuse and distort his plain narrative for a traditional invention of their own. The mass of critical and new material brought together by the editor is great; it is altogether a notable production

\*The Bruce, by John Barbour. By W. M. MACKENZIE, M.A., F.S.A., Scot. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1909.

that all future writers on the subject must follow and quote.

Our object, however, here, is briefly to show the value of Scottish Nationality as a link in Imperial unity. So long as the separate factors maintain their sense of national existence and patriotic feeling, there is no fear of the Empire. Some years ago a little book on Wallace and Bruce was issued by a well-known Scottish educational house for use in India. It is not generally known that every such book has to be submitted to the Viceroy in Council, so that no statement, however slight, directly or indirectly capable of wounding native social or religious feeling, shall pass. The book was passed by three men, all patriotic Scots, who wisely decided that no child, Indian or British, could know too much about Stirling Bridge and Bannockburn. Absence in their case had only made the heart grow fonder, and their *imprimatur* was strong and hearty. A great sale resulted, but the consequences were beyond their expectation. Here was no merely traditional rubbish about "England" and the Wars of the Roses, "English" Heptarchies, "English" navies and "English" victories; only sound sense and talk on Scotland. All over India, from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, there was a strange wave of excitement in the native schools. Something had evidently happened, and the attention of Government was naturally directed to the point. Were we on the verge of another mutiny, and were we face to face with an original and far-spread movement that might shake the Empire to its base? Investigation showed Wallace and Bruce had been educationally valuable. Instead of awakening native resentment, they had roused native interest. For the first time a school

book had touched a genuinely human note, beyond the reach of the traditional rigmarole of annotated *Bacon's Essays*, godless science-primers, and Chaucer's *Prologue*. All over India children had been playing a game invented out of the little book. It was the hunting of King Robert Bruce, by the bloodhound of John of Lorn, and the interest to the children of the Empire lay in the fact that his descendant was Lord Elgin, the Viceroy. Never before had a Viceroy been so popular. Barbour's story had gone round the world, and Scotland had stood for the Empire.

When will educational publishers learn wisdom? When will they cease to issue books about England, a mere department of the British Empire annexed by Scotland in 1603 and 1707? England, a mere fraction, kept out of the clutches of Germany through the united force of Scotland, Ireland, Wales and the Colonies. All such untruthful compilations, distorting and falsifying history, and undermining Imperial feeling should be rigidly exposed and excluded from all Scottish Schools, and from every Colonial School when a Scotsman can rule. On this subject the late Lord Linlithgow held, as we know, very pronounced opinions, and we believe Lord Balfour of Burleigh is equally keen over the injustice to Scotland by merely English compilers of traditional fiction. Now that the Budget and Small Holdings, from which all patriots expect so much, will soon be before the country, we trust that this important phase of Scottish Rights will not be lost sight of, and that Captain Pirie, M.P. for North Aberdeen, who so gallantly has stood up for his country at Westminster, will be supported by the united action of all true Scotsmen. WM. KEITH LEASK.







