On May 29th (Restoration Day) and 10th June (White Rose Day), Mr. Theodore Napier, in honour of these two notable anniversaries, had his armorial banner flying from his residence at "Magdala," Essendon, Melbourne. Mr. Napier has similarly observed these historic events for many years both in Australia and when living in Edinburgh. "What is Loyalty? Loyalty is the essence of devotion and courage! Devotion to a principle or a person, and courage to sustain that devotion in the face of any opposing influences and effects. That is loyalty. It is not easy. It is not self or even self-preservation. Therefore to-day it is hardly understood, nor does it appear to advance with the times. But principle does not alter, nor does it appear to advance with the times. The times may advance without it. But whither?"—H. S. Wheatly-Crowe.

Mr. Rathmell Wilson, of 32 Regent Street, London, W.L., has recently been elected vice-president of the Forget-me-not Royalist Club, of which the Earl of Lindsay is President and Mrs. Leslie Moir, founder and secretary. On March 10th a most successful "At Home" was given at the Delphic Club, Regent Street, when short addresses were delivered by Mrs. Leslie Moir, Captain Shannon of the Russian White Army, and Mr. Rathmell Wilson. On April 17th a meeting of the Royalist Club was held at the Lyceum Club in commemoration of Culloden.

Writing from Paris in 1760, Goring informed Prince Charles Edward that his adherents were about to publish printed protests against the coronation of George III., and if Charles remained obdurate they would approach the King of Sardinia, who was—falling Charles and his brother the Cardinal—the rightful heir. Writing in 1788, Oliphant of Gask, said—"You know the King never dies, and were Henry IX. to do so, unquestionably the King of Sardinia is our lawful Prince." The foregoing extracts are important as showing that the old Jacobite party clearly recognised that with the extinction of the Stuart male line in 1807, the hereditary succession immediately reverted to the descendants of Charles the First's daughter, the Princess Henrietta. There are some ingenious people, who endeavour to demonstrate that in 1807, by some mysterious means, the Hanoverian dynasty became possessed of the hereditary right to the Crown.

That is unquestionably the changed position to-day.

Then in the interests of true monarchy I would earnestly say let us Royalists gather to the standard and form what I will call our coalition against the forces of elective-monarchy, republicanism, and anti-Christian movements of various kinds.

We have done a good deal lately in the direction of removing the dust and dirt of Whig propaganda from the pages of history. I speak from what I know. But we must be ready to make some little real sacrifice. We must not hesitate to spend our money or our efforts in furthering the aims of so important a cause.

I believe a Federated Association of Royalists would be an excellent form of organization.

With greetings and good wishes to all.

HENRY STUART WHEATLY-CROWE
(Capt.) President R.M.C.U.
Pencraig, Ross-on-Wye, Easter, 1921.

In these days of the ascendency of the moving picture it is surely a matter for regret that so few of the great episodes of history are screened. The ignorance of most people on matters of history is deplorable. The only history they ever read is what is served up to them in the pages of their daily newspaper—much of it more or less inaccurate and written from the standpoint of conformity to the powers that be. The picturisation of some of our great milestones in history would undoubtedly be productive of good and prove a means of enlightenment to many. "Out in the Fifteen" or "With Prince Charlie in the Forty-Five"—one can imagine the enthusiasm wherever these subjects were screened.
A Plea for an Old Cause.

(Continued from last issue.)

Dr. King, who would not go out of his way to praise James, says in the "Anecdotes of his Own Times":— "If James had been indifferent in matters of religion, or had professed the same faith with the Emperor of China, he would have proved one of the best princes who have governed the British islands." This shows, what anyone well acquainted with the history of that period must know, that it was a blind hatred of popery, and not a love of religion, that influenced the Whigs of that day. I have carefully examined all the facts that bear upon the religious aspect of the question. I have compared what James did, and intended to do, with what enlightened legislation has since done, and I have arrived at the conclusion that he was one of the most tolerant monarchs who ever sat upon the English throne. When the Edict of Nantes was revoked, when five hundred thousand people preferred their liberty of conscience to their homes, who was it that assisted the persecuted Protestants with money, and gave them the shelter of a country in which they could exercise their religion with freedom? Not only did James aid and protect these refugees, but he openly censured Louis XIV. for his intolerant conduct.

James is accused of intolerance, because he wished that clergymen of his own religion might be permitted to exercise the rights of that religion. What would his accusers say to Lord Egerton and the Tories, who carried on the 29th April, 1825, a series of resolutions in favour of a State provision for the Roman Catholic clergy? Or what would they say to the Tory writer in the "Quarterly Review" for 1845, who proposed to settle £300,000 per annum on the Irish priests? Those who are blind to all the facts of history, or who cannot rely on the honour of a prince who never broke his word, assert that James intended to force Popery on the people. The "Original Papers of the House of Stuart and the House of Brunswick-Lanenburgh," throw some light on this subject. We there find the significant fact that the Pope devoted all the power of his Jesuatical intrigues to the support of William of Orange (pp. 301-302); and that the Spanish Ambassador at the Hague ordered Masses to be said publicly for the success of the usurper's expedition. On the other hand, we find (Hancower Papers, s. 8, page 156), in a letter from Schutz to Robethon, the statement that all the members of the Church of England in Scotland were Jacobites, without exception." Everyone knows the feeling of the High Church party in this country at the time, and surely there can be no better indication, in addition to the King's own statement, of what his intentions must have been. Those who fancy the Church would be in danger under the Stuarts should read the speech made upon the scaffold by that heroic Protestant clergyman, the Rev. Mr. Paul, who died for his devotion to James III.

With regard to the character of James II. as a statesman, Mr. Jesse in his "Memoirs of the Stuarts," says:— "He loved and was proud of his country, and probably no one of our monarchs ever had its honour and glory more deeply and even enthusiastically at heart. He was extremely frugal of the public money. He not only gloried in the magnificent naval power of England, but he watched personally and vigilantly over the interests of the naval service, and, more than any other prince, gave encouragement to trade, and improved the commercial interests of the empire."

Macpherson says of him:— "He applied himself with unremitting attention to his business. He managed his revenues. He retrenched superfluous expenses. He was zealous for the glory of the nation. He endeavoured to expedite from the Court, and to restore decency and morality. He was himself at the head of all his affairs. He presided daily at the Council, at the Board of Admiralty, and at the Treasury. He even entered into the whole details of the concerns of all the great departments of the state."

James maintained his spirit of toleration to the last. How characteristic of the dignified and gallant bearing of his family is his speech to the officers when the rebellion had commenced. "If any of you is not satisfied, let him freely declare himself. I am willing to grant passes to such as choose to join the Prince of Orange, and to spare them the shame of deserting their lawful sovereign."

The calumnies which have been heaped upon him are almost trifling compared with those which have been heaped upon his son. With literal truth it might be said of this unfortunate prince, that from his cradle to his grave he was pursued by slander. He has been called a coward, though his bitterest enemies cannot point to a single instance of his flinching from danger. At the battle of Malplaquet his conduct was of the utmost gallantry. The French general Bouflers, in his despatch to his sovereign, giving the following brief testimony to the gallantry of the royal volunteer: "The Chevalier St. George behaved himself during the whole action with the utmost valour and vivacity." St. Simon also notices, in strong terms, his great bravery during the campaigns in which he took part. In the previous expedition of Dunkirk his gallantry almost bordered on rashness. He was then only in his twentieth year, but the moment he heard of the intended sailing of the French fleet he set off for the coast. Almost within sight of the sea he took sick, and in spite of the warnings of his physician, had himself taken on board the admiral's vessel. His forebodings as to the effect of delay were fulfilled. When the fleet approached the shores of Scotland, it was met by the far larger squadron of Sir George Byng. De Forbin, the French admiral, at once gave orders to retreat. James at first urged him to give battle, but when he found the admiral determined not to risk the fleet, he asked to be landed on the coast of Fifeshire, in order to raise his standard on the ancient castle of Wemyss. This De Forbin refused, stating that he was responsible for James' safety with his head. The ships then returned to France.

(To be Concluded)
A Shameful Act.

[The following is extracted from a pamphlet written some years ago by Mr. Theodore Napier. The pamphlet is entitled "The Royal House of Stuart: A Plea for Restoration" and makes a strong appeal to all loyal Scotsmen.]

"Whatever their adversaries may lay to the charge of the old Stuarts, it is undeniable that no law ever passed during their long continuance as sovereigns of Scotland and Great Britain could compare in tyrannical oppression, as well as in meanness, to that notorious Act, passed in 1747, in the reign of George II., the heading of which was: 'An Act for Restraining the use of the Highland Dress,' and the object of which was to destroy the nationality of Scotsmen in general and of the Scottish Highlanders in particular. This policy of the Hanoverian Government was one worthy of Macchiavelli and it did not fail in its fell purpose; for what William of Orange failed to accomplish by the ruthless massacre of Glencoe (and we are indebted to one of his Ministers of State that it was not a general massacre of the whole of the loyal Jacobite clans)—I say, what William failed in accomplishing by massacre, George did by law of Parliament, by pulling the tartan and plaid off the Highlanders, thus adding national degradation and shame to the already barbarous outrages committed on them after Culloden.

We believe that nothing broke the Highland spirit more than this shameful Act. For to realise it fully, we might suppose this nation of Britain conquered by the Turks, and all Britishmen compelled to discard their ordinary dress, and to wear that of the Turk. What would be the feelings of our people in regard to such a marked, standing humiliation? Would not transportation, or even death, be preferable to such scandalous degradation? This was the condition this infernal Act reduced Scotland to! It is a marvel to us that Scotsmen, and more especially those of Highland descent, should not regard it more as a point of honour to revive and wear the ancient Highland garb, if it was but only as a protest against the treatment their countrymen and nation received at the hands of the Hanoverian Government of that century. I am personally acquainted with one Scottish gentleman who is proud to wear constantly the dress that existed in Scotland, and was worn by Scottish Highland gentlemen before the Revolution, and when the Stuarts still reigned over Britain. It reminds us of the days when Scotland was a real Nation (although, perhaps, oppressed by many bad laws, but still a living Nation), and before the present infamous Treaty of Union had bound her hand and foot to be the slave of an Hanoverian monarch and Government."

Faithful and True.

When the Jacobites were marching to Derby in the campaign of 1745 they crossed the Mersey at Cheddleton. A few gentlemen of Cheshire had drawn up on the southern bank of the river, and among them was a Mrs Skyring. She was in extreme old age, and as a child had been lifted up in her mother's arms to view the landing at Dover of Charles II. Her father, an old cavalier, had afterwards to undergo the present infamous Treaty of Union which had bound her hand and foot to be the slave of an Hanoverian monarch and Government.

When the Jacobites were marching to Derby in the campaign of 1745 they crossed the Mersey at Cheddleton. A few gentlemen of Cheshire had drawn up on the southern bank of the river, and among them was a Mrs Skyring. She was in extreme old age, and as a child had been lifted up in her mother's arms to view the landing at Dover of Charles II. Her father, an old cavalier, had afterwards to undergo the present infamous Treaty of Union which had bound her hand and foot to be the slave of an Hanoverian monarch and Government.

Royal Oak Day.

Royal Oak Day was celebrated in London by a most enjoyable dinner and dance at the Lyceum Club, Piccadilly, organised by the Forget-me-not Royalist Club.

Princess Karadjia presided, and during the evening a number of interesting speeches were made by Messrs. Brodie Innes, Rathnell Wilson, Henry Simpson, and Mrs. Leslie-Moir.

In his speech proposing the toast of "The Cause," Mr. Rathnell Wilson quoted some lines on Loyalty from "The Jacobite," and urged all good Jacobites to subscribe to the paper.

The Tartan.

How darkly green the tartan flows
At peaceful gatherings on the plain,
When every heart with ardour glows
With hope that freedom will again.

When killed men with measured tread
Fared forth to find a nameless grave;
And, though their fight was all in vain,
Still cherished is the milk-white rose
In hearts that gather on the plain;
Where darkly green the tartan flows.

—CAMPBELL MACINNION

A loyal Jacobite in the 18th century was one who upheld the cause of King James III. and his two sons, and a loyal Jacobite in this 20th century is one who upholds the self-same cause—the cause of the old Stuart Royal Line.

At Christie's the other day there was spirited bidding for a Jacobite wine-glass. It was finally knocked down for the sum of £120—a lot of money for a fragile transparency which the hand of a careless individual could smash instantly. But such relics are extremely difficult to procure nowadays, and in consequence are highly prized by those into whose hands they fall. This particular glass was engraved with a full-face portrait of Charles Edward Stuart, and an inscription setting forth his claims to the throne. Another inscription stated that "Whoso quaffed a glass of good Oporto wine from this beaker also swore allegiance to his cause."
Jacobe Toasts.

(The following letter appeared in a recent issue of the "Otago Witness," As it will be of interest to our readers we publish it here.)

SIR,—An article in the "Woman at Home" for March on "Toasts" directs attention once more to those old Jacobite toasts which, generation after generation, have been honoured by those faithful to the exiled Stuarts.

It was during the eighteenth century that toasts acquired a direct significance. Everyone knows how the Jacobites compounded with prudence and loyalty by holding their glasses over a finger bowl, or a vase of flowers, when the toast of "The King" was drunk—thus pledging secretly their own king—over the water.

Another famous and well-known Jacobite toast was that to "the little gentleman in the Black Velvet Jacket"—meaning thereby the mole, who had caused the death of William of Orange. That prince did, indeed, stumble over a molehill when riding, and had a heavy fall, which induced the illness that was fatal to this great enemy of the Stuarts.

In the early eighteenth century sometimes apparently hale and hearty persons might be seen limping round dining tables, with their glasses to their lips, and that in complete silence; they were then drinking the most "treasonable" of all toasts. For to limp signified in the form of an acrostic:

L for Louis XIV.
I for James
M for Mary of Modena
P for the Prince of Wales

The Rev. Robert Kilgour (afterwards Bishop of Aberdeen) was at one time Episcopal Minister of Peterhead, and, like most of the North Country Episcopalians, was a strong Jacobite. One day sometime after the battle of Culloden, he happened to be dining with some Hanoverian officers. After dinner the Colonel gave the usual toast of "The King" without preface or remark, simply saying, "Gentlemen, the King." The words in themselves were indefinite and capable of a double meaning, being applicable to King James or King George. The company all rose, and lifting their glasses echoed, with the exception of Mr. Kilgour, the words "The King." He, not choosing to use them, said instead—"Our Lawful King." The words seemed to have a Jacobite tinge, but, like the toast as given, they were still ambiguous. They were not allowed to pass unchallenged. A young subaltern, desiring to show his zeal for the Government, turned to Mr. Kilgour, and addressing him said: "Sir, that's not King George." To this Mr. Kilgour replied: "Young gentleman, I am very much of your way of thinking."—I am, etc.

C.C.B.

Humanity of Charles Edward.

In considering the campaign of 1745 nothing stands out more clearly than the gentlemanly and humane conduct of Charles Edward. He was humane to a fault. His conduct stands out in striking contrast to that of his opponent, the ruffianly "Duke of Cumberland." We have but to notice the contrast between the treatment meted to the English and Hanoverian wounded and captives after the Prince's victory at Prestonpans. Like the chivalrous descendant of a hundred kings, he treated the wounded and captives with mercy and humanity. The wounded were carried to the infirmary at Edinburgh. The Hanoverian dead were buried. The captives were allowed the liberty of the city of Edinburgh upon their parole until some of them made their escape, upon which most of those who were not wounded were sent to Perth, and had the liberty of that town, where they continued till after Culloden the name of the Prince crossed the border into England. These captives later on were found intriguing with Edinburgh, contrary to the word of honour they had given, yet no punishment was inflicted on them. To put them beyond the power of working further mischief, they were simply removed to Glamis, Leslie, and Cowper, where they could want nothing, and were under no restraint but their parole.

Maxwell of Kirkconnell writes concerning prisoners taken later in the campaign:—"The officers that were afterwards taken in Sutherland, were as well used as if their fellow-officers had behaved themselves like men of honour. Even the common soldiers were as well treated as the necessity of the Prince's affairs would allow. He had a great many of them on his hands towards the end, and they were maintained while his own men could hardly find subsistence; so that if it is possible to err on the side of lenity, several errors of this kind may justly be imputed to him (Charles)."

Another instance of the humanity of Charles is contained in the following: When the Jacobites were marching into England they captured a government spy. According to all the laws of war, he should have been shot; "yet so surprising," says Murray of Broughton, "was the Chevalier's humanity and good nature, that he would not inflict on him the punishment he so justly demerited." With reference to this incident Maxwell of Kirkconnell writes: "I cannot tell whether the Prince on this occasion was guided by his opinion or his inclination; I suspect the latter, because it was his constant practice to spare his enemies when they were in his power. I don't believe there was one instance to the contrary to be found in the whole expedition."

The example thus set by the Prince was followed by his officers. In this respect the exemplary conduct of Lord George Murray is worthy of mention. It is certainly a fact that after the defeat of Charles Edward at Culloden, many English soldiers who had been temporarily prisoners of the Jacobite army, wrote to Lord George, mentioning their gratitude for the courteous treatment they had received at his hands.

With regard to the barbarity practised on his gallant opponents after Culloden the name of the "Butcher Cumberland" will be eternally emblazoned on the banner of infamy. A volume might well be compiled, its every page blackened with the infamous acts of this scion and representative of the Hanoverian monarch. Space permits us to mention but two notorious instances. Just after the Battle of Culloden Cumberland was riding over the field with Colonel Wolfe (afterwards the conqueror of Quebec). Seeing a wounded Highlander staring at him with what appeared to be a defiant smile, the Duke commanded Wolfe to shoot him. This the Colonel promptly refused to do, instantly placing his commission at Cumberland's disposal. Yet another instance. Cumberland's instructions to his human bloodhounds: "No prisoners, gentlemen." And truly and literally they carried out his bloody commands.
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