

An Hour with the Editor

SCOTTISH HISTORY

David Bruce, son and successor of Robert, inherited his father's courage, but not his military skill, fortitude under adversity, or high patriotism. He came to the throne in 1329, when he was only five years old. In the previous year he had married Joana, daughter of Edward II. of England, and in his seventh year he was crowned with her at Scone. His father had appointed Randolph, Earl of Moray, and Lord James of Douglas, as joint guardians of the King, but had enjoined upon the latter that he should bear his heart to the Holy Land for burial. Having died under excommunication, Robert Bruce was desirous of making some sort of atonement, and according to the ideas of the time the duty entrusted to Douglas was so regarded. Douglas set out on his journey, but learning that the King of Spain was at war with the Moors, he joined the Spanish standard and was killed in battle. By his death not only did the great family of Douglas become extinct in the legitimate line, but Scotland lost a great soldier and statesman at the time she could least afford to do so. The Earl of Moray administered the government with much capacity, but did not carry out certain stipulations in regard to Lords Beaumont and Wake, English owners of Scottish fiefs, who were to be restored to their estates in pursuance of the treaty made between Edward II. and Robert Bruce. Meanwhile Edward Balliol, son of the deposed King John Balliol, had found high favor at the English court. Edward III. having come to the English throne, he was anxious to reassert the suzerainty over Scotland, which his father had lost, and he encouraged the efforts of Balliol, Beaumont and Wake to overthrow the young Scottish King. They invaded Scotland by sea, and the Earl of Moray advancing against them, died upon the march, it was suspected from poison. This left Scotland without a leader of ability and, although the Scots bravely resisted the invaders, they were unable to make a successful defence, and in a short time Edward Balliol was in possession of the crown, whereupon he at once acknowledged fealty to Edward III. But the Scottish people were in no mind to sacrifice the independence of their kingdom, and they resolved to rid the country of the English invaders. The struggle which ensued was bitter and terribly wasteful of the best blood of the kingdom. Time and again was the country laid waste, not only by the invaders, but more frequently by the Scottish people themselves. In Southern Scotland and Northern England the crops were neglected year after year, and what was once a fertile and cultivated land became overgrown with bushes in which wolves and deer made their home. No conception can be formed of the straits to which the people were reduced, and there were several authenticated cases of cannibalism. Pestilence followed starvation, and hundreds of the people abandoned the country, removing to Flanders or France. It seemed as if the fate of Scotland were settled for all time to come as the scene of the wrath of the Almighty. After varying vicissitudes Balliol was driven from the kingdom, and David Bruce once more reigned as king. His prospects were completely shattered at the battle of Neville's Cross, where he was taken prisoner. The Scots still refused to acknowledge either Edward or Balliol, and the Lord Stewart was declared regent in the absence of David. The family name of the Stewarts was Fitz-Alan, and they were of Norman origin. The historians of Scotland do not use the word Stewart as a family name until about the time of the events above outlined. The office of Stewart was what would nowadays be understood by the title, except that it applied to the affairs of the whole kingdom. Its possessor was a sort of business manager. The office had been made hereditary. Its holder in the reign of David had the blood of the Bruces in his veins, and he was looked upon as the successor to the throne if David should die without children. He administered the affairs of the kingdom with ability and successfully negotiated for the ransom of the King. Balliol, who hoped to have been replaced on the throne, went into obscurity on a handsome pension allowed him by Edward III., and David once more returned to his kingdom. He sought, however, to secure from the nobles a recognition of the claims of Edward III. to be over-lord of Scotland, but in vain. He later sought to have Edward recognized as his successor, but in this also he was unsuccessful. His wife, the English Princess Joana, having died without children, David married Catherine Logie, a young and very beautiful girl, but this marriage did not result in children. Catherine was extravagant and gay, and David sought to divorce her, and shortly after David died in the fifty-seventh year of his reign. As a king, David was a conspicuous failure. He was very fond of pleasure, and greatly preferred the luxury of the English court to the privations of life in his own country. Yet, strange to say, during his reign, Scotland was welded into a unity very different to what it had known before. It was a turning point in the history of the country. The long period of war had led to the extinction of nearly all the great families. A few names only can be traced back to the reign of Robert Bruce. The list of those who took part in the battle of Durham, in the reign of David Bruce, is looked upon as the foundation of most Scottish genealogies. The very weakness of David promoted the development of a spirit of nationality. The nobles in the lack of a competent leader, to whom they could acknowledge allegiance, were forced

to abandon their personal feuds and stand together for neutral defence, and the claims of rivals to the crown made it essential that parliamentary sanction should be obtained when possible by the respective claimants. Thus some good came out of much evil, and Robert Stewart came to the throne of a kingdom that was animated by a determination to maintain its independence at all hazards, and he was able to establish a royal line, the representatives of which today reign in the United Kingdom.

FOUNDATION OF LAW

Being alive one has the right to live. Upon this is built up the whole fabric of human society, the whole involved system of human law. The right to live carries with it the right to obtain and utilize those things that are necessary to support life, and, owing to the natural conditions of a climatic nature under which we live, the right to retain for our own use things we do not at present require follows as a matter of course, and hence arises the idea of property. Language is often history in miniature. A word may be an epitome of the story of an age. Take the word "property." The fundamental meaning of "proper" is that which is not common; that is, what is our own. Property is therefore that which is ours, and no one else's. As society has been developed, the idea of public property has been evolved; but the original conception of the word and what is of more importance, its meaning is that, having the right to live, we have the right to something which is exclusively our own. A condition of things is possible under which there would be no idea of property. If we assume the existence of a land, where nature produces with lavish hand everything necessary for the support of life at all times, so that all the inhabitants have to do is to put forth their hands and take what they need for food, and where the climate is so benign that shelter is unnecessary, the idea of property would never suggest itself, and everything would be held in common. With the absence of the necessity for taking anything into possession for any other purpose than for immediate use, there would be no incentive to burden one's self with the acquisition and retention of property. It is by no means improbable that the world has passed through just such a period, or, in other words, that there was a time when Edenic conditions existed. The Eden of the Book of Genesis, in which man at one time lived, is far from being a geological impossibility. The inhabitants of this Eden would have no incentive to acquire property. They would need no law, and as without law there can be no sin, Eden would have been sinless.

As soon, however, as the necessity for preserving food for the support of life and of securing shelter against storm, heat or cold arose, there also arose the conception of duty, and here the original meaning comes to our assistance again, for we see that, whereas property means what is ours for our own use, duty means what is due from us to others. Now it is evident that one person has as good a right to live as another person, and each has therefore the same right to acquire property. If this is admitted, it follows that we must recognize each other's rights to what has been acquired. Immediately there arises the necessity for law, and this self-protection, or, in other words, the right to live, is the foundation of all human law. But it is evident that no law is of value unless it carries with it what the old law writers used to call its sanction, which comes from the same root as the Latin word "sanctus," which we translate holy, and which means established by authority. The sanction of human law is the authority of the community behind it. The difference between youth and age and also between the sexes would necessitate that as soon as the necessity for law arose the necessity for its sanction by the power of the community would become apparent, and there would at once arise a new entity distinct from the individual, namely, the community, to offend against which would be unlawful. Hence would arise the distinction between private rights and public rights, and as the maintenance of the latter would be essential to the preservation of the former, it would follow that the safety of the state would supplant the safety of the individual in the first place in the general welfare. Thus we see that from the right of an individual, being alive, to continue to live as long as nature would permit, we derive more or less directly the whole vast and complicated structure which we call The Law. The prohibitive parts of the Ten Commandments need no divine author. They would arise out of the very necessities of mankind.

If the above line of reasoning is correct, we can logically go a step further and claim that laws, which have a tendency to create conditions under which the right to live, which in the very nature of things is equal in all individuals, is rendered impossible or needlessly difficult, are unnatural, except so far as its restriction is necessary for the well-being of the community. Herein we find the only logical justification for the punishment of crime by death. We execute a murderer because he has shown his disregard to the fundamental right of each individual to live. If we can imagine an individual in an Edenic community making the claim that he had not only the right to live, but also to determine if others should do so, his presence would be intolerable, and his death would become necessary in order that others might enjoy their right to live. This is not an argument for the expediency of the death penalty. It may or may not be expedient in an advanced

civilization, but that is beside the question under consideration. No less an authority than the Apostle Paul has recommended us to observe the distinction between things that are lawful and things that are expedient. It may easily be inexpedient to do a lawful act, but no act that is truly expedient can be unlawful. As has often been said, necessity knows no law, or, as the Lord Chief Justice of England recently said, it is always lawful to do the necessary thing in an emergency. Of course the community itself must retain the right to say whether any specific act was necessary in an alleged emergency.

The right to live implies the right to freedom of action in order to turn life to the best advantage. Hence we have the right to "liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and it is the duty of the community to protect us in these as far as it can consistently with its own existence. The weakness of our modern laws, as exhibited in the poverty and wretchedness so common in the midst of high civilization, arises from successful efforts, extending over centuries, of some to gain advantage over others. At a very early period in human history the power of the community became concentrated in the hands of a few individuals, and the few made laws for the many, and out of this has come the ill-adjusted conditions of modern society. There are signs that the race is slowly returning to first principles, to the recognition of the supremacy of the whole community over any part of it, and of the right of each person to live under conditions as favorable as nature will permit. The final summation of the movement may be long deferred, but it is something to know that the movement is in the right direction.

THE EARTH

XIV.

Europe, while the smallest of the continents, is structurally the most complicated, but it can be described in fairly general terms. In the south there is an irregular elevated area extending for the whole length of the Mediterranean Sea, and suggesting from its general appearance on a geological map that there was a great upheaval here similar to that which characterized the northwest coast of America. The southern coast of Europe in a general way resembles the American northwest coast. There are mountain ranges with fertile valleys between them and numerous islands. Through the ranges rivers, originating in the higher levels, find their way to the sea. These southern mountains occupy a large part of Spain, a small part of France, practically the whole of Switzerland, the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula, a portion of Central Germany and Eastern Hungary. On the northwest there are the mountains of Scandinavia, of which those of Scotland and Wales seem to be outliers. On the northeast is the Ural range and the Caucasus Mountains extend between the Black and Caspian Seas. The greater part of Europe consists of a plain less than 600 feet above the sea level. A line may be drawn from the southwestern corner of France, to the northeastern corner of Russia, a distance of about 3,000 miles, and, except in Central Germany, it will not encounter any considerable elevation. Indeed if the line is curved slightly to the north at one point it will pass for its entire length over a great plain. Included in this plain are the greater part of Ireland, England, the southern part of Scotland, nearly all France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, most of Germany, the greater part of Austria-Hungary, a large part of Sweden, a part of the Balkan Peninsula, and practically the whole of Russia. Thus if we take the southern mountains of Europe as corresponding to the Rocky Mountains, and the Scandinavian Mountains as corresponding to the Laurentian Hills, we find Europe structurally not very unlike Canada, except that in Canada the great mountain range runs north and south, whereas in Europe it runs east and west.

When Europe is considered geologically, it is found to be exceedingly varied. The older formations are found in the north, and towards the south they become more recent. The result of this is that in no part of the world is there a greater diversity of mineral wealth. Another point to be noted in regard to Europe is that, except as to a part of the Alps, there are no places in the continent where there are serious obstacles to the movements of population. Thus Europe possesses in a high degree those natural features which are necessary for the support of a large population and the development of a high civilization. Among them may be mentioned an exceptionally large area, relatively speaking, lying at a low elevation and covered with fertile soil, a generally level country favorable to the migration of races, sufficient physical barriers to permit of the development of small independent communities, a greatly indented sea coast, favorable for the development of navigation, great and varied stores of mineral wealth. It is through no accident that Europe became the birthplace of our aggressive modern civilization. It is worth while to consider for a little the part which its peculiar structural features have played in the history of the human race. When we first learn of Europe in history, we find a number of isolated communities living along its southern border. There seem to be reasons for supposing that these may have been the survivors of a race which had attained a high civilization, but be this as it may, we first know them as living as separate peoples in the valleys between the spurs of the mountain ranges. The genius of the Roman people enabled them to establish supremacy over all these communities. Meanwhile across the Great Central Plain were moving those great hordes spoken of sometimes as the Northern Barbarians. When we get a picture of Europe in our mind's eye, the history of the early part of the Christian Era takes on a new interest. Indeed it is well to read history in the light cast upon it by geography. The map of Europe shows us how the great Barbarian march, extending over centuries, was possible. It shows us how there could be such careers as those of Charlemagne and afterwards that of Bonaparte. It explains Waterloo. It accounts for the Spain of the Twentieth Century. It demonstrates the nature of the German menace. It casts a flood of light upon the Near-Eastern question. It gives us an insight into the story of the Norseman and of that wonderful people whom we mis-call Anglo-Saxons. Indeed it may be said without qualification that the physical conformation of Europe, and especially the southern mountain chain and the Great Central Plain, has determined the history of the world.

Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces

(N. de Bertrand Lagim)

RICHARD WAGNER

"Denker und Dichter
Gewaltigen Willens,
Durch Worte und Werke
Wecker und Meister
Musischer Kunst."

Most of us have thought of Wagner solely in the light of a musician, and have not taken into consideration the fact that this truly marvelous genius was a no less greater poet than a musical composer, and a philosopher before everything else.

Wagner appreciated more keenly than any of his contemporaries that the artistic taste of his day had vastly deteriorated from what it had been generations before his time. And while this prevalence of uninspiring sentiment influenced the whole world of German art, especially, he recognized that it left its impression upon the drama. Therefore he made it his earnest endeavor to counteract this baneful influence, by educating the public mind to a higher standard. Only a master-genius would have the ability to accomplish so vast a purpose, but Wagner, who loved a task the more for the difficulties of its obstacles, dared to undertake the elevation of the dramatic art, by producing within himself the means to effect a change upon the whole vast body of the public. We recognize the reasonableness of his arguments in paragraphs like the following:

To account to ourselves for this attitude of the public towards the performance, we must necessarily pass to a judgment on this public itself. If we cast a look at earlier ages of our theatrical history, we can only regard this public as involved in an advancing degradation. The excellent work, the pre-eminently fine work that has been done already in our art, we surely cannot consider as dropped upon us from the skies; no, we must conclude that it was prompted withal by the taste of those before whom it was produced. We meet this public of fine taste and feeling at its most marked degree of active interest in art production, in the period of the Renaissance. Here we see princes and nobles, not only sheltering art, but so engrossed with its finest and its boldest shapings that the latter must be taken as downright summoned into being by their enthusiastic need. This noble rank—nowhere attacked in its position, knowing nothing of the misery of the thralls whose life made that position possible; holding itself completely aloof from the industrial and commercial spirit of the burgher life; living away its life of pleasure in its palaces, of courage on the field of battle, this nobility had trained its eyes and ears to discern the beautiful, the graceful, nay, even the characteristic and the energetic; and at its commands arose those works of art which signal that epoch as the most favored artistic period since the downfall of Greek art. The infinite grace and delicacy in Mozart's tone-modelings, which seem so dull and tedious to a public bred today on the grotesque—were delighted in by the descendants of that old nobility; and it was to Kaiser Joseph that Mozart appealed, from the mountebankish shamelessness of the singers of his "Figaro." Nor will we look askance at those young French cavaliers whose enthusiastic applause at the Achilles area in Gluck's "Iphigenia in Taurus," turning the wavering balance in favor of that work; and least of all, will we forget that while the greater courts of Europe had become the political camps of intriguing diplomats, in Weimar a German royal family was listening with rapt attention to the loftiest and most graceful poets of the German nation. But the rulership of public tastes in art has passed over to the person who pays the artist's wages, in place of the nobility which erstwhile recompensed them; to the person who orders the art-work for his money, and insist on ever novel variations of his one beloved theme, but at no price a new theme itself—and this ruler and this order-giver is—the Philistine. As this Philistine is the most heartless and the basest offspring of our civilization, so is he the most

domineering, the crudest and foulest, of art's bread-givers. True that everything comes aright to him; only that he will have naught to do with what might remind him that he is to be a man—either on the side of beauty or on the side of nerve. He wills to be base and common, and to this will has art to fit herself; for the rest—why, nothing comes to him amiss. Let us turn our look from him as quickly as may be.

It was in 1876 that Jean Paul Richter wrote, little realizing that his prophecy was so quickly to be fulfilled: "Hitherto Apollo has always distributed the poetic gift with his right hand, the musical with his left to two persons so widely apart that up to this time we are still waiting for the man who will create a genuine opera by writing both its text and its music." It was the year in which these words were written, 1873, that Richard Wagner was born in Leipzig.

Never was artist to meet with greater obstacles than this man who undertook to educate the German people to appreciate the highest conception of art, for to the world at large the task seemed ludicrously beyond the capabilities of a single individual. But Wagner possessed within himself the qualities of a great poet, a great literary artist, and a marvelous musical composer, and, knowing this, he felt fully competent to impress his world in time. The years have proved that he was right, but, during his life, his work was at times made bitterly hard. Nothing daunted him, however. From the depths of his poverty he hurled the javelins of his thought broadcast, not minding in the least ridicule, contumely and sneers. To accomplish his purpose in the face of opposition was his sacred duty. It was for him to dictate to the public, not to try to come to terms with it.

"Hope, faith and courage," he wrote, "we can only gain, when we recognize the modern Philistine, not merely as a conditioning, but likewise as a conditioned factor of our civilization. . . . We shall not win hope and nerve until we bend our ear to the heart-beat of history, and catch the sound of that sempiternal vein of living waters, which, however buried under the waste-heap of historic civilization, yet pulses on in all its pristine freshness. Who has not felt the leaden mark that hangs above us in the air, foretelling the near advent of an earth upheaval? And we who hear the trickling of that well-spring, shall we take affront at the earthquake sound? Believe me, no. For we know that it will only tear aside the heap of refuse, and prepare for the stream that bed in which we soon shall even see its living waters flow."

. . . The artist has the power of seeing beforehand a yet unshapen world, of tasting beforehand the joys of a world as yet unborn, through the stress of his desire for growth. But his joy is in imparting; and if only he turns his back upon the senseless herds who browse upon the grassless wasteheap, and clasps the closer to his breast the cherished few who listen with him to the well-spring—so finds he too the hearts—ay, finds the senses—to whom he can impart his message. We are older men and younger; let the elder not think of himself, but love the younger for the sake of the bequest he sinks into his heart for new increasing; the day will come when that heirloom shall be opened for the weal of brother men throughout the world."

(To Be Continued)

A ROMANCE OF THE CAT SHOW

(By C. L. Armstrong)

"Twas a nice little cat,
On a nice little mat
In a beautiful basket blue.
It was plain that she
Was of high degree,
And of sheltered up-bringing too.
Her nice little paws
Harbored nice little claws
That never were known to scratch;
And her nice little nose
Was as pink as a rose,
With a nice little ribbon to match.
But, next to this nice little cat (Ah me!)
In a basket of glaring green,
Was an old Thomas Mouser—
As bad an old rouser
As the nice little puss e'er had seen.
His massive old head
Showed big patches of red
Where the fur had been taken off clean;
His whiskers were broken—
A very bad token—
And his legs were thick-muscled and lean.
"What a shame" (you'd have said,
Had you been there instead
Of Yours Truly) "to put such a sinner
Beside such a nice little, sweet little cat!
I don't care if he is a winner"
But, the nice little cat
On her nice little mat
In her beautiful basket blue,
Fell in love with the Mouser—
The wicked old rouser—
Alas! it is sad, but true.
And day after day
She pined away
For love of the bad old cuss,
Which never could be—
He was married, you see—
And the moral is ob-vius.

She's very domestic in her tastes, isn't she?"
"Decidedly. They say she really enjoys her husband's cooking."