

---

## Book Review

---

# A touch of Peter Pan

by Katherine Kanter

---

### **A Touch of Treason**

by Ian Hamilton QC

Lochar Publishing, Moffat, Scotland, 1990  
207 pages with index, hardbound, £10.95.

---

These are the memoirs of Ian Hamilton, one of Scotland's best-known criminal lawyers. The "touch of treason" in the title refers to the event which made him an extremely popular public figure in his native land: On Christmas Eve of 1950, as a young law student, he broke into Westminster Abbey and removed back to Scotland the Stone of Destiny which King Edward of England had stolen in 1306. This was the first of several attempts by Mr. Hamilton to restore to Scotland some parcel of its former statehood, lost to England in 1707 under a bizarre arrangement known as the Treaty of Union.

In 1953, Hamilton and an outstanding constitutionalist, John Macdonald MacCormick, took out a suit against the Crown impugning the right of the English Queen to style herself Elizabeth "II" of Scotland, since there had never been an Elizabeth I in that country. During the disputes in the case, which made legal history, the sham underlying the 1707 Treaty of Union was exposed to public view as never before, in particular, the incompatibility between the Scots doctrine of Sovereignty of the People, and the English doctrine of Sovereignty of the Crown-in-Parliament. In 1954, on becoming an Advocate, Hamilton made it known that he would not swear the oath of allegiance to Elizabeth "II." Popular feeling in Scotland was so high that the Crown found it more politic to bend rather than break. The numeral "II" was removed from the Scots Advocates' Oath.

Unfortunately, that was almost 40 years ago, and that was about the last Scotland has heard from Ian Hamilton. I know him as a lovable man with a very keen mind, and I hoped to write enthusiastically on his memoirs. But to do so

would not be fair. All Hamilton succeeds in doing here is to prove that he is not a leader and never wanted to be. Typical are the few lines he devotes to his decision to return the Stone of Destiny, which is now back in London under the English Monarch's throne. Why return it? Were there threats to his life? Why not tell what really happened? The few Europeans in this century who have given any thought to Scotland, always ask why that nation has not yet recovered its statehood. The answer is simple: Scotland has had no leadership since the death of Robert Burns in 1796.

Since Hamilton obviously reads a lot of books, he must know whether Scotland has made any contribution at all to European culture, or whether she *deserves* to lie under the English boot. Why does Scotland have a system of education and law completely different from that of her English overlord? Is this Scottish system better, or worse? In fact, better, but you will not learn why by reading Hamilton, the more disappointing because he is a high-flying lawyer.

Another example: the poet Robert Burns. As an intellectual, Hamilton surprisingly has nothing to say on this man who is not only one of the foremost artists of the last centuries, the Schiller of his native land, but also a great political leader. There is no way a national movement can be built by ignoring Robert Burns. What we *do* learn, is that England is Hamilton's "favorite foreign country"—whereas, the utter destruction of Scotland's population since the Union tells a different story about the way England deals with subject peoples. In the year of the Union, the ratio of Englishmen to Scots was 5 to 1; it is now over 10 to 1.

Scotland is a country which people in Poland, in Ukraine, in Lithuania, consider to be, like themselves, a martyr nation—though unlike Russia, England was never stupid enough to seal the Scots inside their border, or the explosion would already have happened. The history of Scotland since 1707 is tragic in the extreme. In the 18th century, the Scottish people fell victim to massacres and deportation by their powerful new "ally." In the next century, the only way Scots could vote on the Union was with their feet. Between 1860 and 1910 Scotland lost 1 million people to emigration, out of a total population of about 4.5 million! During several decades in the 19th century, more than *one-quarter* of all youths left, never to return. By comparison, France had in 1941 about 40 million people; she now has 57 million. Today, as all the Scottish political parties slavishly tail after the Green Wave, the little that is left of the Scottish population is about to be ecologized and birth-controlled out of existence.

### **Embracing the Green fanatics**

Something has gone sour in the minds of the Scottish elite to which Hamilton belongs. They have adopted British ideology, they have gone malthusian. The Scottish National Party can write unashamedly in its program, that a population of 5 million is in perfect ecological balance with the scenery. If Hamilton will not say anything to the constitutional crisis