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NOTE

The Evangelicals was the convenient, popular designation given to members of the Free Church. The latter body, of course, came into existence at the Disruption in 1843, being comprised of the sizeable proportion of erstwhile Church of Scotland ministers, elders and members who in that year seceded from the Established Church over the patronage issue.

The members of the United Presbyterian Church were popularly termed the Voluntaries, a designation which since at least the 1830s had been applied to all Scottish religious dissenters who called for complete disestablishment throughout Britain and who vigorously maintained that churches could preserve spiritual independence only through total separation from the State. The U.P. Church as such was formed on these principles in 1847, from an amalgam of the majority of the dissenting sects formerly known as the Seceders and the Relief Church.
In recent years, fairly exhaustive investigation has been undertaken into British attitudes towards social and political conditions in America during the Reconstruction era, into British speculations on the future of the freed slaves, and into the nature and extent of British involvement in contributing aid for them. The basic object of this thesis, however, is to narrow the focus from a wide-ranging consideration of general British viewpoints and actions to a more specific concentration on purely Scottish attitudes and responses. It has therefore been the principal aim to give a greater measure of detailed attention than hitherto to the views expressed on post-Civil War America (and most especially on the plight, progress and future prospects of the emancipated Negro population) by influential Scotsmen in all spheres of life, by Scottish travellers to the United States who had acquired first-hand knowledge of the situation, by Scottish journalists keeping their eyes trained on American developments, and by interested groups and bodies (for example, the dissenting Churches) within the community.

Closer scrutiny has also been given to the reasons why prominent individuals and certain sections of the Scottish people assumed the attitudes which they did: and that exercise has necessarily involved trying to determine whether the distinct cultural heritage and development of Scotland, which in several significant respects tended to make its society quite different from that of England in the mid-nineteenth century, had any positive effect in producing characteristics peculiar to the Scottish outlook on America after the Civil War and to the Scottish approach to freedmen's aid. In this connection, there has been taken into account such specifically national features as, for instance, the consciousness of a distinctively Scottish identity, based largely on recognition of Scotland's ancient struggle for political and religious independence and the country's
widely acclaimed attachment to democratic and egalitarian principles; the impact and influence upon society of the flourishing, independent Presbyterianism of the Free and United Presbyterian Churches; and the exceedingly strong and frequently strict religiosity of the middle class elements who made known their views on American Reconstruction and who participated in the freedmen's aid movement.

On another level, consideration has also been given to the possible influence on attitudes towards post-Civil War America of certain marked trends within the traditional Scottish outlook on the United States, and of specific Scottish links, both personal and general, formed with America over the preceding three or four decades. And perhaps most importantly, there existed the need to assess the way in which the sympathies held and the actions pursued by various individuals and groups during the abolitionist campaign and in the years of the American Civil War were carried over into the Reconstruction era. Previous studies have made it clear that Scotland maintained an extremely keen, active interest in both the abolition of American slavery and the fortunes of the combatants in the Civil War, and it consequently remained to be discovered if a comparable level of interest was sustained in the process of American Reconstruction. More specifically, an attempt has been made to ascertain if the exceedingly strong and vigorous Scottish concern which had been displayed for the American slaves was adequately matched by the concern which Scots showed for the welfare of the freedmen. In giving consideration to the general question of the Scottish response to freedmen's aid, substantial attention has been paid not only to the actual character and extent of participation within the country but also to what would appear to have been the principal stimuli for supporting the movement. The intention in concentrating closely on the latter aspect has been to gain a deeper insight into the disparities
and the similarities which existed between the Scottish and English patterns of involvement in the freedmen's aid cause.

So far as the political aspects of the post-war American situation are concerned, it was felt that Scottish attitudes to these could not properly be examined in isolation from Scottish attitudes to the wider issues of American democracy and the practical functioning of the American system of government. Accordingly, the attempt has been made to evaluate opinions on specific Reconstruction policies largely in the perspective of views held on the basic character of United States political institutions. This has inevitably involved extending the scope of the thesis somewhat beyond the examination of attitudes to the issues, the partisan measures, and the principles which constituted the politics of Reconstruction.

In general terms, perhaps one of the most striking features to emerge from the investigation into Scottish views on the United States during the mid 1860s to 1870s was the sheer volume of interest and comment sustained over that period. Consequently, partly in order to demonstrate something of the diverse character of that widespread interest, some indication has also been given of the ways in which America, and especially American slavery, remained popularly fixed in the attention of the Scottish public throughout the first decade or so after the Civil War.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: THE SCOTTISH-AMERICAN CONNECTION IN PERSPECTIVE

When on 9 April, 1865, General Robert E. Lee surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Courthouse, the pattern had already been well set for substantial British attention to and involvement in the process of American Reconstruction. The intensely sustained and highly charged emotional awareness which, over the preceding four years, had characterized Britain's response to the Civil War was itself solidly grounded in a tradition of interest in the Republic of America stretching from the War of Independence, and gaining in momentum over the first half of the nineteenth century as the blossoming of American democracy provided an irresistible focus of attention for both its British detractors and advocates.¹

With, however, several key issues which had concerned men on both sides of the Atlantic apparently resolved by the outcome of the war (the abolition of slavery, the triumph of democratic institutions as represented by the Northern states, the controversy over states' rights), Britain might have been expected to react to the ensuing period of American Reconstruction with a sadly diminished and dispassionate interest. But, as recent scholarship has illustrated, such was not the nature of the British response;² rather, the immediate post-war years were marked by a tremendously strong determination to keep abreast of developments political, social, and economic in the United States.³

---

¹ The continuing British focus on America has been fully examined in several works, notably E.D. Adams, Great Britain and the American Civil War (London, 1925); G.D. Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom: the Impact of American Democracy upon Great Britain 1830-1870 (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955); David Paul Crook, American Democracy in English Politics, 1815-1850 (Oxford, 1965).


³ Ibid., p. 385.
Yet, after all, there is perhaps little that is remarkable in the
existence of a powerful post-war American orientation. It was rendered
likely as a result both of the traditional British interest in the
United States, and of the peculiar legacy of the Civil War. Because
the conflict between North and South had involved not only the fate of
the institution of slavery, but also the fate of the United States as
a viable national structure, the issues of the Reconstruction era were
recognized by British observers not merely as problems extremely difficult
to solve in themselves, but also as the pivots on which depended the
success or failure of permanent reunion. This in itself was sufficient
to ensure that until the early 1870s at least, America would be observed
with a fascination and seriousness at least equal to that common to the
British outlook earlier in the century.

Views influential by, and held in common with, those of England

Into the general mosaic of "British" attitudes to the United States
during the Reconstruction years, it is tempting simply to fit the
opinions of those inhabiting "North Britain". Certainly, many of the
sentiments expressed by Englishmen towards events in America, and many
of the controversies aroused within England by differing interpretations
of those events, were substantially reflected in Scottish comment on the
American situation. Given the close interaction of the two societies
at that time, it could hardly have been otherwise. On the level of
press comment, for example, it was difficult for Scottish editors, unless
they happened totally to disagree in principle with its arguments, to
remain uninfluenced by the London Times articles on Reconstruction. A

---

1 In fact several did; for instance, James Robie of the Caledonian
Mercury, John Leng of the Dundee Advertiser, William McCombie of
the Aberdeen Free Press. The attitudes of these sections of the
press, along with those of the Times school, are considered in
some detail throughout the thesis.
combination of its international reputation, the volume of its comment on America at that period, and the convincingly authoritative nature of the writing made it a quotable source of reference for provincial Scottish newspapers, while the Scotsman, assuming for itself a position in Scotland broadly analogous to its London contemporary, undoubtedly tended on occasion closely to parallel the latter's arguments on Reconstruction.¹

Again, personal and ideological links between prominent Englishmen and Scotsmen sympathetic to the Northern cause during the Civil War, and to American democracy in general, found a natural extension in the post-war years. The influence in Scotland of John Bright's persistent comments on the United States, for instance, was facilitated by the fact that there was a fairly strong stream of Brightian Liberalism running through Scottish political thinking, spearheaded in Edinburgh by Bright's brother-in-law, Duncan McLaren.²

¹ Indeed, the Scotsman's proximity to the Times in terms of general political sympathies was sufficient for its great Edinburgh press enemy, the Caledonian Mercury, in considering the paper's attitude to British military action following the Jamaican rebellion of 1865, to stigmatize it, with some justice, as the Times' "drilled substitute in Edinburgh". Caledonian Mercury, 21 Nov., 1865. Again, with direct reference to the similar opinions of the Times and the Scotsman during the course of the Civil War, the Scotsman was branded "its diluted substitute here". Ibid., 4 Jan., 1866.

² William Ferguson, Scotland: 1689 to the Present (Edinburgh, 1968), pp. 302-303, has argued that at least for the period 1832-1867, many Scottish Liberals stuck by the creed of the Manchester school. The mid-nineteenth century saw the rise to activity, at least at municipal level, of the dissenting, middle-class Scottish radical, and while John Vincent has made the point that, socially, Scottish Liberal M.P.'s were proportionately more aristocratic and territorial than their English counterparts in the 1850s and 1860s, he concedes that radical Liberalism was far from lacking in the constituencies - John Vincent, The Formation of the Liberal Party, 1857-1868 (London, 1966), p. 48. In 1868, Edinburgh granted Bright the Freedom of the City, and the Chamber of Commerce - of which Duncan McLaren had been chairman from 1862-1865 - simultaneously elected him as its second honorary member. See J.B. Mackie, The Life and Work of Duncan McLaren (London and Edinburgh, 1883), Vol. II, pp. 60, 63-64.

For a biographical note on McLaren, see Appendix I.
Disseminating the Brightian line on America, as on domestic policies, was the long established Edinburgh Caledonian Mercury. With its self-professed championship of the working classes and its traditional agitation for a fairer deal for Scotland through increased devolution, it catered especially for those sections of the capital’s radical, dissenting middle-class for whom the “moderate Liberalism” to which the Scotsman was committed approached rather too closely to the convictions of the Conservative Edinburgh Evening Courant. Symptomatic of the polarity between it and the Scotsman was the feud in which they engaged in the 1850s over the Caledonian Mercury’s endorsement of the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights. This was a difference which the Mercury chose vigorously to maintain until at least 1866, when the ownership passed from James Robie.

Championship of Scottish rights certainly did not preclude, however, the paper’s adoption during the American Civil War of a firm, unequivocal line of criticism on all anti-Union sentiment. For the Mercury, unwavering in its Brightian admiration for American democracy, the constant British stress on the kinship and special ties linking the two countries took the form of expressing a pride in the intelligence, perseverance, and courage of the Americans – “our kith and kin” – in their struggle to emancipate the slaves. The emphasis on this aspect was strictly in line with the paper’s sympathies during the war. Not without reason, it frequently took the opportunity to pat itself on the back for having been one of the very few British newspapers

1 In the 1865 Press Directory, the Scotsman is represented as “the organ of the moderate Liberals throughout Scotland”. Mitchell’s Press Directory, 1865 (London, 1865), p. 94. See also advertisement furnished by the Scotsman, ibid., p. 160.
3 Caledonian Mercury, 14 Aug., 1865.
consistently to support the North.\(^1\) Although the paper ceased publication in summer, 1867,\(^2\) it is worth recognizing here as a filter through which some of the tenets and opinions of a national figure could reach those sectors of the Scottish public likely to be receptive to them.

Patterns of attitudes basically similar to those which emerged in England also developed on specific aspects of the American situation which had a direct bearing on Britain and which, though not strictly central to the Reconstruction theme, naturally formed a vital part of the British focus on the United States in these years. Faced with such issues as the 'Alabama' controversy, the American sympathy shown - even at Presidential level - to the Fenians, and the early post-war fears of United States designs on Canada, the reactions of Scotland, no less than those of her Southern neighbour, tended to be for the most part defensive, irate, sometimes ballicose, and always trenchant.

Not that the Scottish response on all these issues was anything like monolithic: on the 'Alabama' problem especially, a number of voices were raised in a plea for understanding of the American case. Most strongly outspoken in this respect were those sections of the Scottish press which had supported the North during the war, and which

---

1 This fact had been recognized by J.M. Sturtevant, D.D., President of Illinois College, when, lecturing on a three months tour of Britain at Chicago in Spring, 1864, he had bitterly denounced as "mouthpieces of the English aristocracy" the many sections of the British press which, following the Times, "display before the English public every loathsome ulcer or unsightly pimple on the American body politic". Exempt from his censure, indeed praised as "true to our country in this hour of her trial, and true to freedom", were the Daily News, the Morning Star, and the Caledonian Mercury. See J.M. Sturtevant, D.D., "English Institutions and the American Rebellion", published in pamphlet form as Extracts from a lecture delivered at Chicago, April 28, 1864, by J.M. Sturtevant, D.D., President of Illinois College. (Manchester, 1864)

2 Extant files of the Mercury unfortunately end as early as June, 1866.
looked kindly on American democracy and on the Republic in general. Leading the field in forthright condemnation of British policy over the 'Alabama' and allied Confederate cruisers, the Caledonian Mercury used the vulnerability of Britain's position on that issue, and on the connected question of recognition of the Confederacy as belligerents, to further its traditional attacks on the British ruling classes and on the "reactionary" Liberalism of Gladstone and Russell.

Maintaining that Britain had absolutely no right to let loose the 'Alabama' and her sister ships on a friendly power trying to curb domestic insurrection, the paper argued from that premise against according belligerent status to the South. The blame was put squarely on the shoulders of "the British governing classes, the privileged orders": "all who enjoy the sweets and comforts of life at the expense of other men's labour and toil" had had a vested interest in seeing the South granted equal rank and belligerent rights with the North.¹

No doubt it seemed a very fine thing for Mr Gladstone to talk of the Confederacy as 'a nation', and Earl Russell ... to characterise America as the 'disunited States', especially as both had in all likelihood personally come to the [common] conclusion ... that the North could never conquer its rebels and vindicate its national authority and laws, and that the South must be a sovereign and independent Power.²

While the paper's most caustic sarcasm was reserved for the builder of the 'Alabama', Laird of Birkenhead,³ the ultimate responsibility for the ship's subsequent career was held to lie indisputably with the British government. Lord Russell was naturally singled out as particularly blameworthy: "The idea that a Cabinet Minister should not be able

¹ Caledonian Mercury, 13 Sept., 1865.
² Ibid.
³ The Mercury seized with predictable relish on Laird's public refutation of the statement put out by the Southern States that he had been one of the British contributors to the Confederate Loan. It was the least he could have done, an editorial commented, to have given a few thousand pounds to the Confederates as his "friends" and "employers". Ibid., 13 Oct., 1865.
to prevent a piratical vessel from leaving the port of Liverpool is ... rather absurd." Critical also of his reluctance to go to early arbitration over the American claims, the Mercury's standard line of reasoning was well illustrated in an editorial chastising Russell on this score:

The sooner the thoughtless mischief-makers who clapped their hands as the Alabamas and Floridas and Shenandoahs left our shores, and did not hesitate, even in the House of Commons, to manifest their satisfaction at the tales of ruin done by the Confederate cruisers, begin to seriously reflect on the consequences of their mischief, the sooner they will be in a position to meet suitably and honourably the claims made upon them.  

The recognition of British culpability on the issue of the Confederate cruisers was conditioned largely by the degree to which the observer was willing to admit that Britain had consciously deviated from her traditional creed of fair play and open dealing. Thus, the kernel of the Caledonian Mercury's diatribes on the subject was the insistence that Britain, placed in the same situation as America, would have acted in precisely the same way:

It is hard to suffer at the hands of a professedly friendly Power the worst evils of war. If these evils are endured through bad faith on the part of the professedly friendly Power, we have no hesitation in pronouncing that Power responsible. If they occur through its negligence, it is still liable for the consequences ... We have not the slightest doubt that had we been in the position of the Americans, and the Americans in ours, that we should have made pretty much the same demands upon them as they now make on us. The golden rule was meant for nations as well as individuals, and it would be well for the world if it were always acted on.  

The strength of conviction and the confidence which characterized such value judgements derived in the Caledonian Mercury's case from the

1 Ibid., 13 Oct., 1865.  
2 Ibid., 15 Nov., 1865.  
3 Ibid., 13 Oct., 1865.
knowledge that in attacking the principal British perpetrators of this particular "crime" against the free states of America, it was simultaneously attacking those elements in British society with whom, ideologically, it had no truck, and also the Conservative and Whiggish press, against whose powerful influence it was literally fighting a battle for survival. It was thus possible to launch an eloquent denunciation of British policy without alienating the paper's readers, on the grounds that the initiative had during the Civil War been in the hands of "men of great pretensions and little brains" who had laugh[ed] and mock[ed] at America in the time of her calamity", "so-called aristocratic classes", and "blind guides at the Press" who had led astray "a large proportion of our middle classes ... and urged [them] to believe that Providence was vindicating the rights of a pampered oligarchy to perpetual dominion over the bodies and souls of millions of prostrate slaves."¹

Similar sentiments were expressed by the radical-Liberal Dundee Advertiser which, recalling that it had always denounced the destruction by the British-built vessels and had urged Britain to put itself in America's place, lamented that most of the upper and middle-classes had, with press backing, defended the actions of the 'Alabama'.² Especially bitter against Laird and his associates, the paper went so far as to argue that "They made Fenianism possible [in the United States], because their acts led the United States Government and Legislature to look indifferently, even admiringly, on the Fenian organisation."³

¹ Ibid., 15 Nov., 1865.
² Dundee Advertiser, 2 Nov., 1866.
Adding its voice in strong criticism of the British government for allowing the 'Alabama' to escape, the Liberal Aberdeen Free Press, like the Caledonian Mercury, traced the trouble back to British recognition of the Confederate States as belligerents. This had meant, it was argued, that Confederate cruisers, under nominal shelter of international law, were enabled to act towards the Northern mercantile fleet "as the worst class of pirates, ... supplied from this country with their whole means of carrying on their barbarous and most destructive form of warfare."\(^1\)

While taking issue with America about complaining over British recognition of belligerent rights, on the grounds that the North, too, had recognized the South, even the Whig Glasgow Herald ultra-cautiously admitted that on the 'Alabama' issue itself, "our conduct was not wholly defensible".\(^2\) On the side of the Conservative press, the Aberdeen Journal reminded its readers that it had always held England to be at fault, and declared that British acceptance of the terms of the 'Alabama' treaty meant more than simply a desire to preserve British-American relations; it was also explainable by "a latent doubt of the justice of our attitude towards the United States in both the recognition of the Confederates as belligerents, and the course pursued with respect to the Alabama."\(^3\)

But at least for those Scots who vindicated the British course on the 'Alabama' right the way through from its escape to the Washington Treaty, the vindication was - and could only be - made in terms which

---

1 [Aberdeen Free Press, 20 Oct., 1865. See also 6 Sept., 1867; 14 May, 1869; 17 Sept., 1872.]
2 [Glasgow Herald, 25 May, 1869.]
3 [Aberdeen Journal, 17 May, 1871.]
recognized the need for Britain as a nation to stand firm against the unjustified and impertinent encroachments of the American government.\(^1\) The identification of a community of interest thus produced a Scottish line of reasoning on this question which could not fail to be akin to its English counterpart.

II Characteristics of the Scottish outlook towards America in preceding generations: the utilization of the American experience

When the debt to English influence has been acknowledged, however, it still remains worthwhile to look more closely at specifically Scottish attitudes to the Reconstruction years in America, if only to try to discover the relative strength of Scotland's separate, indigenous cultural traditions in moulding these attitudes. For essentially, even at those times when opinion reflected standard English lines of argument, the Scottish response to American Reconstruction had its ultimate base in a tradition of Scottish interest in the United States marked by fairly strong distinctive characteristics.

The perils of definition make it dangerous to suggest that this Scottish tradition of interest had been characterized from an early stage by a strong vein of radical thought. Yet, stretching even from beyond the outbreak of the American Revolution, there had been inherent in much Scottish observation of America at least a broad open-mindedness, an objectivity in analysing the American situation. For instance, it had been from a Scottish professor of moral philosophy, Francis Hutcheson, that there had come, in the 1740s, the first systematic

---

\(^1\) Foremost in expressing this attitude in the Scottish press was the Scotsman. It insisted that America was deliberately "keeping the scar open" between herself and Britain by dwelling on the 'Alabama' claims, that British recognition of the Confederacy was totally justifiable, and that the British government could not be held responsible for acts of depredation committed by "foreigners" - "even in a ship which in its original and innocent condition, had been British." Scotsman, 28 Dec., 1869, 4 Jan., 1872. See also 28 May, 1869, 24 Sept., 1869, 4 March, 1872, 15 March, 1872.
development of a theory justifying the right of colonies to resist the mother country if and when, because of the oppressive nature of the latter's policies or the natural growth of colonial maturity, subjugation became "burdensome".¹

When ultimately the American colonies did decide that the time had come to bid for independence from Britain, Scottish opinion, helped by irritation at the military stalemate as the Revolution dragged on, increasingly tended to favour the American cause. Significantly, this was a trend which extended to embrace virtually all sectors of society: even among the Scottish politicians, generally tools of the administration at that time, an element felt constrained to speak out in support of the colonists' struggle.²

Given, then, a Scottish predisposition to look not unkindly on the American argument, the success of the Revolution was perhaps a stimulus for Scots to continue their interest in the unfolding of the American experience. Certainly, amid the welter of British travelogues on the United States which appeared in the second third of the nineteenth century, works by Scots, distinguished and undistinguished,

¹ Caroline Robbins, "'When It Is That Colonies May Turn Independent': An Analysis of the Environment and Politics of Francis Hutcheson (1694-1746)" in William and Mary Quarterly, Third Series, Vol. 11, No. 2, April, 1954, pp. 215-217. While English influence was extremely important in the formulation of Hutcheson's thought, his arguments were nevertheless substantially aided, both in their development and in their reception, by the grievances and discontents peculiar to contemporary society in Scotland and in Ireland (where he had spent the first half of his life).

figured prominently. And if, in the pattern of development of American civilization, there was much that offended Scottish sensibilities, there remained a strong body of opinion which had confidence in the working-out of democracy in America as a panacea for social and political evils both there and in Britain, and which looked sympathetically and anxiously on American attempts to eradicate existing abuses within the social and political framework.

The principal question which engaged the attention of Americans and sympathetic Scots through the middle decades of the century was unquestionably the institution of Negro slavery. With the emphasis placed on the need for a transatlantic community of spirit to combat the evil, a new

---

1 See, for instance, W.E. Baxter, America and the Americans (London, 1855); William Thomson, A Tradesman's Travels in the United States and Canada (Edinburgh, 1852); James Stirling, Letters from the Slave States (London, 1857); Alexander Mackay, The Western World (London, 1850), 3 Vols.; Charles Mackay, Life and Liberty in the United States (London, 1859), 2 Vols.; William Chambers, American Slavery and Colour (London, 1857) and Things as they are in America (Edinburgh, 1854); Amelia M. Murray, Letters from the United States, Cuba and Canada (New York, 1856); James Lumsden, American Memoranda (Glasgow, 1854); James Logan, Notes of a Journey through Canada, the United States and the West Indies (Edinburgh, 1838); Laurence Oliphant, Minnesota and the Far West (Edinburgh, 1855).

For discussion of the content of most of the works listed above, and for a general survey of the literature of the British visitor to America in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, see Max Berger, The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860 (New York, 1943; reprint, Gloucester, Massachusetts, 1964).

2 Notable in this respect are W.E. Baxter and Alexander Mackay in the works cited above, and William Chambers, Things as they are in America (Edinburgh, 1854).


dimension was introduced into the Scottish focus on America. Up until that time, the "radicalism" of the interest in the United States had of necessity been nebulous, manifesting itself in passive pronouncements on the nature of the young Republic. The anti-slavery movement channelled Scottish interest in America into an organizational framework through which, by direct activity, it was possible to register a more positive practical radical response to the American situation than ever before.

Scottish commitment to "universal emancipation" had long preceded that of England, and enthusiasm for it remained stronger throughout the 1830s. But it was in the strong Garrisonian line chosen by the most influential Scottish emancipation societies, following the 1840-1841 split in the American anti-slavery movement, that the essence of the radical response lay. In choosing to reject the tenets of the moderate Tappanite faction, and Eliza Wyharn's Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, William Smeal's Glasgow Emancipation Society had determined the existence in Scotland of organizations actively pursuing a known radical course with the specific intention of helping to bring about a reform in American institutions. Their commitment to a radical programme of action - whatever the reasons for adopting it - was to some extent a formalization of the old tradition of radicalism in the Scottish outlook on America.

It has been convincingly demonstrated that an innate characteristic of this outlook was the utilization of the American experience - especially, it would seem, in its times of crisis - as a screen on which to project Scottish differences of opinion. The high-water mark of this trend was

1 Rice, The Scottish Factor, p. 41.
2 Ibid., pp. 42-43. Subsequent chapters of Dr Rice's thesis discuss the implications of the United States split on British abolitionist societies, and the disproportionate strength of radicalism in the Scottish reaction to it.
reached in the varied response of disparate groups within Scotland to the fragmented United States abolitionist movement. Nor were elements of this tradition wanting in Scottish controversy over the Civil War itself. With the cessation of hostilities, however, it would appear that this fundamental aspect of the Scottish transatlantic focus began somewhat to diminish in significance. There was a dual causation behind the fact that though there remained a real and deep interest in America during Reconstruction, this interest did not really have the traditionally powerful effect of bringing into play antagonisms already existent in Scottish society.

Firstly, the aims behind Reconstruction, however confused, frustrated, and submerged they may have become in practice, were basically stabilizing - the stabilizing of order and prosperity after the war, the stabilizing of race relations on a more equal footing: in short, the rewelding of a broken nation. And these, in themselves, were uncontroversial, laudable goals. Where controversy could, and certainly did, arise was in Scottish views on the methods by which these worthy ends could be effected. It could, of course, be suggested that the same argument was equally true for Scottish sentiments on American abolitionist efforts: it was the means rather than the end which made for contention. What constituted the vital difference, however, was that the problems of Reconstruction were not so readily projectable on to the Scottish domestic scene as earlier American questions of import had been. Thus, whereas the abolition of slavery in the United States (involving as it did a basic moral principle) had been an issue capable of producing active, practical

1 Rice, *The Scottish Factor*, p. 5 and passim.

responses from Scottish society which in turn had directly illuminated and exacerbated existing splits in that society, Reconstruction remained of necessity an essentially American problem, to be sorted out by Americans, with as much British financial help as could safely be given without fear of offence to American sensibilities.¹

While the extent of direct Scottish involvement in the Reconstruction process was therefore necessarily limited by the very nature of that process, the practical Scottish response which was made, in terms of contributions to freedmen's aid, was itself of a kind which largely precluded any differences of opinion as to approach. Basically, there could be only one approach - to give as liberally as possible. Freedmen's aid, because it was, first and foremost, simply a case for philanthropy, raised, in Scotland at least,² few of the vexed questions which had split the Scottish emancipation advocates and afforded a stage on which inherent domestic rivalries could be played out under cover of the American cause.

The second factor militating against this tendency was the apparent quietening down in Scotland itself of old domestic quarrels by the mid

---

1 For reference to American anxiety lest appeals to Britain should seem importunate, and to British concern not to appear to be meddling in American politics through sending contributions for freedmen's aid, see Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, pp. 191, 192, 214-215, 404-406.

2 This is not to suggest that the freedmen's aid movement in Britain was totally free of contention at all levels. On the contrary, there was internecine feuding in many of the societies, while the influential London British and Foreign Freedmen's Aid Society explicitly refused, from a fear of the curtailment of its autonomy and from differences on policy, to be affiliated to the National Freedmen's Aid Union. See ibid., pp. 200, 204, 378, 380-381; and Vaughan, The British Freedmen's Aid Movement, passim.

For an instance of the very great bitterness which was felt towards those elements not willing to join the projected Union, and remaining adamant on their decision to include Jamaica in their Freedmen's Aid programme, see Arthur Albright to Aspinall Hampson, February, 1866. Anti-Slavery Papers, Rhodes House, Oxford, (hereafter cited A-sl. P.), MS. C117/25.
1860s and 1870s. The rivalry and bitter antagonism between Voluntary, Evangelical, and Established churches which existed from the 1830s until the 1850s, and which played so central a part in fragmenting the abolitionist drive in Scotland, was largely a spent force by Reconstruction times. 1863 saw the beginnings of the movement for Union between the Free and United Presbyterian churches. And while it must be admitted that the vociferous and influential minority of Free Church anti-union agitators were the cause of much serious bitterness and recrimination within the Free Church during the ten years when serious overtures were being made, it remains the case that the vast majority of people in both denominations sincerely desired union at that time. In addition, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, having shed its adherence to archaic forms in 1863 by voting overwhelmingly in favour of ending the suspension and expulsion of church members who voted in Parliamentary elections, also saw its way clear to joining in the discussions, and union with the Free Church was achieved in May, 1876. Moreover, there were even tentative noises made on the subject of reunion by the Established Church in the late 1860s.

Again, those nonconformist elements in business and the professions


2 Matthew Hutchison, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, Its Origin and History 1680-1876* (Paisley, 1893), pp. 331-383. Hutchison stresses that "It marked a very significant change in the general attitude and state of feeling in the Churches, to find them prepared to consider how much they held in common rather than to emphasize points on which they differed." p. 342.

which, as a rising class not yet fully accepted, had tended in the second third of the century to channel their social frustrations into spirited leadership of the Glasgow and Edinburgh Emancipation Societies, could scarcely be said to have been similarly motivated in their interest in freedmen's aid. For by the sixties and seventies, this sector, while still clinging to its professed "radicalism", had come to be less and less outside the pale of the Establishment. This was particularly true of Edinburgh, where nonconformists interested in the working out of Reconstruction and concerned with the plight of the freedmen, were in many instances prominent figures in the city, or in the country itself. While they may well have felt themselves obliged to carry on the tradition of Scottish dissenting help for America, eminently successful men like Benjamin Hall Blyth, his brother, Edward L.I. Blyth, William and Thomas Nelson, William Chambers, Francis Brown Douglas or Duncan McLaren

1 Rice, The Scottish Factor, pp. 77-78.
2 For biographical notes on Thomas Nelson, William Chambers, Duncan McLaren, and the Blyth brothers, see Appendix I.

William Nelson was the elder son of Thomas Nelson, sen., the Edinburgh bookseller and publisher. In 1835, at the age of nineteen, he entered his father's business and along with his younger brother, Thomas, gradually built it up into a leading publishing concern. A capable businessman, he was considerably less dedicated than his brother to unremitting hard work. He interested himself in the improvement of Edinburgh, spending large sums on the restoration of old buildings and monuments. In December, 1865 he contributed £25 to the Edinburgh freedmen's aid fund launched at that time (see Appendix II(c)). He was a member of the Free Church - see DNB, Vol. 14, pp. 214-215.

Francis Brown Douglas, the son of an advocate, was born at Largs, Ayrshire, but while he was still an infant the family moved to Edinburgh where he was subsequently educated. On leaving Edinburgh University he became an advocate but never practised law seriously, his maternal grandfather having left him a large enough legacy to make it unnecessary for him to earn his living. In his early twenties he developed exceedingly strong religious convictions: becoming a member of the Free Church at the Disruption he was ordained an elder in 1844 and from then until his death in 1885 devoted much of his time and energy to the service of the Church. He became closely associated with Free Church ministers in Edinburgh, regularly attended the General Assembly and took a considerable part in its business, and was extremely interested in evangelistic work. In 1850 he entered the Town Council where he remained for 12 years, being Lord Provost from 1859-62. In sympathy with Duncan McLaren's political ideas, he stood unsuccessfully as an Independent Liberal at the Edinburgh by-election of 1856 and was again defeated as a candidate for St. Andrews Burghs the following year. He acted on the committee of many charitable and "improving" Societies and contributed to a multitude of philanthropic causes. In 1855 he donated £20 to the Edinburgh appeal for freedmen's aid (see Appendix II(c)). See James Stalker, Francis Brown Douglas (Privately published, 1885).
himself (newly elected M.P. for Edinburgh in 1865) obviously had no need to attempt to use the freedmen's aid movement as a ground for focussing their own dissatisfactions.

With the removal of a specific American question which could prove a focus for the playing out of inherent Scottish rivalries, Scottish debate on America in the 1860s and 1870s was at its most animated when it centred on the old business of attacking or defending American democracy and democratic institutions. The Caledonian Mercury, so consistently and sincerely pro-North during the Civil War, certainly used the American example to argue for extension of the British franchise and, on occasion, as a basis for its attacks on British Toryism. Similarly, W.E. Baxter, Liberal M.P. for Montrose burghs, and son of Edward Baxter, one of the founder members of the famous Baxter Brothers flax manufacturing firm at Dundee, tirelessly drew on the example of universal suffrage in America, and the triumph of American democracy in freeing the slave, as spurs for electoral reform in Britain.

On the other side, there was, as ever, a barrage of opinion hostile to the whole concept of American democracy. Popular facets of this attitude included a widely voiced conviction that the natural, inevitable end of all democracies (and, it would seem, the United States brand in particular) was the emergence of a dictatorship; a constant stress on the superiority of British over American political institutions; and an unrestrained horror

---

1 See, for instance, Caledonian Mercury, 10 March, 1866. The Mercury's general standpoint in this regard is considered below, Chapters III, pp. 170-172, 304-3054 IV, pp. 370-371 and passim.
2 For a biographical note on Baxter, see Appendix I.
3 See reports of speeches by Baxter in Dundee Courier and Argus, 7 July 1865, and in Dundee Advertiser, 20 January, 1865, 5 May, 1865, 15 December, 1865. For further consideration of the content of these, see Chapter III, pp. 286, 291-293.
at the possibility of an encroaching Americanization of these institutions. An influential section of the Scottish press abounded with sentiments of this kind – from the relentless stress on the failings of American society and politics in the Whiggish Scotsman and its rival, the Glasgow Herald, through to the virulent attacks on American democratic institutions (especially universal suffrage) in ultra-Tory publications such as the Edinburgh Evening Courant and Blackwood's Magazine. Faced with the apparent débâcle of Reconstruction politics, and the basic dislocation of post-war American society as a whole, it was, after all, a good time to pick holes in the American political structure.

While it could thus be argued that America was still "usable" by Scottish observers during the mid 1860s and 1870s, the use of the transatlantic focus for specifically Scottish purposes had, it would seem, declined in importance. The concern over the impact – or lack of it – of American political mores on the existing British system at that time was, after all, hardly peculiar to Scotland. And for Scotland at least, this aspect formed only part of a much wider, constant assessment, going on almost independently of the Reconstruction process as such, of American society and politics – what was, essentially, a continuous appraisal of the complex experiment in democratic Republicanism. This larger interest is testified to by the sustained reportage in the Scottish press on American affairs into the late 1870s, by which time direct interest in Reconstruction proper had waned considerably.

III Recognition of Anglo-American kinship and the growth of a special sense of mutual mission

Much of the transatlantic interest, in all its forms, hinged, of course, on the strong bond of kinship which was acknowledged to exist between America and Britain. Although stress on this common heritage

---

1 These attitudes are more fully dealt with in Chapter III, pp. 242-280.
2 See Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, pp. 35, 84-86.
could, by the Reconstruction period, militate against sympathy and understanding of the Northern states at times, its value as a factor making for continuing interest in America is inestimable.

At the same time, however, the kinship concept was usually used by different sections in Scotland in a context which reflected the nature of their own main interests in, and preconceived attitudes towards, America during the post-Civil War era. Thus, for those branches of the Scottish Presbyterian church anxious to reaffirm with their American counterparts a friendship which had been strained by the slavery issue, the special Anglo-American relationship was appealed to as the strongest operative factor likely to produce perfect harmony between Scotland and America now that the divisive force of slavery was gone. In an article on William Lloyd Garrison, then visiting Scotland, the United Presbyterian Magazine in 1867 felt his "cordial welcome" would greatly improve relations, and took the opportunity to express its hopes that America and Britain, as kin, would "bury their animosities in the grave in which slavery has been interred" so that they might unite in "a Christian crusade" against ignorance, oppression and immorality in the world.  

Writing in the Sunday Magazine in October, 1870, the Rev. Dr. William G. Blaikie, lately Free Church minister at Pilrig, and, from 1868, Professor of Pastoral Theology in New College, Edinburgh, recalled how happy he had been to accept the offer to go as a Free Church delegate to the Presbyterian reunion at Philadelphia earlier that year, and to express regard and goodwill to American churches and to the people generally.

1 This was the case primarily inasmuch as observers hostile to aspects of Northern society (political graft, corruption, buying of the Irish vote, for example) could bring up the fact that this section was no longer a bastion of the virtues of British stock but an amalgam of the scum of Europe.

2 United Presbyterian Magazine, August, 1867, p. 383.
At bottom, Britain was proud of "her American daughter", and "The time has for ever gone by when some vision of the slave-mart or the whipping-post came between our hearts and the American people."¹

Scottish travellers to America who felt they had gained by their visit greater insight into the political and social ethos of the country frequently used the fact of common ancestry to advocate increased British travel to the United States, in order to dispel old prejudices and misunderstandings. For instance, lecturing on his tour to the United States in 1866, Sir David Wedderburn, advocate and Liberal M.P. for South Ayrshire from 1868-1875, urged that the two countries must get to know each other better, and he deplored the fact that Britain was indeed, as Americans complained, jealous of her "eldest born". For his part, he believed Britain should feel "maternal pride, rather than jealousy, in recognising ... that the day will come when she must be overshadowed by her great and glorious offspring."² Sir George Campbell, returned as Liberal M.P. for Kirkaldy in 1875 following a long and


In giving attention to the unfeigned delight expressed by Scotland's dissenting denominations over the prospects for increased goodwill and associations with America following the abolition of slavery, it is worth noting an observation made by Harriet Beecher Stowe regarding the attitudes of Scottish ministers towards the United States in the mid 1850s. Referring to her close acquaintance (formed during her Scottish visit) with the famous Congregationalist minister, the Rev. Dr. Ralph Wardlaw, Mrs Stowe was prompted to conclude that: "Could our friends in America see with what earnest warmth the religious heart of Scotland beats towards them, they would be willing to suffer a word of admonition [on the question of slavery] from those to whom love gives a right to speak." Harriet Beecher Stowe, Sunny Memories of Foreign Lands (London, 1854), Vol. 1, p. 60.


For a biographical note on Wedderburn, see Appendix I.
distinguished civil service career in India, characterized by enlightened policies towards the native races,\(^1\) toured the United States in 1878 with the stated intention of studying the "Negro question" at first hand. But like his Parliamentary colleague, Wedderburn, he also came back to Scotland urging a better British acquaintance with the American kin. While attacking British writers for constantly showing Americans in caricature, for laughing at and scorning them, he attributed most of the misunderstanding harboured by people in Britain simply to ignorance and prejudice, and accordingly strongly urged British travel to America as the means of remedying false impressions.\(^2\)

During his trip as a Free Church deputy (along with Blaikie) to the reunion of American Presbyterian churches in 1870, the Rev. William Arnot of the Free High Church, Edinburgh, had been struck by the similarities of America and Britain, and returned to impart the message that a trip to the States by "the educated and influential classes" would end "the supercilious sneer at whatever is American ... I scarcely know a better cure for British pride than a tour in the great transatlantic republic."\(^3\) John Leng, owner and editor of the staunchly pro-Northern Dundee Advertiser, similarly found his awareness of the closeness of American and British people reinforced during a trip in 1876. Like Arnot, increased British travel there would, he felt, erode old biases,

---

1. For a biographical note on Campbell, see Appendix I.
   For a biographical note on Arnot, see Appendix I.
for "in heart and soul we are really one people, and of one kindred
and tongue."  

In those Conservative elements of the Scottish press which were
violently opposed to American democracy and repelled by the "vulgarity"
of American society generally, the special relationship of the two
countries, while it could hardly be ignored, tended to be stressed
from a mercenary standpoint. Thus, soliciting generous British aid
for the victims of the Chicago fire of 1871, the Edinburgh Evening
Courant certainly appeared ready enough to admit that "blood is thicker
than water" and that the cause had a strong claim on British sympathies
because, faced with one of the worst disasters of modern times, "our
immediate progeny ... are striving with a heroism, in which we, their
kinsmen, have every reason to take pride." However, behind this lay
a shrewd eye to self-interest: with the European situation looking
ominous, "Such are not the times when we can afford to alienate the
most vigorous representatives of our race from sympathy with our

---

1 John Leng, America in 1876 (Dundee Advertiser Office, 1877), pp. 333-334. The trip was undertaken in connection with investments held by Leng in the U.S. — see below, p. 56.

Similar sentiments were expressed by William Forsyth, Q.C., in "Impressions of America", Good Words, March, 1869, p. 215.


For a biographical note on Leng, see Appendix I.

Andrew Hook, "John Nichol, American Literature and Scottish Liberalism" in Bulletin of the British Association for American Studies, New Series, No. 5, June, 1963, p. 26, has shown that Scottish objections to British ignorance of, and hostility to, everything connected with America appeared as early as the 1830s, in the Edinburgh Review. In the cultural sphere, British assumptions of an innate American inferiority were still being principally attacked by a Scot in the 1880s — by John Nichol, Professor of English Literature at Glasgow University, who had visited the U.S. in 1855 and subsequently published, in 1882, American Literature: an Historical sketch, 1620-1880, the first such work by a British author — see Hook, ibid., pp. 20, 25.

Nichol's trip and his involvement in the anti-slavery movement are discussed below, Chapter III, pp. 235-237.

2 Edinburgh Evening Courant, 16 October, 1871.
sentiments, or from harmony with our politics": and it was freely admitted that "for every generous act we exhibit towards our American kinsmen we are obliterating a past resentment." The ultra-conservative Blackwood's Magazine, ever ready to attack the structure of society and politics in the United States, had similarly conceded that advantages did lie to be gained by Britain from the connection with America. An article late in 1866 argued that Britain, without a true friend in Europe, needed America as her ally, especially since "she [America] will not suffer the land which stands to her in the same relation of a father, to be insulted or degraded." Less openly anxious to profit from the ties of kinship, those solid, staid Liberals of Scotland who looked with acute suspicion and not a little foreboding at transatlantic political experiments, used the connection to bolster up their favourite argument that, of the two divergent political systems developed by the related members of the Anglo-Saxon race, the British was unquestionably the superior. Thus

1 Edinburgh Evening Courant, 16 October, 1871.

The son of James Lever, an English novelist, Charles Lever was born in Dublin in 1805. He graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, in 1827 and (having apparently gone to Quebec in charge of an emigrant ship some five years previously) visited Canada in 1829. He returned to study medicine at Dublin the following year, graduating Bachelor of Medicine in 1831 and proceeding to hold several appointments under the board of health. Poor financial circumstances encouraged him to turn to writing, in which sphere he gained great success as a contributor to Dublin University Magazine in the late 1830s and 1840s. He abandoned medicine for literature, and following three years as editor of Dublin University Magazine, went in 1845 to live in Brussels where he produced over the succeeding years a considerable number of novels. His first 'O'Dowd' articles for Blackwood were written in 1864 and they became a popular feature of the magazine. In 1857 he was appointed British consul at Spezzia and ten years later was given the consulship of Trieste (a sinecure). He was extremely unhappy in the post, and following his wife's death fell into a state of virtually permanent depression. He died in 1872.
the Whig Scotsman, noting the vital concern Britain felt in the fortunes of the United States, smugly observed that if the free government and popular institutions which America had derived from Britain had sustained the tremendous trial of the Civil War, Britain itself had escaped such an experience because her institutions were more stable, "our hearts more united, our hands more pure."\(^1\) The paper was careful to point out that hardly anyone in Britain rejoiced over the calamities of the Civil War and the "unseemly things" still happening in America as evidence condemnatory of the people or of the institutions; after all, they were "kindred in blood and language, and in religious and political institutions."\(^2\) But it simultaneously took the chance to assail the "arch-defenders" of America who, led by Bright, defended the country indiscriminately and would not recognise that its system of government compared unfavourably with that of Britain.\(^3\)

In those circles where American democracy was admired, or at least impartially judged on its merits, reminders of kinship were used to help plead for sympathy and understanding for the United States during her period of difficulties. Commenting on the debate on democracy held in January, 1867, in the Working Men's Institute, Edinburgh, between Ernest Jones, ex-Chartist leader, and Professor John Stuart Blackie, of the chair of Greek at Edinburgh University, the *Daily Review* considered Blackie's "savage attack" on American institutions "cannibalism rather than criticism. For this country to devour the States is for Saturn to devour his own children."\(^4\) Furthermore, it felt the Americans "exemplify,

---

2. Ibid., 20 September, 1866.
3. Ibid.
even more than ourselves, the wonderful capacity of the Saxon family for
self-control and self-government.\footnote{Daily Review, 7 Jan., 1867. The paper made the interesting observation
that "The man who has hitherto done most to make America smell offensive-
ly in the mind's nostril of an Englishman, is Mr Gordon Bennett of the
New York Herald; but whatever his demerits ... he has at least the
virtue of being as genuine a Scot as Professor Blackie himself."}
But the clearest plea for constant rather than casual sympathy for the United States came from John Leng's
Dundee Advertiser when, in the wake of the general Scottish compassion for the American people aroused by Lincoln's assassination, it was moved to advise:

\begin{quote}
Let us be just to ... \{the Americans\} at all times. Let us write and speak of them as we would wish them to write and speak of ourselves. Let us remember that we are kin - that we cannot degrade them without degrading the stock from which they have sprung - while in elevating them we shall enhance the common honour of our common race.\footnote{Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865.}
\end{quote}

While the ties of common ancestry naturally fostered a desire to maintain good relations with America, there stretched beyond that a much larger concept - a nascent sense of mission, with Britain and the United States as joint partners. Dilke in his \textit{Greater Britain} foresaw the advent of an Anglo-Saxon partnership which would rule the world.\footnote{Sir Charles W. Dilke, \textit{Greater Britain} (London, 1868), Vol. I, pp. 304-305, 318.}

Thomas Hughes stressed the tremendous importance for the future of mankind of an alliance between the two Anglo-Saxon nations, and desired them to go forward together "to advance civilisation and Christianity over the whole of the earth."\footnote{Report of speech by Thomas Hughes at the inaugural meeting of the National Union of Freedmen's Aid Societies in 1866, printed in the Freedman's Aid Reporter, May, 1866, p. 8. Quoted in Bolt, \textit{British Attitudes to Reconstruction}, p. 26.} In Scotland, fascinated throughout the nineteenth century with the characteristics of races and with pseudo-

\begin{footnotes}
1 Daily Review, 7 Jan., 1867. The paper made the interesting observation that "The man who has hitherto done most to make America smell offensive-
ly in the mind's nostril of an Englishman, is Mr Gordon Bennett of the
New York Herald; but whatever his demerits ... he has at least the
virtue of being as genuine a Scot as Professor Blackie himself."

2 Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865.


\end{footnotes}
scientific concepts of evolution and race, it was an idea to be seized, totally assimilated, and relentlessly publicized.

Indeed, for Scots to meet the concept of Anglo-Saxon world hegemony was scarcely novel. As early as 1855, none other than W.E. Baxter himself, recording his observations on a recent trip to the United States, justified the American lust for empire mainly on the grounds that it tended to promote the civilization of the world and "to fulfil the mission of the Anglo-Saxon race". Anticipating Francis Parkman, he further concluded that the tremendous expansion of the American continent since its discovery was the result of Anglo-Saxon enterprise, the French settlers having long ago yielded the title of superiority to a race who seem to be the only real colonists, and to whose industry, energy, and perseverance civilization owes... triumphs more wonderful than the campaigns of Napoleon or the victories which carried Alexander from the plains of Thessaly to the confines of Hindostan.

And he felt confident enough to state bluntly that "All men acquainted with the tendency of political events out of... America look forward to an extension of our race and language over regions now either unexplored or groaning under misrule too flagrant to last."

Scottish opinions of this nature really flowered, however, during the Reconstruction period, when a combination of Northern victory (making the Union safe, and consequently strengthening the American Anglo-Saxon branch), the desire of Scottish and American Presbyterian

---

1 See, for instance, Robert Chambers, Vestiges of Creation (London, 1844); Thomas Carlyle, "Occasional Discourse on the Negro Question" in Fraser's Magazine, Dec., 1849; Robert Knox, The Races of Men: A Philosophical Enquiry into the influence of Race Over the Destinies of Nations (London, 1850).

2 W.E. Baxter, America and the Americans, p. 66. See also another Scotsman, James Stirling, in Letters from the Slave States (London, 1857), p. 357.

3 Baxter, America and the Americans, p. 67.

4 Ibid., p. 67.
churches to find a common cause which would help them draw closer together, the tradition of fruitful Scottish missionary-exploration work in Africa, and the legacy of earlier views akin to those of Baxter worked as powerful influences. For instance, James Macaulay, one of the many Scots who from the mid century had gone south to make their mark as literary men and/or journalists, took time off from his labours as editor of Leisure Hour and Sunday at Home to visit America in 1871, and returned proclaiming that it was unnatural for Britain to try to ally with France, and that attempts to maintain a European balance of power were useless and expensive. "The alliance of America and England", he declared, "can never be for such miserable purposes [as maintaining balances of power], but for worthy objects of freedom and civilization through the world."2

Identical sentiments had earlier been voiced by the Aberdeen Herald, when in 1869 it pronounced America "our most natural ally in the advancement of humanity."3 Even the Glasgow Sentinel, hardly a champion of the North during the Civil War, felt obliged to state a belief in the mutual role of America and Britain as guides for the world. Commenting on Lincoln's death, the Sentinel declared that British expressions of sorrow would help foster better Anglo-American relations and strengthen the feelings of amity between "the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon

1 For a biographical note on Macaulay, see Appendix I.
3 Aberdeen Herald, 22 May, 1869.
race, so necessary to the peace, progress, and liberties of the human race."

The most outspoken champions of the concept of Britain and America as joint leaders in the task of civilizing and Christianizing the world were, however, Scottish churchmen. The motivations for emphasizing this role, and the practical uses to which it was directed, will be looked at in a subsequent chapter. It is perhaps worth noting in passing, however, the somewhat unhappy, sinister connotations which could all too readily attach to this idea. As becomes obvious even from the early comments of Baxter, it was a concept which at best carried within it an unhealthy degree of condescension, and which of itself tended to involve a tacit acceptance of the innate inferiority of those other races which were to be "civilized" by Anglo-American co-operation. And in the religious sphere, it can be suggested, there was inextricably bound up with the Scottish ministers' advocacy of this particular missionary goal the underlying desire to see the advancement of Protestant evangelization throughout the world. It was perhaps largely enthusiasm for this aspect which produced what would appear to be a disproportionate concern among Scottish churchmen for ensuring that mankind reaped the benefits of future evangelistic co-operation between Britain and America.

1 Glasgow Sentinel, 6 May, 1865. See also Glasgow Herald, 3 March, 1865; Banffshire Journal, 14 Feb., 1871. The spirit does appear to have caught the popular imagination to some extent - witness the first verse of a poem, inspired by the advent of the electric cable in 1866, by one George Smith, of Elgin:

I bid thee hail! dear Jonathan,  
Thou younger brother mine,  
And drop, as erst I promis'd thee,  
A true and friendly line;  
And with it send a fervent wish  
That Britain long may be  
In league with thee for truth and right;  
And holy liberty.

"The Atlantic Cable" printed in Elgin Courant, 10 August, 1866.

2 See Chapter VIII, pp. 482-496.

3 See Chapter VIII, pp. 496-539.
IV The force of nationalistic and patriotic sentiments in moulding Scottish outlooks during the 1860s and 1870s

Having glanced at some directives which the Scottish transatlantic outlook took up to the second half of the nineteenth century, it remains to consider what type of society this was which now analysed Reconstruction America and made conscious efforts to aid the former slaves. Although there are encouraging signs that this defect is now in the process of being remedied,¹ there is still a very real dearth of material from which to build up a composite picture of Scotland at that time. Yet, however tentatively, it seems necessary to look into some aspects peculiar to Scottish society in the period which may, directly or indirectly, have had an influence in moulding the Scottish outlook on America.

I hold that, by the honour which I render to Sir William Wallace ... by the honour which I render to our Covenanting fathers, who took the field of battle rather than submit to tyranny, - I am bound to render honour to the Slaves themselves, if they can work out and fight out their freedom in America. (Cheers)²

So sounded the customary impassioned oratory of the Free Church minister of Free St. John's, Edinburgh, the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie,³ at a public

---


Much still remains to be done on the social and economic side, however, along the lines mapped out in the pioneering works of W.H. Harwick - Economic Developments in Victorian Scotland (London, 1936); Scotland in Modern Times (London, 1964); A Short History of Labour in Scotland (Edinburgh, 1967).

² Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie, quoted in Dr. Cheever and American Slavery, Report of a Public Meeting held in Queen Street Hall, Edinburgh, on Thursday, December 22, 1859. pp. 11-12. (Pamphlet in Edinburgh Public Library).

³ For a biographical note on Guthrie, see Appendix I.
meeting in Edinburgh to express sympathy with the American abolitionist clergymen, Dr. Cheever, in 1859. On the same occasion, Guthrie’s colleague, the Rev. Dr. Robert Candlish, St. George’s Free Church, Edinburgh, felt constrained to announce that he would be “as loath to condemn John Brown [of Harper’s Ferry] as I would be loath to condemn the rising of Bothwell Brig.”¹ At a St. Andrews Day banquet in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1875, the memory of William Wallace was again extolled, and the Wallace monument at Stirling referred to as “a fit and enduring expression of the general appreciation of those great deeds which challenge the admiration of remotest nations, and their posterity, for the patriot, the hero, and the gentleman.” (Applause).² The speaker on that occasion was Jefferson Davis, replying to the sentiment “Scotland and the Scottish People”.

That the spirit of Scotland’s historic struggle for freedom and independence could be equally revered by men who had stood poles apart on America’s internal conflict testified not only to the adaptability of the Scottish national past but also to the living appeal it had for nineteenth century men who were not themselves Scots. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln might even be said to have outdone Davis in this sphere, too, inasmuch as he named his third son William Wallace.³ The romantic image of Scotland’s past, set down by Burns, and especially by Scott, meant that from early in the century “Englishmen and Europeans became aware

---

¹ Rev. Dr. Robert Candlish, quoted in Dr. Cheever and American Slavery, p. 7. For a biographical note on Candlish, see Appendix I.


for the first time that Scotland was profoundly and romantically different from England."\(^1\) The same fact more than held good for Americans.

But what was the real strength and nature of national sentiment within Scotland by the late 1860s and 1870s? Scottish observers of America at that period showed a tremendous concern with the political aspects of Reconstruction, and particularly with the question of the position of the South - from its initial act of secession to its treatment under, and response to, Congressional policies. Was it possible that, to some extent, this particular interest was stimulated by Scotland's own position within the British Isles as a country with separate, indigenous institutions which she wanted to preserve?\(^2\)

It seems clear that the bulk of those seriously concerned at that time with the role and position of Scotland as an integral part of Great Britain were, as H.J. Hanham has succinctly put it, "patriots rather than nationalists".\(^3\) Essentially, what Scotland abounded in during the 1860s and 1870s - as, indeed, earlier in the century - was a national cultural rather than political self-consciousness.\(^4\) Helped by Sir Walter Scott to believe in and admire a romanticised past, most Scots found it easy to follow him also into adopting a vigorous strain of patriotism which of itself did not preclude the continued acceptance of political union with England. The continual criss-crossing of this somewhat vapid "Scottishness" with the basic tendency to accept Scotland as part of a great and glorious

---

3 Ibid., p. 82
4 See ibid., p. 33, and "Mid-Century Scottish Nationalism", pp. 143-148.
United Kingdom meant that while there certainly remained a healthy suspicion of English over-centralization and "English dominance", with Duncan McLaren in particular carrying on a spirited campaign in parliament for the redress of Scottish grievances,¹ Scottish "nationalist" protest in the sixties tended to centre rather on the anglicization of the educational system,² or the academic quibbles of William Burns.³ The tone of such protest is well brought out in an article which appeared in the first volume of *The Attempt*, a magazine run by the ladies of the Edinburgh Essay Society. Headed "Nationality", its authoress, having paid due homage to Wallace, Bruce, and the Covenanters, plunged into an attack on anglicization and the anglified ways of some Scots, especially the younger ones: "It is shocking to our ideas of nationality to see Scotch men and women despise the customs of their country as old-fashioned, and even vulgar, sending ... their children to English Schools, merely

---

1 Mackie, *Life of Duncan McLaren*, pp. 82, 117-129. Active in the Scottish nationalist efforts of the fifties, Edinburgh Free Church minister, the Rev. Dr. James Begg was one notable voice still sounding out against English hegemony twenty years later. His pamphlet, *A Violation of the Treaty of Union the Main Origin of our Ecclesiastical Divisions and Other Evils*, appeared in 1871. See Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 75.


3 Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, p. 81.

Even in the sphere of attachment to cultural national identity, however, it would ironically appear that at least up until the mid-1870s the immigrant Scots in the United States showed considerably greater fervency than those at home in preserving and actively demonstrating their distinctiveness from the English. Thus Rowland T. Berthoff, *British Immigrants in Industrial America 1780-1950* (Cambridge, Mass., 1953) pp. 163-207, has indicated that before the threat of domination of local government by the Irish Democratic element forced English, Scottish and Welsh in America to band together in their common interest, these British immigrants had remained predominantly split into distinct cultural groups. The Scots in particular had been very conscious of their separate cultural identity and extremely anxious to maintain it.
because such is becoming the wont of the stylish in the land."  

Paradoxically, the strongest manifestation of Scottish cultural self-consciousness at this period was of a kind which tended to highlight the essential generic differences existing within the country, rather than to make an appeal to traditions of tartan chauvinism. On 16 May, 1873, there was published in Inverness the first edition of The Highlander, a weekly newspaper owned and edited by John Murdoch. Murdoch, a strong land reformer, had adopted the principles of Pintan Lalor when living in Dublin as an exciseman during 1847-1848, and had joined the Young Irelanders. In the opening editorial, he plainly stated that he was launching a journal aimed solely at the highlanders "with the distinct view of stimulating them to develop their own industrial resources and of encouraging them to assert their nationality and maintain that position in the country to which their numbers, their traditions, and their character entitle them."  

The Highlander was a vital stimulus to – but also, perhaps, the product of – a new sentiment emerging in Scotland at the time and retrospectively labelled the "Celtic revival". Declaring that the day had passed when Scots were proud to boast of Norman blood and that

   For a biographical note on Murdoch, see Appendix I.  
3 The Highlander, 16 May, 1873.  
4 In the Lowlands, the chief advocate of the rehabilitation of and revival of interest in the culture of Celtic Scotland was Professor John Stuart Blackie, who constantly urged the establishment of a Chair of Celtic at Edinburgh University. This was eventually set up in 1882. See James Mavor, My Windows on the Street of the World (Toronto, 1923), Vol. I, p. 90. See also Hanham, Scottish Nationalism, p. 40.
there were now honourable men with Saxon names who were ready to trace Celtic origins, Murdoch called for the handing down of the peculiar Celtic type of humanity as a duty:

This is what intelligent men in other lands demand of us. They deprecate a tame uniformity, the result of one race giving in to another. They wish to see both the Celt and the Saxon thriving; and if they can grow side by side ... each gaining and rejoicing in the growth of the other, so much the better. But it cannot be so, if the one race denies this liberty to the other, or if the other shrinks from maintaining its own distinctive character and position. 1

In forcing on the Scottish highlanders an increased awareness of their distinctiveness, the paper was in effect arguing for the existence of a splinter group within Scotland which, in terms of racial traits, cultural traditions, and contemporary agricultural and landholding problems, had more in common with Ireland than with the rest of Scotland. 2

Yet, as can be understood from the tone of the editorial quoted above, there was apparently little desire on the part of Celtic Scotland to cut itself off, politically or otherwise, from the mainstream of Scottish or, indeed, Anglo-Saxon British, society. Basically, what Murdoch was agitating for from the rest of Scotland and from the British government was what McLaren was agitating for in Parliament for the whole of Scotland - a fairer deal. Once given an end to coercion and exploitation by lairds, and the assurance of fuller consideration at governmental level of the needs and grievances of the highland community, The Highlander

---

1 The Highlander, 16 May, 1873.
2 See, for instance, a letter from 'Eilain-Nan-Breaban' in ibid., 26 July, 1873, in which the writer, referring to the continuing depopulation of the Highlands, remarks on the similarities between the methods of coercion used to evict tenants there and in Ireland. From its earliest issues, the paper gave very considerable coverage to the struggles of the Irish tenantry.

For evidence of Fenian interest in supporting the aims of The Highlander, see the Protestant Ulsterman Dr. William Carroll to John O'Leary, 23 April, 1879, in O'Brien and Ryan, Devoy's Post Bag, pp. 433-434.
would have been quite happy to see the Scottish Celts settling down
"to contribute something of value to national public opinion on current
questions." It found increasing signs of a general appreciation of
Celtic culture "cheering", and praised "those Saxons like Blackie"
who attempted to advance the Celtic cause.  

At national level, even the National Association for the Vindication
of Scottish Rights, formed in 1853-54 for the express purpose of drawing
attention to governmental injustices towards Scotland, carefully avoided
any hint of home rule sentiments, and a measure of its weakness as a
potential force for substantial reforms can be found in the heterogeneity
of its membership. From the antecedents of the Association, and from
the later (1858) Scottish interest in a monument to Wallace, it was easy
for the Times to argue that Scotland was clinging to outmoded ideas of
nationality.  

Yet, the awareness of nationalism as a dynamic force capable of
making considerable impact on the history of the later nineteenth
century was certainly present in Scottish thinking on the subject during
the 1860s. Given the political situation in Europe, it could scarcely
fail to be so. Looking at the American situation after the capture of
Wilmington by the Federal forces, the Glasgow Herald conceded that the

1 The Highlander, 16 May, 1873.
2 Ibid., 4 October, 1873.
3 Hanham, "Mid-Century Scottish Nationalism", p. 166.
4 Membership of the Association included elements from all ends of
   the political spectrum, from Duncan McLaren and his United Presbyterian
   friends, and the similarly orientated Caledonian Mercury, to a powerful
   Tory contingent supported by comment in Blackwood's Magazine.
   See Hanham, ibid., p. 170 and Scottish Nationalism, p. 77.
5 Hanham, Scottish Nationalism, p. 80.
South's position seemed hopeless, but at the same time, fought shy of forecasting certain Northern victory on the grounds that if the South was really determined to be free, and was prepared to sacrifice life to establish independence, it would probably succeed. "The power of a united nation fighting for its existence and acting on the defensive is incalculable, as the history of the Old World abundantly testifies."\(^1\)

The clearest exposition of the belief appeared in late 1866 in the Banffshire Journal, a northern paper, which in an editorial entitled "The Principle of 'Race'" argued for the predominance of nationalist sentiment as "one of the chief characteristics of the age", an active spirit which seemed to have "diffused like a mental atmosphere among the nations of the earth."\(^2\) The activities of the Irish, however, had already apparently made it, in relation to Britain, unattractive; it was seen as Britain's "fly in the pot of ointment".\(^3\) Fenianism, flourishing amid the need of the contending parties in the United States to win the Irish vote, was unanimously condemned in the Scottish press,\(^4\)

\(^{1}\) Glasgow Herald, 6 March, 1865.
\(^{2}\) Banffshire Journal, 25 September, 1866.
\(^{3}\) Ibid. The Caledonian Mercury was able to cash in on this fact to again attack the bulk of the British press for having supported the Confederacy during the Civil War. It cynically commented that it was gratifying to be able to acknowledge the unanimity with which the press had approved the British government's seizure of the Fenian press and leaders "inasmuch as it is comforting to know that however generally ... our Press writers have sympathised with rebellions across the Atlantic, and lent their aid to make them effective, they have no special inclination to see them attempted at home." Caledonian Mercury, 20 September, 1865.

\(^{4}\) Only the Caledonian Mercury, with its tradition of support for the National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights, and its Irish editor, James Robie, took the trouble to emphasize that it condemned the movement only because it was the work of "a mere handful of the lowest sort of people", the "labour dregs", in Ireland, and that if the whole Irish people had been united in their interests and determinations on this, the paper would have "maintained their perfect right to vindicate at every risk their independence and freedom." Caledonian Mercury, 20 Sept., 1865. It is rather galling to find this self-professed champion of the working-classes condemning the Fenian leaders largely on the basis of "the poverty of their origins and the plebianship of their brains." See ibid., 13 September, 1865.

and frequently held up to ridicule. Yet, if it was possible for much of the time to bravely dismiss the Fenian movement as an "expensive joke", the Jamaican rebellion of November, 1865 proved that "racial consciousness" could produce very positive problems for the British Empire. In a revealing comment on "Fenianism and the Jamaican Insurrection", the ultra-Conservative *Edinburgh Evening Courant* sarcastically taunted the Fenians with being over-shadowed by their "fellow-insurgents" in Jamaica who had used action, not merely words. Posterity would be "apt to give Quashee credit for more pluck than the Irishman", the Negroes having plotted "to exterminate the whites in Jamaica, and to rear the standard of republicanism on the ruins of our colonial government." The linking of the Fenian troubles with those in the colonies had its counterpart in a reinforced belief in the efficacy of a continuing strong British presence in the areas of disaffection. Thus there was the feeling that it would be untenable for the British to remove either from Jamaica or Ireland since in either case their withdrawal would be the cue for the native populations to start killing each other off.

Nationalist aspirations as a whole were therefore seen to present troubles for the British Empire which gave rise to much genuine concern within Scotland, and largely smothered any real efforts at an active

---


3 *Banffshire Journal*, 19 September, 1865, 14 November, 1865.
Scottish nationalism. It becomes clear that where sympathy for the conquered South was expressed in terms of sympathy for a people who had justifiably aspired to be independent and were now crushed under the heel of their victors, it was a sympathy which did not spring automatically from a widespread synonymous feeling of discontent and sense of oppression in Scotland itself. Similarly, it was from passive patriotic rather than active nationalistic sentiment that Scottish analogies were drawn between the Southern effort and the ancient Scottish struggle against England.

The Scottish outlook, complete with the misgivings spawned by current displays of domestic nationalist sentiment, was well caught by Elizabeth, 8th Duchess of Argyll, when in 1863 she remarked in a letter to Charles Sumner, "The feeling is against the possibility of subjugation [of the Southern States] so strongly. All our history is full of the success of those who fight for, and on their own land, the one exception of Ireland is a very ominous one." (sic.)

Tangible bonds and relationships between Scotland and America during the post-Civil War era

The Scotland which looked across the Atlantic to the upheavals in America was, however, far from free of strains and stresses within its own society. Through mid-century, from roughly the end of the Hungry

---

1 Scotland consciously felt itself to be fully enough integrated with England occasionally to rebuke the latter for its neglect of Ireland. The Huntly Express' remedy for the Fenian troubles, for instance, was to send Queen Victoria over to Ireland. It advocated that royalty should pay more attention to the island, and compared Scotland, where the queen visited annually, and where there was no fear of revolt among the population. "Who shall say that an occasional visit by majesty to 'auld Ireland' for the last ten years would not have prevented all this foolish Fenianism?" Huntly Express, 7 Oct., 1865

2 For examples of this attitude, see Chapter III, pp. 184-219.

Forties to the early 1870s, the structure of Scotland's economy was transformed to such extent that the period has been dubbed by a leading authority the "Years of Plenty". Instrumental to the whole process of change was the tremendous rise of heavy industry, facilitating the growth of large-scale combinations, the concentration of population in towns with the usual attendant problems of readjustment, overcrowding, and so forth, and the revival of Trade Unionism. Added to the customary evils associated with the transition from a domestic rural to an urban industrialised economy was the continued influx into the industrial lowland towns of Highlanders and immigrant Irish. With the country in so considerable a state of flux, it was perhaps to be expected that domestic issues would command so much attention as largely to exclude sustained Scottish interest in the internal affairs of a foreign nation.

Yet, as far as the United States was concerned, Scotland's own situation perhaps helped stimulate a curious interest in how America was coping with her problems of adaptation and reorganisation following the war. Indeed, in some respects, the problems had superficially the same ring: difficulties of assimilation - the highland migrants and the Irish in Scotland, the freedmen in America; difficulties of

3 Hanham, *Scottish Nationalism*, pp. 17-20, would seem to suggest, however, that a new rapprochement between Lowland and Highland Scot was at least as much the outcome of the Highland migration south as were problems of assimilation. And it has been shown that for at least one town in Lowland Scotland, Greenock, the assimilation of the Highland migrants was remarkably rapid and complete. R.D. Lobban, The Migration of Highlanders into Lowland Scotland (c. 1750-1890) with Particular Reference to Greenock (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh University, 1969), pp. 275-302.
4 For a comprehensive study of the impact of Irish immigration on Scotland in the nineteenth century, see James Handley, *The Irish in Modern Scotland* (Cork, 1947).
structuring a new economy which would make the best use of the labour forces available; and difficulties of deciding how best to provide help and relief for those elements of the population most desperately in need of it. ¹

A much more tangible bond of interest in the United States was forged, however, by the tremendously heavy Scottish emigration there, which, gaining momentum from the mid-1840s, accounted for seventy-two per cent of all Scottish emigration by the period from 1861 to 1870. ² The familiar push and pull characteristics perhaps operated as fully for Scots in these years as at any time. Organized and assisted passages, with none of the odium attaching to those initiated after the Highland Clearances, continued to operate, Alexander McDonald establishing in 1865, for instance, the Scottish Miners' Emigration Association to finance the passage to America of unemployed miners. ³ From the other side came persistent and attractive calls for Scottish farmers and farm workers to improve their condition by acquiring a comfortable holding in the new world. The Southern States in particular launched a vigorous campaign to attract Scottish — and often specifically "Scottish" — farmers to go

¹ The 1860s and 1870s saw some strivings in Scotland towards new looks at relief measures (and measures for sanitary improvement), but these were admittedly very rudimentary. See Thomas Ferguson, Scottish Social Welfare, 1864-1914 (Edinburgh and London, 1958), p. 2.

² Gordon Donaldson, The Scots Overseas (London, 1956), p. 112. In round figures, 38,769 people left Scotland for the United States between 1861 and 1870, and 67,564 in the years from 1871 to 1880 — see Berthoff, British Immigrants, p. 5. It has been estimated that approximately half a million Scots emigrated to the U.S.A. in the period 1861-1901 — see W.H. Marwick, Scotland in Modern Times, p. 123.

³ Marwick, A Short History of Labour, p. 26. Of the large body of Scottish miners leaving Glasgow for the United States on 22 April, 1865, a fair proportion had been supplied with funds by McDonald. See Dundee Advertiser, 25 April, 1865.

McDonald was not alone in assisting emigration in the hope that it would help ease unemployment in Scotland. See Donaldson, The Scots Overseas, p. 96.
to help rebuild Southern prosperity on a sound, knowledgeable agricultural footing.

Foremost in this respect was Virginia, largely bereft of her old labour force. The purpose of the state's Central Immigration Society was to recruit farm tenants and labourers (and also labourers of every sort) "first from the Scottish, then from the English, and lastly from the emigrants from other countries".¹ David Macrae, popular writer and lecturer, soon to become ordained as a minister in the U.P. Church, and an individual deeply interested in and sympathetic to the American people and their post-war difficulties, was assured by Virginians in 1870 that Scottish emigrants would be extremely welcome and would receive the fullest co-operation from the old planter class. Macrae himself believed that "Scotch perseverance, Scotch 'canniness', and Scotch farming are precisely what Virginia wants", and felt that those prepared to overcome the early obstacles would "emerge... from this transition state in the South in a better position, and with brighter prospects than they could hope for in almost any other part of America."² A tour from the Atlantic states to the Pacific in 1871 had apparently similarly convinced John Brown of the Kyles of Bute that Virginia was a much better place.

¹ See letter from a Scot in Virginia, published in the Scotsman, 6 Dec., 1865. See also Scotsman 11 Oct., 1865, 2 Feb., 1867, 29 August, 1867. A series of articles discussing the farming prospects in different regions of the United States was featured, under the heading "Scottish Farmers and American Emigration", in the Aberdeen Free Press during the early months of 1873. Virginia and the South generally was examined on 5 May, 1873.

² David Macrae, The Americans at Home: Pen-and-Ink Sketches of American Men, Manners and Institutions (Popular edition, revised, Glasgow, 1874), p. 114. As late as 1899, Macrae, on a return trip to America, found that the state of Virginia was still desperately anxious to attract Scottish agricultural labourers and smallholders - see Macrae, America Revisited and Men I have Met (Glasgow, 1908), p. 46. For a biographical note on Macrae, see Appendix I.
destination than the western states for prospective emigrant stock raisers.\footnote{Letter from John Brown, Kyles of Bute, in North British Daily Mail, 1 December, 1871.}

To reinforce his argument, he publicised a letter he had received from a northern states man, Henry Mason, who had recently gone as a cattle breeder to Virginia. Mason made no bones about his desire to see "a good colony of Scottish farmers" established in the state. Asking Brown to try to muster a group of twenty-five to thirty competent Scots farmers, he maintained that he was willing to put them on the best farms going:

... I would gladly use my time and influence without recompense, other than to see a good colony of sturdy Scotch farmers settle hereabouts. I could easily bring down a large number of Irish from the North, but I want to see a good Protestant element take possession of this beautiful country.\footnote{Letter from Henry Mason to John Brown, printed in ibid.}

Visiting the United States four years later, John Clay, son of a large-scale farmer in Kelso and himself a famous stock-breeder in Chicago later in the century, found that "the British settler is now a great institution, and the element to which the old Virginian looks for the renovation of his fruitful country."\footnote{John Clay, New World Notes: being an Account of Journayings and So-journings in America and Canada (Kelso, 1875), p. 10.}

Strong testimony in favour of the state had been furnished as early as summer, 1865, by an emigrant Ayrshire farmer who had gone to the United States in February of that year and who had soon been anxious, "like many other of my countrymen", to visit the South. He had subsequently become connected with the agricultural department at Washington. In addition to praising the soil and climate of Virginia as unrivalled, he adopted the obvious line of stressing the tremendous opportunities for foreign emigrants consequent on the abolition of slavery.\footnote{Letter from ex-Ayrshire farmer to private friend in Glasgow, printed in Glasgow Herald, 2 Aug., 1865. He had made a tour of inspection through Maryland and Virginia to examine the state of the land in June, 1865. See also a letter to "a gentleman in Scotland" listing the attractions of North Carolina, another state hit by the drift of the Negro to the cotton belt, in ibid., 9 Dec., 1865.}
Indeed, the emigrant letters which frequently appeared in the press extolling the virtues of American soil, climate, and so forth, helped to generate an interest in America during the Reconstruction years in the "far flung" agricultural regions of the North and North East where conditions for farm labourers, especially in regard to housing, were generally bad. By 1872, in an effort to raise wages by reducing supply of labour, Aberdeenshire farm servants had set on foot a fund to raise £10,000 to facilitate the emigration to America of those of their number ready to make the journey. And among all groups of labourers and tradesmen in the North of Scotland, it was reported that "The exodus [to the United States] has indeed been exceptionally

1 See, for instance, Huntly Express, 22 June, 1872; Inverness Courier, 5 October, 1871; Aberdeen Journal, 5 June, 14 August, 25 November, 1872; Glasgow Herald, 15 April, 1869. A regular feature in the Aberdeen Free Press during most of the seventies was "Notes from Nebraska" in which James Alexander, an Aberdeenshire emigrant, wrote copiously and encouragingly on prospects in American agriculture. Private letters from emigrant Scots to relatives or friends in Scotland were constantly being published in all sections of the Scottish press during the 1860s and 1870s. Indeed, it is clear that by that time such correspondence had already become an extremely important aspect of the general links and communications which existed between Scotland and the United States in the nineteenth century: in this connection, see Dallas L. Jones, The Background and Motives of Scottish Emigration to the United States of America in the Period 1815-1861, With Special Reference to Emigrant Correspondence (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Edinburgh, 1970). Dr Jones' study provides a comprehensive analysis of the content of emigrants' letters written over the forty-five years prior to the outbreak of the Civil War, and includes (pp. 189-223) a section devoted to examination of Scottish comment on agricultural conditions in the United States.

2 Ferguson, Scottish Social Welfare, pp. 40-41. From 1861-1910, the North East counties suffered the greatest relative population loss through emigration in Scotland. Aberdeenshire alone lost 110,619. Ibid., p. 15.
large."¹

So far as the Southern states are concerned, however, there is
some evidence that by no means all the Scottish farmers who had answered
the seductive calls of the Southern land-agents became prosperous, con-
tented pillars of their adopted state's agriculture. On 15 April, 1875,
the Glasgow Herald carried a letter from "A Returned Emigrant" which
sparked off a vigorous debate in the columns of the paper on the
reception and prospects of emigrants to the South. "Returned Emigrant"
stressed that he fully corroborated, from personal experience, the black
picture previously painted by some returned Scots of conditions in the
old Confederacy, and added his personal indictment of the nature of
Southern society in the later stages of Reconstruction:

Had it been thought returning emigrants would expose in the
newspapers the frauds practised on them, they would have been
prevented from leaving the country. People in this country
have no idea how dangerous it is in the Southern States to
give publicity to one's opinion, as there is a risk of getting
a bullet through one.²

An immediate rebuttal of the letter, and of all similar assertions,

¹ Inverness Courier, 9 May, 1872. The Aberdeenshire farm servants'
fund was almost certainly one product of the enthusiastic moves
which took place in the county during the first half of 1872 to
form a farm servants' Union there. The movement got under way in
February, 1872 and by June, many district associations had been
formed as an initial step towards the ultimate establishment of a
united county organization. Local activity was sufficiently en-
couraging for a list of rules to be drawn up for the proposed "Aberdeen-
shire Farm Servants' and Agriculture Labourers' Society". And along
with the aim of securing such basic and immediate improvements as a
shorter working week, increased wages, and a fundamental alteration
in the system of hiring labour, the farm servants' union movement
had as one of its main objectives the subsidizing of emigration to
relieve the glut in the labour market. In the event, however, several
critical factors combined to prevent the achievement of a co-ordinated
county organization - see G. Evans, "Farm Servants' Unions in
Aberdeenshire from 1870-1900" in Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 31,
No. 3 April, 1952, pp. 29-31.

² "Emigration to the Southern States": letter from "A Returned
Emigrant" in Glasgow Herald, 15 April, 1875.
came from a Southerner then resident in London, M.S. Fife. Branding such opinions "grossly untrue and mischievous" as applied to the Southern states in general, he suggested that all those voicing them must have associated while in the South merely with Negroes and carpet-baggers, "or received their information through these foul channels ... It can hardly be that they associated with white people - the only real 'people' of the country."¹ Basically, he was concerned to argue for the existence of good and bad in all nations, but his Southern pride had obviously been sufficiently injured to produce a considerable lapse in his Southern politeness. Drawing on his three weeks' residence in Glasgow and London, he hit back by stating that

in that short time I have seen sights, and read, and heard recitals - aye, from the mouths of Scotchmen, too, of deeds of dishonesty and inhumanity, acts of hypocrisy, lewdness, swindling, theft, robbery, rapine, and murder occurring here enough to gorge even the buzzard crop of such a harpy as Harriet Beecher Stowe! ²

Further correspondence brought accusations that the land in the South was utterly worthless and unimprovable, and that native farmers were selling their land to unsuspecting emigrants to get away themselves. Many Scottish families thus lured out were almost ruined, and "after finding out the deception practised on them are unable to leave the country, and are almost at starvation."³ A case in point was illustrated by a letter from "A Victimized Emigrant", writing from Washington, D.C. His particular plight involved ownership of a large plantation on which

---

¹ "The Southern States": letter from M.S. Fife, Blackfriars, London, in Glasgow Herald, 22 April, 1875.
² Ibid. Fife's letter was replied to by "Scotus", Glasgow, in ibid., 27 April, 1875. The writer quoted North Carolina's Raleigh Sentinel of 27 Aug., 1874, where it was stated that the number of immigrants to the Southern states who were returning to Europe nearly equalled the arrivals.
he had made a down payment and, on the advice of the agent, carried out vast improvements. Crop failures had eroded his money, so that despite the apparently harrowing condition of his family, the agent had stepped in, foreclosed the plantation, and bought it back himself for the amount due on it. Again, Southern society as a whole was implicated in the emigrant's censure: he maintained that there was a tradition that in all foreclosing cases whereby none of the neighbouring gentlemen would offer above the agent's bid because they had a mutual agreement. His general message of warning was explicitly stated:

A northern man, resident in the same county for the past seven years, kept a list of northern men, English and Scotchmen, who arrived there having large amounts of money. All left before me, ... and on adding my name it amounted to one hundred ... Since coming to this country I have been south, north, west - travelled 15,000 miles - and can say that emigrants may do well in the Western and Northern States, but let them keep out of the Southern States as they would out of Hades, where the land is as miserably poor and deceiving as its owners.1

This was strong enough language to elicit a direct refutation from none other than Henry Nason, whom we have already observed touting for Scottish emigrants earlier in the decade.2 From Orange County, Virginia, he wrote demolishing all "Victimised's" arguments, specifically labelling as "an outrageous and wilful slander against a most respectable class of our citizens" the assertion that native Southern farmers never made bids against agents. Having suggested that "Victimised" had managed his affairs badly, he still insisted that Virginia held out better inducements for immigrant stock farmers than any state in the Union. Interestingly, he referred "Victimised" to the Rev. John Brown, by this time a pastor in Washington, but, according to Nason, a native

2 See above, p. 43.
Nason's strictures probably made little impression, however. Subsequent correspondence in the Herald exposed the relationship between Brown and himself, showing that Brown, a native of Colintraive, Argyllshire, not of Inverness, had in fact formerly acted for Nason in persuading people to go to Virginia, and had written to the Glasgow Herald in 1872, from Colintraive, with that object. It was also alleged that Brown had bought land for his three brothers in Virginia, and that even they were disappointed in the soil and in Nason's treatment of them. Further information on the lack of freedom of speech, the lawlessness, and the general worthlessness of the land was used to hammer home the message of the disillusioned to their fellow Scots—ignore the importunings of Southern land-agents and others, "all the balderdash with which they know so well how to gull the intending emigrants." A year later, "Ecossais" was still wielding his pen against the South when opportunity arose. Rejecting the Glasgow Herald's assumption that an English parson, who had gone on behalf of the Good Templars to "mission the negroes" in the South, had greatly exaggerated the catalogue of threats and intimidation he was exposed to, "Ecossais" affirmed that "any one who has been in the Southern

1 Letter from Henry Nason, Orange County, Virginia, (n.d.) in Glasgow Herald, 25 September, 1875. Nason pointed out that he was not a land-agent, though he readily helped newcomers to buy farms in his vicinity. Brown's earlier connection with Nason is alluded to on p. 43.

2 Letter from "Ecossais", Glasgow, in Glasgow Herald, 30 Sept., 1875.

3 Letter from "A Returned Emigrant", in ibid.

4 See "Ecossais" and "A Returned Emigrant", ibid.

5 "Ecossais", ibid.

6 See Glasgow Herald, 12 December, 1876.
States of America must be aware of the fact that if a stranger shows kindness to the negroes he is certain to draw down the resentment of the whites." He himself had been accused of trying to "raise the niggers" because he had offered to teach two Negro plantation hands.¹

The attitudes of those who returned dissatisfied, or who were obliged by circumstances unhappily to remain, form an interesting (if prejudiced) comment by Scots involved at first hand with the situation in the South in the mid 1870s. Because their involvement with the region was both relatively deeper and more prolonged than the transitory one experienced by travellers like Macrae and Clay, their impressions of the land and its people are significant reminders not only of the need carefully to balance the travellers' essentially roseate picture of the South as a field for Scottish emigrants, but also of the specific grievances and injustices - not, it will be noted, always exclusively agricultural - existing within Southern society which most readily frustrated Scots actually settled in that community.

The two most spectacular fields of Scottish commercial relations with the United States had been direct consequences of the Civil War itself, and inevitably, the nature of these relationships tended, in the areas affected, to colour attitudes to post-war America. The phenomenal rise of Dundee's jute industry, and the unprecedented prosperity it brought to the town, was solidly based on supply of army requisites to the Northern states.² The victory of the North gave the Dundee juteocracy the reassurance that their wealth was founded after

1 "Ecossais", in ibid., 14 December, 1876.
all on a righteous cause which, operating as a positive power for good in the United States, had happily, with the help of Dundee jute, triumphed over the forces of darkness and inhumanity.¹

Glasgow, on the other hand, had had the misfortune to profit from aiding the losing side in the Civil War. Compensating for the death blow which the outbreak of hostilities had dealt her founding cotton industry,² the city had not only initiated a supply of iron to the Confederate states, but had also established itself as a leading supplier of blockade runners for the Confederacy.³ The protracted, gloomy controversy over the 'Alabama' and allied Confederate cruisers blighted Anglo-American relations in the early years following the war, and could have done little to predispose Clyde shipbuilders either to sit back easily on their fortunes or to show any overt interest in American Reconstruction.

In practical terms, the diverse nature of Dundee and Glasgow's wartime commercial involvement with America was almost certainly a crucial factor in producing so strikingly different a public response to freedmen's aid in the two cities.⁴ Significant, too, was the difference in tone in sections of the press. The Liberal North British

¹ Enid Gauldie has stressed how Dundonians thought in straightforward terms of the Civil War as a contest against Negro slavery. Ibid., p. 29. David Carrie notes how the Dundee Advertiser tended also to see slavery as the only real issue - ibid., p. 9. This trait certainly carried through into the paper's editorial comment on Reconstruction - see Chapter III, p. 156. But, as Carrie recognizes, (ibid., p. 9) this was not a unique attitude.


³ Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, Chapter II.

⁴ See Chapter IX, pp. 180-198.
Daily Mail included, no journal appeared in Glasgow even remotely approaching in sentiment the Dundee Advertiser's passionate and unwavering concern for the freed Negro, and its strong commitment to Congressional Reconstruction.

Close commercial ties with the United States were maintained throughout the Reconstruction era by individual Scottish firms which had earlier in the century established lucrative American branches. The Paisley cotton thread manufacturing firms of George A. Clark and J. & P. Coats had both benefitted substantially from the transatlantic connection. Clark's had established a factory in New Jersey in the forties. J. & P. Coats' famous works at Pawtucket, Rhode Island, established in the 1860s, were built primarily to counteract the rising United States tariff rates and thereby preserve a trade which had been carefully built up on the American side by Andrew Coats.

Arriving in the country in 1839, Andrew had, by late 1840, successfully persuaded his brothers James and Peter to send shipments of thread in their own name rather than to an American customer.

In 1854, Thomas Nelson, jun., partner in his father's Edinburgh publishing firm, travelled to New York to establish the first branch of a British publishing house in the United States. His elder brother, William, became the steadier visitor to America, however, making the trip as late as 1870 to travel across the continent on the new Pacific Railway - and barely miss falling into the hands of raiding Sioux.

1 Marwick, Scotland in Modern Times, p. 92.
2 Donaldson, The Scots Overseas, p. 115.
3 Andrew Coats, From the Cottage to the Castle (Privately published, 1890), pp. 14, 16-17, 90-92.
A more abortive attempt in the same direction had been made, also in the fifties, by the Glasgow publishing firm of Blackie and Son. A New York agency, with sub-agencies in Philadelphia and Baltimore, had been established in 1852, but persistent troubles with agents led to the decision to wind up the American side of the business in 1859. It seems likely, however, that substantial contacts would have been maintained with so lucrative a market. Certainly, Walter G. Blackie, second son and head of the firm following his father's death in 1874, visited New York in 1877 as delegate from the Association for Reform of the Law of Nations for discussions on copyright.1

The commercial links forged in the first half of the century, and strengthening as the years went on, were the solid base on which was founded a strong and genuine concern on the part of these Scottish firms for the problems which beset America during the immediate post-war years.

In the 1870s, a new dimension entered into the Scottish link-up with America - Scottish investment. It has been shown that several factors, including the serious American economic crisis which for a time lowered many securities in the stock market, and the beginnings of continuous westward expansion, made 1873 a good year for Scots to embark on a programme of investment in the United States.2

1 Agnes A.C. Blackie, Blackie and Son 1809-1959 (Glasgow, 1959), pp. 26-27. See also Walter G. Blackie, Concerning the Firm of Blackie and Son, 1809-1874 (Privately printed, 1897), p. 55. The youngest son, Robert, had been mainly responsible for the firm's American business, and almost certainly he continued to attend to transatlantic connections following the closure of the agencies in 1859. In 1877, he married as his second wife the daughter of a Savannah doctor.

2 W. Turrentine Jackson, The Enterprising Scot (Edinburgh University Press, 1968), pp. 10-11. The earliest Scottish movement into the American investment field dated from the late 1830s when four separate companies were formed in Aberdeen. Ibid., p. 8.
Scottish companies to be registered in Edinburgh in 1873-74 - the Scottish-American Investment Co. Ltd., concentrating on stock market securities, and the Scottish-American Mortgage Co. Ltd., concerned with mortgages on real estate - were merely the precursors of a tremendously long, successful line of Scottish investment extending into the mid twentieth century. In the first ten years alone (that is, up to 1883), an estimated £40 million of Scottish money had found its way to America in the shape of investment trusts, investment in mines, cattle, land, and lumber companies.¹

The investment companies of the 1870s are important not only inasmuch as they reflect an added stimulus to keep in close contact with affairs in America, and (what is extremely significant) the proof of abounding Scottish confidence in an early and complete settlement of America's internal problems. Equally significant is the fact that a very substantial proportion of the pioneers of these early ventures were figures already connected - usually commercially - with America, and/or interested in the country for its own sake at that period. William J. Mensies, founder of the Scottish-American Investment Co. Ltd., had become Writer to the Signet and adviser to investors in 1858. In this latter capacity, he visited the United States in 1864, 1867, and 1872.² During the 1867 trip, his activities were extended beyond the field of investment enquiry when on behalf of the S.S.P.C.K. he

¹ "Scottish Investment in America (1870-1914)", p. 1. Abstract of a paper delivered by Dr. John Butt, Department of Economic History, University of Strathclyde, at a symposium on "Scottish Influences on America", Dundee, 1970.

Commenting on the total Scottish investment in America over the years, Jackson has pertinently remarked that "When this financial stake is thought of in terms of the Scottish economy and the nation's population and resources, it is a major aspect of Scottish history." Jackson, *The Enterprising Scot*, p. 315.

² Ibid., p. 13
investigated the disposal of funds sent by the Society to Dartmouth College for the educating of American Indian youths. As beneficiaries of an estate in America, the Menzies family also had a personal link with the country.

While Menzies himself appears, however, to have given no public indication, either by word or by contribution to freedmen's aid, as to his feelings on the problems of Reconstruction, the same cannot be said for his fellow directors on the Board of the company – John Cowan, owner of a large paper mill at Valleyfield, Penicuik, (and an uncle of Menzies who had accompanied him to America in 18673), Thomas Nelson, Edward L.I. Blyth, and J. Dick Peddie. On the Board of the second registered company, the Scottish-American Mortgage Co. Ltd., both Charles W. Cowan, Edinburgh politician and another of the Penicuik


3 Ibid., p. 36

4 For further references to these men, see Chapter IX, also Appendices II(c) and II(d).
paper manufacturing family,¹ and Robert Mackenzie of Dundee had previously shown themselves concerned with and, in the case of Mackenzie at any rate,² fascinated by American problems.

The composition of the Dundee Investment Trusts similarly reflected an America-conscious personnel. Robert Fleming, who launched the Scottish American Investment Trust in July, 1873, first became aware of the potentialities for Scottish investment when in 1870 he visited America as agent for Baxter Brothers, who already held "extensive" United States securities.³ The Oregon and Washington Trust Investment Co. Ltd. (registered in October, 1873) included on its Board Thomas H. Cox, an original trustee of the Scottish American Investment Trust,⁴ and a partner in Cox Brothers, a Dundee manufacturing firm which had been

¹ Charles W. Cowan, born in 1801 in Edinburgh, was the eldest son of Alexander Cowan who had built up the Valleyfield paper mills (acquired and conducted on a small scale by his father) into an extremely important and flourishing business. When in 1811 the mills were sold to the Government for adaptation as prisoner-of-war accommodation during the Napoleonic Wars, the family moved to Edinburgh for three years and then to Melville paper mill near Lasswade. Cowan was educated at Edinburgh High School and at the University there, and after a year in Geneva (1817-18), he joined the family paper business. At the 1847 general election, standing as an Independent Liberal, he defeated the sitting member Thomas Macaulay to become M.P. for Edinburgh, but came second in the poll when Macaulay was re-elected five years later. He regained the seat in 1857. An enthusiastic admirer of America and American democracy, he visited the United States in the summer of 1867. In response to the freedmen's aid fund established in Edinburgh in December, 1865, he contributed £10 (see Appendix II(c)); and in the spring of 1869 he spoke in support of an appeal made at a public meeting in the city by Professor Humiston of the ANA (see Daily Review, 23 March, 1869). A zealous member of the Free Church, he was a liberal philanthropist – see Charles W. Cowan, Reminiscences (Edinburgh, 1878), passim.

² Robert Mackenzie, a distinguished Dundee merchant, wrote a pamphlet praising the workings of the Sanitary and Christian Commissions, entitled America and her Army (London, 1865), and five years later had a book published, The United States of America: A History (London, 1870).

³ Jackson, The Enterprising Scot, pp. 21-22.

⁴ Ibid., p. 24.
catapulted from fairly minor operations to a position rivalling that of Baxter’s by its handling of jute during the Civil War. The firm apparently retained a post-war interest in America. Partnering Cox as a Board member was John Leng, publisher of the Dundee Advertiser, which we have already had occasion to note as a staunch champion of the North during the war, and of justice for the freedmen after.

It was, of course, only to be expected that those who were predisposed to look benevolently on America, to attempt, like Leng, to explain sympathetically to the Scottish public her trials during Reconstruction, or to come forward with substantial financial aid for her ex-slaves, should have been among the first to risk heavy investment in the American West. If nothing else, there was the very simple fact that these were the people who had the money — for investment, no less than for philanthropy. Yet it is perhaps worth noting how in so many instances, involvement in this tremendously important aspect of Scotland’s links with America during the later years of Reconstruction appears to have sprung directly out of an involvement with, and interest in, the early period of Reconstruction, and back beyond that.

In addition to influential individuals such as these, a particular section of Scottish society which had earlier in the century contributed greatly to the strengthening of Scoto-American bonds had been the

1 Enid Gauldie (ed.), The Dundee Textile Industry 1790-1885 (From the papers of Peter Carmichael of Arthurstone) (Edinburgh, 1969), pp. xxiv, xxix. During the Civil War, Cox Brothers had bought a Baltimore clipper, held in London because of hostilities, and used it to import jute direct from Calcutta to Dundee. See Gauldie, "The Effect of the American Civil War on Dundee’s Trade", p. 29.

2 See Appendices II(b1) and II(b2).

3 See above, pp. 22, 51. Leng was sent to the United States in 1876 to check North-West investments, and consider extension of mortgage operations. The result of his findings led to the formation of a new company, the Dundee Mortgage and Trust Investment Co. Ltd. Jackson, The Enterprising Scot, p. 28.
dissenting Presbyterian Churches. Most religious denominations throughout Britain did in fact maintain close links with their brethren in America in the early years of the century.1 For Scotland, the connections meant regular attendance by Scottish ministers at General Assemblies of Presbyterian churches in the United States. And while it is true that the Quakers and Unitarians had the closest and most regular contacts with their American counterparts during the years of Britain's involvement in the anti-slavery drive, it is equally significant that the Americans themselves set tremendous store by the actions of the Free Church, which they recognized as Britain's leading Evangelical church.2

The invidious "Send back the money" campaign acted as a stimulus not only for the hostilities of Voluntary elements in Scotland towards the Free Church but also for a strong, genuine sense of American abolitionist outrage at so apparently gross a defection by a Scottish Church from anti-slavery principles.3 But if the slavery issue had served to make the Free Church a stalking horse for both Tappanites and Garrisonians in their efforts to rally anti-slavery sentiment in Scotland, it had also, on the obverse side of the coin, had the effect of disrupting relationships within the Scottish-American religious community. From the anti-slavery position it had taken up, the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland had felt itself "estranged" from its American brethren.4 And even within the Reformed Presbyterian Church,

1 Thistlethwaite, America and the Atlantic Community, pp. 76-86.
2 Rice, The Scottish Factor, pp. 32, 33, 278.
3 Ibid., Chapter VI.
4 United Presbyterian Magazine, October, 1867, p. 475. The relationship of Scottish and American Presbyterian Churches during Reconstruction is more fully discussed below, Chapter VIII, pp. 539-613.
which both in Scotland and in America had always been united in unequivocably denouncing slavery, the "peculiar institution" came in 1863 to be directly associated with reaffirming the old 1833 split between the Old Light and the New Light Synods in the United States. This underlining of the American schism, as it was judged in Scotland, tended further to alienate the Scottish branch of the church from the majority of its Old Light brethren in America. As will be demonstrated in a subsequent chapter, in this particular area of Scottish-American relations, the Reconstruction period proved to be, above all, a time for reaffirming mutual Christian roles, and for binding up old wounds between Scottish and American Presbyterian churches, no less than between the various Presbyterian branches within Scotland itself.

VI Conclusions

From the kaleidoscopic pattern of interweaving, complex, subtly or widely diverse attitudes expressed towards all aspects of the post-war situation in the United States by Scotsmen of various social backgrounds, political persuasions, and religious beliefs, it would seem possible to form the tentative general conclusion that Scotland reacted to American Reconstruction on three basic levels. These can be broadly categorized as:

a) reaction to the politics of Reconstruction;

b) reaction in practical, philanthropic terms to the needs of those suffering most - the freedmen - in the dislocated post-war society of America;

c) reaction on a more general level to the whole question of

1 Hutchison, The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, p. 409.

2 Ibid., p. 409. See also The Reformed Presbyterian Magazine, April 1865, p. 131.

3 See Chapter VIII, pp. 539-613.
race as it affected the relationships of nations throughout the world, but specific reaction also to the problem of the ultimate place of all coloured races in the United States.

Factors within contemporary Scottish society combined with historical concepts and a traditionally strong transatlantic focus to produce a strength of interest in America at this time which ensured that the reactions, on all levels, would be voiced with both spirit and conviction.
CHAPTER II

SOME ASPECTS OF THE POST-WAR TRANSATLANTIC OUTLOOK:
NEW FACTORS, OLD PREJUDICES

I Popular manifestations of substantial Scottish interest in post-war America

In the company of Dr. Charles Mackay, London-based Scottish journalist, and literary Jack-of-all-trades, Jefferson Davis had, by late August, 1869, progressed as far north on his tour of Scotland as Inverness.1 With Mackay's old and intimate friend Robert Carruthers - proprietor and editor of the Inverness Courier - as guide, a pilgrimage was made to the battlefield of Culloden. Nearby, they met with a shepherd who was sitting reading while tending the flock. Carruthers approached him, pointed out the distinguished visitor, and asked if he had ever heard of Davis, ex-President of the Southern Confederacy. "Never du'd", replied the shepherd. "And what was the Southern Confederacy, as ye ca' it? Was it in England? Or was it a Limited Liability Company?"2

The answer must have come as something of a surprise, not to say a personal set-back, for Carruthers, who in the editorial columns of his weekly journal had consistently championed the Confederate side during the Civil War, and had subsequently done as much as could be expected of a small, regional newspaper to keep the justice of the struggle for Southern independence before the public during the early years of Reconstruction.3

---

1 Inverness Courier, 26 August, 1869.
2 Charles Mackay, Through the Long Day, or Memorials of a Literary Life During Half a Century (London, 1887), Vol. 2, pp. 367-368. At the other extreme, there was the Edinburgh firm of Nicoll and Mitchell, grocers, who advertised as a special delicacy "Confederate Green Turtle Soup" - see Scotman, 30 Jan., 1865, and Kennington & Jenner of Princes' Street, who proudly announced that they had received a delivery of coloured blankets which had been "expressly manufactured" for the officers of the Confederate army. These were advertised as being "admirably adapted for gentlemen's shooting and fishing suits". Ibid., 10 April, 1866.
3 See, for instance, Inverness Courier, 20, 27 April, 1, 15 June, 1865; 27 Sept., 1866.
It is just possible, of course, that the shepherd had been a staunch supporter of the North, and, having no particular desire to meet the erstwhile leader of the Southern secessionists, had manufactured an ingenious way of opting out of the introduction. But if his comment was genuine, his ignorance of the recent history of the United States was probably largely atypical, even in his own neighbourhood. Although David Macrae, reflecting on the general popular Scottish response to the visiting ex-President, did remark that the extent of knowledge of some of the people who turned out to see him was difficult to judge,\(^1\) Davis' presence as a guest of A.C. Dallas at Dochfour House, near Inverness, was in itself sufficient to generate enough local interest for a "considerable number" to gather at the railway station on the day of his departure, to regard him with "respectful attention", and to cheer him as he left for Edinburgh.\(^2\)

Certainly, there would seem to have been enough understanding in Inverness of contemporary American problems to make it worthwhile for Macrae himself to make the journey from Glasgow to publicize the U.P. students' scheme for raising money to send bibles to the American freed-men. Macrae, "already well known to many locally in connection with popular literature",\(^3\) duly delivered his "very interesting" address on "Christian Work amongst the Freedmen of America" at the Union Street U.P. Church on 13 June, 1869.\(^4\) Less than two years later, "the popular author of The Americans at Home"\(^5\) returned to lecture on "American Peculiarities, etc." to a crowded meeting held under the auspices of the Inverness Working

---

1 "Mr. Jefferson Davis" from 'Wayside Notes' by David Macrae, first printed in Glasgow Weekly Herald, reprinted in Glasgow Herald, 21 Sept., 1869.
2 Inverness Courier, 26 August, 1869
3 Ibid., 10 June, 1869.
4 Ibid., 10, 17 June, 1869. Macrae's activities on behalf of the U.P. Theological Hall Missionary Society are more fully explored in Chapter IX, pp.
5 Inverness Courier, 5 January, 1871.
Men's Club in the Music Hall. Having been received with "great attention and delight", and "frequent loud cheering",\(^1\) he followed up this success by returning later in the year to lecture to the Club.\(^2\)

His performances there were by no means unique. Throughout the Reconstruction years, Scottish interest in the situation in America was fed not only by voluminous press comment, numerous travelogues by Scots, and appeals from platform, press, and church on behalf of the freed slaves, but also by a rash of public talks and lectures on various aspects of a country facing, it was widely recognized, a unique post-war crisis of readjustment and reorganization. Following the publication of his work on the United States, Macrae, with his polished, engaging presentation and literary turn of phrase\(^3\) was in fact probably one of the most sought-after speakers in this sphere.\(^4\)

His ability to convey entertainingly, but pertinently, the essential ethos of American life and society as he saw it at that time was well brought out in his lecture on "American Characteristics", delivered in the Athenaeum, Glasgow, early in 1873. Seeking to illustrate the "feverish anxiety" and tremendous ingenuity of the American people as a whole, he interestingly chose an example from the Southern states to demonstrate his point. His choice was significant inasmuch as it served to emphasize his premise that even in a society which, at least until the abolition of

---

1 \textit{Ibid.}, 30 Jan., 1871.
2 \textit{Ibid.}, 9 Nov., 1871.
3 When he was ordained as U.P. minister of Gourock in 1872, Macrae had "been known for ten years in the literary world" - see Robert Small, \textit{History of the Congregations of the United Presbyterian Church from 1732 to 1900} (Edinburgh, 1904), Vol. 2, p. 203.
4 He had given a talk on the same subject to Newington Young Men's Association, Edinburgh, on 2 March, 1869 - see general notice in \textit{Scotsman}, 25 Feb., 1869.
slavery, had been considered by many Scottish critics to be feudalistic, moribund, and stagnant compared with the progressive North, there was a unique dynamism and informality totally alien to the British environment. Thus, while he acknowledged that the South still retained distinct, peculiar characteristics (finding it "a mixture of old country ideas, and the rough Republican ideas of sixty, seventy or eighty years ago"), he related the story of how he had found Alabama's Secretary of State working in his shirt sleeves as evidence that even in the old, "aristocratic" South there was an independence and freedom in the actions of men in upper circles of society that could not exist in Britain.¹

Other Scots who had visited the United States after the war were similarly pressed upon to air their views in public. Sir David Wedderburn gave two lectures on "The United States of America in 1866" to the Philosophical Institution, Edinburgh in early March, 1868, ² in which he not only stressed the strength of Anglo-American connections ³ but also defined the relative positions of the Republican and Democratic parties vis-à-vis centralization, added his own observations on American feeling towards this vexed question, discoursed on the strictly egalitarian nature of the American system of government, and assured his audience that there was, at that time, "no subject so interesting and instructive to the historian, statesman, or philosopher as the American Republic". Should any members of the Institution have felt disposed secretly to question this, probably even they were forced to capitulate in the face of Sir David's lyrical assertion that

² See general notice in Scotsman, 3 March, 1868.
³ See above, Chapter I, pp. 21-22.
All that is grandest and most promising in the future of the human race, especially to that great family to which we as Englishmen belong, is bound up in the fortunes of the youthful giant who already overshadows the entire New World.¹

Rather fittingly, E.A. Baxter, son of W.E. Baxter, made his debut as a public speaker in 1872 when, under the auspices of the Y.M.C.A., he delivered a talk entitled "Across the American Continent" to a "large audience" in the Kinnaird Hall, Dundee. As was perhaps to be expected in a first speech from one whose father's pro-American views were so widely publicized and vehemently pronounced, Baxter junior's lecture was much concerned simply with the stock traveller's descriptions of places visited. But realizing, perhaps, that both his name, and the old (and continuing) commercial relationship which had fostered Dundee's keen interest in the United States would lead his audience to expect more than this, he did cautiously venture to voice an opinion on the relative merits of North and South. Predictably, he greatly preferred the North in every respect:

¹ would infinitely rather associate with the people and live among the beautiful scenery of New York, Vermont or Massachusetts, than mingle with the so-called aristocracy of the South and spend my days in the swamps of South Carolina or Louisiana.²

At an earlier period, Broughty Ferry Young Men's Mutual Improvement Society had recruited the services of William Robertson, Tay Park, to present his impressions of a recent visit to America.³ Nor had Dundee's popular interest in the United States waned by the mid 1870s. Robert

---

¹ Percival (ed.), Sir David Wedderburn, pp. 86, 87-88. Mrs Percival (Wedderburn's sister) incorrectly gives the date of his lectures as Feb., 1868 (p. 85). In Glasgow academic circles, Professor John Nichol chose to conclude his series of lectures to ladies at Glasgow University (March, 1871) with an appraisal of American Literature. This decision is interesting inasmuch as it involved a jump from Dryden and Pope, the subjects of the two previous lectures. North British Daily Mail, 4 Jan., 1871.


³ Ibid., 31 Dec., 1869.
Mackenzie, the city merchant whose panygeric on the young Republic had appeared in 1870, lectured on "America" at the Working Men's Club, Tay Street, on 23 March, 1874, "in accordance with a request signed by a large number of members". Apparently Mackenzie had also made the trip to the United States following the war, since in his talk he expressed his satisfaction with the American educational system, touched on the difficulties, as he saw them, of emigration to the mid and far west, described a visit to a Negro church, and stressed the warmness of the American welcome.2

The chance to increase public awareness of the United States - even in a city well enough attuned to transatlantic developments - must certainly have been gratifying to Mackenzie. Lamenting the "very limited attention" which had hitherto been paid by the British to the history of the United States, with British youth being allowed to "remain ignorant of the history of that people whose marvellously rapid development is one of the grand characteristic circumstances of the nineteenth century", the stated intention of his book had been "to make the present generation better acquainted with America".3

Not all Scottish observers agreed with Mackenzie's sentiments, however, or appreciated the results of his scholarship. In a review which sought to demolish the book as hopelessly biased in favour of Northern

---


2 Report of lecture by Robert Mackenzie, 23 March, 1874, in Dundee Advertiser, 24 March, 1874. Unfortunately, no record of Mackenzie's U.S. visit has been discovered; nor does the Advertiser's account of his lecture give any details of his attitude to the Negroes with whom he came in contact, other than to report that he alluded to the "peculiar characteristics" of Negroes and Indians, and found the Negro preacher "very noisy".

3 Mackenzie, The United States of America, pp. iii-iv.
society and the Federal cause during the Civil War, the Scotsman
maintained that any intelligent reader was bound to be aware that the
history of America was better known in Britain than that of probably
any other country in the world: "It has been obtruded upon us in such
an unpleasant fashion so often that it would be strange if it was not
known". What Mackenzie really meant, though he did not seem to be
quite aware of it, the paper suggested, was that he took a different
view of the history of the United States from that usually taken in
Britain:

He has an intense admiration of the Northern States - of New
England in particular - and the people of those states, failing
as they must always fail, to convince the old country that they
are invariably right, turn round upon us and insist that it is
our ignorance which blinds us: and forthwith they begin to give
us their history according to Boston and Massachusetts generally,
Mr. Mackenzie has shared their feeling, and has followed their
course.¹

What becomes evident from the platform addresses so far considered,
however, is that not a few people in Scotland were, in fact, anxious to
attend public lectures where the speaker was, to a greater or lesser
degree, generally sympathetic to the North. Confidence in the drawing
power of a talk on an American tour by an individual who tended to favour
the Northern states was well demonstrated by the choice of the Rev. J.P.
Chown of Bradford to lecture in the Queen Street Hall, Edinburgh, in aid
of a fund for liquidating the debt on the U.P. Duncan Street Chapel,
Newington.² With the influential Charles Cowan of Valleyfield presiding
over a "considerable audience", Chown's address - a descriptive narrative
containing fulsome praise of General O.O. Howard of the Freedmen's Bureau -

¹ Scotsman, 24 June, 1870.
² Caledonian Mercury, 17 April, 1866.
was well received.  

But on one occasion at least, a visiting lecturer, not hand-picked to suit a particular occasion or audience, did afford the opportunity for Scots who held differing opinions on the merits of the North to reassert their prejudices in public. Dr. Mary E. Walker, an American lady physician, duly appeared at the Music Hall, Edinburgh, in early May, 1867, and delivered her "popular and highly interesting" account of incidents connected with her services as a contract surgeon in the Federal army, her capture by Confederates, and her four months detention as a prisoner of war. With the Civil War still recent enough for many details of the military combat to be fresh in Scottish minds, and given the tremendous novelty value of this particular speaker, the lecture was extremely well attended.

Though received at the commencement with great applause, Dr. Walker (hindered, perhaps, on this occasion by the betrayal of feminist beliefs somewhat too rampant for Scotland's capital) scarcely met with unanimous approval. According to the Scotsman, "The lecturer had no sooner opened her mouth than she began to give evidence of her Northern prejudices, and her remarks in this respect were received by the audience with manifestations of mingled approbation and disapprobation, the latter predominating". The audience continued to enter into the spirit of the

---

1 Report of lecture by Rev. J.P. Chown, 16 April, 1866, in ibid., and Scotsman, 17 April, 1866. For an earlier reference to Cowan's interest in America, see above, Chapter I, p.55.

U.P. congregational interest in the U.S. had earlier that year been catered for by a lecture in the High Street U.P. Church by Charles Rose on "A Tour in the Western World during the recent war". See Scotsman, 12 Feb., 1866.

2 General notice in ibid., 25 April, 1867.

3 The notice publicizing her appearance assured prospective patrons of glimpses into "Her strange Adventures, Thrilling Experiences, Important Services, and Marvellous Achievements, exceeding anything that modern Romance or Fiction has produced". Ibid.

4 Report of Lecture by Dr. Mary E. Walker, 1 May, 1867, in ibid., 2 May, 1867.
thing, with the gallant physician drawing support from the applause of erstwhile Northern supporters, and holding her own against the rumblings of the critics:

She was going on to speak of the Southern antipathies to the Yankees, when some manifestations on the part of the audience unfavourable to the latter elicited from her the further observation - 'I suppose some of you have forgot what is the origin (sic) of Yankee. Our American Indians called the British Yankees when they came over.'

A proliferation of provocative remarks - branding the hero-figure Lee, for instance, "the leader of the greatest scenes of blood and carnage in the oppression of mankind that the world has ever known" - ensured frequent hearty rounds of applause and hisses. ¹

Contemporaneous with the serious orations of platform speakers anxious to enlighten their audiences on the current state of the United States, there was the minor army of platform entertainers who contributed their own small but unique part in keeping the peculiarities of American life, society, and politics - past and present - before the attention of the Scottish public during the years following the Civil War. The roles of the Jubilee Singers, the coloured choir which in the 1870s twice toured Scotland in successful fund raising efforts for Fisk University, and of the "Negro delineators" - black-face music hall acts whose number was legion at this time - will be considered in subsequent chapters. ² Apart from these, there were basically three ways in which the American scene was brought to life on the Scottish stage.

Firstly, there was the straight, American-style entertainment by

¹ Ibid., with admission costs as high as 3/- for reserved seats, 2/- for side seats, and 1/- for the gallery and under it, the strength of opposition to some of Dr. Walker's remarks may be partially explainable by the fact that a substantial proportion of her audience would probably have been drawn from those better-off classes notorious for their Southern sympathies.

² See, respectively, Chapters X, pp. 279-304, and pp. 608-612.
white "artistes", sometimes consisting simply of authentic music as provided, for instance, by the Kentucky Serenaders,¹ or the inclusion in the music hall programme of a solo act like that of Mr. Stephen Palmyre, American humorist", billed to appear at the Edinburgh Music Hall on 25 March, 1865, in "his celebrated American entertainment, introducing concertina and banjo".² Occasionally, a turn of this nature was announced which seemed to promise something more interesting than the ordinary run-of-the-mill performance. Thus, with the war just a month over, the North British Daily Mail carried the message that there would soon be appearing in Glasgow one Harry B. Macarthy "The Confederate Bard! Arkansas Comedian! ... Assisted by Mrs. Lottie Macarthy, Louisiana's Daughter, Danseuse, Vocalist and Commedienne".³

Vying in popularity with these conventional music hall forms were the American "spectaculars" - pretentious "dioramas" which apparently aimed to instruct as well as to entertain the audience. A representative example of these was supplied by a gentleman happily named Washington Friend, "the celebrated American Artist, Vocalist, Lecturer, Musician, Traveller, and Composer", who, appearing at the Waterloo Rooms, Edinburgh, for twelve days in late April, 1867, claimed to present a great new, panoramic American entertainment - "a picture of life and scenes in America with appropriate songs, lectures, etc."⁴ Equally ambitious was Banvard's "American Diorama" which included scenes of "Negro life in the Southern States".⁵

¹ The Kentucky Serenaders appeared in Edinburgh on 9 Dec., 1865 - see general notice in Scotsman, 6 Dec., 1865.
² Ibid., 24 March, 1865.
³ See general notice in North British Daily Mail, 8 May, 1865.
⁴ See general notice in Scotsman, 26 April, 1867.
⁵ See general notice in ibid., 27 Jan., 1876.
Perhaps equally valuable, however, in affording Scottish audiences an insight into at least one mysterious product of the American political system was the stage stump oration. Frequently, this phenomenon was part of the stock-in-trade of the "Negro delineator", and tended on occasion to be singled out as the highspot of the performer's repertoire.¹ Christy's Minstrels, the famous black-face troupes which became virtually a permanent fixture of the Scottish music hall scene in the sixties and seventies² delighted audiences with their "stump speeches" in Edinburgh's Operatta House no less than in Perth's City Hall.³ Certainly, the performances were recognized by the audiences as deriving their impact from gross distortion and exaggeration; yet it may be valid to suggest that even while acknowledging this, that great proportion of the Scottish public which rested secure in its belief in the superiority of British political institutions over those of America would have been not a little reassured in its complacency by the visible propensities for absurdity inherent in the American system. That this innocuous type of humour could have insidious over-

¹ See, for instance, the notice announcing the appearance at Brown's Royal Music Hall, Glasgow, of the "Great Negro Delineator", Orville Brown, in North British Daily Mail, 19 July, 1869; and the recommendation that "None should fail to hear ["Negro delineator"] West in his stump oration" at the Southminster Music Hall Edinburgh - see general notice in Scotsman, 1 April, 1868. E.W. Mackney, "The Greatest Living Delineator of Negro Character", was also renowned for "his celebrated stump speech" - see general notice in ibid., 12 November, 1866.

² There were at least two separate groups of Christy's Minstrels circulating at this period, both claiming to be the original troupe, and ultimately becoming involved in a legal battle to settle the question.

³ See, respectively, Scotsman, 10 Sept., 1873, and Perthshire Courier, 2 May, 1865.
tones of a less pleasant character is well illustrated by the Scotsman's appreciation of another Christy Minstrels' special - "an extravagant and laughter-producing burlesque entitled 'Justice in a Coloured Court'."  

The second form of entertainment directing attention towards the United States sought more directly to convey something of the flavour of "things as they had been" in pre-war America. The popularity of this testifies not only to the Scottish public's continuing ability to be interested in the well-worn theme of American slavery, but also to its readiness - now that the peculiar institution had been abolished - to accept and enjoy a nostalgically romanticized picture of old plantation life. And in their readiness to accept this, the audiences were simultaneously, inevitably, subjected to (and prepared to accept) a reinforcement of the "Happy Sambo" stereotype, also concurrently presented to them on the stage by solo Negro "comedians and minstrels", and by the "Negro delineators".  

The most successful attempt to present an extravaganza drawn from the "Bright Side of Slavery" was that made by the "Great American Slave Troupe and Brass Band" from Georgia, a company of ex-slaves who won wide acclaim on a tour of the Scottish music halls in 1868. Following appearances at Glasgow (where they were billed as "Untaught African Slaves from the Plantations") and Dundee, they reached Edinburgh in mid February. The notice for their first performance at the Music Hall there,

1 *Scotsman*, 10 September, 1873.
2 For further references to these, see below, Chapter V, pp. 608-612.
3 See general notice of performance by the Grand American Slave Troupe in *Dundee Courier*, 8 February, 1868.
4 See general notice, in *North British Daily Mail*, 6 Jan., 1868.
5 See general notice in *Dundee Courier*, 8 February, 1868.
on 15 February, speaks for itself:

Real Negroes! No Burnt Cork! The Original and only Combination of Genuine Black Performers in the world. Slavery as it appeared in America prior to the Great Rebellion, faithfully portrayed by those who have lately been freed from its iron yoke. The Negro as he is, and as he appeared on the plantations, with all the drolleries, witticisms, and eccentricities characteristic of the race. Plantation scenes, songs, dances.¹

Having "created a sensation" at these Edinburgh Saturday evening concerts,² they proceeded north to Aberdeen, where, by way of further introducing the performers and their talents, prospective audiences were informed that these "sixteen real Negroes" had been "but a short time since ... the legal property of their masters", and were now "nightly presenting to the astonished thousands the only True Representation of Negro Life on the plantations of America".³ At Inverness, the first of their two performances was patronized by the provost, magistrates, town councillors, and officers of the artillery volunteers.⁴

In addition to these "genuine" portrayals of the Negroes' manner of existence under slavery, there was also a vogue in the Scottish theatre at this time for dramatizations of slave life. Of these, the most popular were undoubtedly Dion Boucicault's "The Octoroon", a stage version of "Uncle Tom's Cabin", both of which achieved phenomenal successes. "The Octoroon" opened at the Princess's Theatre, Edinburgh, on 16 October, 1865, to an "enthusiastic" reception, a "very full house", and the Scotsman's prediction that it was likely to have a good

¹ See general notice in Scotsman, 13 February, 1868.
² Ibid., 1 April, 1868.
³ General notice in Aberdeen Journal, 29 April, 1868. The troupe appeared in the Mechanics' Hall on five consecutive evenings, commencing 5 May.
⁴ See general notice in Inverness Courier, 21 May, 1868.
run. By the end of the year, it was also playing to good houses at the Theatre in Aberdeen. Three years later, Edinburgh's Southminster Music Hall was crowded every evening, and boasting of its "immense success" in presenting the "Great American Drama of the 'Octoroon' or 'Slave Life in the Sunny South'", while in 1869, the Theatre-Royal chose to re-open with a revival of the play. It was still being performed in the city as late as 1873. The drama based on "Uncle Tom's Cabin", if less consistently performed, was similarly well received in Edinburgh, while in Glasgow its "great and triumphant success" had so crowded the Royal Alexandra Theatre as to necessitate a repeat performance two nights later.

---

1 *Scotsman*, 17 October, 1865. "The Octoroon" had first been performed at the Winter Garden Theatre, New York, in December, 1859, under the direction of Boucicault himself. According to the American actor Joseph Jefferson, who in the original production was cast as the Yankee overseer, Salem Scudder, the play was "produced at a dangerous time" and had from the outset a great effect on the audience. Solidly centred around the problem of slavery, it apparently aroused divergent opinions on whether its sympathies lay basically with the North or with the South. But in Jefferson's view - one which, on a reading of the play, can be accepted as valid - "The Octoroon" was essentially "non-committal", its dialogue and characters making the audience feel for the South, but the action effectively "proclaim[ing] against slavery and call[ing] loudly for its abolition". Joseph Jefferson, *The Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson* (London and New York, 1890), pp. 214; 207, 215.

The subtleties no less than the convolutions of the plot render a synopsis of the play likely to be highly unsatisfactory. Suffice it to say that the main theme of the drama is the love between George, the young nephew (just returned, be it noted, from an education in Europe) of a venerable, recently deceased Southern planter, and Zoe, the octoroon girl whom his aunt and uncle had adopted and raised, and the unscrupulous efforts of the villainous Northern overseer McClosky to win Zoe for himself - see Dion Boucicault, *The Octoroon* (published in Dick's Standard Plays, No. 391, 1859).

The Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. 2, p. 475, records that the play was one of Boucicault's greatest successes and was something of a milestone in the American theatre.

2 *Aberdeen Herald*, 9 December, 1865.
3 General notice in *Scotsman*, 11 June, 1868.
7 See general notice in *North British Daily Mail*, 20 September, 1869.
The popularity of these two dramas could perhaps be seen as an encouraging sign that — even granted the frivolous level of involvement — the Scottish public was not prepared to let the figure of the American Negro slip out of its consciousness (or, in some instances, perhaps, even its conscience) now that he was free. But obviously, it could equally well be argued that at a time when that same freedman was struggling for civil and political rights, struggling, indeed, in many cases, for survival itself; at a time when for him slavery was, after all, a vanished horror, for Scottish audiences to be entertained by "The Octoroon" and "Uncle Tom's Cabin" was evidence of a static, rather than of an actively progressive outlook towards the Negro in the United States. If Harriet Beecher Stowe deserves an indictment for her instrumental role in transferring the kernel of Scottish abolitionism into the hands of satin-clad philanthropists, the lingering impact of her *Uncle Tom's Cabin* also paradoxically helped to foster, in the Reconstruction era, a crude nostalgia for the days when the pitiable American Negro formed the central issue in a clear-cut question of right and wrong.

To some extent, the Scottish audience's appreciation of these stage presentations in the post-war years was simply an extension of the old tradition of romanticism in British attitudes to the Negro, a characteristic displaying itself in the 1850s, for instance, in the great

---

1 For a critical analysis of Harriet Beecher Stowe's influence within the Scottish anti-slavery movement in the 1850s, see Rice, *The Scottish Factor*, Chapter IX.
enthusiasm for fugitive slave stories. But at the same time, it is possible that other factors were at work in stimulating and preserving Scottish interest in the vanished institution of American slavery. The old situation in the South, product of a wrong still unrighted, had been much easier to comprehend, to feel genuine moral indignation over, and to become popularly involved in than the confused and confusing situation which developed there after the Civil War. Scottish audiences flocked to see dramatizations of a system so recently abolished that it did not even rate a historical interest. They did so not simply because the subject, with its stock heroes and villains, was perfectly translatable to the Victorian stage (though the sheer entertainment value must have been a powerful draw), but also because, having lived through the vigorous transatlantic drive for abolition, the roots of their knowledge of, and feeling for, America were embedded in the era portrayed on the stage. Furthermore, even in the sixties, it was basically much easier for Scots to understand and pity the slave lashed at the whipping post than to understand and pity the Negro freedman, pleading in vain for forty acres and a mule from the Freedmen's Bureau. The attitude was understandable, but none the less regrettable.

Some slight indication of the impact made by the Christy Minstrels and other professional black-face performers, by the Negro minstrels,

---

1 See *ibid.*, pp. 513-515.

Discussing the tremendous impact made on both sides of the Atlantic by Uncle Tom's Cabin, as book and as stage drama, Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union* (New York and London, 1947), p. 409, has concluded that at least so far as the United States was concerned, "No small part of the incredible over-optimism with which the North later approached the task of converting slaves into voters, self-dependent citizens, and legislators, thinking it could be done overnight, is chargeable to the impression diffused by Mrs Stowe."

Nevins also suggests that one reason why the play, and the novel itself, were so popular in America and Britain was that the treatment of the subject was so thoroughly moral and religious that no stigma of somewhat dubious, reprehensible entertainment (frequently applied to the Victorian novel and the Victorian stage) could be attached either to the printed tale or to the dramatization - *ibid.*, pp. 407-408.
and by the slave troupes, is afforded in the third type of American orientated entertainment - the attempts of native Scots to present their own entertainments along these lines. Usually, these home-made efforts were given in aid of a deserving cause. Thus, at an amateur musical concert in 1865 for the inmates of Edinburgh's poorhouse, the programme consisted mostly of "negro melodies ... thoroughly appreciated by the audience". In a more salubrious setting, and with the Lord Provost's patronage, an amateur concert was presented in the city's Music Hall, for the benefit of the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary, at which the "Edinburgh Ethiopian Singers" performed selections of "favourite Negro melodies". And in March, 1871, the "Inverness Minstrels", complete with "banjos and conundrums", gave a concert in aid of the fund for providing dinner for the local poor on the day of the Marquis of Lorne's marriage to Princess Louise - a somewhat ironic gesture, since the bridegroom, unlike his parents, the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, or his grandmother, the Duchess of Sutherland, could scarcely be said to have harboured a sympathetic affection for, or even a gently romanticized notion of, the Negro race.

1 Daily Review, 7 December, 1865.
2 Scotsman, 13 February, 1866.
3 Inverness Courier, 23 March, 1871.
4 For consideration of the Marquis of Lorne's attitudes to the Negro, see below, Chapter V, pp. 547-550.

It is also rather ironic that Lorne himself, when in New York in 1866, had been told the story of a Negro who had gone to see one of the black-face Negro minstrel bands, then at the height of their popularity in America as in Britain. The Negro, having suffered the performance for some time with astonishment and contempt, finally exclaimed "What cussed fools dese white men do make of themselves!", then got up and left the theatre. A Trip to the Tropics, p. 208.
II The nature of the sentiments produced by the Scottish visit of
Jefferson Davis

The music hall acts, however damaging in their stereotypes or spurious
in their sentiment, at least had the importance of keeping some sort of
popular image of America before the public eye. And while the organ-
izing and patronizing of public lectures testified to the Scottish desire
to keep abreast of the social and political situation in Reconstruction
America, specific post-war events in the United States capable of exciting
British interest and concern, and new links between Scotland and America,
tended to complement these efforts by continually reactivating the focus
on America. As will be seen, this was so even in the later years of
Reconstruction.

Of some importance in this connection was the trickle of American
wartime personalities who, on trips to Europe, included Scotland in
their itinerary. Jefferson Davis, as we have seen, was a case in point,
and his visit had the effect not only of arousing the interest of the
naturally curious or uninformed, but also of reawakening old Scottish
attitudes and passions towards the lost cause of the South. Two years
before his arrival on Scottish soil, the loyally pro-North Dundee
Advertiser, commenting on his proposed future tour of Europe, had warned
that in Britain, at least, "he need not expect a very cordial reception".
The paper based this general conclusion on the assumed legacy of resent-
ment from an old, familiar theme:

The sufferings endured by the cotton operatives of Lancashire
are too recent to be forgotten, and it is not likely the con-
spirator who had so prominent a hand in bringing about the cotton
famine will be received with much favour in the manufacturing
districts of England.1

1 Dundee Advertiser, 17 May, 1867.
Indeed, the Advertiser, announcing that the ex-President was simply "another victim to the modern ideas of the natural rights of man", predicted that in all Europe, he was likely to get sincere sympathy only at the Vatican, adding, with a neat Protestant bias uncharacteristic of the paper's columns, that "His Holiness was the only Monarch who openly gave his blessing to the South". ¹

But, in Scotland at least, Davis' reception was far from being the damp squib which Leng's paper had prophesied and hoped for. Ensuring that his welcome would be neither downright hostile, nor even merely lukewarm, there gravitated towards him throughout his tour of the country a bevy of prominent Scots whose sympathies had in earlier days lain with the Confederacy, and who were both proud and honoured to form a personal post-war association with the old chief. Foremost among these was surely Charles Mackay himself, an individual whose pro-Southern bias during the war years had been strong enough — and blind enough — to earn him dismissal as the London Times American war

¹ Ibid.

During the Civil War, Pope Pius IX expressed views on the conflict which earned him the hostility of American Federal sympathizers — see Thomas J. Pressey, Americans Interpret Their Civil War (first published Princeton University Press, 1954; Free Press Paperback Edition, 1965), pp. 42, 57, 142. E.J. Pratt and D. Jordan, Europe and the American Civil War (Oxford University Press, 1931), p. 194, have however indicated that although much was made of the Pope's correspondence with Davis, his interest in the fate of the Southerners would seem to have been purely humanitarian and his political sympathies, if any, directed more towards the Northern cause.
correspondent, and whose savage denunciations of American democracy and virulently racist articles on "The Nigger Question" consistently coloured the pages of Blackwood's Magazine during the Reconstruction years. Although Mackay had never met Davis, neither during his first trip to the United States in 1857-58, nor in the course of his wartime stay, he quickly took the initiative in introducing himself to the distinguished American visitor, and by mid-July, 1869, was apparently on close enough terms to refer to him as, significantly, "my excellent and highly accomplished friend Mr Jefferson Davis, the Southern President."

1 Mackay had become correspondent for the Times in 1862, following the unscheduled return of the famous W.H. Russell. Almost immediately, the extreme partisanship of his reports had disturbed the paper, causing its manager, Mowbray Morris (himself a Southern sympathiser), to remonstrate as early as Sept., 1862 - "I ask myself whether any Government or set of men can be so wholly bad that not a single good word can be said for them by an impartial observer". Mackay, however, persisted in indulging his bias to the full, and when the war began to go heavily against the South, continued to send back "glowing and thoroughly misleading" accounts of Southern progress. On 21 April, 1865, in an extremely harsh letter of dismissal, Morris commented - "This result ... has been brought about by your blind and unreasonable condemnation of all public men and measures on the Federal side ... the paper has suffered in reputation through your partial representation of affairs in the North ... and ... our readers have been misled by your statements to take an erroneous view of current events". Stanley Morison, The History of the Times (London, 1939), Vol. 2, pp. 377-388. Morison makes it clear, however, that Mackay was to some extent used as a scapegoat by the paper when the South began to lose the war - see ibid., p. 389.

For a biographical note on Mackay, see Appendix I.

2 For discussion of the attitudes expressed by Mackay in these articles, see below, passim.

3 Mackay, Through the Long Day, Vol. 2, p. 361. His first visit to America had been made for the purpose of writing a series of letters on his impressions to the Illustrated London News, and to deliver a course of lectures on "Poetry and Song" in the principal American cities. See Mackay, Forty Years Recollections of Life, Literature, and Public Affairs from 1830 to 1870 (London, 1877), Vol. 2, p. 375. The letters later appeared as a two volume work, Life and Liberty in America (London, 1859)

4 Mackay, Through the Long Day, p. 361.

5 Charles Mackay to John Blackwood, 14 July, 1869, Blackwood MSS., Ms. 4250, fol. 46-47, National Library of Scotland. (Hereafter cited as Bla. MSS).
The deliberate retention of the title (he referred to Davis as "The President" in subsequent correspondence) suggests something of how an individual, harbouring a deeply seated love of the Southern cause—which was reinforced rather than diminished by events in America during Reconstruction—could, as a result of direct contact with one of the great heroes of the Confederacy, almost come to feel that the cause itself was still alive. Certainly, first hand acquaintance with Davis served to further convince Mackay of the indisputable basic superiority of the Southern whites over those of the North. Accepting on behalf of Davis and himself an invitation to visit John Blackwood, he wrote, "I think you will be pleased with him— as a statesman—a philosopher—and (what is commoner at the South than at the North) a gentleman."

Above all, the presence of the ex-President in their midst provided an opportunity for influential Scotsmen of the same mind on the South, on the Negro problem, and on Reconstruction generally, to get together under circumstances which made it inevitable that the main subjects of conversation would be, in fact, these very topics. Mackay shepherded his charge to John Blackwood's summer home at Strathtyrum, near St. Andrews, in late July, where it appears Davis found the reception "the most agreeable and grateful to his feelings [of any in Scotland]." While it was clearly diplomatic for Mackay to flatter his publisher by supplying this information, it nevertheless remains the case that from the Blackwoods' point of view, the visit was a complete success.

1 See Mackay to Blackwood, 9 Aug., 1869, ibid., MS. 4250, fol. 60-61; and undated letter (probably 27 or 28 July, 1869), fol. 106-107.
2 Mackay to Blackwood, 23 July, 1869, ibid., MS. 4250, fol. 52-53.
3 Mackay to Blackwood, unheaded and undated letter (probably mid August, 1869), ibid., MS. 4250, fol. 68-69. See also ibid., fol. 60-61.
Almost twenty years later, Blackwood's daughter chose the occasion as one of the incidents most clearly impressed on her childhood recollections, "probably through hearing it later so often alluded to". Blackwood, "eagerly welcoming the opportunity of seeing the hero and entertaining him under his own roof", had assembled his family on the doorsteps to meet Davis. When he arrived, "We felt it was quite like entertaining royalty, and we ought to have had a band playing, and a guard of honour". The visit produced the sort of atmosphere in which a hard-headed, sceptical, comfortably middle-aged publisher like John Blackwood - almost certainly a more prosaic supporter of the Confederacy, and definitely a relatively less vitriolic critic of America during Reconstruction and of the Negro race than the romantic and melodramatic Mackay - could pronounce that he would fight for Davis any day. "He is a grand old man. I could mount and draw sword for him at a moment's notice".

For one "ardent [Scottish] pro-Southerner", however, Davis' visit provided simply the chance to renew an old friendship. During his two-


2 Blackwood favoured the South partly because of the currently common sympathy for soldiers fighting against great odds, but largely because many of his friends were with the Southern army and they reported to him of the courage of Confederate officers. See ibid., p. 141. In the moulding of his opinions, there was no equivalent to the personal experience of America in wartime which helped to fashion Mackay's extreme views.

For a biographical note on Blackwood, see Appendix I.

3 See Mackay to Blackwood, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fols. 16-17, 90-91; MS. 4237, fols. 61-62, 63-64.


day stay in Glasgow (10-12 August), he was the guest of James Smith, Dowanhill, partner in the American firm of Smith and Wellstood, patent stove manufacturers and founders. 1 Smith, a native of Glasgow, had emigrated with a sister to Mississippi in the forties and had established a drug business there, 2 as well as profiting from cotton planting. 3

Having returned to Glasgow following his wife's death in 1855, he turned his capital into a sizeable fortune and became one of the city's strongest supporters of the South during the Civil War, donating a battery to the Confederacy, 4 investing £100 in Confederate bonds, and leading a vocal contingent of protesters against a Glasgow rally held in support of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. 5 His younger brother, Robert, who had followed Smith to Mississippi in 1850, became a colonel of the Tenth Mississippi Infantry and fell at the head of his Regiment at Munfordville, Kentucky, in September, 1862. 6

Having nourished so intensely strong and personal a commitment to the Southern cause, it was but natural that Smith would extend a particularly warm welcome to his guest. What is more significant is the fact that in the city of Glasgow, a relative stronghold of Scottish sympathy

1 North British Daily Mail, 6 Aug., 1869; Glasgow Herald, 10 Aug., 1869.
3 Strode, Jefferson Davis, p. 335.
4 Ibid.
5 Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, p. 663.
6 Wiche, "Britons in the Civil War", pp. 2-3, 8. For further references to the Smith family in this connection, see below, Chapter III, pp. 200-201.
for the South during the war, the old sentiments were still, almost five years after the end of hostilities, overt and powerful enough for no less than thirty gentlemen to attend a dinner given by Smith in Davis' honour. And probably few of Glasgow's citizenry judged the ex-President indiscreet in visiting the Parkhead Forge and Napier's shipbuilding yard, and in requesting to sail direct from Glasgow Bridge quay to Oban because he was so anxious to see the various shipbuilding yards on Clyde banks, "and to witness", as the Glasgow Herald innocently remarked, "the results of the improvements which have been effected upon a river of which he has heard and read for many years".

On leaving Glasgow, Davis was similarly cosseted by admirers in the aristocratic shape of Lord and Lady Abinger, Inverlochy Castle, Kingussie. Demonstrating that visiting abolitionists by no means retained an exclusive American right to the hospitality of the Scottish upper classes, he was likewise feted by Lochiel, the Duke of Buccleuch, Lord Lothian

---

1 See Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 337-338, 773-779: see also references in speech by Councillor Moir at a public breakfast to Garrison, reported in Glasgow Herald, 20 July, 1867; and letter from "Emancipation" in North British Daily Mail, 14 Aug., 1869.
2 Glasgow Herald, 12 August, 1869.
3 Ibid.
4 Mackay to Blackwood, 9 Aug., 1869, Bla. MSS., MS. 4250, fcl. 60-61; Mackay, Through the Long Day, pp. 366-367; Strode, Jefferson Davis, p. 351. Strode records that Lady Abinger was the daughter of General Bankhead Magruder, Confederate officer and fellow cadet with Davis at West Point. William Frederick Scarlett, the 3rd Lord Abinger, and a lieutenant-general in the British army, had in fact married in 1863 Helen, daughter of Commodore George Allan Magruder of the U.S. Navy.
5 Glasgow Herald, 20 August, 1869.
(who presented him with an inscribed copy of his fiercely pro-Southern book, *The Confederate Secession*[^1], and - the greatest irony of all - by the Dowager Duchess of Sutherland's own son, the Duke of Sutherland[^2].

Part of Davis' tremendous popularity in the ranks of his old, influential Scottish supporters almost certainly stemmed from the fact that in every respect he must have lived up well to their expectations. In the first place, he looked right. There attached to his gaunt physical appearance an aura of the leader of the lost cause, putting on a brave face against a host of secret sorrows. Thus David Macrae, scarcely disposed to be sympathetic from a political standpoint, observed that he looked old for his years, "and had a somewhat broken down appearance, as if he had personally collapsed with the Confederacy"[^3].

He also acted right. Again, Macrae summed it up best, alluding to the "dignity about him, telling of grander days", and conceding that "his quiet bearing and unostentatious kindliness of manner won the hearts of all"[^4].

Furthermore - and most importantly - he fitted admirably into the Scottish stereotype of the cultured Southern gentleman, for in addition to the qualities listed above, he exhibited an extensive knowledge of Scottish tradition and history, paid honour to Burns as one of his favourite poets[^5], and practically knew his Scott backwards. He could hardly be torn away from Abbotsford (which he visited in the company of Alexander Russel, editor of the *Scotsman*[^6]), and Mackay boasted that if

[^2]: Ibid.
[^3]: Macrae, "Mr Jefferson Davis" from 'Wayside Notes' in *Glasgow Herald*, 21 Sept., 1869.
[^6]: Mackay to Blackwood, 27 July, 1869, Bla. MSS., NS. 4250, fol. 54-55.
Marvin, The Lady of the Lake and The Lay of the Last Minstrel were lost, Davis would be able to restore them from memory.\(^1\) And his companion took a retrospective pride in the memory of Davis assuming for himself the name of Mactavish at Culloden.\(^2\) Finally, Davis flattered his hosts by being suitably - even overwhelmingly - delighted with Scotland.\(^3\)

It was a delight gleaned not merely from his associations with a sympathetic clique of influential Scots, but also from a considerable degree of favourable popular sentiment towards him in the country at large. The precise temper of this public response is difficult to judge; but it is possible that it derived its main impetus as much from a combination of the romantic aura which attached to the figure of Jefferson Davis, and a natural curiosity, frequently, perhaps, largely uncomprehending, as from any significant widespread, passionately held public feelings for the old Confederacy during Reconstruction.

Admittedly, in some instances popular approbation probably sprang largely from the existence during the war of a strong local sympathy for the South. In Dunfermline, for example, where Davis' presence provoked "great excitement in the streets",\(^4\) wartime sentiment had been solidly anti-Federal.\(^5\) But the enthusiasm of the "unusual crowd" which

\(^1\) Mackay to Blackwood, unheaded, undated letter (probably 27-28 July, 1869), ibid., fol. 106-107. See also Mackay in Inverness Courier, 17 July, 1873. Davis was also fittingly impressed by Edinburgh, in which city, Mackay had predicted, "a man of his tastes and rearing is not likely to be disappointed". - Mackay to Blackwood, 23 July, 1869, Bla. MSS., MS. 4250, fol. 52-53, and 27 July, 1869, fol. 54-55.

\(^2\) Report of a lecture by Mackay on "The Scotch in America" delivered under the auspices of the Gaelic Society in the Music Hall, Inverness, on 13 July, 1873, in Inverness Courier, 17 July, 1873.

\(^3\) Porter, William Blackwood, pp. 201-203; Strode, Jefferson Davis, p. 352, quotes Davis as writing to Mackay that he could happily spend the rest of his days in Scotland. Strode heads the chapter on the Scottish tour "The Trip of his Life".

\(^4\) Glasgow Herald, 6 August, 1869.

\(^5\) Joseph Frazier Wall, Andrew Carnegie (New York, 1970), pp. 182-183, 186, has demonstrated Carnegie's horror on returning in 1862 to find his native town a stronghold of pro-Southern sympathies.
waited at Rothesay to catch a glimpse of him as his steamer came into
the pier is less easily explainable.¹ Nor can it be clearly determined
what feelings motivated the stolid Ardrishaig fishermen to swarm on to
the ridge where their nets were drying in order to see him pass,² or
their counterparts at St. Andrews to press for a handshake.³

For one Glaswegian, however, the attention accorded Jefferson Davis
left much to be desired. Writing to the North British Daily Mail in mid
August, 1869, "D.M." complained that there must be thousands in the city
who were disappointed at the undemonstrative reception given to the
visitor. He argued that some of Glasgow's leading men, if not the civic
authorities themselves, should have shown "some mark of respect to ... Mr. Jefferson Davis[,]... one of the few notable men of our time", the
former head of "that bright constellation of brave and heroic men, whose
names will go down to posterity as the heroes of the late American war".
Lamenting that it was because of his lack of success that he was "unsung
by the bigwigs of the commercial capital of Scotland", he concluded that
the Chamber of Commerce might profitably have consulted Davis on many
questions affecting the prosperity of Scotland and the United States.⁴

Against this, the North British Daily Mail itself had earlier voiced
a thinly veiled criticism of the Southern hero when it hoped that "in
our land of real liberty" he might learn "a few unwelcome political
truths which were hitherto undreamt of in his philosophy".⁵ "D.M.'s"

¹ The most eager piled up on carts or climbed lamp-posts when the vessel
was sighted - Macrae, "Mr Jefferson Davis", Glasgow Herald, 21 Sept., 1869.
In terms of British political affiliations, it was a fact that the county
of Bute had long been a traditional Tory stronghold - see Scotsman, 4
Feb., 1865 - and although a Liberal, W. Lamont, was elected M.P. in 1865,
Charles Dalrymple, son of Sir Charles Dalrymple Ferguson of Ayrshire and
a staunch Tory, easily won the constituency back for the Conservatives in
1868.
² Macrae, "Mr Jefferson Davis", Glasgow Herald, 21 Sept., 1869.
³ Porter, William Blackwood, p. 201. For further reference to this
incident, see below, Chapter III, p. 328.
⁵ Ibid., 6 Aug., 1869.
letter provoked a much harsher criticism, however, and further demonstrated the power of Davis' presence to stir up old antagonisms on America, as well as to reactivate Scottish sympathies, during Reconstruction. Pertinently using the pseudonym "Emancipation", the critic maintained that since Glasgow people had now recognized their error in sympathizing with the Confederate attempt to establish a slave empire, they could scarcely be expected to publicly fete Davis. With the confidence of a member of an erstwhile minority group within the city who had seen his beliefs vindicated by the Northern success, and the political power of the slaveholders smashed by Congressional Reconstruction, "Emancipation" triumphantly declared

Glasgow did not want for Confederate sympathisers during the Civil War; and that they have not the courage now even to get up a [public] dinner to one who three years ago was the main object of their idolatry shows the utter hollowness of the sympathy they then so loudly expressed.

The impact of their crimes was extended into the Reconstruction era, "Emancipation" stressing that it was they who were responsible for the current difficulties over the 'Alabama' and concluding that it would be "time to feast Davis when the bill to the Federal government is paid".¹

A gentler reaction, seeking rather to point out to "D.M." his misconceptions on the question of slaveholders' heroism and to suggest that a public welcome for Davis in Glasgow would have been a failure in any case, came from "A Native of Barbadoes". The writer reminded "D.M." that Davis had, after all, gone through the country without encountering any expressions offensive to his feelings, and - harbouring no ill-will himself towards the former President - he counselled that it was best not to reopen old scars.²

¹ Letter from "Emancipation", Glasgow, in North British Daily Mail, 14 August, 1869.
² Letter from "A Native of Barbadoes", Glasgow, in North British Daily Mail, 16 Aug., 1869.
In the final analysis, it seems likely that, so far as support for the Federal as against the Confederate cause was concerned, most Scots who during the war had denigrated Davis and all his cause stood for were indeed, when brought into personal contact with him, only too happy to let sleeping causes lie. Thus Macrae, from actively campaigning on behalf of freedmen's aid in mid August, 1869, could, six weeks later, sit down to write a not unkindly pen-sketch of the ex-Confederate leader, and do so in the knowledge that the bulk of his readers would see no more inconsistency in this than he himself did. And Edward Ellice, Liberal M.P. for St. Andrews and wartime critic of the Confederates, felt no qualms of conscience in extending several days hospitality to Davis at his highland seat, Invergarry, and in displaying a yacht specially decorated in his honour. If - as in the case of the Duke of Sutherland, for example - there seemed at times to be a supreme irony in all this, it may be excused (or at least explained) largely by the fact that with the vanishing of the invidious cause which he had championed (irrespective of whether or not it had vanished into the romantic "lost cause" bracket), Davis could justifiably be honoured as a principled, dignified, cultured man in his own right.

To some extent, Davis, in Scotland in 1869, brought to life the myth of the old South. On the attitudes of his old Scottish supporters, the

---

1 See North British Daily Mail, 11 Aug., 1869.
2 Macrae, "Mr Jefferson Davis", Glasgow Herald, 21 Sept., 1869.
3 Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 495, 531.
4 Mackay, Through the Long Day, pp. 366-367; Glasgow Herald, 20 Aug., 1869. It was from here that Mackay wrote to Blackwood that he and Davis were "knocking about in the Highlands overwhelmed with hospitalities". Mackay to Blackwood, 9 Aug., 1869, Bla. MSS., K3. 4250, fol. 64-65.
impact was totally predictable - a hardening of the belief in the righteousness of the old Confederate cause and, by implication, a hardening of sympathy for the "stricken South" during Reconstruction. And for some of those who had earlier sunk their opinions against the South, by 1869, flirtation with the myth - for a time at least - proved more alluring than a strict faithfulness to the defence of the puzzling Radical measures (the sequel to the North's victory) currently being enacted in Reconstruction America.

III  The nature of the attitudes expressed upon the visit to Scotland of ex-President Grant

Of all the important Americans to visit Scotland during the Reconstruction years, Davis had perhaps the greatest effect in throwing into relief the strengths and weaknesses in the continuity of Scottish sympathies from wartime through to Reconstruction. But others who came also helped both to preserve the Scottish focus on America and to reaffirm the existence within Scottish society of some of the old loyalties towards North or South. With the Civil War more than a decade in the past, the 'Alabama' controversy settled more or less acceptably to all (or settled, at any rate), and the passage of time and events having brought the United States itself into the era of the Hayes-Tilden compromise, by late 1877, almost all of the cut and thrust had inevitably gone out of the Scottish debate on Reconstruction. Yet, the arrival of ex-President Grant in Scotland demonstrated the potential of a transatlantic "personality" to rekindle, as late as September, 1877, a lively spark of interest not only in the war itself but also in the immediate post-war years in America.

Grant and his family disembarked at Liverpool in late May, 1877, \(^1\) and at the beginning of June, the Glasgow Sentinel ran one of the earliest

\(^1\) See Inverness Courier, 31 May, 1877.
Scottish editorials on the British visit. The Sentinel, while apparently considering it prudent to moderate the rabid pro-Southern bias it had displayed during the war years, had nevertheless followed through by adopting a basically sympathetic, if sometimes rather muddled, stance in support of Johnsonian Reconstruction. From roughly the dawn of the seventies, editorial comment on the situation in the United States had been minimal. Now faced, in Grant's visit, with "a domestic event of some interest", it broke silence on the recent President in a manner which both reflected - overtly - its deliberate policy during Reconstruction of playing down its wartime sympathies, and - more subtly - the basic lack of regard it had for Republican policies as they had developed since the war. Thus the paper did not spare itself in paying tribute to his martial qualities:

The highest praise with which his name may go down to posterity ... is that he fought for his country and saved her when others had despaired of victory ...

And he was further credited as "the man who crushed the Confederate army, and so settled forever the question of slavery".

As against this - and in what may be accepted as the paper's veiled indictment of the whole nature of the Reconstruction process under Grant and his Republican Congressmen - the editorial comment on his term as President was full of cautious insinuation. Allowing that he had not been a very selfish or venal President, "we do not suppose for a moment that the duty of improving his own fortune was allowed to interfere with his duty to the State". But on the other hand, it declared "The meanest thing that can be said of him is that he has quitted the Presidential

1 Glasgow Sentinel, 2 June, 1877.
2 See below, Chapter IV, passim.
3 Glasgow Sentinel, 2 June, 1877.
chair with every probability of being able to end his days in comfort if not in luxury".¹

Under cover of ostensible praise, the paper managed to be equally damning on Grant's actual Reconstruction policies. Acknowledging his courage in tackling the major problems of Reconstruction, it condescendingly judged that his "comparatively few" errors had been of judgement rather than heart. He had kept "'pegging away' ... until he was enabled finally to relinquish the reins of government, satisfied that the States are now in the enjoyment of political tranquillity at least".² Finally, in a prediction not unlike in nature that issued by the pro-Northern Dundee Advertiser on Davis' visit,³ it announced that Grant's visit was unlikely to excite much enthusiasm in Britain. For a paper which had zealously supported the unsuccessful Southern cause, the Sentinel's reason for thinking this way was the most fitting and understandable one - "The fact is, the American Civil War has gone down into the domain of history, and to the younger generation, the story of Grant's victories is merely a matter of boyish recollection".⁴

In the columns of the Sentinel's rival, the North British Daily Mail, Grant's arrival on British shores had initially prompted similarly favourable comment on his military career, and the benevolent observation that if he had not proved equally successful as a statesman, he still

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid. The use in this context of the phrase 'pegging away' is itself damaging by connotation. First coined by Grant himself to describe his military tactics during the war, it was seized on after the war by those critical of his strategy as symbolizing a policy of dogged perseverance which had resulted in a tremendously careless wastage of soldiers' lives. See, for instance, North British Daily Mail, 14 Sept., 1877; Scotsman, 12 Nov., 1877.
³ See above, p. 77.
⁴ Glasgow Sentinel, 2 June, 1877
"deserve[d] well of America"\textsuperscript{1} especially since he had entered the Presidential office at a very difficult time. By mid-September, however, the erstwhile strongly pro-Confederate organ was showing distinct signs of chagrin at the warmth of the welcome which Scotland was according to the ex-President. A calculated attempt was made to depreciate the personal element in the reception meted out to him, the Mail uncharitably pointing out that Grant, as the first ex-President to visit the country, had been assured of a hearty welcome, and further suggesting that it was neither to the soldier nor to the President as such that the welcome was being extended but simply to "a prominent American who has many of the qualities which Englishmen specially admire"\textsuperscript{2}.

Fresh aspersions were cast on his domestic policies as Chief Executive, and in addition, his military reputation gave way to the uncomplimentary conclusion that there would always be controversy over his military capabilities, since "constant hammering away without regard for soldiers' lives" was no proof of military genius. Scorning the essential nature of Grant's Scottish trip ("he has already exhausted the ornamental side of Scotland, even to its dukeries"), the North British Daily Mail looked beyond the person of the ex-President himself to see in the British enthusiasm which his visit generated a final affirmation, at the end of the Reconstruction era, of the ties and goodwill which existed between Britain and the United States, and which, it was hoped, would extend into the years ahead.\textsuperscript{3}

Curiously more unstinting in its praise of Grant's military prowess was the Edinburgh Evening Courant. The proudly Conservative newspaper

\textsuperscript{1} North British Daily Mail, 29 May, 1877.
\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., 14 Sept., 1877.
\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
had, during the war, been as totally committed to support of the Southern cause as any journal in Britain, and had remained throughout the Reconstruction era unquestionably the bitterest, most consistent critic of the Republican party's policies in the ranks of the Scottish newspaper press. Perhaps not uninfluenced by the fact that he had just been created a "fellow-burgess" of Edinburgh, the paper, however, readily saluted the "military genius" of the Northern General, and even ventured beyond this to suggest that he had laboured as zealously for peace following the war as he had laboured in the role of soldier during it. But the paper was quick to make it clear that this compliment was paid exclusively in regard to foreign relations - the only sphere in which Britain should attempt to judge Grant's worth as a statesman, because

There is not one Englishman or Scotchman in a thousand competent to pass an opinion on the causes of the domestic disorder which has prevailed in the States since the Civil War.

The war itself had disorganized the entire social and political system, introducing a new class of citizens, new habits of business, and a new laxity in morals.

The Courant's statement is revealing. After all the cast-iron judgements it had made on Reconstruction through the years, in the end it had apparently come to the rather incredible conclusion that Britain could not really hope to understand or evaluate the post-war years in America.

2 With regard to the Scottish periodical press, Blackwood's Magazine, carrying critical articles in the uncompromising prose of Charles Mackay, matched the Courant's mood. For a consideration of the attitudes of both in this connection, see below, Chapter IV and passim.
3 Edinburgh Evening Courant (hereafter abbreviated to Edinburgh Courant), 1 Sept., 1877.
4 Ibid.
Perhaps the assertion could be interpreted largely as a gesture of politeness on the part of the paper's editor who, not wishing to offend a distinguished American guest in the Scottish capital, purposely refrained from all criticism of Reconstruction politics at that time. But the Courant had never pulled its punches in the past, and it seems likely that there was a strong grain of genuine sentiment in its pronouncement. Grant's visit may well have provided the necessary opportunity for this bastion of Scottish Conservatism finally to begin to realize that underlying the social and political changes which it had so consistently attacked during Reconstruction, there were fundamental social and political complexities which it had not even begun to comprehend.

Easily the strongest criticism of Grant appeared, indeed, through the somewhat unique channel of a "Conservative" newspaper\(^1\) which had supported the Northern side in the Civil War. The Aberdeen Journal's Conservatism had neither extended to embrace the cause of "aristocratic" slaveholders, nor been the root of any particularly vicious attacks on the Radicals during Reconstruction (though qualified support had been accorded to Johnson's conciliatory policy\(^2\)). Yet, by-passing the formality of paying tribute to his militarism, it concentrated on Grant's too evident misuse of "strategy" in episodes like the 'Alabama' arbitration and the "counting-in" of President Hayes, his "deficiency" of statesmanship in the higher sense", and the general mediocrity of his Presidential career. In a tone reminiscent of Donald McLeod in his indictment of Harriet Beecher Stowe, the Journal declared

\(^1\) In 1865, Mitchell's Newspaper Press Directory, p. 90, described the Aberdeen Journal as "Conservative". By 1877, the designation had changed to "Liberal-Conservative" – ibid., 1877, p. 118.

\(^2\) For a consideration of the Journal's attitudes to the politics of Reconstruction, see below, Chapter IV, passim.
Dining with royalty, feted and be-citizened in the civic palace of our great metropolis, and lionised by our great provincial towns, General Grant must be tempted to deem himself a more important man since he came to this country than he found himself in Washington.¹

It seems clear that the paper's bitterness was the direct product of a very real sense of disappointment and disillusionment in Grant as the elected head of the United States during the greater part of the Reconstruction years. There is evidence that when he took office, the Journal had high hopes of Grant as the ideal man to sort things out and put the Republic on an even keel following the earlier conflict between Executive and Legislature.² Disappointment with Grant for his failure to live up to the paper's expectations in this appointed role resulted in the adoption of a severely critical line on his policy towards the South and on his administration generally, culminating in an editorial indictment of December, 1876, headed "President Grant as Dictator".³ The strength of the paper's vilification of Grant can be seen to have sprung directly from the depth of its disappointment with him: because for the Journal, with a tradition of support for the North but also with a streak of conservatism in its outlook, Grant, as a Northerner of note and a moderate-conservative Republican, had surely bid fair to prove the perfect Reconstruction President.

The Aberdeen Journal's hostility sounded a strident note in the tremendously popular reception accorded to Grant in person in the North and North-East. As the only important American of international repute

¹ Aberdeen Journal, 23 June, 1877. The editorial further suggested that Grant had received a warm welcome in Britain merely because he represented a kindred country, and not for his own sake.
² See ibid., 4 Nov., 1868; 14 July, 1869; 29 Dec., 1869.
³ Ibid., 2 Dec., 1876; see also 16 Oct., 1872; 21 Oct., 1874; 13 Jan., 20 Jan., 1875; 7 Sept., 1876.
to visit this area of Scotland during the Reconstruction era,¹ his presence was not only the occasion for excited welcomes but also the means of producing several interesting public observations on past events in the United States from a region which had necessarily been relatively less vocal on the post-war American situation than the more populous urban districts of central and southern Scotland.

And for one Scottish ducal family at least, the magnet of a Federal American ex-President in Britain provided an opportunity for, as it were, a reversal to type. Thus, Grant's Scottish trip was effectively put to use by the Duke of Sutherland as a means of redressing the balance in favour of the family's traditional sympathies for the anti-slavery, Federal cause in the Civil War, a balance somewhat upset, it will be recalled, by the Duke's eagerness to make the acquaintance of Jefferson Davis in 1869.² While he had been invited to spend a few days at the Aberdeenshire seat of the Earl of Kintore,³ and while he probably visited Castle Grant as guest of the Earl of Seafield, chief of Clan Grant,⁴ it was to Dunrobin Castle, home of the Sutherlands, that Grant purposely made his way north as guest of honour in the first week of September.

¹ Davis had certainly gone north to Inverness, but the route he had followed had taken him across country from St. Andrews, and through the central highlands of Scotland. He did not touch the North-East or the far Northern counties.

² See above, p. 84.


⁴ Scotsman, 6 Sept., 1877.
The warmth of the welcome he received as his train passed through the north-eastern counties can certainly be partly accounted for by the feelings aroused among the local population in seeing this most famous living representative of the Clan Grant return to the regional territory of his ancestors. The Banffshire Journal's correspondent, reporting from Dornoch, paid the hero of Vicksburg and Appomattox the ultimate in compliments by describing him as a plain, homely-looking man with strong Scottish features, who "might well pass for a well-to-do Banff or Morayshire farmer".1 At Nairn, he was enthusiastically cheered at the station,2 while at Grantown-on-Spey - capital of the Grant country - a large crowd surged forward to the train to welcome him to "the country of the Grants".3

But the content of the speeches made by civic heads in the several northern towns which formally welcomed him or presented him with the freedom of the burgh indicate that respect for Grant was fostered as much by knowledge of, and sympathy with, his military and Presidential career as by more romantic notions of ancestral association. Thus, in honouring him as the first American freeman of Wick, Provost Rae stressed, to great cheering, the particular pride Scots took in him as descended from "our own Scotland"; but his tribute to Grant as a worthy ex-President of America drew equally warm applause:

We admire and honour you as one of the greatest men of the age we live in (cheers) ...[Y]ou have had the honour of being the first President of a wholly free people, with the approbation

1 Banffshire Journal, 11 Sept., 1877.
2 Ibid., An interesting personal connection with one of Nairn's inhabitants was discovered by Grant when he recognized one Mrs. Mackay whose father's house in Culpepper County, Virginia, had been the seat of his military operations for two years (following its evacuation as Lee's Headquarters). Moreover, her cousin, General Rollins, had been one of Grant's advisers - see ibid.
3 Ibid. See also Scotsman, 6 Sept., 1877.
of all intelligent men throughout the world (loud cheering) ... You won never-dying renown in liberating the down-trodden slaves; and wherever and so long as the English language is spoken, your name will be handed down to prosperity with admiration (great cheering).

Similarly praiseworthy had been his efforts to promote good feeling between Britain and the United States.¹

At Thurso - where Grant had arrived with the Duke of Sutherland to be greeted by a band playing "Hail Columbia", and the artillery volunteers waiting to act as his guard of honour to Thurso Castle - the chief magistrate's address of welcome was also slanted towards the role Grant had personally played in freeing the slave. He was one by whose heroism in war and conduct in peace, as the twice-elected President of the United States of America, the rights of freemen have been secured to all classes in his great country.²

And in his speech conferring the freedom of the town on Grant, the Provost of Inverness, while avoiding direct reference to the American freedmen, nevertheless concentrated fully as much on his achievements as conciliator between North and South during Reconstruction as on his military exploits. "Civil affairs [in the Reconstruction period] offered few opportunities for brilliant exploits, but your administration was eminently peaceful and progressive".³

¹ Report of speech by Provost Rae at Wick, 7 Sept., 1877, in Glasgow Herald, 8 Sept., 1877. Grant was so moved by the speech that he later requested Rae to send him a copy of it, intimating that "Your kind words will be preserved by me as a remembrance of a pleasant visit to the North of Scotland". See letter of Grant to Rae, printed in ibid., 19 Sept., 1877.
² Report of speech by Provost Bremner at Thurso, 7 Sept., 1877, in Elgin Courant, 11 Sept., 1877. Grant does not, however, appear to have been granted the freedom of Thurso.
³ Report of speech by the Provost of Inverness, 8 Sept., 1877 in ibid. See also Scotsman, 10 Sept., 1877. Despite the "lusty cheering" which had welcomed Grant to the town, not all Invernessians carried so high an opinion of him and of his administrative capabilities. Carruthers' Inverness Courier, 31 May, 1877, for example, had bluntly stated that his reputation had declined since the end of the Civil War and his accession to the Presidency.
While Grant's visit stirred northern Provosts to displays of unaccustomed eloquence on the happier aspects of Reconstruction America after Johnson, it also sparked off an absorbing clash of opinions between the rival Aberdeen Free Press and Aberdeen Journal. In this connection, indeed, it is certainly possible to recognize the utilization of the American focus as a weapon with which to inflict subtle blows at enemies, both local and national, in the domestic political front. At the outset of the northern tour, the Aberdeen Free Press, a strongly Liberal paper which had been passionately pro-North during the Civil War, and was concerned to see justice done to the freedman during Reconstruction, carried a distraught editorial deprecating the fact that while other northern burghs had offered Grant the privilege of becoming a burgess, Aberdeen had not. In the first place, "it ought not to be forgotten that the community of Aberdeen has a considerable, and, in many ways, extending connection with the United States ...", even having the distinction of sending two of the jurors selected from Scotland to attend the Centennial Exhibition. But, more pertinently, it was simply "churlish" of the city not to offer to honour Grant when it had "fall[en] over backwards" in the past to get the chance to present the burgess ticket to Disraeli, whose political career had undeniably been "dubious".¹

The carefully aimed blow at British Conservatism was probably intended to hit the sensibilities of its "conservatively" inclined rival, the Aberdeen Journal, which, as we have already observed, had earlier in the year delivered a scathing attack on Grant² - a fact not likely to have escaped the Free Press at this stage. Certainly, the tone of the Journal's sole September editorial on the tour suggests that it was fashioned as a direct

¹ Aberdeen Free Press, 5 Sept., 1877.
² See above, pp. 94-95.
rejoinder to the Free Press' statements. Accordingly, whereas the latter had stressed the honour, respect and regard for Grant as a distinguished statesman which motivated Scottish towns in the north to offer him their freedom, the Journal deliberately seized on the "great number of burgess tickets" as its main focus of ridicule. Apparent approval of the Scottish gesture as "the popular expression of the ... affection and honour with which we regard our American relatives" was more or less effectively cancelled out by the paper's simultaneous mockery of the Highlanders' attempts to identify Grant as their kinsman. Probably the wail of the bagpipes, it suggested, had come to the visitor as a familiar sound, "being transmitted through the memory of his fathers in best Darwinian tradition". And whereas the Aberdeen Free Press had censured Aberdeen for its failure to entice Grant, the Journal blamed the American for not deigning to visit the city, despite the fact that the social science congress was being held there. Apparently he could not be dragged away from the Spey, the heather on Ben Nevis, "the shadow of the hills", or even Wick, with its smell of herring. Grant's attachment to the "dwelling place of his forefathers" was satirized as illustrating well the "homely ... simple nature of the man, who was but yesterday a citizen king".¹

Doubtless cheered by Aberdeen Town Council's belated decision to confer the freedom of the city on Grant,² the Free Press sprang back to renew its eulogy on him as more of a representative man than the ordinary "distinguished personage":

He represents living principles, not hereditary notoriety. He has been an actor in great national affairs, and not a more

---

¹ Aberdeen Journal, 11 Sept., 1877.

² At a special meeting of Aberdeen Town Council on 6 September, Lord Provost Jamieson presiding, it had been unanimously agreed to present Grant with the burgess ticket. See Aberdeen Free Press, 7 Sept., 1877.
receiver of adulation. His celebrity is due to other means than that he is the son of his father ... [He is] the special and peculiar representative of the average common sense of the great multitude of average people that (sic) make up the United States. ¹

And while he was credited with having established freedom for black as well as white in America, the greatest praise was reserved for the part he had played in bringing about a "new perfect understanding, ... goodwill and cloudless accord" between Britain and the United States. Significantly, this achievement was seen as a joint one between Grant and Gladstone. The Liberal government's "courageous and moral act" in paying out the Geneva Award in the face of Conservative obloquy had eradicated the discord between the two countries, a discord which had been fed by slaveholding and British built rebel cruisers, but which was traceable in origin to "the fatuous Tory policy that led to the War of Independence and the establishment of the Republic". ² Falling at the very end of the Reconstruction era, Grant's visit gave the Aberdeen Free Press the excuse to serve up a final indictment on the "reactionary" forces within Britain whose policies had hampered good Anglo-American relations, and to reassert its confidence in the American experience.

Even at this late date, there was still some scope for the American scene as a factor emphasizing domestic rivalries. That Grant's presence was deliberately appropriated by the Free Press for this purpose is strongly suggested by the fact that in the past, the paper had never been too kindly disposed towards Grant as a statesman. ³

¹ Aberdeen Free Press, 11 Sept., 1877.
² Ibid.
³ See, for instance, ibid., 10 Dec., 1869, where the paper condemned Grant's Message to Congress as a totally unstatesmanlike document - "He is just a Yankee of the Yankees, with all Uncle Sam's "high-fallutin" notions, and strictly self-bounded regards ..." - and specifically censured his remarks on foreign relations as displaying "the unrestrained Yankee lust of all things under the sun". See also ibid., 2 Aug., 1874, and - following the visit - a criticism for partisanship, 2 Oct., 1877.
At Edinburgh, Lord Provost Sir James Falshaw demonstrated the almost equally common Scottish practice of drawing analogies between American Reconstruction statesmen and famous figures in British history.¹ In presenting him with the freedom of the city, Falshaw compared Grant to the Duke of Wellington, "a great warrior but essentially a man of peace", who at a time of great danger and anxiety had granted Roman Catholic emancipation, and had subsequently made "unceasing efforts" to establish peace at the time of the Chartist riots in 1848. And in a city which prided itself on its anti-slavery traditions,² the Provost made it clear that Grant's reputation rested on his contribution to producing a situation in America where "the blood-stained banner of slavery is torn down (applause) and trampled under foot of freedom, never again to be raised (applause)".³

Similarly welcoming him as a new freeman, Glasgow also chose to see him as "the Wellington of America", and to honour him as instrumental in totally uprooting "the upas tree of slavery" which Lincoln had first struck down.⁴ But, conscious still, perhaps, of the old, unhappily pro-Southern sentiment of Glasgow in former days, Lord Provost Sir James Bain felt it necessary in his address to put stress on Grant's role in healing the post-war wounds of America, an emphasis quite lacking in Falshaw's speech. Indeed, in this connection the responses of both North and South were singled out for praise, Bain declaring that no more worthy

---

¹ For further instances of this, see below, Chapter IV, pp. 364-365.
² Consider, for instance, Duncan McLaren's reference to the city's anti-slavery tradition - see below, p. 114.
³ Report of speech by Lord Provost Sir James Falshaw at the Free Assembly Hall, Edinburgh, 31 Aug., 1877, in Scotsman, 1 Sept., 1877. For an earlier analogy between Grant and Wellington, see Mackay, "The Outgoing and Incoming President" in Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 105, April, 1869, p. 465.
⁴ Glasgow Herald, 14 Sept., 1877.
example was to be met with in the world than that of the American people

who, after the great war, ... met hand in hand and agreed to forget
the past. They showed by the feelings of each man embracing the
other as no longer enemies, the greatest example of Christian
practice and Christian principle that this world has ever seen
(cheers) ... They said 'We shall together decorate the graves of
our dead, and we shall go on hereafter as one great nation - one
great, free, and united people' (cheers).1

With the Hayes-Tilden compromise a reality in the United States, and
the process of Reconstruction to all intents and purposes finally
concluded, so far as British observers were concerned, the Provost's
over-optimistic conclusions served in some measure both as a requiem
for old controversies on America within the city, and as a fitting
epitaph for a post-war interlude now regarded as finally over.

Provost Bain may well have felt himself better qualified to dis-
course upon the current situation in America than most of his fellow
chief magistrates obliged to address Grant at that time. He had, in
fact, only recently returned from a visit to the United States.2

Accordingly, when another famous American, who had shown him great kind-
ness during his stay, arrived in Glasgow, Bain made a point of visiting
him. Little can be discovered on Samuel Tilden's Scottish visit, but
he was certainly in Glasgow in late August, 1877, and subsequently toured
the Trossachs.3 It is likely that the man whose battle with Hayes for
the Presidency had so recently provided a last rush of interest in the
Scottish press on Reconstruction America aroused again some small
demonstrations of interest in the areas which he visited.

More demonstrative a reception had been accorded General Sherman,

---

1 Report of speech by Lord Provost Sir James Bain at the City Hall,
Glasgow, 13 Sept., 1877, in Scotsman, 14 Sept., 1877.
2 Glasgow Herald, 21 Aug., 1877.
3 Ibid.
who made the trip to Scotland in summer, 1872. For most of his stay, he was the guest of John Burns, Castle Wemyss, son of George Burns, co-founder of the Cunard Line, and, by the 1870s, himself a partner in the business following his father's retirement.1 Burns was subsequently to lend support to the Jubilee Singers and to Josiah ("Uncle Tom") Henson, in their fund-raising efforts in Scotland.2

Sherman was brought by his host to Glasgow on 26 August where, having been shown round places of historical interest, and the leading shipbuilding and engineering yards, he was entertained to lunch by the magistrates and important city businessmen, who apologised that they had been unable to arrange a public reception because of the very short notice of his visit.3 A further visit to Glasgow followed, when Sherman again toured several public places and inspected manufacturing works, and was the guest of a former acquaintance, A.F. Stoddard, an American who had retired to Scotland only to establish in 1862 a carpet-manufacturing business with a large export trade to his native United States.4 A prominent figure in Glasgow, he was active both as a Northern sympathizer during the war, and in freedmen's aid circles later.

In each case, the closest continuing contacts of prominent Americans in Scotland during the Reconstruction period were therefore naturally

---

3 Glasgow Herald, 27 Aug., 1872. Included in the lunch party were several Glasgow men who had earlier played prominent parts in the freedmen’s aid cause in the city – for instance Bailies Salmon and Moir, and A.F. Stoddard.
See also biographical note, Appendix I.
with Scots who continued to sympathize strongly with their wartime or post-wartime activities. But it seems likely that the impressive amount of country covered (at least by the two most important, Davis and Grant), and the very considerable public contacts made by these men played some part in bolstering up the Scottish transatlantic focus in these years. These specific American figures were, of course, in addition to the many American Negroes who came to Scotland following the end of the Civil War to appeal on behalf of the freedmen. These, along with United States Presbyterian ministers who attended (and spoke at) the Scottish General Assemblies, and the singular figure of William Lloyd Garrison, whose sanctification as chief abolitionist was finally secured during his visit to Scottish shores in 1867, will be dealt with in subsequent chapters. Suffice it to say here that the "external" American factor of four million ex-slaves, cast out upon their luck in the old South, worked in conjunction with timely reminders of Scotland's traditionally strong anti-slavery record to produce at least a vigorous public interest in - if a somewhat uneven practical response to - the various appeals for freedmen's aid.

IV The impact of Lincoln's assassination on the Scottish public, and general reactions to it

The occurrence which had unquestionably the greatest impact of any single contemporary event in riveting Scottish attention on American Reconstruction at its very outset was, however, the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. If Scots had imagined that the spotlight they had constantly kept focussed on America during the Civil War could be turned off, or at least considerably reduced in intensity, once the President

1 It should be noted that Grant, having received the freedom of Glasgow, proceeded on his way to Inveraray Castle to spend several days with the doyens of the abolitionist, pro-American faction of the British aristocracy, the Duke and Duchess of Argyll. See Glasgow Herald, 18 Sept., 19 Sept., 1877.
had successfully put in motion the magnanimous Reconstruction policy he seemed pledged to embark on, the action of John Wilkes Booth changed the picture entirely. With the removal of Lincoln from the scene, it became necessary, if any track was to be kept on the American situation at all, to maintain as close a scrutiny as possible on his successor's actions, directly from the day he took office. For while Scottish observers tended by April, 1865 to have a fairly coherent - and surprisingly unanimous - idea of what Lincoln's intentions were with regard to reconstructing the nation, it is clear that, for the most part, glorious uncertainty characterized their speculations on Johnson's probable policies. The clarification of Scottish attitudes to Johnsonian Reconstruction, and the value judgements made on it, will be examined in a subsequent chapter. But as a background to the development of Scottish thinking on this topic, and for the insights which many of the comments give into various themes running through the Scottish outlook on Reconstruction as a whole, it has been thought worthwhile to look in some detail at immediate reactions to the shattering news of Lincoln's death.

Writing from Göttingen on the 28th April to his mother, the Duchess of Argyll, Lord Archibald Campbell deplored the "terrible news" of Lincoln's assassination and felt it necessary to complain that "The Germans are not half so much interested about the American war as one would have thought, and all of them, nearly all at least[,] very ignorant about details". 

1 See below, Chapter IV.
2 Lord Archibald Campbell to Duchess of Argyll, 28 April, 1865, Argyll Family Letters (transcripts), Green binders, Inveraray Castle. (Hereafter cited as APL). Lord Archibald was the second son of George, 8th Duke of Argyll, and his wife Elizabeth, daughter of the Duchess of Sutherland. He had gone to study at Göttingen University earlier in the 1860s.
Having himself checked up on the details of the murder in the London Times, he subsequently commented on the apparent strength of feeling in Britain, adding that while everyone in Germany was "horrified" by the tragedy, "it [nevertheless] seems to have made a greater impression in England than on the continent".  

Britain had indeed responded to the news with an excess of feeling, and Scotland shared to the full the horror and genuine sorrow of the whole country. The Glasgow Sentinel, having earlier observed that in Glasgow, the topic had "soon filled the public mind to the exclusion of all else", asserted that there had "never been such a spontaneous outburst of feeling on any single act", and catered for the public mood by printing on its front page a huge picture of Lincoln as an accompaniment to its detailed description of events on the evening of the assassination. With good reason, the Dundee Advertiser, reflecting on the mood in Scotland five years later, commented: "When the President was murdered, we were all Americans". In an editorial predictably less overflowing in sorrow for and laudations of the murdered President than most, it was nevertheless left to the conservative Edinburgh Courant to pinpoint a vital factor making for the intensity of the Scottish response. With his ungainly appearance, jokes, and quaint sayings, Lincoln, the paper suggested, had caught the imagination of the British public better than any American politician since Washington: "he really was humanly familiar to us in Britain".

1 Lord Archibald Campbell to Duchess of Argyll, 3 May, 1865, AFL.  
2 Glasgow Sentinel, 29 April, 1865.  
3 Ibid., 6 May, 1865. For other Scottish press references to the unique extent of British feeling on the subject, see, for instance, Glasgow Herald, 27 April, 1865; Dundee Advertiser, 2 May, 1865; Perthshire Courier, 2 May, 1865.  
4 Dundee Advertiser, 9 Feb., 1869.  
5 Edinburgh Courant, 27 April, 1865.
In terms of public meetings alone, reaction was immediate and overwhelming. As well as the crowded meetings held in three of the four main Scottish cities, \(^1\) public horror at the deed, and sympathy with the American people, was publicly expressed in innumerable smaller towns and parishes throughout Scotland. Among those which convened meetings or sent addresses to the American Ambassador were Paisley, Lanark, \(^2\) Hawick, Montrose, Falkirk, Berwick, Jedburgh, Ayr and Musselburgh. \(^3\)

Even so augustly practical a body as the "Commissioners of Supply and Turnpike, and Commutation Road Trustees of the County of Aberdeen" resolved at their annual general meeting early in May to set up a committee to prepare and transmit an address to the American minister in Britain. \(^4\) Their counterparts in the counties of Fife, Forfar, Stirling, Lanark and Roxburgh \(^5\) acted similarly. And — surprisingly — there was a sufficient number of commercial men in Glasgow with strong enough feelings about Lincoln to give rise to a meeting chaired by the Lord Dean of Guild in the city's Merchant's House on 3 May. \(^6\) While in

---

1. See reports of public meetings at Edinburgh, 3 May, in Scotsman, 4 May, 1865; Glasgow, 2 May, in Glasgow Herald, 3 May, 1865; Dundee, 3 May, in Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865. Curiously, despite the fairly voluminous and analytical comment in the local press on U.S. affairs both during and after the Civil War, no public meeting on Lincoln's death appears to have been held in Aberdeen. The Town Council, acting on the proposal of the chairman, Lord Provost Leslie, did, however, enter in its minutes "an expression of the horror which Aberdeen felt" about the assassination, and a record of the sympathy which the city accorded to the American people. A committee was appointed to draw up a resolution transmitting these sentiments to the United States Minister in Britain — see Aberdeen Free Press, 5 May, 1865.

2. See North British Daily Mail, 3, 10 May, 1865, respectively.

3. See Scotsman, 4, 5, 6 (Falkirk and Berwick), 8, 10, 11 May, 1865, respectively.

4. Ibid., 2 May, 1865.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid., 4 May, 1865; North British Daily Mail, 4 May, 1865.
Dundee, with its close recent commercial connections with the Northern states, there was no separate meeting of the city's influential commercial magnates, the over-crowded public meeting heard John Sharp, chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, follow up his proposal of the resolution expressing the city's sorrow and indignation with an explanation that he was there as a representative of the unanimous feeling of the Chamber of Commerce. And he made it clear that this body had even considered calling a meeting of its own to express these sentiments.1

It would indeed seem that Scotland answered well enough the early call made by "Sigma" of Edinburgh for public meetings to be held throughout the United Kingdom — meetings which were essential, the writer believed, because the British had "a duty to vindicate ourselves and our common humanity from the crimes and outrages which are committed in its name".2 But there was one single, significant, and surely representative objection to the arrangements made in Scotland for public expressions of sympathy. On the eve of the large Edinburgh meeting of 3 May, "W.W." of Castle Mills wrote to the Scotsman to point out that the Scottish working-classes never got the chance to attend these meetings since they were always held at mid-day. Questioning that the Scottish efforts could validly be called "public" meetings at all, he suggested that the English model be adopted, where, under the chairmanship of the Mayor, M.P.'s, tradesmen, and workers congregated side by side to discuss each others views: "Were this done here, and at a convenient hour, a better and kindlier feeling would pervade the whole community".3

---

1 Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865. Leith Chamber of Commerce passed a resolution deploring the assassination and passing on sympathy to the American people — see Scotsman, 3 May, 1865.
2 Letter from "Sigma", Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 29 April, 1865. It would appear that the writer of this letter was, in fact, the renowned abolitionist, Elizabeth Pease Nichol — see Anna M. Stoddart, Elizabeth Pease Nichol (London, 1899), p. 254.
3 Letter from "W.W.", Castle Mills, in ibid., 3 May, 1865.
Obviously a strong case can be made out for "W.W's." objection. Without exception, the huge gatherings in the big cities were held at mid-day, and it is clear that pride was taken in securing an attendance comprised of "the most influential residents" in the city. Indeed, the North British Daily Mail's pleasure in the composition of the gathering which filled Glasgow's Trades' Hall on 2 May tends to divorce the glittering crowd from the object of the meeting altogether and to reduce the whole affair to the level of a bumper, ritual turn-out of the middle-classes for the purpose of again expressing their moral indignation. There were, the paper reported, "many well-known merchants, clergymen, and other gentlemen ... forming perhaps the most influential meeting that has taken place in the city for some time past".

Addresses to America were sent privately from the Union and Emancipation Society of Glasgow, and from the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society. The task of framing the latter's chief resolution (and of drawing up a letter of sympathy to Mrs. Lincoln) devolved upon Elizabeth Pease Nichol, the veteran abolitionist who was by this time President of the Society. The particular nature of the BLES' concern over Lincoln's death was demonstrated in a minute recorded at the May monthly meeting which stated that he had been "peculiarly needed" to re-adjust North and South and "to effect a reconciliation between the North and South, with freedom for its basis".

1 Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865. See also Scotsman, 4 May, 1865 ("a very large and influential attendance"); Glasgow Herald, 3 May, 1865.
2 North British Daily Mail, 3 May, 1865.
3 Stoddart, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, p. 255. For biographical note on Elizabeth Pease Nichol, see Appendix I. For the role she played in the Scottish abolition movement, see Rice, The Scottish Factor, passim.
4 Reported in Scotsman, 5 May, 1865.
Similarly, the Glasgow Union and Emancipation Society, in an Address to Johnson himself, hoped that the "beneficient purposes" of the assassinated President would be fulfilled in "a peace which shall conclude war with mercy", and, while securing freedom for the slave, would unite all sections and parties in one nation. It was much to hope for, but in essence, as will be seen, it reflected the hopes of the vast majority of Scottish observers at this time. Robbed by Lincoln's death of the apparent certainty of Presidential magnanimity during Reconstruction - and already, perhaps, unable to comprehend the magnitude of the difficulties which were to face American statesmen in the coming years - they could still hope that a perfect solution to post-war problems had not been buried with Lincoln.

The violent manner of Lincoln's death gave ample scope for melodramatic Victorian expressions of shock and revulsion. There was a general consensus that the deed was "one of the blackest crimes of our age", and in language only slightly more extravagant than that employed by most public speakers and leader writers on the subject, Sheriff Gordon of Edinburgh denounced it as "an unwarrantable, a licentious, a brutal crime which the laws alike of God and man brand with their warning stigma, and smite with their avenging justice". Almost inevitably, in several

---

1 Substance of the Address reported in Glasgow Herald, 29 April, 1865. The specific reference here to security for the freedman during Reconstruction was fitting and logical, coming as it did from an organization which only five weeks before had sent an Address to Lincoln expressing satisfaction with the ratification of the 13th Amendment, and regarding its passing by so large a majority as "one of the greatest triumphs of modern civilisation" - see ibid., 22 March, 1865.

2 See the draft of an address to the Evangelical Churches in the United States prepared by an appointed committee of the Free Church of Scotland, and read by Mr. Nelson, Greenock, at the General Assembly of the Free Church, 30 May, 1865. Proceedings and Debates of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, May, 1865, p. 270. (Hereafter cited as Procs. Free Church G.A.).

3 Report of speech by Sheriff Gordon at the public meeting on the assassination held in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, 3 May, 1865, in Scotsman, 4 May, 1865.
attempts to bring home the enormity of the disaster analogies were drawn
with earlier victims of assassination. Thus the Glasgow Herald pro-
nounced that "no similar event has created such a profound impression
since the day on which William the Silent was slaughtered in his palace",\(^1\)
while the Edinburgh Courant perhaps protested a little too much that
positively no extenuating circumstances attached to this particular
assassin's act:

The murderer need not hope that posterity will remember him with
any of the feelings which have made history indulgent to Charlotte
Corday. Abraham Lincoln had nothing in him of the Marat.\(^2\)

The poignant injustice of the event was widely appreciated in frequent
laments on the theme of the victor struck down in the hour of his glory,
and the triumphant North prostrated in the midst of its success. Anxiously,
the Aberdeen Free Press recognized that, with the hope and the confidence
of the nation resting in him, he had been cut down "at the hour when the
genius of order, and the firmness of assured and consolidated power are
in most urgent requisition".\(^3\) And even after the immediate effusions of
remorse had died away, the Caledonian Mercury bitterly recalled that the
tragedy had happened when Lincoln had

passed through the most fiery ordeal to which the ruler of a
great nation could be exposed; when he had broken the back of a
formidable rebellion against natural rights and human liberties ...
It was a shot aimed at the heart of the nation when it was in the
hey day of its triumph at the prospect of returning peace ...\(^4\)

\(^{1}\) Glasgow Herald, 27 April, 1865. See also the Elgin Courant, 28 April,
1865, which took both William the Silent (probably following the lead
of the Glasgow Herald) and Henry IV of France as parallels; and the
Dundee Advertiser, 28 April, 1865 (Henry IV of France).

\(^{2}\) Edinburgh Courant, 27 April, 1865.

\(^{3}\) Aberdeen Free Press, 28 April, 1865. See also Huntilt Express, 29
April, 1865.

\(^{4}\) Caledonian Mercury, 8 July, 1865. The paper's initial reactions to
the assassination are unfortunately unknown since the files for the
first six months of 1865 are missing.
Eulogies on the assassinated statesman were also made, of course, by those who had not hesitated to condemn Lincoln's actions while he lived. A classic example of this was contained in the *Scotsman*'s praise of him as "one of the world's most truly great men" among "those who have done great things in the cause of all men". ¹ Earlier in the year, however, the paper had strongly suggested that Lincoln was fully prepared to compromise on slavery for the sake of preserving the Union, and that his stature must be diminishing in the eyes of abolitionists - "After all, Mr Lincoln would seem to be more of a politician than a philanthropist, and more of a one-idea'd and obstinate man than either". ²

But if the *Scotsman*'s posthumous tribute to Lincoln as the emancipator of the Negro race in America smacks of hypocrisy, there did exist at the same time within Scotland a genuine reverence for the man who had finally ended slavery by legislative enactment. In a balanced comment, the *Glasgow Herald* credited him not as a leader of the abolition movement but as one who had had the courage to move along with it, and to act when the proper time came.³ A less sophisticated judgement honoured him as having "staked the life-blood of his people" on the aim of achieving freedom and honour for the slave.⁴ And it seems clear that the strong anti-slavery traditions of Scotland had helped to incubate a public frame of mind which readily chose to highlight Abraham Lincoln as the Hero of Emancipation.⁵

¹ *Scotsman*, 27 April, 1865.
³ *Glasgow Herald*, 27 April, 1865.
⁴ *Huntly Express*, 29 April, 1865.
⁵ See, for instance, the concluding lines of blank verse in "The Song of the Freed Woman", Appendix IV.
The anti-slavery tradition of the capital city, at least, was deliberately brought up as a factor conditioning Edinburgh's response to Lincoln's death. At a public meeting there, Duncan McLaren reminded his audience that from the time, over three decades before, when Dr. Andrew Thomson had announced his commitment to immediate abolition, Edinburgh's anti-slavery feeling had been unmistakably strong among all classes and parties. Yet - by way of indicating Lincoln's "advanced" position on emancipation - McLaren confessed that he and others had initially doubted the wisdom of the Emancipation Proclamation. The subsequent success of this measure had merely demonstrated the late President's tremendous sagacity. Following McLaren on to the platform, the famous Free Church minister, the Rev. Dr. Robert Candlish, devoted at least as much of his speech to rejoicing in the prospect of the abolition of slavery throughout the world as to eulogizing on Lincoln.

And one of the main considerations determining the Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland's responses to the assassination was the anti-slavery character of the late President's policy. Considered at the June meeting of the Synod were proposals, put forward at the May Synod, to extend to the American government and to Lincoln's widow the Church's sympathy on the assassination, and its sense of satisfaction over the passing of slavery. Enthusiastically endorsing the resolutions, the June meeting conceded that while it would certainly be a case of the Church seeking to act on a State - and therefore counter to Reformed Presbyterian principles - the action could be vindicated in this particular instance on the grounds that it consisted exclusively in the expressing

1 Report of speech by Duncan McLaren at the public meeting held in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, 3 May, 1865, in Scotsman, 4 May, 1865.
2 Report of speech by Rev. Dr. Robert Candlish, in ibid.
of sympathy with a friend whose course of action on the slavery question had almost been the same as theirs. An earlier Synodical committee had, indeed, recognized Lincoln as the man raised by God to be the chief instrument of emancipation, and "the steady, unchanging friend of the poor Negro".

Less unanimity prevailed in the United Presbyterian Church, however. At its May meeting, the Glasgow Presbytery was requested by the session of the East Campbell Street church to ask the forthcoming U.P. Synod in Edinburgh to appoint a committee which would prepare an address for transmission to the Moderator of the U.P. Church in America, expressing the Synod's great satisfaction over the abolition of slavery, and sending sympathy on Lincoln's assassination. The overture had the effect of splitting the meeting, a spirited opposition to the move being led by the Rev. Dr. John Taylor, minister at Busby and lately Professor of Theology in the U.P. Church of Canada. Aside from questioning the closeness of the affiliations between the U.P. Church in Scotland and its opposite number in America, Taylor objected to the whole idea on the grounds that ecclesiastical courts should not be asked to give opinions on matters of that nature.

He was supported by one Mr. McColl who argued that it would be a

1 Reformed Presbyterian Magazine, June, 1865, p. 190.
2 Report of the committee on the "Signs of the Times" at a meeting of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Glasgow, 9 May, 1865, in ibid., p. 196.
3 Report of the monthly meeting of the Glasgow U.P. Presbytery, held in the Presbytery Hall, 9 May, 1865, in North British Daily Mail, 10 May, 1865.
4 Small, History of the ... United Presbyterian Church, Vol.1, pp. 163-164; Vol. 2, p. 140.
5 For further reference to Taylor's arguments on this point, see below, Chapter VIII, pp. 576-577.
great pity if church courts were to take up great contemporary events and make them the subject of discussion. Seconding Taylor's motion to refuse the overture, he suggested that these courts should confine themselves to their own special work; and he made it clear that while sharing the sentiments contained in the proposal, he felt it totally unnecessary for the U.P. Church to send a special communication to America since there had been ample opportunities elsewhere for members to express their feelings on the death of Lincoln and the abolition of slavery - feelings which the country had already transmitted to the United States. Another speaker opposed to U.P. involvement cautioned against precipitate action by questioning whether slavery would in fact ever now be abolished in all the states.

In moving the rejection of the overture, Taylor himself had gone even further into the dangerous waters of United States politics and Scottish U.P. principles. Not content with resting his case on his argument that the "dignity and spirituality" of the Church would be damaged through meddling in questions bearing a political complexion, he went on to warn against "stirring up Northern feelings" at a time when it had become "perhaps necessary to check them a little". Furthermore, he stated that the Synod was not entitled to commit the entire U.P. body to a certain view of politics concerning this issue, since he had personally met a great number of "most respectable", intelligent U.P. members who, to his surprise, had been "rather inclined to take the side of the South". Despite this startling revelation, however, the Glasgow Presbytery's desire not to appear reticent in expressing its feelings on the assassination and on slavery resulted in the carrying of the overture by seventeen votes to nine.1 Ultimately, the Synod in Edinburgh

1 North British Daily Mail, 10 May, 1865.
approved the Glasgow Presbytery's duly presented overture by remitting the matter to the committee on Correspondence to Foreign Churches. ¹

The clash on American relationships at this juncture was almost certainly symptomatic of a wider domestic conflict within the Glasgow U.P. Presbytery between those who were prepared to stretch the principles of the Church to meet the needs of the changing current situation and to reflect popular sentiments, and a hard-line, "reactionary" faction committed to unswerving adherence to the strictest traditions of the U.P. denomination. It is perhaps significant that at the Union of the U.P. Church with the Free Church in Canada in 1861, Taylor chose to resign his Canadian professorship and pastorate and to return to Scotland.² And of his performance as a preacher (even before his removal to Canada), it has been recorded that, although interesting, he "dealt too exclusively with the intellect to be broadly popular".³

If direct action on the apparently inextricably connected issues of Lincoln's assassination and the abolition of slavery highlighted differences of opinion in U.P. circles, the way in which the two themes were publicly interwoven at this time could be used by the secular press as an indirect weapon of attack on religious and political opponents. Thus, in a thinly disguised criticism of the speeches of McLaren and Candlish at the Edinburgh meeting, the Edinburgh Courant commented that denunciations of slavery included in public meetings on Lincoln were "inappropriate on an occasion like this, when the crime which struck down Mr. Lincoln, and not the cause for which he worked, was the proper theme". The Courant

¹ Ibid., 20 May, 1865.
² Small, History of the ... United Presbyterian Church, Vol. 1, p. 164. Taylor had been nominated by the Mission Board of the U.P. Church to his Canadian appointment in 1852.
³ Ibid.
significantly added, of course, that Lincoln had in any case been neither
an early, nor a violent, anti-slavery man.  

The strongly Liberal press, on the other hand, tended either
directly or by implication to associate the crime of assassination with
the residual crimes of the Southern slave system. The Aberdeen Free Press
for example, succinctly labelled its editorial on the shooting "The
crowning crime of the rebellion".  
W.E. Baxter, speaking at London in late April, expressed a similar sentiment: "The most unjustifiable revolt in history has ended in the most dreadful of history's crimes".  
With characteristic directness, however, the Dundee Advertiser stated
that from the widespread recognition made of the Northern cause at
meetings on Lincoln, it was obvious that the assassination had at least
"opened the eyes of the people of this country to the debasing influence
of the slave power".  
And for the ELES, it was "the last desperate act of the dying iniquity of slavery".  

Recognition of the fact that the South had been the "sentimental source" of the political crime of assassination bred recrimination and
guilt feelings among some of those Scottish observers who deprecated the
attitude which had predominated in Britain during the Civil War. The
panegyrics on Lincoln by journals which had earlier denounced the Northern
cause provoked a representative outburst from the Aberdeen Free Press:

1 Edinburgh Courant, 4 May, 1865.
2 Aberdeen Free Press, 28 April, 1865.
4 Ibid.
6 Aberdeen Free Press, 5 May, 1865.
But for the sympathy, encouragement, and ample material aid accorded to the South, by the most influential sections of the people of this country ... the cause of the Confederates would probably never have inspired any other sentiments than those of condemnation and abhorrence.¹

In similar vein, the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, minister of the Barony Church, Glasgow, since 1851, and one of the most famous figures in the Established Church of Scotland in the nineteenth century, recorded in anguish the shortcomings of his Church and nation:

Heard of Lincoln's death. It will, under God, be a huge blessing to the North, and be the ending of the accursed South ... I am ashamed of my country. This sympathy with the South is an inscrutable mystery to me; I cannot make it out. But I fear we shall have to suffer for our grievous pride ... I have never swerved in my sympathy with the North, and I believe that the day is not far off when we shall hardly believe that Britain's sympathy was with the South. Oh, my country! Oh, Christian Churches! Repent in dust and ashes!²

But specific aspects of the assassination stressed by Scots who had supported the South serve to illustrate that these were certainly not prepared to minimize their old feelings for the Confederacy in the face of this tragedy. The strength of conviction in the justness of the Confederate cause, and the concern for the wellbeing of the Southern states at this time, is a pointer to the powerful continuation of such sentiments in the Reconstruction years. Thus, the Edinburgh Courant found the assassination "utterly abhorrent" because although it had been indirectly caused by the defeat of the South, the deed was totally alien to the excellent character of Southern men. A great effort was made to point out how revolted the Southern leaders must have been at the crime, and none made to conceal the Courant's personal feelings on Lincolnian policy - "this remarkable person ... when chosen President in 1860[,] ... was by no means an

¹ Ibid.

      For a biographical note on Macleod, see Appendix I.
abolitionist ... He was not a great man, and to his policy we have always been opposed". ¹ Similarly, the North British Daily Mail avoided profuse expressions of horror, or sympathy for the American people, to concentrate on the new plight of the South. Fearing the likely results of a different Presidential policy, it looked back in alarm to earlier Northern pronouncements that "the proper way to solve the Southern difficulty was by utter extermination". Speculating on the possible enforcement of so ruthless a policy, the paper reminded readers that early in the war Lincoln himself had been an advocate of it, only displaying conciliatory traits in his character towards the close.²

It was but one step from these sentiments to those expressed by "Justitia" who, writing to the Edinburgh Courant, also feared "an immediate blood orgy against the South" by Johnson and Butler. Judging the assassination as a natural act of revenge by the South, coupled, probably, with "a mistaken idea of patriotism", "Justitia" maintained "Our own Wallace thought it no barbarism to slay and tan the skin of Hesselrig", while William Tell had been considered a patriot for slaying Gesler, and Charlotte Corday for assassinating Marat. "I do not class President Lincoln with either of these blots on humanity; but I cannot disguise the truth that under his Government there has been more private injury inflicted than was done by either of those tyrants".³ In sending his armies to "scourge ... a people convinced they were fighting in a righteous cause", Lincoln had sown the wind and had now, regrettably but not surprisingly, reaped the whirlwind.⁴

¹ Edinburgh Courant, 27 April, 1865.
² North British Daily Mail, 27, 29 April, 1865.
³ Letter from "Justitia", Edinburgh in Edinburgh Courant, 28 April, 1865. For analogies between the Southern cause and the old Scottish fight for independence, see below, Chapter III, pp. 200-219.
⁴ Ibid.
Lincoln's death had the effect of promoting reflections on the historical crime of political assassination also by the Rev. Dr. George Gilfillen, minister of the United Presbyterian church in School Wynd, Dundee. The eccentric and dynamic Gilfillen, one of the U.P. Church's most outspoken critics of American slavery in the 1850s, had caused a sensation when at a huge public meeting held in Dundee during the Civil War to express sympathy for the North he had spoken out in favour of the Confederate cause. Having subsequently adhered more or less firmly to his commitment to supporting a cause fighting justifiably, as he believed, for independence, he was able, even while deploiring this particular slaying, to cite arguments ancient and modern condoning the crime, and dispassionately to illustrate that he personally believed that there were some cases in which the removal of a tyrant by assassination was, at least, deserved. But he was careful to emphasize that Lincoln's murder belonged in that category of assassinations which could do nothing but harm, because, by leaving Johnson in power, it "threatens in some quarters to re-kindle the expiring ashes of Confederate revolt". Included among the unjustifiable slayings were the assassination of Cardinal Beaton, which had retarded the progress of the Reformation, and that of the Regent Murray, whose death had set Protestantism back in Scotland.

Gilfillen's somewhat ambiguous remarks on assassination, and his pro-

1 David Macrae, George Gilfillen: Anecdotes and Reminiscences (Glasgow, 1891), pp. 147-148.
2 Gilfillen's strangely ambivalent attitudes to America are referred to in Chapter III, pp. 201-203, 329-330.
3 Lecture by the Rev. Dr. George Gilfillen on "The fall of Lee, and the murder of Lincoln" (the second of three lectures on war, as illustrated by the American contest), held in Dundee, 7 May, 1865, reported in Scotsman, 9 May, 1865. His remarks on assassination were challenged by "B" of Edinburgh who accused him of "pandering to the most unchristian prejudices and fostering the most unchristian passions". Ibid., 11 May, 1865.
Southern predilections, should not be allowed to obscure the very real regret which he felt at the loss of Lincoln. His death demonstrates clearly the virtually unanimous desire among both pro-Northern and pro-Southern Scots for the immediate implementation of a magnanimous Federal policy towards the defeated states, and, moreover, the widespread belief that "[Lincoln's] life seemed indispensable for the wise and speedy readjustment" of affairs between North and South. It has been argued that the British press paid scant attention to Lincoln's Reconstruction plans while he was in office. But in Scotland at least, the fears harboured in connection with the succession of Johnson suggest that, over and above the martyr's glory attaching to him, Lincoln had indeed been seen to offer a positive Reconstruction policy which could be acknowledged as basically just by both pro-Confederate and pro-Union observers. Thus, even Charles Mackay could retrospectively write in glowing terms of his proposed magnanimity to the South, commenting as late as 1868 that "he had no heart to press heavily on a fallen and helpless foe".

A typical sense of foreboding was voiced by Candlish at the Edinburgh meeting on the assassination:

the South, in the view of coming events, I think, had far more to fear than to hope from whoever might succeed the President.

The Scotsman held out little hope of Johnson, the man who had disgraced

1 Dundee Advertiser, 28 April, 1865.
2 Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 47.
4 See Scotsman, 4 May, 1865. See also comments in Glasgow Herald, 27 April, 3 May, 1865; North British Daily Mail, 27 April, 1865; Edinburgh Courant, 2 May, 1865; Aberdeen Journal, 3 May, 1865; Banffshire Journal, 2 May, 1865; Glasgow Sentinel, 29 April, 1865.
the Senate by his "drunken grimaces and babble", following through Lincoln's course, while the Dundee Courier gloomily concluded

If Vice-President Johnson is not controlled by the better feeling of the North, or is not deposed by a revolution, we may expect the South to be treated in such a fashion that a high-spirited people would deem death preferable to submission ...²

Yet if Lincoln's death early helped to bring out what was to be a primary concern of many Scottish commentators during Reconstruction - leniency towards the Southern states - it also set the stage for the antagonistic attitudes towards the two sections of America which were to colour debate on Reconstruction during the early years. The tone of the Caledonian Mercury's basic outlook on North and South in Reconstruction was well crystallized in the comment that Lincoln's exercise of clemency was "as magnanimous as it was undeserved".³ And partisanship was blatantly defended at a preliminary meeting of "Friends of the North" in Paisley on 1 May, convened to consider calling a public meeting to express sympathy on the assassination. Replying to the chairman, Baillie Morrison, who had made known his discomfiture over the proposed restriction of attendance to "friends of the North", maintaining that he was sure the South was not implicated in the crime, Councillor Cochrane strongly supported the decision to confine the meeting to Federal sympathizers. Lincoln, he argued, had been assassinated for being true to the Northern cause, and had endeavoured to put down "one of the unh holiest rebellions on record".⁴

---

¹ Scotsman, 27 April, 1865. See also 2 May, 1865.
² Dundee Courier, 27 April, 1865.
³ Caledonian Mercury, 8 July, 1865.
⁴ Report of speech by Councillor Cochrane in the Artizans' Institution, Paisley, 1 May, 1865, in North British Daily Mail, 3 May, 1865.
Having duly railed against such newspapers as the North British Daily Mail "for having deceived the public mind on this [i.e. the Civil War] the greatest question that ever occupied the attention of mankind", he proceeded to use the occasion for an attack on British Toryism. Appropriating the rail-splitter and poor tailor images of Lincoln and Johnson, he made the point that it was not at all surprising that aristocracies were against the North, where the poorest might rise: "These are facts which do not go down well with the aristocracy of this country. They must have rulers descended from the ancient chivalry - (laughter) from such men as William the Conqueror". Lincoln's assassination afforded the earliest opportunity during Reconstruction for the reform-conscious Paisley councillor to demonstrate his willingness to use the "American question" to give substance to his arguments in favour of popular government.

Cochrane had directly implicated the South in Lincoln's slaying, maintaining, to applause, that, true to its antecedents, it had gone against all laws, human and divine. It has already been noted that some tended to see the crime as inextricably connected with the old curse of slavery. Speculations of the existence of a Southern conspiracy against Lincoln's life reflect both the early uncertainty as to how the South,

---
1 Ibid. Cochrane took especial care to forgive "the large proportion of the working-classes" which, "constantly engaged in daily toil", had been led astray by the press.
2 Ibid.
3 Cochrane was an active member of the Scottish National Reform League, and was on the platform at its reception for Garrison in 1867 - see Glasgow Herald, 20 July, 1867; North British Daily Mail, 15 Oct., 1866.
4 See above, pp.118-119. The Duchess of Argyll wrote in her Journal on 12 April, 1865, "one felt with awe that the evil spirit of slavery had doomed itself to utter desstruction, when Lincoln was murdered". 8th Duchess's Journals, Argyll MSS.
with its violent background, was going to respond to submission and Reconstruction, and the concern on the part of pro-Confederate observers to show that it was completely blameless regarding the crime and could fall victim to an unjustly revengeful North.

Few were willing to state without qualification that "there has evidently been a organised [Southern] conspiracy existing for months to murder all the leading members of the Washington Government", 1 or so outspoken as to suggest that

when men cannot carve their nationality without the aid of the assassin's dagger, then the quicker those men are swept from the earth, the better for humanity - for cursed must be a nationality cemented with the blood of victims, and built up by the hands of murdering hirelings. 2

But while discretion usually credited the great body of the Southern people with feeling revulsion at the assassination, it was nevertheless commonly admitted that "it is difficult for such deeds done on behalf of a cause to be entirely dissociated from that cause itself". 3 And this could finally resolve itself simply into an indictment of old Southern civilization:

It is impossible to overlook the fact that slavery begets in the slaveholding community a reckless disregard of human life, that makes violence and murder seem much less heinous crimes than they are seen to be by us. 4

However, for those anxious to exonerate the South on all counts, attitudes to the assassination could be twisted so as not only to

---

1 Elgin Courant, 28 April, 1865.
2 Huntly Express, 29 April, 1865.
3 Glasgow Herald, 1 May, 1865. See also Glasgow Sentinel, 29 April 1865; Aberdeen Journal, 3 May, 1865.
4 Glasgow Herald, 24 May, 1865. The paper reminded readers that the Southern press often reported murders as "spirited affairs", and that four years before, Lincoln had been threatened with assassination by Southerners, and a reward had been offered to anyone who would kill him.
achieve this end but also to incorporate an attack on the nature of American civilization as a whole. Thus, the Edinburgh Courant ultimately concluded that the assassination fitted in naturally with the events of the preceding four years, and was merely proof that "under the surface of that boasted American civilization of railways and cheap newspapers rage all the base instincts and fierce passions of every age of mankind". In a moral atmosphere producing men like Butler, Brownlow and Beecher, crimes like assassination were not to be wondered at: "Where men write, and speak, and preach daggers, they are only too likely to use them into the bargain".¹

V Conclusions

The difficulties in getting to grips with the complexities of the American political system tended to make it common for Scottish observers to evaluate their American politics largely in terms of the policies and proposals represented by influential personalities within (or recently part of) the American political spectrum. Accordingly, the Scottish visits of Jefferson Davis and of Grant, aside from providing a renewed focus on the old American struggle and on the years which followed, provided very real opportunities for many Scots to express personal and deeply held convictions on the nature of United States society and politics since the war. To some extent, the emotional responses registered towards these two representative personalities are a microcosm of the conflicting and complex attitudes which existed within Scotland to the process of Reconstruction.

Still more clearly, the responses to the assassination of Lincoln highlight the early existence of many of the main strands of thought and areas of argument which were to characterize Scottish opinions on the

¹ Edinburgh Courant, 3 May, 1865.
course of Reconstruction proper. Accordingly, even in April-May, 1865, it has been possible to identify in the Scottish outlook the prevalence of hopes for leniency to the South; judgements on the nature of society in the North and South; the concern of Scottish churches to maintain or to reaffirm links with their American counterparts; appeals to and reminders of the strong anti-slavery tradition in Scotland; the shame or anger of some Scots at the memory of British sympathy for the South during the Civil War; the existence of partisanship; and, perhaps strongest of all, the persistent influence on post-war thinking of old prejudices relating to the North and South.

Present also in no small measure at this time was the eagerness, which was to persist throughout Reconstruction, to strengthen Anglo-American bonds.\(^1\) Frequently, the hope was expressed that the proferring of British sympathy for the Americans would help to cement the friendship between the two countries.\(^2\) Easily the most emotional pronouncement on the impact which had been made in this connection came from the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod. Speaking at a public meeting for freedmen's aid, held in September, 1865, in Glasgow, he recognized the three American ministers present\(^3\) as "the representatives of a new era that was inaugurated when England grasped the hand of America with a full heart, and with a tearful

---

\(^1\) It is worth noting in this connection that at most of the civic receptions for Grant in 1877, his record as an improver of relations between Britain and the United States was loudly acclaimed.

\(^2\) See, for instance, Glasgow Herald, 2 May, 1865 (Lanark Commissioners of Supply meeting); Glasgow Sentinel, 6 May, 1865; Scotsman, 4 May, 1865 (Edinburgh public meeting); Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865 (editorial and report of Dundee public meeting); Reformed Presbyterian Magazine, 1865, p. 190; Duchess of Argyll, 8th Duchess's Journals, 14 April, 1865, Argyll MSS.

\(^3\) These were the Rev. Dr. Storrs, delegate from the National Freedmen's Aid Society of New York, the Rev. Sella Martin, a former slave, and delegate from the American Missionary Association, and the Rev. Mr. Milligan of Pennsylvania. See Glasgow Herald, 23 September, 1865.
eye over the dead body of one of the greatest men who ever lived - Abraham Lincoln (loud and prolonged cheering)". Significantly, (and understandably, perhaps, given this particular venue) the keynote of his "new era" was fraternisation with the Northern states - a joy that for the first time for nearly fifty years, Britain would be allowed to meet "the true America - the America of the North" face to face, and to feel with her, and not the South, an era marked by peace and amity.¹

The wide extent and diverse nature of Scottish public interest in post-war America, something of which this chapter has attempted to convey, precluded, on a general level, the possibility, inherent in Macleod's reasoning, that the Southern states could be virtually ignored by Britain as a spent force in the American scene. Certainly, we have seen the popularity throughout Scotland of lectures, delivered during the Reconstruction years, which were predominantly favourable to the North. But while Scottish audiences could still be entertained by music hall acts based on almost exclusively Southern-orientated life and character, and, much more importantly, while it was still possible for someone in Scotland even loosely to equate the action of John Wilkes Booth with that of William Wallace, and for Jefferson Davis to command the reception he got in 1869, it is clear that the Scottish focus on the United States during Reconstruction inevitably remained, at all levels, at least as squarely, and often as sympathetically, fixed on the South as on the North.

¹ Report of a speech by the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod at a public meeting held by Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society in the City Hall, Glasgow, 22 Sept., 1865, in ibid., 23 Sept., 1865.
CHAPTER III

INDEPENDENCE AND DEMOCRACY: THE SCOTTISH HERITAGE, THE SOUTHERN CAUSE, AND NORTHERN DEMOCRACY

The unprecedented state of accord which Lincoln's death had occasioned among Scottish observers normally bitterly at odds with each other in their opinions of the United States was the product of exceptional circumstances, and as such, it proved essentially transitory. With the intensity of Scottish interest in the logistics of the Civil War having been matched by an equally strong intensity of sympathetic commitment to either the Northern or the Southern cause, it was perhaps largely inevitable that the continuation of wartime sympathies would form one of the most powerful forces in moulding attitudes to America during Reconstruction. So concerned were Scots with retrospectively analysing the causes of the war, with vindicating their own positions and condemning those of their opponents relative to the conflict, and with judging the character and motives of the antagonistic sections, that it is impossible to understand their attitudes towards post-war politics and race relations in the United States without first looking closely at the differences of opinion towards the war and its aftermath which continued to rage in Scotland in the sixties and seventies. Indeed, the process of looking back itself formed a vital aspect of the Scottish outlook on America at this period.

During Reconstruction, the persistent reassertions of old predilections towards North or South were invariably made not simply in terms of support for, or condemnation of, Congressional policies, nor merely within the context of reviewing how the Negro freedmen or the Southern white population were reacting to their post-war situations. More often than not, observations on the progress of Reconstruction were tied to some form of incidental comment on the nature of the recent struggle. The same was true with
regard to the unabating crop of pronouncements for and against American democracy, the debate on the merits and demerits of the American governmental system continuing to prove a central feature of the Scottish focus on the United States at this time.

It has been suggested that the Civil War period itself marked the climax of the old conflict between British supporters and declaimers of democracy. But, given Scotland's traditional affinity with, and interest in, American democracy, it would appear that post-mortems on the conflict combined with fresh debates on the likely consequences (for America and for the world) of the Federal win to provide an area of speculation which assured at least as heavy a Scottish concentration on the democratic aspect during Reconstruction as in the preceding period. For although the abolition of slavery had fundamentally affected the standing of the United States as the world's figurehead of democracy, old feelings towards the republic's political institutions not only survived, but tended to be actively reinforced by the course of events in the years immediately following the war.

If, therefore, there can be discerned any semblance of a pattern in the myriad of diverse Scottish opinions on post-war America, it is in the general, strong adherence to old sympathies, in the concomitant prevalence of old controversies concerning the United States, and in the widespread use and careful interpretation of recent United States history to back up these specific convictions. It is hoped to give some indication in this chapter of the way in which Scottish attitudes to the Reconstruction era developed against a background of constant reappraisals of the nature of the Civil War and of Scottish reactions to it, and to consider the role of the Scottish "democratic" and "nationalistic" traditions in determining

1 Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom, p. 107.
outlooks towards a nation now more truly egalitarian and democratic; but also - with the exception of the actual war years - now more sullenly disunited in spirit, than at any stage in its history.

The widespread sentiment in favour of Northern leniency towards the South, and appreciation of actions framed in that spirit

Amid the expressions of what were often vigorously antagonistic opinions on the reconstruction of the Union, there was one sentiment (aside from those of horror and sympathy produced by the death of Lincoln) which, through its universality, formed at the outset an area of common agreement among virtually all Scottish commentators - the hope for magnanimity from the Northern victors. Something of the strength of this sentiment has already been observed in the posthumous praise meted out by Scots to Lincoln for his proposed conciliatory policy towards the South, and in the widespread feeling of apprehension over the possibility that his successor might prove less willing to advocate clemency. The desire on all fronts to see a generous measure of leniency in Northern dealings with the recently defeated Confederacy was to a large extent simply an example of the natural humanitarian concern felt by an uninvolved nation (in the role of interested observer) that, following a war of catastrophic proportions, no more blood should be unnecessarily shed in the bitter early days of peace, nor any excessively harsh reprisals taken against courageous, but obviously prostrated, adversaries.

Certainly, purely humanitarian considerations were a powerful driving force behind many of the Scottish appeals for clemency. The pro-Federal Aberdeen Journal epitomised well the temper of the press, as well as reflecting the sentiments of individual Scots commenting on the United States at this time, when, in paying tribute to the "unsurpassable heroism" of the Confederates during the war, it quietly maintained that the North

1 See above, Chapter II, pp. 110-111; 122-123.
could afford to be generous, and to "offer the hand of peace on the simple condition that the dead past bury its dead".¹ The tone and substance of this sentiment found a ready echo in the earnest pacifism of Glasgow Quaker Robert Smeal who, in assessing the possible effects of Lincoln's assassination, commented that "it is surely to be devoutly hoped that the North will not be provoked into the spirit of retaliation so as to continue the war. Now, if ever, they ought to be satisfied of its being 'time to sheath the sword, and spare mankind'."²

While the Duchess of Argyll wrote anxiously to Charles Sumner, counselling that the best hope for his country lay in "being merciful",³ and the Duke of Argyll's future brother-in-law, Sir John McNeill, wished that there might be magnanimity because the Southern states, no less than the Northern, were heavily peopled by emigrant Britons and their descendants,⁴ the existence of analogous views among the Scottish public was reflected in its appreciation of public references to conciliation.⁵

¹ Aberdeen Journal, 19 April, 1865. The deliberate use of a phrase from Longfellow's poem "A Psalm of Life" (first published in 1839) shows a conscious attempt by the Aberdeen Journal to add impact to its argument by deftly employing a familiar American literary source. Longfellow, it should perhaps be noted, was the most popular poet in nineteenth century Britain. For the expression of similar, direct sentiments, see, for example, Aberdeen Herald, 29 April, 1865; Dundee Advertiser, 18 April, 1865; John Sharp, chairman of Dundee Chamber of Commerce, and H.B. Ferguson, linen manufacturer, at the public meeting on Lincoln's assassination, reported in ibid., 5 May, 1865; Dundee Courier, 18 April, 1865; Perthshire Advertiser, 16 May, 1865; Scotsman, 27 April, 1865; Lord Provost William Chambers, Edinburgh, at the public meeting on Lincoln's assassination, reported in ibid., 4 May, 1865.

² The British Friend (owned and edited by Robert Smeal), May, 1865, p. 117.


⁴ Report of the speech by Sir John McNeill at the public meeting on Lincoln's assassination held in Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 4 May, 1865. Sir John was to be married in 1870 to the Duke of Argyll's sister, the former Lady Emma Campbell - see Paul, The Scots Peerage, Vol. 1, p. 339.

⁵ See, for instance, the warm reception given to those who, at the Dundee, Edinburgh and Glasgow public meetings on Lincoln's assassination, expressed hopes that the North would continue to proffer the olive branch - Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865; Scotsman, 4 May, 1865; Glasgow Herald, 3 May, 1865.
and, at times, in an even more direct manner. Thus an aspiring poet in Aberdeen, John Petrie, was moved to write an ode, "To America", an effort which was exclusively devoted to putting forward a plea for Northern clemency towards the South:

O, thou, the Grand Republic, do not now
When thou hast won the battle, be severe
On those who did it lose, because as thou -
They were in their conviction right sincere -

Thou may'st o'ercome by Faith, but not by Fear;
Spare then the back that is beneath thy knee -
Sheath swords and draw thy brotherhood more near;
By saving of the Southern chieftain's life,
Thou wilt but nobly seal the end of strife. 1

In his specific concern for the survival of Jefferson Davis, Petrie was far from unique. The capture of the ex-Confederate President, and Johnson's attempt to implicate him in the assassination of Lincoln aroused a furor of speculation on his probable fate. Feelings of indignation at the apparently outrageous charges levelled against him and partisan sympathy for the fallen chief, now reported to be manacled in a Northern prison, combined with considerations of expediency, detached (as well as biassed) assessments of the legality of hanging Davis as a rebel, and straightforward appeals for compassion, to produce a powerful consensus against execution. The latter strand was exemplified in the Glasgow Sentinel's rejection of the American newspapers' demands that Davis be brought to the scaffold, and in its fervent hopes that, "for the sake of humanity", wiser councils would prevail. 2 A sterner rebuke, directed towards the North as a whole for having expended energies to capture

---

1 "To America" by John Petrie, in Aberdeen Herald, 3 June, 1865.
   Petrie offered a further contribution on the theme of mercy to Davis, entitled "A Dream of America", in which he described how he had dreamt he was ferried to the United States on a boat called "Peace" and had seen passing before him on the boat the family of Jefferson Davis. See ibid.

2 Glasgow Sentinel, 3 June, 1865.
Davis in the first place, was handed out by the *Scotsman*. The change from earlier Federal recognition of Davis as "an independent monarch" to the capture of him as a traitor was reminiscent, the paper suggested, of the ethics of the Middle Ages, and of "acts such as occur at the present day in such countries as Madagascar, Scinde and Afghanistan; but who would have prophesied that such an event in the centre of Puritanism, teetotalism, peace and equal rights would have found a believer?"\(^1\)

Emotionalism in pleading for the lives of Southern heroes was not, however, confined to those who had supported the Confederacy and who continued to bear an old animus towards many facets of Northern society. If John Leng's *Dundee Advertiser* had nothing but contempt for Davis as "the advocate ... of all the worst pro-slavery legislation",\(^2\) and approved a policy of pardon largely on the grounds that execution must surely make him a martyr,\(^3\) it nevertheless sprang to a remarkably spirited defence of General Robert E. Lee against rumours of possible reprisals. Strongly admiring his qualities as a man and as a soldier,\(^4\) the paper was prompted by reports that Lee was in danger of being indicted for treason to pass a rare judgement of censure against the North. Greatly deploring the "spirit of vengeance" which it saw as existing among "a section of the Northern people", the *Advertiser* went on to remind the North that it had long winked at the institution of slavery when it should have actively

---

1 *Scotsman*, 30 May, 1865.
2 *Dundee Advertiser*, 21 April, 1865.
3 Ibid., 6 June, 1865.
4 See Ibid., 21 April, 1865, in which the merits of Lee were offset against the unscrupulous, deplorable character of Davis. Such a distinction between attitudes to Southern soldiers and Southern politicians was, of course, by no means unique to pro-Northerners in Britain. In mid April, "A Wisconsin Scot" could write to the *Aberdeen Free Press* emphasizing the difference in feelings within the Northern states themselves towards the two sets of Southern man, and pass the remark that "I verily believe, had General Lee appeared [in the North just after the surrender], the people would have cheered him". Letter from "A Wisconsin Scot", Milwaukee, 12 April, in *Aberdeen Free Press*, 5 May, 1865.
opposed it. Only the abolitionists, whom the paper recognised as pledged to counteract the general Northern movement for revenge, escaped indictment on all counts.

When such a vindictive spirit is manifested against men of Lee's stamp, it becomes almost a matter of congratulation to hear of the escape of men like Benjamin, Breckenridge, and Trenholm, who have certainly no claim on the sympathy of the people of this country.

Bearing in mind the fact that the Dundee Advertiser was one of the staunchest and most consistent sources of pro-Federal sympathy in Scotland both during and after the Civil War, the vehement tone of this particular editorial serves as a timely reminder of the variables which could determine attitudes to specific events or policies during Reconstruction.

While the survival of wartime sympathies remained by far the most important guideline for Scottish commentators on the United States at this period, the complex and frequently confusing issues which dominated the American scene after the cessation of hostilities occasionally produced diversifications of opinion on aspects of the current situation such as were neither possible nor necessary so long as it had remained essentially a question of supporting either the Federal or Confederate armies.

Thus, because there was, after the war, no longer any call for a total commitment of sympathies towards either one cause or the other, the range and modulation of Scottish views on the United States increased tremendously. As the United States proceeded with the task of reshaping and reuniting the Union, Scottish observers, following as best they could the rapidly changing transatlantic pattern of political and social events, found themselves under increasing pressure to reassess, redefine, and expand upon their pre-existing attitudes towards basic issues such as

1 Dundee Advertiser, 27 June, 1865.
North/South relations, the future path of American democracy, and the problem of the Negro race in the reconstructed nation. And the freedom with which the Dundee Advertiser readily indulged its hero-worship of Lee testifies not only to the scope afforded by the ending of the war for expressing forthright, unshackled opinions, but also to the little cross-currents which, time and again, can be seen to lie under even the smoothest flow of attitudes.

Whatever the subsequent individual judgements on the development of Reconstruction, it was widely recognized at the outset that in the reorganization of their country, the American people were faced with a problem of gigantic proportions. This aspect was stressed both by those campaigning for Scottish financial help for the freedmen, and by those anxious, for partisan reasons, to see the implementation of a conciliatory policy towards the ex-Confederates. There was, after all, perhaps no better argument for the adoption of generous, prompt measures of reconciliation than that which warned that any other course must at least seriously retard the work of reconstitution, and, at worst, produce a situation of smouldering resentment which would ultimately prove disastrous to the United States.

In its over-riding desire to have Jefferson Davis escape all manner of punishment, the Glasgow Sentinel openly appropriated this line of reasoning alongside its purer plea simply for mercy. Referring to the "gigantic task" of restoring order to Southern chaos, and of settling the freed Negroes, the paper counselled that "Proscription and bloody reprisals will throw insurmountable difficulties in the way, and render

1 See below, Chapter VIII, pp. 347-365.
the work of pacification all but impossible". This theme was repeated with more sinister intent when in its next issue, the Sentinel used the American situation to perpetuate its old feud with the radical Glasgow councillor, James Moir.

Again arguing that leniency towards the South would ultimately prove the most profitable course for the United States, and suggesting that the majority of "right-thinking people in America and Britain" wanted to see an end of all strife and the speedy return of amity between the two sections, the paper implied that precious American democratic institutions must be defended against those who professed great radicalism but who would endanger American democracy by too stern reprisals on the South. Thus, the chance was seized to attack Moir "and like men who call for more blood and for confiscation as though the free government of America were only a reproduction of the despotism of Russia". Under cover of concern to see the essence of American democracy preserved from the misguided policies of extremists, the Sentinel was able to deal a heavy blow at the allegedly reactionary nature of the "radicalism" of its local adversaries:

When those who wax eloquent over popular government and the rights of the people begin to talk about treason and proscriptions, their admirers should look for the cloven hoof, as it is very likely that such individuals, could they get the chance, would be as arbitrary and despotic as the Czar of Russia or any of the autocrats against whom they level their shafts.

Yet, it seems certain that the Sentinel's earnest appeals did encompass a genuine concern not only for the fate of ex-Confederates but also for the future of the United States as a truly unified power. Accordingly, there

---

1 Glasgow Sentinel, 3 June, 1865. See also ibid., 29 April, 1865; Elgin Courant, 28 April, 29 Sept., 1865.
2 Glasgow Sentinel, 10 June, 1865.
was an insistence that exasperation of the South by severity would be unwise since the united exertions of both North and South were required to overcome the many difficulties facing the country, and, in particular, to work out the problems of providing for the freedmen.\footnote{Ibid., 20 May, 1865. See also Sir John Lawrence, Vice-Roy of India, who acknowledged that if the North did not elect to be "wise and magnanimous", the difficulties of reconstruction were only starting, and who, despite his Federal proclivities, tended to feel that a "real reunion" after all the bloodshed was "practically improbable" (sic). Sir John Lawrence to Duchess of Argyll, Simlah, India, 16 June, 1865. Argyll MSS. In the transcripts of the Argyll MSS, Sir John Lawrence is wrongly cited as "Lord John Laurence". The individual who maintained a casual correspondence with the Duchess of Argyll in the mid-1860s was in fact the Sir John Lawrence who had been governor-general of India prior to, and throughout the period of, the Indian Mutiny. Largely as a result of his handling of that event, Lawrence had received the KCB in 1856 and been created a baronet two years later. In 1863, on the death of Lord Elgin, he accepted the viceroyalty of India. He returned to Britain in 1869, and it was only then that he was raised to the peerage. See DNB, Vol. 2, pp. 703-714.}

If, in facilitating a combined effort between North and South, conciliation might therefore positively promote progress, it was also acknowledged as essential simply for the prevention of further discord. And at the back of this latter belief there inevitably lay pronouncements on the nature of Southern society, these taking the form, usually, of explanatory statements rather than indictments. Thus, the \textit{Glasgow Herald}, while recognising that the North must have some guarantee against the immediate resurgence of the old slaveocracy in Congress, nevertheless hoped that Butler's "extreme measure" of military government for the South would not be necessary. Subjugation to any form of military dictatorship would be "very galling to the high-spirited South", and the scheme would be likely to defeat its own ends, for under superficial adherence to law and order, the South would be stirring up fires for a new rebellion.\footnote{Glasgow Herald, 15 May, 1865. See also Elgin Courant, 23 April, and 9 June 1865, where an editorial argued that if the Southern planters were disinherited and the South kept under Federal troops Britain could expect to hear of murders and incendiarism ten times more terrible than in Ireland.}

\footnote{\textbf{}}
Basically similar sentiments could, of course, be couched in terms which reflected credit on the defeated South rather than portraying it as a turbulent, embittered, anarchical territory. Easily the most outspoken in this direction was the Scotsman, which, having early predicted that Johnson's projected policy would create untold difficulties in reconstructing the Union,\(^1\) sternly warned of the dangers of going against the natural impulses of the Anglo-Saxon character to initiate a policy of deliberate extirpation on the fallen foe. The South simply would not be trampled on:

\[\text{should the Anglo-Saxon race so far forget its noble traditions as to lapse into political intolerance, there is another characteristic of the blood that may not so easily desert it - the unconquerable will, the spirit never to yield ... what sort of serfs the Southern gentry will make - how easily they will be dragooned and policed - how safely they may be insulted and oppressed - the North has had some opportunity of knowing, and, were it not drunk with success and vanity, would know to edification.}\(^2\)

Concern to secure a healthy, promising start for Reconstruction through the adoption of magnanimous measures by the victors was matched in some circles by concern for the image of the North. Among those who had loyally supported the Federal cause through all its vicissitudes, none were more anxious than the Duke and Duchess of Argyll that the early post-war policy should be such as would reflect honour on the Northern states. Writing in the early summer of 1865 to her husband at Balmoral, the Duchess neatly summarized her feelings on the matter - "One cannot feel for a people thro' (sic) evil report for four years without a passionate wish they should do as nobly as possible now, and it is intensely interesting."\(^3\) The Duke of

\[\begin{align*}
\text{1} & \quad \text{Scotsman, 2 May, 1865.} \\
\text{2} & \quad \text{Ibid., 30 May, 1865. The Scotsman was presumably unconscious of the irony involved in thus assigning to the Anglo-Saxon race the qualities assigned by Milton to the fallen Satan - and of doing so in language substantially reminiscent of the poet's.} \\
\text{3} & \quad \text{Duchess of Argyll to Duke of Argyll, Argyll Lodge, London, 2 June, 1865. AFL. For biographical notes on the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, see Appendix I.}
\end{align*}\]
Argyll having earlier remarked that he would have preferred that Davis had never been captured, or that he might now die in prison, the Duchess pertinently observed that "I suppose no Southerner cares so much for Jefferson Davis's life as those do who care for Northern fame coming brightly out of all this".

While the Duke fended off Court ladies and others who were "screaming at me about the manacles on Jeff Davis" by telling them that "he is better treated than he treated the Federal Prisoners - and that I have no pity for the wretch at all - tho' (sic) I don't wish him hung", the Duchess was discovering the tone of her friends' attitudes towards the possibility of Davis' execution. So disturbing did she find it that she was again prompted to pass on her convictions, making the point that the national character of America now virtually depended on the granting of mercy to Davis, and significantly concluding that "there is no chance of England (sic) being fair to the North, if a man hunted under accusation of murder [.] if purged from that [.] should be killed for treason".

---

1 Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Balmoral Castle, 27 May, 1865. AFL.
   The Duke was in attendance on Queen Victoria at Balmoral for much of the summer - to his increasing chagrin (see for instance Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Balmoral Castle, 4 June, 1865, in which he described the boredom of life there and lamented his inability to think up an excuse for getting away).

2 Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Balmoral Castle, 29 May, 1865. AFL.

3 Duchess of Argyll to Duke of Argyll, Cliveden, 7 June. AFL.
   Writing in her journal on Lincoln's assassination and on the possibility of repressive measures by Johnson, the Duchess had earlier commented - "the feeling will be strong that a Political Enemy was hunted as a Felon. God grant that Lincoln's spirit may plead for mercy - one desires it intensely for the sake of their [the Northern states'] future". 8th Duchess's Journals, 14 April, 1865. Argyll MSS.

4 Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Balmoral Castle, 11 June, 1865.
   See also 8, 9 June, 1865. AFL.

5 Duchess of Argyll to Duke of Argyll, Hatchford, Surrey, n.d. (probably 11 June, 1865). AFL.
Something of the same concern to see the North bring credit on itself was shared by the Dundee Advertiser. Still optimistic that Johnson seemed disposed to deal leniently with the South, an early editorial urged

Let the Northern Government push vigorously on in the path of reconstruction, dealing humanely with their erring brethren, and establishing their authority in such a manner as will win willing obedience from black and white alike, and they will command the respect of foreign nations and all true lovers of freedom far more effectually than by any mere display of material strength.¹

Following the disappointment over the conditions of Johnson's amnesty, however, there entered into the paper's opinion a strong hint of impatience towards the North, and a strand of the reasoning which was later to produce the spirited outburst against "Northern vengeance", and in defence of Lee. Irritably emphasizing that the very fact that the North had been fighting for a just cause had naturally led to the expectation that, as the victor, it would temper justice with mercy, the Advertiser maintained that, with slavery gone, the Northerners had after all nothing to fear:

It was more the system than the men they had to do battle against; and to deal harshly with the misguided slaveholders now ... would be a lasting disgrace upon the citizens of the Republic.²

Furthermore, persistence in a policy of vengeance must lose Johnson and the Northern people the respect and support of "the best friends of the North on this side [or] the Atlantic".³

Clearly, in urging that the North should vindicate the faith and preserve the respect of its British sympathizers by repudiating severity, the Dundee Advertiser was much more ruthless towards the North itself than

¹ Dundee Advertiser, 23 May, 1865. See also Perthshire Advertiser, 30 May, 1865; Scotsman, 6 June, 1865, which, in a totally uncharacteristic concern for "the name of the North abroad, and its comfort and security at home", advised that these could best be secured by "wise and gracious forbearance".
² Dundee Advertiser, 13 June, 1865.
³ Ibid., 13 June, 1865. See also 27 June, 1865.
were either of the Argylls. The relative harshness of its strictures was determined both by a sense of disappointment that the need to counsel clemency should have arisen at all, and by the totally untenable distinction which the paper chose to make between the institution of slavery and the men who had fought for it - a distinction which, incidentally, goes much of the way towards explaining the hero-worship of Lee.  

The confusion and controversy which for years before the outbreak of war had surrounded the principle of State Rights was also a factor acknowledged by Scots, not all of whom had supported the rebellion, as a valid reason for the North to show leniency to the defeated South during Reconstruction. Addressing herself in this vein to Sumner, the Duchess of Argyll wrote with customary pertinancy "Lee's letters to his sister tell us how severe the struggle might be between loyalty to the Union or the State".2

The possibility that Davis might have to face a charge of treason brought out most of the comments on this theme. Not unsympathetic to the Northern cause during the war, the Glasgow Herald, judging that the right to secede or not was still unsettled, could not see how, with justice, the Federal government could single out Davis for a rebel's punishment.3 And, in an editorial offering the same interpretation but with much more vigour, the Glasgow Sentinel's old prejudices in favour of the Southern cause showed through:

"It was no vulgar uprising or riot in a cabbage garden this Southern rebellion, but a general movement of an entire people, and this must be taken as an important element of the question when the fate of President Davis"

---

1 For further references to similar distinctions made by Scots, see below, pp. 230-231.
2 Duchess of Argyll to Charles Sumner, 12 May, 1865, PMILA, p. 104.
3 Glasgow Herald, 29 May, 1865.
is to be considered.  

Similar feelings induced the Elgin Courant to voice a representative denunciation on the trend in transatlantic developments:

No European nation would execute a similar offender. Even Russia would hardly send such a man to Siberia ... But the Americans are intoxicated with victory, and, in their towering rage, seem to thirst for blood as the leaders of the Reign of Terror did in France seventy years ago.²

Probably the small, regional journal had here taken its cue from the Edinburgh Courant which, at an earlier date, had virulently attacked the "mean baseness of character" and "low savagery" of Johnson, and had branded his pronouncements as

exactly in the spirit of Robespierre at a meeting of the Committee of Public Safety, and seemingly it would need only some triumph, unlikely though that be, of the Confederate arms, to produce the repetition in the American Democracy of the bloody melodrama of the Reign of Terror as enacted during the early years of the First French Republic.³

Behind the thinly veiled indictment of the character of American democracy, the specific censure of Johnson stuck. Much of the onus of blame for the apparently repressive actions of the North in the earliest stages of Reconstruction was, indeed, seen to lie with the new President. Some of the immediate misgivings which many Scots felt on Andrew Johnson's accession to power have already been considered,⁴ and in the days and weeks which

---

1 Glasgow Sentinel, 3 June, 1865.

The "riot in a cabbage garden" is presumably a derisory allusion to the Young Ireland movement, the "rebellious" course of which had been decisively terminated by the capture, after resistance, in 1848 of William Smith O'Brien, and others in a widow's cabbage-patch at Ballingarry, Co. Tipperary. The Glasgow Sentinel may have found it especially appropriate to frame this particular reference because the rebels involved in the 1848 rising were members of organizations officially designated "Confederate Young Ireland Clubs" and were loosely referred to in the literature of the day as "Confederates" — see Desmond Ryan, The Fenian Chief (Dublin, 1967), pp. 1-34.

2 Elgin Courant, 2 June, 1865.

3 Edinburgh Courant, 1 May, 1865.

4 See above, Chapter II, pp. 122-123.
followed, these appeared to have been amply justified.

To a very considerable extent, criticism of Johnson's policies had its base in earlier adverse judgements on his personal character and suitability for high office. Voluminous press comment testifies to how strongly Victorian sensibilities had been offended by the reports of his allegedly drunken performance at the Vice-Presidential inaugural. Harsh indeed had been the assessment of the Edinburgh Courant which, finding in "the drunken rowdy from Tennessee" an admirable weapon with which to assail the calibre of the regime which had raised him to power, commented on his appearance there:

The wretched creature seems to have been half-conscious of his plight, and began by incoherent ejaculations that he was a 'plebian', a statement which must have been at once asserted to by his wondering hearers ... [He is] a man whom no respectable American (and there are respectable Americans) would admit into his house, unless, indeed, it were a public-house.

Over and above the odium which attached to the President as the arch-villain in the move to hang Davis and as the man who had ventured so far as to make his "treason is a crime" speech, Johnson's early reconstruction measures - and even those rumoured measures which in the event were never adopted - were quick to incur the censure of those in Scotland who were following, step by step, the immediate post-war proposals for reorganization. One specific point of contention was the threat of confiscation of Southern lands and property. While the straightforward approach to this was simply to condemn it as the machinations of a tyrant

1 Edinburgh Courant, 22 March, 1865. See also letter from "Justitia" in ibid., 28 April, 1865.

References to his intemperate lapse were also made in the Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 24 March, 1865, which pithily observed that "matters have come to a deplorable pass when it is necessary to excuse the brutal vulgarity of the next highest personage of a great nation by explaining that if he had been sober he would have been less vulgar", and in the Aberdeen Herald, 29 April, 1865; Glasgow Sentinel, 29 April, 6 May, 1865; Glasgow Herald, 27 April, 1865.
of the first order, the *Inverness Courier* illustrated how this most domestic of United States concerns could be related to earlier experiences in Scotland and in Ireland. Fearing wholesale confiscation, the paper pointed out that, in cases where the whole community had participated in rebellion, history showed that such a policy was a terrible mistake, and one which would ultimately prove a greater evil to the government which had implemented it than to the rebels concerned.

The confiscation in Scotland in 1715 and 1745 punished the offenders without inducing disorganisation and disaffection among the community, but in Ireland the confiscations of Cromwell, and even William, though ruining individuals at the moment, have been vast evils to the State ever since.\(^2\)

Along with sympathy for the Southern planter class and a natural distaste for attacks on personal property, a partial knowledge of the nature of Johnson's personality occasionally gave rise to fears of the advent of a communistic, socially levelling era in United States history. As a "fierce hater of the Southern aristocracy", it seemed possible that the President was deliberately planning confiscation as a means of setting up the "democracy" of the South against the aristocratic elements for the purpose of bringing a powerful Southern party on to his side.\(^3\) And following the *Spectator's* line of reasoning on proposed confiscatory measures and on the exemption from Johnson's amnesty of 29 May of those worth more than £20,000, the *Elgin and Morayshire Courier* decided

President Johnson, in order to accomplish the work of reconstruction upon his own plan, has begun the wholesale demolition of the existing fabric of Southern society. The principles of the communists were never before developed on such a vast scale, or in such an extraordinary manner, as they now threaten to be in Virginia.\(^4\)

---

1 See *Elgin Courant*, 12 May, 1865.
2 *Inverness Courier*, 18 May, 1865.
3 *Dundee Courier*, 15 May, 1865
4 *Elgin and Morayshire Courier*, 4 August, 1865.
As was to be expected, the terms of the amnesty rankled most strongly among those whose desire for conciliation to the South was based in past support of the Southern cause, and in at least some measure of open admiration for Southern society. Thus, the Scotsman grumbled that the proclamation had granted amnesty "to nobody whom it would not have been both troublesome and scandalous to punish; while everybody is excepted who could really have been with grace and benefit received again into the favour of the Washington government". Amnesty and oath of allegiance were together denounced as "ungenerous and unfair" in their discrimination against leading political and military figures, and those "who can have any standing in the South by reason of the possession of property". In the anxious concern to see a speedy and total restoration of all the old rights and privileges to those regarded as the natural rulers of the South, the Scotsman's views on this particular facet of early Johnsonian policy can indeed be seen to have set the pattern for all the paper's subsequent comments on and attitudes towards Reconstruction. And anticipating the tremendously strong volume of protest which throughout the Reconstruction period greeted all supposed attempts to "crush the Southern aristocracy forever", the Elgin Courant, in finding the amnesty exemptions "absurd, unjust, and ominous", accused Johnson of resolutely attempting to "make ... [the Southern aristocracy] what the Conqueror of England made the Saxon aristocracy - hewers of wood and drawers of water".

So far as the President himself was concerned, however, criticism of this nature was effectively stilled and a more benevolent attitude

---

1 Objections to the amnesty on the grounds that it discriminated against the rich rather than the rebellious were, however, also common - see for instance Aberdeen Herald, 10 June, 1865; Banffshire Journal, 13 June, 1865.
2 Scotsman, 10 June, 1865.
3 Elgin Courant, 16 June, 1865.
adopted towards him following the perceptible softening of the Johnsonian line of Reconstruction during the summer of 1865. In an editorial seeking to correct its earlier assessment of Johnson as a dangerous advocate of communism, the Elgin and Morayshire Courier, for instance, freely stated that it had entirely misjudged him:

Mr Johnson is neither the vindictive tyrant nor the narrow bigot that we supposed; but he is, on the contrary, a man who conscientiously strives to know the right and do it ...  

If more candid than most in its admission of error, the paper, in so altering its views to conclude that "Andrew Johnson is after all the right man in the right place", substantially reflected the sentiments of its much more influential contemporaries in the Scottish press by the autumn of 1865.

But while those who had retracted their criticisms of the President happily pronounced themselves satisfied with his new magnanimous course, there were those who were prepared to judge (although, it must be admitted, often retrospectively) the general Northern policy as magnanimous in a broader sense; to see the leniency towards the South as not contained purely and simply within the conciliatory policy ultimately adopted by Johnson. Even the anti-Northern Scotsman had, at the very outset of Reconstruction, shown itself to be cautiously optimistic on the likely temper of the Northern population towards the South. For instance, taking the view that Lincoln's policy had been shaped by "the convictions and wishes of an entire people", the paper had felt reassured with regard

1 Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 29 September, 1865.
2 Ibid., 29 September, 1865.
3 Attitudes to Johnson's policy from mid-summer, 1865 until the end of his Presidential term of office are looked at in some detail in Chapter IV.
4 Scotsman, 27 April, 1865.
to future Presidential policy by the fact that Johnson was "bound by the endorsement of the majority of the North to follow in Lincoln's footstepp".\textsuperscript{1} And the Northern \textit{people}, in contrast to the chief Executive, were seen to favour clemency for Davis.\textsuperscript{2}

This fairly optimistic outlook, with the \textit{Scotsman} hopefully foreseeing a magnanimous North leading a very new, excessively bitter President into a just reconciliation, was to change startlingly with the disgust and disillusionment felt towards the Presidential/Congressional fight. But among Scottish observers who had always been basically pro-North, early confidence in the magnanimity of the Northern \textit{people} was judged to have been borne out through the early years of Reconstruction, and was paid tribute to not only as generous, but also as sensibly balanced compared to the policy of "selling out to the South" which Johnson had followed.

Thus, strongly influenced (as, it has been suggested, were the people of the Northern states themselves\textsuperscript{3}) by the conviction that Johnson's course would rob the North of the fruits of victory through establishing a hegemony of recalcitrant Southerners in Congress, and through virtually re-introducing slavery, the \textit{Dundee Advertiser} eagerly looked forward to the eclipse of Johnson at the 1866 fall elections. On the eve of polling, in an editorial optimistically headed "The Republican Victory", it chastised the President for his "reactionary" policy, for attempting to "infiltrate the Government with rabid Democrats" and in so doing, deal a blow to freedom all over the American continent; and the Northern people were praised for their sagacity in eschewing the Democratic party and for ensuring that the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\setlength{\itemsep}{0pt}
\item Ibid., 2 May, 1865.
\item Ibid., 6 June, 1865.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
objectives of the war were not lost.¹

Yet, even while concerned to preserve Republican unity and strength, the population of the Northern states was seen to have acted admirably towards the defeated rebels. Characteristically, in attempting to explain why it should be that the conduct of the North was nevertheless frequently denounced while a European ruler, offering similar terms, would have been lauded, the Dundee Advertiser argued that British censure in this area of United States domestic politics again simply stemmed from British antipathy to American democratic institutions. Thus, the paper maintained that there was an automatic, built-in animus to every measure, however just, which had derived from the representatives of what the anti-Americans liked to call "the mob".² Later, with the conflict between President and Congress working towards a climax, the same views were conscientiously adhered to:

> Beyond the necessary losses of the war, which may be justly said to be self-inflicted, the Southern States have had to pay no penalty for their rebellion.³

Arguing for "a magnanimity unequalled in history", European governments were indicted for having, by their "malignity", hindered the post-war progress and development of the "loyal" states.⁴

Though less concerned to attack European attitudes to Republican Reconstruction, Dundee's Robert Mackenzie nevertheless also made a point of strongly emphasizing the tremendous forbearance and humanity which he believed had been exhibited by North towards South. Dismissing Johnson as "imperfectly educated, of defective judgement, blindly and violently

¹ Dundee Advertiser. 30 October, 1866.
² Ibid., 30 October, 1866.
³ Ibid., 21 January, 1868.
⁴ Ibid., 21 January, 1868.
obstinate”, he rejoiced that the American people had been too wise to listen to him in his support of the "extravagant pretensions" of the ex-rebels.¹ For Mackenzie, as for his townsman Leng of the Dundee Advertiser, staunch advocacy of the Northern cause and an unwavering confidence in the principles of democracy had led logically to admiration for the spirit of clemency manifested by the people of the North.

Similar sentiments were shared by the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie, who believed that through the Federal success, and the victors' conduct after it, America had earned the respect of the entire world. Addressing a freedmen's aid meeting in Dundee in early 1868, he asserted (to thunderous applause) that the United States had shown a clemency during Reconstruction towards the conquered section fit to make every European nation blush. It was a degree of mercy, he suggested, unsurpassed at any time, in any country:

Contrast the clemency of America to the rebels when her foot was on their neck - contrast her clemency with the vengeance Cumberland wreaked upon our broken clans in Scotland - contrast her clemency with the spectacle of scores of Highlanders hung up before the sun, in cold blood, by the British government above the gates of Lancaster, Preston and Carlisle!²

Nor was the opportunity lost by those in sympathy with United States political institutions to hold up the post-war generosity of the North as a lesson for the old world. Laurence Oliphant, the remarkable character who - having previously crammed into his thirty-six years a series of story-book adventures - became M.P. for the Stirling Burghs in 1865, returned from a trip to the United States to proclaim that among all the many anomalies and apparent contradictions of the great republic,

¹ Mackenzie, The United States of America, pp. 265-266.
² Report of speech by Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie at a public meeting for freedmen's aid in Ward Chapel, Dundee, 6 Jan., 1868, in Dundee Advertiser, 7 January, 1868.
the greatest anomaly was the "extraordinary leniency of North to South". Finding this "totally remarkable", and "the key to the whole episode [of the Civil War]", he compared the conduct and the freedom of speech permitted to the ex-Confederate officers immediately after the war with the repression he had personally seen in European countries in 1848 and later:

the contrast between a Civil War in a free country and the revolt of an oppressed nationality against a despotism struck me forcibly. 1

Although unsympathetic to the Northern cause during the war, and crediting the ensuing temperate conduct almost entirely to the strong initiative eventually taken by the President in this direction, the Glasgow Sentinel's role as champion of "the people" against the dictatorial measures of an "aristocratic" British government channelled editorial comment into an endorsement of the post-war development of American democracy. The war, it was argued, had proved the stability and adaptability of democratic institutions, and popular institutions had been demonstrated as being the best for healing differences, since "no despotic Government would have succeeded in accomplishing one-half of the work of pacification which has been effected by the Federal Government since the collapse of the rebellion". 2 The message was clearly that the "despots

---

1 Laurence Oliphant, On the Present State of Political Parties in America (Edinburgh and London, 1866), pp. 7-8. The essay is in fact the substance of a lecture delivered in the Stirling burghs, and published in pamphlet form by Blackwood and Sons one month after Oliphant returned from the United States. The exact date of the trip is uncertain, since no mention is made of it either in Oliphant's autobiography, Episodes in a Life of Adventure (Edinburgh, 1887), or in the competent biography by Margaret Oliphant, Memoir of the Life of Laurence Oliphant (Edinburgh and London, 1892). It was almost certainly undertaken at the end of 1865, however, since Oliphant gave the same address, under the title "The Political Condition of the United States", in the Music Hall, Dunfermline, on 29 Jan., 1866 - see Dundee Advertiser, 2 Feb., 1866.

For a biographical note on Oliphant, see Appendix I.

2 Glasgow Sentinel, 30 September, 1865.
of the old world" should take a lesson from the United States in how to treat refractory subjects.¹

Precisely the same sentiments were sounded in the Dundee Advertiser - "If such is the spirit and conduct of the "mob" in the hour of victory, the sooner the contagion spreads to the Old World the better for the interests of humanity".² But the advice was driven more directly and specifically home some months later when the paper advocated that Britain should take an example from America in showing clemency to the Fenian prisoner Bourke, then under sentence of death in Dublin jail.³

This plea was, indeed, later echoed from the American side. Present at the Free Church's General Assembly in May, 1867, was the Rev. Dr. H.M. Field, a New York minister deputed to represent the New School Presbyterian Church of America. In the course of his address to the Assembly, Field touched on the gross misunderstandings which had characterized European thinking on the Civil War, and, having gone on to argue that there had not been an example in history of so huge a war ending with less vengeance, proceeded to make an extremely imprudent reference to Bourke:

Pardon me if I recall this unexampled magnanimity and mercy [the freeing of Davis] - at this moment when the great English Government ... feels it necessary to send a miserable Irishman to the scaffold, concerned in an insurrection that did not rise even to the dignity of a mob - and reflect, with satisfaction, that my country, after the most terrible Civil War known in history, has not stained its triumph by one drop of blood.⁴

The unfortunate Dr. Field, having committed the double indiscretion of insulting the time-honoured traditions of British clemency to the foe,

¹ Ibid., 28 October, 1865.
² Dundee Advertiser, 30 October, 1866.
³ Ibid., 17 May, 1867. General Thomas F. Bourke had been sentenced to death in April, 1867 for his part in the Fenian rising of that year. His sentence was afterwards commuted to imprisonment, and he returned to the United States in the next decade.
⁴ Address by the Rev. Dr. H.M. Field, New York, to the Free Church General Assembly, 27 May, 1867, in Proc. Free Church G.A., May, 1867, pp. 73-74.
and of pleading for the life of a convinced Fenian at a session of the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, was forced to seek refuge from the hisses which assailed him from the gallery in an appeal to the spirit of John Knox. And to some extent he did, indeed, find favour again by reminding the Assembly that Knox himself had not feared to speak plainly.¹

There was some plain speaking also among those who, in endeavouring to enlist British sympathy for the conciliatory efforts of the Northern people after the war, chose to stress that the Federal government was by no means obliged to be magnanimous. We have already observed the tone of the pro-American Caledonian Mercury on this factor.² More discreetly, the Glasgow Herald was prepared to reason that Johnson's early retributive policy was not unduly harsh, given "the terrible calamities which the South has been inflicting upon the North", and the necessity of ensuring that the victors did not lose the peace. A general amnesty which allowed the resumption of power by the old slaveocracy in the South would, it was argued, greatly retard pacification.³ And the Aberdeen Free Press, having maintained that the American people, by their "quite wonderful" self-possession, had shown themselves worthy of British sympathy in their trials,⁴ attacked "the herd of flippant journalists who are so forward to dictate a becoming policy to the Americans".⁵ While it might be highly expedient to save Davis' life, for instance, it was "very incompetent" of the British

---

¹ Ibid., p. 74.
² See above, Chapter II, p. 58
³ Glasgow Herald, 15 May, 1865. The paper argued that while Johnson's policy might be slightly sterner in execution, in its essential guiding principles it remained the same as that proposed by Lincoln.
⁴ Aberdeen Free Press, 5 May, 1865.
⁵ Ibid., 2 June, 1865.
to refuse to see that "there must not be a little to say on the other side".¹

Nowhere was the ultimate reasoning behind such sentiments more clearly brought out than in the Free Press' rival, the Aberdeen Journal. The Journal maintained that although Johnson's mind might be warped and prejudiced, he had "always been known as a man of unimpeachable integrity", and that those in Britain who had denied the right of armed constraint by the Federal Government could not be sufficient judges of the justice or injustice of Johnson's policy:

if it was treason in Government officials to turn the facilities afforded by their position into a means of overthrowing the Union which they had sworn to uphold ... to break up the nation for the sake of slavery and slavery alone, by resorting to arms against a government which had been for thirty years of their own choosing, and a legislature in which they were doubly represented - then, whatever leniency is shown can only be the act of mercy or policy. It cannot be claimed as a right on any ground of morals that we are aware of.²

Public law made by the representatives of a nation was judged to be supreme over all force so long as it was held inviolate by the Government, and administered faithfully by national tribunals. Believing that the Confederate revolt could not be justified on the pretext that the laws had been forced on the Southerners against their will, or over-ridden by central authority, the Journal accordingly concluded that the South had simply fought for the perpetuation of slavery, which it had believed to be endangered.³

1 Ibid., 2 June, 1865.
2 Aberdeen Journal, 24 May, 1865.
3 Ibid. The Aberdeen Journal's attempts to censure the London Standard and Daily Telegraph for their portrayals of the Southern combatants as patriots serves to illustrate the somewhat peculiar nature of the paper's "conservatism". Thus, condemning the Standard's arguments as "a glorification of the doctrine of unlimited rebellion, not against irresponsible force only, but against constitutional ordinances", it defended Johnson's doctrine during the war as based on "the sanctity of representative institutions from the assaults of force".
In adopting this line of argument, the Aberdeen Journal was merely expounding a basic attitude to the late Civil War which was commonly held among those whose concern it was to stick as loyally by the North during Reconstruction as in the war. Naturally, the correlation was high between those who stressed the unprecedented show of magnanimity by the Federal Government and those who pinpointed slavery as the cause of the war: this, after all, was one instance where seeing the present in the light of a strictly interpreted past could only reflect additional glory on the victors.

II The character and intensity of post-war insistence on the preservation of slavery as the Confederacy's main wartime objective, and of post-war denunciation of British support for the South

Of these elements in the Scottish press which had eagerly praised Northern clemency, the most consistently outspoken in equating the Confederate cause with a struggle for the preservation of slavery was the Caledonian Mercury. Following, perhaps, the lead of Bright's Morning Star, the hardy little Edinburgh journal, dedicated to domestic reform, challenged the opinions of both the powerful Scotsman and Edinburgh Courant to spit out its message time and again:

The Confederacy was not a nation; it had no title to be called such, even by courtesy ... It was composed of conspirators against the rights and liberties of their country; it was designed to elevate a number of ambitious spirits above constitutional law and human obligation; it had as its motto the unchangeable supremacy of the slaveholder and the unalterable degradation of the slave ...2

1 Caledonian Mercury would frequently print extracts from Morning Star news items of a "liberal" nature on Reconstruction in America - for example, the issue for 12 August, 1865, carried a full column quote on the emancipated Negroes, favourably discussing their behaviour since freedom, and looking with optimism to their future role in the society and economy of the Southern states.

2 Caledonian Mercury, 13 Sept., 1865. See also ibid., 8, 29 July, 11, 26, 27, 30 Sept., 15, 22 Nov., 23 Dec., 1865; 17 April, 1866.
Significantly, the charge of hypocrisy was levelled more strongly against British supporters of the Confederacy than against Southerners themselves:

Though in this country every possible reason was assigned for the rebellion except the right one, simply because the right one in its unblushing villainy would have disgusted the freedom-loving and slave-hating sons of Great Britain and commanded universal sympathy for the North, the Southerners themselves never were such hypocrites as to disguise under false names or support under false pretences the iniquitous objects they had in view. They fought for slavery and nothing else because they had nothing else to fight for.¹

As late as January, 1866, the Mercury was still congratulating itself on never having expressed a second opinion as to the cause of secession, and for having believed that the South, once committed to founding and perpetuating an empire based on "human degradation", must surely be crushed in the attempt.²

Though careful to point out that it had "never claimed for the whole people of the North a sincere and disinterested regard for the liberation of the slaves" but had rejoiced, rather, that force of circumstances had compelled them to follow the Abolitionist lead,³ the Dundee Advertiser nevertheless remained adamant in its conviction that the object of the slaveholders had been to extend slavery from the Atlantic to the Pacific, if not over the whole American continent.⁴

The sighs and cries and tears of the oppressed have not appealed to Heaven in vain. This war has brought on the South calamities only exceeded by the plagues of Egypt, and yet the Southerners have clung to slavery as tenaciously as the Egyptians did to holding the Israelites in bondage.⁵

¹ Ibid., 27 September, 1865.
² Ibid., 4 January, 1866.
³ Dundee Advertiser, 18 April, 1865.
⁴ Ibid., 4 April, 1865. See also ibid., 20 Jan., 30 May, 1865; 4 July, 10 Nov., 1876.
⁵ Ibid., 4 April, 1865.
Writing on a trip to America at the end of the Reconstruction era, the paper's owner and editor, John Leng, still felt it worthwhile to reassert that "The main question [of the Civil War] from the beginning, and all through, was that which was openly avowed and proclaimed in the end – whether the Union was to be maintained in the interests of freedom or of slavery".¹

It is easy to see how such strongly held feelings on the nature of the Southern cause could condition subsequent attitudes to the Northern response to peace.² A similarly consistent, if more complex and devious line was taken during Reconstruction by the Glasgow Sentinel. As it chose to stress the democratic basis of the North's magnanimity,³ so this former champion of the Southern cause, in a skilfully managed volte face, came to acknowledge that the Civil War had been fought "not only to put down domestic rebellion, but for human freedom throughout the world".⁴ And if, during the war, the Sentinel had certainly not ranged itself on the side of those Lancashire and west of Scotland cotton operatives who had remained "most hearty sympathisers with the North", it was ready enough, once hostilities were over, to praise "the operative in his humble dwelling ... [who alone] suffered from the unnatural contest in America" for his

---

¹ John Leng, America in 1876, pp. 328-329.

² Of those other Scottish newspapers which had on the whole commented favourably on the immediate post-war reaction of the Northern people to the South, the Glasgow Herald (3, 20 July, 1867), the Daily Review (14 Sept., 1865), and the Aberdeen Free Press (21 April, 22 Dec., 1865) all indicted the South for having fought to preserve slavery. Especially severe had been the Free Press' strictures, pronouncing the Confederate rebellion to have been undertaken for "the worst cause for which a people ever rose in arms" – 21 April, 1865.

³ See above, pp. 151-152.

⁴ Glasgow Sentinel, 1 July, 1865. The paper had earlier announced its conviction that the South had fought "to perpetuate and extend slavery" – see ibid., 22 April, 1865.
"courage and consistency" in upholding such a battle.¹

This was set against the mercenary attitudes of the British "monied classes" - the merchants, manufacturers and shipowners who had supported the South not so much from genuine sympathy with its aims but simply because, through the new monopoly of world trade which they had enjoyed as a result of the war, they had stood to gain by the continuation of hostilities.² For the Sentinel, ever conscious of its importance as a custodian of working class interests,³ the perpetuation (or perhaps renewal) of the domestic class war was more important than the preservation of a consistent adherence to the spirit of a defunct foreign cause. The change in attitude was reinforced in a later editorial which bluntly stated that there was "no doubt whatever" but that slavery had been the original cause of the war, and continued

By some means or other the constitutional amendment [i.e. the Thirteenth Amendment] must be accepted by all the states, North and South; not a slave must be left to taint American soil; and under whatever temporary disabilities the black population may be placed, they must not be treated as good and chattels, but as living human beings.⁴

1 Ibid., 1 July, 1865. In line with its contemporaneous active campaign for British intervention to aid the South in the Civil War, however, the Sentinel had expressed remarkably antithetical views on 15 July, 1862 - "The idle artisans of the English towns begin to regard the American conflict less in the light of a misfortune to an allied people than as a blamable struggle for supremacy between the two factions of the States in which the North especially seeks to gratify its desire for territorial aggrandisement". See Royden Harrison, "British Labor and American Slavery" in Science and Society, Vol. 25, 1961, pp. 301-302.

2 Glasgow Sentinel, 1 July, 1865.

3 Royden Harrison, "British Labour and the Confederacy" in International Review of Social History, Vol. 2, 1957, p. 84, suggests that the Glasgow Sentinel was the most important working class paper published outside London.

4 Glasgow Sentinel, 26 Aug., 1865. Again, there is not a little irony in the fact that such concern for the liberties of the Negro freedman should have been expressed by a journal which had earlier (11 Oct., 1862) criticized the Emancipation Proclamation as deriving from "petty and abortive spite" - see Harrison, "British Labor and American Slavery", p. 305.
With perhaps more justification, the theory that the South had fought to preserve slavery was used by others at the centre of the Scottish reform movement. At a massive reform demonstration organized by the Scottish National Reform League and held in mid-October, 1866, Councillor John Burt, in the course of the afternoon open-air meeting on Glasgow Green, presented an address on behalf of the League committee to the visiting English reformer, Edmond Beales. Having asserted its belief in "the identity of human interests", the address went on to recall "with grateful admiration" that when the enemies of liberty and progress had supported the attempt to establish "a slave empire on the Continent of America", Beales had vigorously defended "those free States which upheld the dignity of labour".¹ And four days later, at a demonstration for reform in Alexandria, the forthright Glasgow councillor, James Moir, addressing an audience of 1,300 workers from Dumbarton and the Vale of Leven, spoke of the Confederates as "human devils who wanted to establish the Devil's kingdom upon the earth, who wished to see the Devil's reign".²

For those Scots whose great desire it was to see a measure of "American democracy" applied to the British political system in the shape of a widened franchise, it was more than ever necessary after the Civil War to drive home the message that the conflict had been one between "a great democracy living under the freest institutions ever given to men,

¹ Report of the great Reform Demonstration held on the Glasgow Green and in the City Hall, Glasgow, on 16 Oct., 1866, in North British Daily Mail, 17 Oct., 1866. The demonstration took the form of a procession of working men through the city, followed by an open-air meeting on the Green at which six platforms were occupied by speakers, and ending with an evening meeting in the City Hall.


Both Councillors Moir and Burt of Glasgow were active members of Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society. For further references to their activities in these twin spheres, see below, Chapter VI, pp. 72-79; Chapter IX, pp. 76, 79 fn. 4.
and a slaveholding aristocracy".1 The triumph of the North, quite easily adapted to signify a great triumph for democratic government, provided these elements with an advantage which could best be fully exploited by constantly reminding the public of the strength and despicable nature of the opposition which had had to be overcome before the whole of the United States was made safe for democracy.

In another sphere, however, it is possible that post-war insistence on the South's attachment to the "peculiar institution" may have helped (although much less deliberately) to serve a practical purpose. A retrospective reference to slavery as the crucial cause of the war could on occasion, it would seem, be the means of keeping alive an emotionalism with regard to the American situation which acted as a spur to continuing Scottish interest or active participation in the progress of the freedmen during Reconstruction. Thus, speaking at a public meeting organized by Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society in the City Hall in September, 1865, the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod geared much of his address to the argument that the Civil War had turned essentially on the problem of slavery, the real question of which had been "was the negro a man or was he not?" From this base he went on to ask rhetorically whether the Rev. Sella Martin (the popular and highly respected ex-slave who, as a deputy from American Missionary Association, was present at the meeting) was "a brute or a brother", and impressively to recount how he personally had been offered a woman and child who were for sale at an auction in America. Finding the slave system "an insult to humanity ... and to the race of which

---

1 Report of a speech by W.E. Baxter at a meeting on Lincoln's assassination held in London, 30 April, 1865, in Dundee Advertiser, 5 May 1865.

The impetus given to Scottish reform agitation by the existence of universal suffrage in the United States, and, more specifically, by the emancipation of the slaves, is more fully considered below, p. 290 et seq. and in Chapter VI, pp. 74-99.
Jesus Christ is a brother", he insisted that it had been well worth the high cost involved in purchasing the Negroes' freedom in the United States. The frequent loud applause which punctuated this section of the address testified to the audience's appreciation of such sentiments.

Clearly, a reminder of the moral wrong which had been perpetrated against the Negro for so many years was a much more effective way of enlisting sympathy for the freedmen than by simply appealing to the Scottish public on grounds of current need. And it was even better when - as in this case - it was possible to argue that current need had been caused by an effort to perpetuate that moral wrong.

Something of this seems to have been appreciated by the Duke of Argyll, who, besides defending the principles of the Northern cause, also played an active role within the Scottish - and indeed the national - freedmen's aid movement. In early June, 1865, he wrote from Balmoral to the Scotsman refuting a speech made on 30 May at the Free Church General Assembly by Lord Dalhousie, in which the latter had "totally and entirely" denied that the origin of the war had been to settle the question of abolition, and had argued that the conflict had arisen simply out of "the struggle of party against party". Argyll maintained that the Government and people of the United States had not, in regard to

1 Report of speech by the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod at public meeting for freedmen's aid held in City Hall, Glasgow, 22 Sept., 1865, in Glasgow Herald, 23 Sept., 1865.

Presumably Macleod came into contact with American slavery in the course of some excursion into the United States during his visit as a deputy of the Church of Scotland to British North America in 1845, although there is no mention of such an excursion, or of any subsequent trip to the United States itself, in his memoir - see Donald Macleod, Memoir of Norman Macleod, passim., and Vol. I, p. 274, for information on the Canadian visit.

slavery, merely been blind and unconscious instruments in the events
which led to its abolition; and while he conceded that the war had
indeed arisen from a struggle between parties, he reminded Dalhousie
that the divisory element had, at bottom, been slavery itself.

It is as unjust to them as it is to the North to affirm that the
Slave States involved their country in a bloody civil war for no
intelligible reason, or on account of differences of interest or
opinion which were not essential. Nor did the Southern States
ever pretend in America that the interest which they rose to
defend was any other than the interest of slavery.1

Having at the outset explained that he had taken the trouble to
challenge Dalhousie’s speech only because he felt it was of practical
importance whether or not public opinion in Britain was right or wrong
on the question of slavery, the Duke significantly concluded that he
had written the letter for the strictly practical purpose of benefitting
the British Freedmen’s Aid Societies:

It is true that such a call for charity as this is entirely
independent logically of any opinion on the origin or causes
of the late war. But it is impossible that the hearty symp¬
thies of the people of this country can be enlisted as they
ought to be in support of this demonstration of good feeling
towards America, if they believe that the people of the United
States have been actuated by nothing better than "evil passions",
or by political interests in which there were no elements of

1 Letter from the Duke of Argyll, dated 2 June, 1865, in Scotsman,
5 June, 1865.

The Duke intended his letter to be a "pretty strong" denunc¬
iation of "the ignorance which leads men to speak of slavery having
had nothing to do with the war". Duke of Argyll to Duchess of
Argyll, Balmoral Castle, 3 June, 1865, AFL. Dalhousie, however,
subsequently wrote to Argyll intimating that he would not be
convinced – Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Balmoral Castle,
6 June, 1865, AFL.

Nevertheless, the last word on the episode came from the
Duchess. Noting with pleasure that the letter had been copied in
full by the Times, she remarked that the London paper’s article
on it was great nonsense, "but they are glad of so respectable
a crittur as Dalhousie to be by way of agreeing with". Duchess of
Argyll to Duke of Argyll, Cliveden, 8 June, 1865, AFL.
moral value.¹

In other words, some degree of belief in the idea of the Federal battle as a moral crusade was both desirable and necessary among those advocating and those subscribing to the freedmen's aid cause.² Perhaps the greatest difficulty which the British Freedmen's Aid movement had to overcome was the fact that there no longer existed, in any real sense, a "moral wrong" towards the Negro in America on which to base a strong emotional (rather than a purely logical and practical) appeal for aid. Within the movement - as in the country at large - moral indignation tended therefore to be frequently expressed in references to the past misdeeds of the Southern slaveocracy. A facet of this trend was the fairly persistent - if somewhat redundant - condemnation of American slavery as it had been, an exercise which throughout the Reconstruction era continued to occupy the energies of the Scottish press, the churches, and many of those Scots who wrote of post-war visits to the United States.

¹ Letter from Duke of Argyll in Scotsman, 5 June, 1865.

² Speaking from the chair at a meeting of the National Committee of Freedmen's Aid Societies in London on 17 May, 1865, Argyll had stressed that it would be perfectly consistent for any of those with Southern sympathies to take part in the proceedings of the Societies. But he had also recognized that "men are largely guided by their sympathies and feelings", and that the "limited nature" of the Societies' membership up until then had probably been due to the fact that a great number of persons who would sympathize with the object in itself had withheld support through a belief that the movement was more or less connected with political feeling towards the Civil War. More importantly, he acknowledged that many were being put off supporting the freedmen's aid societies by the feeling that the United States Government had not, during the war, been dealing with perfect fairness and sincerity in the matter of slavery, and he went on to argue - in the same vein as he replied to Dalhousie - that the "deep underlying principles" of Lincoln's platform had been abolitionist, and that the Civil War had been brought on by the North's increasing devotion to the anti-slavery cause. Report of a speech by the Duke of Argyll at a meeting of the National Committee of Freedmen's Aid Societies, held at the Westminster Palace Hotel, London, 17 May, 1865, on John Rylands Microfilm.

² This point is more fully considered in Chapter VIII, pp. 427-439.
Public proclamations that the South had fought to preserve slavery were occasionally made by ministers of religion apparently for the purpose of clarifying their own strong, personal viewpoint on the great moral issue of slavery in relation to its abolition as a result of the Civil War. Following Dalhousie as speaker at the 1865 Free Church General Assembly, the Rev. Dr. Robert Buchanan of the Free College Church, Edinburgh, felt it incumbent upon himself to comment in no uncertain terms on the Earl’s conclusions. While conceding that the Civil War had not come about for the explicit purpose of abolishing slavery, Buchanan maintained that there had been a tremendous difference between the position of the two parties entering the conflict. To constant warm applause, he continued:

The position of the South, unquestionably, was the position of a party bound on upholding slavery at all hazards - at the expense of rending their country in twain, and of deluging their country with blood. If, on the one hand, the purpose of the North was not directly and immediately the abolition of slavery, certainly, on the other hand, it was not the upholding of slavery. Certainly, slavery was the occasion of forcing upon them the necessity of going to war.

Commenting that God had seemed, in the Civil War, to be putting the pro and anti forces on trial as regarded slavery, Buchanan suggested that Divine intervention had contributed decisively to the eventual outcome of the war. This was, indeed, a conviction which was widely held by Scottish churchmen (and even by some secular observers), and the very considerable importance which it exerted as an influence on attitudes towards certain aspects of Reconstruction will be discussed in a later


Buchanan, one of the prominent leaders at the Disruption, had been transferred from Tron Parish, Glasgow, to the Free College Church in 1857, and he became senior minister there in 1866. See William Ewing, Annals of the Free Church of Scotland, 1843-1900 (Edinburgh, 1911), Vol. 1, p. 108.

2 Ibid., p. 275.
consideration of the Scottish Presbyterian response to freedmen's aid.¹

An intensely firm, personal attachment to "the cause of liberty as interpreted and defended by the North" was, in the case of the Rev. Dr. Alexander Raleigh, even more passionately tied up with evangelical condemnation of the Southern attempt to save slavery. Speaking in the densely crowded Castle Green Congregational Chapel at Glasgow in late 1865, Raleigh turned a meeting called for the purpose of hearing a report by him on the continental Churches of the United States and British North America into a virtual harangue on the Southern states. Believing his "known repugnance and hostility" to the Southern cause to have governed his appointment as a visiting representative of the Congregational Union to the Church's American brethren, he illustrated the steadfastness of his attitude by declaring that there was positively no reason for the South to have gone to war but to preserve slavery.

The offence was that civilisation was lighting her lamps too near them (hear, hear) - that Christianity with her spirit of impartiality and universal love would not sanction their institution.²

The Scottish dissenting conscience had been so deeply disturbed for so long by the perpetuation of human slavery within a country which, in other respects, admirably reflected its own creed of individual liberty and independence³ that it was perhaps only natural for Scots like Buchanan

---

¹ See below, Chapter VIII, pp. 430-441.

² Report of speech by the Rev. Dr. Alexander Raleigh at a meeting in the Congregational Union's Castle Green Chapel, Glasgow, in late Oct., 1865, in Glasgow Herald, 2 Nov., 1865.

³ Raleigh, a native of Galloway, had succeeded the famous Dr. Wardlaw at Glasgow in 1855, then proceeded to London four years later where he took charge of a newly founded church at Canonbury. He was pastor of Kensington Chapel from 1875-1880. A D.D. of Glasgow University (1854), he was chosen Chairman of the Congregational Union in 1868, and "enjoyed all the honours for which Congregational ministers are eligible" - see Irving, Eminent Scotsmen, p. 422.

and Raleigh to make a point of reminding their appreciative audiences that a deliberate battle had (ultimately, at least) been waged against an equally deliberate attempt to extend a cardinal evil across the United States. This urge was still discernable as late as 1871. The Rev. William Arnot's main reason for publishing the impressions gathered during his trip to the United States in 1870 was to "contribute to the removal of prejudice, and the consolidation of friendship" between America and Britain. Yet despite this stated intention, despite the "unprecedentedly quick recovery" which he felt the country was making, and despite the deep impression made on him by personal contact in the Southern states with "maimed men ... damaged minds and bodies", he still felt it necessary to hark back on the nature of the Civil War itself, and to stress the South's determination at that time to make slavery its keystone. Again, this inclination was backed by the remembrance of a strong personal commitment to the Federal cause - "I was a fast friend to the North, in public and private, throughout their darkest days" - and an espousal of the abolitionist cause dating from the Scottish agitation against slavery in the British colonies.

1 William Arnot, ibid., No. 1, p. 66. See above, Chapter I, p. 21.
2 Arnot, ibid., p. 73
3 Ibid., pp. 69, 71-72.
4 Ibid., p. 67.
6 In January, 1832, he wrote in rapturous terms to his father of his experience in attending a meeting in Glasgow for immediate emancipation in the West Indies - "... I have had an opportunity of raising my voice in unison with that of thousands of fellow Christians in one unanimous and loud demand that slavery, which we consider a foul blot upon our national character, be immediately abolished." Ibid., p. 99.
In Arnot's reassertion that the South had fought for slavery there is also, however, an element of an implied rebuke to Britain for the strong moral support which she had accorded to the Confederate cause during the war. Grieving over the current 'Alabama' problem, he regretted the "chorus of sympathy" in the country which had lulled the Government into a slackness in maintaining neutrality.\(^1\) Arnot's incidental reminder of the strength of British feeling for the fighting South was by no means unique; throughout the first five years of the Reconstruction era, Scottish commentators who had favoured the Federals found themselves again looking over their shoulders to the immediate past, this time in order to maintain an incredible flow of attacks on those of their countrymen who had supported the South.

And in the vast majority of cases, this was an appeal to the past made for strictly practical purposes. Certainly, during the war the Argylls, for example, had discreetly sought to make mild rationalizations to Sumner regarding the volume of British sympathy for the Confederacy,\(^2\) and the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie had later sadly suggested that British failure to support the Federals might have been attributable to hostility to "their perpetual and offensive bragging".\(^3\) But in general, during Reconstruction

---


2 See Duchess of Argyll to Sumner, 29 April, 1863, in which she suggested that although Sumner had every right to be disappointed in the British response to the Civil War, from Lincoln and Seward's statements, many believed it was purely a fight for the Union and that the cause of freedom was not really involved. PNHZ, p. 77.

The same point was made by the Duke of Argyll to Sumner, 3 Dec., 1862, ibid., p. 100.

3 Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 9 June, 1865, Guthrie MSS, National Library of Scotland, MS. 3007, fol. 105-107.
it was this particular aspect of the recent Scottish focus on America
which was most readily seized upon by Scots to further existing specific,
localised rivalries or national domestic antagonisms.

As early as February, 1865, the Glasgow Sentinel had given a fore-
taste of how it would be possible to use the pro-Southern sympathies of
certain elements in Scotland to add fuel to an attack on a domestic
rival over a domestic issue. It is safe to assume that between the
Sentinel, and its sister journal, the North British Daily Mail, there
must have existed a fierce professional rivalry. Both were published in
Glasgow; both were well-established, important voices for social and
political reform, influential not only in the city itself and throughout
Scotland but also on a national level; and both aimed primarily at lower
middle-working class readership. Accordingly, when the North British
Daily Mail came out in opposition to workers' efforts at Trade Union
organization, the Sentinel, leaping to the defence of the Unions, triumph¬
antly accused it of playing to the sympathies of better class working men
by informing them that their wages would be kept down by the Trade Unions,
and of thus seeking to set this class against their fellow workers.
Suggesting that working men well knew the benefits of Union organization,
the Sentinel deplored the Mail's criticism as betraying "the most ludicrous
ignorance, or still worse, an undoubted desire to help the ... capitalists
by sowing dissension among the labouring class".3

1 The North British Daily Mail, Scotland's first daily newspaper, started
life as the North British Mail on 14 April, 1847, with George Troup
(later editor of the Bee-Hive) as editor. Cowan, The Newspaper in
Scotland, pp. 173, 286-289.
The Glasgow Sentinel was founded by the Owenite socialist Robert
Buchanan in October, 1850. Ibid., p. 290, and Mitchell's Newspaper

2 The Sentinel was described in 1865 as being "completely identified
with what is termed 'the popular cause" - Mitchell's Newspaper Press
Directory for 1865, p. 96.

3 Glasgow Sentinel, 4 Feb., 1865.
At least on one foreign issue, however, the two papers had in the past found themselves in substantial agreement: for at the height of the American Civil War, in common with those other Glasgow "Liberal-reformist" organs, the Glasgow Citizen, the Morning Journal, and the Glasgow Sentinel itself, the North British Daily Mail had unflinchingly supported the Southern rebellion. Having already deserted the sinking Confederate ship, however, the Sentinel fastened on this very fact of the Mail’s sympathy for the South as indicative of its reactionary character not merely on the home front but in relation to the international status of labour.

Affecting a Liberal reputation, this journal has, in the interests of its commercial readers, occupied an infamous notoriety as the rabid supporters (sic) of niggerdom across the Atlantic and now logically enough seeks for the disorganisation and oppression of the industrial classes at home ... Enraged at the efforts made to emancipate the black race in America, the Mail is furious that the working men of this country should not resign themselves to the dictation of their employers, and is especially angry that the organisation of Trade Unions should consistently support the claims of working men to obtain the highest rate of wages.

Given the nature of the Sentinel’s own sympathies during the Civil War, and the fact that, subsequently, it was never really disposed consistently to link the cause of the free Negro labourer with that of the British working man, the castigation of the North British Daily Mail on these specific terms must rank as the most blatant of all attempts to use pro-Southern

---

1 Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 529-530, 535.
2 Botsford, ibid., p. 529, suggests that the North British Daily Mail probably had close connections with Glasgow shipbuilding interests.
3 Glasgow Sentinel, 4 Feb., 1865. With a totally remarkable submersion of its own former attitudes on the strength and prospects of the Confederacy, the Sentinel commented that "the ignorance of ... [the North British Daily Mail’s] military strictures [on America] have been sufficient to provoke the laughter of a schoolboy". Its prophecies had been all wrong - "A more culpable and incapable public oracle could not be selected".
4 See below, Chapter VI, pp. 85-90.
attitudes to the American conflict as a weapon with which to assail personal rivals. Yet, among many of those who had supported the North, there was during the early years of Reconstruction a similar strong, unmistakable trend.

During the last summer of the war, the innocuous little *Huntly Express* had found itself on the receiving end of a somewhat bathetic attack by a Bostonian who, believing that the paper tended to be disparaging in its comments on Northern troops, wrote from Massachusetts charging it with "belonging to a section of the newspaper press who have been doing what you can (sic) to mislead the British people upon this American question", and who argued that from top to bottom of that section - "from the London Times down even to the *Banffshire Journal*" - the great motive power had been not to try to get at the truth about the conflict, but to sell the papers.¹ The undeniable support which most of the leading British journals had indeed accorded to the Confederacy provided an excellent point of attack for those "radical" liberal elements of the Scottish press which, in the sixties as less than earlier, found themselves increasingly faced with the challenge of holding their own against the encroachments of the comprehensive, widely distributed *Whig Scotsman* - and, indeed, of the ever more available London *Times*.² The Federal victory provided these journals with a unique opportunity to hit out from a position of real strength at the heinous sympathies, the mistaken and misleading prophecies which their larger, threatening contemporaries had consistently propounded.

We have already seen how the struggling *Caledonian Mercury* was ready to accuse the influential pro-Southern press of having been instrumental

---

¹ Letter from "New England Echo", Boston, Massachusetts, in *Huntly Express*, 13 August, 1864.

² For further reference to the growing influence of the big national newspapers in Scotland at this time, see below, Note on Newspaper Sources.
in helping to create a climate of public opinion which would approve
British recognition of the Southern states as belligerents, and largely
acquiesce in the weak Governmental action over cruisers for the Confederacy.\(^1\)
This was but one instance of a frequently recurring, general censure, in
which the *Times* was singled out for particular obloquy as "the worst foe
of the United States at the Press of Great Britain"\(^2\) - but with its
"diluted substitute here, the *Scotsman*"\(^3\) not far behind - and in which
"an unscrupulous Press" was somewhat hysterically linked with "an inter¬
ested aristocracy"\(^4\) in having sought to advance an "infamous cause"
capable of producing Andersonville, Wirz ("a Swiss by birth, and apparently
a murderer by profession")\(^5\) and "so many Judases, \[who\] betrayed their
common country".\(^6\)

The most direct indication of the *Mercury's* own sour hostility towards
the *Times*, the Saturday Review, and other highly successful press com¬
petitors was, however, contained in a later editorial, where United States
affairs served both as a splendid reason for putting these journals in
the pillory, and as the basis for the insults then hurled at them.
Commenting on the recently published American list of alleged Confederate
bondholders in Britain, the *Mercury*, having yet again reminded its public

---

1 See above, Chapter I, pp. 7, 8. The *Mercury* had during the war itself
attacked the *Times* and the *Scotsman* for stirring up war feelings and
"sensation-mongering" in regard to the American contest - see Botsford,
*Scotland and the American Civil War*, pp. 486-488.
2 *Caledonian Mercury*, 13 Sept., 1865.
3 Ibid., 4 Jan., 1866. For reference to an earlier designation along
similar lines, see above, Chapter I, p. 3, fn. 1.
4 Ibid., 11 Sept., 1865.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., 13 Sept., 1865. See also 27 Sept., 1865.
of the incredibly foolish wartime prophesies of the Times and its allies, concluded that the American press had printed this "fabrication" regarding the loan merely in retaliation for the way in which "the British pro-slavery press" had deceived the British people during the war. American journalists were no worse than many British ones; they had, in fact, simply copied Britain:

To be sure, their copy has been clumsy and overdone; some day, however, with greater experience they may learn to "lie like truth", and thus obtain a still wider circulation and enjoy a still larger amount of public confidence.¹

The Mercury was supported in its attacks on the Times and the Scotsman by readers who had their own personal reasons for taunting these papers with their record of sympathy towards the South. Thus, in early July, 1865, there appeared a letter, headed "The Yellow Fever Plot", in which was quoted a lengthy extract from the New York Tribune which sought to prove that there had been a deliberate plot on the part of a Southern doctor to introduce yellow fever into Northern cities.

The correspondent, suggesting from this that the world would soon see what sort of men "the pro-slavery British prophets" had supported, regretted that the past year had been "the blackest in the history of the British press", and thanked the Caledonian Mercury for "doing battle for truth and equity almost singlehanded in evil times".² A few days

¹ Ibid., 10 October, 1865.
² "The Yellow Fever Plot": letter from "Jerubbaal", in ibid., 11 July, 1865.

The correspondent displayed a somewhat obscure train of thought, and still more a measure of pretentious vanity, in choosing for himself the pseudonym "Jerubbaal". As related in the book of Judges, chapters 6-8, Gideon, one of the judges of Israel, received from his father the name of Jerubbaal ("Let Baal contend") for his action in overturning an altar to Baal. It was Gideon who was called by the angel of Yaweh to save Israel from the Hidianites and other peoples of the east who had invaded central Palestine; and stirred both by concern over the hardships endured by his fellow countrymen and by a deepening religious zeal, he was ultimately instrumental in driving the Hidianites and their Baalish practices out of Israel. He has been described as "the most remarkable and attractive military leader of the Old Testament"—see Madeleine S. Miller and J. Lane Miller (eds.) Black's Bible Dictionary (London, 1952), p. 226.
earlier, the same writer had severely taken to task the *Times*, the *Scotsman*, and all "anti-reformers of the Press and Parliament" who maintained that the British people were indifferent to whether or not they got the suffrage. Predicting that "the people" must win through soon, he drew on his "daily contact" with the working classes around Edinburgh to suggest that the *Times* and the *Scotsman* were "as men standing ... outside of a volcano, whose contents have long been unseen, though simmering and groaning below".¹

A similar connection between the reactionary responses of a large section of the British press to domestic parliamentary reform and to the American Civil War had earlier been made by "An Elector". Directing his attack exclusively at the *Scotsman*, the writer sarcastically praised the excellent "prophetic vision" of the paper:

> Do you ask where are those bright visions and scenes of future greatness and glory so confidently predicted by the *Scotsman* for the Confederacy. I answer they are in Utopia, or, if you will in the visionary and muddled brain of the editor of the *Scotsman* - the man who has done so much for the emancipation of the slave, and who is at present doing so much for the emancipation of the electors of Edinburgh from the thralldom of Whiggery and Conservatism ... I hope that his predictions as to the result of the election will just be as true as his hallucinations about the Confederacy."²

Addressing a large audience holding "divergent sympathies"³ on the war then still in progress, W.E. Baxter deliberately made it his business, as one who had twice visited the United States and who had closely studied its history and politics, to "throw out a few hints which will not be found in the *Times*, or in those other journals

---

¹ "The People and the Franchise": letter from "Jerubbaal" in *ibid*., 8 July, 1865.
² Letter from "An Elector", Edinburgh, in *ibid*., 1 July, 1865.
³ See reference to this fact in the introductory remarks of W.S. Souter, chairman, and in the vote of thanks, when John Adamson, Erchistside Works, referred to the "disturbing influence" of the Civil War on a whole world-wide circle of social and commercial interests, and commented that he did not ask the audience to endorse all that Baxter had said - *Dundee Advertiser*, 20 Jan., 1865.
which seem to get their information solely from that quarter".\(^1\)

Endorsing Baxter's strongly anti-Southern speech, the Dundee Advertiser found it a "very able, clear, and cogent statement of incontrovertible facts". Reminding its readers that the "pro-slavery Democrats" had held (and abused) all the chief offices in the Government for years before the Civil War, the Advertiser eagerly took up Baxter's criticism of the "pro-Southern press", accusing it of totally ignoring the history of the years immediately prior to the rebellion and of championing men who were attempting to overthrow a Constitution they had sworn to uphold. The Times and others of the press had jumped to applaud wrong-doers when they were winning - "as it ever is the fashion in that quarter to write high plaudits on successful wrong".\(^2\)

Nor was this section of the press seen to have adopted more enlightened attitudes to the United States during Reconstruction. Deploring the decision of the 1868 Democratic Convention to pay the national debt in greenbacks, the Advertiser went on to attack the British press for consistently supporting (at least up until then) a party which sought always to appeal to the secret sympathisers with the Rebellion, and which had "always been strongest in abusing Britain".

"In company with the Times, [the Tory journals], these misleaders of public opinion[.] have been the persistent eulogists of the Democrats".\(^3\)

---

1 Lecture on "The Great Struggle in America", delivered by W.E. Baxter for the Blairgowrie Mechanics' Institute, in New Hall, Blairgowrie, 17 Jan., 1865, in ibid.

2 Ibid., see also Aberdeen Free Press, 5 May, 20 Oct., 1865.

3 Dundee Advertiser, 10 July, 1868.

While the Advertiser was prepared to recognize that some Republicans were being foolish enough to advocate soft money, it was content to credit the Republican drive for greenbackism to simply a few "extreme partisans" like Benjamin Butler - see ibid.
From the tone of the examples already considered, there is a clear indication that even where attacks on the pro-Southern section of the British press were substantially influenced by the petty resentments of a pro-Northern minority group of smaller, regional journals, there was at the back of this a wider and much more basic factor - the class issue. Indeed, to some extent it is valid to see the censure levelled against the Press as simply an integral part of the broader indictment of British upper and upper-middle class sympathies, since the Times and its companions were unanimously judged by their critics to represent the interests and accommodate the views of the die-hard Tory-Whig elements within these classes. Certainly, in these years of reformist activity, no single international issue gave greater scope for Scottish reformers and radicals to parade their faith in the intrinsic worth, high character, and good judgement of the workers than did the American Civil War. And they made the most of it, drawing relentlessly on the allegedly sacrificial, selfless, nature of the working class response to the conflict, as against the coldly calculated, reactionary opinions of the upper and most of the middle classes.

Modern scholarship has effectively exploded the myth of a British - and even of a specifically Scottish - working class solidarity of opinion in favour of the North during the war. The important point so far as this thesis is concerned, however, is the fact that, in the immediate post-war years, certain Scots were themselves prepared, for the sake of a definite, practical purpose, to accept and publicly to maintain that there had been something very nearly approaching a British working class solidarity...

1 See Harrison, "British Labour and the Confederacy", passim., and "British Labor and American Slavery", passim.
consensus on support for the North.\(^1\) We have seen how the Glasgow Sentinel quickly erased its own pro-Southern record when it realized that the interests of the Scottish working class might best be served by stressing the altruism of the British workers in their steadfast condemnation of the Confederate fight for slavery.\(^2\)

For Councillor James Moir, a routine reform speech could gain a certain precise fervour by the injection of a reference to the Civil War. It was surely satisfying, alike for speaker and audience, to be able to remind the huge gathering at the Dumbarton reform demonstration that there had never been a public meeting in Scotland where the workers had advocated American slavery or sympathized with it, that such gatherings had been the province of the "learned" classes, who were now opposing reform again - this time at home.\(^3\) Moir's concern to play up the class issue in relation to recent attitudes towards America seems, indeed, to have been an indispensable part of his armour as one of Scotland's most prominent reformers. Thus, before moving the Scottish National Reform League's Address to the visiting William Lloyd Garrison, he personally issued a strong diatribe on the position taken by the upper classes during the war, maintaining that two out of every three of the governing classes in Glasgow had been "pro-slavery":

Greater ignorance than that displayed by the governing classes during the American war it was impossible for any man to conceive - it was actually disgraceful ... [It was motivated by] the

---

1 Harrison, "British Labor and American Slavery", p. 291, himself concedes that contemporary observers, committed reformers, and every member of the House of Commons agreed that the British working class had stood solidly and consistently by the Federal cause.

2 See above, pp. 27-28.

miserably selfish desire to see the great Republic broken up, and the government of mankind fail ...1

A similar line was followed by a yet more eminent Scotsman of the time. Duncan McLaren, who, by 1867 (with two years as an M.P. already behind him) had certainly mastered the technique of rallying lower and middle class reformist support to his side, still found it worthwhile to draw upon responses to the Civil War as an effective sop for his audience and rebuke for his opponents. Thus, he told a loudly appreciative meeting of Edinburgh electors and non-electors that the Americans had been very grateful for "the support which the intelligence of the working classes gave them in this country, when it was a notorious fact that nine-tenths of the richer classes were dead against them".2

The radicals' strange persistence in looking back to Civil War attitudes as a basis for attacking the governing classes and for underlining the class antagonisms of the late sixties is perhaps largely explainable by the fact that while it was marginally possible to continue to denounce the "anti-democratic" elements in Scottish press and society for their attitudes to American Reconstruction,3 the issues in the United States at this later period were so much more complex, so less clearly defined and definable that they gave rise to relatively less confident appraisals from these sources. Consequently, the discussion on Reconstruction problems proper tended to be by-passed by those seeking to identify a powerful, clear-cut international issue on which to censure the attitudes of the British upper classes. For example, for McLaren in 1867

---

1 Report of a public meeting held under the auspices of the Scottish National Reform League to present an Address to Garrison in Merchant's Hall, Glasgow, 19 July, 1867, in Glasgow Herald, 20 July, 1867.


3 See, for instance, below, pp. 280-292; Chapter IV, passim.
to have set about effectively challenging the essentially conservative attitudes towards Reconstruction of his own local detractors, the *Scotsman* and the *Edinburgh Courant*, it would have required a sophisticated knowledge not only of the basic inner workings of the United States political system but also of the constantly changing contemporary pattern of American political affiliations and faction - a degree of knowledge possessed neither by the press which had commented on the situation in the first place, nor by McLaren himself, and certainly not by the members of the general public. Furthermore, no Reconstruction policy as such could be held up for immediate open and ferocious attack in quite the same way as could the patently diabolical policy of the Southern slaveholders, which policy, their critics claimed, the British supporters of the Confederacy had condoned.

The essence of the reasoning behind the Scottish radical tirade against the "interested aristocracy" on this score was well illustrated by the *Caledonian Mercury*, which stigmatized the erstwhile sympathisers with the South as men who hoped that the great and glorious Republic of America had been severed and rent asunder, never again to be reunited, and who trusted that 'the aristocracy of the South', forming a powerful nation, would lessen the influence and strength of the Free States, rivet the chains of the slaves for all time, and prove to the satisfaction of despot everywhere that freedom and free institutions are incompatible with universal suffrage, vote by ballot, the extinction of all class privileges and class legislation, and the absence of a dominant Established Church.¹

More placidly, the *Dundee Advertiser* voiced exactly the same conviction (and that even after the 1867 Reform Bill had been passed):

---

¹ *Caledonian Mercury*, 11 Sept., 1865. The *Mercury* supported the principles and interests of the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland. See also *ibid.*, 14 Aug., 1865, where an editorial passionately accused the ruling heads of Britain - "the orders of privilege and despotism" - with aiding the Confederacy and attempting to have it recognized by Britain as a nation, complete with the "hapless bondsmen" and "a lewd and tyrannous oligarchy as its chief corner-stone".
the British advocates of Southern secession] did not sympathise with Southern independence as much as they abhorred popular government altogether. They professed to side with Jeff Davis and with the right of rebellion - they really sympathised with aristocratic tyranny and insolence.

And this pronouncement was again made, of course, against a background of earlier observations on the "right-heartedness" of the British people:

The meanest weaver of calico in this country abhorred the conduct of those who traded in their fellow creatures as cattle, and de-based men and women made in the image of GOD into property.

It was this straightforward attribution to the old American struggle of positive, directly opposing goals (the grossest tyranny versus freedom and the quest for basic human rights), and the identification of British class interests with these goals which made Scottish attitudes to the Civil War so durable a point of contention. Thus, when in autumn, 1866, a Conservative, Kintrea, offered himself as a Parliamentary candidate in the strongly radical burgh of Paisley, the heavy opposition which he encountered was squarely focussed on the fact that he had, during the American Civil War, accepted an invitation from Lord Wharncliffe, the Marquis of Salisbury, the Marquis of Bath, and other noblemen to become agent for the advancement of the Confederate cause in Parliament.

His protestations that he had only accepted the post on the assurance that his prospective clients had no intention of helping to perpetuate Negro slavery carried no weight with the huge audience of electors and non-electors which he addressed, nor with the Glasgow Herald which observed that, even if Kintrea had not perhaps wished it, the success of

1 Dundee Advertiser, 11 Sept., 1868.
2 Ibid., 4 April, 1865. Original emphasis. See also ibid., 20 Jan., 1865; 2 Nov., 1866; 9 Feb., 1869.
3 Glasgow Herald, 7 Sept., 1868. Paisley Reform Society had been the first in Britain to support the Northern cause - see Botsford, op. cit., pp. 619-620.
the pro-South advocate in Parliament must inevitably have led to the perpetuation of American slavery, and that it was only through the non-success of his clients that freedom had been established throughout the United States.² Paisley's Councillor Cochrane, an eager and bitter critic of upper class sympathy for the South,³ and a staunch supporter of the constituency's defending Liberal M.P., H.E. Crum Ewing,⁴ was so enraged by Kintrea's candidature that he wrote to John Bright, explaining about the post as a Confederate agent and asking his views on the candidates. Cochrane was careful to make public Bright's reply that Kintrea had been bold to stand for nomination, and that the voters should definitely stick by Ewing.⁵

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 7 Sept., 1868.
2 See above, Chapter II, p. 124.
3 Addressing his constituents on 31 Jan., 1865, Crum Ewing had clearly indicated his support for the Federal cause on the grounds that the struggle directly involved the abolition of slavery - though he conceded that on the question of paying so high a price for the maintenance of the Union there was room for difference of opinion. See Scotsman, 1 Feb., 1865.

Bright was soon to have the opportunity of expressing himself more fully within a Scottish context on the unhappy attitude which the aristocracy and many of the middle class had adopted towards the Civil War. In a speech following his installation as a burgess of Edinburgh, he declared that if British self-interest and jealousy had been "stripped from the question as it really was ... there is not an Englishman, not a Scotchman ... who would have said he hoped that that insurrection should succeed". Report of speech by John Bright on receiving the freedom of Edinburgh, 3 Nov., 1868, in Daily Review, 4 Nov., 1868.

In a very real sense, those Scottish radical elements who during the Reconstruction years drew attention to the disparity which had existed between the attitudes of the British monied classes and the British working class towards the American Civil War took their cue from John Bright himself, for while the armed conflict was in progress, the Rochdale M.P. had made a point of publicly contrasting the right-minded, pro-Northern sentiments of the British workers with the deplorable support for the Confederacy displayed by statesmen, rich men, and the press - see Richard Greenleaf, "British Labor against American Salvery" in Science and Society, Vol. 17, 1953, pp. 44-50.
A much more positive evil, in the sphere of international relations, was seen by The Reformer to have developed as a result of the recent short-sighted and blameworthy governmental and upper class outlooks on America. The first edition of the Reformer appeared on 15 August, 1868, published in Edinburgh, and edited by the city's radical councillor, David Lewis. Dedicated to "the industrial classes of Scotland", it adopted from the outset an advanced Liberal stand, pledging itself to "the consolidation and extension of recent political progress, and the introduction of social and industrial questions to a more just and prominent position than they have hitherto had".

Not particularly interested in the working out of America's domestic problems of Reconstruction, the thorny path of the 'Alabama' negotiations, on the other hand, prompted the journal to take up the cudgel against British wartime treatment of the North. In the first of a series of 'letters to Working Men', "An old Radical", having argued that American fractiousness was only natural in view of Britain's deplorable action over Confederate cruisers and so forth, went on to state his belief that there must be a wider study of foreign - and especially American - affairs, and that the initiative in this must come from the workers. Insisting that it was always in the best interests of the worker to preserve peace, the writer urged working men to "bestir themselves" and push for a settlement of the negotiations, which were otherwise likely to be "hung up indefinitely". It was seen as one occasion when

1 Lewis had been present at a meeting of Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society in honour of Garrison on 12 July, 1867, where he had censured the British press for its pro-Southern attitude during the war, and "commented severely" on the silence of the Church on the conflict. See Scotsman, 13 July, 1867.
2 The Reformer, 15 Aug., 1868.
workmen can, if they will, assert their power, and prove their
title to it by showing themselves the guardians of their own
welfare and that of their common country.  

Certainly, in their "intellectual imbecility or moral decrepitude", the
governing classes were judged to have failed miserably in the related
tasks of providing for the working class and preserving good Anglo-
American relations. While the Reformer recognized that "A quarrel with
America means want of work and dear bread", it also bitterly acknowledged
that "the mismanagement of British rulers" during the Civil War had
during the Reconstruction era thrown the United States into an unnatural
friendship with "despotic Russia" instead of "liberty-loving Britain".  
In the depressed economic conditions of late 1869, the old class polar-
isation on the Civil War was accordingly fastened to a more militant call
to Scottish workers for action. Urging the working class to assert its
rights, to demand universal suffrage, it was not to the contemporary
struggle of the American Negro freedman to win justice and equality that
the Reformer directed attention but to the selfishness, corruption, and
incompetence of the British governing classes as exemplified by their
actions regarding the Civil War: "Did they not heartlessly help to pro-
tract and embitter the struggle by extending their moral (?) (sic) support
to the side that gloried in human slavery as an institution?".  

1 'Letters to Working Men': "The Dispute with America" by "An old Radical", Reformer, 27 Feb., 1869.  
2 Ibid., 9 Oct., 1869.  
3 'Letters to Working Men': "Britain and America" by "An old Radical", ibid., 27 March, 1869.  
4 'Letters to Working Men': "Russia and America" by "An old Radical", ibid., 3 April, 1869. See also "Russia, the Mischief-Maker", 10 April, 1869; "Britain, America, and Russia", 17 April, 1869.  
5 Ibid., (leader, headed "The Poverty of the People and its cause), 9 Oct., 1869.
discounting the highly ambivalent attitudes to Negro enfranchisement held by the Scottish "radical" press in the first place,\(^1\) it remains an obvious fact that since the vilification of the British upper classes formed so central a part of the Scottish drive for reform, the business could better be advanced by reminders of the government's "assist[ance to] the slave oligarchy of the South to perpetuate and extend slavery"\(^2\) rather than by reasoned appeals to Parliament to emulate the United States Congress in enfranchising all the working class.

But the Liberal reformers did not quite have it all their own way. On the other side of the fence, also, sporadic attempts were made to capitalize politically on apparently suspect affiliations with America. In an editorial recording the death of Lee, and observing that he had been more bitterly attacked by certain elements in Britain than he had been in the Northern states, the Scotsman took the opportunity to combine criticism of the radicals' excessive rancour and spite with a thinly disguised suggestion that their support of the North had been hypocritical:

That school of politicians which has not hitherto shown that it has much of generosity among its principles, and which adopted the cause of the Northern States though it involved principles the very opposite of those which had been supported in Europe, became more Federal than the Federals, outdid Mr Sumner in bitterness, and never to the latest (sic) moment forgave General Lee any more than it ever forgave Jeff Davis.\(^3\)

This cynicism had been capped much earlier, however, by the Edinburgh Courant, which seized on Laurence Oliphant's maiden speech defending the 'Alabama' claims to advance one of its favourite themes — that America

\(^1\) This aspect is considered in Chapter VI, pp. 80-93.
\(^2\) "The American Question": letter from "Veritas", Edinburgh, in Reformer, 29 May, 1869. "Veritas" suggested that a special tax should be levied on those with over £1,000 p.a. in order to meet as liberally as possible the United States claims on the 'Alabama'.
\(^3\) Scotsman, 18 Oct., 1870.
was admired by many British M.P.'s essentially because this was an attitude which seemed to win approval in Parliamentary ranks. Scoffing at Scottish Liberals in general, but maintaining that there was no necessary connection between even Liberalism and "truckling to the United States", the Courant scathingly concluded that it seems, [however] as if our younger politicians were allured by the triumph of Mr Forster into fancying that philo-Americanism is the best passport to office. Perhaps they are not very far wrong at present ... Not unnaturally, Mr Oliphant may have fancied that philo-Americanism would do something for him, since it had made Mr. W.E. Forster Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies.¹

III The post-war continuation of undiluted Scottish sympathy for Southern war aims, and the identification of the Confederate cause with the ancient Scottish struggle for independence

Despite the contumely heaped on their conduct by interested parties and by those who charged that, as a result of it, Britain's image as a defender of basic liberties had been seriously tarnished,² there was, indeed, little indication during the Reconstruction era that those Scots who had favoured the South had recanted their views. Nor was there even much discernible reticence in continuing publicly to affirm the old conviction that the Southern resort to arms had not constituted a rebellion pure and simple, but had been a genuine - and largely justifiable - bid to win national independence. Seeking to explain the volume of British support for the Confederacy, the London correspondent of the pro-

¹ Edinburgh Courant, 27 Feb., 1866. The use of the American situation to illustrate the argument that self-interest was the exclusive motivation of British Liberals' actions was further demonstrated in a comparison between Thaddeus Stevens and John Bright, when it was affirmed that Stevens had made a speech abusing Johnson "in language only paralleled in our own country by Mr. Bright when denouncing Conservatism with an eye to a dinner invitation from Lord Russell". - ibid., 8 March, 1866.

² See, for instance, Aberdeen Free Press, 5 May, 1865; A.F. Stoddard, Slavery or Freedom in America, or the Issue of the War. A lecture delivered at Paisley, 26 Jan., 1863 and published in pamphlet form, Glasgow, 1863, pp. 49-50; Robert Mackenzie, The United States of America, p. 274; Rev. Dr. William Anderson, John Street U.P. Church, Glasgow, at a public breakfast in honour of Garrison in Merchant's Hall, Glasgow, who spoke of "the dishonour they did our country" - Scotsman, 20 July, 1867.
Northern Aberdeen Free Press suggested that it had been primarily motivated not so much by an unshakeable belief in the Southern cause as by the fact that "we thought they [the Confederates] represented the 'little 'un' in the fight".¹

While there was certainly some grain of truth in this, his implication that the residue of sympathy would quickly dissolve after the Southern defeat was - at least so far as Scotland was concerned - grossly inaccurate. Taking stock of Scottish attitudes to the political situation in the United States at the time of Johnson's electioneering tour in 1866, the Dundee Courier based its prediction that there would be much sympathy for the Johnson-Seward policy solidly on the grounds that there was "no proof that sympathy with the Secessionists has died out in Scotland"; and of course the survival of that sympathy would directly intensify hopes for a speedy and painless reconstruction policy.²

The Courier itself spoke from a pro-Johnson standpoint, but its conclusions are not less valuable because of that since they remain a valid comment on the development of attitudes to Reconstruction among those who had vigorously advocated the Southern cause. Thus, the tone was set for all the Edinburgh Courant's subsequent attitudes towards the South during Reconstruction (and, of course, towards those who sought to legislate for it) by the temper of its initial response to the news of the fall of Richmond and Petersburg:

The sympathy shown to the officers and crew of the Shenandoah at Melbourne, the capital of democratic Victoria, has proved how false is the assertion that the British feeling for the South is confined to one section or party, and does not extend wherever there is a capacity for admiring the heroic resistance of a minority, and a struggle, unsurpassed in its gallantry, for what may be called national independence.³

---

¹ Aberdeen Free Press, 2 June, 1865.
² Dundee Courier, 21 Sept., 1866.
³ Edinburgh Courant, 17 April, 1865.
At no point did the paper seek to play down its strong bias towards the South. Indeed, not even content with reasserting its own conviction that "never did a nation show more united or devoted patriotism than did the ... gallant [Southern] people who were sacrificing everything for freedom," the Courant ultimately issued a spirited defence of all British sympathy which had been accorded to the Confederacy. Identifying "sheer national arrogance and self-sufficiency" as the root of American "hostility and suspiciousness" towards Britain, the editorial attacked the United States for refusing to acknowledge that Britain could have been activated by other than "base and sinister purposes and feelings" in withholding sympathy for the North. With a significant appropriation of terminology usually reserved for descriptions of the condition of the slaves it continued:

The idea that we [the British] did not unanimously sympathise with the North because we deemed it would have been better for humanity if nine millions of freemen were not forced to bend under a yoke which they detested [i.e. the Southern whites being chained to a Union which they hated] and did sympathise with the South because we admired the heroism and courage and self-devotion with which it fought for national independence - is a stranger to the American mind.²

Perhaps, however, the Courant protested too much about the unfairness of the suggestion that ulterior motives substantially influenced British thinking. For in its own columns, the paper betrayed an early post-war concern over the possibility that the United States might be "re-combined into an insolent and aggressive whole, capable of menacing the rest of civilisation".³ While naturally disposed to approve of Johnson's con-

1 Ibid., 19 April, 1865. This particular editorial deplored the fact that the Southern cause had been denied recognition by European powers, even though more worthy of it than any nation that had struggled for freedom. See also ibid., 21 June, 1865; 15 July, 1867.
2 Ibid., 25 May, 1865.
3 Ibid., 17 April, 1865.
ciliatory policy towards the South, fears (bolstered by the realization that South as well as North had been irritated by British wartime policy) involuntarily grew that "should North and South be reunited, then might come the time for them to attempt to take a joint revenge". Accordingly, although heartily endorsing the President's veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill and his reconstruction measures generally, and hyper-critical of the Radicals' obstructionist tactics, the Courant was nevertheless unable to restrain its misgivings:

But any British satisfaction with the restoration of peace and unity to the American Union cannot be unalloyed. As the internal difficulties of the States disappear or diminish, ours in dealing with them - as we have often said - may be intensified and multiplied.

This crippling restriction on the Courant's enthusiasm for a speedy policy of reconstruction - so completely contrary to what might have been expected from a paper of such strongly held pro-Southern views - brings to the fore an extremely interesting conflict in its sympathies. In essence, the pull was between the advocacy of a fair deal for the Southern states with whom all its affiliations and sympathies lay, and the apprehensions felt by an ultra-Conservative journal towards the possible foreign policy, and the likely effects on British institutions, of a strengthened democracy. Thus the conflict was, paradoxically, rooted in the antagonism of two conservatisms - a) the conservatism which favoured the socially stratified society of the South, and wanted to see Southern men of influence and breeding reinstated to positions of power in the

1 Ibid., 16 Oct., 1865.
2 Ibid., 8 March, 1866.
3 Ibid. Although still uneasy, the Courant gradually became less alarmist on this score, taking refuge in the belief that there would long be "tendencies of rebellion and disruption" within United States society - see Ibid., 3 Feb., 1869.
councils of the nation, and b) the conservatism (on balance, understandably stronger) which feared that a full reconciliation of North and South would mean the emergence of a democratic giant which could, and probably would, threaten Britain not only through a consciously belligerent foreign policy but also through the infiltration of democratic ideas into the British body politic.¹

Although something of a popular Scottian (rather than Scottish) nationalism seems to have indeed enlivened the Edinburgh Courant’s sympathies for the struggling South,² it seems reasonable to suggest that in this particular case, the distrust of the American Leviathan was not to any appreciable extent determined by a deep regional dissatisfaction with the English Leviathan. The Courant was almost certainly the most "Anglicized" of Scottish newspapers at this time, submerging the interests of Scotland in those of Britain as a whole, and taking a fierce pride and concern in Britain’s status as a world power. Consequently, it was the threat to the constitutional solidity of a united Britain which the Courant so greatly feared from the reunification of the transatlantic Republic.

In the Scotsman’s opinion, a misguided attachment to "democracy" in the shape of the Union and the Constitution was judged to have blinded the Northern people to the legality and constitutionality of the Southern attempt to secede.³ Relatively less alarmed than the Courant over the possible intentions of a reunited America, the Scotsman gave full rein

¹ The day after the Courant had so candidly expressed its fears regarding a reunited America, the following considered judgement on democracy appeared: "We say that democracy and constitutionalism are antagonistic systems, because the latter depends on the preservation of a due equilibrium between all classes in the community; the former upon the unqualified supremacy of a single class." Ibid., 9 March, 1866.

² See below, pp. 203-204.

³ Scotsman, 23 January, 1866.
throughout Reconstruction to its cry for speedy reconciliation and a swift and complete renewal of all the rights and privileges (except, of course, slavery) held by the white Southerners before the war. This plea was based on the firm conviction that the Southern effort had been "something quite different both in nature and magnitude from what is ordinarily understood by a rebellion"; by the consideration that it was impossible for a purportedly democratic government to exclude from political privileges for any length of time what amounted "numerically, geographically, and otherwise [to] a whole nation". ¹ Admitting that the controversy over Reconstruction was "so encrusted with technical details, and so complicated by party manoeuvres" that it was very difficult to analyse accurately,² the paper accordingly elected to base its attitudes to the ensuing Reconstruction measures on certain "visible and comprehensive" premises regarding the nature of the Civil War. Basically, these were:

1. That the North had fought solely for preservation of the Union under the Constitution, but that there had also been a "large and earnest portion" of Northern people who simultaneously fought to end slavery, and a zealous abolitionist stream which, ostensibly battling for the Constitution, had really been concerned to secure abolition. As a result of this there had existed a great fundamental incongruity within the Northern ranks because the American Constitution which they fought for sanctioned and virtually guaranteed slavery by providing that it could only be destroyed with the slaveowner's consent. This inconsistency had therefore inevitably become the basis for much difficulties during Reconstruction because, by forcing abolition on the conquered South, the North had violated the Constitution it fought to preserve, had "alter[ed] the Constitution

¹ Ibid., 7 Oct., 1865.
² Ibid., 1 Sept., 1866.
with constitutional formalities, but by palpably unconstitutional means ... [and] set [it] aside in substance whilst adhering to it in practice".¹

Time and again this argument was used by the Scotsman as a basis for criticizing measures of Congressional Reconstruction, the paper's standard contention being that since the "Radicals" had not scrupled to break the Constitution over emancipation in the first place, they were ready to frame legislation in total disregard of it during Reconstruction.

2. That the South was not merely the revolted and subdued portion of a State one and indivisible, but that - according to the American Constitution - the several states had always been only partly united with each other.²

Again, because of this belief, the Scotsman naturally tended towards criticism of Reconstruction policies which continued to exclude the old planter element in the South from immediate representation in Congress.

3. That while the North wanted to be united to the South, the South itself wanted to be separate. This, the Scotsman recognized, was "the mother of all difficulties - the real cause of the war, the real obstacle to reunion". Thus, assessing the progress of Reconstruction up until the "furious" autumn election contest of 1866, and speculating on the advent of a renewal of something like Civil War, the paper concluded:

To govern against its will what is virtually a nation, and govern it under institutions the principle of which is self government; to unite in fraternal bonds with those who hate you, and so unite under a Constitution the principle of which is ... self-government - these are the problems to be solved, and no wonder that the solution is not easy and immediate.³

Companion to the view that the South - after the war as well as during it - sincerely desired dissolution of the Union was the belief that the two antagonistic sections could never be successfully reunited. As early as

---

¹ Ibid.
² This basic argument is well advanced in ibid., 1 Oct., 1866.
³ Ibid.
1862, the Scotsman had maintained that North and South could never again become "one nation in spirit or in truth", and this basic conviction was sustained not only for the duration of hostilities but throughout the Reconstruction era. And despite its fears regarding the likely repercussions of a workable reunification of both sections, the Edinburgh Courant never really lost faith in its early premise that "These States can never be again united. The North may endeavour to hold the South as a conquered country, but to talk of union is an absurdity". As late as 1871, it believed that though a renewed attempt at secession was not then imminent

"Lost causes" have a habit of turning up again in history; and utterly wrecked and hopeless as the Southern cause must have appeared to all its friends and sympathisers, it was hardly possible to believe the Southern population would ever heartily acquiesce in the verdict of the war. There is room enough in America for both North and South, and the two peoples are irreconcilably hostile.

No Scot adhered more firmly to the view that the North was forcing the South into an unnatural union than did Charles Mackay. In August, 1866, he wrote to John Blackwood, "The Civil War is not at an end. The original elements of mischief are all busily at work - and will produce a new explosion". Blackwood hardly needed reminding of Mackay's opinions on this matter, however, since in two articles for Blackwood's Magazine earlier

---

1 Ibid., 11 Oct., 1862, quoted in Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, p. 536.


3 Edinburgh Courant, 14 April, 1865.

4 Ibid., 15 Sept., 1871. See also ibid., 26 April, 1865; 11 Jan., 21 Jan., 1866. At least during the early post-war period of social and political flux in the United States, several pro-Southern Scottish journals reasoned along these lines - see, for instance, Daily Review, 18 Dec., 1865; Inverness Courier, 20, 27 April, 1865; North British Daily Mail, 24 April, 23 Sept., 1865; Perthshire Courier, 18 April, 1865.

5 Charles Mackay to John Blackwood, 16 Aug., 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 54-55.
in the year he had made it quite plain that he considered the "reunion" of North and South to be

the union of a strong man with a wife who hates him - with one whom he has scourged, beaten, spat upon, bruised, maimed and insulted by words more venomous than deeds ...

He subsequently embellished this view by declaring that while the North had conquered the South by "brute force" and "pauperised everyone in the South, ... negroes as well as masters", Congress, through its destruction of the Constitution and its contempt for State rights and local liberties, was not even attempting to restore the Union on a viable basis.

At the back of Mackay's reasoning - and of those others who made similar assessments - was the firm belief that permanent reunification was impossible because the two societies, North and South, were innately and irrevocably quite different from each other. The fullest exposition of this was, indeed, put forward by Mackay in an article which was apparently "reprinted complete in all the principal Southern States with complimentary allusions both to the writer and to the Magazine". Drawing on his considerable first-hand knowledge of the Republic, he concluded that there were basically three factors at work in the social and political system tending to produce a disruption of the Union when the time was right.


2 Mackay, "Blackie and Jones - democracy in America" in ibid., Vol. 101, Feb., 1867, p. 236. Mackay here applied the old argument that the Southerners were no more worthy to be branded rebels than were the Americans in 1776. See also his Forty Years' Recollections, Vol. 2, pp. 412, 423.

   For much earlier examples of reasoning on this line, see Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 502-503.

3 Mackay to John Blackwood, 26 Sept., 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 14212, fol. 64-65. According to Mackay, President Johnson was also "greatly pleased" with the article.
In the first place, there was the effect of climate on the national and individual character of the two sections. Asserting that slavery had been confined to the South only because of its unprofitability in the colder North where white labour had been cheaper and better, Mackay argued that the wide regional variations in temperature, in producing totally divergent patterns of labour and society, had greatly contributed to immense dissimilarities in character, undiminished in the years following the Civil War.

A second cause of estrangement was the continuing conflict of interests between an economy based on agriculture in the South and on manufacturing in the North. The old fight over the tariff had not subsided, Mackay recognized, with the ending of active hostilities. 2

Lastly, and most important of all, there was "the aggressive, dictatorial, and intolerable assumptions of North or 'Down-East' Puritanism to meddle with other people's affairs". 3 His intentionally harsh denunciation 4 of New England Puritanism centred around the conviction that, as a creed, it tended to the proscription of individual liberty since it was dedicated to the radical alteration or complete overthrow of all political, social and religious beliefs which did not conform to its own narrow interpretation of "liberty". Declaring that the Puritans had a greater belief in their own infallibility than even Pope Hildebrand, he drew up a list of "intolerant acts", passed by early Puritan legislatures in New England, and triumphantly

---

2 Ibid., pp. 26-27.  
3 Ibid., p. 24.  
4 Forwarding the article to Blackwood, he wrote in a covering letter: "I am severe upon the Puritans - but trust there is no harm in that - but the contrary". Mackay to John Blackwood, 8 June, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 26-27.
proclaimed that there never had been anything like them in the South. From this premise it was but a short step to his ultimate argument - that the mid-19th century South, already full of misgivings about slavery, had only been goaded into elaborate defence of the institution by the exasperating and disgusting threats of the Puritan ultra-abolitionists. In its presumptuous attempt to completely destroy the pre-existing order of things, Puritanism "threw down a gauntlet which Conservatism was compelled to lift". And although the divisive force of slavery had been removed by the conflict, the essential ideological and spiritual differences which persisted between the section moulded by "New Englandism", and the states which had formed the Old South, meant that the post-war "restoration" tended to be one of name only.²

Precisely the same sentiments governed the North British Daily Mail's persistent belief that the Confederacy would one day rise again. The consequence of the South's return to allegiance to the Washington Government would not be a rejuvenated Federal Union of states, it felt, but "a strong Northern Republic - New Englandism its animating principle - which has annexed by conquest the territory called the Southern States".³

Equating the motives of "the New England war party" with those of Bismarck in invading Schleswig and Holstein, the paper directly accused "New England despotism" of fighting the Civil War to further its aim of becoming the dominant power in the United States.⁴ Neither the Mail nor Mackey believed that this object had been secured in the long-term by the Northern victory, however; both foresaw a concerted effort by West and South to combat the

---

1 Mackey, "The Principles and Issues of the American Struggle", p. 27.
2 Ibid., pp. 27-32.
3 North British Daily Mail, 21 April, 1865.
4 Ibid., 18 April, 1865.
political and economic stranglehold of the Eastern states,\(^1\) and Mackay even envisaged the ultimate existence of "three great and not necessarily hostile Republics, those of the North, the South, and the Pacific Slopes".\(^2\)

Aside from his basic conservatism, which was revolted in true Carlylean fashion by the over-zealous, fanatical "negrophilists"\(^3\) and by the political "revolutionists and terrorists" of the Reconstruction era,\(^4\) Mackay had personal reasons for feeling particularly bitter towards the reform-conscious "Puritans" of the North. Having been furnished by George Combe with letters of introduction to leading philanthropists and anti-slavery apostles,\(^5\) his lecture tour of the United States in 1857-58 had been characterized by the close acquaintanceships he had formed with such men as Sumner, Greeley, Seward, and Chase.\(^6\) Especially friendly with Seward, he became the latter's guide and constant companion during

---

1 See ibid., 15 Sept., 1865; Mackay, "The Principles and Issues of the American Struggle", p. 34.

2 Mackay, Through the Long Day, Vol. 2, p. 240. This view dated at least from his first trip to the United States in 1857-58, when his observations - helped apparently by the convictions of Seward (Recollections, Vol. 2, pp. 385-390) - led him to conclude that if slavery was ever abolished, there could well be a tripartite sectionalisation of the Republic - see Life and Liberty, Vol. 2, pp. 52-53. And as American wartime correspondent for the London Times, he seems to have attempted to popularize the theory - see, for instance, extract from a report by "the New York correspondent of the Times" in Scotsman, 10 Jan., 1865.

3 See Mackay, "The Negro and the Negrophilists", passim. (The vitriolic attack on philanthropists concerned with the Negro Freedman, and the savage racism which characterize this article are discussed in Chapters V and VIII, below). Mackay had early believed that it was because of the exaggerations of "malignant philanthropists" that slaveowners had been enabled to think they had vindicated slavery when they had proved that they did not actually mistreat the slave - see Life and Liberty, Vol. 1, p. 315.

4 Mackay to John Blackwood, 2 May, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. h212, fol. 20-21.

5 Mackay, Forty Years' Recollections, Vol. 2, p. 375.

6 Ibid., pp. 363-399.
a visit to London in 1859. 1

With his subsequent three and a half years' sojourn in the United States as Times war correspondent, however, these old relationships were to alter drastically. Seward quickly pronounced himself disappointed with the content of Mackay's reports to the Times, and implored him to speak out boldly for the Northern side. 2 When he continued to produce rabidly pro-Confederate material, the breach in friendship was almost total, with Seward writing on the eve of Mackay's departure for Britain in late 1865 "It has been very hard to find you, the friend of my best manhood, among ... [my country's] enemies. I pray God to forgive you for the great crime you have committed". 3 In Sumner's case, the estrangement was complete, 4 and although the friendship with Greeley was amicably enough maintained, he, too, had initially attacked Mackay in the Tribune. 5

Mackay's chagrin at such treatment did not mellow over the years because he continued to insist that his erstwhile friends - Seward and Greeley in particular - had simply deserted the stand they had taken relative to the Union when first he knew them, namely, that circumstances could arise where the only logical course would be to condone the division

---

1 Ibid., p. 390.
2 Mackay, Through the Long Day, p. 272.
3 Quoted in ibid., p. 274. The bitterness in Mackay's recollections of Seward - from the credence he gave to the rumour that Seward had been prepared to offer him a substantial sum of secret service money to support the North in the Times (ibid., pp. 272-273) to the malicious little anecdote about how Seward had bribed a British policeman who had told him to stop smoking during a visit to the Crystal Palace (Recollections, p. 392) - indicate the very deep impression made on Mackay's feelings by this particular loss.
4 Mackay, Through the Long Day, p. 274 - "my opinions on the war had given him unpardonable offence".
5 Mackay, Forty Years' Recollections, pp. 413-423; Through the Long Day, pp. 275-276.
of the Union. He summed up the position as follows:

I was an enemy of slavery, but with Mr Seward, Mr Greeley, and all the more important abolitionists of the time, I recognised the right of the South to secede from the North, if the two could not live happily together ... \(^1\)

The change in attitude which he found among these men on his arrival in the United States in 1862 he attributed to the pressure of the "aggressive" anti-slavery forces of Massachusetts, "that zealously bitter corner of the Union, sometimes called New England" whose die-hard anti-secessionist opinions had been so effectively propagated as to gain prevalence throughout the North. \(^2\) With his penchant for analysing situations in terms of cliques and personalities, Mackay found in the New England "Puritans" the perfect scapegoat for the general ostracism which was his lot as one of the most blatant supporters of the Confederacy in the war-torn North.

While Mackay thus had special personal reasons for so loyalty boasting his continued sympathy for the Southern cause during Reconstruction, the overt pride which he took in recording his position as a supporter of the Confederacy was not unique. Other elements in Scotland which continued to share his totally unshakable belief that an attempt at dissolution of the Union at some point was the most natural of all occurrences and that the Southern secession could not by any stretch of the imagination be considered illegal since it was simply the culmination of an old tradition fostered by North as well as by South, \(^3\) were similarly proud to restate their Southern predilections.

Shortly after the end of the war, the Dundee Courier confidently

\(^1\) Mackay, Forty Years' Recollections, p. 412. See also ibid., pp. 385-390; The Founders of the American Republic, p. 380.

\(^2\) Mackay, Forty Years' Recollections, p. 413.

\(^3\) Mackay, writing in the 1880s, remained as adamant on these points as he had been a quarter of a century before - see The Founders of the American Republic (1885), pp. 386, 387.
claimed that "the vast body of the intelligent people" of Britain had sympathized with the Southern cause, while the considerable support for the Federals, if sincere enough, had been "very vulgar".\(^1\) Subsequent American arrogance over the 'Alabama' claims, and the threat to international Conservatism seen to be posed by the apparent Radical take-over in the United States during Reconstruction increased Scottish readiness to reassert the validity of having supported the Southern cause. Thus, Sumner's fiercely anti-British speech, demanding heavy compensation for the depredations of British built Confederate cruisers, occasioned a timely reminder that British sympathy had been "unmistakably" with the Confederates in the war, and that "our most intelligent politicians" still believed that the South had had a perfect right to withdraw from the Union.\(^2\)

Roundly condemning the American attempts to "call the British people to account for their personal sympathies", the Edinburgh Courant candidly admitted that Laird must have known what the 'Alabama' was ultimately intended for, and that it could be assumed that the ship was constructed in the hope and expectation that it would aid the Southern cause. Seeing nothing at all unethical in this, the Courant recalled that "a large section of fellow-Britons" had similarly hoped to see the South secure its independence and rise to a position of strength as a power totally separate from the North:

> We honestly believe that the sympathies of the better classes of British society were wholly with the South during the war; and we confess that we, along with ... many more, deeply regretted the actual issue of the war.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Dundee Courior, 11 Oct., 1865.

\(^2\) Elgin Courant, 7 May, 1869.

\(^3\) Edinburgh Courant, 29 May, 1869. See also ibid., 25 May, 1869.
In Conservative circles, the regret was all the more acute in consequence of the seemingly revolutionary social policy pushed through by the Republican Congress at the height of Reconstruction. The victorious region which had taken its ultimate "galling" revenge by forcing the South to be "ruled by those who were its servants - by a low and degraded race, which, let the advocates of 'progress' say what they may, can never reach the high level of an intelligent civilisation",¹ was both despicable and potentially dangerous enough to strengthen the Edinburgh Courant's conviction in the justice of the Southern cause: "We are not ashamed now that such was our attitude, and that we conceived hopes for Southern independence that have not been realised".² After all, a powerful, autonomous South would have provided on the continent of America a convenient conservative balance against the dark, unruly forces of rampant democracy which threatened to spill out from the heterogenous cities of the North and engulf not only the whole of the United States but also, in time, the institutions of Great Britain.

But whatever their underlying reasons for having championed the Confederates, it becomes clear that the vast majority of those Scots who did so (with the notable exception of the Glasgow Sentinel, and, to some extent, Edinburgh's Daily Review) showed little or no later inclination to minimize their attachment to the lost cause. On the contrary, as we have noted, there was in some cases a conscious pride in boasting of a sympathy for the South which stretched back beyond the immediate sympathy for the plight of a conquered people during Reconstruction. It would seem, indeed, that relative to their English counterparts,³ there was in

¹ Ibid., 15 Sept., 1871.
² Ibid.
³ Sheldon Van Auken, English Sympathy for the Southern Confederacy (unpublished B. Litt. thesis, Oxford, 1957), pp. 11, 101, suggests that after the war, English sympathizers with the South were extremely reticent in admitting to a genuine liking and enthusiasm for the Confederacy - which sentiments, he argues, had nevertheless existed. (pp. 98-99).
the Reconstruction era a much greater readiness and boldness among Scots to defend the pro-Southern opinions they had held during the war.

There has not been discovered sufficient direct evidence of conscious Scottish identification of the Confederate struggle for independence with that of the ancient Scottish fight against England (or, indeed, with that of the contemporary Scottish battle against English over-centralization) to warrant the conclusion that this difference was principally determined by a more intense Scottish feeling for the South, based on a romantic analogy between the Confederacy's aspirations and the traditional Scottish struggle for independence. At the same time, however, there can be no doubt but that Scotland's peculiar historical background, recently so effectively popularized and romanticized by Scott,¹ remained a constant, important image in the minds of Scots and Americans, both sympathetic and hostile² to the defunct Confederacy, who sought to clarify for themselves or for others the essential spirit of the attempted Southern secession - and, indeed, of the Southern reaction to defeat.

Unquestionably the most terse and forthright assumption of a spiritual affinity between the Scottish and the Southern struggles was made long after the Reconstruction era by Jefferson Davis' friend, James Smith of Glasgow. Having had more personal reasons than most Scots zealously to support the South, Smith returned in 1884 to Munfordville, Kentucky, to unveil a monument to his brother Robert who had fallen there in 1862.³

¹ The impact of Scott's works on the Old South is a familiar theme which has been fully analysed in Rollin G. Osterweis, Romanticism and Nationalism in the Old South (Gloucester, Mass., 1964), pp. 26, 41-53, 61-63, 136, 138, 162-165, 165, 169, 170.
² As Osterweis, ibid., p. 51, has importantly pointed out, the ante-bellum North was also captivated by the writings of Scott. Visiting the United States in 1868, David Macrae had discovered, for instance, that Wendell Phillips had "read and re-read Sir Walter Scott with such avidity and enjoyment that he said himself it was a hard thing to get the Conservative taste out of his mouth and acquire a liking for Radicalism" - Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 396.
³ See above, Chapter II, p. 82.
At the unveiling ceremony he commented:

His [Robert's] most intimate historical knowledge was with his native Scotland's long and sore, but stern and ultimately successful struggle to preserve her integrity, and his impulse and judgement clearly fixed his action in the same vital emergency which came at last upon his adopted state.¹

For those who supported the South, patriotism in the Scott mould, complete with nostalgic devotion to, and pride in, the old Scottish struggle for independence, certainly formed the basis for the direct analogies they drew between the historic Scottish cause and the Confederate one. Something of a critical authority on the works of Scott, and complimentary to the sentiments of "nationality" which characterized them,² the Rev. George Gilfillan, in common with the majority of leading Scottish Voluntary and Evangelical ministers, had sympathized warmly with the mid-century nationalist aspirations of Mazzini, Kossuth, and Garibaldi.³

Where he parted company with his clerical brethren, however, was in extending the support which he had given the European movements to cover the cause of the Confederate States of America. We have already noted how Gilfillan, from a position of total commitment to the anti-slavery cause,⁴ moved to support the South through the sincere belief that it

¹ Quoted in Wiche, "Britons in the Civil War", pp. 4-7.
² See report of a lecture by Gilfillan on the works of Sir Walter Scott delivered to a large audience in the Queen Street Hall, Edinburgh, on 7 April, 1870, in Scotsman, 9 April, 1870.
⁴ For a biographical note on Gilfillan, see Appendix I.
fought legitimately for independence and, furthermore, through the concomitant belief that the North was "hypocritical" in waging a "wretched ... cruel" war ostensibly for Negro emancipation but actually for sordid conquest. 2

A personal friend of Gilfillan, the staunchly pro-Northern David Macrae, sought to explain the sympathy for the South primarily in terms of Gilfillan's impulsive - then inflexible - attachments to specific causes. 3 But while personal factors may have helped colour Gilfillan's reasoning, 4 there is no reason to doubt the depth of his sincerity when, shortly after the Southern defeat which left him "smitten to the heart", 5 he pronounced that

The South [will undoubtedly] be again ripe ... for a renewed attempt to secure that independence to which she is as much entitled as Scotland is to hers ... 6

---

1 See above, Chapter II, p. 121.
2 George Gilfillan to unknown correspondent, 31 Dec., 1864, MS. Lall354, Edinburgh University Library.
3 Something of the passion of Gilfillan's sentiments on the war is communicated in this letter - "The North seems transfigured into one mad conglomeration of mad butchers who have inscribed the name ... of Liberty on banners streaming with human blood and in pretended love for the black man, are thirsting for the utter extermination of the white". He believed that the tradition of religious revivals in America - for which he had the deepest contempt - had helped produce the "bloodthirsty Christians" of the North - see report of a lecture on Ireland by Gilfillan at Dundee, 4 March, 1865, in Scotsman, 7 March, 1865.
4 Gilfillan disliked the materialistic and "corrupt" tone of Northern society - "The nearest approximation to an earthly hell" - Gilfillan to unknown correspondent, 31 Dec., 1864, MS. Lall354, Edinburgh University Library; and he was also irritated by American persistence in republishing his books without paying him - see Macrae, George Gilfillan, p. 68.
5 In Memoriam: the Rev. George Gilfillan (pamphlet reprinted from obituary in Dundee Advertiser, 1878), pp. 43-44.
At this critical juncture, the impact of the Scottish national heritage on his own personal upbringing predisposed him to use the historic Scottish struggle for political and religious independence, rather than the modern struggles of Italy or Hungary, as most poignantly analogous to that of the (temporarily) prostrated South. The son of a vigorously radical minister of the Secession (or Covenanting) Church, Gilfillan had been, from his youth, "steeped in the history and traditions of the Scottish Covenanters". Throughout his life, he stuck firmly by the fiercely independent religious tenets of the Covenanters’ and Seceders’ faith, ultimately producing a laudatory, if controversial, volume on the Covenanters which became his most popular literary work.¹

Similarly grounded in an appeal to the Scottish tradition was the Edinburgh Courant’s insistence on the ultimate resurgence of the "lost cause" of the Confederate South. Looking back over six years of bitterly reluctant Southern acquiescence in Federal Reconstruction, the Courant concluded that the war had but naturally strengthened the desire for national independence:

From numerous battlefields where they [the Southerners] had gallantly fought against terrible odds there came incitements to remembrance if not to revenge... The war has provided background of tradition to their history which a people cling to all the closer because they have no ultimate success to boast of.²

---

¹ Watson and Watson, George Gilfillan, pp. 6-11, 391.
² Edinburgh Courant, 15 Sept., 1871. It might be suggested that Charles Mackay, although he never overtly identified the cause of the South with the Scottish one, was probably very alive to the possibility of comparison. Certainly, in his poem, "Lament of Cona for the Unpeopling of the Highlands", written in 1845, he betrays a strong, emotional feeling for the vigorous, battling, romantic tradition of Scotland in language which reflects precisely his attitudes to the Southerners after the Civil War - for example:

Once thou wert home of a people of heroes and sages;
Strong in the battle and wise in the counsel were they

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...

Pure were their actions in story;
Clear was the light of their glory
Proud were the chiefs of the clansmen who came to their call,
Proud of their race and laws,
Proud of their country's cause,
Proud of their faith, of their liberty prouder than all.

See also "Lochabur No More" in ibid., p. 691.
And, more explicitly, when the last stronghold at Petersburg was known to have fallen, the precedent of ancient Scottish tenacity and resilience was immediately called up - "Our own Scotland was often tenfold more crushed under the English invaders, but the spark of liberty was never extinguished, and we are now a free country".  

For the Edinburgh Courant, the attraction of using the popular image of the glorious, traditional Scottish struggle for independence to keep alive sympathy for the Southern states was heightened by the fact that it could thereby issue a strong emotional comparison, based on legitimate admiration of a historical Scottish cause, while at the same time not necessarily feeling obliged to champion the modern Scottish movements against English over-centralization. It has already been indicated that the Courant tended simply to identify the social and political interests of Scotland with those of "Great Britain", and the somewhat quaint observation that "we are now a free country" suggests that the paper was basically disposed to rest content with the degree of autonomy enjoyed by Scotland in her separate religious and educational institutions.

So far as Duncan McLeren's modern, radical agitation for increased Scottish devolution was concerned, the organ of the Scottish Conservatives wanted none of it. Contemporary domestic "nationalist" activities - however muted - tended, after all, to become unpleasantly disruptive:

---

1 Edinburgh Courant, 19 April, 1865.

2 See above, p. 188.

3 As has already been demonstrated (see above, Chapter I, pp. 33, 35-36) McLeren consistently agitated for increased Parliamentary attention for Scotland rather than for home rule. He was, in fact, a Unionist, to the point of breaking with Gladstone over Ireland in 1886 - see Mackie, op. cit., p. 248ff. And it is worth noting that as John Stuart Blackie became increasingly attached to "Home Rule for Scotland", he deserted the Irish cause and became a notable Unionist. Anna M. Stoddart, John Stuart Blackie (Edinburgh and London, 1895), Vol. 2, p. 273.
in the light of the Fenian threat, for instance, the paper even felt it necessary to clarify how it was possible justifiably to support the Southern bid for independence and not the Irish one. Thus the Courant, conceding that "We have a discontented Ireland as they have a dissatisfied South", pinpointed as the vital difference between the two situations the alleged minority support for total independence within Ireland, and the unanimous desire of the Southern people to be entirely separate from the North. ¹

And the Whig Scotsman, in earlier advancing the same argument, had denounced the Fenian attempt to "dismember ... an ancient kingdom" by explaining that, whereas the Southern and Northern states of America had, comparatively recently, entered into a voluntary, partial, and conditional union, Ireland had seven hundred years before been rescued from constant tribal warfare by the English crown. Consequently, "As to sanctions of time, constitutions, and compacts, there was ... a good deal to be said for the claim of the Southern States to be 'independent' when they chose, and nothing at all to be said for the claim set up in the name of Ireland". ² For those Conservative or stolid "moderate Liberal" Scots who had supported the South, the great advantage of the romanticized, Scottish nationalist past - and one which made it usable in this context - was that it remained, safely and firmly, the past.

This being the case, and granted the widespread 19th century popularization, both in Scotland and in the United States, of the country's stirring tradition of conflict for national independence and the equally heroic struggle for civil and religious liberties, it is perhaps rather curious that Scottish supporters of the Confederacy did not make more of this particular analogy to draw compassion from their fellow countrymen for the

¹ Edinburgh Courant, 15 Sept., 1871.
² Scotsman, 14 Nov., 1866. See also ibid., 31 Oct., 1865.
"stricken South" during Reconstruction. It may have been that all but the most blatantly Conservative journals (like the Edinburgh Courant) tended to fight shy of drawing vividly direct comparisons between the two struggles since those doing so would inevitably have laid themselves open to censure by the ex-supporters of the North on the grounds that they were equating the hallowed Scottish fight for freedom with what had been a battle for the preservation of human slavery. We have already seen the tremendously fierce attacks made by domestic rivals against those Scots who had done no more than straightforwardly support the Confederacy on its own merits. As the Scotsman in particular seems to have realized, for those constantly reporting and commenting on the situation in the United States during Reconstruction and continuing to uphold the Southern right to secede for independence, the soundest policy was to abide by the dry, but consistent and solid, constitutional arguments. And such a course largely precluded the intrusion of emotional and - by comparison - rather facile and vulnerable analogies between the past struggles of Scotland and of the Confederacy.

No such considerations restricted ex-Confederates, however, who on occasion boldly put to use their high appreciation of and regard for the Scottish fight for freedom. Thus, in mid February, 1865, with desertion rates in the Confederate armies disastrously high and a creeping demoralization of spirit among Southern civilians, the influential Richmond Sentinel had exhorted the South to resist submission to "a state of slavery.

---

1 On the contrary, the Daily Review, erstwhile supporter of the South (though fairly uncommitted during Reconstruction), chose on one occasion to make a singular equation between a popular feature of modern Scottish "nationalist" sentiment and a symbol of the South's identity, and to ridicule both. Thus, the paper commented that in 1851, "the founders of the new commonwealth proposed to make the use of ... [slavery] a national and honourable distinction - just as there are enthusiasts in Braemar who consider the use of an ill-made petticoat, [the kilt] which owes its existence to a period when the sartorial art was in its infancy, an honourable and national distinction ... Sambo was thus to the Saxon that which the kilt is to the Celt, an emblem as well as a use". Daily Review, 4 Oct., 1865.
more degrading, cruel and exacting than ever before was imposed on human beings" and to "take to the bush" as all unconquered peoples such as the Scots and Welsh had done before them.\(^1\) And during Reconstruction, it was in the letters of ex-Confederate soldiers that the potential for comparison between the historical Scottish situation and the one created in the Southern states was most fully developed.

Ever ready to throw open its columns to American press extracts or personal testimonies indicting the course of Reconstruction, the *Edinburgh Courant* carried in the summer of 1865 a lengthy and extremely bitter letter from an ex-Confederate soldier on the current conditions of life in the South. While most of the private post-war correspondence of Southerners to Scottish acquaintances which found its way into the Scottish newspaper press was primarily involved with indignantly describing the outrageous actions of Northern troops and the utter destitution of the Southern people,\(^2\) the "Confederate Soldier's" direct message to the *Courant* was concerned rather to publicize the existence of an unrepentant, defiant unsubmissive spirit among the population of the South. His attempt was permeated with examples from Scottish history, one of which, if effective enough for the writer's purposes, was hardly complimentary in the context in which it was used. Denouncing an English clergyman who had emptied his Church in Mobile by handing a Yankee brigadier a prayer-book on the first Sunday after occupation and announcing that the Church did not recognize North or South, the correspondent described the "congregation of sobbing women and children", and passionately declared "I only wish

\(^1\) *Richmond Sentinel*, 15 Feb., 1865, quoted in *Scotsman*, 6 March, 1865.

that a Jenny Geddes had been found among them".  

More importantly, "Confederate Soldier" sought to invoke the spirit of recent Scottish cultural identity to reinforce his argument for the vital importance of the new patriotic traditions which the South had absorbed as a result of the war. With the Union "irretrievably" broken, he pinpointed the recent history of the South as the motivating force which would ultimately achieve the longed for independence, and finally prove the cultural differences which had always existed between the two sections:

The war has given us a history and traditions; it has united the South in a common bond of suffering and heroism ... We have a history now to be proud of; not a mere record of material progress and successful money-getting. If we accomplished what we did, our sons may confidently expect to win their independence".

Drawing on the example of Scotland, he argued that the strength of Southern nationality would produce the growth of an essential national literature, despite the temporary subjection to Federal rule:

Was it encouragement to home literature that produced Burns and Walter Scott? If ever a country led a perfectly disembodied national life, with an entire freedom from national or patriotic prejudices, it was the age and country which preceded and evolved these immortals. If there were any prejudices in that age of Scottish literary life ... they were exclusively French; yet, ... what more fervid type of national and life-like literature than that we are accustomed to call Scottish, which succeeded the days of Hume, Adam Smith, and the intellectual icebergs of the eighteenth century? 2

Reared on Scott and Burns, the "Confederate Soldier's" confidence in the future of a national cause on which he had staked his life was bolstered up tremendously by the knowledge that Scotland, simply by the

---

1 "Life under Yankee Rule": letter from "A Confederate Soldier", Mobile, Alabama, 24 July, 1865, in Edinburgh Courant, 26 Aug., 1865. The writer would doubtless have been somewhat aggrieved to discover that within Scottish society the bitterest critics of the Southern clergy, both for their role in countenancing slavery and in fostering intransigence to the North after the Civil War, were the Voluntary and Evangelical ministers.

2 "A Confederate Soldier", in Edinburgh Courant, 26 Aug., 1865. He took pains to make it clear that the South had read more works by "English authors" than the North had.
strength of its history, had after the Union of 1707 succeeded in preserving a strong national and cultural identity. Close personal involvement in the conflict understandably led to an intense emotional desire to vindicate the lost cause by directly or tacitly identifying it with one already widely acknowledged as noble and just. There is, then, perhaps some significance in the fact that one Scot who shared none of the apparent reticence of many of his countrymen in equating the Confederate struggle with Scotland's one had seen active service in the Confederate army.

It seems fairly certain that the "Late Confederate Officer" who wrote from Sutherlandshire on conditions in the post-war South was, in fact, Scottish. Besides seeking to pass on information he had received from the United States, his somewhat incoherent letter had a specific, practical purpose. Influenced, perhaps, by the form of fellow Sutherland man Donald McLeod's strictures on the Duchess of Sutherland's anti-slavery activities, "Confederate Officer" adapted this line of attack and linked it with an appeal to Scottish patriotism to argue against Scottish involvement in the freedmen's aid cause. The gist of his argument, contained in a long rambling sentence, is best communicated by a fairly lengthy quote:

1 "Starvation in the Southern States"; letter from "A Late Confederate Officer", Sutherlandshire, 31 July, 1866, in ibid., 4 Aug., 1866. The infuriating Victorian practice of preserving a strict anonymity when writing to the press increases the difficulty of trying to determine this writer's nationality. The tone and phraseology of the letter, however, is quite revealing; thus he refers to "our [British] landed interest", and suggests that the state of the South in Reconstruction is reminiscent of "the worst period of the famine years in Ireland".

2 Donald McLeod, Gloomy Memories in the Highlands of Scotland versus Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe's Sunny Memories in (England) a Foreign Land (Glasgow, 1892 edition) levelled a bitter indictment against the Duchess of Sutherland for showering sympathy and philanthropy on the American slaves while treating callously the tenants on the Sutherland estates, and against Harriet Beecher Stowe for conveying a falsely roseate impression of the Duchess' policy towards the crofters. See also Rice, The Scottish Factor, p. 502.
I ask in the face of such tragedies [i.e. those he had described as obtaining among the Southern whites during Reconstruction] ... how we can be called on to assist New England to pay salaries to self-ordained preachers to labour among a well-off negro population, while she [New England] refuses to send a farthing to assist the starving at her own door, [i.e. the Southern poor whites] the most of whom the wildest fanatic of abolitionism cannot accuse - if that be the correct word - of ever having owned a slave, and whose sole misfortune is one no Scotchman with the memory of Bannockburn and Robert Burns in his soul is likely to twit them with - that they loved their own dear mountains, and fighting fell in defence of them, their wives, and daughters ... yeoman as picus and God-fearing as the tenants of lonely covenant-soldier graves in the Pentland and Dumfriesshire wilds, who, like them, never failed to invoke in all sincerity and humbleness the God of battle before they stepped calmly into the deadly ... horrors of a modern engagement.  

It was for no such direct, practical purpose that the most prominent ex-Confederate of all sought to invoke Scots and Scots-Americans to remember "the glorious deeds of their forefathers".  

1 "A Late Confederate Officer", in Edinburgh Courant, 4 Aug., 1866. It seems probable that the writer was prompted to make those views public by his irritation at a large freedmen's aid meeting held in the Free Church General Assembly Hall, Edinburgh, on 2 July, 1866, in accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly. From America, the Revs. D. Patton and Sella Martin, representing the American Missionary Association, had there made appeals which were subsequently sent to all ministers of the Free Church and "otherwise widely circulated" in Scotland. See Scotsman, 3 July, 1866.  

2 Jefferson Davis, Scotland and the Scottish People, p. 30. It is perhaps worthy of mention that as late as 1923, Americans writing from a pro-Confederate bias could still find it expedient and effective to cite Davis himself as a perfect example of a Southerner who had carried down in full measure the spirited passion for freedom and national independence exhibited by his early forefathers in the old country. Thus Dunbar Rowland, Jefferson Davis's Place in History. As revealed by his letters, papers, and speeches (Mississippi, 1923), p. 6, asserted that "it is important in explaining Jefferson Davis to know that he was descended from Welsh and Scotch-Irish ancestry, two races as much in love with individualism, self-determination and community independence as any on earth. When we know that Jefferson Davis came from the same racial stocks that produced Robert Bruce, William Wallace, John Knox, Rhodrie Mawr and Owen Glendower, we can readily understand why he is one of the world's greatest examples of unshaken faith and fidelity to a cause, the principles of which had been bequeathed to him by liberty-loving ancestors in the mother country ..."  

3 See above, Chapter I, p. 31.
intense pleasure he derived from his trip to Scotland — a trip which, indeed, must have increased his conviction that the tradition fostered by his hero Robert Burns, no less than that popularized by his idol, Scott, sanctioned the right of "small nations" to fight to the death for independence. Thus, a highlight of his tour had been to visit Burns' cottage and find that the poet's great-nieces had hung a framed portrait of him beside that of Burns as a welcoming gesture. And it had been possible, in the early days of confusion which followed the close of the Civil War, for a leading Scottish newspaper which was not rabidly pro-South during Reconstruction to hope that Davis would be spared execution since "his death will cover the name of Andrew Johnson with eternal obloquy, as the death of William Wallace covered the name of Edward Long-shanks."

Davis' post-war observations on the Scottish past are interesting inasmuch as they appear to represent a tacit attempt to justify the Confederate cause, and to place the Southern position during Reconstruction in some sort of universal perspective by concentrating on particular aspects of Scottish culture and character. As the ex-President of the defeated Confederacy, it seems possible that Davis was simultaneously passing a considered judgement on the South (as well as for the South) in 1875 when he

1 See above, Chapter II, p. 85.
2 Ströde, Jefferson Davis, p. 349.

In the pamphlet of Davis' St. Andrew's Day address at Memphis, 1875, there is a footnote by "J.S." — probably James Smith, Dowanhill, Glasgow, who accompanied Davis to Burns' cottage — which records Davis' pleasure with this particular visit (p. 16).

Contemporary struggles for national independence do seem to have aroused the active sympathies of Burns' known descendants: his sons forwarded to Garibaldi a portrait and autograph of Burns inscribed "To the William Wallace of Italy, from the sons of Robert Burns". Garibaldi replied that he would leave it as a family souvenir "of a man who so much honours a country which I love". See Glasgow Herald, 2 Nov., 1865.

3 Ibid., 29 May, 1865.
declared that "Scotland lives for the past, though she lives for the future". 

Perhaps imbibing from his close friend Charles Mackay the conviction that conservatism was an over-riding characteristic of the Scots' race in the old world and in the new, Davis carefully stressed that alongside this went a fierce spirit of enquiry, and a bold assertion of what was believed to be true - an assertion which at times (most recently with the Disruption) had reached revolutionary proportions. Thus it could be implied that the same blend which had existed in the conquered South - conservatism, plus a revolutionary spirit activated by a cause deeply believed in - had produced the proud and honourable history of Scotland. Something of the same feeling prompted Stonewall Jackson's widow to present David Macrae with the coat worn by Jackson when he fell at Chancellorsville, with an accompanying note referring to Scotland as "the dear old land beyond the sea - that land which of all beyond the sea I admire and love the most - good, honest-hearted, Presbyterian Scotland!"

Nor was the possibility for analogy between the Southern situation and the Scottish one totally ignored by Northerners after the war. Herman Melville, in the "supplement" to his "Battle Pieces and Aspects of the

1 Davis, Scotland and the Scottish People, p. 9.

2 On 13 July, 1873, in his lecture on "The Scotch in America" in the Music Hall, Inverness, Mackay had emphasized the strong conservative influence of the Scots in America - see Inverness Courier, 17 July, 1873. But is is possible, of course, that Mackay himself first heard this argument voiced by Davis during his visit to Scotland in 1869.

3 Davis, Scotland and the Scottish People, pp. 24-26.

4 Glasgow Herald, 5 Aug., 1868. See also Macrae, The Americans at Home, pp. 141-142. Jackson had visited Scotland in 1859, done the standard tour of the Scott country, and been generally delighted with his trip - ibid., p. 159 (fn.). Macrae seems to have been fascinated by Jackson's character, and amassed enough information and anecdotes on him to fill two chapters in his book (pp. 141-154). He made a point of again meeting Mrs. Jackson when he revisited America in 1899 - see Macrae, America Revisited, pp. 85-86.
War", optimistically predicted that if George IV could erect a monument to
the memory of Charles Edward Stuart, it was probable that the bitter ani-
mosities between the two sections of the United States would soon fade away.
Scotland's proud preservation of her national identity, even while she
existed as part of a greater Union, was again focussed on, as it had been
by the "Confederate Soldier", as providing encouraging proof for a specific
point of view. In Melville's case, however, the Scottish example served
not as a base on which to build ultimate separation but as a base on which
to forge permanent union. The next generation of Southerners would be loyal
to the Union, he believed, and recognize their vested interest in maintaining
it, while

yet cherishing unrebuked that kind of feeling for the memory of the
soldiers of the fallen Confederacy that Burns, Scott, and the Ettrick
Shepherd felt for the memory of the gallant clansmen ruined through
their fidelity to the Stuarts - a feeling whose passion was tempered by
the poetry inculuing it, and which in no wise affected their loyalty
to the Georges ...

To some extent, these early contradictory interpretations of the example
to be gained from the Scottish situation represent the essence of the
polarity of feeling regarding the future of the Union which existed between
North and South during the unhappy years of Reconstruction. While few so
readily voiced their total confidence in a vital resurgence of the Con-
federacy, the "Confederate Soldier's" belief in the potential of the South's
battle-scarred "history" as a divisive force was certainly borne out by
the smouldering resentment and bitter antagonism which South felt towards
North after the war. And on the Northern side, continued strong love for
the Union meant that even those who, like Melville, were generous enough to
recognize what the legacy of the Civil War must mean for the South, tended
sadly to over-estimate the willingness with which it might soon obediently
become a docile land of poetic sentimentalists.

1 See arguments of "Confederate Soldier" above, pp. 208-209.
2 The Battle Pieces of Herman Melville, ed. Hennig Cohen (New York and
The flexibility of Scotland's national past therefore rendered it usable to more purpose during Reconstruction by Americans than by Scots directly seeking to stir up Scottish sympathies for the defeated South. Furthermore, it is worth noting that, although he consistently spoke out against American democracy, Scotland's leading advocate of modern cultural nationalism, John Stuart Blackie, did not (even in his great debate with Ernest Jones) refer directly to the American Civil War or give any indication that he had especially favoured the Southern bid for independence. Perhaps a heightened awareness that the South fought for slavery as well as independence checked Blackie from capitalizing on the obvious and widely used argument that American democracy was, in addition to all its other faults, inherently imperialistic and tyrannical.

Ironically, the clearest indication that modern Scottish nationalist sentiment could be the means of producing a sympathetic acknowledgment of the Southern struggle lies in the attitude of none other than the Rev. David Macrae. As we have noted, Macrae had staunchly supported the North during the war, approved of Federal policies to elevate and advance the cause of the Negro in the South during Reconstruction, and was personally involved in organizing Scottish freedmen's aid efforts. Later in the century, his attention and restless energies increasingly turned to

1 See Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, p. 626; Glasgow Herald, 23rd April, 1866; Scotsman, 4 Jan., 1867.

2 See, for instance, report of the speech by Blackie against democracy at the Working Men's Institute, Edinburgh, 3 Jan., 1867, in Scotsman, 4 Jan., 1867.

3 Both Blackie and his wife were close friends of the leading British abolitionist, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, after her marriage in 1853 to the well-known Scottish academic, Dr. John Pringle Nichol. They became constant visitors when she moved to Edinburgh following Nichol's death in 1859 - Anna M. Stoddart, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, pp. 179, 209-210, 212, 284.

4 See above, Chapters I and II.
the fight to preserve Scottish history and culture from total submersion in England. Determined to oppose everything tending to falsify or minimize the importance of Scottish history, he became associated with the founders of the Scottish Patriotic Association, and ultimately became its honorary president.¹ A leading advocate of Home Rule, he readily endorsed Froude's contention that "three small countries have ploughed a furrow deep in the fields of time - Judea, Greece and Scotland".²

Accordingly, when Macrae encountered in Richmond a dashing Confederate soldier who passionately asserted he had fought only for his


² W. Mitchell, Home Rule for Scotland and Imperial Federation (Edinburgh, 1892), p. 11. Mitchell, Honorary General Treasurer of the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA), credited Macrae as being "one of the most eloquent advocates of Home Rule all round" - ibid., p. 11. Macrae was a Vice-President of the SHRA, an organization formed in May, 1886 (the month following Gladstone's introduction of the Irish Government Bill), and composed of "a few earnest and patriotic men ... who had never become reconciled to the extinction of Scottish National life" - see ibid., p. 8, and Constitution and Rules of the SHRA printed on SHRA Pamphlets, 3/2820*, National Library of Scotland.

Mitchell's tract contains an interesting reference to the fact that the "contempt" with which Scottish business and Scottish M.P.'s were treated in Parliament "soon satisfies those domiciled Scotsmen who go as M.P.'s to Westminster that the game is not worth the candle, and they retire from a field which is getting filled more and more with an army of English Carpet Baggers" - p. 57. If Mitchell's work is anything to go by, however, the predominant transatlantic focus of the Scottish Home Rule movement in the 1890s was not particularly favourable to retrospective analogies between the old, heavily reconstructed Southern states and the currently "neglected" Scotland. Rather, the United States was cited as the prime example of how a federal system might in practice work out for the best, and Andrew Carnegie's observations - made in a speech on American Home Rule at Glasgow on 13 September, 1887 - on the excellent interplay of national and state government in the United States were eagerly seized on - see Mitchell, Home Rule, p. 70.

See also Mitchell, Seventy Years of Home Rule Legislation (Edinburgh, n.d.), pp. 4-5, SHRA Pamphlets 32820/43; Home Rule for Scotland (The opening speech read (in part) at the discussion on that subject in the Conference Room of the National Liberal Club, on 7 May, 1889) ( Paisley and London, 1889), p. 24; SHRA Pamphlets, 3/2820(3). And Scotland and Home Rule (reprinted from The Scottish Review, April, 1888), pp. 24-25, in which it was argued that Scottish Home Rule could take an example from the successful federal United States model - SHRA Pamphlets, 3/2820.
beloved state of Virginia, and was ready to do so again, the Southerner's sentiments involuntarily prompted a sympathetic response:

In the thrilling tone of his voice and the kindling of his eye as often as he named Virginia, I learned more of real Southern sentiment than I had from many a book. Perhaps as a Scotchman I understood him more readily. I had only to imagine a rupture of the British empire - Scotland separated again from England - an English army marching north, and Scotland calling on her sons to defend her. I felt if such a thing were possible, how many there still are who would turn a deaf ear to the questions at issue, whose sole motto would be, "Scotland and the right! but, right or wrong, Scotland!"

Though full of praise for the "noble" efforts of Northern teachers labouring among the Southern Negro population, and deploring native white opposition to them, he nevertheless found the temper of the situation best conveyed by suggesting that a New England teacher was "looked upon in the South with much the same feeling that an Englishman would have encountered in the Highlands after the atrocities of the Duke of Cumberland".

Macrae's unconcealed admiration for several of the South's military commanders helped him to equate the Southern idolization of Jeb Stuart with "the glowing enthusiasm which was excited amongst the Jacobite ladies by the gallant Prince Charlie". The South's veneration for its leaders was more analytically commented on by another Scot who had visited the United States during Reconstruction. Samuel Smith, a native of Kirkcudbrightshire who worked his way up in the Liverpool cotton trade to eventually establish in 1864 the firm of Smith, Edwards and Co., cotton brokers, had in 1860 made an exhaustive six months tour of America preliminary to starting his own business in Liverpool. During the trip, he had visited

1 Macrae, The Americans at Home, pp. 102-103. Note Macrae's compassionate portrayal of the visiting Jefferson Davis in 1869 - see above, Chapter II, p. 84.
3 Ibid., p. 186. Apart from his fascination with Stonewall Jackson, Macrae also revered Lee, removing him from "the secessionists and firebrands" of the South who had fomented the war - see ibid., pp. 160-161.
the Northern commercial centres and the cotton-growing South, and had
"followed with eager interest the absorbing controversy between the
Northern and Southern States on the slavery question, and the cognate
question of State rights". 1 His interest in the politics of the country
seems to have been sustained during his second visit, undertaken in 1866,
when he sought to explain - and to at least partially vindicate - the app-
arently "harsh" policies of Republicans like Thaddeus Stevens. 2 Arguing
that conquerors had seldom exacted less rigorous conditions of the con-
quered than had the North, he suggested that one of the most instrumental
factors in producing the South's continuing "stubborn spirit of indepen-
dence" against measures such as the Fourteenth Amendment was its pride in
clinging to the principles of a defeated cause - a cause made doubly
glorious by the nature of the leadership:

The South loved its Lees and Stonewall Jacksons as ancient Scotland
revered its Wallace and Bruce, or Holland the Prince of Orange ... 3

While the personal qualities of Lee, for instance, were indeed re-
cognized and respected by the Northern states themselves during Recon-
struction, 4 it may just be possible that the peculiar nature of Scotland's
"romantic" nineteenth century patriotism, with its "outpouring of emotions
about the past", its general divorce from political aspirations, and -

Smith was also, from 1864, head of the Liverpool branch of James
Pinlay and Co. of Glasgow. He became President of Liverpool Chamber
of Commerce in 1876.
2 Ibid., p. 84. In the sphere of domestic politics, Smith was a Liberal,
and won a by-election in a Liverpool Conservative stronghold in 1882.
Following defeat in 1885, he was subsequently returned for Flintshire
in 1886 and retained his seat till 1905.
3 Ibid., p. 84. The nephew of a minister who had seceded at the Disruption,
Smith was a "zealous presbyterian" and one of those concerned in inviting
Moody and Sankey to Liverpool in 1875. DNB., Second Supplement, Vol. 3,
pp. 344-345.
4 See, for instance, Molville, Battle-Pieces, p. 197.
most importantly of all—its tremendously strong cult of national hero, helped pro-Northerners like Macrae and Smith, and Scottish newspapers which had not supported the Southern cause, to build up Lee in particular into something of a popular hero. Thus even the Caledonian Mercury, while deprecating the cause he had fought for, was eager to concede that Lee had acquitted himself "honourably and chivalrously ... He was never known, during the entire history of the struggle, to do an ignoble or dishonourable act". And his quiet and dignified acceptance of defeat was seen as virtually unprecedented in history—comparable to some extent only with Garibaldi's withdrawal to Caprera. The Dundee Advertiser's admiration was fully as open, and the Glasgow Herald pronounced him "the grandest character of the brave, self-sacrificing South, in her sore struggle against the destruction of that independence she saw so fully guaranteed". An isolated indication of public veneration for Lee within Scottish circles opposed to the slave-owning South was in the hostile reception given by Scottish Congregationalists to Dr. Alexander Raleigh's derogatory remarks on Lee's conduct as a slaveholder.

For the pro-Southern Glasgow solicitor, Alexander Watt, the Scottish national hero cult certainly helped to add emphasis to his appreciation of the Confederate cause. Accompanying his great friend James Smith to Munfordville, Kentucky, in 1884, he recalled

1 Hanham, "Mid-Century Scottish Nationalism", p. 147.
2 Caledonian Mercury, 24 October, 1865.
   It is worth bearing in mind that the Mercury still maintained its traditional concern for ensuring that specifically Scottish interests and grievances were not swamped by those of England. Like Macrae, the paper made it clear that Lee had had no truck with the advocates of slavery, and it found it "intelligible" that he took up arms purely for his own state of Virginia—see ibid., 13 April, 1866.
3 See above, pp. 134-135.
4 Glasgow Herald, 3 Oct., 1872.
5 Ibid., 2 Nov., 1865.
The war is ended... the result has been accepted, and all that we can do is to pray that a bright future still awaits the Sunny South. But I can not resist the opportunity of saying that my heart, aye, and the hearts of thousands of my countrymen, were with you in that hour of agony. We felt, instinctively, that you were fighting for your hearths and homes, and I know of no greater heroes in the annals of the Old or New World than Generals Lee and Jackson, and many other of your leaders. Why, to us Scotsmen these men appeared not only as brilliant commanders, but as the very incarnation of patriotism and self-sacrifice, recalling to us the magic names of our Wallace and of our Bruce.

IV Attitudes towards post-war Southern society, and acknowledgement of the adverse legacy of slavery upon it

Such opinions were fostered by the belief that the Southern military leaders were superior to those of the North. Following the Confederate reverses in the winter of 1863, the Marquis of Lorne, disgusted over the fact that "Papa and Mama [the Duke and Duchess of Argyll]... are crowing about America where the Yankees are certainly just now on the upper side of Fortune's wheel", lamented that in his home he never heard any impartial opinion on the American war: "They praise great Northern men and abuse great Southern men... They cannot recognise the merits of Longstreet, Lee or Stonewall Jackson and - who shall I say? There are not many Northern men any (sic) can admire."²

Basically similar sentiments persisted among pro-Southern commentators during Reconstruction, and were frequently alluded to by attributing the Federal victory solely to the North's much greater force of arms.³ Their

---

1 Printed in Munfordville Courier Journal, and quoted in Wiche, "Britons in the Civil War", p. 10.

In this connection, it is noteworthy that the movement for soliciting British aid for the erection of a monument to Lee at Lexington had been launched by correspondence between "gentlemen of Glasgow" and the authorities of Washington and of Lee University, Virginia. James Smith was in charge of all subscriptions raised in Britain - see Glasgow Herald, 3 Oct., 1872.

2 Marquis of Lorne's Journal, 1863-1867 (transcript), 21 Dec., 1863, Argyll MSS.

For a biographical note on the Marquis of Lorne, see Appendix I.

contention served, in turn, to bolster up arguments condemnatory of the direction which Federal policy towards the South, and United States democracy in general, had taken since the end of the war. Typical of Scottish Conservative reasoning in this connection was that of Archibald Alison, junior. Having stressed that the Northern army enormously outnumbered the Southern thanks largely to the abundance of Irish and German mercenaries in the Federal ranks,¹ he maintained that in every single action where there had been some approach to equality of numbers, the Confederates had been victorious. Given the unscrupulous background of the Federal military victory, it was not surprising, Alison implied, that the Congressional radicals sought after the war to impose on the South either a military despotism, or a despotism of the former slaves. Writing in 1870, he saw the latter as obtaining:

> It was an ingenious and cheap method of persecution to (sic) the Southern planters to hand over the government of the South to its Helots, and only to retain the garrison necessary to keep the Helots themselves in check. Russia is now copying the device in Poland, and keeping it by the aid of the enfranchised serfs.²

Alison's categorization of Poland as the "Southern states" of Russia was a novel twist on a much more common Scottish tendency to equate the plight of the South during Reconstruction with that of recently conquered

---


Alison was the eldest son of the Scottish historian, Sir Archibald Alison. Entering the army in 1846, he went on to achieve high military distinction. Early postings to Barbadoes and Nova Scotia were followed by distinguished service in the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny, on which he contributed material for *Blackwood*. Following his command of a British brigade in the Ashanti war, he was made KCB in 1874, and reached the rank of major general in 1877. In 1882, he commanded the force in charge of securing the Suez Canal and was promoted to lieutenant general. He continued to gather military honours until his death in 1907. *DNB*, Second Supplement, Vol. 1, pp. 33-34.
Poland under Russia. Surveying the progress of Reconstruction up to mid-August of 1865, the Scotsman, with a fine British complacency, decided that the Federal government was clearly bent on "northernising the South—that is, making it a Poland instead of treating it as an Ireland". Working from the premise that the South was essentially a nation quite different from the North, the analogy was applied to indicate the allegedly despotic nature of United States democracy. Thus, it was argued that the late war and the subsequent Federal legislation had well illustrated the innate tendency of democracies to crush rebellion in a manner reminiscent of "the most old-fashioned despotisms". The Scotsman considered the claims of the Northern states to rule over the Southern no higher than those of Russia to rule over Poland, or Austria to rule over Hungary and Venetia. And, rejoicing that the war had struck "a blow at the pretensions of democracy worth untold gold" by proving that the new world was not exempt from the follies of the old, the Edinburgh Courant suggested that with a little reflection, Bright and his colleagues would also realize that the North's triumph was "just like that of Russia over Poland, of Prussia over Denmark, by numbers, and money, and material advantages, and centralisation".

Throughout Reconstruction, the belief persisted within Scottish Conservative circles that there was a basic "race-antagonism" between North and South, produced by "differences of feeling" and "divergent interests". At the back of this, of course, lay the old, unshaken preference for the

1 Scotsman, 14 Aug., 1865.
2 Edinburgh Courant, 26 April, 1865.
3 Scotsman, 23 Jan., 1866.
4 Edinburgh Courant, 26 April, 1865.
5 Ibid., 15 Sept., 1871.
remnants of what had been the cultured, socially stratified society of the old South. The mixture of concern for the national liberties of small nations and the positive attachment to the social ethos of the Southern states was effectively encapsulated in a telling entry in the Marquis of Lorne's personal journal, written in the summer of 1865:

María exulting of course over the fallen South and talking Northern sentiment by the yard which makes me feel sick when I hear it from her, and furious when from others. It is dreadful to see two such causes as that of Denmark, and that of the South trampled under foot by the dead weight of numbers within a twelvemonth, to witness a struggle in which no amount of self sacrifice and bravery in one party can be of any avail against the least perseverance in the others. It reminds me more of a fine stag pulled down by a pack of curs, than a contest between peoples. ¹

A visit to the United States in 1866 did, however, apparently cause Lorne to modify his highly unfavourable view of Northern society. Pleasantly amazed by the rapidity with which the Northern soldiers had resumed their "honest work", he felt this testified not only to a "marvellous ... versatility and adaptability ... [in] the American character", but also to the proof that the Americans were "really a peace-loving people".² And at Boston - "the abode of all that are (sic) first in literature, culture, and civilization in America" - he was disappointed only by "their ... hopes for the policy of their country. The South had been conquered ... but they felt that she must also be kept down; and here I differed from them so

¹ Marquis of Lorne's Journal, 1863-1867, 22 June, 1865, Argyll MSS.
Lorne's adoption of a fiercely independent and antagonistic line of thought on the American situation seems to have been, to some extent, part of a personal rebellion against what he felt to be general parental dictation of his life. Although he tried to acknowledge that it was natural for his father, the Duke of Argyll, who had "himself succeeded so well in public life" to "wish his unfortunate eldest son to follow in his footsteps and to help his father and his party" (Journal, 9 Feb., 1864), he nevertheless bitterly resented being obliged to represent "the tiresome interests of a lot of county poops" in Parliament, feeling himself both unqualified and disinclined by nature to be an M.P. (Journal, 8 Nov., 1863). He desperately wanted to join the army, but the suggestion met with "violent" parental scorn and opposition (Journal, 8 Nov., 1863, 9 Feb., 1864). Even before he embarked on his trip to the West Indies and the United States, he dreaded returning to "that wretched Cambridge" and to his eventual role as Parliamentary representative of Argyllshire - "I have been dragged on to the groove by the cuff of the neck and have gone with as good a grace as possible so far, so I shall now have to fight my way on - I am for it, and must do my best" (Journal, 22 Dec., 1865).

² Marquis of Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 203-204.
much that we could hardly speak on the subject". 1 Indeed, when he did speak on the Civil War and Reconstruction to the "bitter" Longfellow, he found that "We did not get on so well together after that". 2

But, as the spectre of a victorious democracy loomed up across the Atlantic, Scottish critics of the American political system generally also strengthened and widened their attacks on the nature of Northern-dominated United States society as a whole. The North and the North-Eastern states in particular became during Reconstruction increasingly open to British Conservative (or at least anti-democratic) attack. It was castigated as a society riddled with graft, corruption and fraud, denounced as grossly materialistic, criticized for its continued adherence to Protectionist economic principles, contemptuously scorned for its "brag" and vulgarity, and generally marked down as the inferior, immigrant-saturated section of the United States. Perhaps the most consistently "anti-American" on every count was the Scotsman. As Scotland's most influential daily newspaper, it took upon itself the duty of keeping the country informed of the "outrageous" course of affairs in the transatlantic Republic. Commenting on a recent large embezzlement by a bank teller from Phoenix Bank, New York, a cutting editorial noted that the Civil War obviously had not acted as a sedative but rather as an irritant to America's "peculiar sins" of widespread fraud and dishonesty:

Perhaps it [the Civil War] did not last long enough to fairly stir

---

1 Ibid., p. 206.
2 Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, Boston, 14 April, 1866, in package marked "Letters of the 9th Duke: West Indies and America, 1866. I-VIII (transcripts), Green Box File, "19th century", Argyll MSS. (Hereafter cited as Letters: W.I. and Am.)

For his book, A Trip to the Tropics, Lorne simply reproduced verbatim the bulk of the information contained in these letters to his mother. Direct citation of the original manuscripts indicates that the specific remarks were either adapted or (much more frequently) omitted altogether in the book itself.
the hearts of the American people to the appreciation and love of honesty, and simplicity and purity of life. If this be so, it is a great pity that so much blood was shed to so little profit ...

In innumerable comments throughout the Reconstruction years the basic tone and substance of these sentiments were repeated. The Bellknap scandal of 1876 prompted the judgement that the "tide of corruption" had been "steadily overflowing" since the close of the war, and a restatement of the belief that the American system of government fostered and encouraged this. Nor was there any wavering of the conviction that the greatest evil afflicting the United States was an "absence of true public spirit", and a "lack of practical every-day patriotism".

As against this, Samuel Smith found that, among political and municipal corruption widespread enough to threaten the basis of the Republic, the United States people themselves were steadfast enough:

The solid mass of honest and virtuous citizenship in America carries the nation successfully through every crisis. If the politicians are often unworthy of their great country, the patriotism of the citizens never fails when a serious demand is made on it.

Similarly confident that the people of the North had "genuine stuff" in them at bottom, the advanced Liberal Aberdeen Free Press had - at least at the outset - few qualms about the progress of Reconstruction in their hands:

It is to the energy and devotion of the people - of the descendants of the New England Puritans and the Scotch colonists of the West - that the success of the war is due, and it will lie with them to shape and determine the policy under which order is to be restored, alienation overcome, and freedom, with equality in the eye of the law, assured to all. It must now rest more than ever with the PEOPLE.

But the "bustling, speculating, worldly, industrious, commercial race"

---

1 Scotsman, 4 Sept., 1865.
2 Ibid., 10 March, 1876
3 Smith, My Life-Work, p. 29.
4 Aberdeen Free Press, 28 April, 1865. See also Glasgow Herald, 13 Oct., 1866; 9 Nov., 1868; Dundee Advertiser, 9 March, 1869; Banffshire Journal, 31 Dec., 1867; 9 Feb., 11, 25 May, 1869.
5 Daily Review, 19 May, 1869.
which inhabited the Northern states remained, of course, something of an unknown breed to all Scots, so that even those who had supported the Federal cause during the war were occasionally unable to become totally reconciled to all aspects of Northern society as it was in the Reconstruction era. In the case of the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie, for instance, sympathy — after the Emancipation Proclamation — for the Northern struggle and personal involvement in American efforts to aid the freedmen during Reconstruction, were paralleled by a basic suspicion of and distaste for the "perpetual and offensive bragging" and the "laughable vanity" of the Americans. Before Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation had made it possible for him to support the North on the grounds that a Federal victory must result in the end of American slavery, Guthrie had unhesitatingly pronounced the North equally guilty with the South on the slavery question, entertained the belief that dissolution of the Union might ultimately be the best policy and consistently made clear his strong reservations on the American character. Nevertheless, he was well thought of in the United States itself, had many friends there, and seems to have cherished a sincere

1 Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 9 June, 1865, Guthrie MSS., MS. 3007, fol. 105-107, National Library of Scotland. Guthrie was, however, generous enough to concede that the United States would lose these unpleasant characteristics when the nation matured a little more.
2 Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 8 Sept., 1862, Guthrie MSS., MS. 3007, fol. 90-93.
3 Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 16 Jan., 1862, ibid., MS. 3007, fol. 85-86; 8 Sept., 1862, ibid., MS. 3007, fol. 90-93. Even Harriet Beecher Stowe, who had become personally acquainted with Guthrie during her visit to Britain in 1853, did not fully escape censure — she was not "altogether free of the American meanness" — Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 19 May, 1853, ibid., MS. 3007, fol. 44-45.
4 See, for instance, Mrs Oliphant, A Memoir of the Life of John Tulloch, D.D. LL.D. (Edinburgh, 1889), p. 293; David K. and Charles J. Guthrie, Autobiography of Thomas Guthrie, D.D. and Memoir (London, 1875), Vol. 2, p. 365, in which it is recorded that Guthrie had "countless urgent invitations" from Canada and the United States to visit America. He did in fact have the journey in view for many years but in the end never succeeded in making it. In their Memoir his sons do also significantly indicate that against the high reputation he enjoyed in America, his "intense hatred of negro slavery" had made him unpopular in some quarters of the United States — see ibid., p. 365.
regard for their "grand country", even while recognizing its faults.¹

As a staunch Free Church man, it was the nature of the United States' rapid growth which Guthrie found objectionable: "With the floods of low Irish, and godless gambling and Sabbath breaking Germans poured on their shores and into their body, they [the United States] ... furnish a very curious and remarkable illustration of these words of Scripture, 'Thou hast multiplied the nation and not increased the joy'".² When Guthrie's colleague, the Rev. William Arnot, shared a steamer with emigrants to the United States in 1871, he was likewise distressed that the majority were "rather unpromising" material for American citizens. Since, however, his description of his United States trip was meant to dispel Scottish prejudices about the Republic, he patronizingly suggested that the Americans deserved sympathy, not condemnation, for the "unsavoury sediment, lying for a time in the bottom of the cesspools" which tended to congregate in the cities of the East.³

While branding New York "a sink for the ignorance, vice, and crime of all Europe", the more analytical David Macrae was at pains to point out that the city should not be taken as a fair illustration of American institutions, its government being run by a mass of ill-educated Irish and German immigrants.⁴ No such qualifications coloured the thinking of Charles Mackay who, as usual, epitomised the staunch Scottish Conservative

---

¹ Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 15 Aug., 1872, Guthrie MSS., MS. 3007, fol. 142.
² Guthrie to Duchess of Argyll, 8 Sept. 1862, ibid., MS. 3007, fol. 90-93.
³ Arnot, "The Civil War - its causes and results" in The Family Treasury, 1871, p. 67.
⁴ Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 58. In his reply to Professor Blackie's attack on American democracy, ex-Chartist Ernest Jones had also made this point - see report of speech by Jones in Scotsman, 5 Jan., 1867.
viewpoint when he concluded that in recent decades "an immense immigration from Ireland and Germany, from the filthy back-slums and over-crowded human ant-hills of Europe" into the North had ruined the original pure ideals of the Republic. The only places where the old strength and homogeneity remained were among the "Puritans and slave-haters" of New England, and the ex-planters of the South.\(^1\) Mackay's insistence that the population of the South was the purest British stock in the United States led him to recognize during his trip to America in 1857-58 the existence of an especially close affinity between the Southern states and Britain.\(^2\) Touring the South in 1870-71, Robert Somers, the newly retired editor of Glasgow's Morning Journal, found that South Carolinians still looked fondly to Britain, and "contrast the present misrule with the time when the laws of England were the laws of South Carolina".\(^3\)

Admiration for the superior society of the conquered South was, indeed, highlighted by a sense of outrage that men so obviously born to be politicians should have been totally excluded from active participation in the government of their respective states. Conservatives, lamenting the eclipse of government by the "noble elements" in the Southern states, defiantly insisted that the "vulgar demagogues" who had won control of the United States would not alienate the heroic Southerners from the deep respect which the British nation felt for them.\(^4\) The Scotsean's American

---


\(^2\) Mackay, Forty Years' Recollections, pp. 377-378.

\(^3\) Robert Somers, The Southern States since the War 1870-1 (London and New York, 1871), pp. 41, 59.

For a biographical note on Somers, see Appendix I. And for a more detailed consideration of his findings during his journeyings through the Southern states see below, Chapter VII, pp. 202-227.

\(^4\) Dundee Courier, 10 June, 1865. See also Edinburgh Courant, 19 April, 1865.
correspondent, painting a gloomy picture of the prospects for settlement of United States' difficulties in 1868, cited as the greatest source of discontent the appropriation of political posts, regarded as the lawful inheritance of great Southerners, by men who had "rushed from the North, a horde of adventurers, as the Goths and Vandals descended from their own barren and inhospitable land upon the fertile and smiling plains of Southern Europe". The correspondent readily acknowledged that the real concern of the Southern aristocracy was not the fear of Negro domination but the desire to forestall the takeover of political power by unworthy Northern whites:

There is a very natural and not at all blameworthy unwillingness among the Virginia gentlemen to be ruled by ignoble white men of whom no one knows anything, and who have not the slightest pretence to relationship with the 'first families'.

Along with these considerations, as important a factor in reinforcing old predilections for Southern society during Reconstruction was the dramatic effect which the Civil War had had on the social framework and material condition of the Old South. The concept of a great, dazzling people brought to their knees after a display of courage and heroism seldom equalled in battle, with the "flower of their society" lost, and the land laid waste, gave scope for impassioned and romanticized pronouncements on


The Scotsman's American correspondent began contributing copious reports to the paper in late May, 1867, and continued to provide regular articles throughout the remainder of the Reconstruction years. A very significant proportion of these were directly concerned with conveying information on issues bearing on the state of the post-war South. All efforts to trace the identity of the journalist have proved unsuccessful. The records relating to the newspaper at this period were unfortunately destroyed by fire.


3 North British Daily Mail, 19 April, 1865. This was contrasted with the Northern losses, which were seen to be constituted mainly in terms of "hirelings".

4 Mackay, "President Johnson and the Reconstruction of the Union" in Fortnightly Review, Vol. 4, April, 1866, p. 480.
the desolate South, in which the character and culture of the vanished planter aristocracy assumed an ever greater brilliance. Charles Mackay, with as little regard for the accuracies of the American situation as he had shown while reporting on the Civil War itself, was striking a blow for British Conservatism when he bitterly reflected that

Men who before the war were as rich and powerful as English earls and dukes, were slain, exiled, or reduced to pauperism ... Over the whole country the freed slaves — most of them paupers, many of them thieves — prowled at will; squatted upon the lands of their former masters, and assumed the insolent airs which ignorant men, whether white or black, are but too apt to assume in the position proverbially ascribed to beggars on horseback.¹

But such views were not lacking among professedly "liberal" elements within Scotland. No more sensational picture was painted of the once powerful South languishing in the midst of ruined homesteads and flattened cities, with families scattered, no capital or credit available, and Negroes everywhere dominant, than by the North British Daily Mail.² While the Mail appears to have been seeking to foster a specific aim (in this case, the encouragement of capital investment from Glasgow into the South³) by stressing the deplorable state of affairs there, its tradition of support for the Confederates during the war meant that the newspaper was in fact perfectly consistent in adopting such an attitude towards the early trials of the South during Reconstruction.

Slightly more inconsistent, but easily understandable, were the feelings towards the Southerners of several Scots who, having condemned all the Confederacy stood for, found themselves in personal contact with the ex-rebels after the war was over. Witnessing at first hand the widespread devastation and the obviously disconsolate population, and not insusceptible

¹ Ibid., p. 480.
² North British Daily Mail, 9 Sept., 1865; 8 Dec., 1865; 25 Sept., 1874.
³ See Ibid., 8 Dec., 1865.
to the still charming manners of the Southerners, these Scottish visitors to the South tended to make special efforts to exonerate at least some aspects of the Southern character. Writing of his trip to the South in 1870, the Rev. William Arnot pertinently observed that if the hospitality he had personally received from a Virginian proprietor and his family was a fair specimen of the warmth of Southern society, he was not surprised that many visitors were fascinated, "and from admiration of the social virtues of the slave-holders, have learned to look with favour on the system itself". ¹

While Sir David Wedderburn remained totally unconvinced by the battery of arguments vindicating slavery,² it was almost certainly because of his close association during his Southern travels with leading plantation owners that he came to make an untenable distinction with regard to the Southern attitude to the institution. Thus, failing to consider such nefarious practices as the breaking up of families, the ill-treatment of slaves, and the business of slave-breeding, he was prepared to maintain that it had been the labour, not the person, to which the Southern planters had claimed absolute right, and that they had long looked on the selling and punishment of slaves as reprehensible.³ In spite of himself, he was charmed by the romance of Southern society:

Mediaeval knights and barons were not more genuine aristocrats than modern Virginians or South Carolinians; Venice was scarcely a more aristocratic republic than either of their States, in all except name; it was their own States and not the great Union that they loved, and still love to a degree foreigners can scarcely

¹ Arnot, "Sketches in the United States: No. IV, Miscellaneous", in Family Treasury, p. 257. Although Arnot well recognized the power of Southern hospitality over the visitor, there are signs that he himself was to some extent a victim of it - see ibid., p. 258.

² Percival (ed.), Sir David Wedderburn, p. 83 - "... I think my gallant Southern friends have pretty well made a Yankee of me".

³ Ibid., p. 83.
appreciate.\textsuperscript{1}

Wedderburn's increased understanding of the Southerner's attachment to his native State was more than echoed in the case of the Rev. Dr. William Garden Blaikie, who accompanied Arnot to America in 1870.\textsuperscript{2} Deeply moved by the sorrow which seemed to engulf the South, he felt the more intensely for the people because personal acquaintance led him to admire their essential character:

They were men of a fine lively nature, sad against their nature and against their will; and I confess to having been saddened by the sadness that left its traces on so many countenances ... You cannot dull your sympathy by general considerations; you cannot crush it down by saying that they had no business to rebel.

For Blaikie, it became possible to exonerate the men of the South who had fought simply for the South, and, logically, to "[feel] for them, with their shattered fortunes, their bereaved homes, their political humiliation, their deserted country".\textsuperscript{3}

Despite his first-hand experience of violent upheaval and devastation in many parts of the globe, Laurence Oliphant was nevertheless still taken aback by the ruin which confronted him when he revisited the South three months after the close of the war.\textsuperscript{4} New Orleans, for instance, he found

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 83. It is worth noting that during his first trip to the United States in 1860, the pro-Federal Samuel Smith, although repulsed by the violence inherent in the planter community, and by the slave-owners' fierce intolerance on the Negro question, was much impressed with Southern hospitality, and decided that the principal families of South Carolina - "largely of English Cavalier and French Huguenot descent" - had "a distinguished air about them which contrasted with the plebian type of the Northern States" - see Samuel Smith, \textit{My Life-Work}, pp. 23-26.

\textsuperscript{2} See above, Chapter I, pp. 20-21.

\textsuperscript{3} Blaikie, "America and the Americans ...", seventh paper, "Richmond" in \textit{Sunday Magazine}, April, 1871, p. 400.

"the saddest place I ever entered"; and, although his subsequent description of the plight of the coloured freedmen warranted his name to be put forward as a possible speaker on behalf of the British freedmen's aid cause, he could not help but feel that "a new and not a pleasant class" had replaced the old aristocratic ruling class which he had known - and admired. - on his first trip to the United States.

Yet, the essential difference in pace between North and South still remained evident enough by 1868 for David Macrae to remark that Charleston was to New York what Edinburgh was to Glasgow: "The streets are not so full of people who look as if they had just invented a machine and were running away to secure the patent". While recognizing that in some respects the South was indeed superior to the North (honour and virtue were higher, for instance), and that there were many "kind-hearted and noble" men among the ex-slaveholders, Macrae, however, very largely resisted the temptation to fall prey to the charms of Southern society. A genuine sympathy for the plight of the South during Reconstruction did not blind him to the section's inherent shortcomings, and its attributes, he implied, were more than balanced by the evil effects which slavery had had on the land. The South's "peculiar institution" had, he argued, put "the brand of degredation upon labour", checked the enterprise and inventiveness of

1 Laurence Oliphant, ibid., p. 112.
3 Laurence Oliphant, Episodes in a Life, p. 112. Margaret Oliphant, Laurence Oliphant, p. 112, records Oliphant's remark that he had found his stay among the best people in New Orleans "one of unqualified enjoyment".
4 Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 212.
5 Ibid., pp. 215-216.
6 Macrae, Amongst the Darkies and Other Papers (Glasgow, 1876), pp. 9-15.
the Southern people, encouraged laxity of morals among successive generations of planter aristocrats, and effectively insulated the South from the progress which characterized the North, so that Southern virtues, no less than Southern vices, were "characteristic of feudal and patriarchal times". 1

Relatively more unimpressed by personal contact with the remnants of the Southern chivalry was Kelso farmer John Clay. Although Clay was too young to have fully appreciated the issues at stake during the late Civil War, his family background, his own stated reason for visiting the United States in 1874, and his subsequent American contacts make it more than likely that he made the trip as a young man with no illusions about the innate superiority of South over North. His father, John Clay senior, tenanted extensive farmlands in the Border country but was a convinced Liberal in politics who delighted in refusing to vote for his landlord's Tory son-in-law, 2 and who in the 1865 general election seconded the nomination of the Liberal David Robertson as M.P. for Berwickshire. Although at that time Clay senior cautiously stated that "I do not pretend to give any opinion of who was right or wrong in the great American struggle, but I thank God that the freedom of the slave has come out of that contest", 3 it is significant that while he was basically a supporter of the North, David Robertson's own position regarding the United States was somewhat confused. 4

1 Ibid., p. 217.
2 John Clay (jun.), John Clay, A Scottish Farmer (Privately published: Chicago, 1906), pp. 64-65. The Clays were of an old Border family, and by 1867, Clay senior (the subject of this memoir) had amassed five large farms in Roxburghshire and Berwickshire. He subsequently leased two others in the seventies.
3 Ibid., pp. 71-72.
4 See report of a speech by Robertson on being re-elected for Berwickshire in Caledonian Mercury, 20 July, 1865.
By his own volition, Clay junior's visit to the United States and Canada in the mid-seventies was made as a pleasure trip, "yet with an eye to the main chance". Work on his father's best farm had convinced him that a farmer's life in Scotland was "pleasant but slow on material benefits", but he was also interested in American agricultural prospects because of the tradition of liberty and equality there - "Inheriting from my parents many radical views, mainly political, and being naturally blessed with independence and self-reliance, it was a short step to explore the widening influence of the new world".  

His decision to return to America in 1879 as manager of a company for improving the quality of Canadian livestock floated (with the aid of Scottish capital) by George Brown of the Toronto Globe, was almost certainly influenced by the recent experience of his father's having had to struggle against steep rent increases imposed by his landlord, the Duke of Roxburgh, when he sought to renew the leases on two farms which he himself had improved. Retrospectively, Clay suggested that when he first went to America in 1874, he was already in rebellion against a caste system ... just as prevalent in Scotland ... as it was on the banks of the Ganges. It meant in our Borderland a social segregation of classes, a smothering of ambition, a fierce fight against political

---

1 John Clay (jun.), My Life on the Range (Privately published: Chicago, 1924), p. 2. He liked to think the family was connected with Henry Clay, and stressed the family likeness - see John Clay, p. 6.

2 Ibid., p. 9. Clay met Brown, whom he found an "enthusiastic agriculturist", during his first visit to America. Brown's company had got off the ground through the influence of his Edinburgh brothers-in-law, William and Thomas Nelson, and it was the latter, along with William Mensies, the prominent Edinburgh solicitor and pioneer of Scottish investment in America, who arranged for Clay to go and report on the situation from Canada in 1879. The result was Clay's return on a permanent basis later in the year - ibid., pp. 6-9.

3 Clay, John Clay, pp. 33-42.
independence, the neglect of ability, the silent, sarcastic repression of any forward movement, the absence of a generous uplift, the extravagance of our landed proprietors and their utter inability to meet adverse times ...¹

Once in the Southern states, he encountered the remains of a planter class which shared many of the characteristics he so despised in the oppressive landlord elite of his native Borders. While sympathizing to some extent with the ruined ex-slaveholders as a class "generous and hospitable" to strangers like himself, and as fellow agriculturists who had lost all, he was appalled by their methods of working the land, and could find little complimentary to say of men who were content with the tremendously backward state of agriculture prevalent in the South. Accordingly, he found that pinnacle of the legendary Southern gentleman, the Virginia planter, generally "a rough-looking, ill-dressed individual" and contrasted the refinement and accomplishments of the Southern ladies with the "boorish and ill-educated men."² Clay was even prepared to concede that what he saw as the temporary lapse of the Negro freedmen into irresponsibility and drunkenness was no more than a measure of the South's just desserts:

It is a just retribution. The tobacco and cotton planters of the ... South may complain of their hard lot in having the uneducated, vicious negro put politically and in many respects socially, on a level with themselves; but they must remember who it was that (sic) produced this galantry - who it was that (sic) fostered up the system of slavery ...²

But of all pro-Northern Scots who visited the South during the Reconstruction years, apparently the most immune to the attractions of Southern society and the Southern character was John Nichol, Professor of English Literature at Glasgow University. As the son of Glasgow's late Professor of Astronomy, John Pringle Nichol, and stepson of the famous British abolitionist Elizabeth Pease Nichol, John junior had had every opportunity to

¹ Ibid., pp. 2-3.
² Clay, New World Notes, pp. 4-5.
³ Ibid., p. 7.
develop a sympathetic attitude towards the American anti-slavery agitation through personal contact with the many leading Northern abolitionists who during the 1850s stayed with the Nichols when in Britain, and through first-hand knowledge of the views of others who corresponded regularly with his stepmother.¹ Having staunchly and actively supported the Federal cause during the Civil War,² he made the trip to the United States —"full of admiration and hope for most things American"³ — in the autumn of 1865. Travelling in Virginia, he acknowledged the proliferation of "broken houses, broken fortunes, and broken-down looking people", but the compassion which had so strongly characterized Blaikie's and Oliphant's reactions to such scenes was completely lacking in Nichol's case. In its place was the restatement of a harsh, unyielding opposition to Southern society:

Everything I hear in the South, explicitly or implicitly, confirms everything I have heard in the North ... All I said at home now seems to me too mild in praise of the Northern, in dispraise of the Southern cause ... All around in Virginia there is the same prevalent desolation, the punishment of her crimes.⁴

His emotionalism was reserved rather for the Northern states, where his delight with Boston society and with his abolitionist friends went

¹ Stoddart, Elizabeth Pease Nichol, pp. 221, 228. In August, 1859, there were so many abolitionist visitors at the Nichols' home at Glasgow observatory that a large anti-slavery party was held - p. 228.

² He was a keen member of the Glasgow Union and Emancipation Society, and ultimately became a Scottish Vice-President of the movement — see Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 673, 679. He also chaired an important public meeting held by the Glasgow Emancipation Society in April, 1863, when it was resolved to petition Parliament to take steps to end the supply of British built ships and British money to the Confederacy — GBS Minute Book No. 4, 28 April, 1863, Smeal Collection, Mitchell Library, Glasgow.

³ Knight, John Nichol, p. 271.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 273-274.
beyond all expectations, and induced him to write "I would give my left hand to leave Glasgow and come here".¹ The Southern ethos, which, as we have seen, tended to impress even the most astute Scottish observer, held no charms for Nichol, even in retrospect. Thus, in his pioneer work on American literature,² the basic design of which dated from this early post-war visit,³ he made a point of depreciating the culture of the South, dismissing it as "the comparatively rare hothouse fruit of wealth and leisure in a select society — a society whose prestige has been heightened by an outer circle of semi-barbarism".⁴ Because of "the indolence which is the natural concomitant of despotism", the Southerners had produced hardly any literature at all: "Like the Spartan marshalling his Helots, the planter, lounging among his slaves, was made dead to art by a paralyzing sense of his own superiority".⁵

Both Clay and Nichol were enabled to make strongly derogatory judgements on Southern white society during the Reconstruction period by their knowledgeable recognition of positive Southern shortcomings in the fields of agriculture and literature respectively. But for other short-term visitors — such as Arnot and Blaikie — who were not concerned to examine and evaluate any particular aspects of the Southern scene, there was much less reason to be dogmatic about the shameful failings of post-war society in the South. Obviously, while slavery had still existed as a condemnable institution, there had been some practical point in Scottish observers

1 Ibid., p. 276.
2 See above, Chapter I, p. 23, fn. 1.
4 Ibid., p. 16.
5 Ibid., p. 18.
focussing their criticism on the degenerate, enervated nature of society which the slave system tended to foster. Even Charles Mackay, conveying his impressions of his first trip to the United States in the mid 1850s, readily asserted that, mainly because of the impact of slavery on its life and character, the South, to its detriment, had nothing like the same social, commercial and literary energy as the North - "In the Free States all is bustle and activity; in the Slave States there is elegant and drowsy stagnation".¹ Once slavery was abolished, however, the imperative need to pinpoint its deleterious effects on the Southern white as well as on the Negro population vanished also, and the general tendency among Scots recording their impressions of the South during Reconstruction was largely to ignore the continuing unfavourable aspects of society and politics in the South which had their bases in the slave system.

Suggestions that the adverse effects of slavery must directly continue to taint Southern society for some time were, indeed, more commonly voiced by Scottish commentators observing the Reconstruction scene from the other side of the Atlantic. If Charles Mackay was prepared in the post-war era to lament over the licence given to anarchy in America by the defeat of a people whose "timid and unwise Conservatism" he had criticized in pre-war days,² less blatantly Conservative Scottish opinion dismissed the idea that the war had been one between the principles of democracy and aristocracy, and refuted attempts to equate the Southern gentry with the British:

> It is surely absurd to identify in character or feeling, morally, socially, or politically, the aristocracy of England with a slave aristocracy, which represents the times of European serfdom, and the feudal practices of the worst ages of modern history, lacquered over with the gloss of civilization.³

---

² Ibid., p. 27.
³ Aberdeen Journal, 24 May, 1865. See also ibid., 14 June, 1865.
The uniquely aloof character of the old planter class was similarly appreciated by the *Edinburgh Review*, where speculations on the likely progress of Reconstruction took into account the difficulties certain to be encountered from the intransigence of this particular Southern element. Arguing for the existence of an "unhappily large" contingent of embittered and unforgiving ex-planters, P.W. Clayden suggested that their fiercely irreconcilable attitude to defeat had its origins in an ingrained adamance which was a direct product of slavery times, when the planters had ignored all opposition, and made no compromise of their will. Helped by their loathing of the Northern commercial class, these men, Clayden predicted, would for at least a generation act to frustrate the course of Federal Reconstruction:

For years to come, this class will be an element of disunion all through the South. They will not lose their old prestige all at once, and so long as it remains they will use it to obstruct and disunite.¹

Constituting in Clayden's judgement an even greater threat to the successful working-out of Reconstruction were, however, the poor whites. On this class he showered as bitter contempt as did Mackay (and Carlyle before him) on the Negro race, and in so doing, struck a blow against the subsequent extreme racism and idealized post-war concept of Southern society which characterized the Reconstruction articles in Edinburgh's other literary periodical, *Blackwood's Magazine*. Again, the slave South was roundly blamed for having fostered this "class of civilised barbarians", the mainspring of America's endemic lawlessness and violence:

Unity the indigence of the poor to the pride of the rich; a landless and moneyless aristocracy of the skin; a class who cannot dig and are ashamed to beg; idle, gambling, and dissolute, they

are the scourge of Heaven on a society which has made labour a dis-
grace and honest toil a badge of slavery.\footnote{Clayden, "The Reconstruction", p. 546.}

From this element, it was argued, had been drawn the overseers and slave-
drivers, and Clayden, realizing that the poor whites would resent emanci-
pation as a personal affront, gloomily warned of a wide increase in violence
towards the Negro freedmen from that quarter throughout the ensuing years.

His personal conviction as to the most desirable evolution of post-
war society in the South involved a wild deviation from basic British
premises on the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race (even in its most
degraded form) in the American continent, and on the future of the Negro in
the United States; and that the \textit{Edinburgh Review} did not balk at publishing
his conclusions - or, indeed, at commissioning Clayden to write on Recon-
struction in the first place\footnote{The \textit{Edinburgh Review} had been strongly pro-Confederate during the Civil War, tending to accept the arguments of the vehement James Spence of Liverpool. By 1866, it was being published by McLaren's political rival, the Whig R.P. Adam Black - see Botsford, \textit{Scotland and the American Civil War}, pp. 501-503, 538, 852.} - testifies, perhaps, to some concern on the
\textit{Review}'s part to offer a more balanced and comprehensive survey of the
United States one year after the end of hostilities than was obtainable
through the partisan reports of Edinburgh's most influential daily newspaper,
the \textit{Scotsman}. Thus, Clayden boldly asserted that "The only hope for Southern
society is, that thus elevated \cite{Clayden, "The Reconstruction", p. 546.} to a position of equality with the poor whites
the blacks will compete with them and supplant them, and that under the new
conditions of society they will soon disappear".\footnote{Clayden, "The Reconstruction", p. 546.}

In general terms, Clayden's penetrating analysis of the potentially
disruptive elements in the post-war South can be taken as representative
of the sentiments of many liberally minded Scots who continued to distrust
the responses of a land which they had long considered to be a retrograde
society - enervated, unenterprising, commercially paralysed, and given
over to gross intolerance and violence through unwavering adherence to its
"peculiar institution". ¹ Even among those who (unlike Clayden) believed
that the Southern planter and poor white classes would soon adapt and
prosper, and constitute no real drawback to Southern Reconstruction, there
was an involuntary tendency to remember that, prior to the current state
of transition, the Old South had moved cumbersome along "the dirty path
of slavery", tainted with "many a mental mud-spot of vice and crime, of
cruelty, and meanness, and degredation". ² With the war over (a war which
had, significantly, highlighted some of the better qualities in the Southern
caracter) and slavery safely abolished, those looking to a strengthening
of the Southern influence in the reconstructed Union could afford to
acknowledge the deleterious effect which slavery had exerted on the ante-
bellum South. Accordingly, the erstwhile Free Church organ, the Daily
Review, did not necessarily have to abandon its wartime Southern sympathies³
to retrospectively denounce what must, in the halycon days of British progress
and self-made Scotsmen, have been considered the cardinal sin of the South -
its contempt of labour:

Affecting the foibles of an aristocracy ... [The Southerners] looked
on the manufacturing enterprise of the North with the same kind of
sentiment which, in this country, we find young slips in the Guards
avowing for the men of the City, and especially for the men of
Manchester. It was a most pernicious error ... It was a barbarous
sentiment found in the Choctaw savage as well as in the Carolina
planter; and the man who devised all industrial occupation upon

¹ See, for instance, Caledonian Mercury, 11 Sept., 15 Nov., 23 Dec., 1865;
4 Jan., 1866; Dundee Advertiser, 20 Jan., 14, 18, 21 April, 1865; 21 Jan.,
1866; 20 Feb., 1872; Aberdeen Herald, 29 Dec., 1866; W.E. Baxter at
Montrose in Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865; James Hoir at meeting for

² Daily Review, 6 Oct., 1865.

³ The Daily Review had supported the Confederacy on Gladstonian grounds -
see Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, p. 530.
his negro was not far removed from the man who devolved it upon his squaw.\textsuperscript{1}

The vital difference which characterized the importance of this value judgement from that of Clayden, Baxter, Leng of the Dundee Advertiser, and others who had supported the North was that while these were prepared to argue for a residual pernicious influence of slavery on the Southern character beyond the end of the war, the Daily Review was basically concerned to illustrate how the experience of the blockade and ultimate defeat had emancipated the Southern white population from the thrall of a destructive system and left it free to wield an immense power for good in the United States as an aspiring, self-sufficient section of the community.

V Hostile attitudes towards American democracy and its post-war development

But while the relative merits and position of the post-war South within the Union remained in themselves a continuing source of interest and speculation, the aspect of the political upheaval resultant from the Civil War which gave rise to the most direct and consistent concern among Scottish observers was undoubtedly the triumph of democracy as personified and foreshadowed by the new hegemony of the triumphant Northern states. There was, of course, nothing unique about Scotland's preoccupation with the entrenchment of a democratic system of government on the other side of the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{2} But since much of the most passionate language and strongest convictions concerning the United States during Reconstruction were voiced in this connection, to skim casually over this vital area of Scottish debate would be seriously to distort the overall pattern of interlacing opinions which characterizes Scottish attitudes towards America at this time.

\textsuperscript{1} Daily Review, 4 Oct., 1865.

\textsuperscript{2} For a discussion of the close focus on post-war American democracy by those from every shade of the political spectrum throughout Britain, see Henry Pelling, America and the British Left (London, 1956); also Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom, p. 107 et seq.
We have already observed the traditional strength of the Scottish interest in the working out of American democracy, and more particularly, the traditional strength of Scottish sympathy for the democratic experiment. As against this, however, it would seem that in the early-mid decades of the nineteenth century (and especially after the passing of the 1832 Reform Act), Scotland, through the medium of Blackwood's Magazine, had also produced some of the most extreme of all British polemic against United States' democracy. With Charles Mackay as virtually its sole contributor of articles on America in the early post-Civil War years, Maga more than kept up this tradition in the Reconstruction era. Indeed, the Blackwood essays, along with equally strong denunciations in the Edinburgh Courant, and the persistent criticisms of the Scotsman, add up to a tremendously influential body of Scottish opinion against the basic structure, the visibly unsatisfactory consequences, and the possible spread of the United States' system of government.

Scottish attitudes to Reconstruction proper can only validly be examined in the context of the wider Scottish assessment of United States' political institutions as they developed after the Civil War. This is especially true when considering criticisms of the course of American policy, for while the apparent chaos of Reconstruction certainly added fuel to the declaimers' fire, at the same time, those who aimed to discredit the very roots of the American system sought to suggest that such an unsatisfactory post-war adjustment was but the natural outcome of a political framework itself basically weak, anomalous, and unstable. Legislation in the United States was seen to be caught up in a vicious circle,

1 See above, Chapter I, pp. 10-13.
2 Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom, passim., frequently cites Blackwood's Magazine to illustrate particularly virulent attacks on American democracy and on those who supported it in Britain.
in which the policies of the Republican Reconstructionists greatly exacerbated the grave shortcomings of a democratic system which had itself formed the political basis for such policies to emerge.

Something of the balancing of forces involved in such reasoning is illustrated by typical Scotsman comment on the political situation in the United States. Maintaining a steady focus on all facets of American life, the paper came to the conclusion that the Reconstruction era was marked by a "spirit of lawlessness" among legislators and administrators unknown in pre-war days, and springing from a recent "mischievous" idea that there was a 'higher law' above the written Constitution and laws of the land. In practice, this meant that those empowered to execute or administer the written statutes felt themselves at liberty to modify, disregard, or openly violate these laws if they thought the occasion required it, or to fit their own ideas of what was right. The origins of this practice lay, the Scotsman argued, in the Civil War period when the Republican party had simply accepted that it could only prosecute the war "by the disregard of certain provisions of the Constitution, the inconstruction of others, and the flagrant violation of still others."

This trend had been continued and intensified throughout the post-war years, so that by the early 1870s, with a compliant President at the helm, the Republicans showed an "utter disregard" of constitutional limits on the Executive and Legislature, and "an ever increasing desire to absorb the few remaining rights of the [Southern] States in the prerogatives of the central government". President Grant himself was not exempted from censure on this score, having acted on Congressional encouragement to "treat the South as a general would treat a hostile province", and having approved the Force Bill - the "most tyrannical" measure of all. It was therefore

---

1 Scotsman, 6 Aug., 1872.
possible to argue that the peculiar circumstances and exigencies of Reconstruction produced new and probably lasting abuses in the vulnerable political structure of the United States.

At the same time, the existing weaknesses of the United States' system were recognized as hampering the chances of a speedy, satisfactory reorganization of North and South. The Scotsman's American correspondent was of course distressed to report that throughout the South, "not one man of eminence" or with more than an ordinary education was to be found in the State governments, and that in "great old Virginia", for instance, government was to be in the hands of "mechanics, small politicians, and negro preachers". Significantly, however, he made it plain that even if the best Southerners had been chosen, the South's situation would not in fact have been miraculously altered and improved since few of these men knew anything about political economy. It was a deficiency shared by Northerners, and a serious one, produced largely by a traditionally excessive concentration on the study of constitutional law. Faced during Reconstruction with tremendous problems which demanded a rational and philosophical rather than an emotional approach, American politicians had consequently found themselves "wholly unfitted, by education or habit, for their intelligent discussion". 1 Thus, the deplorable tenor of American Reconstruction was carefully attributed not only to immediate causes and to the emergence of new, mercenary forces in the American body politic, but also to inherent failings in the basic political structure.

Within Whiggish and Conservative circles throughout Britain, it was, indeed, widely recognized during the Reconstruction era that a natural fault of United States democracy was that as it developed, it had tended by its nature to repel and eliminate the "best men" in the country from active participation in government. 2 Although never disposed to be over-

---

2 See Pelling, America and the British Left, p. 13.
critical of American democracy, the Glasgow Herald spoke for moderate, complacent Scottish Liberalism when it succinctly remarked

Politics are understood to be a trade in America, by means of which thousands make a living. Among the respectable portion of the community a politician and an adventurer are considered synonymous terms. The services of both may be had at a certain price ...  

Beyond condemning the desperate lack of "statesmanship" in the United States, the Scotsman consistently denounced the venality of the mediocrities who did find their way into Congress or public office. Partisanship, not integrity, was the criterion for preferment, it insisted, and by the early 1870s, it found the general tone of national and municipal politics sordid enough to comment that "if there are any honest men left in the United States, they are not at present those in public office".

To some extent, then, the acts of the Reconstruction regimes in the South were bound to be seen as simply fitting into the general pattern of political vice, corruption and partisanship widespread throughout the Union. In an editorial lamenting the lack of morality in the public lives of American politicians, the Scotsman extended its indictment to cover the "private vices" of Benjamin P. Butler's nephew who, as American Consul-General in Egypt, had allegedly indulged in "disgraceful" orgies. Significantly, however, the paper concluded that his offences had "exceeded but slightly in atrocity the crimes of some of the 'carpet-bag' governors and legislators of the Southern States; and these were, in their turns,

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 10 Dec., 1868. See also Aberdeen Journal, 27 Sept., 1871.
2 See Scotsman, 2 March, 13 May, 27 July, 1867; 19 April, 1869; 3 Jan., 1870; 20 May, 1872; 1 Dec., 1873; 7 Dec., 1876.
3 Ibid., 7 May, 1869.
4 Ibid., 17 Feb., 1873.
but a shade worse than the deeds of some of the men who even now hold the rank of great leaders in the Republican party.\(^1\) An earlier conclusion had pronounced the "deeds of the 'carpet-baggers' in the Southern States" as "every whit as bad, and in some respects ... worse than the exploits of the Tammany Ring in New York."\(^2\) Inevitably, there was a tendency to judge the whole constitutional struggle which disturbed the United States during the Reconstruction years as having sprung, like much of the country's other problems at that time, from "paltry personal and party squabbles", selfish motives, and purely mercenary considerations.\(^3\) Condemning the Radical "factions" which threatened to drag the South back into the Union for "purely party reasons", and the arbitrary change in the balance of power from President to Congress, the \textit{Edinburgh Courant} concluded, "There must be a serious lack of patriotism in the States when public men will precipitate the gravest crises in national affairs on account of paltry individual considerations.\(^4\)

At the back of all the censure of the post-war development of American politics there lay, of course, a straightforward indictment of the basic structure and ideology of United States political institutions. Charles Mackay found the turbulent Reconstruction era a perfect vantage point from which to proclaim his strong conviction that the original Constitution as framed by the Founding Fathers - although "in all respects an irreproachable document" in its own right - had been too fragile to withstand the trials and pressures which subsequent, less "virtuous", generations of American politicians and citizens had placed upon it. The emergence of the spoils system, the ignorance of the masses about the principles of their government,

\(^1\) \textit{Ibid.}, 14 Oct., 1872.
\(^2\) \textit{Ibid.}, 16 Oct., 1871.
\(^3\) \textit{Edinburgh Courant}, 29 Feb., 1868.
\(^4\) \textit{Ibid.}
and the polarity between North and South, especially on the slavery and tariff questions, had been instrumental factors in weakening the foundations of the Constitution, so that "At the very first severe strain to which it was subjected, the beautiful, the symmetrical, the perfect Constitution broke hopelessly down". 1

Mackay's belief that the original intentions of those who had framed the Constitution had been progressively swamped, and his contention (paralleled by that of the Scotsman and Edinburgh Courant) that the Constitution itself had been finally dispensed with by the Republicans during the Civil War, were later endorsed in Blackwood by Roswell Sabine Ripley, one of the many ex-Confederate officers whom Blackwood came to know, and whose work he published during the Reconstruction years. 2 Writing in the true Haga tradition, Ripley vehemently denounced the entire course of Reconstruction, confidently maintaining that

the Republican party have (sic) notoriously no policy, except to

1 Mackay, "The American Constitution and the impeachment of the President" in Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 103, July, 1868, pp. 708-709. See also "The Principles and Issues of the American Struggle" in ibid., Vol. 100, July, 1866, p. 21, in which Mackay also cites as a weakening factor the initial and persistent difference of interpretation of the Federal Union compact within political circles in America.

2 Ripley was a graduate of the United States Military Academy, and early distinguished himself as a soldier in the 1840s, his distinctions reaching their climax in action during the Mexican War which led to his being commissioned first lieutenant and then brevetted captain in 1847. Although a native of Ohio, he commanded a reconditioned Fort Sumter, and in August, 1860, he was made brigadier-general and placed in command of South Carolina. His relations with his military superiors were extremely stormy, and only his excellent military work, recognized by Lee and Davis, prevented his early removal. After the fall of Charleston, he joined the army of the West, but ultimately returned to South Carolina, and subsequently settled briefly in Britain where he engaged in an unsuccessful manufacturing business in London - DAB, Vol. 15, pp. 625-626.

Blackwood also published Civil War material by the Prussian ex-Confederate soldier, Heroes Von Borcke, and by Captain Fitzgerald Ross, a cavalry officer in the Austrian Hussars who contributed articles during 1864-65 on a thorough visit which he had made to all the principal cities and armies of the Confederacy from May, 1863 to April, 1864 - see Ella Lonn, Foreigners in the Confederacy (University of North Carolina Press, 1940; Gloucester, Massachusetts reprint, 1965), p
retain their (sic) ascendancy and the emoluments of office. For this they have kept large portions of the South under the most odious tyranny, and have been constantly ready to renew the excitement and turmoil of material strife.¹

But these particular evils, along with all the other internal troubles which the American government was then currently facing, were again strictly related to their historical background. Like Mackay, Ripley traced the malaise of Reconstruction America back to the ruthless partisanship which had first blossomed earlier in the century, and which he believed to be encouraged by the frequency of American Presidential elections.

Among Scottish critics of American democracy (as among their English counterparts), the tangled state of public affairs, grounded as it was in the inherent failings of the Republic, gave scope for what was both woeful speculation and wishful thinking on the likely future of the United States. Conservative reaction to rumours from America in 1868 that military commanders were to take over from the existing State governments in the South, and that a Commander-in-Chief would be their head, was to suggest that the best thing might be to have a "suitable dictator" in the North also. Such a culmination was, after all, simply "the natural, expected destiny of a Democracy".² And from a powerful section of the moderate Liberal camp, as concerned to stave off the Americanization of British institutions as the ultra-Conservatives, there was an equally urgent desire to illustrate how "honesty and patriotism" had become subordinated to "allegiance to party and the self-interest of the masses".³ The Scotsman, having proved to its own, and doubtless to its readers' satisfaction, that universal suffrage

² Edinburgh Courant, 3 Feb., 1868. See also ibid., 17 Oct., 1866; 11 Jan., 1868.
³ Scotsman, 14 Oct., 1871.
could never be a satisfactory political basis for such a large and populous country as the United States, tended to round off its descriptions of the dangers in which "The great experiment of Democratic Government" was placed by a standard line of reasoning:

Very swiftly does that country seem drifting towards the gulf which has swallowed up all the great Republics of the world. The forces which are impelling it toward an anarchy that can only end in a Dictatorship, are precisely those which can least successfully be resisted in a Republic.¹

A tremendous fillip for the promulgation of such views in Scotland had been given by the most influential literary Scot of the period, Thomas Carlyle. In his inaugural address as Rector of Edinburgh University, delivered just one year after the end of the American Civil War, Carlyle drew on Machiavelli's argument that democracy could not long exist anywhere in the world, and - with an apposite reference to Cromwell's Protectorate as "the most salutary thing in the modern history of England" - endorsed the Machiavellian conviction that a Dictator was occasionally needed in such circumstances: "And an extremely proper function surely, this of a Dictator, if the republic was composed of little other than bad and tumultuous men, triumphing in general over the better, and all going the bad road, in fact".²

Carlyle's blistering direct attack on American democracy in "Shooting Niagara: and After?", published the following year,³ simply added fuel to a fire of opposition to United States institutions already well established and assiduously kept burning by Scottish Conservatives and anti-American

---

¹ Ibid. For further Scotsman references to the United States as a potential dictatorship, see 20 Nov., 27 Dec., 1871; 30 March, 1872.
² Carlyle, Inaugural Address at Edinburgh, April 2nd, 1866; by Thomas Carlyle, on being installed as doctor of the University there (published in pamphlet form, Edinburgh, 1866), pp. 18-19.
Whigs. The real impact of Carlyle's thought on Scottish attitudes to American democracy lay, it could be argued, rather in his earlier writings on great men and the nature of leadership. Certainly, these doctrines would appear to have had a formative influence insofar as Scottish Conservatives and Whigs remained attached, through the Reconstruction era, to a Carlylean distrust of "mob rule" and the sort of leaders it produced. At the same time, however, this full exposition of his views on the great American experiment probably helped implicitly to encourage anti-democratic elements within Scotland in their battle against "Americanization", providing them with the reassurance that they were consistently supported by one of the greatest Scottish minds of the age.

Certainly, "Shooting Niagara" appeared at a time when the Scottish public had but recently experienced a show of native academic distaste for democracy on the United States model. Persuaded in the last resort, Charles Mackay, already by August, 1867 well into his stride in sounding out against United States democracy, acknowledged after reading Carlyle's article that "The philosopher is not very wrong" - Mackay to John Blackwood, 13 Aug., 1867, Bla. MSS., MS. 4223, fol. 86-87.

2 Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, pp. 602-604, makes a case for the influence of Carlyle on Scottish outlooks towards democracy during the period of the American Civil War.

3 In ibid., p. 787, it is indicated that during the Civil War the Edinburgh Courant, in denouncing prominent British supporters of the Federal cause, proudly cited Carlyle as a Southern sympathiser, and contrasted the superior power of his intellect with that of pro-Northerners Francis Newman and John Stuart Mill.
perhaps, as much by a sincere political Conservatism\(^1\) as by a nationalist's dislike of the rampant centralization of American government, Professor John Stuart Blackie engaged in January, 1867 in a public debate on democracy with Ernest Jones, ex-Chartist and by that time Vice-President of the Reform League. The debate originated in a challenge thrown down by Blackie to any reformer to dispute publicly with him the wisdom and advantages of substantial political reform. Blackie's biographer was later to state that he had not expected anyone to actually take up the challenge,\(^2\) and certainly the correspondence relative to the encounter with Jones suggests that the professor was indeed a reluctant participant in the debate which he had brought upon himself. His reluctance manifested itself in the unreasonableness of the conditions under which he made it clear that he desired to speak, and in an apparent attempt to kill Jones' interest in the project by indicating that he had not seriously intended challenging the reformer to a public discussion. Thus, in late November, 1866, Jones, communicating through the medium of the Scottish National

\(^1\) Duncan McLaren genuinely respected Blackie's forthright Conservatism and his courage in openly pronouncing himself opposed to reform in Britain: "Although we do not sail in the same boat as respects politics, I think I may safely say that there is no man in Edinburgh who more heartily appreciates your honesty of purpose, and moral courage in avowing your opinions and acting on them" - McLaren to Blackie, 26 Oct., 1866, Blackie MSS., MS. 2627, fol. 115, National Library of Scotland. His biographer suggests, however, that his conclusions on democracy were derived purely from classical precedent and his own consciousness, that he was unhappy about being seen as the representative of a political party, and that he was rather disconcerted by the standing his lecture gave him among Conservatives because he had views on land and the crofter question which were opposed to theirs - Stoddart, John Stuart Blackie, Vol. 2, pp. 30, 32-33. But Blackie himself vigorously refuted Duncan McLaren's suggestion that professors should not meddle with politics, stating that "from the very fact of professors being highly educated men they are better able to form political opinions than linen drapers, clothiers [McLaren's trade], or shoemakers" - see report of a speech by Blackie on democracy delivered in Corstorphine schoolroom, 17 April, 1866, in Edinburgh Courant, 20 April, 1866.


For a biographical note on Blackie, see Appendix I.
Reform League (whose representative he was to be in the meeting), found it necessary to object to Blackie's new decision to hold different meetings before different audiences on separate evenings, and to insist that the Scottish National Reform League should be left to arrange the details.¹

At the same time, however, the British Reform League's Vice-President was not to be easily dissuaded from engaging in a confrontation which would provide him with an opportunity to publicize and justify popular reformist views against the apparently reactionary antiquarianism of a leading Scottish academic.² Replying to what had almost certainly been an inadequately disguised attempt by Blackie to back out of the debate, Jones pertinently - and somewhat mischievously - reasserted his willingness to meet Blackie:

I object as much as you can to "a vulgar fight between two political combatants to gratify the snob" - but permit me to observe that the "vulgarity", if any, would arise, not from the presence of the people, but from the conduct of the disputants, and that I cannot conceive that an audience of respectable working men could in any way detract from the dignity of the proceedings.³

Blackie's indecision and prevarication gave rise to more immediate concern among officials of the Edinburgh Working Men's Club, under the auspices of which the discussion was scheduled to take place. By early December, 1866, the Club's secretary, J. Wilkie, was obliged to request that the committee should "know fully" Blackie's mind on the matter, that he should indicate whether he would be prepared to lecture on the same evening as Jones, and whether, indeed, he wished to lecture at all.

¹ Ernest Jones to John S. Blackie, Manchester, 22 Nov., 1866, Blackie MSS., LS. 2627, fol. 156-157.
² There are some signs that Jones, realizing his own deficiencies in the field of classical education, sought to be vaguely sardonic about Blackie's use of Greek and of classical allusions in his correspondence to him - see ibid., LS. 2627, fol. 156-157.
³ Jones to Blackie, Higher Broughton, 3 Dec., 1866, ibid., LS. 2627, fol 168-169.
Wilkie made it clear that he personally had thought the challenge "a piece of fun and banter", and that neither he nor the Club had any desire to tie Blackie down to something said in that way; but he stressed also that subsequent events had made it necessary to have definite knowledge of the professor's plans.¹

Clearly, by this stage, withdrawal from the meeting with Jones would have involved a serious loss of face for Blackie. A sympathizer who furnished him with relevant contemporary literature to help him in his lecture ("you cannot be too well armed against your vulgar opponents") was quick to recognize this, and to impress his conviction on Blackie. He advised his friend to engage in the discussion as soon as possible, and to ignore suggestions that he should not carry out the lecture: "This matter will not be forgotten and you may depend upon it that any retreat will not fail to be associated with your name".²

Doubtlessly influenced to some extent by such considerations, the unenthusiastic Blackie finally let it be known that he would take part in the proposed debate. But the eventual firm commitment did not appreciably lessen the perverse, unaccommodating attitude which he persisted in

¹ J. Wilkie (Secretary, Edinburgh Working Men's Club), to Blackie, Edinburgh, 3 Dec., 1866, ibid., MS. 2627, fol. 175-176.
² A. Macdonald to Blackie, Pollokshaws, 3 Dec., 1866, ibid., MS. 2627, fol. 170-174.

It is conceivable that Macdonald was a member of the "Blackie Brotherhood", an active clique of friends and intellectual acquaintances who surrounded the eminent and popular professor at this period. The "Brotherhood's" vigorous championship of their hero in his brush with Jones was illustrated by the song composed for the occasion by one of their number, Alexander Nicolson. The words were set to the tune of "Hey, Johnny Cope", and the chorus is indicative of the general sentiment:

Hey, John Bright, are ye talking yet,  
And is your tongue awagging yet?  
Here's our Blackie will mak mincemeat  
Of you and your gang of reformers.

adopting towards the organization of the proceedings. An exasperated Wilkie, attempting along with the rest of the committee of the Edinburgh Working Men's Club to satisfy both speakers, ultimately took it upon himself to send a strongly worded objection to Blackie's awkward demands and intentions. The professor's conditions as communicated to him were, he declared, quite opposed to those of Jones, "and, in my opinion, to the terms in which your proposal was originally made". And Wilkie conveyed in no uncertain terms his extreme irritation over Blackie's decision not to allow Jones to hear, read, or allude to his lecture: "... we could never ask Mr. Jones, or any other gentleman, to come to Edinburgh professedly to meet you, in answer to your invitation, on the express understanding that he was to keep his eyes, ears, and mouth shut in regard to anything his 'opponent' may choose to say".

Eventually, Ernest Jones having agreed to talk on the evening after Blackie, the difficulties were ironed out, and the much-heralded debate took place on the evenings of 3 and 4 January, 1867. Speaking in the Edinburgh Working Men's Institute, Blackie drew on the American example as indicative of all the worst abuses which could result from unbridled democracy. Arguing for "a just mixture of aristocratic and democratic forces" as the best form of government, he maintained that the United States was "not free from a single vice which had stained democracies in ancient times", that it was impossible to look, even superficially, into "the foul atmosphere of political life in that country" without becoming painfully aware of "a degree of gross corruption and shameless unscrupulousness to which the worst revelations of our bribery committees could not afford a parallel". And, of course, there was a moral attached to

1 J. Wilkie to Blackie, Edinburgh, 4 Dec., 1866, ibid., MS. 2627, fol. 177-178.
his purposeful demolition of the American political system - a warning to Britons to cease idolizing the imperfect United States: "These facts might be sufficient to brush the paint from the fair transatlantic harlot who has been set up for us to worship". 1

As with Carlyle, however, it is extremely difficult to gauge exactly how great the influence of Blackie's lecture was, either upon those he hoped to convert or upon those who already thought as he did. Certainly, if the immediate reactions of the audiences who attended the respective lectures are anything to go by, Blackie seems to have aroused surprisingly little enthusiasm among an "upper crust" of working men who might conceivably have been disposed to accept some of his impressively erudite reservations on the nature of United States democracy. On the other hand, Jones' eulogies on the growth and material well-being of the United States, and on the essential smoothness of the transition from war to peace, were consistently and loudly cheered. 2 Similarly, there was little applause for Blackie among those sceptics and declaimers of American politics who might have been expected to gladly welcome and endorse these public statements by so popular a Scottish figure. Only the fiercely anti-American Edinburgh Courant showed open enthusiasm in welcoming his unrelieved tirade against democracy, ancient and modern. Significantly, the paper chose to concentrate its editorial comment on his denunciations of the weaknesses of the American system, considering that to "a practical public like that of Edinburgh", the greatest interest must centre around the references to contemporary democracy and the moral applicable to their own circumstances.

1 Report of lecture delivered by Blackie at Working Men's Institute, Edinburgh on 3 Jan., 1867, in Scotsman, 4 Jan., 1867. Despite all this, by 1877 his books were enjoying a considerable vogue in the United States and he was repeatedly asked to lecture there - see Stoddart, John Stuart Blackie, Vol. 2, p. 156.

2 See report of lecture delivered by Jones at the Working Men's Institute, Edinburgh, on 4 Jan., 1867, in Scotsman, 5 Jan., 1867.
Fully endorsing Blackie's contention that only a very limited advance in the working class vote was necessary since "It is a law of God which cannot be contravened, that the high should rule the low", the Courant decided that "Professor Blackie's disquisition on the democracy of the United States is one of the most valuable passages of his address, and will, we hope, be very generally weighed".

But the paper's belief that something of real value had emerged from the debate, its feeling that Edinburgh could congratulate itself on having provided one of the speakers, as well as having been the arena, for the discussion, was hardly shared by other influential contemporary journals. Perhaps Blackie himself, with his flamboyant passion for Celtic nationalism, and his other eccentricities, was too outre a figure for most of the staidly Conservative-Whig organs to regard without considerable reservation. But it seems likely there was a more prosaic reason for his subdued reception by the Scottish press. For while it was certainly the case that Scotland, proud of her educational as well as her religious independence, looked directly to her academics as well as to her ministers for political and intellectual inspiration, Blackie's talk, along with "Shooting Niagara",

---

1 Blackie, reported in ibid., 4 Jan., 1867. Blackie's speech was printed in full in the Courant, and the text of Jones' reply, with only minor omissions, was also published.

In spite of his strongly anti-reformist views, Blackie was sincerely fond of John Bright, and dedicated his work, The Scottish Highlanders and the Land Law (published 1884) to him - see Stoddart, John Stuart Blackie, Vol. 2, p. 259. This dedication was almost certainly induced by Bright's pioneer work in government-aided land purchase in the context of the Irish Land Act of 1870 and subsequently.

2 Edinburgh Courant, 7 Jan., 1867.

3 Ibid.

4 Hanham, Scottish Nationalism, p. 40, indicates that Blackie was judged by his contemporaries as something of a "picturesque eccentric". Meeting him for the first time in 1869, Sophia Jex-Blake, leader of the campaign to have women admitted to the medical faculty at Edinburgh University (a cause which Blackie supported) wrote in her diary, "Half and looking, certainly" - see Margaret Toad, The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake (London, 1918), p. 239.
tended to fit into an already well-established line of Scottish criticism on America rather than to stir up any specifically new consciousness of the evils of democracy.

The *Scotsman*, finding little bite in the debate, chose to concentrate exclusively on making an editorial attack on the fallacies in Jones' lecture.\(^1\)

The *Glasgow Herald*, committed to a "gradual and cautious" extension of the British franchise, though with "nothing to say in favour of Democracy", had previously shown its contempt for Blackie's allegedly alarmist view of the popular trend in British politics by sarcastically describing how he had delivered "a tremendous phillippic against Democracy" in the unlikely venue of Corstorphine village schoolroom.\(^2\) Subsequently, the debate with Jones was dismissed as having produced "nothing new", the *Herald* maintaining that the best argument against democracy was still that it was "simply an impossible form of government, that has often been put upon paper, but has never been reduced to practice". As proof of the unworkability of the system, it drew on the example of the current Reconstruction crisis:

President Johnson and his Cabinet have at the present moment a certain policy towards the Southern States, and which they do carry out as far as they possibly can; the nation has another policy, opposed to that of the Government; and here, in this land of pure Democracy, as it is called, where the nation ought to rule, we find an opposing force which effectively hinders it.\(^3\)

The value of the Blackie/Jones debate was most clearly depreciated, however, by Charles Mackay. Nothing, he felt, had been gained from the discussion, since neither speaker had convinced the other of his argument, and the "comparatively limited" audiences would have been merely reinforced in their previous views rather than converted. Although he wrote an article

---

1 *Scotsman*, 9 Jan., 1867.
2 *Glasgow Herald*, 23 April, 1866. This lecture (in which Blackie also included a denunciation of American democracy) simply foreshadowed his later one – see report of the speech in *Edinburgh Courant*, 20 April, 1866.
3 *Glasgow Herald*, 7 Jan., 1867.
for Blackwood reviewing the arguments of the two speakers, he made it clear that he was giving attention to the debate only because he believed that both Blackie and Jones, through lack of real knowledge of America, had misstated their cases. Jones was strongly censured for having allowed his love of the United States to obscure his understanding, a circumstance which had led to "mistakes, perversions and misconceptions" in his theories on American institutions. Blackie's error was much slighter, consisting of his having concentrated too much on the corruption of New York city and neglecting to emphasize the gross corruption which was widespread all over the United States. Hackay's article was mainly concerned, therefore, to set the record straight on the extent of the corruption which existed throughout America.¹

Hackay also made a point, however, of registering his approval of Blackie's stand against the Americanization of British political institutions. Like Blackie, he upheld the principle of government by the wise and good, and not of government by the whole people, who may very often be good, but cannot under any system of education and training be rendered uniformly wise, unselfish, and unimpassioned.²

British statesmen, he had earlier warned, should not be "mad enough" to Americanize the British Constitution "before they see whether the Americans will not have to Anglicise theirs in order to save themselves from wars and insurrections, and the despotism that ultimately crowns the evil work of mob-rule and too much liberty".³

² Ibid., p. 235. Such sentiments were, however, firmly grounded in a tradition of British Conservative pronouncements from the 1832 Reform Bill on - see, for instance, convictions of Sir Robert Inglis in Lillibridge, Beacon of Freedom, pp. 22-23.
It becomes clear that in the vast majority of cases, Scottish diatribes against United States democracy were made with the explicit intention of warning against the disastrous consequences for Britain of an importation of the American political system. While the triumph of the North in the Civil War was tacitly accepted by Conservatives and most "moderate Liberals" in Britain as a triumph for the dark and unruly forces of democracy in the United States, the increased tendency to fear a trend towards imminent Americanization of British institutions was further heightened by the successes in the 1865 general election of pro-Northern British radicals such as J.S. Hill, Thomas Hughes, and Henry Fawcett, and, at a purely Scottish level, of such men as Duncan McLaren, Laurence Oliphant, James Stirling, and W.E. Baxter.

Before the election, in one of its earliest editorials on the likely repercussions of the outcome of the Civil War, the Edinburgh Courant had sorrowfully predicted that Britain could now expect to see "a considerable revival of spirits and audacity in the American party in Britain", with Bright and his colleagues attempting to represent the Federal victory as one for the democratic principles which the American party want to see dominant in Britain. A year later, general developments on the British political front spurred the paper on to strike a timely blow against the

---

1 Pelling, America and the British Left, p. 8. Pelling argues that an intensified concentration on the merits and defects of democracy formed the main focus of British interest on the United States in the post-war years. He has also demonstrated the concern among specific sections of the community throughout Britain to stress publicly the evils of American democracy, and to campaign actively against their transference to Britain.

2 McLaren, Oliphant and Stirling were returned for the first time in 1865.

3 Edinburgh Courant, 26 April, 1865. The Courant took pains to insist that the Northern triumph represented a gain for the forces of repression and domination rather than those of freedom and democracy – see above, p. 249.
"curious use" which it felt was being made of the United States example in British discussions on political reform. Insisting on the warlike tendencies of democracy (a favourite theme), the Courant identified, beyond the peace-loving men like Bright, a "formidable body of their Radical brothers, who are for Garibaldi and Kossuth ... [and who] like the stir of war as well as its objects". And the intolerance and aggression inherent in radicalism had, it was argued, recently been demonstrated by the British radicals who, disliking the British territorial interest and vaguely believing the American conflict to be one between landholders and landless, had supported the armed overthrow of the landed class. "The fact testifies to the ancient bellicose character of democracy, and may warn us what democracy would be here".¹

Significantly, British radicals were warned that such a conflict as the United States had experienced could never be so well withstood by Britain: "Our civilisation is a vase - small, ancient, costly. Theirs is a huge earthenware pot - full of good coarse plenty, and which will stand a great deal of knocking about". And even in America itself, the military war had been followed by a political one equally as fierce, and one which illustrated just as clearly (through the attitudes of the Congressional Radicals towards the South) that radicalism and despotism - "those old, old friends!" - were really the same thing.² Accordingly, Johnson's successive vetoes against radical "tyranny" and "aggrandisement" were given unstinted praise, increased by the acknowledgement that "the keenness of our own struggle against democracy at home ... ought to increase our interest in the resolute and courageous resistance of President Johnson

¹ Ibid., 18 April, 1866.
² Ibid.
to the policy of American Radicalism". Johnson's struggle was considered analogous with that of the British Conservatives inasmuch as the American radicals apparently wanted to annihilate the legitimate political rights of the Southerners in the same way that the British radicals hoped to destroy the influence of the landed and Conservative interest in the House of Commons, and to make the Negro their stalking horse just as their British counterparts used the British working man. Following closely the feud between President and Congress, the Courant was convinced that the outcome was bound to have an effect on Britain. An ultimate triumph for Johnson, it estimated, would certainly "strengthen the hands of the great party, and combination of parties, which in this country opposes the clamorous Radical faction, all but identical with that now seeking in the States to depose the President and to subject the South to a reign of terror."

To check the growth of British radicalism, bid fair as it seemed to emulate the excesses of the transatlantic brand, Scottish Conservatives and Whigs naturally looked to a curb on the introduction of those political processes which were seen to have given rise in the United States to so powerful a radical faction. This meant the waging of a relentless campaign, both before and after the passing of the 1867 Reform Bill, against the very pivot of democracy, universal suffrage. It was simple and convenient to blame the whole political crisis of Reconstruction on a basically unsound democratic framework, on "a system which teaches all included in it that every man is equal to every other; that the opinion of the

1 Ibid., 2 June, 1866. The immediate cause of this particular eulogy on Johnson's policy was his recent veto on the Bill to make Colorado a State.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 10 Jan., 1867.
foolish is worth as much as that of the wise". And since comparatively few in Scotland (or, for that matter, in England) had studied in depth the intricacies and complexities of the American system of government, it was easy enough in the days of Tweed and the Tammany Ring in the North and carpetbag regimes in the South to put forward a convincing argument to the effect that true democracy in the United States had become an illusion, the mass of the people having little or no power at all, and being unable to protect themselves against "open and flagrant plunder by their rulers". From such revelations, the Edinburgh Courant was again able to mount an attack on radical and Liberal elements in Britain by suggesting that these simply did not understand the basically "undemocratic" functioning of American government in practice, and that when they did, there would be less confusion among the British public, and "less talk of Americanising British institutions".

A more specific attack on "our free and easy" Scottish Liberals had been similarly aided by focussing directly on "the abuses and disgraces of manhood suffrage in America". It was with alarm that the Courant in 1866 recognized that a lowering of the Parliamentary franchise would also mean a lowering of the Scottish municipal franchise which had remained at a higher level than the English household one. Realizing that bringing it into line with England would give power to "a needy and ignorant class", the paper warned that Scottish Liberals who were agitating for the reform should take a lesson from an article by "New York reformers" which had recently appeared in the North American Review, advocating curtailment,

1 See ibid.
2 See Felling, America and the British Left, p. 10.
4 Ibid.
not extension, of the franchise: "unlike our so-called reformers, they do not seek to cure corruption by adding more corruptible matter to the already putrid mass, nor do they think that the whole secret of political engineering lies in going lower down".¹

But if we can take the Scotsman as a representative voice, those "moderate" Scottish Liberals who did favour a limited extension of the suffrage in Britain hardly deserved the Edinburgh Courant's charge that they were steering the country towards the democratic abyss. Ironically, this element feared the bogey of Americanization almost as much as the Conservatives, and for basically the same reasons. Accordingly, the Scotsman fully endorsed Gladstone's belief that equality of political

¹ Ibid., 6 Nov., 1866.

It is not immediately clear to which article in the North American Review the Courant was referring in this instance. Within the scope of the material which appeared in the several issues of the periodical over the six months prior to November, 1866, the most likely source for the Edinburgh paper's statement would seem to have been an anonymous article in the July number (Vol. 103), entitled "The Right of Suffrage", Constructed around the review of a British book, The Workman and the Franchise. Chapters from English History on the Representation and Education of the People by the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice. But certainly, it would have been stretching the writer's statements to the point of distortion for the Edinburgh Courant to have used this article as a basis for asserting that elements within America looked favourably on actual curtailment of the franchise. The paper could, in fact, with greater justification have grounded its remark on views put forward in a review published one full year earlier, in the North American Review for July, 1865. There, discussing contemporary works on the nature of government and law by John Stuart Hill and Henry Sumner Maine, the reviewer had strongly argued that the suffrage should be looked on as something "held in trust for the rest of the community" and not as a personal right. From this basic premise, he had gone on to deplore the fact that "every ignorant peasant" entering America believed he had a natural right to vote, and to consider the unfortunate consequences of undue "exaltation of the poor": and it was his stated belief that the right to vote should henceforth be governed by educational qualifications applicable alike to black and white - see review (untitled) in North American Review, Vol. 101, July, 1865, pp. 109-120.

It should be noted that both the article published in July, 1865 and the one which appeared a year later would appear to have been the works of single authors. The Edinburgh Courant's mysterious reference to authorship by "New York reformers" remains inexplicable.
power was neither desirable nor necessary to liberty and good government, and deprecated those in Britain "who contemplate the subversion of our institutions and the construction of more symmetrical or perfectly rational institutions as the chief or only political object worth struggling for". ¹

It was every bit as anxious as the Edinburgh Courant itself to illustrate that the British system of government was infinitely superior to the American one: the degree of freedom enjoyed in the two Republics of France and the United States was less, it argued, than that achieved "under our own institutions as modified by the reforms of the last forty years". While thus tacitly acknowledging the salutary effects of moderate liberalizing influences on British politics, the Scotsman was ready enough to admit that nineteenth century Britain, even at its Tory worst, had never fallen prey to the political oppressions and abuses which the nature of American democracy gave scope for, and which had become commonplace in the United States after the Civil War;

There is a sort of vague belief that there is in America abundance of liberty, in the British or proper meaning of the word. But, though there is much liberty and scarcely much less licence, there are also things done there every day, in the way of invasions and suspensions of liberty by the Government, which in this country would not have been endured even in the days of Sidmouth and Castlereagh.

By way of amplifying this statement, the paper indicated how recent intelligence from America had shown that no particular stir had been aroused there by a Presidential proclamation of martial law in nine counties of South Carolina. The point was further driven home by contrasting the British situation in 1866 when Habeas Corpus had been suspended in Ireland only with great reluctance by Parliament, and amid strong popular opposition. ²

¹ Scotsman, 31 Oct., 1871.
² Ibid.
Scottish Conservatives could have found little to dispute in the Scotsman's assumption that one of the basic evils afflicting American society was the fact that, in the large cities at least, "every man is a voter, but only one man in twenty is a tax-payer". The Scotsman championed piecemeal (and consistent) Parliamentary reform in Britain almost certainly because its editor, Alexander Russel, believed that such a course would be the most effective antidote against radical discontents which might otherwise gather strength enough to precipitate the country into the horrors of universal suffrage, resulting - as in the United States - in "large bodies of ignorant and corrupt voters" placing in power men who were equally ignorant and irresponsible. Although it was recognized (and, insofar as circulation figures are a guide, rightly so) as Scotland's leading national daily newspaper, and while its views on reform are in fact likely to have been fairly representative of many of Scotland's Liberal M.P.'s in the 1860s and 1870s, the "Liberalism" which the Scotsman represented was essentially the comfortable, middle-of-the-road Liberalism of the Edinburgh upper middle classes - the Liberalism, in fact, of "an haute bourgeoisie of lawyers, churchmen, merchants, professors, bankers and manufacturers in old-style industries like brewing and printing,

1 Ibid., 27 Dec., 1871.
2 Ibid., 13 Dec., 1873.
3 Ibid., 23 Oct., 1871; 13 Dec., 1873.
4 The popularity of the Scotsman increased steadily throughout the 1860s, and by the early 1870s, its daily circulation was 40,000. It had the greatest productive power of any paper in the United Kingdom except for two or three metropolitan journals - see James Grant, History of The Newspaper Press, (London, 1872), Vol. 3, p. 448.
5 Vincent, The Formation of the Liberal Party, p. 48 has shown the predominantly wealthy, landed nature of Scottish Liberal M.P.'s, and has concluded that Scottish Liberalism as represented by them involved no real political revolt but rather a "cultural and intellectual phenomenon".
elevated high above a working population devoted almost entirely to catering for their needs." 1 The city, indeed, saw its prosperity as based in law and medicine. 2 Something of the tone which this background — and readership — gave to the paper's views on democracy in the United States was neatly illustrated in an editorial which suggested that the Americans "select ... [their political rulers] as we should hire a scavenger to clean out a filthy sewer — not asking for his advice but ordering him simply to do his work well", while the British, as when choosing a doctor or lawyer, sought as their leaders "men of wisdom greater than our own and in whose skill and honesty we have confidence". 3 

Nor did the apparent fallacy of the paramount role of "the people" in United States government escape the scrutiny of the Scotsman. Long before its bitter enemy, the Edinburgh Courant, attacked British Liberals for their failure to discern the subversion of the popular will in American politics, the Scotsman's New York correspondent had embellished his regular catalogue of the undesirable elements in American democracy by intimating that "the King, the Lobby and the Caucus are the three rulers of the country", and that "the people have just about as much to do with the government as the people of Edinburgh had to do with the election of M.P's before the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832". 4 He continued throughout

1 Hanhan, Scottish Nationalism, pp. 21-22.
2 A description furnished by local papers for the 1865 Press Directory stressed that Edinburgh "cannot be called a place of trade or manufacture, being chiefly supported by persons in the law and medical professions, especially the former. But the great bulk of the inhabitants are not engaged in productive industry. There are numerous manufactures ... but almost all are on an inconsiderable scale, and conducted without the limits of the city". Mitchell's Newspaper Press Directory, 1865, p. 94.
3 Scotsman, 19 Oct., 1872.
4 Ibid., 12 Nov., 1869.
the later years of Reconstruction to draw to the attention of those who "prated" about the Americanizing of British institutions the total negation of individual political freedom which existed in a country where, in practice, "party organisations compel a man to vote either the one ticket or the other". 1

With the significant qualification that the Scotsman readily saw the superiority of British over American political institutions in the perspective of a disciplined reformed and reforming British system, while the Edinburgh Courant tended to spotlight the turbulence of Reconstruction America in the hope that the example would help to freeze domestic reform altogether, the basic lines of argument by both journals against Americanization are strictly similar. "Moderate Liberalism" in Scotland (and perhaps most especially in Edinburgh) had after all as much to fear as had Conservatism from the increasingly active and prominent "radical" element in Scottish politics. Almost certainly aroused by the content of speeches by men like the Glasgow councillors Burt and Noir, and the English reformer Edmond Beales at the recent great Scottish National Reform League demonstrations in Glasgow and Dumbarton, 2 "D.M." of Sandyford, Glasgow attempted to counterbalance what he believed to be the misleading references to the advantages of United States democracy in "speeches by those urging reform in Britain";

The very unfortunate fact for the United States is that ... bare numbers override the intelligence, wealth, and education of the great Republic ... [Numbers alone will either impeach President Johnson, hang Jefferson Davis, or plunge the country into the convulsions of another conflict ... whether the wealthy, the

1 Ibid. (U.S./c., New York, 6 Nov., 1871), 20 Nov., 1871.
2 See above, p. 159; and below, pp. 310-311.
intelligent, and the educated like it or no.\footnote{1}

Drawing on his personal experience of Chartist and of the working of universal suffrage in the United States, he had come to appreciate the superiority of "intelligent and moderate Liberalism".\footnote{2}

It was also personal experience of the American political system which was largely responsible for producing, in the writings of Charles Mackay, some of the strongest polemic against Americanization to emerge in Scotland during the Reconstruction era. Enough has already been said about Mackay (his fanatical Southern bias during the Civil War, his attitudes towards North and South during Reconstruction) to indicate the strength of his feelings against any possible democratization of British political institutions. A sharp, virulent condemnation of United States democracy and its results punctuated all his articles for Blackwood at this time, and it is necessary here only to single out the most important of these in this connection, "Manhood Suffrage and the Ballot in America".\footnote{3}

The title afforded ample scope for what was in principle an argument against the introduction of any measure of the American system into Britain, for a long, unrelied tirade against the evils consequent upon the overpowering of the aristocracy of mind and money in the United States and the rule of the ignorant masses. Into this was inevitably dragged one of his favourite themes, the gross injustice done by North to South in failing to restore to her full political and constitutional rights after the war's

\footnote{1} "The Franchise in America": letter from "D.H.", Sandyford, Glasgow in Glasgow Herald, 24 Oct., 1866. The writer specifically referred to Beales as an offender in this respect, and sought directly to refute his contention that United States democracy did not swamp the influence of property, intelligence and education in the country.

\footnote{2} Ibid. "D.H." was later to revile Glasgow for the undemonstrative reception it gave Jefferson Davis during his visit there - see above, Chapter II, p. 86.

\footnote{3} The article appeared in Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 101, April, 1867.
end. This aspect he employed as a double-edged sword against the democratic aspirations of Bright and like men in Britain by suggesting that on the vexed question of Negro suffrage, the Southerners were right since "like wise men elsewhere in Old and New England" they were not happy about granting the franchise to the very poorest and utterly uneducated, and by stressing the tyrannical nature of a democratic North which was bent on keeping the South "in subjugation and virtual enslavement" simply because it was afraid of Southern power and potential.¹

There is no question but that Mackay's diatribes against United States democracy were primarily designed to strike a blow for the Conservative cause in Britain. In his first letter to John Blackwood, in which he offered to write for *Nara* a series of articles on America, he made a revealing statement not only of his intentions with regard to the series but also of his highly personal reasons for embarking on it:

Going to America [in 1862 as the *Times* correspondent] somewhat of a Liberal, I have come back very much of a Conservative; and I think I could write for *Blackwood* a series of sharp, pungent and readable papers — full of real indictment ... to show how a revolutionary hot radical and negro-worshipper was converted to the purer faith — such as is held by English gentlemen who do not desire to see this country revolutionized; and their ancient institutions remodelled on the Yankee fashion.²

From the outset, he was concerned in the articles to "do good service to the Conservative cause in England"³ and early conceived the idea of eventually collecting his proposed series on "the journey of my rampant English radical in America" into a book.⁴ On learning, however, that


² Mackay to John Blackwood, 7 March, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 12-13.

³ Mackay to Blackwood, 2 May, 1866, *ibid.*, MS., 4212, fol. 20-21.

⁴ Mackay to Blackwood, 26 June, 1866, *ibid.*, MS. 4212, fol. 36-37.
James Maguire, the radical Member for Cork, had made arrangements with Longmans to write a book on America, but was temporarily diverted from this particular scheme to favour a more grandiose project which would totally eclipse Maguire's effort.¹ He tried hard to sell his idea for the definitive work on contemporary America to Blackwood, promising a "thorough - impartial - and comprehensive" book, and suggesting that with Blackwood as publishers, it "would be certain to carry weight with the great Conservative ... party".

[It] will, I flatter myself, be a valuable contribution to the Conservative cause in England - as well as that of true and rational liberty in America, and take the place of de Tocqueville's work - which recent events have superseded, and rendered obsolete. ... I think it will be the book on America; and make a sensation.²

Despite Mackay's impassioned plea that he desperately wanted to write the book "for the deliverance of my soul: for the sake of Great Britain - for the sake of Conservatism - and for the sake of all that is good and worth keeping in America",³ the shrewd, level-headed Blackwood promptly rejected the overture to publish such a work.⁴ John Blackwood had by the 1860s built up Longmans into a bastion of British Conservatism, and a tremendously influential literary and political force both at home and in the

---

¹ In the event, Maguire tended to consult both his own area of expertise and his ethnic predilections, for his book when it appeared was The Irish in America (London, 1868).
² Mackay to Blackwood, 25 July, 1866, ibid., MS. 4212, fol. 46-49.
³ Mackay to Blackwood, 14 Aug., 1866, ibid., MS. 4212, fol. 52-53.
⁴ See Mackay to Blackwood, 16 Aug., 1866, ibid., MS. 4212, fol. 54-55, in which Mackay agreed, although only for the time being, to yield to Blackwood's "superior judgement" on the book. Mackay does seem to have been somewhat piqued by Blackwood's attitude, however; he could not even find time to call on the publisher when visiting Scotland that summer, despite his earlier plans to talk over the prospects for the book with Blackwood in Edinburgh - see Mackay to Blackwood, MS. 4212, fol. 52-53, and the fols. from late August to late September, 1866.
In the circumstances then, Mackay, with his intimate personal knowledge of the United States, his vehement hatred of American democracy and "Americanization", and his vigorous, experienced literary style, might have seemed the ideal contributor for Blackwood on American affairs. On the other hand, however, Blackwood almost certainly trod extremely warily in his professional relationship with the controversial Mackay. A close friend of John Delane, editor of the Times from 1841, Blackwood must have know well all the details of Mackay's ultimately disastrous stint as the paper's war correspondent in the United States, and appreciated in advance the extremist views which he would be likely to offer on Reconstruction America.

Accordingly, it would seem to have been John Blackwood's policy to keep a tight rein on the fiery journalist from the very outset. The language in the very first article, on "The Negro and the Negrophilists", (even as it stands, as savage and vitriolic a piece of prose as Carlyle's Occasional Discourses) had to be moderated at the publisher's request.

1 Blackwood's Magazine was probably the most widely circulated British periodical in the United States at that time. See Francis Lawley to Blackwood, 24 Aug., 1871, Bla. MSS., MS 4277, fol. 294-295; in which he stated that Blackwood was "more read in the United States ... than all the other magazines of England put together". See also Lawley to Blackwood, 28 July, 1871, ibid., MS. 4277, fol. 290-291. When Jefferson Davis stayed with the Blackwoods in 1869, he wrote back to his daughter Varina that he was the guest of the proprietor of "your favorite magazine" - see Strode, op. cit., p. 346. Both Putnam's Monthly and the Atlantic Monthly were consciously modelled on Blackwood - see Frank L. Mott, A History of American Magazines 1865-1885 (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), Vol. 3, p. 279. And facsimile reprints of Hara had been common in America since the mid 1830s; indeed, it was the only foreign work which American republishers had felt themselves forced by popular feeling to reproduce in facsimile. By the mid 1840s, it was purportedly read with equal enthusiasm throughout the length and breadth of the United States - see Cleveland Cox, "Hara in America" in Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 62, Oct., 1847, pp. 423-431.


3 Mackay to Blackwood, 10 April, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 16-17; 16 April, 1866, ibid., MS. 4212, fol. 18-19.
And subsequently, he was likewise instructed to tone down his pronounce-
ments against some aspects of American democracy. In a peevish and re-
monstrative letter to Blackwood concerning his article on "Women and
Children in America", he indicated that he had qualified some passages
"at which you draw up dubiously", but insisted that the original version
had hit nearer at the truth, and that after all, Trollope had been severer
on the working classes than he.¹ Quite apart from the formidable task
of curbing Mackay's invective throughout a full-length volume, Blackwood
was too experienced a publisher to risk damaging the reputation of his
firm by handling a work on the politics and society of post-war America
by a named author whose notoriety as a reporter on American affairs was
already assured in British literary and journalistic circles, and in the
Northern states. At least as a contributor to *Hags*, Mackay's name was
not publicly divulged.

Mackay was not to be put off by Blackwood's initial rebuff, however.
Plagued by financial difficulties, for which he did not hesitate to blame
the *Times* (though diplomatically exonerating Delane),² he continued to
pester Blackwood to publish either in book form, or as a series of articles,
his old project for "a Radical's travels in America in search of non-existent
Liberty" and his gradual conversion to Conservatism as a result.³ App-
preciating, perhaps, that Blackwood might be reluctant to publish so soon
after the Civil War the opinions of a writer who had been seen to lose

¹ Mackay to Blackwood, 15 Dec., 1866, *ibid.*, MS. 4212, 90-91; also
27 Nov., 1866, *ibid.*, MS. 4212, 92-93.
² See Mackay to Blackwood, 8 Dec., 1866, *ibid.*, MS. 4212, fol. 86-87, in
which he blames the *Times* for having taken him away from his "old pur-
suits and connections", and failing to keep a promise to give him a new
engagement when he returned from America. Delane had been his friend,
he believed, but his influence had been counteracted. See also MS. 4212,
fols. 84-85; MS. 4237, fol. 67-69.
³ Mackay was constantly asking for advance payments from Blackwood - see, for instance, Mackay to Blackwood, *ibid.*, MS. 4212, fols. 84-85,
88-89; MS. 4223, fols. 29-30; 72-73; MS. 4237, fol. 53-54; MS. 4279,
fols. 52-53, 29-32.
³ Mackay to Blackwood, 14 Oct., 1866, *ibid.*, MS. 4237, fol. 63-64.
face on that issue, Hackay was even prepared to swallow his egotism and suggest that such a book could be published anonymously or under a pseudonym. And by the time that he was prepared to settle for a short series of articles on this theme rather than a book, he had obviously learned his lesson— at least so far as writing for Blackwood was concerned—against the use of too much invective: "I will do my very, very best with it [the series]— and put lots of fun—and no ill-nature into it". He remained, however, as firmly bent as ever on reinforcing confidence in British Conservatism by illustrating and denouncing its ultimate antithesis, the American system, and by strongly attacking "the pusillanimity of John Bright and the active Americanizers, who are constantly overrating the States and underrating Great Britain".

Clearly, then, the productive working relationship between Charles Mackay and John Blackwood was governed from start to finish by a continual

1 Mackay to Blackwood, 25 Oct., 1866, ibid., MS. 4212, fol. 70-71; 27 Feb., 1867, ibid., MS. 4223, fol. 41-42.
2 Mackay to Blackwood, 3 Aug., 1868, ibid., MS. 4237, fol. 61-62. See also MS 4237, fol. 63-64.
3 Mackay to Blackwood, 29 March, 1869, ibid., MS. 4250, fol. 27-28. Bright he defined as his "favourite averter"— MS. 4212, fol. 72-73.
4 Mackay persisted throughout the 1870s in his attempts to persuade John Blackwood to publish material by him on the United States—see Mackay to Blackwood, Jun.-Nov., 1870, ibid., MS. 4265, fols. 56-57, 58-59, 90-91; Jan.-April, 1871, MS. 4279, fols. 16-17, 19-20, 21-22, 29-32 (this 1870 and 1871 correspondence related to Mackay's idea of writing a series of biographical and historical sketches of the first seven Presidents of the United States which could hopefully be published as a book. Blackwood did not handle the project); Feb.-Nov., 1872, MS. 4294, fols. 15-16, 19-20, 29-30; Aug.-Sept., 1874, MS. 4322, fols. 1'-10, 19-20; May, 1875, MS. 4355, fol. 122-123. There are clear indications that by this stage, however, John Blackwood was no longer interested in publishing Hackay's work. In 1871, he had occasion to be extremely angry with Hackay over the latter's views on the Lord Byron scandal ("that confounded little book about the supposed daughter of Byron shook my faith and disappointed me in you"— draft of a letter from Blackwood to Hackay, 8 Sept., 1871, written on the back of a letter from Hackay, ibid., MS. 4279, fol. 49), and although there appears to have been no continuing ill-feeling on either side following this incident, the working relationship between the two men steadily deteriorated over the succeeding years. Hackay became increasingly irritated at Blackwood's failure to answer his letters, and finally severed his association with the Edinburgh publisher in late 1872—see, for instance, Hackay to Blackwood, 23 Feb., 1872, ibid., MS. 4294, fol. 19-20; Hackay to William Blackwood (John's nephew and partner in the firm), 8 March, 1872, ibid., MS. 4294, fol. 21-22.
push from Mackay's side, both as regards the vituperative content of his articles and the pressure on Blackwood to publish his projected books and miscellaneous writings on the United States. But since Mackay's views on America during Reconstruction were extreme by any British standards, to say that Blackwood was relatively less bigoted against the victorious North and the American system of government is not to give much insight into the attitudes of Scotland's influential publisher towards Reconstruction. What is perhaps much more significant in this connection is the fact that, fully appreciating the nature of Mackay's feelings on the war and its aftermath, Blackwood should have chosen to use his material at all. That he did so — but guardedly and in moderation — suggests that Blackwood was seeking to keep his tribune of the Scottish Conservatives running on the old, traditional lines so far as attitudes to the United States were concerned. This tradition consisted of strong polemic against American democracy, forcibly argued and presented by good writers and, with the advent of the Civil War, a tremendously deep commitment to the Southern cause and a readiness to accept the horrors of war in the hope that "mob rule" might thereby be ended.¹

Mackay, therefore, can be seen to fit into this pattern; and Blackwood's reception of Jefferson Davis, plus the fact that in 1871 he became a joint stockowner in the fiercely anti-American Edinburgh Courant² testifies to his continuing strong personal feelings on the United States after the war.

This said, however, what Blackwood had no place for in Naga was a partisanship expressed in terms strong enough to turn the article in question into mere propaganda. In this connection, it is perhaps worth noting that

¹ For a classic example of this last sentiment, see E.B. Hanley, "Democracy Teaching by Example", Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 90, Oct., 1861, pp. 401, 404-405.

² The Courant was transferred to a joint-stock company in 1871, in which the chief partners were the Dukes of Buccleuch, Richmond, and Atholl, the Marquis of Bute, Sir William Stirling-Maxwell, and John and William Blackwood — see North British Daily Mail, 27 Sept., 1871.
he never took up an offer by Henry Hotze, former editor of the Confederate propaganda journal in Britain, the Index, to write for Blackwood a series of six articles analysing the politics of the Civil War, even although Hotze, having admitted that he was "heart and soul devoted to the Southern cause which I hold to be that of conservatism and orderly government against the despotism of mere numbers", promised to write with "calm impartiality". ¹

Similarly, Francis Lawley, who had reported for the London Times from inside the South during the Civil War (Mackay had been permanently based in the North), had an article on Lee rejected because the style was too florid and exuberant. ²

The ferocity of Mackay's attacks on "negro-worshippers", on the Federal policy of Reconstruction, and on American democracy in general was determined at bottom by a very deep personal disillusionment with the United States. His preoccupation with producing a work which would chart how "the virulent English radical becomes a Conservative in the face of his American experience"³ simply reflected a desire to aid Conservatism in Britain as best he knew how - by recording the process of his own personal conversion to it. For all the signs are that this most reactionary of Scottish commentators on Reconstruction America did, in fact, go to the United States if not a "virulent radical" then certainly, as he claimed, "somewhat of a Liberal".

---

1 Henry Hotze to Blackwood, 13 May, 1865, Bla. MSS., MS. 4199, fol. 139-142.
2 Francis Lawley to Blackwood, 24 Aug., 1871, ibid., MS 4277, fol. 294-295.
Francis Charles Lawley, the youngest son of Baron Wenlock, had entered Parliament as an advanced Liberal in 1852, became Gladstone's private secretary at the Exchequer, and Governor of South Australia in 1854. Scandal concerning his dealings on the stock market led to a cancellation of his colonial appointment and his emigration to the United States for nine years. During the Civil War, he was in close touch with Confederate military leaders. He returned to Britain in 1865 and quickly became recognised as a journalist of merit. See DNB, Vol. 2, Second Supplement, pp. 426-427; also Morison, The History of 'The Times', Vol. 2, p. 378.
3 Mackay to Blackwood, 3 July, 1869, Bla. MSS., MS. 4250, fol. 44-45.
Given the tenor of Mackay's political persuasion by that time, it seems incredible that in 1873 the committee members of the recently formed Charles Mackay Testimonial Fund should have found it possible to launch a national appeal to benefit and honour Mackay for "the valuable services that he has rendered to the cause of social progress" and for his concern to elevate and ameliorate the general condition of the people. From the content of the poems which he wrote earlier in the century, however, it becomes clear that politically, and in terms of social conscience and of simple compassion, the Mackay of Blackwood's Magazine was far removed from the Mackay of twenty-five years before. As he zealously campaigned in the interests of British Conservatism through attacking American democracy in the 1860s and 1870s, so in the mid 1840s, prior to the repeal of the Corn Laws, he had taken up the cudgel on behalf of the labouring classes who were agitating for repeal. In his series of poems, "Voices from the Crowd", he powerfully combined straightforward appeals for betterment of the miserable plight of the working classes with the recurrent idea that the dawn of justice for the workers was near and that if the rulers were wise, they would not shut their ears to the "march of freedom of the people":

A new light hath dawn'd on the darkness of yore,
And men shall be slaves and oppressors no more

... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ...

1 Copy of circular of the "Charles Mackay Testimonial Fund" sent to Blackwood by the secretary, Arthur A. Hutton, 8 Oct., 1873, in BL. MSS., MS. 4308, fol. 15-16. Equally surprising is the fact that so far as the American connection is concerned, such pro-Southern Scottish elements as the Marquis of Lorne, Robert Carruthers and the indubitable James Smith of Dowanhill, Glasgow, were joined on the committee by pro-Northern men like the Duke of Sutherland and Charles Cowan of Valleyfield.

The serf that was yesterday bought,
To-day his defiance hath hurl'd,
No more in his slavery dumb;
And tomorrow will break from the fetters that bind,
And lift a bold arm for the rights of mankind.¹

In the light of his later writings for Blackwood, his early indictment of the "charitable" upper classes is significant:

And rich men kindly urge us to endure,
And they will send us clergymen to bless us;
And lords who play at cricket with the poor,
Think they have cured all evils that oppress us ... ²

But perhaps the best measure of the change in Mackay's attitudes over the years is the contrast in sentiment and emphasis between "The Good Time Coming" (written in 1846 and perhaps Mackay's most famous poem) and "A Man's A Man For A' That (A New Song to an Old Tune)", written in 1876. A central theme of the former was that

Worth, not Birth, shall rule mankind,
And be acknowledged stronger ...

While still seeking in the later poem to argue that "honest worth" was the only criterion of true greatness, Mackay was primarily concerned to show that all the poor and the working classes were not true and brave, and that the work-shy "louts" who, because they were physically strong, claimed to be as noble as a Duke or Lord, were at best animals, not men. Furthermore, worth was not the exclusive prerogative of those of humble birth; titled and landed men might be of the highest character, while

---


² Hardening of attitude towards "the mob" later in the century was paralleled by a hardening of attitude on race, since none of the vehement racialism which Mackay expounded in the Reconstruction era was evident in these early days.

³ "The Cry of the People" in ibid., p. 206.

4 "The Good Time Coming" in ibid., p. 209.
... Donald herding on the moor,
    Who beats his wife and a' that,
Is nothing but a brutal boor
    Nor half a man for a' that.

The progression of Mackay's thought in this direction was certainly significantly aided by the disillusionsment which resulted from personal experience of the consequences of "pure democracy" in the United States. His first trip to the States in the late 1850s promptly observations on the weaknesses and abuses of the United States system of government, and on the highly detrimental effects of popular rule, which simply foreshadow his writings for Blackwood during the Reconstruction era. These initial misgivings were fully borne out and reinforced by his unhappy years as a pro-Southern Briton in a hostile North. Yet the basis for Mackay's bitter denunciations of the immediate situation in America after the war went beyond mere disillusionsment with the country's political institutions to the greater disillusionsment which accompanied his realization that because of force of circumstances (in this case, the political coup - as Mackay saw it - by the ultra-Radicals) a passionately held belief was no longer viable. For the disastrous, unjust Reconstruction policies of the victors, the submersion of all the best elements in United States society, and the apparent ascendancy of a dangerous Radicalism had finally shattered Mackay's old confidence in the United States as a land of freedom and opportunity, as a vigorous, energetic young nation founded on the spirit of the pioneers of the west, and, perhaps most poignantly, as a land where evicted Scottish crofters might find new hope, and leave, as an influence for good, the

1 "A Man's A Man For A' That (A New Song to an Old Tune)" in ibid., pp. 620-621.
2 See, for instance, Mackay, Life and Liberty, Vol. 2, pp. 156-162.
3 See "To the West! To the West!" (n.d.) in Poetical Works, p. 549.
strength and virtue of their character. 1 And while many Scots recognized the Reconstruction era as a perfect starting point for the forging of closer ties between the two countries and the fulfilment of their mutual role as guides and civilizers, Mackay's disenchantment with the United States at that time effectively ended his early visions of close Anglo-American cooperation so clearly expressed in his popular poem "John and Jonathan". Clearly, the bitterness which Mackay felt towards America during Reconstruction was to a very large extent the bitterness produced by old dreams and old optimisms which had gone sour.

VI Enthusiastic support and admiration for American democracy and its post-war development

Among very many of Mackay's countrymen, however, the old image of the United States as the triumphant fountainhead of freedom and democracy was still faithfully revered, still loyally defended against the attacks of whose who tried (as they had always tried) to throw obloquy on the politics and society of the Republic. Reference has already been made to the traditional affinity between Scottish liberalism and American democracy. 2 The success of the North (and therefore of democracy) in the Civil War, and the growing agitation for Parliamentary reform in Britain, perpetuated and helped to strengthen (at least in the short term) the traditional sympathetic outlook by keeping the eyes of Scottish Liberals firmly and appreciatively focussed on the United States during Reconstruction. It was, indeed, to counter a healthy, vigorous brand of philo-Americanism that the Scottish Conservatives and sceptics among the "moderate Liberals" launched their consistent and scathing attacks on

1 See "Lament of Cona for the unpeopling of the Highlands" (1845) in ibid., pp. 102-105:

    For o'er the rolling Atlantic the day-star shall shine;
    Young o'er the Western main
    Albyn shall bloom again,
    Raising new blossoms, old land! as majestic as thine.

As we have observed above, p. 212, fn. 2, Mackay in a lecture for the Gaelic Society of Inverness in 1873 carefully stressed the strong Conservative influence of Scots in American politics.

2 See above, Chapter I, pp. 10-13.
democracy, and their dire warnings on the dangers of Americanization. Fully appreciating the stimulus which the recent triumph of American democracy gave to the reform movement at home, Scottish "advanced Liberals" and radicals appeared to their Conservative detractors ready indiscriminately to extol United States institutions and, in their own interests (if not out of inexcusable ignorance), seriously to play down the potential dangers inherent in modern democracy.

And perhaps to some extent these enthusiastic pro-American reformers did indeed fail to face up to, or - more likely - to recognize the real challenges and contradictions posed by the changing face of United States democracy during the Reconstruction years. Looking at the democratic experiment from the other side of the Atlantic, keenly conscious of its importance for British liberalism, and willing to give no quarter to Conservative, anti-American opponents, no Scottish radical, while standing up for the basic merits of United States democracy, was simultaneously prepared openly to concede with Walt Whitman that "It is useless to deny it: Democracy grows rankly up the thickest, noxious, deadliest plants and fruits of all".¹ Nor would many Scots who admired United States institutions have been so lenient towards Carlyle's "Shooting Niagara" as was Whitman who, after an initial angry reaction, re-read it "with respect as coming from an earnest soul, and as contributing certain sharp-cutting metallic grains, which, if not gold, may be good hard, honest iron".² Certainly, Carlyle's warning

2 W.B. Baxter, writing in 1855 on his recent visit to the United States, had been ready enough to acknowledge the defects of American democracy - see Baxter, America and the Americans, pp. 50-63 - but by the Reconstruction era, when he used the American example to plead for British reform, the less attractive aspects were tactfully referred to but quickly passed over - see, for instance, report of speech by Baxter at Montrose, 5 July, 1865, in Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865.

Whitman, "Democratic Vistas", p. 376. Whitman had at first been "roused to much anger and abuse" by Carlyle's essay, "so insulting to the theory of America".² ibid., p. 375.
blast against democracy had not been quite so generously accepted by the democratically minded United Presbyterian church in Scotland. Recognizing his installation as Rector of Edinburgh University, the church's monthly magazine, while refraining from direct comment on the anti-democratic content of his inaugural speech, significantly estimated that his popularity had recently been waning, and that posterity would probably judge him "a more destructive than constructive genius".1

The U.P. church's fiercely independent principles had always tended to make it look with especial favour on both the independent status of America's religious denominations and the free, democratic nature of its political institutions.2 Nothing of this tradition faded after the Civil War; nor was it left to Duncan McLaren to alone represent, by his close associations with Bright, his zealous campaigns for wider religious privileges for Scottish dissenters and for parliamentary reform (including women's suffrage),3 the

2 The U.P. church was formed in 1847 from an amalgam of the majority of the Secession and the Relief Churches. The union was based on Voluntary principles, which meant that the new denomination continued to argue for the total separation of church from state on the American model. See W. Ferguson, Scotland, pp. 307, 312; J.R. Fleming, The Story of Church Union in Scotland (London, 1929), p. 30.
3 McLaren's interest in franchise reform dated from before the first Reform Bill. He unhesitatingly supported the moves of J.S. Mill and Henry Fawcett in 1866-67 to extend the franchise to women, and his name became the centre for all Scottish agitation on the question, the Edinburgh Society for Women's Suffrage (1867) being one of the earliest to be formed in Britain and having McLaren's wife as President and his sister Agnes as its joint secretary, along with Eliza Wigham. See Mackie, Life of Duncan McLaren, Vol. 2, pp. 102-103, 141 et seq.; Constance Rover, Women's Suffrage and Party Politics in Britain 1866-1914 (London, 1967), pp. 5-6, 56. In 1871, Agnes McLaren formed a close, lifelong friendship with Sophia Jex-Blake, then at the height of her vigorous campaign to get women admitted to the medical faculty at Edinburgh University. Along with Duncan and Priscilla Bright McLaren, she took an active part in the struggle and eventually studied medicine herself, not because she felt any vocation for it but simply because she wanted to be associated with Sophia Jex-Blake in her work - see letter from Agnes McLaren to Sophia Jex-Blake, 10 Nov., 1872 in Toad, The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake, p. 386; see also ibid., pp. 323, 325, 346, 362, 365 et seq.
brand of U.P. radicalism which welcomed, rather than feared, some degree of "Americanization". Supporting the proposal under discussion to take steps to secure the transmission of a formal address to the American U.P. church regarding Lincoln's death and the abolition of slavery, one Mr Edwards sought to remind the May, 1865 meeting of the Glasgow U.P. Presbytery of the exceptionally praiseworthy nature of the United States government. For nearly a century, he insisted, an important political experiment had been going on in America - one which was destined to prove whether men were competent to govern themselves without nonarchical forms of government. It was an experiment which all members of the U.P. church, as believers in man's right to political freedom, must sympathise with, and which all men must rejoice to see successfully worked out.¹

And confidence that the experiment would ultimately be successful was preserved, even amid America's visibly chronic difficulties during Reconstruction. Reporting on his recent trip to the States, a writer in the June 1866 edition of the United Presbyterian Magazine strongly refuted all current auguries of failure for the union of North and South. With religion free from state interference, a system of national education, the recent abolition of slavery and, above all

with so much ... of the conserving salt of vital Christianity in the land, and the marked effusion of God's own spirit from time to time - we cannot but confidently hope, and fervently pray, for the triumph of republican freedom.

If America remained true to God and itself, he believed, it could sort out its great problems, for republican government really meant self-government - "the ruling of one's own spirit ... the highest and most perfect of government forms". With these radical convictions went a new sense of

¹ Report of the monthly meeting of the Glasgow U.P. Presbytery, held in the Presbyterian Hall, 9 May, 1865, in North British Daily Mail, 10 May, 1865.
perspective: "from the summit of the Capitol, our own dear old ... Great Britain did appear not altogether quite so great and peerless as it used to do".  

A similar shade of sentiment was later expressed by a leading figure within Scotland's other principle dissenting religious body, the Free Church. Although by the early 1870s membership in either the Evangelical or Voluntary church probably did little to hinder social, professional or political advancement in Scotland, for the Rev. William Arnot, as for the U.P. observer, (and, indeed, for all the many men from these respective denominations who had visited the United States earlier in the century) a prime attraction of the American system remained the unfettered freedom and the total equality of all religious denominations: "Your place in society or your prospect in life is not affected by the shade of your religious profession". Arnot, too, was confident that the United States would overcome its grave political difficulties and become, hopefully, the greatest world power. Similarly convinced that "The Lord reigneth" in Reconstruction America, he maintained that those who "intelligently love their kind, and desire to see the reign of righteousness established on the earth" had a direct interest in seeing the government and constitution of the United States consolidated. It had been the British connection with America over the early decades of the nineteenth century which had hastened the liberalizing of British institutions, and thereby saved Britain from the convulsions experienced by Continental nations.  

3 Ibid., pp. 135, 263. Arnot had visited the United States briefly in 1864 while acting as temporary minister in the newly organized Free Church in Montreal. He had identified himself with the reform cause in 1832 – see A. Fleming (ed.) William Arnot, pp. 101, 165, 190.
The centenary of American independence gave the Aberdeen Free Press its chance to argue in like vein. Carrying on the advanced liberal, dissenting traditions of its late editor, William McCombie, the Free Press congratulated America for having proved "resolutely faithful to the principles of political liberty" for which it had originally fought, and for having done much by its example to spread these principles throughout the world. The success of the War of Independence had promoted the political freedom of the masses everywhere, while "in England itself, it helped greatly to diminish the kingly authority that had been so grossly abused, and to establish the principles of popular government".

For these admirers of American democracy, then, the recognized difficulties and political instabilities of the Reconstruction era were not to be viewed (as the Conservatives and Whigs viewed them) in terms of the natural consequences of a basically unsound and unworkable political system. On the contrary, certain facets of the post-war experience were emphasized as indicative of the fundamental strength and sophistication of democratic institutions. At the height of the political crisis of Reconstruction, with the impeachment trial imminent, the Glasgow Sentinel, in an editorial entitled "Representative Institutions on their Trial", pertinently observed that those who are hostile to democratic institutions are in great glee at the embroglio in the United States, forgetting that, had the same difficulty occurred in any other country, there would have been a Civil War long ago.

1 William McCombie during his seventeen years as editor of the Aberdeen Free Press did sterling service to the cause of Liberalism in Aberdeenshire. A staunch advocate of Voluntaryism, he was originally a U.P. and remained a sympathetic and active supporter of this denomination, even after his formal affiliation to the Baptist church in 1858. He died on 6 May, 1870 - see William Alexander, Twenty-Five Years: A Personal Retrospect (Aberdeen, 1878), pp. 2-7; W. Robertson Nicoll, James Macdonell: Journalist (London, 1890), pp. 36-37, 48; obituary in U.P. Magazine, Nov., 1870, pp. 509-510. For a biographical note on McCombie, see Appendix I.

2 Aberdeen Free Press, 21 June, 1875.

3 Glasgow Sentinel, 7 March, 1868.
As the paper itself had earlier acknowledged, however, it had been the
success with which the Republic had weathered the tremendous military and
social upheaval of the Civil War which had most decisively proved that
Republican institutions were "equal to any emergency".\(^1\) Pointing out that
America had withstood both a Presidential election by universal suffrage
and the assassination of the Chief Executive without a single riot, W.E.
Baxter asked his constituents "Have not ... [Democratic institutions in
the United States] passed through the fiery ordeal in a manner that may
well make the despots of Europe tremble on their thrones?"\(^2\) And although
the storms of the bitter political strife which was to dominate the earliest
years of Reconstruction were already brewing, the Aberdeen Free Press, re¬
calling the smooth take-over of Presidential power by a man "bred a working
tailor, and ... never a day at school!", readily complimented the United
States on its "stability": and, finding that Johnson had easily taken his
place "with the first of your born Kaisers, and your Statesmen bred and
trained in the most privileged circles of court diplomacy", the paper con¬
cluded that Britain had much to learn from the governing of the United
States.\(^3\)

The America-orientated tradition of dissenting Scottish radicalism was
still more fully demonstrated, however, by James Macdonell, an Aberdeenshire¬
born journalist who was launched on his press career through close acquaint¬
ance with McCombie in the 1850s. Macdonell, who was to work on the Edinburgh
Telegraph (where he became assistant editor)\(^4\) made his views on the American

\(^1\) Ibid., 13 May, 1865. See also ibid., 22 April, 1865.
\(^2\) Report of a speech by W.E. Baxter to electors and non-electors in the
Assembly Hall, Montrose, 5 July, 1865 in Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865.
\(^3\) Aberdeen Free Press, 19 Jan., 1866.
\(^4\) For a biographical note on Macdonell, see Appendix I.
situation clear when in June, 1861 he wrote a leader on slavery for the Aberdeen Free Press. In this, he forcefully repudiated the slaveowners' assertions that they bore no personal antipathy towards the Negro, as well as their claims that they were justly entitled to hold slaves both by virtue of ancient Greek and Roman precedent and by virtue of the fact that the Bible did not condemn slavery as illegal. So far as the planters' general attitude towards the black race was concerned, he maintained that their actions towards the slaves "speak of that hatred which we are apt to direct against those whom we wrong, on account of their being reminders of the evil we have done". Still more intense was his concern to discredit the arguments that slaveholding was justifiable through ancient precedent and Biblical sanction. On the latter claim, he insisted that slavery was branded sinful by the principles if not by the letter of the Christian religion, and that the pervasive influence of Christianity had been totally directed towards eradicating the evil. The validity of the proposition that contemporary slavery in the Southern states of America could be justified by appeal to the mores of ancient Greek and Roman civilization was equally easily and vigorously dismissed by a statement that the progress of time had brought a greater enlightenment which left no justification for acting as the Ancient World had done. The Southern slaveholder, he suggested, could not in the nature of things be considered as humane as some Roman slaveholders might have been: "He is a slaveholder in spite of the rebuke of the enlightened world, and therefore his moral defection must be of a more than local caste".

Macdonell was ready to concede that both the British, "who first gave impetus to slavery in America", and the Northern people, who were too apt to "play ... the part of slaveholders in the counting-house, and of abolitionists on the platform", were deserving of a share of criticism for their
earlier stance on American slavery. But it was for the slaveowning Southerner with his pretensions to aristocratic lineage and his contemptible social position that Macdonell reserved his sharpest barbs. His hostility towards them for their key role in perpetuating the slave system was rendered the more acute because he judged slavery, with its pernicious effects on all sections of the Southern community, to be "the well-spring" of all that was currently crippling and prostrating a country which he deeply admired and respected.  

During the Reconstruction years, the quality of Macdonell's veneration for America was brought out in his joyful contemplation of the Republic now truly a land of freedom. Writing to a friend who was on a trip to the United States in 1870, he revealed how much he longed to stay for a period in America and study its "thousand problems":

America is untying many of the knots which we in the Old World have often thought must be cut by the sword. She is teaching us that it is possible for a nation to get on very well without a king, or an hereditary aristocracy, or a State Church, or a great standing army ...  

Recognizing that if he were an American he would be excessively proud of his country and "too conscious of the fact that a Republic is a much more rational form of government than a monarchy", Macdonell's admiration was nothing less than a vigorous republicanism.

The apparent proliferation of such sentiments in the Scottish newspapers which he read prompted a Banffshire emigrant, James Burns, to write in protest from Lynchburg, Ohio. Regretting that a tendency to favour republicanism was clearly replacing the old, loyal attachment of Scotland

---

1 "American Slavery", Aberdeen Free Press, 14 June, 1861. Nicoll, James Macdonell, p. 65, indicates that this leader was Macdonell's work.
2 James Macdonell to Annie Harrison, 5 March, 1870, quoted in ibid., pp. 170-171.
3 Ibid., p. 171.
to the crown, he warned that "The tendency of all popular majorities is to tyranny and absolutism", and declared himself convinced that the British government was the best in the world. But Burns was perhaps taking too simplistic a view of Scottish attitudes to United States democracy at this time inasmuch as he made no distinction between those radicals who were prepared to argue for the establishment of republicanism in Britain and those elements who simply admired the working of the republican system in the United States and accepted that it could usefully serve to curb the excesses of existing forms of government in Europe. Thus the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, a pillar of the Church of Scotland, Conservative in politics, and one of Queen Victoria's favourite chaplains who was on very close terms with the Royal family, enthusiastically recorded his confidence in republicanism at the end of the Civil War:

I rejoice in the unity and prosperity of the grand Republic; its strength is a blessed counterpoise to continental despotisms and mere king-craft. I have the brightest hopes of its future... It is a mystery to me that Britain does not rejoice in America. I do.  

The conviction that United States institutions were basically sound, and that the Old World could directly or indirectly profit from them, was shared by Scots who, unlike James Burns, had found their confidence in

---

1 Letter from James Burns, Lynchburg, Ohio, 17 Dec., 1872, in Banffshire Journal, 14 Jan., 1873. See also his letters in ibid., 9 Jan., 5 March, 1872. Burns had emigrated to Ohio in the early 1840s.

2 See, for instance, a letter from Macleod to his wife from Balmoral, 15 Oct., 1866, in Macleod, Memoir of Norman Macleod, Vol. 2, pp. 208-209; Elizabeth Longford, Victoria R.I. (London, 1964), pp. 152, 424, 427; and p. 408, where it is indicated that on the death of an infant son of the Princess Royal's in 1866, Macleod was one of the Queen's greatest comforters - "he would read aloud the poetry of Burns while she turned her therapeutic spinning-wheel".

democracy and republicanism increased by a lengthy stay in America. Refuting "D.M." of Glasgow's allegations against democracy, a Glaswegian, looking back on his eleven years' residence in the United States, boldly maintained that while it might be partly true that wealth and education were overridden by numbers inasmuch as the majority carried the day, this was only as it should be. Denunciations of bribery and corruption in American politics he dismissed as a joke: "If there is anything we can beat the Yankees in, it is this wholesale selling of votes at elections". He thoroughly endorsed the ability of the American people to turn Johnson out of office if they found him unfit: "If every tyrant and unfit governor could be treated in the same way it would be good for the world". And among the many letters from Scottish working men in the United States which, during the Reconstruction years, found their way into the Glasgow Sentinel, one of the earliest, from P. Sinclair in New York, reflected not only the writer's personal opinion but also symbolised well the feeling of all Scottish radicals at home on the basic significance of the outcome of the Civil War for Britain, and on their hopes for the United States in the years to come:

The ability of the people to govern themselves has been demonstrated. Liberty has triumphed ... The United States of America before this war began was the best country in the world for the white working man. Now this war is over, America is the best country in the world for all working men ... [The adaptability of this people to meet every changing aspect of the great trial through which they have passed has astonished and proclaimed at fault the wisest of seers ... To all lovers of liberty - to all who desire to better their condition, I say, come to this goodly land].

1 See above, pp. 268-269.
3 "A Voice from America to the Working Men of Great Britain": letter from P. Sinclair, New York, August, 1865, in Glasgow Sentinel, 23 Sept., 1865. Sinclair also made special reference to the South as a new, excellent emigration field for manpower and capital - see Chapter VII, p. 253.
The strength, and the strengthening, of American democracy which Sinclair emphasized in his letter was, then, fully appreciated by Scottish advocates of Parliamentary reform, and there quickly developed among them the irresistible tendency to make direct reference to the immediate situation in the United States in their efforts to push the cause of franchise extension in Britain. The *Glasgow Sentinel* itself was a case in point. By late September, 1865, it was not only predictably voicing its enthusiasm for the conciliatory Reconstruction policy of Johnson but also finding in his successful statesmanship a tailor-made opportunity to demonstrate the unquestionable ability of the working man in national politics. The message for Britain was clear:

Surely, when working tailors in America are trusted — and found worthy of the trust — with the control of affairs in a great national crisis, the working tailors in this country might at least be entrusted with the right of voting for the men who are to govern them and the country they belong to.¹

In the general Scottish use of American democracy as an impetus for British reform there were, however, basically two main lines of emphasis — a direct appeal to the example of universal suffrage, and a more specific concentration on the recent emancipation of the slaves. Ready to employ both these strands was the radical M.P. for Montrose burghs, William E. Baxter. Baxter's early belief² that the United States had before it a magnificent destiny "fraught with the greatest possible blessings to the whole human race"³ had never wavered over the years, and it was simply reinforced by the outcome of the Civil War. He freely admitted that the

---

¹ *Glasgow Sentinel*, 30 Sept., 1865. See also ibid., 23 Dec., 1865, where the abilities of Lincoln in high office are also stressed.

² For the impressions already formed by Baxter in 1855, see *America and the Americans*, pp. 6-7, 17, 70.

³ Report of speech by Baxter at a meeting on the assassination of Lincoln, in London, 30 April, 1865, in *Dundee Advertiser*, 5 May, 1865.
conflict itself had for its duration largely preoccupied his thoughts to the exclusion of domestic political topics, believing as he had done that the issues involved were "far greater and grander than most people in this country suppose". The issues could be clearly spelt out, and the importance of the outcome for Britain confidently predicted:

[The Civil War was] a contest between a great democracy living under the freest institutions ever given to men - and a slave-holding aristocracy - and I shall be greatly disappointed and mistaken if this grand and glorious result does not give impetus on this side of the Atlantic to the cause of progress and reform.¹

The same theme was hammered home by Baxter two months later when, seeking re-nomination as their M.P., he addressed a crowded meeting of electors and non-electors in Montrose. A very considerable proportion of his speech was devoted to vindicating the late Federal cause and to assessing the probable effects of the Northern success. The political lesson which he read in the close of the Civil War was that democratic institutions could successfully weather the severest trials, and this lesson he automatically adapted and applied in the cause of domestic reform:

... I want to know if the people of the United States can manage their own affairs so ably and admirably with universal suffrage, why we are afraid in this country, which boasts of its superior enlightenment, to admit even a portion of the working classes within the electoral pale. (Cheers)²

Having been duly re-elected at the 1865 general election, Baxter was subsequently entertained to a dinner in Arbroath by his constituents as a mark of their appreciation of his services in Parliament during the time he had represented them, and of their confidence in him for the future. The function gave him yet another opportunity to use the American experience of universal suffrage to argue for the extension of the franchise to

¹ Ibid.  
² Report of speech by Baxter in the Assembly Hall, Montrose, on 5 July, 1865, in Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865.
British working men.  

Baxter's strong views on the United States were of such long standing and were so well known by the Reconstruction era that presumably his emphatic post-war statements on the significance of the triumph of democracy there did little more than reassure that majority of the Montrose electors who had in the past found his radical sentiments acceptable. The immediate impact of the Northern victory can perhaps be more accurately gauged by considering the reactions of - and the public reactions to - several other prospective Scottish M.P's who were fighting to be returned at the 1865 general election.

Certainly, the Northern victory became a root cause of some of the difficulties and unpopularity which faced Tory and anti-reform Whig candidates at this time. Defending Selkirkshire for the Conservatives, Lord Henry Scott, for instance, was subjected to a violently hostile reception which worsened when he declared that all the Conservatives wanted to do was to maintain the "great bulwarks" on which the British Constitution rested, and to ensure that they were not "brought into the condition of other countries":

---

1. Dundee Advertiser, 15 Dec., 1865; also Scotsman, 14 Dec., 1865.

2. "You know", he told his constituents in July, 1865, "what my opinions have been all along on this great conflict" - Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865. Baxter took his intense interest in the United States very seriously. Even his first trip, as a very young man, had been undertaken "to study the American people" (Dundee Advertiser, 5 May, 1865), and this had been followed up by a later visit there and sustained concentration on the history and politics of the country. "No one knows how constantly it [the Civil War] was my thought and study" he said, and it seems likely that he was accepted locally, if not nationally, as an authoritative voice on the American situation - see, for instance, report of speech by him on "The Great Struggle in America" at Blairgowrie, 17 Jan., 1865, in Scotsman, 20 Jan., 1865; see also Ibid., 5 May, 1865.

3. Lord Henry John Montagu Douglas Scott, born 1832, was the second son of the 5th Duke of Buccleuch. A Conservative, favouring "a moderate measure of reform and non-intervention in foreign affairs", he was first elected for Selkirkshire in 1861 - see Robert P. Dod, Parliamentary Companion 1864, p. 189. He was successful in his bid for re-election - see below, p. 299.
Do you wish a democracy like that of America? (cries of "yes, yes") - or would you like a democracy such as that in France? (cries of "no, no")

Similarly unmoved in his opposition to a generous extension of the franchise and similarly (if less consistently) heckled, was Lord Henry's elder brother, the Earl of Dalkeith, Conservative candidate for the county of Edinburgh. Arguing that he was against "the mere reduction of the franchise by itself without other elements being introduced at the same time", he pointed out that a very low franchise qualification would eventually lead to universal suffrage which, while perhaps satisfactory enough in theory, was in practice less satisfactory, even for the enfranchised, than a "slight alteration and improvement" of existing British institutions.

If we look to America, we will there see universal suffrage (a voice - "We will have it here"). Although America is a fine country, you can hardly wish we should have the same institutions, and we should be very jealous of their introduction.

A somewhat more practical show of public opposition to hostile intransigence on the suffrage question was prompted by the remarks of Lord Elcho, defending his seat as M.P. for Haddingtonshire. Having represented the county for eighteen years, Elcho, a right-wing Whig and erstwhile Conservative, found himself in 1865 faced with a Liberal challenge from

2. William Henry Walter Montagu Douglas Scott, Lord Dalkeith, born 1831, was the eldest son of the 5th Duke of Buccleuch. He was M.P. for Midlothian (the constituency at that time being styled the "county of Edinburgh") continuously from 1853-1866, and again from 1874-1880, being unsuccessful only in the contested elections of 1858 and 1868 - see Joseph Foster, Members of Parliament, Scotland 1357-1882 (London and Aylesbury, 1882), p. 89.
4. Francis Richard Charteris, Lord Elcho, born 1818, was the eldest son of Francis, 6th Earl of Wemyss. M.P. for East Gloucestershire from 1841-1846, he was first returned for Haddingtonshire in 1847, and consistently retained the seat until 1868 when he did not contest it but became M.P. for an English constituency. A B.A. of Oxford and LL.D. of Edinburgh, he was a lord of the treasury from 1852-1855 - see Foster, Members of Parliament, p. 120.
George Hope, a local farmer who had been petitioned by the electors to oppose the aristocratic candidate. At a lively meeting where the two candidates faced the constituents, Hope's sponsor, William Brodie, made it clear that the formal Liberal opposition had arisen from Elcho's clear statement that he was against suffrage extension on the grounds that it would "Americanise and revolutionise the constitution". When this was defined, Brodie fiercely insisted that the word "Americanise" had been in the address, and Elcho was forced back lamely to defend himself on the United States front by declaring that while slavery had not been the original cause or object of the American Civil War, he was glad that the result of the struggle had been its extinction. On a show of hands at the end of the meeting, Hope got three-quarters of the vote.¹

A hint of the essential change which was seen to be working in the county to bring about a slackening of political fetters (and which, in a wider context, has already been noted in certain letters to the *Caledonian Mercury* at this time²) as well as something of the popular local excitement caused by the turn of events in Haddingtonshire is well conveyed in the sentiments of one of Hope's supporters, James Scott:

> We have set up a "tenant farmer" to oppose a "Lord" ... and that, too, in a country that was considered at the beck and bidding of Lord Elcho! Verily, these are stirring times we live in - times in which noble lords as well as plebeians, obstructionists and renegades to reform, must be taught to stand by and allow men of intellect, common sense, honesty, and decency to guide the helm of State.³

Despite these high hopes, Elcho was returned by a majority of ninety-seven, and in the speech following his election, he impressed on his constituents how his victory had mercifully saved them from witnessing the establishment in Parliament of a radical triumvirate of McLaren, Hope and Bright.⁴

---

² See above, pp. 172-173.
³ Letter from James Scott, Haddington, in *Caledonian Mercury*, 18 July, 1865.
⁴ Report of speech by Lord Elcho in *ibid.*, 20 July, 1865.
While the Conservative and Whig aristocracy succeeded in retaining their seats in the face of voluble popular opposition, it is possible, however, that the fillip given to Scottish reform by the Northern triumph in the Civil War may have had relatively more impact in determining the results of contests between more evenly matched contenders. In Dumbartonshire, for instance, there developed the keenest of all the Scottish fights in the general election when the defending Conservative, P.B. Smollett, faced Liberal opposition from the well-known pro-American, James Stirling. Ultimately, both found themselves returned to represent the county since the result was a tie. An even more decisive victory for Liberalism was recorded in the traditional Tory stronghold of Bute. At the beginning of the year, a by-election in the county had resulted in the election of the Conservative George P. Boyle who, in his meetings with electors, had made clear his strong pro-Confederate sympathies. The unsuccessful candidate

1 Stirling had made an extensive tour of the United States in 1856, and although only his penetrating, well-balanced letters from the South were subsequently published, as Letters from the Slave States (London, 1857), he had in fact visited the North and West also. For reference to some of the attitudes he formed during his trip, see below, Chapter V, pp. 505-508. The son of a Glasgow merchant and himself a calico-printer to trade (although retired by 1865), James Stirling became in autumn, 1864, secretary of the Glasgow Union and Emancipation Society and was responsible for compiling and transmitting to America an address of sympathy to Garrison — see Botsford, op. cit., pp. 811-812. He was on the platform at the public meeting on Lincoln's death held in Glasgow — see Glasgow Herald, 3 May, 1865. As an enthusiastic Liberal, he favoured reduction of the franchise to £6 in the burghs and £10 in the counties, the redistribution of Parliamentary seats, and the abolition of Church rates. In addition to his account of his American trip, he wrote pamphlets on "Banks and Bank Management" and "The Failure of the Forbes Mackenzie Act" — see Dod, Parliamentary Companion, 1865 (New Parliament Edition), p. 288.

2 Caledonian Mercury, 19 July, 1865. Consequent upon this result, neither member was eligible to sit or to vote in the Commons until a Parliamentary Committee had come to a decision on the matter. In the event, however, Stirling did not wish to defend his return to Parliament, and Smollett therefore retained his seat as M.P. for Dumbartonshire — see Dod, Parliamentary Companion, 1867, p. 290.

3 See report of a speech by G.P. Boyle to electors in Millport in Scotsman, 16 Jan., 1865.
at that stage was James Lamont, and, although he devoted most of his
electioneering speech to a spirited attack on the Episcopalianism of his
opponent, he did at least make a passing reference to his great desire to
see peace preserved between Britain and America. With the general election
later in the year, there was a rather remarkable reversal of fortunes, Lamont
snatching victory from his old rival and declaring triumphantly that for the
first time since the passing of the 1832 Reform Bill, the county had been
"rescued" from great territorial influence.

If the Tories, then, were somewhat frustrated by a rejuvenated Scottish
Liberalism which tended uproariously to challenge their inborn fears of
Americanization, the Liberals themselves were not totally immune to certain
difficulties caused directly by conflicting attitudes to the American sit¬
uation. In April, 1865, a meeting of the electors and non-electors of the
Leith Burghs was called to discuss the position and future of their Liberal
M.P., William Miller, who had earned himself a fair degree of notoriety
amongst at least some of the local Liberals by his support of the South
in the Civil War. Seconding a proposal that Miller was no longer fit to
represent the burghs, one Mr. Rendall made it clear that he had withdrawn
his support purely because of Miller's views on the "American question".
Significantly, however, the meeting was generally fiercely hostile to the
proposals to dispense with Miller, and when Rendall was bold enough to
suggest that British proceedings in the 'Trent' case had been an outrage,
the crowd (helped by the lofty indignation of the chairman) virtually
erupted. The outcome was that the meeting endorsed Miller as an acceptable
representative for Leith.

1 See report of a speech by Lamont to electors and non-electors at
Rothesay, in ibid., 21 Jan., 1865.
2 See Caledonian Mercury, 21 July, 1865.
3 Report of a meeting of electors and non-electors in Leith, 20 April,
1865, in Scotsman, 21 April, 1865.
It is, of course, likely that there had been other, domestic, factors behind the split within the Liberal ranks in Leith at this time. Yet there can be no doubt but that the difference of opinion on current United States issues had been a major source of genuine, deep antagonism. This was implied in the speech of Provost Lindsay of Leith made on the occasion of Miller's re-election at the general election in July. Recognizing that there were many in the audience who before the previous election contest had "thought it their duty" to oppose Miller but who, having seen his subsequent efforts to serve Leith, were now supporting him, Lindsay felt it necessary to specifically allude to the late American Civil War. The gist of his somewhat veiled message was that the British people should have been prepared to go to war with the United States if they felt their honour threatened, and that Miller himself had been singled out by the Times as a man who, despite having extensive trade in different parts of the world, had been ready to make common cause with the government to "maintain the honour of the country".¹

The fact that Miller's opinions on the United States were not held by the majority of Liberals in Leith to be of crucial enough importance to warrant his rejection as their M.P., and the surprising discovery that many of those who had bitterly opposed him on this very issue were prepared to immediately fall in and support him again once the controversy over British policy to America became redundant, cautions us against overestimating the importance of the influence of the United States on the practical side of Scottish liberal and radical thought. In this connection, it is perhaps worth noting a specific incident involving the Scottish miners' leader,

---
¹ Report of a speech by Provost Lindsay at the election of William Miller, Town Buildings, Leith, 11 July, 1865 in Caledonian Mercury, 12 July, 1865. Miller expressed great satisfaction over the fact that he had been successful in his attempts to reconcile his political opponents.
Alexander MacDonald, who had first visited the United States in 1867.

Addressing a meeting of Maryhill miners, convened to discuss what action should be taken over a proposed reduction of wages, MacDonald disclosed that American miners had been horrified at what they considered to be the "pauper wages" of British miners, and also explained that American employers did not dictate to or browbeat their workers. Yet, despite all this, the United States example had apparently a fairly negligible effect in strengthening his radicalism, since he strongly advised the Maryhill men to accept a wage reduction for a time with a view to later success through organization.

And of course many of those who openly admired the American democratic set-up were careful in 1865 to point out that their current agitation for extension of the franchise did not ipso facto entail a desire to achieve immediate universal suffrage for Britain. In an address to a crowded meeting at Selkirk, William Napier, the prospective Liberal candidate for the county who was subsequently to be defeated by Lord Henry Scott, enthused over what he judged to be a general pattern of change towards liberalism in the world over the preceding six years. India, Europe, and especially the United States had all, he maintained, been "revolutionised" in that time, and he pledged himself to stand as the people's champion, not only in the Liberal interest "but also for your independence, and for your liberties, which have been so long overridden". Presumably he felt safe to commit himself to helping Selkirkshire workers to "triumph over [the] tyranny" under which

---

1 See above, Chapter I, p. fn.

2 Report of a meeting of Maryhill miners in Lyceum Rooms, Maryhill, in North British Daily Mail, 14 Jan., 1868. This example may be taken as fairly representative of MacDonald's whole philosophy regarding labour relations. He was dedicated to achieving class harmony, and as President of the Miners National Association (1863-69), his was a dominant voice for arbitration and conciliation. He was a personal friend of a leading Scottish mineowner, Lord Elcho - see Raymond Challinor, "Alexander MacDonald and the Miners" in Our History, Pamphlet No. 48, Winter, 1967/68, pp. 7-30.
they had so long suffered since he was sure that the British working class would be "perfectly satisfied with their fair share of the representation, and will be the last to care to see any such undue preponderance given to them that would inevitably sacrifice their own interests". Their "forbearance and heroic conduct" during the difficulties imposed by the American Civil War was sufficient evidence that they were to be trusted with "the privileges of a sufficient property suffrage".  

Re-elected as Liberal M.P. for the county of Berwick, David Robertson's nomination had been proposed by the controversial Miller of Leith. Despite this unlikely affiliation, he assured his constituents that "I would have fought and died for the Union"; but so far as "Americanization" of British politics was concerned, he went only so far as to support a £6 property qualification in the Scottish counties and Baines' private member's bill to reduce the borough franchise to £6.

Much more significant in this respect, however, was W.E. Baxter's support of Baines' measure. Acknowledging as he did that universal suffrage had admirably survived the test of a devastating Civil War, when Baxter talked about the immediate United States experience providing an impetus for the British reform movement, he was talking about reform in the short term. And reform in the short term meant for him, as for other Scottish radicals, a substantial reduction rather than the total abolition of

1 Report of a speech by William Napier in the County Hotel Assembly Room, Selkirk, in Scotsman, 26 June, 1865.
2 See Caledonian Mercury, 20 July, 1865.
3 Acceptance speech by David Robertson of Ladykrik, 17 July, 1865 in ibid.
4 See, for instance, speech by Laurence Oliphant at Dunfermline, 29 Jan., 1866, in Dundee Advertiser, 2 Feb., 1866. Mackie, Duncan McLaren, Vol. 2 p. 153, indicates that McLaren was in 1866 personally ready to welcome household suffrage but unwilling publicly to advocate more than the liberal party was then prepared to concede, namely, the £6 franchise.
The page contains text discussing property qualifications:

You know that I do not base the franchise on the doctrine of absolute right, or advocate universal suffrage. My position is, and always has been, that in a free country every man should possess a vote who can exercise his privilege intelligently and independently ... Gradual changes made in time ward off revolutions ... Seeking to refute the argument that reform would lead to an objectionable transfer of power from one class to another, he went so far as to state that that would certainly be the case with an immediate adoption of universal suffrage, but that Baines' bill, by leaving two-thirds of the male population still unenfranchised, would not have this effect. In the long term, however, Baxter did not regard the £6 franchise as final: "I look forward with hope and pleasure to the good coming time when it will be wise, prudent, and in the strictest sense, conservative, to admit a much larger proportion of the working classes into the electoral body. You cannot forever lag behind the United States and your own colonies." 

Basically similar attitudes had been adopted by representative spokesmen of the working men - or at least the upper crust of the working men - themselves, at a workers' reform meeting held in Edinburgh on 27 June, 1865. The tone of the gathering was characterized by cautious, reassuringly moderate pronouncements, and by a total lack of any clear commitment to radical demands for immediate introduction of universal suffrage. Thus, in arguing that the workers had a right to have a direct influence in government, and that their general "social, moral, and intellectual improvement" since 1832 meant that there could no longer be a legitimate delay in franchise extension, James Wilkie, a printer, simultaneously took care to insist that all talk

---

1 W.E. Baxter at Montrose, 5 July, 1865 in Dundee Courier, 7 July, 1865.
2 Ibid.
3 This may have been the individual who as secretary of the Edinburgh Working Men's Club had the uncongenial task of arranging the Blackie/Jones debate - see above, pp. 253-255.
about destroying the constitution, setting up a democracy and enacting a revolution was "a mischievous misrepresentation" of the workers' legitimate demands. More explicitly, a Mr. Mackenzie (no trade given) stressed that the working class wanted to bring about universal suffrage gradually and that it had no wish "to disturb the existing arrangements of the country".

Somewhat more abstruse were the short term aims of other speakers such as printer George Hackay, and George Lorimer, builder. The latter was certainly ready strongly to endorse the principle of universal suffrage at this stage, remarking to loud and prolonged cheering that in the United States, manhood suffrage had put in the Presidency "the twice-elected and lamented old honest Abraham Lincoln - who can stand comparison with the hereditary nobility of any country or age". It was an inherent right conferred by God, Lorimer contended, that all men who were taxed should also be allowed to vote. Yet, despite individual pointers stressing the ultimate desirability of a fully democratic Britain, the meeting contented itself with unanimously approving a resolution that the introduction of a measure of reform lowering the franchise to £5 in the burghs and £10 in the counties would be "a wise and acceptable concession to the working classes".¹

It becomes clear, then, that whatever the inherent limitations of Scottish radicalism at this time, the shining image of United States democracy after the Civil War did become a powerful stimulus for the stronger elements of Scottish reformist opinion. Surveying the transatlantic political connection in 1870, David Macrae asserted that America was exercising "a powerful influence" on Britain:

The two nations are knit together as parts of one body. What affects the one affects the other. Disaster to America means disaster to us, though it may temporarily benefit a few; progress in America means progress here, though it may involve changes hostile to class interests. It was the consciousness of this that caused Britain to take such an interest in the recent war. North

¹ Report of a meeting of working men on the reform question in the Music Hall, Edinburgh, on 27 June, 1865, in Scotsman, 28 June, 1865.
and South were felt to be but names for two great principles, contend¬
ing not only in America but here. On those battle-fields of Virginia British conservatism and British liberalism fought by proxy. Mr. Gladstone's Reform Bill was carried by Northern bayo¬nets long before it went to the vote in Parliament. The triumph of the North meant British reform, John Bright in the Cabinet, Free Schools, and justice to Ireland.¹

In terms which were somewhat too general and vague, the Dundee Ad¬
vertiser nevertheless retrospectively attempted to define the feverish spirit which had characterized the reform activities of advanced liberals in the mid-sixties by declaring that the Liberal party in Britain had been "reconstructed and enlightened" by the effects of the American Civil War.² Much readier to distinguish between the attitudes of the Whig and radical wings of the Liberal party towards the United States was, however, the Glasgow Sentinel. As we have observed, a realization that the purposes of domestic reform could best be served by backing the victorious "democratic" cause in the American Civil War had by the last stages of the conflict helped swing the journal to support of the North.³ In February, 1865, the Sentinel accordingly exposed what it suggested was destined to be a major facet of the Whig campaign for "a renewed lease of power", namely, the in¬sistence that democracy in America had collapsed, coupled with professed support for limited suffrage extension in Britain. This tactic of half claiming to be a reformer, but stopping short of total commitment, would be used by candidates, the paper argued, to mislead electors and to hinder the extension of British democracy: "America will be flung in the teeth of those who cry for a redemption of Whig pledges, or demand for the people a share of political power".⁴

¹ Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 10
² Dundee Advertiser, 11 Sept., 1868.
³ See above, pp. 157-158.
⁴ Glasgow Sentinel, 25 Feb., 1865.
In an effort to discredit the basic premise that American democracy had perished, the Sentinel pointed out that the Civil War had had its origin not in democracy but in slavery ("this feudal and aristocratic taint introduced by European lords and buccaneers"), and that democratic institutions showed every sign of surviving the war:

As for Jonathan, he would as soon ask for Mephistopheles himself as for a European importation of either King or Emperor - which means an expensive court and aristocracy, a State church, exclusive laws in favour of a privileged order, and hard work and short commons for the working bees that create all the honey consumed by the drones.1 Understandably, then, the Northern triumph was ultimately seen not only as a victory against American Negro slavery but also as a victory for "human freedom throughout the world".2 Two years later, Duncan McLaren was loudly cheered at a reform meeting in Edinburgh for voicing exactly the same sentiments.3

But of course the most immediate tangible result of the Civil War remained the fact that "between four and five millions of formerly helpless, outraged, and dishonoured slaves" had been "elevated to the dignity of men, and must be respected and treated accordingly":4 and it was from this specific act of emancipation that Scottish reformers drew an additional impetus for their reform drive in the mid 1860s. The crusading Caledonian Mercury was prompted by "the heart-thrilling and soul-inspiring" news of the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment to suggest that it would be some time before Britain and the world would fully realize how much was involved in the freeing of the slaves. The fundamental lesson it spelt out quite clearly, however - if centuries of oppression and wrong could end in five years,

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., 1 July, 1865.
4 Caledonian Mercury, 4 Jan., 1866.
"other great things" could be done "for God and Humanity" elsewhere in a short time. The American struggle was seen as a warning to men everywhere who, in the hopes of retaining their privileges, denied common rights and refused common justice. And the *Mercury* proved that it had lost nothing of its old readiness to attack domestic institutions by declaring that there were in Britain many "hoary customs supported by the Press and vindicated by the Pulpit and upheld by the State" and that the day might well come when Britain, through the intransigence of the privileged classes, would also end up in arms.  

Equally anxious to promote wide-ranging reform, the Scottish National Reform League seized the opportunity of William Lloyd Garrison's visit to Scotland in 1867 to formally put on record its acknowledged debt to the American emancipationists. A crowded public meeting held under the League’s auspices in the Merchant's Hall, Glasgow, heard an address moved by city councillor James Moir, and subsequently adopted, which unambiguously tied up Garrison's personal efforts and the whole drive for emancipation in America with the British struggle for the extension of freedom for the workers:

> The eager joy with which the enemies of liberty in Europe, and their allies among the aristocracy of Britain, hailed that infamous attempt to solve all questions affecting capital and labour by making the labourer capital, aroused our countrymen from that political apathy, which is fatal to a free state, and so encouraged the advocates of popular liberty in this country again to raise the Standard of Reform. Your success won half our battle.  

In his reply, Garrison played to his audience by insisting (to loud applause) that the best possible base for government was to include all

---

2 Report of the address to Garrison from the Scottish National Reform League, Merchant's Hall, Glasgow, 19 July, 1867, in *Glasgow Herald*, 20 July, 1867. See also above, pp. 167-168. Among known radical reformers present at a tea meeting of Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society given for Garrison were James Robie, editor of the *Caledonian Mercury*, and councillor David Lewis, later to become editor of the *Reformer* - see *Scotsman*, 13 July, 1867.
the people with equal rights, and by making out a forceful case for granting every man his rights, no matter how poor or ignorant. And there was warm approval for his remark that abolition in the United States should be an inspiration to the Scottish National Reform League. For Garrison, the old campaigner who had flirted with Scottish reform movements (most notably with the moral force Chartists) in the 1840s in an effort to win active working class support for the anti-slavery cause, it was a neat reversal of role.

The fire of controversy which in the 1840s had raged in Scottish abolitionist circles around Garrison and his "ultra radical" principles had subsided by the 1860s. Yet, so great had been his impact on the country in these earlier days, so fierce had been the conflicts over his doctrines, that perhaps William Lloyd Garrison - or at least attitudes to him - were always calculated to arouse contention at some level within Scotland. Certainly, his presence in Britain during the early post-Civil War years was still capable of directly provoking strong, incisive Scottish comment in defence of the British record on abolition and Parliamentary reform, and - in one instance at least - of forming the basis for an attack on local political opponents.

Towards Garrison himself, the Whiggish Glasgow Herald was cordial and deferential. The adoption of such an attitude was understandable enough: violent denunciations of past "extremism" would have been somewhat out of line, faced as the paper was with commenting on a public reception to an elderly man who (whatever his controversial methods for achieving his aims) had undeniably devoted his life to an eminently worthwhile cause, and whose

1 See G.C. Taylor, Some American Reformers, pp. 154-158.
2 For further discussion of the nature of the Scottish reception to Garrison in 1867, see below, Chapter VIII, pp. 404-411.
untiring efforts had been seen to be ultimately crowned with total success. Garrison and his followers were credited with having lent a moral weight which had made the North as a whole less pliant to the South, with having been instrumental in creating a climate which finally stung the South into energetic action. Praising the Garrisonian abolitionists for adhering to their strict anti-slavery principles at a time when these were "wrongly branded fanatical", the Herald retrospectively judged their devotion to be "the salt ... which kept ... the controversy of slavery continually sore".¹

All this said, however, there was a veiled implication that Garrison had accepted too readily the premise of the Scottish National Reform League that the United States had led Britain in the abolition crusade:

Mr. Garrison could have told the League that the first lesson in abolition was given to his party by Englishmen, who fought the battles of freedom for the slave before there existed in the Northern States a vestige of public sympathy on his behalf.²

But in vigorously seeking to refute the assumption that emancipation in America had substantially stimulated the British reform drive, the Glasgow Herald directed its main line of attack at those radical elements in the city and surrounding areas who constituted the nucleus of the Scottish National Reform League. Strong exception was taken to the part of the League's address which stated that half the success of recent Parliamentary reform in Britain had been due to Garrison's triumph. Clinging tenaciously to the same brand of "moderate Liberalism" which prompted its Edinburgh counterpart, the Scotsman, to extol British political institutions as the best in the world, the Herald stubbornly refused to see in what respect an

¹ Glasgow Herald, 22 July, 1867.
² Ibid. In a letter to the Glasgow Herald at the time of the framing of the Thirteenth Amendment, seeking to explain why the measure had aroused so little enthusiasm in Britain, it was pointed out that Britain had been the first to fight slavery and to inaugurate emancipation, and that she had been urging America to the same course for twenty years - see "Glad Tidings from America - what are they worth?": letter from "J.R.", Glasgow, in Ibid., 1 March, 1865.
American liberator could also be called a British one, since there were no political slaves in Britain for Garrison and his followers to emancipate. While the Reform Leaguers might have been stimulated by the Civil War to agitate more energetically for reform, the important fact as the Herald saw it was that the question had been seriously and earnestly debated in Parliament before, and that it had remained an active issue for all political parties.

To say that the success of the Northern armies over the slave-owners, and the success of principles which had been fostered long ago in this country, won half the battle of political freedom here, is as absurd and impertinent as it is unpatriotic.¹

Although less directly concerned to depreciate the influence of United States emancipation on British reform, the Scotsman was nevertheless equally ready to use the occasion of Garrison’s visit to demonstrate the fine tradition of British reforming, abolitionist activity, and to denigrate the American record. Like the Herald, the Scotsman went to some lengths to stress the important role which the American abolitionists had fulfilled in creating a public sentiment in the United States hostile to the principle of slavery and to discredit the arguments of those who still attacked Garrison for his methods. But commenting on the public breakfast held for Garrison in St. James’s Hall, London, where Bright had been chairman and Duncan McLaren had been present, the Scotsman regretted that some speakers had been "so carried away as greatly to overstate the credit due both to the people of Great Britain for their feelings and dealings in regard to the same matter".² Most severely censured in this connection was Lord Russell,

¹ Ibid., 22 July, 1867. The Herald did, however, acknowledge the Thirteenth Amendment as "the key-note of a higher civilisation - the apotheosis of American liberty" - see ibid. (editorial), 1 March, 1865.
² Scotsman, 5 July, 1867.
who was firmly reminded that "slavery was on a very small scale in the States when they left us seventy years ago". There was a clear enough implication that so far as the liberalizing of institutions went, America had absolutely nothing to teach Britain:

"The American people did not voluntarily and deliberately abolish slavery - the British people did not leave it a day's life after they had power over it [i.e. after 1832]. These things ought not to be concealed, but remembered - not in taunt to the American people, but in justice to the British people, who did well, and to those Americans, like Mr. Garrison, who laboured nobly and vainly to persuade the American people to do likewise."

Precisely similar sentiments were voiced by the Conservative Edinburgh Courant, which watched "the mutual satisfaction and self-complacency ... and self-glorification" in which Garrison and his British abolitionist friends were indulging, and refused to concede that the abolitionists, with their "fanatical and excited spirit, tempered by neither wisdom nor prudence" had significantly contributed to achieving emancipation in the United States. The North had been at least as guilty in maintaining slavery as the South, and had ultimately abolished it merely as "an act of self-defence" during war, whereas in the case of Britain, emancipation had "resulted from the conviction that slavery was an intolerable injustice", and had been undertaken at considerable cost to the country.

VII The expedient recognition by reformers and others of the freedom-loving and egalitarian traditions of Scotland, and the ambivalent relevance of the Scottish past to the American situation.

Scottish opponents of "Americanization" were perhaps especially keen to seize every opportunity to disparage both the nature of United States emancipation and of its democratic institutions because although appeals by reformers to the American experience on both these counts were not, of course, a purely Scottish phenomenon, it is nevertheless the case that

---

1 Ibid.
2 Edinburgh Courant, 15 July, 1867.
3 See Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, passim.
the Scottish tradition of civil and religious liberties, conveniently con-
densed into stirring quotability by Robert Burns, could be specifically
used in conjunction with references to the American example to agitate for
the extension of the suffrage in Britain. Garrison himself ended his appeal
to the Scottish National Reform League to follow the American example and
strive for universal suffrage by quoting two verses of "Scots Wha Hae".  
And at the League's monster reform demonstration in Glasgow a year earlier,
councillors John Burt and James Moir had recognized both the importance
of the Northern win and the applicability of Burns to their cause. Burt,
believing in the imminence of an era of international liberty and progress
"when man to man the world o'er, shall brither be and a' that", declared
that Scotland would be false to her traditions were she to "stand by idly
and remain apathetic while all nations are striving for liberty and unity".  
And Moir drew on the freeing of the American slaves to emphasize that in
Scotland, too, "We are determined that a man shall be a man for a' that".  

Ironically, however, it took an Englishman to frame the strongest
appeal to the "Scottish democratic tradition" at this time. Endorsing
Burt's pledge of solidarity between English and Scottish reformers, Edmond
Beales, President of the Reform League in London, rejoiced that his wife
came from Scotland - "the land of true and earnest men - the land of civil
and religious liberty - the land, not only of Wallace and of Bruce, or of
Knox, but by no means last or least, of Huir and Palmer". To great cheering,
he reminded his huge audience that Scotland had never yet been conquered,

1 Glasgow Herald, 20 July, 1867.
2 Speech by councillor John Burt at reform demonstration on Glasgow Green,
3 Speech by councillor James Moir in ibid. General Neal Dow of the United
States, and J.H. Bailey, U.S. Consul in Glasgow, were both present at
the demonstration.
and would not be; that Scotland and England, the moral force "not of London alone, but of Scotland", would unite to claim the people's right to manhood suffrage by ballot, a right which the descendants of their own forefathers in the United States already enjoyed.¹ His sentiments were echoed by the Scottish National Reform League itself. An address from the League to John Bright, presented by Glasgow reformer George Ross in the name of the working men of Scotland, emphasized the idea that "Freedom and union are to-day the ideas which inspire and control the peoples of the world", and, rejoicing that those "who sought empire with division and slavery" in Europe and America were being crushed, the address concluded with the pledge that "We, the sons of Wallace and Knox, join the men of England and Ireland" in pressing for liberty.²

The deliberate association of contemporary emancipation triumphs with the acts of Wallace, Knox, and other Scottish fighters for civil and religious rights, reminds us of the old tendency to recognize a correlation between the traditional Scottish struggle for basic liberties, and the fight by the North and by the Negro race to win liberty for all men in the United States. An example of the effective use of such an analogy by Scots in the pre-Civil War era has already been observed in the rhetoric of Free Church ministers Guthrie and Candlish.³ From the American side, the potential for linking

---

¹ Speech by Edmund Beales in ibid. The memory of Thomas Muir and other Scottish revolutionary martyrs had been assiduously kept alive for Glasgow working men by Peter Mackenzie in his Glasgow Gazette. Paradoxically, however, the Gazette came to believe during the Civil War that the source of all America's difficulties was democracy - see Harrison, "British Labour and American Salvery", p. 302.

² North British Daily Mail, 17 Oct., 1866.

³ See above, Chapter I, pp. 30-31.
the Scottish past with the current United States abolition crusade had been fully exploited by emancipationists such as the Rev. Theodore Cuyler of Brooklyn,¹ Henry Ward Beecher - who remarked that "Scotland had the good fortune to have had men that (sic) knew how to make heroic history" and that he had come to the country "almost as a pilgrim would go to Jerusalem"² - and Harriet Beecher Stowe. The latter's early dependence on the Scottish national heritage as a source for parallels with the spirit of freedom and justice in the United States (exemplified, for instance, in her characterization of John Brown of Harper's Ferry as possessed of "the militant religious ardour of the old Covenanters of Scotland"³) was enthusiastically developed in her Sunny Memories. Convinced from her personal experience that there was "no nobler land" and fully conscious of the worth of "the old seed here sown in blood and tears",⁴ Mrs. Stowe believed that all Americans felt a deep sympathy with the endurance of the Covenanting ministers who had given up all security "rather than violate a principle".⁵

It is because America, like Scotland, has stood for right against oppression, that the Scotch love and sympathize with her. For this reason do they feel it as something taken from the strength of a common cause, when America sides with injustice and oppression. The children of the Covenant and the children of the Puritans are of one blood.⁶

¹ See Botsford, Scotland and the American Civil War, p. 518.
² Report of the Proceedings of a public meeting held in the City Hall, Glasgow, 13 October, 1863, to hear an address on "The American Crisis" by Henry Ward Beecher (Pamphlet in Rhodes House Library, Oxford).
³ C.A. Shepperson, "Harriet Beecher Stowe and Scotland, 1852-3" in Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 52, No. 113, April, 1953, p. 45. Glasgow's North British Daily Mail was later capable of paying Brown a rather different compliment, finding him "that most extraordinary of monomaniacs" - North British Daily Mail, 11 Nov., 1865.
⁵ Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 186-189.
⁶ Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 100.
During the Reconstruction era, essentially the same sentiments were voiced by Americans who, like Harriet Beecher Stowe, can be seen to have had a special interest in emphasizing the egalitarian, "democratic" associations and similarities between Scotland and the United States. The important nature of the relationship between the Presbyterian church in the two countries at this period is examined elsewhere,1 but it is worthwhile noting in this particular context the feelings of the Rev. Dr. H.M. Field, minister in New York, and delegate from the New School Presbyterian church in America to the Free Church of Scotland General Assembly in 1867. Since the occasion was the first on which delegates from his branch of the Presbyterian church in America had been invited to attend the General Assembly in Scotland, and since both countries hoped that it marked the start of a long association, Field apparently felt it incumbent upon himself to remark upon the special cultural affiliations of America and Scotland. Accordingly, he paid tribute to the independent, battling traditions of Wallace and Bruce, but also, more emphatically, he stressed the closeness of the links which had been forged by the democratic force of Presbyterianism, asserting that a tie had been established, through the reciprocal influence of the great metaphysical and theological writers and thinkers of both countries, which had drawn Americans to Scotland more than to any country in Europe — including England.2

Field's open acknowledgement of the American debt to Scottish religious traditions is significant at this time because he spoke as the representative of the New School Presbyterians, the more progressive element within the American Presbyterian church which by its adamant insistence that slaveholding was a sin in all cases and its condemnation of the Southern Presbyterian

---

1 See below, Chapter VIII, pp. 539-613.
church for tolerating the institution, as much as by its more "radical"
theological doctrines, had precipitated the 1838 schism in the American
Presbyterian church.1 Accompanying Field as a representative of this
section of United States Presbyterianism was the Rev. Dr. Ezra Eastman
Adams. Proud to remind his hearers that "we [in the New School Presbyterian
church in America] were delivered from the burden and the curse of slavery
before our honoured brethren of the other branch had the power or the
courage to achieve their emancipation", Adams implicitly identified this
particular brand of free thinking with the traditions of Scotland, lapsing
into eulogies on Ossian, Burns, Allan Ramsay, and the metaphysicians, and
acclaiming the nation "land of the Catechism and the Bible ... land of heroes
and patriots who shed blood for home, and country, and kirk".2

If Field and Adams appropriated their reverence of Scottish traditions
for the immediate practical purpose of strengthening post-war relations
between the American and Scottish churches, the same mixture of sincere
regard and calculated expediency probably prompted those occasional references
to the tradition of ancient Scottish civil and religious liberties made by
Americans appealing on behalf of the freedmen's aid fund. Following Field
as speaker at the Free Church General Assembly, the Rev. J.A. Thome,
representing the executive committee of the American Missionary Association,
made the most of the fact that he was "the son of a Scots father and a Scots
mother", and implied that Scottish people had always shown a particular
interest in the plight of the freedmen.3 The Rev. Sella Martin, ex-slave

---

1 For an analysis of the split, see C. Bruce Staiger, "Abolition and the
Presbyterian Schism" of 1837-38" in Mississippi Valley Historical
2 Report of speech by the Rev. Dr. Ezra Eastman Adams at the Free Church
General Assembly, 27 May, 1867, Proxm. Free Church G.A., May, 1867,
pp. 66-67.
3 Rev. J. A. Thome in ibid., pp. 74-75.
and perhaps the most popular of the several American figures who publicly brought the cause of the freed Negroes to the attention of Scotsmen, was on occasion similarly inclined to aim his appeals directly at the independent Scottish religious tradition. Thus, in one carefully tailored address to the Free Church General Assembly, he hinted that the lively response of the people of Scotland to the freedmen’s aid campaign was directly attributable to the freedom-loving, independent character of their Presbyterianism, which he took to be "a medium between the wildness of democracy and the despotism of Episcopacy". And at the Church of Scotland’s General Assembly in 1866, he had declared that in his present location it was not worthwhile for him to refer to the question of the natural inferiority of the Negro race, since "You know too well that Scotland has long ago made up her mind on that question to accept the word of God rather than the dictum of any so-called scientific men". It seems likely that Martin’s somewhat over-generous judgement of the Scottish attitude in this connection was coloured not only by a sincere theoretic regard for the egalitarian tenets of Scottish Presbyterianism, but also by the extremely kind and helpful treatment he had personally received from those who were its living representatives, and by the fact that a prominent Scotsman, the Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, had been instrumental in raising £500 in Britain to purchase the freedom of Martin’s sister and her children.


3 Sella Martin’s campaign in Scotland is further considered below, Chapter IX, pp. 69-101 and passim.

4 See Proceedings at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1866, p. 14. Kinnaird was the Liberal M.P. for Perth, and well known as having a "warm sympathy for the United States" - see Perthshire Courier, 29 Aug., 1865.
But the most elaborate American acknowledgement of the power and uniqueness of the Scottish heritage was undoubtedly made by the Rev. Dr. A.H. Storrs of Cincinatti, a representative of the Western Freedmen's Aid Commission, and to some extent a rival of Martin and the American Missionary Association for the support of the people of Scotland. Addressing a public meeting on behalf of the freedmen in the City Hall, Perth, Storrs delivered a tribute to the Scottish love of liberty and passion for human rights which deserves to be quoted in full, since it not only neatly encompasses the feelings of so many visiting Americans - past and present - who were devoted to the cause of Negro freedom and justice, but also reflects the feelings of Scots who believed that a regard for the true nature of the Scottish past must produce a commitment to the extension of basic liberties to all men in the United States.

Christian friends, it is a very pleasing duty for us to confer with the people of Scotland upon questions involving human happiness and well-being, especially of emancipated slaves. Scotland stands foremost in this; she has determined to enjoy for herself both civil and religious liberty, and she has always stood forth as the constant friend of the oppressed. Scotland has for generations and centuries exerted an influence in behalf of the freedom of mankind, the largest liberty of the greatest number, and this comes from the spirit of liberty in the hearts of the people, combined with the Christian philanthropy - which has made them citizens of the world - which has made them of one blood, in birth and reality, with all the nations ... upon the ... earth.2

Over a decade later, in a somewhat similar context, John Burns3 of

---

1 See Sella Martin to unknown correspondent (probably Hampson), Glasgow, 18 Aug., 1865, A-sl. F., C159/68; and James Sinclair, secretary of Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society, to Dr. F. Tomkins, Glasgow 17 Aug., 1865, ibid., C160/70.


3 John Burns of Castle Wanys (see also above, Chapter II, p.104) was the son of George Burns, co-founder (along with his brother James) in 1830 of the Cunard Line of Burns, Cunard and Hiciver.

For a biographical note on Burns, see Appendix I.
Castle Wemyss likewise took pride and satisfaction in glorifying Scottish antecedents. The occasion was the first public appearance in Glasgow of Josiah Henson, the ex-slave who claimed to be the "Uncle Tom" of Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel, and who in 1877 came to Britain to raise funds to clear off a £1,000 mortgage on his farm which he had contracted in order to meet a lawsuit over the Dawn Educational Institute with which he was involved. By the time he visited Glasgow, the sun had been reached, and the aim was to raise a further £1,000 as a personal present to Henson. Presiding over the "vast concourse" which met in the City Hall for this purpose, Burns suggested that the appearance of Henson must make them thank God that, as Scots, they lived in a land where love of freedom and hatred of tyranny had been handed down as heirlooms. To the applause of the audience, he declared that "I am proud to be a British subject, but I glory in being a Scotsman", and stressed that in all his travels, whatever the country or city, it was unlikely that Henson would find more heartfelt sympathy or deeper interest in his history than in Glasgow.

But that the earlier activities for freedmen's aid could inflame as well as inspire Scottish patriotic sentiment was illustrated by the reaction of an ex-patriate Scot to a speech made by the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod at a public meeting sponsored by the Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society in late September, 1865. Writing from Ipswich, W. Dickie expressed vigorous indignation over the fact that Macleod had consistently used "England" instead of "Scotland" - or at least "Great Britain" - "in front of an audience of working men at a Freedmen's Aid meeting". In such circumstances it was, he believed, an insult to a Scottish audience, and to Scotland generally, to have the country so ignored. He suggested that there should

---

1 See Glasgow Herald, 20 March, 1877.
be strong audience disapproval of Scottish public speakers who, like Macleod, were "so effeminate as to be ashamed of their country and her good name", and who thereby encouraged elements of the London press "to indulge in their constitutional hatred, envy, and misrepresentation toward Scotland and Scotsmen." 1 Significantly noting that Macleod's "renegade speech" had in fact been deplored by many in Glasgow, a local correspondent to the North British Daily Mail sought, however, to placate Dickie somewhat by pointing out that only the minister had insulted his country, "the gentlemen [i.e. Storrs and Martin] who addressed the meeting on the all-important question of the negro's destiny in the United States" having both carefully used "the proper forms of expression". 2

It could, of course, be argued that in Dickie's case the freedmen's aid meeting simply provided the incidental background for what was essentially an attack on Macleod's lack of Scottish patriotism, and that any other venue would have served the correspondent's purpose equally well. Since the automatic use of "England" rather than "Great Britain" or "Scotland" was a common enough practice among public speakers in Scotland, however, and since Macleod himself frequently appeared on the public platform, it seems logical enough to conclude that Dickie did in fact feel a special compulsion to attack the slighting of specifically Scottish traditions in regard to this particular subject.

---

1 Letter from W. Dickie, Ipswich, 27 Sept., 1865 in North British Daily Mail, 30 Sept., 1865. At a dinner held in his honour, Dickie was subsequently presented with a silver drinking cup by his countrymen in Ipswich in appreciation of his "true Scottish patriotism", and acclaimed as "an upholder of Old Caledonia who never shrank from the contest when her rights were endangered" - see ibid., 3 April, 1867.

Ironically, Macleod was nevertheless clearly appreciative of the contemporary romantic image of Scotland's past, himself contributing to it by collaborating with his wife in writing the words of the stirring Jacobite song, "Sound the Pibroch". For his love of the Scots' language and of the highlands, see D. Macleod, Memoir of Norman Macleod, Vol. 2 pp. 217-223.

On the other side of the coin, however, it was possible for another Anglo-Scot not merely to censure isolated elements for ignoring Scotland's unique status as a liberty-loving nation but rather to indict the majority of the Scottish people for having clearly flouted the fine traditions of their country. Convinced that Scotland, because of her egalitarian historical background, should have been overwhelmingly disposed to aid at every stage of its development the cause of liberty and equality for the Negro, D.H. Russell of London could only write to the Caledonian Mercury dispiritedly after the Civil War was over that as a native of Scotland, he had been "grieved to see the amount of sympathy shown to an iniquitous cause by the country which has been an entire battlefield for liberty". ¹

Similarly, W.E. Baxter's interpretation of the vital principles which constituted Scotland's ancient claim to national pride had left him free to attack those Scots who sought to identify the Southern struggle with the old Scottish fight for independence. Having quoted the Vice-President of the Confederacy as saying that slavery would be the corner-stone of the Southern government because it was the Negroes' natural condition, he had asked of his audience towards the end of the Civil War:

"Is it still possible to say that these men are fighting for independence; nobly battling against oppression, fit successors of Wallace? . . . To say this is an insult to patriotism . . . They are fighting not to free themselves of shackles but to rivet the shackles of the black man."²

Strongly held opinions on the nature of the Scottish past could even help — and perhaps directly influence — individuals to transcend the standard

² Lecture by W.E. Baxter on "The Great Struggle in America" at Blairgowrie, 17 Jan., 1865, in Dundee Advertiser, 20 Jan., 1865. It was, however, still possible for Scottish pro-Southern liberals to acknowledge that Lee and Jackson could be for the South what Wallace and Bruce were for Scotland — see above, p. 217.
attitudes of the bulk of their political colleagues towards the Northern victory at this time. Addressing a pre-election meeting near Lennoxtown in July, 1865, the sitting member for Stirlingshire, Peter Blackburn, proved himself steadfast to the Conservative cause by voicing his grave reservations on substantial franchise extension — "take care that you don't go down to a class who have not sufficient intelligence or energy to manage [affairs]". But with reference to American affairs, far from lamenting over the fate of the South, he won great approval from his constituents by declaring that

I cannot believe that a free people such as the people of Scotland are, who have many times fought for liberty and preserved it, can — without reference to the question of what party was right or what party was wrong at the beginning of the American war — be otherwise than rejoiced at this satisfactory conclusion that has followed it, namely, that it has given true freedom to the United States and that slavery no longer exists in ... a fifth-part of the whole habitable world.¹

And David Macrae tacitly acknowledged that at the roots of Scotland's national history there was a spirit of belief in the essential quality of all mankind when, commenting on the furore caused by unspectacular moves to lessen social discrimination in the South, he declared that it was "difficult for a Scotchman" to understand the horror with which the white South regarded even the mildest attempts by Negroes to initiate social as well as political equality.²

The "egalitarian" strand of the Scottish tradition, along with Scott's fiercely nationalistic strand, had by the second half of the nineteenth century burned itself on to the popular imagination on both sides of the Atlantic. For instance, at a large public meeting in Edinburgh advocating

¹ Report of speech by Peter Blackburn near Lennoxtown, 4 July, 1865, in Glasgow Herald, 5 July, 1865. Blackburn was subsequently defeated at the polls by the Liberal candidate, Admiral Erskine.
² Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 176.
the enfranchisement of women owners or occupiers of land or houses, Jane Taylour - one of the leading lights in the tremendously active Edinburgh Society for Women's Suffrage - considered it fitting to include an appeal directly on the grounds of Scottish patriotism: "Yes, Scotchmen, if you love liberty and justice, we, your sisters, love them too. The same blood that flows in your veins flows in ours - the blood of those who fought and bled in the defence of right". It was possible even for one so close to English Quaker ethics, and to the mainspring of English as well as Scottish radicalism as John Bright's sister, Priscilla, to find herself identifying a peculiar Scottish ethos, rooted in a central belief in the equality of all men, and in the desire to aid, and to see justice done by, struggling humanity everywhere. Thus, writing in 1876 of the ceremony where she and her husband, Duncan McLaren, had unveiled a statue to David Livingstone, she referred to the "compassion for mankind" which characterized Livingstone's father-in-law, Dr. Moffat, and was moved to write:

I never saw a finer face. I liked to see him and papa [Duncan McLaren] stand together - so different and yet so alike in the grand realities of devotion and courage. I once saw them and William Chambers [the Edinburgh publisher and well known philanthropist] sitting - the three side by side ... and I felt that Scotland did certainly produce wonderful men.

As has already become obvious, much of the credit for popularizing

---


The Edinburgh Society for Women's Suffrage had in 1870 passed the first resolution supporting the Bill drafted by J.S. Mill, with Duncan McLaren presiding, and the resolution being moved by Sir David Wedderburn. Throughout 1871, Scotland led the way in agitation, which included a marathon course of lectures throughout Scotland by Jane Taylour and Agnes McLaren. It has been remarked that "had Scotland alone been concerned, the Bill would have been carried" - Helen Blackburn, Women's Suffrage (London and Oxford, 1902), pp. 103, 103.

2 Dr Moffat had christianised the Bechuanas tribe.

3 Quoted in Mackie, Life of Duncan McLaren, Vol. 2, pp. 77-78.

4 See above, p. 310.
the image of the Scot as an independent, self-reliant lover of liberty and equality belonged to Robert Burns. "Without the race of which he is a distinct specimen, (and perhaps his poems) America and her powerful Democracy could not exist to-day", wrote Walt Whitman in the 1880s.¹ And addressing the Burns Club of Washington at their Burns Supper in 1869, John Greenleaf Whittier - prominent Quaker abolitionist as well as poet - took care to praise Burns not merely as a "versifier" but also for his "immortal sarcasms against the Pharisees in the Church and the oppressors in the State ... In the shout of enfranchised millions, as they lift the untitled Quaker of Rochdale into the British Cabinet, I seem to hear the voice of the Ayrshire poet".²

Burns' importance for the Scottish national past in an era when the spirit of freedom and the primacy of human rights were seen to be successfully challenging privilege was that while his works were instantly applicable to the cause of the oppressed and downtrodden in every country, he still remained so essentially Scottish a poet that his sentiments seemed simply to epitomize the immutable feelings of generations of Scots before and after him. It was surely not without a conscious touch of national

¹ "Robert Burns as Poet and Person" in Stovall (ed.), The Collected Writings, p. 559. The essay first appeared as "Robert Burns" in The Critic, Dec., 1882, but the expanded and revised version was published in Democratic Virtus and other Papers (London, 1888.)

² North British Daily Mail, 20 Feb., 1869.

Himself a labourer on his father's farm until the age of eighteen, Whittier's initial appreciation of poetry and the inspiration for his own poetic efforts were in fact derived from the works of Robert Burns. While in his early teens, he first became acquainted with Burns' songs through hearing them sung by a wandering Scotsman who called at his father's farm. Subsequently, a schoolmaster brought to their house a volume of Burns' poems "from which he read, greatly to my delight. I begged him to leave the book with me ... This was the first poetry I had ever read, with the exception of that of the Bible, ... and it had a lasting influence upon me. I began to make rhymes myself, and to imagine stories and adventures" - Prefatory Memoir in The Poetical Works of John Greenleaf Whittier (London and Glasgow, 1857 edition), pp. ix-x.
pride that the Dundee Ladies' Anti-Slavery Association chose to embellish the front page of its annual reports with Burns' fitting reminder that "Man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn".  

At the same time, it should be recognized that so far as the United States was concerned, Burns was held in fully as much esteem and reverence by the aristocratic South as by the "democratized" North. It has validly been suggested that much of his impact on the Southern mind stemmed from the fact that "His sentiment and simplicity struck a responsive chord with people of an essentially rural background". Yet, in retrospect, there seems to be a basic incongruity in the old slaveocracy's continuing attachment to a poet whose admittedly fierce national pride and love of homeland was offset by concepts of the rights of man and the equality of mankind which appeared to be in direct conflict with all that the socially stratified, slave-ridden South stood for. After all, the "radicalism" which characterized the writings of Dickens and the life of Shelley was enough to ensure that the works of both were firmly spurned and denounced by the South.

It might be suggested, however, that Burns' egalitarian sentiments did not necessarily preclude his acceptance by Southern society because they could simply be applied in such a way as to render their implications innocuous to the basic master/slave set-up in the South. Thus, for second and third generation planters, whose forefathers had gone to the South

---

1 9th and 10th Annual Reports of the Dundee Ladies' Anti-Slavery Association, 1861 and 1862 - anti-slavery pamphlets in Dundee Public Library, 311(15), and 311(16).

2 Osterweis, Romanticism and Nationalism, p. 32.

3 See, for instance, the attitudes of Jefferson Davis during his Scottish tour in 1869, above, p. 211.

relatively poor men and had built up their wealth by hard work, and who
would still have insisted that they believed wholeheartedly in the prin-
ciple of every man being able to achieve greatness in the land of freedom,
it was possible, surely, to identify romantically, in a nostalgic way,
with some of the sentiments in "A Man's A Man", just as it was possible
to identify romantically in a more positive sense with Scott's chivalry.
Things were made that much easier, too, by the fact that in the reasoning
of many Southerners, the Negro was not a man anyway, and therefore did not
enter into Burns' equation. Moreover, for South as well as for North,
there remained the appeal of Burns purely in terms of his being a fascinat-
ing, all-round character - an intensely human man as well as a poet of
humanity. Whitman best summed up the essence of this appeal:

[Burns] was the average sample of good-natured, warm-blooded,
proud-spirited, convivial, amative ... young and early-middle-
aged man ... everywhere ... [The] essential type of so many thou-
sands - perhaps the average ... of the decent-born young men and
the early mid-aged not only of the British Isles, but America
too, North and South, just the same.¹

But if the full influence of Burns' writings on the United States as
a whole tends further to emphasize the versatility of the popular image of
Scottish traditions in the American context, the indigenous cultural trad-
itions of Scotland had, in general, helped throughout the first half of the

¹ Whitman, "Robert Burns an Poet and Person" in The Collected Writings,
pp. 559, 562. Whittier also declared that while people could admire
other poets, they loved Burns, and that he himself loved him for "his
true manhood and native nobility of soul" - see North British Daily Mail,
20 Feb., 1869. And if it may seem a little quaint and incongruous for a
mild-mannered member of the Society of Friends to celebrate the works
and character of so vigorously full-blooded an individual as Robert
Burns, Whittier made it abundantly plain that he was willing to ignore
and to overlook the poet's personal failings, "the ribald line", the
"evil strain, To lawless love appealing", in his great love and admiration
for Burns as the champion of all mankind and as the consummate writer of
songs - see Whittier, "Burns" in Poetical Works, pp. 223-224; and "Lines:
read at the Boston Celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the birth

To-day be every fault forgiven
Of him in whom we joy!
We take, with thanks, the gold of Heaven
And leave the earth's alloy.
nineteenth century to forge a fairly strong affinity between Scottish liberalism and American democracy. As we have observed from attitudes of dissenting Scottish churchmen and laymen during the Reconstruction period itself, there was within both the Evangelical and Voluntary churches enough independence of spirit to create a high regard not only for the freedom of American religion but also for the freedom of American political and social institutions as a whole. There was, after all, much of the pioneering, frontier spirit in the Free Church and in the United Presbyterian church. Both denominations recognized as a cardinal principle the primacy of the will of the people; both faced the challenge of establishing new churches from the foundations up, depending entirely on congregational support; and, through their massive missionary projects abroad, both desired to push on and conquer new fields. And above all, both churches maintained a fierce independence from State interference. It should perhaps be borne in mind, however, that it was through a controversy which directly concerned the United States - the "Send Back the Money" campaign - that the professedly democratic and egalitarian principles of the Free Church came most bitterly to be attacked.

Again, the Scottish educational system had tended to foster, perhaps, a keener interest in and awareness of educational developments in the United States. Certainly, many Scottish travellers to America throughout the century devoted part of the records of their observations to the virtues of the informality and experimentalism of the American system.¹ Education being accepted in Scotland not only as the fountainhead of

¹ See, for instance, Macrae, The Americans at Home, pp. 470-479; the Rev. Charles Grant, Notes on Schools and Colleges in America, from a summer tour in 1868 (an address delivered to the Aberdeen University Debating Society, November, 1870, and published Aberdeen, 1871), pp. 33-34; Wedderburn, in Percival (ed.), Sir David Wedderburn, pp. 89-90; John Leng, America in 1876, pp. 274-276.
independent thinking but also as one of the first essential prerequisites to self-help and advancement,¹ it is worth noting the concern and indignation which Scots such as Macrae, visiting the Southern states during Reconstruction, registered towards the slaveowners' pre-Civil War practice of refusing to allow their slaves to be educated.²

But when the recognized³ sympathy between Scottish liberalism and American democracy has been acknowledged, it is clear that in relation to the American Civil War and its aftermath, there remained a fundamental dichotomy in the applicability of the Scottish national, "democratic" tradition to the American situation. We have observed the adaptability of the Scottish past in this connection - how what might loosely be called (for want of better terms) the independent "nationalistic" strand and the "democratic" egalitarian strand were retrospectively used during Reconstruction with equal effectiveness by supporters of the South and of the North respectively. Perhaps the basic question which should be asked in considering Scottish attitudes to Reconstruction is how far it was possible for Scots to reconcile the disparate strands which went to make up this unique national tradition. For it would seem that the American Civil War showed up, as perhaps no other single event in Scotland or out of it could have done, the divergent connotations which could be put upon the concept of a "national Scottish democratic tradition".

Taking into account the fact that personal political interests were

---

¹ The living Scottish testimony to this was, of course, the "lad o' pairts" who invariably made his way up from humble beginnings, by way of an unstintingly helpful and usually rather brilliant parish school-master, to university and national renown in his chosen profession.

² See Macrae, The Americans at Home, pp. 248-249.

naturally a strong determining factor here, the matter resolved itself into a question of priorities. Depending on whether, as a Scot, one was committed more strongly to the radical, Covenanting, Presbyterian tradition which insisted with a religious fervency that all men were created equal in the sight of God, regardless of race, and that the holding of property in man was a sin against the Creator, or to the patriotic, romantically nationalistic tradition which stimulated the championship of all apparently oppressed nation states struggling to be free, one supported the North or the South. Normally, the two strands of the Scottish past wove quite nicely into a complementary democratic-patriotic pattern, but obviously, in the peculiar circumstances of the American Civil War, where the "oppressed nation" also happened to sanction domestic slavery, a dilemma arose. This dilemma was well reflected - despite the loud, unmistakable overtones of pro-Southern bias - in the Scotsman's rueful editorial commenting on the imminent fall of Charleston and Wilmington:

The dead-weight and the curse of slavery are, one would suppose, showing themselves of more avail than the noble impulse and the reflected blessings of patriotism. If the honourable strivings of a high-hearted people after independence are doomed to bloody and complete failure, at least we must remember that justice has had a most complex question to deal with. If the slave will be avenged for his wrongs by the freeman [i.e. the Southern white] being robbed of his rights, there will yet be no cause to despair of the cause of liberty ... [It may be that it [the South] is destined not to be free until it has done to those others, whom the sins of earlier generations ... have placed in its power, as it would have others do unto itself.]

And it is significant, both as illustrating the recognition of the power of Scottish traditions, and the complexity of the sympathies which

1 It was obviously to the advantage of Baxter and other Scottish reformers to highlight the "democratic" nature of the Scottish tradition, just as it served the Conservative purposes of the anti-democratic Edinburgh Courant, for instance, to use the Scottish example as proof of the worthiness of "nationalistic" causes like that of the South.

2 Scotsman, 4 March, 1865.
these helped to produce towards the United States at this time, that even the ultra-Conservative Blackwoods should have admitted an apparent anomaly in the tremendously warm reception and obvious regard for Jefferson Davis shown by the fishermen and seafaring folk of St. Andrews. Blackwood's daughter, who from lengthy residences at their summer home near St. Andrews knew the people well, confessed the family's surprise:

Hardly the sort of reception one would have expected these sometimes aggressively free-born and independent Scots to accord the champion of the Southern cause, but the result, we supposed, of their admiration of his personal bravery and gallant conduct throughout the war.¹

The schizophrenia of the Scottish tradition as it is reflected in attitudes to the United States at this period is indeed neatly symbolized by the fact that an extremely warm welcome had been personally extended by Burns' nieces to Davis in 1869,² while almost a decade later, the individual who had been instrumental in crushing Davis' cause, Ulysses S. Grant, was formally granted the freedom of ayr, the burgess ticket being presented in a specially made casket of silver, lavishly engraved with thistles and Burnsiana, and enclosed in a box made of elm wood from Alloway kirk.³

For Scots who were sincerely devoted both to the cause of peoples struggling legitimately for national independence and to the extension of basic liberties and rights for the individual, the American Civil War could prove to be a real testing time. Since varying interpretations were put on the nature of both the Federal and the Confederate causes by their supporters and detractors, it remained theoretically possible, of course, for Scotsmen placed in this dilemma to maintain that they still adhered

¹ Porter, William Blackwood, p. 201.
² See above, p. 211.
³ See Glasgow Herald, 7 Sept., 1877.
lovingly to both principles. But in fact the Civil War forced Scots to choose - in a way that the abolition question had never done - where the relative strength of their sympathies for independence and for individual freedom lay. Such a situation was necessarily productive of apparent anomalies, like the case of the Rev. George Gilfillan who, as we have seen, had been one of the United Presbyterian church's most outspoken critics of American slavery in the 1850s but who yet became an inflexible supporter of the South during the Civil War and after. When the outbreak of war made it no longer possible for Gilfillan to lift slavery out of the society from which it sprang and to campaign for abolition purely on the grounds of its being a "good cause", he in effect turned to support the society which had condoned the evil. This he felt he could sincerely do on the twin grounds that the North was fighting an imperialistic war, and that the South had every right, as Scotland had had, to struggle for independence. Clearly, in fulminating against the enforced subjection of what he saw as an aspiring nation state, Gilfillan was acting as much within one area of the Scottish democratic tradition as were those who argued that support for the North meant support for a cause which, if victorious, would ensure the beginning of a process which would go some way to achieving in the United States practical recognition of the equality of all men.

But even in so adamant a character as Gilfillan, consciousness of an incontrovertible triumph for human liberty could work to produce a striking ambivalence in opinion on America at this time. Thus, he wrote of a sermon which he had preached at the time of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation (and which was delivered but three months before his strong outburst against the North at an anti-slavery rally in Dundee):

I ... said that I gloried that it had gone forth on all the winds like a great blast of a jubilee trumpet, startling the iron earth and the brazen heaven of Dollar-defying America, lighting up many

---

1 Gilfillan's views are discussed above, pp. 201-203.
a faded African eye and creating hope in many a forlorn African heart, causing the tyrants of Richmond to tremble and the psalms of Stonewall Jackson and his men to quaver and sink in the midst of their blasphemous music.¹

Yet insofar as post-war attitudes to the United States are concerned, it seems certain that the pro-Southern attitude adopted by Gilfillan was instrumental in precluding his active involvement in the freedmen's aid cause, a cause which was, after all, the logical follow up of earlier anti-slavery efforts, and which was eagerly advanced by those of his colleagues who had taken a different attitude than he towards the Civil War.²

In a city which was to show such a marked interest in aiding the freed slaves, the loss of his services to the cause were the greater since, as his long-standing friend John Leng of the Dundee Advertiser was to observe, few men could rouse a Scottish, and especially a Dundee, audience to such enthusiasm as he in his "thundering denunciations of wrong or overpowering appeals for right".³

---

1 Entry in Gilfillan’s journal, 18 Jan., 1863, in Watson and Watson, George Gilfillan, p. 257.

2 Among those of his close personal acquaintances who had supported the North and who subsequently took an interest in the freedmen's aid cause - and with whom Gilfillan had lively debates on the American question - were the Rev. William Anderson and the Rev. George Jeffrey, both of Glasgow - see ibid., pp. 271, 279, 300, 339-340.

3 Quoted in Watson and Watson, George Gilfillan, p. 494.

Leng himself certainly did not follow his persuasive friend into support of the South, however: and if Dundee's response to the freedmen's aid campaign is anything to go by, neither did many of Gilfillan's congregation. Indeed, his own wife - who, it must be conceded, did have a very strong mind of her own and tended to adopt opinions and attitudes to life quite different to his (see ibid., pp. 443-444) - remained President of the Dundee Ladies' Anti-Slavery Association in the early 1860s. There is, however, perhaps some significance in the fact that the Association did not believe in the viability of permanent reunion of North and South - see 9th and 10th Annual Reports of the Dundee Ladies' Anti-Slavery association, 1861 and 1862. Mrs. Gilfillan does not, however, appear to have played any role in freedmen's aid activities.
VIII Conclusions

Yet in this particular respect, Gilfillan can perhaps be taken as representative of the general trend in Scottish outlooks towards American Reconstruction. It was, for instance, understandable and commendable but nevertheless somewhat unrealistic (as indeed the Duke of Argyll, at least, seems to have realized\(^1\)) for advocates of the freedmen's aid movement to hope that theirs was a cause which would be supported by Britons purely on its own merits, irrespective of Civil War predilections. Certainly, so far as Scotland was concerned, such an appeal was over-optimistic, because to some extent, the clock had stopped with the Civil War. As this chapter has attempted to demonstrate, there was, in the vast majority of cases, no significant desire to substantially alter attitudes which had been entrenched during the war years. Of course, there were important exceptions to this general trend - the Glasgow Sentinel's calculated back-pedalling on its old sympathies for the South, the Edinburgh Review's willingness to offer an analytical reassessment of Southern society, for example. And there was the deepening of understanding and compassion for the South experienced by many pro-Northern Scots who visited the region during Reconstruction. But for the most part, Scottish attitudes during Reconstruction continued to be governed by old ideologies and old sympathies.

The greatest military encounter of modern times, fought over issues which throughout the century had engaged the attention of Scots, had been of such consuming interest that the debate on it inevitably continued in varying forms during the years immediately following. Certainly, speculations on the policies proposed and adopted by United States statesmen during Reconstruction were rife. And in a country traditionally so strongly involved with the abolition of Negro slavery, there was a genuine

\(^{1}\) See above, p. 163, fn. 1.
concern in many quarters for the place of the freedman - his spiritual and material well-being and his political and social status - in post-war America, as well as the frequent forecasts from others of the doom which was in store for the United States as a result of badly managed emancipation and premature enfranchisement of the Negro race.

But still there was the irresistible tendency to look back - and not merely to clarify the reasoning behind a current attitude to Reconstruction or merely to use the outcome of the Civil War in its political context for specific domestic purposes (although both were vitally important reasons). Quite simply, it was much easier to look back than it was to look forward, or even effectively to comment on the current state of affairs during Reconstruction. For if it was frequently claimed on both sides of the Atlantic that Britain had not understood the basic issues and principles involved in the Civil War, much less could the majority of Britons coherently follow the intricate workings of the complex American political system which determined the tenor of political life in the United States during the Reconstruction era.

It might be suggested that even among those Scots who remained loyally sympathetic to "the great experiment" at this time, there could be little

1 See, for instance, W.C. Long, The American War: the Aims, Antecedents, and Principles of the Belligerents (Lecture delivered in Dundee, 13 Dec., 1862, and published, at the request of several ministers and merchants of the city, in pamphlet form, Dundee Advertiser office, 1863), pp. 3, 4. William Christopher Leng was the elder brother of the Dundee Advertiser's editor, John Leng, and was himself a writer for the paper from 1859-64, when he became joint proprietor and managing editor of the Sheffield Daily Telegraph - see LIA, Vol. 2, Second Supplement, pp. 454-455. A.F. Stoddard, Slavery or Freedom in America, or the Issue of the War (Lecture delivered in Paisley on 28 January, 1863, and published in pamphlet form Glasgow, 1863), pp. 3, 5-8; Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, M.P., in introduction to the Rev. Dr. Georges Fisch, Nine Months in the United States during the Crisis (London, 1863), p. v; Rev. Dr. M.... Field in Proc. Free Church C.E., May, 1867, p. 73; Lord Lytton to Professor John Nichol, autumn, 1868, quoted in Knight, John Nichol, p. 258.
real comprehension of America's future course of development. Many, of course, optimistically stated their belief in the glorious expansion and material strength which they saw as the destiny of the young Republic. But these were vague, generalized dreams, prophecies aided by the sturdy Victorian faith in progress and in the resourcefulness of the transatlantic branch of the Anglo-Saxon family, and by the desire to see the United States realize her mighty potential for spreading Protestantism across the globe. Events moved too rapidly, and the remote convolutions of the social and political set-up in the United States were too complicated, for pro-American Scots during the Reconstruction era to do very much more than hang on bravely to their faith in the United States and pay the traditional lip service to a democracy which (as they themselves scarcely seem to have appreciated) was already running away from them.

For this element, the great positive, concrete triumphs of the United States were in the past, and to some extent the all too frequent recognition of these triumphs hindered a deeper appreciation of and concentration on the subsequent drift of American affairs. It became too easy to accept the Emancipation Proclamation as the ultimate triumph of American democracy, as the spring from which, in the nature of things, a stream of progress towards full justice, and political and social equality for the liberated Negro must irreversibly flow. There was a grim and perhaps symbolic irony in the fact that three weeks before the last Federal troops were removed from the South, marking the final demise of the experiment in Radical Reconstruction and opening the flood-gates for the systematic erosion of the Negroes' rights, a huge Glasgow audience should have emotionally joined Harriet Beecher Stowe's "Uncle Tom" in singing the old slave hymn, "Glory, glory, hallelujah, freedom reigns today".  

1 Report of a meeting in City Hall, Glasgow, 20 March, 1877, in Glasgow Herald, 21 March, 1877.
CHAPTER IV
SCOTTISH OPINIONS ON ANDREW JOHNSON AND THE POLITICS OF RECONSTRUCTION

The process of reconstruction is about as difficult as cutting a tiger's claws. You must be strong enough to hold him down till the operation is over, and if gentle, you must be sure he doesn't snap your head off. The difficulty is whether to hold the tiger down or to employ gentleness. It all depends upon the amiability of the tiger.

Laurence Oliphant on "The Political Condition of the United States".

With her sustained concern over the constitutional, legalistic, and governmental position of both the Northern and Southern states after the Civil War, Scotland was well primed to take a deep interest in the politics of Reconstruction. The problems which had to be solved after the end of hostilities, involving as they did questions concerning fundamental civil and political rights, and the nature of democratic, republican government, were of too great a magnitude and too universal an importance to be dismissed as mere issues of internal American politics. In an era of British domestic reform, with a growing awareness of and confidence in the potential power of the working classes through trade union organization, the post-war development of the United States was, as we have seen, earnestly analysed and speculated upon by admirer and critic alike in Scotland.

Inevitably, few (if indeed any) of the Scottish commentators fully understood the inner workings of the American political system, a fact which some were ready enough to acknowledge. As the complex struggle between President Johnson and the Radical Republican Congressmen began to warm up, the influential Glasgow Herald, for instance, was grateful that

---

Johnson's speech on Washington's birthday, 1866, in which he had viciously denounced and lampooned Radical leaders, had channelled the questions at issue into a new form "which neutral parties can easily comprehend without puzzling their heads with the intricacies of American Constitutional law and State rights". Three years later, the highly distinguished Scottish Q.C. and standing counsel to the secretary of state for India, William Forsyth, returned from a trip to the United States and on the basis of his personal findings, pronounced that "those [in Britain] who understand the constitution of the United States, the limits of the power of Congress, and the extent of State rights with which that power sometimes comes into conflict, I suspect that the number is small indeed" (sic). He further stressed that even the party nomenclatures "Democratic" and "Republican" were largely misconstrued by the British, and that in general there were few countries about which greater mistakes were made. But an incomplete knowledge of the contemporary political scene and of the basic tenets of the Constitution itself did not in the least deter Scots from making emphatic value judgements on what was frequently seen to be a period of mighty internal upheaval in the American system of government - a belief itself largely fostered by misconceptions about the general pattern of American politics. Something has already been said in the previous chapter about Scottish enthusiasm for, and fears of, the apparent surfeit of democracy which seemed to be the keynote of America's post-war political development. It remains now to consider in some detail Scottish attitudes to specific political moves proposed by opposing factions in the United States during Reconstruction. The crucial question around which debate

1 Glasgow herald, 29 March, 1866. By 10 Oct., 1867, the Inverness Courier was finding recent American affairs "barely intelligible".

2 William Forsyth, Q.C., "Impressions of America" in Good Words, March, 1869, p. 213.
revolved both in America and in Scotland was indeed that which Oliphant pinpointed—whether the Southern states were to be gently and rapidly eased back into the Union, or to be firmly kept in control until they had provided sufficient guarantee that their readmission to Congress would not be on terms which would tend to cancel out the fruits of the North's military victory. And at the root of this basic question, of course, there lay the emotionally charged issues of securing complete civil and political rights for the freedmen, and the extent to which State rights should still be acknowledged to exist following the war. In the United States itself, the difficult years of reorganization, and the difficult personal problems of deciding how far principle should be sacrificed for expediency, gave scope for altruism and idealism as well as for self-interest and the petty intrigues of individuals and factions jockeying for political power.

From a closer look at Scottish views on the momentous battle which developed between Johnson and Congress throughout the early years of Reconstruction, it becomes possible to get some idea of how well the political processes governing Reconstruction and the actual measures proposed were understood by Scots so far removed geographically from the United States and (even in the case of Scottish radicals) ideologically from the onward march of radicalism in America. In this connection also, it is worth noting not only how far preconceived, traditional Scottish biases for or against America coloured thinking on legislative enactments at that time, but also how far the development of Scottish opinion on the Congressional/Presidential conflict paralleled the course of American thinking on the contest.
The growth of confidence in Johnson's policy: July-December, 1865

Enough has already been said in previous chapters to indicate that, by early summer, 1865, those Scottish observers who had feared a deviation by Johnson from Lincoln's proposed conciliatory policy towards the South felt their fears to have been fully justified. It has already been observed that the most powerful anti-Federal organ in the country, the Scotsman, early put its confidence in the nation to follow Lincoln's course. This meant that the Scotsman's attitude to the immediate post-war situation was based to a very considerable extent on its recognition of a fairly close reciprocal relationship between the will of the President and the desires of the Northern people. Accordingly, the tendency not to exhibit an undue pessimism at that stage was attributable to the fact that at the time when Johnson was going through his "traitors must be punished and impoverished" phase, the Scotsman was ready to scream into the attack and to present him simply as a misguided but also rather wilfully villainous character against the backdrop of a much more clear-sighted, benevolent Northern people.

Not until July of 1865, with the easing of Johnson's policy towards the South, did a discernible swing to the President become evident in the columns of the paper. It was set in motion on the first day of the month in an editorial which expressed the hope that the threats of Johnson to deal roughly with Davis and others would soon be proven false, and which significantly reminded readers that through his general amnesty and pardons, the President had already retreated from his original harsh stand vis-a-vis Southern civilians. Approval of the President's course grew through the

1 See above, Chapter II, pp. 122-123; Chapter III, pp. 143-147.
2 See above, Chapter III, p. 148.
3 Scotsman, 1 July, 1865.
summer and early autumn, and the apogee of this early enthusiasm was reached on 26 September when the Scotsman fully endorsed Johnson's plan of Reconstruction to date confidently commenting that the South could not wish to see a better person in whom to place the arrangement of future activities, observing that he even had some advantages over Lincoln, and holding out much hope that he could solve the difficult problems of reunion and reorganization.\(^1\) Apparently, then, the paper's earlier confidence in the power of the Northern people to bring the President into line had not been misplaced.

By autumn, indeed, the vast majority of the more influential Scottish journals - and probably most of the Scottish regional ones following in their wake - had similarly adopted a happier outlook towards Johnson and his policies. Surveying the "social revolution" taking place in the Southern states, the Scotsman's great rival, the Glasgow Herald, concluded that the President's system of Reconstruction was "the most humane that ever was adopted by a victorious country towards a powerful rebellion put down by force of arms",\(^2\) and rejoiced in the fact that Johnson had confounded the extreme Radicals who had "looked upon the President as the very man to become an instrument of vengeance in their hands".\(^3\) An intimate knowledge of Southern society had, it was felt, helped Johnson to discharge a tremendously difficult task wisely and well,\(^4\) since it was obvious that "such a process [of Reconstruction] will be far more successful with a high-spirited people than a system of repression such as ... [is]

\(^{1}\) Scotsman, 26 Sept., 1865.
\(^{2}\) Glasgow Herald, 22 Aug., 1865.
\(^{3}\) Ibid., 9 Nov., 1865. See also Ibid., 5 Oct., 1865.
\(^{4}\) Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865.
practised repeatedly in Poland. Only one reservation was occasionally allowed to creep in, but that was a significant one - the danger that "the Southern people might not faithfully carry through their part".

Among the journals which supported Johnsonian Reconstruction at that time, the Herald was far from unique in expressing such a fear. From mid August, by which time several of the Southern state conventions had already met under Johnson's aegis to ratify the Thirteenth Amendment and to formulate legislation for race relations, reports from the South were certainly beginning to disturb many of those maintaining a regular, watchful eye on the situation. And this included certain elements which in varying degree had been sympathetic to the Confederacy during the war.

Edinburgh's former Evangelical organ, the Daily Review, had early welcomed rumours that Johnson intended enlarging the existing amnesty to include Southerners with property valued at over £20,000. Concern soon arose, however, over the actual direction which Southern participation in Reconstruction seemed destined to take. The return of "hardened and prominent rebels" to the North Carolina state convention produced uneasiness about the extent of disaffection in the state; and when, later, a meeting of Southern whites was held in Richmond, Virginia, to protest against the central government's slowness in recognizing their new loyalty to the Union, and to assert their acquiescence in the issues of the war, the Review was unimpressed:

1 Ibid., 9 Nov., 1865.
2 Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865. See also ibid., 22 Aug., 1865; 5 Oct., 1865, where the paper clearly recognized that "the biggest part of reconstruction" lay in the hands of "Southern gentlemen".
3 Daily Review, 18 July, 1865. It is unfortunately impossible to discover the Review's attitudes to the initial "harsh" phase of Johnson's policy to the South since the files for January-June, 1865 are not extant.
4 Ibid., 14 Aug., 1865.
In the face of what we hear of the treatment of the blacks in the South, we fear the loyalists of Richmond do protest too much ... It is words still that they offer in proof of their loyalty, and the Washington Government may be excused if they (sic) prefer judging of the state of feeling in the South by the deeds of barbarity upon the negroes, of which we have had such harrowing accounts.

Yet, despite the proven dangers of allowing the ex-rebels too free a hand in the promulgation of Southern affairs, the paper continued throughout the remainder of 1865 to support Johnson's policy. Influenced by his apparently favourable disposition towards Britain, it judged that he "comes as near to the ideal statesman as any man in America"; and his large reduction of the army in the South was seen as a vote of confidence in the Negro population - "not only a pledge of peace but a pledge of good government to the freedmen" - the more laudable in view of the recent uprising in Jamaica. The apparent inability on the Review's part to appreciate that the early injustices meted out by the South to the Negro must be perpetuated and intensified by the Johnsonian policy of Reconstruction was largely brought about by the journal's built-in, general bias in favour of the President and his likely course of cautionary democratic progress, as against the probable "revolutionary" proposals of the Radicals. As if to ward off and deflect Scottish reformist sympathies from the looming threat of a more extreme Reconstruction policy in the United States, a lively effort was even made to emphasize the importance for British reform of Johnson's "successful" work in Reconstruction, the Review suggesting that the epithet "Americanise", contemptuously hurled at British reformers for the preceding five years, had been made redundant by Johnson's impressive handling of the democratic processes.

1 Ibid., 11 Sept., 1865.
2 Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865.
3 Ibid., 19 Dec., 1865.
4 Ibid.
With its even more positive commitment to British Parliamentary reform, the Glasgow Sentinel was also, by late 1865, sufficiently impressed by Johnson's performance to hold him up as a shining testimony to the gross misjudgements of those in Britain who argued against admitting the people to a fuller share of political power. Fully satisfied with the President's "wise and liberal" policy, the Sentinel was able to combine, in its attitude to Johnson, a naturally strong desire for leniency to the South with an opportunity to illustrate to British sceptics the potential strength and efficiency of democratic institutions:

When we see much men as Mr. Lincoln and Mr. Johnson elected by universal suffrage, it is difficult to believe that it is the dangerous thing which it is regarded to be in this country.¹

Certainly, the journal had shown some signs of appreciating the difficulties which could follow from a combination of Southern intransigence and an over-conciliatory reconstruction policy. At one point, it was even prepared to admit that there might be some "slight degree of truth" in the Radical allegation that the President was bartering away the fruits of the Northern victory, more especially since "Mr. Johnson himself is Southern by birth and feeling, and although he cast his lot with the North when the war broke out, it was love for the Union and not for its defenders that influenced him". With the North/South conflict merely transferred to the polls and the Legislative halls, and with the South enjoying the advantage of the chief magistrate's support, the Sentinel recognized that "the negro question" had only been half settled by emancipation, and that "the liberated slaves have many prejudices to overcome before they can hope to stand on the same platform with their favoured white brethren".²

¹ Glasgow Sentinel, 23 Dec., 1865. The paper had earlier (30 Sept., 1865) combined an endorsement of Presidential reconstruction with a significant emphasis on Johnson's plebian origins — see above, Chapter III, p. 291.
² Ibid., 28 Oct., 1865.
But this said, the paper's ideas on what would suffice to constitute immediate safeguards for the Negro's newly won freedom remained essentially naive and short-sighted. Faced in the summer of 1865 with reports of white riots and disturbances in the South, and the re-election of ex-Confederates to positions of power, the Sentinel was ready enough to acknowledge that a reconstruction programme which left rebellion "'scotched' but not killed" was highly unsatisfactory. But with a history of spirited opposition to the Northern cause behind it, the paper carefully stopped short of appportioning all - or even most - of the blame for initial complications to the South:

While the Southerners, though defeated in the field, are turning up in force at the ballot-box, and upsetting the reconstruction scheme of the Government, as far as the position of Sambo is concerned, the Northern Republicans are doing all they can to force the Government into an extreme abolitionist course.\(^1\)

Johnson was seen to be awkwardly placed between these two extreme parties, and the crying need was for compromise. In this situation, the Sentinel considered that the main priority was to ensure that each Southern state ratified the Thirteenth amendment, and that once this was done, all the rest of the reconstruction process would be "plain sailing". With every vestige of slavery removed, there would be no reason why ex-Confederates, "the logical rulers of the South", should not be granted political power. So long as there was no disposition to restore slavery and the old state of society, the paper could see no harm in the re-election of Southerners to positions of trust and respect.\(^2\)

What the Sentinel totally failed to appreciate, of course, was the fact that mere acceptance of the Thirteenth Amendment could not of itself

\(^1\) Ibid., 26 Aug., 1865.
\(^2\) Ibid.
provide any real guarantee that there would subsequently be steady, un-impeded progress towards full justice and equality, both social and politi-cal, for the Negro in the South. As later legislation in the South was to demonstrate, it did not require a complete reversal to the status quo ante-bellum for it to be possible to impose virtual bondage on the Negro freedmen during Reconstruction. But by the end of the year, though cautiously conceding that the planters were "not very anxious to make free labour a success", the paper (having seen Johnson take a firm line to secure ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment) continued to put faith in the President's policy, and to maintain that if Congress would only give its full support, all the difficulties of Reconstruction would soon be overcome.¹

Less fulsome admiration was forthcoming from the Sentinel's local rival, the North British Daily Mail, but in its columns, too, by the end of the year there was a general confidence in the policy pursued by Johnson. The Mail chose to identify as the "true question" of the Civil War and Reconstruction not the position of the Negro race in the United States but the fundamental relation of the separate states (whose rights it championed) to the central government at Washington.² From that standpoint, it was naturally disposed to favour the President, whom it judged to support individual state action on key issues such as Negro suffrage.³ His "responsible and capable" responses to the critical difficulties which faced the nation were indeed eagerly welcomed by a journal which had earlier tended to spread alarmist views on the bloody reprisals which the victorious North intended to take on the Southern states.⁴ Far from

¹ Ibid., 23 Dec., 1865.
² North British Daily Mail, 9 Sept., 1865.
³ Ibid.
⁴ See above, Chapter II, p. 120.
becoming the tool of the "violent party" at the North, Johnson was
"acquitting himself with unflinching fierceness of the arduous task of
shielding the exhausted and prostrate South from the implacable wrath of
its conquering foe". 1

But while thus blatantly rejoicing over the President's championship
of the South, even the Mail was forced to concede the dangers inherent in
a Reconstruction policy which seemed to be geared primarily to propitiating
the Southerners. In an editorial surprising both in view of its candidness
and of the paper's antecedent comments on Reconstruction, the Mail accused
Johnson of not scrupling to sacrifice the Negro to appease the South.
So far as the practical results of emancipation, and, indeed, the "Negro
difficulty" in general, were concerned, the old Confederacy was not yielding
more than it could help, while the North was disinclined to exact more
than the South was ready to concede:

Here and there spasmodic efforts are being made by the friends of
the negro and by the negroes themselves to prevent this compromise,
which threatens not only the political rights of the black man, but
by the implications of law, his very manhood also ... Secession and
slavery are both gone, but the South clings to the notion of dealing
exceptionally and despotically with the negro.2

Proof of this was seen to lie in the actions of the four Southern
state conventions which had already met, the Alabama convention's refusal
to allow Negroes to testify in law courts being cited as representative of
the prevailing Southern temper towards the freedmen.3 The Mail's attitude
towards this particular piece of Southern legislation is worthy of special
attention as illustrative of how essentially mercurial Scottish press
opinions tended to be towards varying facets of the Reconstruction process.

1 North British Daily Mail, 30 Sept., 1865
2 Ibid., 25 Oct., 1865
3 Ibid.
We have already noted that a major factor in determining the paper's general support for Johnson was his respect for a significant degree of state autonomy. Presented, however, on this occasion with a situation where state enactment plainly contravened the basic tenets of United States justice, the *North British Daily Mail* temporarily forgot its attachment to the principle of State rights to pinpoint the sham which Negro freedom must remain if an unforgiving South were freely allowed to take its own road in defining the future position of the freedman:

If Congress can permit this outrage of the quondam slave-owners of Alabama, and arm a state militia so as to make such an enactment effective against the coloured population, the blood which flowed during the great Civil War will have been shed in vain, and the battle for the maintenance of Republican institutions and the integrity of the Union will have to be fought again.2

Identifying a powerful desire on the part of both North and South to narrow the gulf between the two sections, the *Mail* concluded that there existed in America a general readiness to sacrifice the claims of the Negro to the exigencies of the occasion. Nor, of course, were the Northern states any more free from censure on this count than was the South, the North being "largely tainted with the political and moral heresy which would consign the people of colour to perpetual degredation, and this in the teeth of the spirit and the letter of the institutions in which they, as all Americans do, so much pride themselves".3

In this sudden and transitory concern for the Negro on the part of a journal which only a few weeks before had expressed regret at the suddenness of wholesale emancipation in America and roundly criticized "well-intentioned but weak-minded philanthropists" in Britain and the Northern states who

1 See above, p. 344.
3 Ibid. It would seem that the *Mail* had, in fact, an exaggerated idea of the eagerness of North and South for a total rapprochement at that time.
could not appreciate the disastrous magnitude of the change involved for
Southern society, there was a strong element of self interest. Throughout
1865, the North British Daily Mail had shown growing concern over the
undecided future of the cotton supply from the Southern states, recognizing
in mid-April that if the Federals were victorious, "they will be excessively
jealous of any attempt at 'compelling' the negro to labour in the cotton
plantations", and already fearing free labour as an unknown quantity.2
Consequently, when voluntary labour in the South had to be accepted as an
established fact, and with Glasgow continuing to require a steady supply of
Southern cotton, the Mail was largely influenced to adopt a new role as
champion of justice for the Negro by the conviction that fair dealing by
the Southern employers (and, on a more general level, by the white South
as a whole) would help to get the cotton crop efficiently harvested.

Thus, although far from confident that the "proud" planter class
would be willing to "stoop to gentleness and persuasion" to get what it
had recently been able to enforce, the Mail advocated "kindness and equi-
table dealing" by the planters to secure the Negro labour which they so
desperately needed.

[1]If the planter does cultivate, it is of great public as well as ...
private importance that he should reap; and equitable agreements,
freely entered into with the black men for seasonable periods, are
perfectly reasonable and necessary ... It is upon this labour base-
ment that the edifice of national peace and prosperity must be reared,
and if the leading men of the South are sincerers in their avowed desire
to restore political and social harmony to the nation, the interests
and rights of the manual worker, be he black or white, must be justly
dealt with.2

As has been demonstrated, however, the strength of these misgivings about
Southern recalcitrance and Northern appeasement was not sufficient signi-

1 Ibid., 9 Sept., 1865.
2 Ibid., 19 April, 1865. See also 7 April, 24 June, 22 Aug., 1865.
3 Ibid., 31 Oct., 1865.
significantly to impair the Mail's early confidence in Johnsonian Reconstruction. Basically, a policy of substantial conciliation towards the South was still seen to be most desirable and "assuring to the representatives of the manufacturing interests of this country"\(^1\): and Johnson himself was accorded the distinction of being a President who well understood British feelings.\(^2\)

Although serving an area of Scotland which had no direct interests in the state of the American cotton trade, the Dundee Courier similarly highlighted the problems early arising from the transition to free Negro labour as one area of Reconstruction which had "a practical side of the utmost importance to Britain, no less than to the Americans".\(^3\) From an objective disinterested standpoint, the paper showed itself genuinely concerned about the treatment likely to be meted out to the freedmen by an unpromisingly hostile Southern planter class:

> Disposed to make every allowance for the difficulties of the planters, and remembering the overmastering influence of deep-rooted prejudice, there seems in too many quarters of the South a positive resolution to continue to do the negro injustice. This is part of human nature; but, acting thus, it is apt to create for itself untold trouble.\(^4\)

Throughout the summer and most of the autumn, the more Conservative of Dundee's two leading newspapers continued to display a considerable distrust of the intentions of the ex-rebels in the South. The dangers of immediately entrusting the fate of the freedmen to the Southern planter class were clearly recognized. And the South's systematic refusal to take official notice of acts of violence against Negroes prompted the Courier to warn that the South had "no claims to more than justice":

\(^1\) Ibid.
\(^2\) Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865.
\(^3\) Dundee Courier, 21 Aug., 1865.
\(^4\) Ibid. The Courier also stressed that it was in the South's own interests to be just to the Negro labouring class.
State rights are valuable; but human rights are of still more importance...men do not unlearn the lessons of slavery in a day. That absolutism which it breeds can ill brook constraint.  

The newspaper's scepticism implied support for a temporary restriction on the full exercise by the South of pre-war rights and privileges. Commenting on the meeting of Johnson with the Southern delegation in early September, the Courier decided that it would be "for the advantage of free constitutions in America if the South should for a time cease to possess that potent sway in the Government it erstwhile (sic) enjoyed" since it had not yet accepted emancipation as a right. "Until this is done the negro is not safe; and until the negro is safe rebellion is not ended."  

Johnson, it was felt, certainly tended to be somewhat too lenient towards the South, and the Southern response was succinctly dismissed as unfavourable:  

Too many at the South, while accepting emancipation as inevitable, are disposed to do all they can to rob the slave of whatever is necessary to make emancipation a blessing. The policy of these people is to render the lot of the freedman as hard as possible.  

In early November, 1865, however, news began to trickle through to Britain of a Negro uprising in Jamaica. By the middle of the month, the country in general, and the press in particular, was seething with speculative reports on the insurrection. While a minority of journals and prominent individuals early adopted a guarded, balanced attitude to the event, it seems safe to conclude that the vast majority in Britain were, initially at least, fully prepared to accept more or less in their gruesome entirety the lurid, graphic accounts of the "atrocities" and "barbarities" allegedly perpetrated by the Negroes. In this respect,

1 Ibid., "Reconstruction in the United States", 18 Sept., 1865.  
2 Ibid., "The South Repentant", 30 Sept., 1865.  
3 Ibid., 26 Oct., 1865.  
4 The Scottish reaction to the Jamaican revolt is looked at in more detail below, Chapter V, pp. 518-574.
the Dundee Courier was no exception. And almost certainly, the shock of "That frightful outbreak of African savagery" was instrumental in producing the remarkable change in attitude towards American Reconstruction which became evident in the paper at that time.

In place of implied criticism of his failure to curb Southern injustices towards the American freedmen, Johnson was now congratulated for having taken a satisfactory policy of "growing moderation" in domestic affairs. With his conciliatory approach having proved "very successful", he was judged a more suitable President than even perhaps Lincoln would have been, since the latter might well have been obliged to follow the less desirable Congressional plan of Reconstruction. Only the "fanatical" Wendell Phillips was seen to constitute a continuing significant opposition to Johnson, and the Courier felt it "gratifying to the world" that the strength of the "extreme party" in America had so greatly diminished. Because of the President's creditable "liberality", the South had been saved from conversion into a wilderness.

No such dramatic change in attitude was as a rule evinced in the Scottish press, however. More indicative of the general development of opinion was, for instance, the pro-Northern Aberdeen Journal's calm and

1 Dundee Courier, 15 Nov., 1865.
2 For further evidence of the effect of the Jamaican revolt on Scottish thinking on America, see below, Chapter V, pp. 43, 50-55, and for an analysis of the impact of the insurrection on Britain as a whole in this context, see Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, Chapter VI, passim.
3 Ibid., 13 Nov., 1865. On 11 November, the Courier had deplored the "characteristic" Negro atrocities in Jamaica and called for "swift, sharp and decisive" punishment.
5 Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865.
analytical progression from criticism of the political divisions caused by Johnson's policy and of the unrepentant, unco-operative temper of the South,¹ to the recognition that although "the Radicals or Republicans" had some ground for complaint against the President for his "conversion to Conservative views", he was pursuing a basically worthy policy in which the "friends of humanity must rejoice".² By the end of the year, he was being eulogised as a truly great statesman who had used central power capably, had held strictly to the American constitution, and, above all, had shown that "when vengeance was in men's hearts, he sought by mercy to effect reconciliation".³ There remained a fairly typical lack of appreciation of the complexities to be ironed out and of the bitterness of the political differences which were beginning to surface in the United States by that stage: and it was possible, in reviewing the year in America, for the paper to conclude that Johnson's moderation had "all but accomplished the reconstruction of the Republic".⁴

A more sensitive judgement might have been expected from the Journal's local rival, the radical Aberdeen Free Press. The Free Press, adhering in the months immediately following the war to the principles of its staunch commitment to the Northern cause,⁵ early became a much more stringent critic of Presidential Reconstruction than the Journal. Obviously much influenced by John Elliot Cairnes' article on Negro suffrage which had appeared in the current issue of Macmillan's Magazine,⁶ the paper in mid-

---

¹ Ibid., 6 Sept., 1865.
² Ibid., 4 Oct., 1865.
³ Ibid., 20 Dec., 1865.
⁴ Ibid., 27 Dec., 1865.
⁵ For reference to the Free Press' very strong pro-Federal bias, see above, Chapter II, p. 99; Chapter III, p. 157.
⁶ See below, Chapter VI, pp. 131-132.
August launched a forceful denunciation of the sinister machinations of the Southerners to regain political power and to re-establish, in effect, the old social and economic framework in the South. The spirit of "the secessionists" was held to be embodied in John Mitchel's statement that since the Confederate government had gone, the Southerners were obliged to give full and instant obedience to the only existing one:

The complacency with which Mr. Mitchell (sic) and his class turn round and become submissive citizens, while it certainly divests them of every vestige of the vaunted Southern chivalry, shows the confidence with which they look to the reunion of the Democrats of the North and the late slave power for the re-establishment of the old regime in a modified form.1

The securities which the government had taken (the oath of allegiance, the exceptions to the amnesty) were insufficient, in the paper's view, to prevent the ex-master class in the South from exercising enough control over state legislation to "reduce the negro population to a state of vagrancy by refusing to give them (sic) work, or offering it 'on terms incompatible with human existence'". It had, after all, required continual intervention by the British government between planters and Negroes to prevent a reinposition of slavery in Jamaica after 1834.2

As the Free Press continued to believe that the South desired swift reunion with the North purely from motives of self-interest, that "the depth of their sincerity in their protestations of loyalty to the Constitution and the Federal Government is exactly the measure of the advantage they expect to reap from it", so the paper felt that Johnson's course was grievously misguided. He was proceeding "as if the Southern people had meant to act in good faith ... In fact the President is disposed to be only

too lenient and conciliatory towards the South, and his plan of reconstruc-
tion is consequently giving general satisfaction throughout the late slave
states". The result was that hostility to the Negro freedmen remained
strong, and that the planters were enabled to do a very great deal to make
the experiment of free labour be, or seem to be, a failure. A prime con-
cern, indeed, was that with the overwhelming forces of the Conservative
Republicans, the Democrats, and the President all against them, and with
Johnson's leniency to the South and his over-anxiety to effect a rapid
reconstruction, the outlook for the Negro would for some time to come be
a gloomy one.¹

Yet, even pronou nce ments so bold and emphatic as these were followed
up later in the year by the surprising conclusion that "reconstruction
has proceeded pretty rapidly under the conciliatory guidance of President
Johnson, who has proved a better man in every respect than was anticipated".²
Except, perhaps, that the Free Press had by that time come to recognize a
real need for a speeding up of the reunification process,³ and that it had
come to feel that Johnson, by shunning reprisals and extremism, had after
all projected the best image of American democracy to the world,⁴ there is

¹ Ibid., 29 Sept., 1865.
² Ibid., 29 Dec., 1865.
³ The concern over America's immediate future was somewhat unfortunately
expressed in verse by one of the paper's readers:

May Johnson find the power to fix,
His staggering States in sixty-six,
Turn guns and swords to hoes and picks,
And cotton raise in sixty-six;
But never urge, with cow-hide licks,
The quivering Black in sixty-six.

"New Year's Address to the 'Free Press" by Sliadh Fada, Aberdeen, in
ibid., 29 Dec., 1865.
⁴ Ibid., 19 Jan., 1866.
no positive indication of why this organ of radicalism in the North-East of Scotland should have shifted so significantly its outlooks towards the administration of a country which it had found "the chief centre of interest during the year".  

It seems likely, in fact, that the general move towards confidence in the President, especially on the part of Scottish journals which had censured him for his ultimate excess of leniency to the South, was not really determined by any specific acts of Johnson at that time nor by any overwhelming changes in the basic attitudes of the respective newspapers towards the United States. Rather, the pattern was part of a wider transatlantic trend in opinion. Professor E.L. McKitrick has assessed that by mid-June, there had been made possible in the Northern states a widespread temporary unity (including virtually every Republican paper in America) for a "trust Johnson" sentiment, due to the fact that the two post-war themes of peace, normality and leniency on one side, security, justice and guarantees of future loyalty on the other were by that time more or less in a state of balance. Although as the months went by there were certainly growing suspicions in the North that the South was being allowed to win the peace, it has been suggested that at least until the autumn of 1865, Andrew Johnson, rather than men of the Sumner stamp, remained the true tribune of the Northern people. It is therefore possible to see the swing by the Scottish press to support of Johnson as simply part of a broad process which ultimately caught up elements of many shades of opinion on both sides of the Atlantic. Delay in communications, delay

1 Ibid., 29 Dec., 1865.
3 Ibid., p. 22.
in isolating the important factors in the American news, and a difficulty in accurately gauging (far less in actually keeping up with) the changing temper of Northern politicians and people towards Johnson's policy helped by the end of 1865 to place the general run of Scottish press comment on Presidential Reconstruction on broadly the same lines as the majority Northern sentiment as reflected in the leading American newspapers several weeks before.

Hickitrick's analysis of the situation in America at that time helps to explain how organs like the Dundee Advertiser, and especially the Caledonian Mercury, so vigorously committed as it was to keeping the South in its place and to securing justice for the freedmen, could come out in praise of Johnson. Perhaps strangely, at no point in 1865 did John Leng's Dundee Advertiser find reason to take issue with the implementation of Johnson's conciliatory policy. While the old pro-Confederate Dundee Courier was warning against the probable unhappy consequences of an immediate Southern ascendancy under Johnson's aegis, its sister newspaper was praising the President for his tact and judgement, in resisting pressure for "extremist measures" such as confiscation.1 Finding Johnson "totally devoted" to the recovery of the country, and equal to the task, it optimistically claimed that "the progress of the year has marked the advance of America towards a state of settlement unparalleled in the history of Peace".2

This statement did not imply, however, that the Advertiser was going to be willing to see the cause of justice and equality for the freedmen sacrificed for the sake of an effective, smooth reunion between North and South. The future position of the Negro in the United States was, indeed,

1 Dundee Advertiser, 26 Sept., 1865.
2 Ibid., 26 Dec., 1865.
one of the paper's principal concerns during the Reconstruction era, and at that stage, the editorial was careful to stress that the "Negro difficulty" was still far from being fully settled. Where the paper's analysis in late 1865 proved to be myopic was in seeing Johnson's policy to date as constituting the best possible hopes for steady progress towards full Negro equality. It would appear that to some extent a sincere admiration for the United States could be something of a disadvantage to those seeking accurately to comment on the early phases of Reconstruction. Thus, in the case of the Dundee Advertiser, as in the case of the like-minded Aberdeen Free Press, sympathetic interest in the plight of the Negroes was matched by a strong desire to see democratic America continue to show an example to the world by its post-war orderliness and unprecedented leniency to the foe, and both journals at some stage failed to appreciate that in the context of Presidential Reconstruction, the second goal unfortunately tended to be incompatible with, or at least to effectively preclude, the first.

Much the same attitudes, leading to much the same misconceptions were held by the Caledonian Mercury. Reporting in mid-August that the President's health was said to be breaking under the cares of office, it commented, "The friends of freedom will unite in wishing that such a result may be averted."

Clearly what attracted the paper to Johnson was its faith in his reputed love of the underdog. At one point, over two columns were devoted to extracts from a biography which portrayed him as a dignified, firm man lacking in vindictiveness, who loved the masses and had a radical antipathy to aristocracy. And it was the policy of the Mercury only to use quotes which agreed with its own viewpoint. By late September confidence in the President was being even more directly expressed. Great

1 Caledonian Mercury, 18 Aug., 1865.
2 Ibid., 19 Sept., 1865.
satisfaction was taken in the fact that he had clarified the origins of the war and the relative blame which should be apportioned to both sides in a way that accorded with the paper's own firmly held convictions. In a very real sense it felt its minority wartime stand had now been vindicated by Johnson's assertion that the South had been the aggressor in a war fought solely for the perpetuation of slavery. Equally acceptable were Johnson's "noble" sentiments to the effect that each section of the United States was dependent on the other and that the Union could not be broken except by God: "They reflect alike honour on the ruler who utters them and on the people who are gladdened by the sound. They are the free gushings of an honest heart and an earnest mind". ¹ Given the Caledonian Mercury's strong belief in the viability of a permanent total reunion of North and South, such sounds from the White House were naturally welcome.²

By the end of 1865, confidence in Johnson's policy remained firm. If the Mercury was aware of the misgivings of its radical counterparts in America, it apparently did not share them. A leader in late November praised the President for having under stress proved sincere to the abolition cause and for having taken up from the first Lincoln's policy that absolute abolition must be the condition on which rebels be restored to the rights of citizenship. No matter how conciliatory he had been, he had not receded from exacting abolition conditions on the Southern states.³ It could be argued, of course, that the Caledonian Mercury was perfectly justified in its attitude to Johnson on that count: he had made rein-

¹ Ibid., 27 Sept., 1865.
² It is perhaps worth noting that the Scotsman, which would for long constantly repeat its conviction that the two sections were inherently antagonistic and that the South was being forced into an unnatural union, chose to ignore this aspect of Johnson's beliefs.
³ Caledonian Mercury, 22 Nov., 1865.
statement of the Southern states conditional on their acceptance of the Thirteenth Amendment. But this proved to be not merely the paper's last, rather late, laudation of the President. Far from launching into an attack on him for failing to keep the South on a tight enough leash, praise was strengthened in comments on his December message to Congress. His Reconstruction policy was applauded as one which "buries past errors in oblivion and provides security for the future". There was no doubt but that he had proved himself equal to the responsibilities of the Presidency:

Down to this time he has belied the slanders and predictions of his opponents and justified the highest expectations of his friends ... If providence spare him he will be able, ere his term of office expire, to give assurance to the world that the worst difficulties of his own Government are over.2

In view of the situation existing in the South by that time - the implementation of the Black Codes, the elevation to power of prominent ex-Confederates, the reorganization of state militias to include rebels, and so forth - it might seem incredible that the Caledonian Mercury could continue to support so enthusiastically the man whose chosen policy had largely contributed to bringing such a state of affairs about. Yet the paper's attitude must be kept in perspective. Even in America, despite the growing rumblings of discontent, there was still a general reluctance on the part of the Republican Congressional majority to break openly with Johnson at this time. While Congress had in effect repudiated Johnson's message by refusing to admit Southern Congressmen and by creating the Joint Committee of Fifteen to formulate a Reconstruction policy, as late as January 1866 the Committee's chairman, William Pitt Fessenden, was publicly stating that no breach existed between the President and Congress. Naturally, the reluctance to acknowledge

1 The necessity for Presidential insistence on acceptance of the Amendment is evidenced by the defiant attitude adopted by several Southern states in their new constitutions where they emphasized that slavery had been abolished by the Federal powers and by no act of their own. See Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia, 1865, pp. 362-363, 398, 759.
2 Caledonian Mercury, 16 Dec., 1865.
3 Ibid., 18 Dec., 1865.
a fundamental schism of that nature was partly motivated by political considerations - the realization of the effect such a split could have on the Republican party. But in this connection, it is significant that by the end of 1865 not even all abolitionists had completely given Johnson up. If Wendell Phillips openly attacked him and did everything in his power to facilitate an alienation between him and the radicals, there were others like Stearns and McKim who still believed he would prove acceptable; and the bulk of the abolitionists seem to have been cautiously hopeful that he would be persuaded to abandon his policy under Congressional pressure and public opinion. 1 At the same time, however, tentative trust based on hope for change to a better policy was something quite different from the confidence in Johnson's course which gave rise to the Caledonian Mercury's lavish praise. Concentrating on the fine image of magnanimity and strong, positive government which the United States was projecting to the world, and unable to appreciate the adverse practical effects which Presidential Reconstruction was by then having on the free status of the Negro, the Caledonian Mercury in fact understood less well than it believed what was involved in being fully committed to securing justice beyond abolition for the freedmen.

II Transatlantic radicalism on trial: reactions to the Freedmen's Bureau Bill and the Civil Rights Bill

Thus, at the commencement of 1866, with only minor regional exceptions the Scottish newspaper press of all political shades had reached a general consensus on the desirability of Johnson's policy for reuniting and reorganizing North and South. Despite the old, bitter denunciations of the President's initial moves towards a ruthless Southern policy, and the more

recent vigorous attacks on his fraternization with the Fenians, the Scotsman led the way in taking stock of his works in 1865 and finding then on balance good. First impressions of him in Europe had been changed, it was argued, by his switching to a policy largely consistent with Lincoln's. And so for the first time there appeared the hint of the idea that it might prove to be the American people, not the Executive, who were going to become the real bar to peace and prosperity. It was felt that Johnson was "healing the country's wounds", and that all would be right again if the Americans would only settle down and cease such troublesome activities as demanding compensation from Britain. With a vagueness reminiscent of that which normally characterized American conspiracy theories, the Scotsman maintained the "hostile parties" in the United States were "reviling" Johnson's essentially Lincolnian policy. At the back of all this, of course, was the apprehension at the creeping increase in power of the Radicals in Congress. Certainly, similar fears had produced similar conclusions in the conservative camp in America at that period.

From the other end of Scotland, pessimism over the prospects for the coming year in America was freely voiced in Carruthers' influential Inverness Courier. Like the Scotsman, it believed that extremists were gathering strength to mount a serious challenge to Johnson, and it foresaw a fight between President and Congress which would badly retard the astounding

1 Scotsman, 1 Jan., 1866.

2 McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 287, has shown how Johnson's conviction that radical intrigues existed in Congress, and that the Joint Committee on Reconstruction was a kind of radical cabal, was instrumental in bringing about his veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill. Gideon Welles, Secretary of War and an influential adviser to the President, also held a strong belief in the existence of a radical conspiracy - see W.R. Brock, An American Crisis: Congress and Reconstruction 1865-1867 (New York, 1963), p. 107.
"rapidity and success" of Presidential Reconstruction. And for observers in Scotland, the first tangible evidence that this war had begun in earnest came with the reports of Johnson's veto, on 19 February, 1866, of the bill extending the life and widening the scope of the Freedmen's Bureau in the Southern states. As was to be expected, the Inverness Courier itself upheld the veto on the grounds that the object of the bill was "to erect in each of what were recently the slave states a sort of imperium in imperio for the purpose of protecting the blacks". 

Rather surprisingly, the country's leading daily newspaper offered no comment whatsoever on the actual momentous vetoing of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, aside from faithfully printing Johnson's stated reasons for his action. But before news of the veto had reached Britain, the Scotsman had made quite clear its total opposition to the Bill on the twin grounds that it proposed providing, at huge annual expense, land and a multitude of social services for the Negro without exacting any guarantee of labour, and that it proposed depriving Southern whites of an effective voice in state government:

\[\text{[\text{\ldots}]}\]

It was, indeed, hardly necessary for the paper to record its natural endorsement of the Executive veto.

1 Inverness Courier, 4 Jan., 1866. Both the Daily Review, 2 Jan., 1866, and the Glasgow Sentinel, 6 Jan., 1866, which felt that "with the finish of the American strife in the interests of Union and free labour we enter upon 1866 full of hope and animation", were, however, more optimistic.

2 Inverness Courier, 8 March, 1866.

3 Scotsman, 5 March, 1866.

4 Ibid., 28 Feb., 1866.
So far as the deeply Conservative *Edinburgh Courant* was concerned, however, the veto had the effect of producing a new, more assured acknowledgement of the correctness of the President's policy. Hitherto, the *Courant* had shown little enthusiasm for Johnson, and had even come to harbour suspicions about his attitude towards Britain. As recently as late February, 1866, it had warned that Britain must not, in looking at him, be "lulled ... into a feeling of too absolute security. The sense and courage which, since his elevation, President Johnson has unexpectedly displayed in his dealings with the South ought not to blind us to the danger which exists, whether he fails or succeeds in his attempts to re-construct the Union".2

Given the very positive Presidential boost for American Conservatism which the veto represented, however, the *Courant* could not restrain its delight over the fact that "the ex-tailor from Tennessee has upset ... [the Radicals'] cherished policy of converting the black man into the sovereign of the white".3 Like the *Scotsman*, the *Courant* saw the Bill itself in terms of a Negrophilist plot, an "ingenious device" of Northern fanatics for continuing to wreak vengeance on the South. The paper's grossly misleading and partisan interpretation of the spirit of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill was in fact but part of a general editorial policy which invested all Radical propositions (on both sides of the Atlantic) with insidious,

---


2 Ibid., 28 Feb., 1866. See also ibid., 16 Dec., 1865. It has been noted above (Chapter III, pp.186-188) that the *Courant* was particularly concerned for the possible repercussions on Britain of a reunited, belligerent United States.

3 Ibid., 8 March, 1866. There still remained, however, very great suspicions of the increasing power of post-war America.
unpalatable undertones. In sum, the various "monstrous provisions" of the Bill added up to the fact that

the black man was to be made the master of the white, with rights, privileges, and authority over his former master never claimed or known to the planter in the palmiest days of slavery ... He might vainly seek a parallel in the proceedings of the French National Convention at the time of the Reign of Terror.

Something of the same extreme attitude, calculated also to highlight the vindictiveness of the Radical Republicans, was promulgated by Charles Mackay. The measure he judged to be one designed to keep the South under a military despotism and which, if carried, would virtually have destroyed the Union, and abolished the Constitution of the United States.

The opportunity was taken to show up leading Radicals in the worst possible light. Thaddeus Stevens in particular had, it was implied, allowed personal factors to influence and deeply embitter his attitude to the South, and Mackay seized with relish on Stevens' open statement that Charles I had lost his head for smaller offences than Johnson had perpetrated by his veto. Sumner, Wendell Phillips, Sella Martin and Frederick Douglass were castigated for having followed Stevens' lead in adopting such views.

1 The constant association by the Edinburgh Courant of American radicalism with its British opposite number is again brought to light at this time in the paper's derision of Thaddeus Stevens as "a Yankee John Bright ... who outdoes even his British prototype in power of insolent vituperation" - Ibid., 8 March, 1866.

2 Ibid., 6 March, 1866.

3 Charles Mackay, "President Johnson and the Reconstruction of the Union" in Fortnightly Review, Vol. 4, April, 1866, p. 485.

4 Ibid., p. 485. In a veiled allusion to the controversial question of Stevens' Negro housekeeper, Mackay viciously remarked that Stevens was "connected by the tenderest relations with the African race"; and he accused Stevens of being peculiarly hostile to the South because of the burning of his iron works in Pennsylvania by the Confederates under Lee.

5 Ibid., p. 485.
Depending on who voiced it, and the cause which it was designed to serve, inflammatory public speech in America at that time was, however, at least partially defensible in Mackay's reasoning. The President's impolitic Washington's birthday speech, delivered three days after the veto and naming as traitors and would-be assassins several of Johnson's leading Radical opponents, was not only readily excused but actively approved by Mackay. The President had been "carried away by the excitement of the occasion", and if the adverse judgements in Britain and America against the speech might to some extent be just, great allowances should be made, since there was a very real chance that Johnson might be assassinated. But apart from that, "Mr. Johnson's speech was as excellent in its way as his veto, and has immensely strengthened his position with the American people".\(^1\)

The Edinburgh Courant, revolted, perhaps, by a performance which probably reminded it of Johnson's "drunken" utterances at his Vice-Presidential inauguration, was comparatively reticent on the speech, although there was a vague hint that the "extraordinary address" was not really out of keeping with the general tone of polemic in the United States during the current "grave political crisis" in its history.\(^2\) It was left to the Scotsman to echo Mackay's feelings on this issue. Probably influenced by the American Democratic press which hailed the speech,\(^3\) it swung from initially questioning Johnson's sanity and/or sobriety\(^4\) to recognizing some peculiar merit in the speech: its style had admirably fitted the occasion, and it had shown Johnson to be a man of resolute will and sincere convictions who had accepted the challenge of his enemies in Congress.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 485-487.
\(^2\) Ibid., 8 March, 1866.
\(^4\) Scotsman, 8 March, 1866.
\(^5\) Ibid., 12 March, 1866.
Thus far had the mounting distrust of Radical plans led the Scotsman to take refuge behind the man who alone could, and more importantly, would battle against them. Personality defects, the original sense of disgust at his backwoods brand of politics, were not only pushed aside but gave way to a totally new emphasis on the integrity and righteous zeal of Johnson the man. Nowhere was this more clearly illustrated than in the comparison made between Johnson and Cromwell. In both individuals, the paper argued, there was inherent the same "feeling of conscious power". Nor was the position of Johnson unlike that of Cromwell who had attempted to restore to the people a Constitution similar to the one they had had before the English Civil War and which had recognized the common rights of Cavaliers and Puritans. As Cromwell had encountered the furious opposition of fanatics who unrelentingly hated the royalists, so Johnson had found difficulty in reconstructing the Union due to Congressmen who cherished the revengeful and intolerant spirit of the old Puritans from whom they claimed descent, and who wanted to keep the Southerners in subjection. In part, the view of Cromwell put forward here was almost certainly derived from Carlyle, who was the first modern writer to see the Protector as a subject for unstinted admiration rather than abuse. Although he had made no attempt -

---

1 Ibid. As has been observed (Chapter III, pp.193-194), Mackay in Blackwood's Magazine, July, 1866, also advanced the idea that the Puritan tradition made for intolerance and hatred.


... Mackay somewhat later observed that the radicals were governing America "as the long Parliament governed England, apparently without fear that any Cromwell will arrive to deprive it of its usurped authority". See Blackwood's Magazine, Nov., 1866, Vol. 100, p. 679.

The traditional attitude to Cromwell could also be used in reference to the American situation during Reconstruction, however. Thus on 2 Jan., 1866, the Aberdeen Journal thankfully concluded that Johnson's meagre support both with the army and the people precluded "the apprehension ... that he would play the part of Cromwell, and dissolve the Congress at the point of the bayonet". And the Glasgow Herald felt that it was basically unfair and inaccurate to compare Johnson to "a despot like Cromwell" - Glasgow Herald, 5 Aug., 1869.
as did the Scotsman – to divorce Cromwell from the Puritans, Carlyle had seen him as struggling in vain to find a Parliament to support him in governing constitutionally, and as the hero battling against the subversive ideals of the Levellers.¹

The analogy drawn between Cromwell and Johnson serves to give some insight into the nature of the largely inarticulate fears of the moderately liberal middle class Scottish commentators regarding the ascendancy of the Radical element in Congress at that time. Essentially, what they feared was social revolution, only Victorian contemporaries did not consciously think in these terms, more especially with regard to the already "democratic" society existing in the United States. So the word "Radical" was adopted as a sort of blanket term covering every imaginable social upheaval, its interpretation depending on how imaginative, credulous, or plainly ignorant the user was. But generally, it signified some degree of social change, and a stigma of vindictiveness was attributed to those agitating for such change. That the Scotsman followed that trend of reasoning is suggested by a comparison which it made on 12 March, 1867, of the Senate and House of Representatives with the French National Assembly during the Revolution.²

Basically the same fear of a potential American descent into the uncharted evils of unbridled radicalism and socialism was reflected in the Glasgow Herald's attitude to the veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill. The paper had "no hesitation" in pronouncing Johnson's action fully warranted, deciding that justice, statesmanship and (most importantly) common sense were on his side. The kernel of the Herald's argument was that "negro affairs" were not only engaging a disproportionate amount of Congressional debating time, but also threatening to be settled through legislation which would unduly favour the coloured race.

² Scotsman, 12 March, 1867.
From being held as a chattel, and being ranked as property along with cattle and horses, he has suddenly emerged on the legislative horizon as a "frendraen", claiming all the rights and privileges of American citizens, and apparently something more. 1

The Freedmen's Bureau Bill must have seemed doubly dangerous as a starting point for a full blown social upheaval since it was seen to constitute not only blatant discrimination in favour of the freedmen but also to embody proposals for a degree of governmental interference in the distribution of land and the establishment of social services unprecedented even in the United States:

No schools have heretofore been founded by Congress for the children of poor white people - not even for the orphans of the men who have fallen in defence of the Union. And ... the Legislature has never considered itself authorised to expend public money in the purchase or renting of farms for the poor and hard-toiling white race, who have surely just as good claims upon the nation's generosity as the negroes can have. 2

Accordingly, there was a tendency in the Herald, as in its Edinburgh counterpart, the Scotsman, to feel that the "violent language" of Johnson's "remarkable" speech on 22 February, 1866 was simply in keeping with the violent nature of the political struggle then raging in the United States. 3

The North British Daily Mail reflected the basic convictions of all detractors of the measure at the Scottish press when it lodged its own opposition to the Freedmen's Bureau Bill on the specific grounds that through the proposed act, the Radical Republicans were consciously aiming to change the Freedmen's Bureau from a philanthropic into an important political establishment. It was reassuring that there was "a man at the head of affairs in the States so patriotic as to prefer the interests of the whole country to the wishes of any section". 4

1 Glasgow Herald, 7 March, 1866.
2 Ibid., Johnson himself had, of course, argued along these lines in giving his reasons for vetoing the Bill.
3 See Ibid., 8, 22 March, 1866.
4 North British Daily Mail, 9 March, 1866.
Maintaining that "the voice of Congress is the voice of disunion", the Dundee Courier also did its best to stress the mercenary considerations behind the Republican drive to extend the life of the Bureau. But the paper, acknowledging its awareness of the arguments that the South must be kept in check in the interests of the freedmen, was simultaneously concerned to point out that the North could not continue indefinitely to supervise labour contracts in the South. Criticizing "one-sided philanthropists" in America and in Britain who appeared to think in these terms, the Courier argued that such supervision not only implied a dis-spiriting lack of confidence in the South, but also postponed the Negroes' ultimate, inevitable acceptance of the fact that they must be dependent on their own energies.

Very different was the attitude of the Dundee Advertiser towards the proposed legislation and the Executive veto. On that vexed issue, it is indeed possible to distinguish a complete reversal in the relative opinions on Presidential Reconstruction from those which had been voiced in the two journals in the summer-early autumn of 1865. The hardening of the Courier's views in favour of Johnson has already been noted. But it was only with the final realization by the Advertiser that a split of epic proportions was developing between Congress and President, and that the President's policy would not, after all, ensure both a fair deal for the Negro in the United States and a fair face for American democracy abroad, that the paper swung into active, unambiguous criticism of Johnson. The veto of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill seems to have spurred it to its first real appreciation of the seriousness of the impending battle between Executive and Legislature, and to have precipitated a decisive disillusionment with Johnsonian Reconstruction.

1 Dundee Courier, 14 March, 1866.
2 See above, p. 349.
3 The first reference to "the growing mutual distrust" of President and Congress over Reconstruction appeared in the Dundee Advertiser on 9 March, 1866.
Almost alone in the Scottish newspaper press at that time, the
Advertiser strove to keep up with Radical policy across the Atlantic. John-
son's veto was roundly censured as "a conclusive proof that he puts a far
higher value on his pet theory of reconstruction than on the protection
and elevation of the negro to the status of citizenship". His Washington's
birthday speech was branded "virulent and discreditable"; and, fearing that
the performance would give good scope for British critics to descry America,
the disenchanted with the President was complete:

Not content with attacking the policy of the Republicans, he
selected Stevens, Sumner, and Philip (sic) - men whose shoe
latchets he is unworthy to unloose, men who had achieved a world-
wide fame for their zeal in the cause of freedom and on behalf of
the oppressed while yet Andrew Johnson, unknown to fame, was seated
cross-legged with his lap-board - for a special attack. The
nature of the Dundee Advertiser's attack on Johnson, and the
tremendously strong feeling with which it was made, is the more significant
in that it is a unique statement of Radical Scottish commitment to the
emerging Congressional policy of Reconstruction on an issue of vital imp-
 ortance to the principle of securing full equality for the Negro through
central legislation. The paper's attitude is best put in perspective by
considering the reaction to the veto of the avowedly radical Caledonian
Mercury, a journal which, it will be recalled, had in common with the
Advertiser earlier looked with confidence on the President's conciliatory
policy. Certainly, initial reaction to the Civil Rights Bill introduced by
Lyman Trumbull alongside the Freedmen's Bureau Bill on 11 January seemed
to be in keeping with the professed radicalism of the Mercury. There was
unstinted praise for "a measure so minute and at the same time so compre-

1 Ibid., 6 March, 1866.
2 Ibid., 9 March, 1866.
3 See above, pp. 355-357.
hensive", and the point was made that the British legislature might take a lesson from it in constructing a Bill for popular freedom. Yet even then, all credit for the extension of freedmen's privileges was not seen as devolving on Congress alone. Referring in glowing terms to the Joint Committee's proposed Fourteenth Amendment, credence was given to the rumour that Johnson himself had suggested it, and its easy adoption by the Southern states was foreseen as evident.

This increasing misreading of Johnson's intentions contributed in part to the support which the Mercury duly gave to his veto on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill. But to justify its position on that issue, the paper was forced to make some contortions of thought with regard to Reconstruction politics which (although it was at pains to stress that this was not so) betray the start of an alienation of sympathy for American radicals. Dismissing as "over-hasty" and "sensationalist" British journalists who believed Johnson had deserted the Negroes and gone over to the Democrats and Copperheads, it maintained that "there could not be a more serious mistake than to assume, simply because the Tribune asserts it, that there is any change in the conduct or policy of President Johnson either as respects his party or opponents, or the coloured people." The editorial's point that it was not possible to enter into the fears and hopes of American partisans was well made. The estimation of the Tribune's fears as unwarranted indicate how the detachment of the Scottish press was such that it led to distortion in its efforts to water down the "sensationalism" as it saw it of American reports.

1 Scottish association of the campaign for Negro rights with the campaign for rights for the British working man is discussed below, Chapter VI, pp. 74-99.
2 Caledonian Mercury, 6 Feb., 1866.
3 Ibid., 7 March, 1866.
4 Ibid.
The Radicals were seen by the Mercury as having been divided into two sections since the end of the war. While both wanted to secure perfect freedom and equality for the ex-slave, their methods for accomplishing that end differed, since one element insisted that no terms should be come to with the Southern states till the freedmen had been guaranteed equal political and civil rights and the other accepted Southern submission as already complete and desired to end all extraordinary measures against ex-rebels. Johnson had merely decided to favour the latter - the larger faction in the Republican party. Actually, it was the conservative forces in the United States which were hopelessly fragmented at that time. The true Radicals of 1866 were united on one thing (if on nothing else) - the determination to secure guarantees of rights to the Negro before the South was reinstated in Congress. The Mercury's conviction of a split in the Radical ranks can only have had its basis in a mistaken but strong tendency to class all Republicans as Radicals. Ironically, this was a Democratic practice.

Having itself gone on to applaud the Washington's birthday speech as characterized by "the set, resolute purpose of a man who knows and is prepared to do his duty", the Caledonian Mercury was forced to acknowledge that Johnson's praises were "being sung in all the organs of class privileges" - those sympathizing with practically nothing in America. With a tradition of attacking the Conservative and Whig press of Britain over its attitude to the United States, it was imperative that the Mercury make a clear distinction between this endorsement of the President, and its own. Thus, it carefully pointed out that "the organs of privilege" in Britain

1 Ibid.
2 Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, passim.
were supporting Johnson in the utterly erroneous belief that his triumph would mean a triumph for the reactionary Democratic party in the States. While the Times and papers like it had supported the veto because they felt it had dealt a blow to the popular and anti-slavery party in America, and by extension, to "the Radical party everywhere throughout the world", the Mercury had supported it as "the assertion, in opposition to the mistaken views of the party that has already accomplished much for freedom and constitutionalism, of the true principles on which the great Republic is founded". Far from dealing popular principles a blow, the veto had given them their highest triumph, for the Freedmen's Bureau Bill had been "excellent in its intentions but vicious in its principle".  

The Mercury's standpoint quite simply revealed that the paper could not accept that the Radical end might justify the Radical means. It was largely a question of conflicting sympathies. Faced with either approving the Freedmen's Bureau Bill as a measure which could secure guarantees of justice and safety for the Negro, or rejecting it as an act which, in continuing Southern subjugation, was contrary to the spirit of the Union,² the paper chose to do the latter. Fears that the extra-constitutionality, as it believed, of the Bill would endanger the principles and administration of the Republic resulted in support of the veto.³ Not that the Mercury

---

1 Ibid., 10 March, 1866.

2 Ibid., 7 March, 1866. There are instances of other liberal, pro-North British newspapers advancing the conviction that it was unjust and dangerous to ignore the rights of the Southern states - for example, the Freeman's Journal, the Manchester Examiner and Times. See Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, pp. 191-192.

3 These were difficult decisions for pro-Federal observers across the Atlantic. It should be noted that Cairnes, the great champion of Negro rights, was similarly extremely uneasy about the proposed Freedmen's Bureau Bill, and acknowledged that "some of the President's reasoning against the Bill seems to me to be weighty, and suggests the impression that the Bill was drawn in somewhat hot haste and without sufficient care to limit the extra constitutional powers which it conferred" - J.E. Cairnes to G. Walker, 6 March, 1866, quoted in Adelaide Weinberg, John Elliot Cairnes and the American Civil War (London, 1967), pp. 115-116.
was blind to the good intentions of those who had framed the Bill:

All good men sympathise with their object, and we can understand and excuse their irritation at the action of the President. But not the less on this account are we bound to acknowledge that Mr. Johnson was right in vetoing their measure.1

Basically, the attitude hinged on the fact that for the paper the most important consideration was that the veto had been an emphatic assertion that the American Constitution which it admired so much was still able to meet and solve problems in the post-Civil War era. Linked with this was a genuine desire to endorse the course which seemed to have the best chance of decisively winning and thereby lessening friction between Congress and President. And after all, although the Mercury and several other similarly slanted journals had evolved their own peculiar reasons for supporting the veto, we must not lose sight of the fact that not all the Republican press in America condemned entirely the President's move. Some elements were prepared to see in it at least a balance of valid and invalid argument.2 Nor was the breach with Congress, though now open as a result of the Washington's birthday speech, yet final. Hopes of closing it were still considerable, and there were serious efforts at reconciliation.3 If the Mercury's reading of the American situation by this stage sadly reflects how damaging were the misunderstandings nurtured by even the most pro-American commentators in Britain, at least the paper could still point to essentially similar attitudes among Republican elements in politics and press in America as proof of its argument that optimism in Johnson as President did not automatically represent a move to support of conservative forces in the United States.

1 Caledonian Mercury, 10 March, 1866.
3 Ibid., p. 194; McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 295-302.
Through April, however, the Caledonian Mercury came increasingly to prefer Johnson's policy to "the sterner and less constitutional proposals of the ultra-Radical[s]". While both sides were honest, and meant well, "the difference ... is that [Johnson's policy] ... has forgiveness, forbearance, and mercy mixed with it, while that of [the opposition] has neither the one nor the other".1 But behind this, the paper's vindication of Presidential Reconstruction illustrated how great had become the gulf between its beliefs and the attitudes of the Radicals in America. Thus it felt that by that stage, not only emancipation but full equality - of life, liberty and property - had been ensured for the Negro, and that state rights should therefore no longer be arbitrarily interfered with or set aside.2

In view of its general outlook, the nature of the Mercury's reaction to the struggle over the Civil Rights Bill, the next major point of contention between President and Congress, was fairly predictable. The paper was of the opinion that the North, dominant in Congress, had inaugurated a new crisis by passing the Bill over Johnson's veto. Since both Congress and President had been within their rights in acting as they had done, one side must eventually give way, but Johnson, it felt, would risk "whatever struggle may be necessary to vindicate his position" and "fight the battle,

---

1 Caledonian Mercury, 13 April, 1866. In attempting to comprehend the Mercury's attitude in this respect, there should certainly be borne in mind the continuing influence of the exceedingly powerful impact which Johnson's predecessor had made on the popular imagination in Britain. By the time of his death, Lincoln had become exceptionally strongly identified in the public mind with the Presidency of the United States; and in a philo-American journal such as the Mercury, the heightened esteem and admiration for the President and his policies which Lincoln had inspired were sentiments automatically transferred to Johnson as the next incumbent of that office. Furthermore, as well as inheriting the faith and goodwill accorded to Lincoln in his role as Chief Executive, Johnson, as a man whom Lincoln himself had chosen, would undoubtedly have attracted a certain initial measure of sympathy and of confidence in his personal abilities.

2 Caledonian Mercury, 13 April, 1866.
as did our own Cromwell, in not very dissimilar circumstances, against all odds. The familiar analogy shows how closely the Herald was by that time approximating to the position of the Scotman with regard to Johnson and Reconstruction, despite its continued spirited denunciation of that paper's attitude to the United States. It echoed the Scotman too in criticizing the American Radicals' assumption that the South was a conquered territory and in a condition to be so dealt with. That assumption, indeed, was seen as forming the basis for the special offensiveness of the Civil Rights measure.

Most of Johnson's arguments justifying his veto of the Bill were adopted - that it was wrong for a new Federal law to be introduced when eleven states were still unrepresented in Congress, that the application of the Bill with its probable overriding of state authority could lead to racial war in the South, and that the Act could give Federal citizenship only, it still being the right of the individual states to confer citizenship on their own population. But the most significant factor marking a definite swing away from the paper's old ultra-liberal stand was its basic agreement with the President's premise that the Civil Rights Bill discriminated in favour of blacks against whites. Acknowledging that the act was "gratifying" insofar as it indicated the great change which had come over the American people with regard to the Negro, it continued:

[At the same time, it is a serious question whether the privilege thus sought to be conferred on the coloured people may not be too sudden, and it is a still more serious one whether the Federal Government, in its new zeal to protect and cherish the negro, may not be setting aside State rights quite as valuable as those they fought ... to maintain. The negro cannot complain if he is placed on a footing similar to his white brother; and this footing he can have without the interference of this Civil Rights Bill.]

1 Ibid., 21 April, 1866.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
Failure to condemn the President's veto on this occasion put the Mercury outside the fold of the United States Republican press as its endorsement of the Freedmen's Bureau Bill veto had never done. With Johnson's renewed refusal to make any substantial concessions to Congressional policy, all American journals which were not frankly Democratic had either deserted him outright or made it clear that there must eventually be some sort of guarantee of freedmen's rights at national level. In Congress itself even the most conservative Republicans saw the Civil Rights Bill as indispensable to government unity and every cabinet member except Welles had hoped the President would sign. It has been pointed out that the only clear, unequivocal American approval for the President at that time came from the Democratic party.

The phenomenon of a paper which had consistently supported the North through the war and had constantly insisted on the need for measures to safeguard the Negroes' rights ending up in mid-1866 so close to the position of the American Democrats can perhaps only be explained in terms of fundamental shortcomings in the Mercury's understanding of Reconstruction America and in its radical ideology. Both the insistence that American politicians must work within the strict line of the pre-war Constitution or be dismissed as dangerous to American democracy (even while their high aims might be recognized), and an attitude to the Negro which dismissed as unnecessary the Civil Rights Bill betrays a lack of appreciation of the uniqueness of the post-war situation. There was a tacit acceptance of the idea that things could and should automatically revert to the normal pre-war situation in relation to state rights, an understandable enough sentiment on the part of a journal which had an extremely strong tradition of opposition to

over-centralization as it applied to Scotland's position within the British Isles. Also conducive to suspicions of Radical attempts at increased Federal legislation was the adoption of Smilesian restrictions on how far the American government should go to help the freedmen. Both considerations were largely influenced by the belief that most Southerners were sincerely repentant and willing to co-operate fully with the North. This belief in turn blinded the paper to appreciation of the fact that without some curb on state rights in relation to the granting of the suffrage, the restored South would win increased representation in Congress on the basis of emancipated but still unenfranchised Negroes.

Yet, while these attitudes may largely have arisen from lack of deep enough understanding, perhaps the most important basis for the paper's insistence that Americans preserve a rigid adherence to the Constitution (and thus the real cause of its sacrificing the liberal attitude earlier held towards the freedmen) remained the fear that chipping at the Constitution would eventually result in a disastrous crumbling of the whole democratic system in the United States. It is just feasible also that there was a conservatism at work—loudly and frequently trumpeted by the Scotsman and other Whig and Tory elements of the press in Scotland, unrecognized but nevertheless active as a driving force behind the Mercury's thinking—which simply deplored as grossly irregular the current attempts of American Radicals to tamper with the principles of their State. The city's legal tradition may have had some bearing on the possible formulation of such a view: Edinburgh as we have seen, was still lawyer-dominated at that period, and the Caledonian Mercury itself may have retained substantial connections with the legal profession. More importantly, by mid-1866

---

1 Earlier, the Edinburgh legal profession had had a controlling interest in the paper. See Grant, The Newspaper Press, Vol. 3, p. 422.
Disillusionment and irritation at the whole Reconstruction process may already have been creeping in. In late April, the paper commented that the British people could have little interest in the Presidential/Congressional fight, the issues being nothing like as important as those of the war.1 And perhaps after all there was not so much of a swing to a new, less liberal attitude as simply the bringing forth, under pressure of constitutional, state rights and "no favouritism" considerations, the always present, underlying limitations in the Caledonian Mercury's attitude to securing justice and equality for the Negro.

For the duration of the Civil War, having once adopted the reasoning that the South was fighting simply to perpetuate slavery, there was positively no wavering in the Mercury's columns from advocating the clear-cut principle of emancipation. The paper's editor and (since 1862) proprietor, James Robie, was able proudly to claim that the testimonial for £700, presented to him by five hundred gentlemen in October, 1865, had been given very largely in appreciation of

the perfect accuracy of my views and the complete verification of my predictions as to the issue of the great war in America in favour of Constitutional rights and human freedom. Many Americans in Edinburgh, and throughout Scotland, and many gentlemen not Americans, who had little or no sympathy with me on general political grounds, entered into and contributed handsomely to the Fund, to mark... their admiration of the pluck I had displayed in so unequal a fight.2

But after the end of the war, when the key issues themselves seemed to be hedged around with so many extraneous considerations, and when a full understanding of the likely repercussions of specific legislation on "the Negro question" came increasingly to depend on a first-hand knowledge of the temper of political factions and liaisons at Washington, it became

1 Caledonian Mercury, 21 April, 1866.
difficult for the Mercury to appreciate and adhere to the truly "radical" line necessary to guarantee freedom for the Negroes.

It has been pointed out that no British newspaper - or indeed, individual - however fully committed to the Union cause in wartime, ever totally approved all aspects of the Republican policy. The crux of the matter was that "radicalism" in the United States meant something completely different from, and potentially much more extreme than, the British brand. The American "radical" politician was a totally alien breed in Britain. Between the "radicalism" of Duncan McLaren, the idol of the Mercury until he quarreled with its editor, and the "radicalism" of Thaddeus Stevens, which could embrace projects such as land confiscation, there was no real comparison, for all that McLaren had championed the Northern cause and, later, the freedmen. The Edinburgh Courant, despite its scornful approach, nevertheless made a valid enough point in relation to the respective politics of Britain and America when, commenting on Stevens' death, it noted:

We scarcely conceive that a parallel to him can be found in British politics, unless we can imagine Cobbett and Bright rolled into one fierce, uncompromising, independent politician and critic of other politicians.

But perhaps most interesting of all is the distinction made between British and American radicalism by the Glasgow Sentinel, a journal which in its attitude to the struggle between Congress and President substantially paralleled the views of the Caledonian Mercury. The word "radical", it suggested, implied something different in the two countries:

1 Bolt, British attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 45.
2 McLaren invested heavily in the Caledonian Mercury in 1862 to keep it viable, but although he also influenced others to invest, his total support was less than Noble had been led to expect. The two men finally quarreled bitterly over McLaren's alleged hesitancy, once elected M.P., to abolish the Clerico-Police Tax - see Noble, The Representative Radicals, pp. 7-20.
In this country it is applied to those of advanced liberal opinions, who manfully contend for the extension of political rights unjustly withheld, while in America it is applied to politicians who hold extreme opinions on the negro question, and who would not be sorry to see the Federal system replaced by a central Government.¹

Proportionately more support for American "radicalism" was, however, shown in the Scottish press in relation to the Civil Rights Bill than had been evident with regard to the Freedmen’s Bureau Bill. The Dundee Advertiser naturally extended its vigorous criticism of Johnson to cover his latest exercise of the veto. Considering his policy in general to be opposed to the spirit of freedom and equality on which the American Government was based, the Advertiser showed its keen appreciation of the shifting temper of majority Republican sentiment in the United States by observing that the old differences of opinion which had existed in the Republican ranks over the veto on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill had given way to a united Republican censure of Presidential action on the Civil Rights Bill.² A paramount concern to see guarantees for the swift establishment of the Negroes' rights as free citizens³ gave the paper a consistency in its "radical" approach to the future of the ex-slaves such as the Caledonian Mercury so obviously lacked.

Thus, whereas the Mercury considered the radical Republicans to be trespassing from the bounds of the Constitution and endangering the sacred rights of the individual states, the Dundee Advertiser judged it to be Johnson who threatened to destroy the fundamental liberties which the United States stood for through his typical Southern post-war response of having "learned nothing and forgotten nothing so far as the recognition of the rights of the Negro is concerned".⁴

¹ Glasgow Sentinel, 14 April, 1866.
² Dundee Advertiser, 10 April, 1866.
³ See ibid., 10, 17, 24 April, 1866.
⁴ Ibid., 10 April, 1866.
The Aberdeen Advertiser was supported in its unequivocal backing of the Radical initiative to secure civil rights for the freedmen by Aberdeen's Free Press. Having remained silent on the earlier presidential veto, the paper clearly pronounced its enthusiasm for the Senate's over-ruling of the veto on the Civil Rights Bill: "By this measure Congress refuses to leave the coloured people at the mercy of their late masters". A direct conflict between Congress and President was likely to be precipitated as a result of the Executive's defeat:

But how Congress could yield, unless prepared to allow Emancipation to be made a practical nullity wherever the state authorities might choose to make it such, is what we cannot see. The power which gave the negro his freedom is bound to see that freedom being made a reality, not a sham.1

And in reviewing the year in America, the generally more laconic Aberdeen Herald - itself hardly an organ of advanced liberal views - tersely commented that in vetoing the Bill, Johnson had simply "trucked to the malignant caste instincts of his Southern supporters".2

Easily the most surprising and unexpected Scottish press endorsement of the Civil Rights Bill was, however, that by the Glasgow Herald. Only a few weeks previously, the paper had shown strong qualms about the extreme "radicalism" which underlay the Freedman's Bureau Bill.3 But having seen both the earlier measure and the Civil Rights Bill passed over the Presidential vetoes, the Herald significantly altered its views on the nature of the struggle between Executive and Legislature. Always more sensitive and respectful to majority opinion in the United States than was the rival Scotsman, the Herald was apparently influenced in its conclusion that both sides in the struggle were acting constitutionally by its growing conviction that

1 Aberdeen Free Press, 20 April, 1866.
2 Aberdeen Herald, 19 Dec., 1866.
3 See above, pp. 365-366.
the voice of the Northern people was more accurately represented by the
Republicans in Congress than by Johnson. Victory, it believed, would
ultimately rest with the majority, and that victory would be a constitutional
one: "We have little fear that Congress or the Executive will transgress
their legal rights."

From this premise, the Herald went on to defend the Civil Rights Bill
on essentially the same grounds as did its more radical Scottish contemporaries.
Believing that "no lover of freedom" could find fault with the measure, it
argued that the Bill simply conferred civil rights to which the Negroes were
certainly entitled "if their emancipation is not to be a delusion and a
snare". Far from leading the United States into the revolutionary path of
Negro suffrage, the Bill merely secured for the black man the same civil
rights as were enjoyed by the white - "or, in other words, puts him in
exactly the same position which (sic) he occupies in this country". And the
Herald naturally took issue with Johnson's argument that Congress could not
enact laws overriding states' civil laws which discriminated between races:

If the President is correct, it seems to us that it is beyond the
power of the Federal law to protect the emancipated Negroes at all ...
If in Johnson's view of state rights is finally adopted, what is to
hinder these [Southern] states enacting that black children shall not
be educated, that Negroes shall have no power to hold property, to sue
a white man, or to have testimony against him in a Court of Justice?
What is to hinder them reducing the negroes to a state of servitude
practically worse than their former state of slavery?2

The Dundee advertiser had contested the President's reasoning that, as
regarded citizenship, the Negroes stood in precisely the same relation to
the United States as new foreign immigrants:3 but the Glasgow Herald was

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 21 April, 1866. The Herald disputed the London Times
assertion that three-quarters of the American population supported
Johnson, and recalled how the Times correspondent - namely Charles
Lackey - had misled Britain on Northern prospects during the late war.
2 Ibid.
3 Dundee Advertiser, 10 April, 1866.
at least equally as acerbic on this point. Unlike the immigrant,
the coloured freedman, it argued, had no country if the United States
turned its back upon him:

There is nothing for him but to accommodate himself to those small
mercies which his native state affords him - accept the "black code"
which it will impose, and slide back gradually into semi-slavery -
into a serf without a master - a man without a man's rights.
The injudicious veto of the Civil Rights Bill had thus effectively given
the "abolitionists" the chance to label Johnson as a slaveholder at heart
and an enemy of the emancipated.¹

The Glasgow Herald's confusing, ambivalent attitude towards the
Presidential/Congressional struggle, in which it exhibited a capacity for
supporting in principle Johnson's conciliatory policy while simultaneously
upholding specific crucial aspects of the Congressional plan, was mirrored
to some extent by a Scot who observed the situation in the United States at
first hand during this critical period. In general, the Marquis of Lorne's
account of Reconstruction America was solidly biased in favour of the
Southern viewpoint. Considering his strong predilections for the Confederate
cause during the war, this was, of course, to be looked for: in contemplating
his forthcoming trip to the West Indies and America, he had, indeed, recorded
that

I have long wished to see the South - indeed, ever since the war
broke out I have wished to be among a people who have so bravely
and so rightly, as I think in spite of their faults, fought for
independence - alas that it should have been partly for slavery.²

With his two travelling companions, the Hon. Arthur Strutt, second

¹ Glasgow Herald, 21 April, 1866.
² Marquis of Lorne's Journal, 1863-1867, Inveraray, 22 December, 1865, arg/11 133.
son of Lord Belper, and H.Y. Thompson, Lorne arrived in the United States in late March, 1866, at the very time when the furore over the veto on the Civil Rights Bill was at its height. The party were in New York when the veto was finally overridden by Congress, and Lorne, surprisingly, was not unduly perturbed about the development:

I do not see anything in the bill to justify the violent talk against its provisions that one reads in the ultra anti-Radical newspapers ... The protection the North wishes to give the freedmen is, in my opinion only the fulfilment of a sacred duty, to which it was doubly bound by its conduct in giving immediate emancipation to the blacks, and by the help the blacks afforded it in preserving the Union ... I am sorry that ... [Johnson] vetoed the Civil Rights Bill; for I believe its main provisions granted no more than justice.

Simultaneously, however, he emphasized his admiration for Johnson's stand against unconstitutionalism and over-centralization, and suggested that in his veto of the Civil Rights Bill, he had shown his hostility to the spirit, only too evidently evinced by many in the North, to favour the freedmen at the expense, or even abasement, of the Southerners. "Give Quashie his rights" is, no doubt, an admirable cry; but when one finds that this new-born zeal for the negro is merely a pretext by which they seek to cover their determination to humble their prostrate enemies, our admiration of the patriotism displayed by the North must be very much qualified.

1 Ibid. There is something approaching supreme irony in the fact that the H.Y. Thompson (erroneously designated "H.V. Thompson" in the transcript of Lorne's journal) who accompanied Lorne was none other than Henry Yates Thompson, one of the mere handful of undergraduates at Cambridge who had vigorously supported the North during the Civil War. Thompson had visited the United States in 1863 to observe the war at first hand. Subsequently, in 1865, he had contested South Lancashire as a Liberal, before Gladstone came forward there after his defeat at Oxford. At that same period (October, 1865), his consuming interest in America and American affairs led him to make a formal proposal to the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University that there be created there a biennial lectureship in the History and Political Institutions of the United States. He personally offered an endowment of $6,000 in American bonds to help establish the scheme. In the event, however, the weight of opposition and prejudice at Cambridge against American scholarship prevented the early implementation of his proposal. See Ged Martin, "The Cambridge Lectureship of 1866: A False Start in American Studies" in Journal of American Studies, Vol. 7, No. 1, April, 1973, pp. 19-22.

2 Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 178, 206.

3 Ibid., pp. 178-179.
His faith really lay in the policy of the President, which he considered would "reconcile the South, and induce its population to join him hand and heart in the reconstruction of the country". He even endeavoured to assure his mother that "If negroes are petted too much by the North, it will do them harm in the South". Radical policy in general, with its insistence on "unreasonable demands" of total allegiance by the South to the Federal government, was roundly condemned as likely to perpetuate sectional bitterness and disunion, and in presenting Sumner's views on the President's policy and on the absolute necessity for immediate Negro suffrage, Lorne was driven to observe that "it is painfully obvious how extreme and violent he has grown".

Perhaps in Lorne's case, special circumstances governed his curiously ambivalent attitude towards so vital a political issue of Reconstruction as the fate of the Civil Rights Bill. For one thing, he tended to glean ideas and opinions on Reconstruction from so many widely divergent and contradictory sources in America that some equivocation on his part was perhaps largely inevitable. More importantly, with parents so deeply committed to the Northern cause in wartime, and to the fate of the Negroes in the United States both before and after emancipation, it was scarcely possible that Lorne himself (however much he personally sympathised with the South, and held openly racist views) could be totally opposed to every

1 Ibid., p. 179
2 Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, New York, 9 April, 1866, Letters of the 9th Duke: West Indies and America, 1866, Argyll MSS.
3 Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 207-208.
4 Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, Washington, 21 April, 1866, Letters of the 9th Duke ..., Argyll MSS.

In the book, Sumner's opinions are not credited directly to him — see A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 217-218 — but Lorne's letter shows the extent to which the American Senator expounded his views to his visitor. The personal comment on Sumner is of course omitted from the text.
effort to secure some sort of security for the Negroes' freedom. Thus, however much he deplored the basic tenets of Radical policy towards the South, his ready recognition that a measure of guaranteed justice was due to the freedmen influenced him on balance to favour a Civil Rights Bill which further eroded state rights and which he believed to be framed for essentially mercenary purposes.

The *Glasgow Herald*'s sudden concern for the Negroes' status in law, taken alongside its implicit regret that Johnson should have been foolish enough to jeopardise his whole policy by allowing the Radicals a substantial victory over a simple issue of justice, suggests not only a conscious desire to keep in step with changing public opinion in the United States but also a certain lack of appreciation of the direction in which the Radicals hoped rapidly to push the law in America. When the Civil Rights Bill had just passed, Sumner was already taking it as a natural and direct stepping stone to Negro enfranchisement. Perhaps, then, it is indicative of the *Herald*'s superficial view of the American situation that it readily supported the measure simply because the Bill did not make any provisions for Negro suffrage.

Scottish detractors of the Civil Rights Bill professed themselves under no illusions about the ultimate "extreme radicalism" of the act, however. Bitterly attacking the Radicals' determination to "thwart by every means possible" Johnson's policy, the *Glasgow Sentinel* denounced the Bill as a measure even "more obnoxious" than the Freedmen's Bureau Bill, framed with the direct object of conferring the suffrage on the Negro population. Like the *Caledonian Mercury*, the professedly radical *Sentinel* took convenient refuge in arguing that the Bill was but one more decisive step towards over-centralization, a trend consistently pursued by Congress since the

---

end of the Civil War. And again, just like the Mercury, it maintained with concern that that trend was highly dangerous to the whole concept of American political liberty since it was almost certain to end in the replacement of the existing Constitution by a despotism. Its apposite recognition of the American Radical as an essentially different type of political animal from his British counterpart left the Sentinel plenty of leeway to continue its praise for Johnsonian Reconstruction, and to conclude (with the customary reminder of his proletarian origins) that "Mr. Johnson is pre-eminently the right man in the right place".

The Edinburgh Courant, at opposite poles from the Glasgow Sentinel in terms of domestic political affiliations, felt much the same way about the veto. Recognizing "the character and importance" of the Bill, it judged that Johnson had rendered a well-nigh inestimable service to "the cause of justice" in opposing it. But for the Courant's part, there was more to be said than that. Once more, the opportunity was taken to bring British radicals into ridicule, this time for having admired a Constitution in which the will of the people could apparently be so easily contravened by the intervention of President or Senate. It was even suggested that in dealing with John Bright's conviction that the Upper House would pass a Reform Bill if the Commons carried it, the House of Lords could take a lesson from Johnson in his handling of the Radicals:

[T]hough British Peers do not require to be taught by an American President, there is something in the courageous attitude assumed by Mr. Johnson towards an angry and insensate Congress which has a certain application to the present crisis in our political affairs.

---
1 Glasgow Sentinel, 14 April, 1866.
2 See above, pp. 378-379.
3 Glasgow Sentinel, 14 April, 1866.
4 Edinburgh Courant, 11 April, 1866.
A more rational view of the implications of events across the Atlantic was taken by the **North British Daily Mail**. The paper acknowledged the Civil Rights Bill to be a sweeping measure - "so important as to be virtually a new constitution for the United States". Remaining highly sceptical of the Southern response to peace, and recognizing the Republicans' natural desire to secure both the fruits of war and their own political position, the *Mail* was prepared objectively to admit a sound basis for the Congressional framing of the Civil Rights Bills. But beyond that, and unique among the pro-Southern Scottish press, it was ready to admit that very many Radical Republicans did in fact have a strong, sincere regard for the fundamental rights of the Negro in America:

This, whatever else may be said of this party, is honourable to them (sic) now, as it has been for long before, and we find those old historic names mixing again in this agitation which, like Clarkson and Wilberforce among ourselves, are the glory of American freemen.¹

This said, the paper itself could not but concede the validity in abstract terms of the provisions contained in the Civil Rights Bill: and its actual support for the veto was based on strictly practical considerations, the *Mail* believing that, although Johnson was dangerously flouting the elected Congress,

yet there is indisputably great practical force in what he says ... such force of argument as would at once be acknowledged and acted on in this country ... [R]eally now the issue is ... whether or not the principles of a wise expediency are to have authority in American politics, or abstract doctrines, true perhaps in themselves, are to override the considerations of time, place, and occasion in the administration of that great country.²

Following the overriding of the veto by the Senate as well as by the House of Representatives, the *Mail*, however, decided that Johnson, in relation to the feelings of the vast majority of the population in the North, really

---

¹ *North British Daily Mail*, 11 April, 1866.
had been too precipitate in his efforts to reunite the nation, and that he had thereby decisively lost all claim to being the representative voice of the people.¹

In complete contrast to this reasoned and reasonable interpretation of the changing situation in America, the indomitable Charles Mackay insisted on maintaining that the Republicans in conflict with Johnson were simply a group of extremists and "negro-worshippers",² and that it was abundantly clear that so far as the general populace was concerned, there was a reaction against "fanaticism and philosophism" in the United States, and a deep desire for "a union of hearts as well as of hands - a union of affection as well as of interests".³ Johnson, as the architect of such a potential union, was accordingly eulogised:

[I]t will be to the imperishable glory of President Johnson, and his undying claim to the gratitude of his country, that he was sagacious enough to see the right course, and bold enough to follow it. Among all the statesmen of his age he stands pre¬eminent ... Greater is his task than was that of Washington: brighter will be his place in history if he perform it.⁴

We have already observed, however, that at least so far as the specific issue of the Civil Rights Bill was concerned, it remained possible for Scottish commentators to continue supporting in principle the general aims of Johnsonian Reconstruction while approving the "just" legislation for securing a degree of positive freedom for the Negro. In this connection, it is worth contrasting here the attitude expressed in the Edinburgh

¹ Ibid., 21 April, 1866.
² See also Daily Review, 10 May, 1866, which was convinced that "Every true patriot endorses the President unreservedly", and that all "res¬pectable residents" in America would "join heart and hand in putting down these would-be revolutionists - these negro-loving radicals".
³ Mackay, "President Johnson and the Reconstruction of the Union" in Fortnightly Review, Vol. 4, April, 1866, pp. 484-485, 490.
⁴ Ibid., p. 490.
Review, a traditional organ of anti-Federal polemic, with the contemporaneous article in the Fortnightly Review, since this helps to throw into relief the peculiarly die-hard opinions of Charles Mackay.

Peter Clayden, writing in the Edinburgh Review, actually anticipated Mackay in suggesting that Johnson, especially in his mastering of events and his eagerness to lead rather than to follow the people, was more truly a statesman than Lincoln. He saw this change in tone, however, as symbolic of a wider change in the nature of American politics in general, and of the Presidency in particular. At Executive level, abolition of slavery, and the Civil War, had cleared the air:

A new dynasty began with Mr. Lincoln, but Mr. Johnson rules in a new age. Subserviency to a violent and anti-national faction [that is, in the South] is at an end. The President is no longer the tool of a party but the organ of the nation. It is no longer his chief function to defend an immoral institution; it is his duty now to be the highest exponent of the political conscience of the people.

So far as the veto on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill was concerned, Johnson was judged to have acted well as custodian of the people's interests against a Congressional measure which made a temporary and exceptional institution into a permanent legislative body, established "a perpetual system of minute interference with the internal administration of the Southern States", and threatened to protect the freedmen at the expense of the Constitution.

1 See above, Chapter III, p. 240. The Edinburgh Review had been one of the few British journals of criticism to remain totally unmoved by the arguments against the South in Cairnes' highly influential work, The Slave Power - see Weinberg, John Elliot Cairnes, p. 43.
2 Clayden, "The Reconstruction of the American Union" in Edinburgh Review, Vol. 123, April, 1866, p. 528. See also Mackay, "Three Presidents of The United States" in Blackwood's Magazine, Vol. 100, Nov., 1866, p. 635, in which he stated that Lincoln had had no will of his own, and criticized him for being guided and led by the will of the people.
3 Clayden, "The Reconstruction", pp. 528-529.
4 Ibid., p. 533.
Clearly, the main concern was once again for the Bill’s unwarrantable encroachment into state rights. The dangers posed by an overpowerful Federal government were seen by Clayden to be quite as great as those raised by attempted secession, the balance and security of the nation depending on a delicate co-ordination of powers. Therefore, Johnson’s policy, in taking account of this danger and avoiding it, had proved itself the true, essential one for the welfare of America.¹

At the same time, however, so astute and sincere an observer as Clayden could not fail to acknowledge that from the end of the war, the South had accepted the natural conditions of defeat (the repeal of the secession ordinances, repudiation of the Confederate debt, ratification of emancipation) with "a reluctance and hesitation which prove that ... it still bears an unconquered heart and an unconquerable hate".² It was recognized that the old planter class and the mean whites would do all they could to deny the Negroes their rights, and "there can be no doubt that if Congress left the civil position of the freedmen to be decided by the separate States, slavery under some form of serfdom would be re-established in most of them". In considering this facet of the situation, the familiar ambivalence becomes evident in Clayden’s reasoning. He realized that in order to counter the "intolerable tyrannies to the coloured race" which would inevitably be enacted by Southern state governments, there certainly had to be Federal legislation on the Negroes’ behalf which would secure them their "inalienable rights". And he was quite explicit in demanding this:

State constitutions which deny these rights, which place them [the freedmen] on account of the physical accident of colour in an inferior and outlawed position, which deny them equal civil rights with other members of the Commonwealth, are clearly inconsistent

¹ Ibid., pp. 534-535.
² Ibid., p. 537.
with Republican government, and Congress must insist on their amendment. A recognition of the coloured men as men must carry with it all the rights and powers which the American Constitution associates with manhood.¹

The great difficulty was how to execute such a Congressional safeguard without exceeding the Constitutional limitations imposed on the central government, and without destroying local liberties.²

So far as the two Presidential vetoes — the two critical areas of early contention between Johnson and Congress — are concerned, then, it becomes obvious that save for the exceptionally resolute and convinced rejection of all facets of the "Radical" programme by Charles Mackay and by the ultra-Conservative forces which governed the Edinburgh Courant, Scottish opinion, as reflected by those seeing the American situation at first hand or by those whose task it was to report consistently on it from the British side of the Atlantic, was in general characterised by a peculiar flexibility and equivocation. To some extent, the failure by much of the Scottish press to adopt a consistent line towards the antagonistic elements in the political struggle at that stage was a result of inadequate appreciation of the bitter intensity which feelings between the two rival camps in the United States had already assumed. With both President and Congress by this time so totally committed to every last plank in their respective programmes for Reconstruction, it was a somewhat pointless exercise for Scottish press commentators to pick and choose among what they felt to be the best elements in both policies, and then faithfully to record these for the benefit of the Scottish public. Yet, this would seem to be the essence of the approach to formulating Scottish attitudes to Reconstruction in the critical early months of 1866. And however imperfect, in some instances, was the under-

¹ Ibid., p. 554.
² Ibid., p. 553. Clayden was prepared to condone a temporary delay in granting the South readmission to Congress, and the exercise of limited, undefined supervision over the constitutions of the several states by provisions within the American Constitution — see ibid., p. 551.
standing of the current temper of American politics, at least most Scottish observers seemed to have a clear enough conception of the particular priorities which they wanted to see secured amid the changes being ushered in by Reconstruction.

Certainly, a major concern among most sources considered was that the United States should escape the dangers of over-centralization. As we have seen, it was a sentiment which flourished independent of old predilections for the Federal or Confederate causes, and which largely helped to produce such anomalies as the complete accord which existed at that particular point in Reconstruction between one of Britain's erstwhile most consistently loyal and outspoken advocates of the North, the Caledonian Mercury, and one of Britain's erstwhile most consistently loyal and outspoken advocates of the South, the Glasgow Sentinel.

But at the same time, as the reaction to the struggle over the Civil Rights Bill demonstrated, there was in most cases at least a nominal appreciation of the argument that some form of Federal legislation - or better still, persuasion - was needed to guarantee a measure of real freedom and justice for the Negro freedmen. A clear, straightforward statement which, like that of the Dundee Advertiser, unequivocally endorsed the more "extreme" Congressional steps taken towards this aim was, however, exceptional in the Scottish press. In general, opinion did a balancing act between concern for the legal position of the Negroes, and concern about the essential limitations which must be put on the Federal government's power to determine that position. The result in most cases was a confusing mixture of sentiments, most of them commendable enough in isolation, but which could not viably be advocated with equal fervour at this particular time. In other words, given the peculiarities and exigencies of the Reconstruction situation in America, only detachment and a significant misreading of the political temper in the
United States could influence Scottish observers to continue to hope and believe (even after the Civil Rights Bill crisis) that adequate legislation for the establishment of Negro rights could be introduced under the aegis of the Johnsonian concept of state authority. There consequently remained, even among the most "advanced Liberal" admirers of the United States, an open suspicion of the American Radicals, who inconveniently pinpointed the fact that there could not be enacted an effective measure of justice for the Negroes without at least a temporary change or suspension of the traditional functioning of the Constitution.

III Principles and pragmatism: the evolution of attitudes towards the deepening conflict between President and Congress

Despite the turmoil of the preceding months, by July, 1866 at least the Glasgow Herald retained its optimism about the eventual outcome of the struggle between Congress and President. Reports were by that time being received from its "Rambling Reporter" in America defining Sumner as "unquestionably a man of great abilities, although... smitten with the disease termed 'negrophobia';" describing Stevens as "the chief of the obstructives... this obstinate old man [who] is doing more mischief in the way of cultivating hatred between North and South than all other influences put together", and finding similar unflattering words for other Radicals, while praising Johnson as "A self-taught, self-made, extraordinary man... [who] looks the man and the statesman every inch of him" and who was eminently suitable as President. Despite this, the Herald insisted on judging both

1 "Rambling Reporter" in Glasgow Herald, 21 July, 1866.

The surprising use of the word "negrophobia" in this connection most probably represents an ignorant confusion of the terms "negrophobia" and "negrophilin". Alternatively, it may have shown awareness on the reporter's part of the longstanding Confederate myth that Charles Sumner personally disliked the company of Negroes, a myth of which the most eloquent evocation is to be found in the superlatively racist novel The Clansman (New York, 1905), by Thomas Dixon, jun. For a balanced view of this matter, see David Donald, Charles Sumner and the Rights of Man (New York, 1964).

2 "Rambling Reporter" in Glasgow Herald, 21 July, 1866.
Executive and Legislature to be still adhering rigidly to the Constitution in their attempts to carry through their respective policies of Reconstruction. Neither side, it was felt, intended "proceeding to extremities", so that little anxiety was evinced for the future development of Reconstruction policy, one way or the other. And the Caledonian Mercury, uncertain about the future and about American support for Johnson following the Congressional success in defying his vetoes, had earlier come to terms with the possibility of a victory for the Radicals' plan for Reconstruction:

The friends of the United States in this country will ... be happy whichever side may ultimately prove the victor. The design of both is the same; the only difference is as to the right and safe mode of its accomplishment.2

But among elements more committed to the Conservative cause in Britain and in America, there was continuing censure of the Radicals' policy following the Congressional victory over the vetoes. The report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction was condemned by the Edinburgh Courant, for example, as a plan characteristic of the "fanatical majority in Congress, whose real object is anything but the reconstruction of the Union"; and no effort was spared to portray Johnson as a guardian of moderation and fair government, ready to interpose his veto "either to shield the South from Radical tyranny, or to defeat the machinations of Radicalism to aggrandize itself at the expense of the Union".4 It has already been noted that by this time, the Courant was identifying the American President as a courageous fighter in the international cause of Conservatism against rampant radicalism.5

1 Glasgow Herald, 31 July, 1866.
2 Caledonian Mercury, 21 April, 1866.
3 Edinburgh Courant, 14 May, 1866. See also Dundee Courier, 15 May, 1866.
4 Edinburgh Courant, 2 June, 1866.
5 See above, Chapter III, pp. 261-262.
Furthermore, the Radicals were deserving of ever greater calumny because of their growing association, for the sake of political gain, with the Fenians. 1 Considering a "decisive collision" between the two factions in America to be imminent, the Courant was thus poised to lend all its editorial strength to the Presidential cause, a cause which, if successful, would not only ensure justice for the Southern states in America but would also check the expansion of transatlantic radicalism and (hopefully) curb the potential growth under Radical blessing of American Fenianism.

It would appear, therefore, that in some respects the Reconstruction era (and the very early period of Reconstruction in particular) was at least as important a period for Scottish conservatives who traditionally looked to the United States with loathing and apprehension as for Scottish radicals who traditionally looked to it with admiration and hope. For in the attitudes of President Johnson, the Conservative Republicans, and the Democratic party, there was embodied the hope within Scottish conservative circles that the Northern victory in the Civil War might not, after all, inevitably presage that rapid descent into total democracy which they had so greatly feared. The knowledge in summer, 1866, that there was still apparently an evens chance for "conservatism" in the post-war United States not only increased the interest of Scottish conservatives in American affairs at that time 2 but also contributed to the vehemence of their attacks on the Radicals.

It was largely because a defeat for the post-war Southern claim for states’ rights would mean a triumph for centralized democracy that Scottish conservatives reverted to their Civil War plea for recognition of the full

1 Edinburgh Courant, 9 Aug., 1866.
2 The Edinburgh Courant, 14 May, 1866, stated that the news from America was "increasing in interest with every mail".
rights and privileges of individual states. That such a plea was worth making at all in the Reconstruction period was encouraging for the conservative cause. Charles Mackay, faithfully carrying aloft the banner of Scottish conservatism in Blackwood's Magazine, thus concluded that the struggle between President and Congress simply opened up all the questions - with the exception of slavery - which had led to the war; and the greatest of these he still identified as state rights. Cautious optimism that this vital issue could be favourably settled in the post-war era was based on Johnson's relatively unyielding disposition in the face of political pressure.¹ But, looking forward to the autumn elections, Mackay was too uncertain about the political climate to hazard a guess at the outcome. Yet in July, 1866, the outcome appeared vitally important for the future of conservatism on both sides of the Atlantic. In simple terms, if the President won, the United States would be "happy, respectable, prosperous and unaggressive", and by virtue of that, of course, less dangerous in every respect to Britain. On the other hand, if Congress, under the influence of men like Stevens and Sumner, were to defeat Johnson, certain despotism would result, the product of a "deceived people" who had allowed it to be established in order to pamper their pride and conceit.²

The sense that America was doomed unless the President's policy triumphed was generally lacking from the Scotsman's evaluation of the situation by July, 1866, however. Its summary mention of the veto on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill had been matched by the quietly unenthusiastic comment that Johnson had vetoed the Civil Rights Bill "as it deserved".³ Although

² Ibid., p. 34.
³ Scotsman, 9 April, 1866.
endorsement of Johnson and an outlook akin to that of the American Demo-
crats was the logical progression from the paper's wartime stand, it was
less happy in this position than were the blatantly Tory journals of
Edinburgh. This was largely because it simply could not find the enthusiasm
to enter into the battle as heartily as, for instance, did Charles Mackay. 1
As we have noted, "moderate Liberalism", as represented by the Scotsman,
was almost fully as much opposed to American radicalism as was ultra
Conservatism. 2 But notwithstanding this, so far as the American situation
was concerned, the main priority for the Scotsman in summer, 1866 remained
what it had always tended to be, namely, to see the restoration of tran-
quillity, order and prosperity there. If these could be achieved under the
aegis of the Presidential brand of Reconstruction, so much the better; but
rather than applaud a fight to the death between the Legislature and Executive
which would inevitably cause increasing turmoil in the already chaotic state
of American politics, the Scotsman was already beginning to formulate an
attitude towards the conflict which would become standard. Broadly, this
consisted in counselling Johnson, as the prospectively weaker party, to
virtually step aside for the sake of peace.

Accordingly, there entered into the Scotsman's attitude towards Recon-
struction a fierce pragmatism totally at variance with Mackay's bellicose
desire (paralleled as this was by Democratic rejoicings in America over the
start of the conflict after the vetoes 3) to cheer on the battle for the
satisfaction of seeing Johnson victorious. Early July brought the first

---

1 Mackay saw the coming conflict as part of "the greatest drama of our
times". See Fortnightly Review, Vol. 4, April, 1866, p. 488.
2 See above, Chapter III, pp. 264-266. In mid-May, 1866, the Scotsman had,
for example, vigorously objected to a Radical proposal to disfranchise
as Federal electors until 1870 all who had voluntarily rebelled against
the North, and had taken some consolation in the belief that such an
"extreme and intolerable" measure would not be accepted by the Conser-
vatives or the President - 14 May, 1866.
3 See Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 172-173.
signs of the new line, with the paper becoming anxious that Johnson, however good his intentions, should not interfere to obstruct any tentative prospects of reconciliation which might be emerging. 1 Placing increasing emphasis on the need for a rapid return to a more settled state of society, the Scotsman, it seems clear, was more and more coming to find the whole Reconstruction struggle tiresome. In keeping with the general sordid, corrupt tone of American politics, the contest between President and Congress was judged "unseemly"; 2 and as it became evident that Johnson had no intention of yielding for the sake of a compromise peace, the Scotsman showed itself impatient rather than admiring of his obstinacy.

Certainly, in the months immediately preceding the decisive November elections there did remain traces of the idea that the President's course was based on fairly substantial support in the country. There was the belief that his tour of the west was likely to be very popular, and the feeling that he could afford to repeat his intention to adhere to his Reconstruction policy when so many prominent men North and South had strongly endorsed it. 3 The predominant tendency was, however, to desert the Democratic position and increasingly to view the misunderstandings between President and Congress as largely the fault of Johnson - the result of his actions on the Freedmen's Bureau Bill and allied issues. He was soundly

1 Scotsman, 3 July, 1866.
2 Ibid., 28 July, 1866.
3 Ibid., 12 Sept., 1866. The Scotsman was obviously behind the times in seeing Johnson's support as broad-based at this time - see McKittrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 312; Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 204-205. Presumably the paper was basing its judgement on the fact that the reception and dinner given at the opening of Johnson's swing-around-the circle in August had been attended by many of the most powerful New York businessmen and financiers. Also, the New York Times was commenting in September on the "unanimity" of commerce and business behind the President (see Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, p. 209), and this is a very likely information source for the Scotsman.
blamed as being the worst offender in confusing the whole Reconstruction issue, and emphasis was placed on how he had changed from a rigorous policy to a soft one, making enemies of former friends, and generally exacerbating the situation.¹

While some of the personal ignominy attaching to Johnson was drained off and attributed to the partisan nature of the office he held,² there was no escaping the conclusion that his character, too, was at fault. The electioneering tour proved that: in common with most of the American people themselves, the Scotsman was shocked by a performance which, it believed, had debased the Presidential office.³ Even his refusal to recommend the South to accept so "radical" a measure as the Fourteenth Amendment was condemned as "obstinate": and by early October, the Scotsman was actually pinning its hopes on the early yielding of the President in order to lessen the risks of a collision between the Executive and the people.⁴ The reference to these two entities as potentially antagonistic is highly significant in pinpointing the changing views on what it apparently saw as the changing nature of the political framework in America. For the first time, the Scotsman was suggesting that Johnson had gone so far in his persistent adherence to his course of Reconstruction that he no longer had "the people" solidly behind him, and could no longer claim to represent their wishes to the letter. This can be seen as the half-way house in the transition from seeing "the people" as represented by Johnson to seeing "the people" as represented by the Radicals in Congress. Giving validity to the Scotsman's changing position was the spectacle of the campaign tour where it was made

---

¹ Scotsman, 4 Sept., 1866. Among modern assessments, the Coxes, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 194-203 and McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 181-184 have squarely blamed Johnson for initiating the contest, for making matters worse by his refusal to make concessions, and for general indeterminancy.

² Scotsman, 20 Sept., 1866.

³ Ibid., 8 Oct., 1866.

⁴ Ibid., 9 Oct., 1866.
obvious that the President had lost the necessary rapport with his audience, and where he actually lost the support of many who had continued to back him up until then.¹ The sweeping Republican victories in the autumn elections were therefore taken as proof that Johnson was charting a lone course against the tide of the people's will, and it was accepted that his last hope of carrying his policy into effect without war had vanished.²

It has been demonstrated that at least by the time of the attempted impeachment of the President in 1868, there had set in a widespread disgust among Johnson's British supporters over (among other character failings) his stubbornness and inflexibility.³ So far as attitudes in the Scottish press are concerned, there was already by the end of 1866 a strong body of opinion critical of the President for his short-sighted obstinacy. Indeed, in this connection, the Scotsman is unique only in the relatively early date at which it began to censure Johnson for his intransigent policy, and in the cogent consistency with which it sustained its argument.

As late as 21 September, the Dundee Courier was offering an interesting analysis of why the majority of Britons apparently tended to favour the policy of Johnson and the Northern Democrats against that of the Radicals. Popular approval for the President, on behalf of the South, was the simple result, the paper argued, of the massive British sympathy for the Confederacy during the war - a sympathy which had naturally led to hopes for a speedy and complete post-war reconciliation. The Courier's conclusions, if less than novel, did at least highlight the degree of popular sympathy which it believed Johnson to command in Britain at that time, and reflected also the

---

¹ For an analysis of the impact and effects of Johnson's tour, see McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 430-433.
² Scotsman, 10 Nov., 1866.
³ Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 75.
paper's own continuing confidence in Presidential Reconstruction. While the Scotsman had already decided that further opposition to the spirit of Radical policy could only lead to futile and damaging wrangling, the Dundee Courier faithfully concentrated on attacking the injustices and "wild bigotry" of the Radicals, suggesting that their extremism had lost them the chance of success in the United States, and pre-judging Johnson's forthcoming campaign tour as a "political pilgrimage" which augured well for the November elections.¹

When the election results began to trickle in, however, and an impressive Republican victory seemed imminent, the Courier earnestly hoped that Johnson would accept the "decision of the North" against him since to insist on his policy in the altered circumstances would probably start a "fierce revolutionary war".² After the final result of the elections was known, the Courier not only made it clear that it felt it to be the President's duty for the sake of the country to accept his defeat, but also took a retrospectively harsh look at Johnson's earlier responses to Radical proposals. The basic argument was that although the President had perhaps done all he could for the South, his proven incompetence in estimating the strength of the Radicals and the temper of the Northern people had ultimately meant that it was almost a pity that he had intervened on the South's behalf: "we are inclined to think that it would have been better had he refrained from vetoing the Freedmen's Bureau Bill; for from that act the bitter feelings which have characterised the elections derived their origin." And there could be no British support for Johnson if "out of mere spleen, and to cover his retreat from a lost field" he were to push the country into a battle which would only be "a faction fight on a large scale".³

¹ Dundee Courier. 21 Sept., 1866.
³ Ibid., "President Johnson and Congress", 23 Nov., 1866.
Similar sentiments were echoed in Glasgow’s North British Daily Mail. Readily conceding that it had all along approved the purpose of Johnson’s policy, by late October the Mail was admitting that his self-willed, defiant approach had been totally wrong, and had only aggravated his own and the country’s difficulties. Much importance was naturally attached to the mass withdrawal of American press support for the President, and it was concluded that the struggle against Congress must inevitably end in Johnson’s defeat. While by the end of the year it was still possible to identify "a sort of heroism" in the President’s determination, the paper was at bottom completely disillusioned with Johnson, and exceedingly irritated by his dangerous insistence that until the South was again represented in Congress, the country had no proper constitutional government: "The statesman who, overlooking the facts of his condition, would apply these theoretical notions to practice, ought to be regarded as blindly obstinate rather than heroically wise". Resorting to its professed respect for the will of the majority in the United States, the Mail insisted that the President should have acquiesced in the Congressional victory, "satisfied that while his plan was the best, he had done his duty in proposing it, and in striving ... to carry it into effect".

From the tone of his annual Message to Congress, the Glasgow Herald was likewise concerned that Johnson, although possibly still right in his Reconstruction policy, was apparently prepared to overrule "the opinions of hundreds". The situation was felt to be important enough to be clarified by an analogy with a hypothetical situation in British politics. If Ireland had revolted five years before, and had been conquered by Britain only after

2 Ibid., 5 Dec., 1866
3 Ibid., 18 Dec., 1866. See also ibid., 27 Dec., 1866.
an exhausting struggle "what would we have said or done in these circumstances had her Majesty, against the wishes of two-thirds of both Houses of Parliament, resolved to restore the Irish people their political rights within a year?"

But the collapse of democratic idealism in the United States at that period was judged here, as elsewhere in the Scottish press, to stretch beyond simply a Presidential challenge to the will of the people as represented by Congress (serious enough though that was acknowledged to be). The Herald's analysis of the contemporary situation produced the rueful conclusion that the original issue of Reconstruction which had caused the fight had been completely lost sight of:

The principles or conditions on which the South is to be re-admitted to a share in the representation of the country are evidently sinking into insignificance in the estimation of certain politicians when compared with the struggle for power which has lately arisen between the Congress and the President.1

Along with the Scotsman, the Glasgow Herald gave the lead in the Scottish press in suggesting that the United States had drifted into a ghastly political and administrative dilemma which was bound to erode some of the vital rights and liberties granted under the American Constitution, no matter what the ultimate solution might be. Thus, any refusal by Johnson to yield would be a blatant defiance of the clearly expressed voice of the nation as reflected in the autumn elections. But at the same time, the mandate given to Congressional Reconstruction policies meant in effect the accession to legislative power of a faction which cared nothing for negotiating conditions of re-entry for the South, but was dedicated to keeping the ex-Confederate states out of Congress for the purpose of perpetuating a Radical Republican ascendency there. Perhaps only a genuine fear that continued opposition by Johnson to the strength of Congress would ultimately result in another calamitous war, and an involuntary sense of revulsion at

1 Glasgow Herald, 19 Dec., 1866.
his personal political tactics, induced these moderate Liberal elements so earnestly to hope for the President's acquiescence in American "extremism" at this stage.

But the Daily Review provides the best example of how far an organ strongly sympathetic to the post-war South could be influenced in its attitudes to Reconstruction by such considerations. Initial reaction to the National Union Convention at Philadelphia had been to rejoice in the apparent proof it gave that Johnson's conciliatory policy was finding greater favour with the masses than the Radical one. Very soon, however, the paper began to caution its readers to remember that the Convention was only a gathering of partisan politicians, and that while the opinions of Southern voters were probably fully represented there, the Boston representative's display of camaraderie with the delegate from South Carolina could hardly be taken as representative of the majority view of Boston, "that intensely Radical city". Already, fears began to be formulated that if Johnson were to gather a large enough minority within Congress, he could unite it with Southern support to constitute, in effect, a separate Congress. And the end product of this would be a renewal of civil war.

Accordingly, there was some relief in the knowledge that, largely because of "the foolish and reckless speeches of the President himself in his late [campaign] tour", the Convention's early enthusiasm for Johnson was not being echoed throughout the country. Johnson himself was harshly censured:

1 Daily Review, 1 Sept., 1866.
2 Ibid., 7 Sept., 1866.
3 Ibid., 2 Oct., 1866. See also ibid., 4 Oct., 1866, where Johnson's stump performances during his tour earned him criticism as "a violent partisan" who had been instrumental in killing his own chances of success by his wild, "undignified" appearance. A similar view was expressed in the Aberdeen Journal, 3, 10, 17 Oct., 7 Nov., 1866.
Whether ... [Johnson's] policy was right in the abstract might be a question; but there was none that the extreme lengths to which he was prepared to carry it in practice would lead to a fresh effusion of civil blood. The only way to prevent it was for all citizens to rally in opposition, to present a firm front to his extreme measures, and to give him no pretext by an evenly divided Congress for asserting that he and those who thought with him were the exponents of the feelings and the wishes of the United States.1

The vehemence of the Review's attack on the President for his inept handling of his Reconstruction policy suggests that to some extent he had become the scapegoat for the paper's frustration and disgust at a prevalent political climate (and, indeed, at a political structure in general) which afforded no real chance of success for an immediate policy of conciliation towards the South. Significantly, in warning its readers against identifying British political parties with either of the contending parties in America, the paper suggested that it was enough merely to watch the struggle and to "witness ... the free play of political passions in an arena where no restraint is put upon the combatants except that which is supplied by their own attachment to the rules of law and the principles of the Constitution".2 In such a situation, where - as in the case of Johnson - such unrestrained political excesses could directly contribute to the defeat of a desirable policy, the Daily Review apparently considered that the only sensible thing to do was to bow to the inevitable, and hope for the best from those who had assumed the reins of power. This involved at least a partial retreat from its old denunciations of the Radical faction, but inevitably there was an extremely cautious approach to the acceptance of the Radical accession to power:

The friends of humanity all over the world will rejoice that the fruits of the late war in the extinction of slavery (sic) are not to be lost by the defeat of their friends [the Radical Republicans]

---

1 Daily Review, 2 Oct., 1866. See also ibid., 8 Oct., 1866, where the point was made that the moderates in the North had probably ultimately supported the Radical Republicans not because they agreed with their policy but because they wanted to avert bloodshed.
2 Ibid., 2 Oct., 1866.
at the polling booths, and we can only hope that the overwhelming majority which the Radicals are likely to have will be used with the moderation which the consciousness of power ought ever to impart to those possessing it.\(^1\)

It becomes clear that while by the end of 1866 there was a wide consensus in the Scottish press in favour of Presidential acquiescence in Radical ascendancy for the sake of peace and a stabilization of politics in the United States, there was at the same time very little positive admiration for, or confidence in, Radical policy as such. The natural tendency, of course, was still to be crippling suscpicious of the emergence of a strengthening Radicalism across the Atlantic; and the Edinburgh Courant, which did in fact continue after the autumn elections to take heart in the presumption that Johnson would still be able to impede Congressional legislation,\(^2\) effectively voiced the continuing convictions of more pragmatic journals when it stated simply that Johnson's Reconstruction policy was "wise, just, conciliatory, and safe, just as the opposite policy is foolish, cruel, irritating, and hazardous", and that "Except that he has given away so much to 'wind and tongue', he is a man ... after Mr. Carlyle's own heart".\(^3\)

Easily the most positive, unambiguous press support for the Radical Republicans in their struggle against Johnson was sounded in the Dundee Advertiser. With the meeting of the Philadelphia Convention in America, the Advertiser broke a long silence on the contest and on the working out of Presidential Reconstruction to follow a line consistent with that adopted

---

1 Ibid.

2 Edinburgh Courant, 21 Dec., 1866. The Courant had earlier disagreed with the Times' suggestion that Johnson should accept the 11th Amendment, arguing that he must not retreat "in the face of the foe", and bitterly condemning the "violent and tyrannical" policy of the Radicals - ibid., 17 Oct., 1866.

3 Ibid., 18 Sept., 1866. In November, 1866, Charles Mackay was still ignoring Johnson's intransigence and stressing that it was the duty of the North, as represented by the Radicals in Congress, to yield and be magnanimous. See "Three Presidents of the United States" in Blackwood's Magazine, Nov., 1866, Vol. 100, pp. 610-611.
towards the Freedmen's Bureau and Civil Rights Bills earlier in the year. Judging the President to be manipulated now by the ex-slaveholders, the paper dismissed the Convention as "a huge conspiracy against liberty, and the moral and social progress of the United States" - a clear renewal of the Southern attempt, supported by Northern allies, to regain supremacy in the country.¹

Characteristically, there was particular condemnation of the Convention's total failure to guarantee that in the future the freedmen would be "honourably dealt with", and against this was set the Radicals' insistence that justice must be secured for the Negro before the Southern states were re-admitted to Congress. Convinced that the return of the Democratic party to power would involve the virtual re-introduction of slavery, the Advertiser showed a remarkable confidence in fully endorsing Radical Reconstruction which was based in an equally unique confidence in the belief that the proposed Congressional policy did not encroach on Constitutional rights:

Our interests - and, if we sincerely desire the extension of freedom, our sympathies - ought to range themselves on the side of those who have shown themselves to be the truest friends of this country, and to whom, under Providence, the freedmen owe the amount of liberty they already possess.

Johnson was already becoming an ineffective obstruction: "A melancholy spectacle truly to see the head of a great nation ... fume after the fashion of Billingsgate, because the majority of Congress, and doubtless also of the people, are opposed to his suicidal policy".²

The results of the autumn elections, therefore, merely convinced the Dundee Advertiser that its calculations of the extent of Johnson's political alienation had been correct. The Northerners, proving too sensible to lose the fruits of war, had decisively rejected his attempts to infiltrate the

¹ Dundee Advertiser, 4 Sept., 1866.
² Ibid.
government with "rabid Democrats", and had shown themselves to be animated with "the spirit ... which brought about the downfall of the Rebellion, and broke the chains of millions of bondsmen". It was an optimistic judgement, notable for its emphasis on the altruism of the Northern response, rather (as in the vast majority of cases) than its stress on the political avarice and self-interested calculations of the Radical Republicans. But so far as Scottish opinion as represented by the press is concerned, it is evident that this far end of the spectrum was much over-shadowed by opinion of a directly antipathetical nature.

For this particular phase of Reconstruction, recorded comment of any sort by individual Scots is rare enough, and positive sympathy for the Radical course apparently totally lacking. In this connection, only a brief observation by the Duchess of Argyll suggests that there may have been privately held views which went some way to redressing the balance of Scottish opinion in favour of Radical policy. Talking over the problems of Reconstruction with Henry Dana during his short visit to Inveraray in September, 1866, and impressed by his uneasiness with Johnson’s course and his conviction that it tended to cancel out the Northern victory and provide no security for the coloured race, the Duchess was moved to record that "It is not for us to doubt the necessity of this [need for safeguards] after what we have seen in Jamaica, where there has not been the bitterness such a war, such as the Americans have had, must have caused". And of course members of the Edinburgh Ladies’ Emancipation Society had been strongly opposed to Johnsonian Reconstruction ever since the President’s vetoes had made clear the direction this course would take. Later, with impeachment a very real possibility, the Society reflected: "We cannot but rejoice

2 Journal of the 8th Duchess, Sept., 1866, Argyll MSS.
that, as one result of Andrew Johnson's policy, it has strengthened a sentiment against him, and on behalf of the negroes".  

But the depth of the concern for the freedmen felt by the Duchess of Argyll and the ladies of the ELES was not, it would appear, generally shared, and other factors entered into the considerations of those attempting to suggest the safest way forward for the American union. Hence even a liberal-minded traveller to the United States at that time could have reservations on the full implementation of proposed Radical policies. Certainly, Sir David Wedderburn showed little overt alarm over the "extremism" of the Radical elements which he had encountered on his American trip in late 1866: he returned to Scotland full of a glowing confidence in the certain future progress and advancement of the United States. What did appear to give him slightly more cause for concern, however, was the Republican trend towards increased centralization. Although he noted of the Southerners that even at that late date, "The idea of slavery tinged all their thoughts, as a form of feudal service", he could not dismiss his personal conviction that however necessary a strong central authority might have been in wartime, permanent centralization was peculiarly dangerous for the United States. The only hope of permanent union lay, he believed, in the practical independence of each community: "By a freewill union for common interests and objects only, a society gains the combined strength

---

1 Annual Report of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society, and Sketch of Anti-Slavery Events and the Condition of the Freedmen during the year ending 4th April, 1867 (Edinburgh, 1867), pp. 8-10. In the Society's 1866 Report, it had been noted that in some quarters Johnson was considered too merciful, but the Society itself was ready enough to concede at that stage that he had "immense" difficulties to face - see Annual Report of the Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society for year ending February 15, 1866 (Edinburgh, 1866), p. 6.

2 See above, Chapter II, p. 64.

3 Percival, op. cit., p. 83.
of all its members, no force being expended in coercing the minority. This is the theory of the United States Constitution". 1 By implication, then, Wedderburn could scarcely approve all the tenets of a Congressional policy which threatened to deprive one section of the United States of its fundamental rights, and thereby endanger, for a somewhat indefinite period, the efficient functioning of the political machine.

The only other Scot who left a record of a visit to the United States in the critical autumn-winter of 1866 was Samuel Smith, 2 and his perceptive observations, recorded shortly after his return, contrast interestingly with the attitudes of the Scottish press viewing the Reconstruction situation largely at second hand, through the medium of the American press. Admittedly, Smith had been pro-Federal during the war while the majority of the newspapers which we have considered in this connection were to a greater or lesser extent supporters of the South. Nevertheless, his conclusions reflect a balanced, objective view of the basic difficulties facing United States legislators, and of the temper of both sections of the Union at this stage.

Like Wedderburn, Smith was forcibly struck by the remarkably rapid post-war recovery of the nation: "It was evident to all that the country had passed successfully through the most gigantic struggle of modern times, and the conviction took possession of me that nothing but a miracle could prevent the United States becoming by far the richest, strongest, and most prosperous nation in the world". 3 Even the excessive American preoccupation with political themes could not dampen his optimism regarding the immediate future of the country, and rather than dismissing the conflict of opinion between President and Congress as but one more squalid illustration of the un-

1 Ibid., p. 88.
2 For an earlier reference to Smith, see above, Chapter III, pp. 216-217.
3 Smith, My Life-Work, p. 77.
patriotic, self-seeking nature of American politics, he believed that "The controversy thus raised travels over the widest fields of political science, and elevates the mind of the nation to a high pitch of thought and argument". 1 But the practical problem of reconstructing the South still remained one of extraordinary difficulty, and in seeking to determine the essence of the difficulty, Smith's thinking was in line with that of the vast majority of Scottish commentators, both for and against American democracy, who judged republican institutions in the United States to be facing a real crisis at that time. As Smith saw it, a republican government was attempting to rule democratically over

half a continent of disaffected citizens ... And as it is perfectly evident that the machinery of republican government is only adapted for voluntary consent, it may be imagined in what a dilemma the North is placed, with the Southern States claiming the rights which republican principles forbid them to deny, but which their dread of Southern influence tells them it is dangerous to concede.2

The most important factor in Smith's analysis of the Reconstruction situation in late 1866 was, however, his appreciation of the Radicals' point of view. Fully aware that the policy of that faction seemed harsh and revengeful when viewed dispassionately from the other side of the Atlantic, he put his personal experience of America to good use in describing the background of continuing sectional disharmony, and the lack of Southern accommodation to Northern sentiments, which had given rise to Radical demands. Most of the better educated and more thoughtful people of the North had, he argued, ultimately approved of a policy of safeguards on immediate Southern resurgence because

you feel that if the South could return its favourite representatives to Congress as of yore, the halls of the Capitol would again become the battle ground of sectional hate. You also feel that the South, restored to self-government, would be a somewhat untrustworthy custodian

---

1 Ibid., p. 82
2 Ibid., p. 84.
of the liberated negro, and that, if the pressure of Northern restraint were removed, the African race would be relegated to a state of abject dependence.¹

Yet, despite his personal knowledge of circumstances in the United States, and his recognition of the need to shape policy to the exigencies of the situation, it remained in the end almost as difficult for Smith as for less enlightened commentators to come to terms with the full ramifications of apparently "extreme" Radical plans for the South. The policy of Stevens and his colleagues would, as we have seen, appear to have been accepted by Smith as unfortunately necessary for the times. But either within this policy itself, or in a more sinister Radical plan which he detected behind it, he found the familiar, strong grounds for unease. Thus, the "chief misfortune" of the situation which existed in America by late 1866 was seen to be not the continuing, insecure social and political status of the Negro freedmen, nor even the general unhappy estrangement between North and South, but rather the fact that these features combined had helped to give ascendancy to the "more vindictive party" in the North, a faction which was only too glad to seize the excuse to "trample out whatever remains of liberty in the South. This extreme party would fain see political rights withheld from the South till its social system was disintegrated and the black population, aided by immigrants from the North, made more than a match for the old dominant class".²

For those Scots disposed to sympathise with the United States in its Reconstruction difficulties, and for those ready to use these difficulties as proof of the inadequacy of American political institutions, there would, then, seem to have been at least one common factor which hampered positive acceptance, and aided criticism, of the Radical policy. This was the recollection that, despite all the obvious peculiarities of the post-war

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.
situation, the American Constitution did still require that the governing body in power in the United States must be there by the consent of all the people governed. If the Scottish critics of America during Reconstruction naturally rejoiced in emphasising this point, it also remained difficult for observers such as Smith and Wedderburn, and journals like the Caledonian Mercury, simply to ignore it. Unfortunately for these latter elements, it was impossible at this particular juncture for their rigid interpretation of the letter of the Constitution to be compatible with the aims and actions of the American Radicals to safeguard the principles of the Northern victory. There was not so much a confusion in the liberal-radical Scottish mind about this as a straightforward inability to grasp the basic contradictions inherent in the desire for a policy which would ensure both guaranteed justice for the freedmen and the rapid return to something approaching the pre-war level of state rights in the South. Nor was any significant consideration given to the proposition that, proceeding from Sumner's interpretation of the status of the Southern states after the war, the Radicals were, according to their own lights, acting strictly within the bounds of the Constitution.

In September, 1866 the Daily Review had attempted to explain that while the Democrats were theoretically right in insisting that the South had never been out of the Union and that it should be treated accordingly, the prevailing atmosphere of Southern resistance and growing Congressional strength called for a policy based on practical rather than theoretical considerations. But having recognised this, the Review itself immediately became unstuck by promptly asserting that on the issue of state rights, as it related to fixing suffrage qualifications, "From the point of view of the American Constitution, the Republicans have not a leg to stand on". Automatically, the need for

---

1 Sumner's argument that the South should properly be defined and dealt with as conquered territory was well known and discussed in the Scottish press.
exceptional measures to meet the peculiar needs of the Reconstruction situation was forgotten in the renewed concentration on describing the readiness of the Republicans to break the Constitution for their own ends. Whatever the practicalities called for under the circumstances, Radical policy for Reconstruction was doubly unpalatable and suspect because it was assumed to derive from a devious wartime goal, namely, a consistent aim to shift a reconstructed union on to a more radical base than the old:

While they [the Republicans] were fighting for Union it was not the old Union they wished to be preserved but a new one, or, at all events, one on a new basis they desired to establish. They aimed at the emancipation of the negroes not merely from actual servitude but from political, and, as far as possible, social inferiority. They wanted for the blacks not only liberty to choose their own masters and make their own bargains, but also to elect their own representatives ...

Since in the succeeding months there was an indisputable entrenching of Republican power in the United States, the Review, in common with greater authorities in the national press, accordingly concluded by early 1867 that America was on the brink of a revolution, brought about by the conflict between President and Congress. Congress, already recognizing in practice that the Constitution was destroyed by the spirit and implementation of Radical policies, was aiming to alter the whole structure of government by drastically reducing the President's power and increasing that of the Legislature. With Congress bent on a course of federalization, it was even possible that Johnson, if he could gather enough support from the North or the army, would find the South willing to help him.

The fact that throughout 1867 there was no respite in the vehemence of the strife between President and Congress not only encouraged speculations like those of the Daily Review but also prompted some relatively deeper thinking on the related questions of strict adherence to the Constitution

1 Daily Review, 22 Sept., 1866.
2 Ibid.
and basic adjustment of the governing mechanism in the United States. News that the House of Representatives had passed Congressman Ashley's resolution to have a committee appointed to investigate Johnson's actions with a view to possible impeachment was interpreted by the Aberdeen Journal as in itself constituting the beginning of a revolution - not in the crude sense of precipitating a direct display of physical force between the supporters of Johnson and the supporters of Congress, but in the sense of initiating a permanent, fundamental change in the traditional pattern of co-operation between Executive and Legislature. The Journal itself was careful to emphasize that the resolution was "revolutionary" not because of the mere fact of a possible impeachment, or because it was unprecedented, or even because it was probably unconstitutional, but because the grounds for it either implied certain conditions in the relationship between Congress and President which had not previously been supposed to exist, or resolved that these conditions should henceforth exist.

One of the major points which had now been clarified was that the President could not with impunity flout the wishes of Congress when these were backed by the mass of the people. Johnson's mistakes in this connection had given Congress the chance to make a bid to become a much greater power in the State, and if the attempt were successful, Presidential powers would in the future be much curtailed. The Aberdeen Journal did not, however, view this prospect with alarm; far from fearing that it would usher in an era of unrestrainable Congressional radicalism, the paper suggested that a switch in the relative basis of strength within the government was probably necessary in the altered circumstances of the United States. Before the Civil War, the independent action of the individual states had tended to

1 The resolution to establish a judiciary committee was passed on 7 Jan., 1867.
limit the influence of the Federal government and the President. But with the increased post-war centralization of power, it was possible that the sphere of Presidential action would have been so enlarged as to make it desirable to restrict the power of the Executive and develop that of the Legislature. There was, the Journal argued, some justification for revolutionizing the government to that extent.¹

Other sections of the Scottish press similarly began to reflect a growing conviction that there might be a positive need for a significant change in the functioning of the American legislative system following the war, and that every Congressional move in that direction should not be construed as a diabolical, unconstitutional Radical plot to seize the reins of government. Even conservatively minded elements could occasionally be forced to admit that Johnson had given "more provocation" than any former President, and that "Congress has sufficient motives, if not absolute necessity, for doing much more than merely giving the contumacious ruler a fright".² It was simply becoming less and less tenable to hope that Johnson could bring enough pressure to bear on events to forestall a substantial take-over of legislative power by Congress. Although by no means consistently approving the Radical Republican policy from this point forward,³ the Glasgow Herald did become reconciled to the fact that rigid attachment to every last principle of the Constitution was not going to produce a reconstruction settlement satisfactory to the victors. "Mr. Johnson and his party ... have failed to see", it declared, "what the Radicals have never lost sight of - although they may ... have lost sight of the Constitution - that the country

¹ Aberdeen Journal, 16 Jan., 1867.
² Inverness Courier, 17 Jan., 1867.
³ See, for instance, the bitter condemnation of the Radical "extremism" which had produced the First Reconstruction Act in Glasgow Herald, 14 March, 1867.
has been passing through a terrible revolution, and that it would have been madness in such circumstances to have held strictly by the letter of the law".  

Perhaps the most demonstrable change in attitude towards the legislative controversy in the United States was evident, however, in the Glasgow Sentinel. Having shown a consistent prejudice against a Radical policy under which, it was argued, "the people of the South will have to remain the voiceless slaves of the politicians of the North", the Sentinel by autumn, 1867, was adopting a more practical approach to the whole vexed issue. "The contest between the President and Congress", it stated, "is not very well understood in this country, because people will not take the trouble to inform themselves concerning the intricacies of American politics". Whether or not the Glasgow Sentinel was itself fully conversant with the complexities of the party set-up in America at that time is debatable; but at least the paper did now attempt to convey to its public the tremendous importance of the struggle for Americans, and to suggest that a strong case could be made for both sides in the contest.

As the Sentinel saw it, the question to be decided by the people was whether to return to the old form of government, represented by the policy of Johnson, or to frame a new system under which there would be only one supreme, all-sufficient head. Although there were some customary references to the Radical Republicans' persistent post-war violation of the Constitution, the Sentinel came to the conclusion that the question of the respective powers of Executive and Legislature could after all best be settled by basic change in the existing structure:

1 Ibid., 30 Jan., 1867.
2 Glasgow Sentinel, 10 March, 1866. See also above, pp. 342-343, 385-386.
The Federal system of state rights and state sovereignty has been tried and failed, and the Republican party are (sic) right in demanding that the Republic shall be a nation and not a Confederacy. The advantage of forming a central government, whose decisions cannot be overturned by local legislatives and executives is so apparent that it needs no argument to support it.¹

Yet, eighteen months before, the advantages of such a state of affairs had been far from obvious to the Glasgow Sentinel itself. On the contrary, "centralization" had been seen as an ominous force, likely to corrode republican institutions and ultimately to replace them by "all the pomp and power of empire".²

Instrumental in influencing the striking change in the paper's outlook was almost certainly the fact that "the people" in the United States had shown themselves to be behind the Congressional mode of Reconstruction. It remained the Sentinel's concern to champion the principle of democracy on the American model, and as we have already observed, it was never slow to adjust earlier principles and prejudices when these subsequently appeared to be out of step with the wishes of the majority in America.³ The desire to educate its readers into attitudes towards developments in the United States which seemed to reflect the mainstream of American thought was understandable enough. But behind all this, there was a conscious effort on the Sentinel's part to understand and come to terms with the fundamental changes which seemed to be emerging out of the confusion of Reconstruction politics.

Its rival in Glasgow, the North British Daily Mail, although also professing to be in general sympathy with American democracy, showed a distinctly less amenable attitude to the continuing "unconstitutional" behaviour of the Radicals, despite its early realization that Congress had the majority support of the nation and that Johnson would do well to yield to its supremacy.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., 10 March, 1866.
3 See above, Chapter III, pp. 151-152, 157-158.
Whereas the Sentinel was ready to emphasize how well American democracy was withstanding the stresses and strains of the prolonged contest between Executive and Legislature,¹ the Mail chose to contrast the rowdy, undignified nature of the American scene with the moderation which characterized party conflicts in Britain. The Republican party was judged to have "too much passion and empiricism" to be capable of formulating a solution.² When the Mail did come to match so many of its contemporary journals on deciding that the outcome of the struggle would probably be "a transformed political system", no attempt was made to discuss the necessity for this, or to speculate on its possible nature: there was merely the sour prediction that anarchy was sure to precede the change - "as surely as if Parliament and king were fighting on the field".³

By the end of 1867, a lessening of support for the Republicans in the United States was enough to raise hopes that the challenge from the Radical quarter had in fact passed without any permanent damage to the country's administrative institutions:

It [the swing from the Republicans] is a protest on the part of the people of the Northern States against the black race ruling any division of their Republic. Negro supremacy they will not tolerate ... To Northern eyes the Southern elections exhibit in a visible form the operation of a political system which has arisen from an inversion of the whole social order; and armed negro mobs and negro vigilance committees are alarming into opposition the very men who have felt it their duty to protect the blacks from oppression.⁴

The kaleidoscopic nature of American politics and American political affiliations at this time made it only too easy for Scottish observers to interpret favourable changes in the political climate in a way which satisfied their own prejudices and theories. And because these shifting patterns

---
¹ Glasgow Sentinel, 7 March, 1868.
² North British Daily Mail, 23 March, 1867.
³ Ibid., 21 Sept., 1867.
⁴ Ibid., 5 Dec., 1867.
made the American political scene far too complex to admit of detailed consideration in the Scottish press, there was a tendency, as in the case of the North British Daily Mail, to make sweeping value judgements on the latest developments of political Reconstruction while apparently remaining largely unconcerned with the subtleties and "intricacies" of the political moves in question.

The degree of perception brought to bear in the Scottish press on the United States during Reconstruction cut across domestic party lines, so that it was possible to find an ultra-Conservative journal such as the Edinburgh Courant taking on occasion a less superficial view of the trend in American affairs than the professedly liberal North British Daily Mail. Admittedly, the didactic element in the Courant's reporting on the United States had its effect on this. But, acknowledging the paper to be commenting and observing from a rigidly Conservative standpoint, and largely for the purpose of advancing the cause of international Conservatism, it deserves some credit for attempting to record and analyse, according to its own lights, "the great change which has recently come over the spirit of the United States' dream". 1

While remaining steadfastly convinced of "the evils which will inevitably flow from the tyrannical and arbitrary legislation of Congress", the Courant was therefore nevertheless prepared to accept the hard fact that - partly because there was no real "statesmanship" in America to save the situation - there could be no immediate way to end the Radical hegemony. The state of affairs had itself to some extent been brought about by a vital change in public mentality towards the relation of individual states to the centralized power. It was largely because Johnson would not recognize this vital change that the Courant finally became impatient with him and his "long

1 Edinburgh Courant, 14 Nov., 1867.
and futile struggle" against Congress. The American people had realized that the President's arguments, though based on the Constitution, disregarded the practical circumstances of the situation, since it simply was not tenable to leave the state rights issue exactly where it had stood before the Civil War. In the resultant confusion and vacuum of authority, "the Radicals, who have a clear purpose of their own, are able to assume the reins and drive the people as they please".\(^1\)

Yet the Radicals too, it was argued, could not realize, or more properly, would not admit, that the war had destroyed the Constitution, and that to proceed on a just legislative basis for all, the Constitution would have to be rigorously adapted to meet the new circumstances. Rather, Congress was prepared to make the most of the popular suspicion of Southern intentions and to implement, under the umbrella of the existing Constitution, a punitive Southern policy which would guarantee supremacy for the Republican party.

And so the game goes on. The President, with pedantic iteration, harps upon the Constitution, not seeing that the Constitution was irrevocably destroyed by the war; the Radicals, with cruelly steady purpose, ... are able to bend the Northern public to their purpose; and dejected and defeated, the South lies prostrate in the dust, while her enemies wrangle over her disjecta membra.\(^2\)

A later analysis of the situation reasserted the belief that the question of Reconstruction had early become removed from the sphere of national politics, and that the South had been made the battle-ground of contending parties. But this time it was clearly stated that Johnson had been the principal offender in refusing to recognize the altered political and administrative circumstances obtaining after the war. The Courant conceded that the Radicals had at least appreciated the facts better, and, with the people's support, had sought to adjust the legislature.\(^3\) Reference was made

---

1. Ibid., 31 July, 1867.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 11 Sept., 1867. See also ibid., 6 Dec., 1867, where the paper argued that Johnson's "absolute and defiant condemnation of Congress" had lost him the opportunity to win the support of those now disillusioned with the Radicals. See also ibid., 11 Dec., 1867.
to the *Times*’ argument that Johnson’s friendship had been "a fatal gift" to the South, causing the Radicals to be increasingly bitter towards the former Confederate states and Congress to be more exacting in its terms. And having demonstrated that the vaunted American ideals of free, constitutional government were in any case extinguished, the Edinburgh Courant was ready to agree with this estimation.¹

Scotland’s own equivalent of the *Times*, the *Scotsman*, had long argued broadly along these lines,² and throughout 1867 there was certainly no let-up in the pragmatism which had been adopted towards the Reconstruction situation. In mid-February, this was clearly demonstrated in an editorial which suggested that the best and wisest plan for the good of the nation would be for the Republicans boldly to "accept ... the truths of their situation, confess ... their inability to longer act under the Constitution, set ... it aside as a dead letter, and appeal ... to the country to support them in the revolutionary and radical changes that must ensue". Permanent peace could not be hoped for in America, it was argued, "until all old things are allowed to pass away and all things are made new".³ What was required was a rapid rebuilding of the government from its foundation up - a discarding of the old Constitution and the formation of a new "upon the same model in some things, but widely different in others".⁴ Praise for Johnson was limited to times when, as in his acquiescence in the military government bill, he "yield[ed] to the inexorable logic of necessity"; and acceptance of the situation by the Southern people, rather than a stubborn attachment to "sentimental ideas of their dignity", would be of great value to the

---

¹ Ibid., 11 Sept., 1867.
² See above, pp. 397-399.
³ Scotsman, 18 Feb., 1867.
⁴ Ibid., 2 March, 1867.
South, and would mean, in immediate practical terms, that it could get to work on controlling the Negro vote.\(^1\)

In mid-May, a new dimension was introduced through the *Scotsman*'s correspondent in America, whose reports appeared regularly from that time on. His copious descriptions of the temper of the South and his analyses of the political and social effects of Reconstruction throughout the Union, were based on the premise that American politics were no longer "unattractive" to British readers, that "since the questions of the elevation of a race, the complete revolution of the existing order of things, and the remodelling of the government of thirty millions of people have entered the political field here, there are few subjects more interesting than the observation of the progress of the work that is to ruin or save America".\(^2\) The correspondent fully subscribed to the paper's stated view that the United States Constitution had perished, embellishing the editorial line with the observation that "every one and any one tramples it beneath his feet; it is no longer spoken of with reverence, or even lamented, save by some aged and puerile politicians who forget that revolutions never go backward".\(^3\) Arguing that the Democrats had themselves been virtually annihilated by the war, he scornfully dismissed the remnants of the opposition party as particularly prone to "prate of the Constitution as it was, and dream of its restoration and their own, as Charles-Edward might have dreamed of regaining the crown his grandfather threw away.\(^4\)

So far as the politics of Reconstruction were concerned, however, one of the most immediately significant perspectives which the correspondent

---

2 *Ibid.*, 4 June, 1867, United States correspondent; hereafter indicated (U.S./c.)
3 *Ibid.*, see also 14 June, 1867.
brought to bear on the *Scotsman*'s general outlook was his assessment of the role of Johnson. He wrote of the President with a virulence of condemnation unparalleled by anything in the editorial columns, and the comprehensiveness of his reports probably meant that he was more widely read and more generally accepted as an authoritative voice on American affairs than were the leading articles. He maintained that the President had brought on the conflict between Congress and himself, an argument which was valid enough; but he also charged Johnson with being either ignorant or knowingly acting an insincere part which he lacked the courage to carry through.\(^1\) Editorially, the paper never went to such lengths. More in keeping with its usual stand was the correspondent's insistence that Johnson's activities were protracting Southern miseries, and that his interference had already delayed that section's re-admission to the Union: "They [the Southern whites] would much prefer that the President should let them and Congress alone. His interference has always brought only evil upon them".\(^2\) This theme was constantly repeated throughout the summer\(^3\) and was coupled in one report with the charge that Johnson had strengthened the Southern delusion that it was still in the Union and entitled to the exercise of its pre-war rights, including the protection of the Constitution. Presidential backing of that sort had, the correspondent declared, ultimately caused the South to see itself as the victim of a gross tyranny, and to adopt a spirit of defiance which had done much to kill the chances of an early rapprochement between North and South.\(^4\)

There was certainly a basis in fact for these arguments. From late 1865, as a direct result of Johnson's statements to and action towards the

---

2. *Ibid*.
South, the attitude of its press, for instance, had changed from one of early advising the Southern people to co-operate with the North to urging them to defy all "Radical" plans relating to the ex-rebel states. Contemporary American travellers to the South had noted a distinct change in the temper of the Southerners from acquiescence and submission to a bold clamour for the re-instatement of pre-war rights and privileges as 1865 progressed. In 1866, the Marquis of Lorne had encountered among Southerners a recognition of their position and a genuine desire to "prove themselves good citizens", but he had also been forced to admit a strong vein of ex-Confederate bitterness which did not seek immediate reprisals against the North, but which fed on the hope that the South might one day experience a resurgence similar to the Cavaliers at the Restoration, and on the fact that "the President is doing all he can to help us". Two years later, David Macrae found that "The feeling against Northern measures, Northern institutions, and Northern people was very strong, and seemed to have been imbibed even by the children", and that the animosity was all on the Southern side. The Scotsman, however, had consistently reported the response

1 A case in point was the New Orleans Picayune which in June, 1865 was advising the population of Louisiana to settle down quietly and accept the inevitable, but which became steadily more outspoken in its denunciations of the Radicals and their measures as increasing confidence was placed in the working out of Johnson's restoration policy. By the end of the year, a fighting spirit had completely replaced the old passivity - see McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 195-198.

2 See, for instance, Whitelaw Reid, After the War: A Southern Tour, May 1, 1865 to May 1, 1866 (London, 1866), p. 317. Reporting in December, 1865 the existence of a rebellious spirit in North Carolina, even provisional governor Holden had suggested to Johnson that government policy might have been too lenient - see McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 195-212.

3 Marquis of Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 303; 214-216.


5 Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 321 (fn.)
of the South to Reconstruction in extremely favourable terms, generally depicting Southern conduct since the surrender as "most exemplary", characterized by a desire to co-operate at all levels.\footnote{See, for instance, \textit{Scotsman}, 14 June, 6, 11, 20, 29, 30 Sept., 11, 18 Oct., 11 Dec., 1865; 12 March, 10 Sept., 11 Dec., 1866; 5, 10 April, 1867.} Closer to the situation, the American correspondent was able to put forward a much more positive analysis of Johnson's role in confusing and inciting the South than had earlier appeared in the paper's columns.

In the Scottish press as a whole, certainly the most direct echo of the \textit{Scotsman}'s correspondent's sentiments in this connection came from the Dundee Courier, which bluntly accused Johnson of being a prime cause of the Southern subjection to military rule: "He fostered that spirit in the South which compelled Congress, acting in the interests of the Federation, to adopt an exceptional law for the provisional maintenance of order in the Southern States".\footnote{Dundee Courier, 6 Dec., 1867.} The \textit{Daily Review} remained primarily concerned in conveying the ineptitude of an American Executive who simply set himself against the will of the majority,\footnote{Daily Review, 23 Feb., 9, 29, 30 Aug., 13 Sept., 9 Dec., 1867.} while the \textit{Glasgow Herald} continued to support the Presidential policy in principle but to recognize its total unworkability in practice.\footnote{Glasgow Herald, 26, 30 Jan., 27 Oct., 17 Dec., 1867.} And if the United Presbyterian church did not overtly censure Johnson for perpetuating a spirit of recalcitrance throughout the South, it did feel strongly enough about his singular "autocratic" course of action to criticize his attempt to readmit Southern representatives to Congress "though scarcely yet purged of their rebellion! ... Let him prepare tomorrow to make the necessary concessions; still, he has lost the time for making them gracefully, as became the President of the American Republic".\footnote{United Presbyterian Magazine, Jan., 1867, Vol. 11, p. 44.}
But perhaps the most scathing indictment of Johnson, both as an individual and as a President, was contained in a report by the Scotsman's correspondent in which he condemned the entire Johnson administration as "a succession of grievous errors and mistakes", concluding with the withering comment (which was doubtless meant to apply to more than the unfortunate President) that America was great not because of her public men but in spite of them. Yet, the strong current of anti-democratic sentiment which ran through large sections of the Scottish middle-class ensured that the tendency was always present to blame the nature of American political institutions rather than individuals for the mess in which the country found itself. This trend was best exemplified in the Scotsman itself, and in the ultra-conservatism of Charles Mackay's articles in Blackwood's Magazine.

For a rabidly pro-Johnson commentator like Mackay, the answer to the muddle clearly lay to a large extent in the evils of the nation's political system. The bitter conflict between the President and the dominant "fanatical" Republicans had had its origins in the fact that Johnson was a minority President. Obviously, then, this constituted a fault in the system. In the November issue of Blackwood he expanded on this conviction that Johnson had been the unfortunate victim of circumstances brought about by a faulty political machine. Tracing the trouble back to the choice of Johnson as Vice-President simply for reconciliation purposes, he insisted that the realization by Radical Republicans that Johnson would never have reached the Presidency on an elective basis had increased their bitterness and frustration at his ultimate refusal to move from his principles.

1 Scotsman (U.S./c.), 27 July, 1867.
3 Mackay, "The Impending Crisis in America" in ibid., Nov., 1867, Vol. 102, p. 636. Actually, Lincoln may have had more substantial reasons for offering Johnson the Vice-Presidency – see McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 90. But with Mackay's basic assumption that Johnson never had any real truck with the party organisation there can be no argument.
Despite its many attacks on Johnson's personal failings, the Scotsman also stuck by the idea voiced in the early stages of Reconstruction that the partisan nature of the United States Presidential office tended to increase rather than diminish political chaos. Even while recognizing Johnson's legal right to remove the Freedmen's Bureau chiefs, Sickles and Sheridan, the paper was not prepared to see the suspending of Sheridan as the act of an entirely disinterested Executive, dictated exclusively by the Constitution. It was judged rather as "too obviously" largely the act of a partisan who had had a favourite policy thwarted. The obvious difference between this example of the political system producing factiousness in the body politic and the examples suggested by Mackay is that in the Scotsman the onus of blame, as we should expect, rests more directly and substantially on Johnson. Neither the Scotsman nor Blackwood's Magazine made any serious efforts to try to discover whether the politicians of the Reconstruction era were motivated by anything other than partisan considerations. No useful purpose would have been served by such speculation. In the perpetual task of reassuring their readers of the immense superiority of British over American political institutions, the bogey of partisan politics was an indispensable part of the stock in trade. A proper understanding of the nature of the Reconstruction crisis was considerably hindered by undue cynicism in this section of the press, based on an exaggerated idea of the role of partisanship.

The alleged manipulation by Johnson of the political machine for self and party advancement was most forcibly argued for by the Scotsman's correspondent when he asserted that the President's course up until autumn, 1867, had been geared to defer black suffrage and to defy Congress in the hope of splitting the Republican party so badly that a Democratic President would

1 Scotsman, 11 Sept., 1867.
be elected in 1868 - Johnson himself. The removal of Sheridan and Sickles was seen as part of the plan.\(^1\) Such a bold assessment must have seemed remarkable even to those who had followed the American situation in depth, and who realized how closely Johnson's outlooks matched those of the Democrats by that time. Certainly, there is no indication of the idea finding support among Scottish observers in Scotland. There is, however, evidence that influential men behind the President - especially Seward - were pressing a conciliatory policy towards the South in the hopes that it would lead to the success and consolidation of a conservative party in the North through an election win in 1868. Their ultimate aim was a grand alliance of conservative forces which would eventually dominate American politics.\(^2\) But despite that attractive possibility, the Scotsman's correspondent did not regard Johnson's scheme as a viable step for the good of the country since the Democrats, he rightly emphasized, did not trust the President and had no confidence in his boldness.\(^3\) Following his extension of full pardon to ex-Confederates on 7 September, 1867, nobody could safely predict what his actions would be: "No party in the country has any confidence in him as a leader. They distrust him on various grounds and for various reasons - but all of them question his sincerity, his boldness and his strength."\(^4\)

Simply, the question resolved itself into the familiar one of indicating the sad lack of real statesmanship to which the inadequate American political system had given rise. Johnson's peculiar course was therefore judged to

\(^1\) Ibid. (U.S./c.), 11 Sept., 1867.
\(^3\) Both as a result of internal ruptures in the party and Johnson's ambiguous actions, many elements in the Democratic party had been uncertain of him almost from the start - see, for instance, the remarks of S.L.M. Barlow of the World in ibid., pp. 74-75. To a very large extent, suspicions were retained as confidence in the President's success sapped.
\(^4\) Scotsman (U.S./c.), 23 Sept., 1867.
be almost as much the product of earlier, inherent weaknesses in the American political experience as the cause of the current malaise during Reconstruction.¹

The acknowledgement of this did not, however, stop the Scotsman from continuing to hope that Johnson might take a practical view of the situation and change his disastrous policy. Through the autumn and winter of 1867 the predominant theme in the paper’s editorial comment continued to be that Johnson, in trying to do his best, was ultimately doing the South more harm than good. The feeling was strong enough to prompt the observation in one leader that the South could not be worse off if he were "obliterated tomorrow" - a drastic remedy but one which would at least end the section’s "feverish hopes [and] disastrous confusion".² Although there was some slight exasperation with the South for allowing itself to be led into a course of defiance by him,³ the burden of blame was still seen to rest on the President.

Even positive action taken by him with a view to aiding ex-Confederates rebounded and brought him in for more criticism. Thus his September amnesty was the cause of an unprecedentedly bitter condemnation. This particular act of his had come at a time when, the paper felt, there were real signs of a thawing out of North/South relations under Congressional Reconstruction. Thus the timing of the amnesty had coincided with the passage by Congress of measures to ensure the return to Congress of loyal men - had been, in fact, issued at a moment when every encouragement to the baffled and brooding Southerners to thwart the policy that, in spite of themselves, is designed to restore them to a place ... in the councils of the common country, creates new delays and dangers for the much needed reconstruction of the Union.⁴

¹ For a further clear example of this attitude, see ibid., 31 Oct., 1867.
² Ibid. (editorial), 11 Sept., 1867.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid., 25 Sept., 1867.
There was a stinging personal indictment of Johnson, too, for having issued the proclamation during the Congressional recess. This had obviously been done with the intention that its purposes should be served "before the actual rulers of the country can reassemble and undo the mischief. There is, therefore, a spice of cowardice in Mr. Johnson's courage". The Scotsman not only judged that was there bound to follow retaliation from Congress but also confidently predicted that with the reconvening of Congress there would be an increased zeal on the part of the Republicans to impeach the President "as nobody now doubts they will do". Impeachment on the grounds of Johnson's 'usurpation of power' was, of course, recommended by a five to four majority report of the Judiciary Committee immediately Congress convened on 2 December.

The nature of such criticism makes it clear that despite its references to his partisanship, the Scotsman, in common with the great bulk of the Scottish press, had come increasingly to adopt Johnson's own stand of seeing the struggle as a personal one, where the President was battling on alone for his principles against Congress and the Radicals. On that showing, it was only reasonable to hold Johnson more or less exclusively answerable for damaging the restoration of peace and order through inciting the South to resistance of Congressional Reconstruction. Certainly, the President was more guilty on this count than any other single individual, if only because of the weight his words carried as the nation's highest authority. It was extremely difficult for the Southerners to accept that the Executive could be 'wrong' in advising them on how to react - especially when the Executive

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid.
3 The Glasgow Herald, 14 March, 1867 recorded, for example, that the quarrel between Congress and President had "assumed a personal shape".
in question was so sympathetic to their condition. And worst of all was his occasional active intervention to crush tentative Southern approaches at co-operation, as demonstrated, for instance, in the instrumental part he had personally played in persuading Virginia and Alabama not to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment. Nevertheless, at least until a real worsening of Democratic confidence in Johnson during 1867, other forces were working towards basically the same ends as the President, and by virtually divorcing him from them, the Scottish press, with the Scotsman as the most important spokesman, tended to publish a somewhat warped understanding of the whole Reconstruction situation.

It was only in the reports of the Scotsman's American correspondent that Johnson's liaison with the Democrats was anything like effectively brought out. Of course, editorials in all sections of the press had occasionally referred in a vague way to the President's Democratic associations, apparently taking it for granted that he could be more or less completely identified with that party. But of the early Democratic pressure on Johnson to urge the South on in its recalcitrance, Scottish observers had no appreciation. Some of their criticism should, in fairness, have been channeled off against the Democrats who both backed and led him. The newspaper press in Scotland simply overestimated the extent of Johnson's personal intervention for good or evil. The misinterpretation is understandable enough: the time lag between communications from the United States made it difficult

---

1 See McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 454-455, 471-472.
2 At least until the establishment of military Reconstruction, the Democrats' main aim was to split the Republican party completely, and towards that end they actively used the South, urging it to prolong deadlock in North/South relationships. Democratic arguments that the South should stand firm against Northern radicalism were used in all the leading Southern newspapers. Johnson's constant affiliations were with men whose prime aims were to encourage Southern intransigence and to urge himself not to yield - see ibid., pp. 464-467. For how close Johnson had always been to the Democrats, see Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, passim.
to keep abreast of all the involved developments taking place in the country at that time. And naturally it was easier to chart the course of one man — and he the President — than to attempt to follow the machinations of the party out of power. All the same, the failure of the press to note the influence of the Democrats, conservative Republicans, Seward and others on Johnson meant proportionately less real understanding of the power structures operating within America during Reconstruction.

In the widespread readiness to identify a sweeping, fundamental change in the nature and functions of the various departments of government in the United States there was also room for a misreading of the actual situation. Again, this was most clearly reflected in the Scotsman's columns where by autumn, 1867 the argument was being put forward that Congress had carried through a total and successful coup, and that the President was relegated to the ranks of the politically ineffective. For all practical purposes, it judged, he spoke now merely as a private individual when he condemned the maintenance of military measures, spoke out against disqualifications from voting, and so forth:

We can see the policy that he would pursue if he were permitted to govern, and can find in that policy features recommending it at once to sympathy and to judgement; but it is on paper merely, and there is no hope that it will become more by its author's persistence in proclaiming that it is his ... The substance of power is gone from the President, and he only deludes himself by flaunting its shadows as if they frightened any one; he rumbles forth an idle thunder, it is Congress that forges and speeds the thunderbolt.¹

Reinforcing this idea was the observation on 18 October that after four weeks, Johnson's amnesty proclamation had had no perceptible effect on the political situation.² It was true, of course, that Congress had stripped the Executive of virtually all the instruments of government and leadership; yet, it has been pointed out that if Johnson had not remained a very active force there

¹ Scotsman, 25 Sept., 1867.
² Ibid., 18 Oct., 1867.
would have been no need for impeachment. The President's "rumblings" may have been empty but they were continuous and provocative enough to have a positive nuisance value for Congress. Johnson still had very definite policies and points of view to express, and he pushed them relentlessly from summer 1867 until the start of the impeachment proceedings. And there were always those in the North and - more importantly - in the South who were ready to listen to him.

It was not of course cheering for the Scotsman to witness the apparent eclipse of Johnson as an effective political force, especially as it viewed the vital question concerning America to be "whether Congress against the Constitution, or the President with the Constitution shall be the governing power". But neither continued sympathy for the Chief Executive's intentions nor the 'unconstitutional' moves of the Legislature could cloud its realism. Faced with an impasse where it had been obliged either to reluctantly accept a "Radical" Congress or to continue supporting Johnson's inefficacious course, the Scotsman had after all chosen to extricate itself by taking a bold reappraisal of the whole post-war situation which had included accepting the conclusion that the old Constitution was dead. Increasingly through 1867 it had been governed by a kind of negative utilitarianism, the avoidance of the greatest ills for the greatest number, which had made possible a grudging acquiescence in the victorious Radical Reconstruction programme. Acquiescence was slightly eased by the fact that the paper recognized Radical Reconstruction as being based on the will of the majority of the Northern people. An editorial comment in late September sums up nicely the position by that time:

These considerations [on which course it would be more practicable to follow] are quite apart from the question whether the unsuccessful policy on behalf of which Mr. Johnson makes such struggles and incurs such risks be wiser, kinder and safer than the policy actually pursued

1 McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 490.
2 Scotsman, 19 Dec., 1867.
by Congress. We have always held that the policy of confidence and
conciliation towards the ... South was the more statesmanlike and
salutary; and the bitterness and hopelessness that are now the
prevailing feelings at the South but show that the policy of distrust
and repression has produced its inevitable fruits. The facts, however,
have to be looked in the face. An overwhelming majority among the
people of these [Northern] States has resolved to rule the South with
a rod of iron, and for that end has by successive stages overridden ...
the Constitution and undermined the power of the President ... Mr.
Johnson has done the South an ill turn in encouraging it to do anything
but submit ... to the irresistible fate that is so heavily pressed
upon it by the armed hand of an arrogant majority.1

So far as the Scotsman was concerned, then, the roles which it had seen
as obtaining at the beginning of Johnson's term were by the end of 1867
reversed. Where Johnson had been judged in spring, 1865 the potential villain
restrained by the Northern people, the actual villain now was Radical Congress,
backed by the majority in the North.

Basically the same attitude was expressed by the Glasgow Herald which,
as has already been noted,2 adopted a similarly pragmatic outlook towards
the continuing battle over the rival Reconstruction policies. Radical
measures continued, however, to arouse impassioned comment. A bill proposing
to put the South under military jurisdiction, framed by the Joint Committee
on Recontrestruction and presented by Thaddeus Stevens, was denounced as "A
bill of pains and penalties ... without a precedent in the history of a
free country".3 The Congressional determination to legislate for the Negro
was more than ever seen to constitute a calculated policy of repression of
the Southern whites, and to offer a dangerous threat to the principle that
the suffrage was a privilege to be earned rather than a right to be granted:

They [the Radicals] wished to see the emancipated slave put upon an
equal footing with his late master, and to enjoy all the rights and
privileges of citizenship, whether he was fit for it or not.4

---

1 Ibid., 25 Sept., 1867. Emphasis added.
2 See above, pp. 416-417, 426.
3 Glasgow Herald, 14 March, 1867.
4 Glasgow Herald, 24 Sept., 1867.
When the results of the autumn state elections showed a decrease in the Republican vote, the Herald nicely illustrated the apparent inconsistency in its political make-up by simultaneously rejoicing over what it assumed to be a big step from conservatism to radicalism in Britain during 1867 (the Reform Act) and a "remarkable change" from radicalism to conservatism over the same period in the United States.¹ There was of course no real inconsistency in the Herald's attitude towards the relative developments in British and American politics at that time; the editorial was simply celebrating the triumph, in both cases, of political moderation. Commenting on the decisive defeat of a resolution to impeach Johnson at the end of the year, the paper reflected contentedly that in America, as elsewhere, there was a large body of moderate men ready to act as a check and to control overzealous party spirit. "These moderates are probably neither good Radicals nor good Democrats, but they are good citizens nevertheless, and their weight never fails to tell when a party crisis comes".² On the other hand, the Scotsman was relatively less sanguine about the impact of moderation in relation to the immediate situation in the United States. While the Edinburgh paper also accepted that the reverses in Radical fortunes in America had proved that a besetting sin in Britain and on the other side of the Atlantic, namely, the carrying of legislation "beyond its proper province", was bound to fail, it still remained far from convinced that the tide of Congressional Reconstruction, already so well established, could effectively be checked by the results of the November elections.³

Contemporaneously, Charles Mackay was also voicing misgivings on the political state of affairs in the United States. There existed, he believed, a group of evils potentially more conducive to civil strife than those

¹ Ibid., 27 Oct., 1867.
² Ibid., 12 Dec., 1867.
³ Scotsman, 28 Nov., 1867. See also ibid. (U.S./c.), 25 Nov., 1867.
obtaining before 1860. These he listed as Reconstruction under military control, the burden of a large national debt, universal political corruption, "the troublesome and hostile attitude assumed by the ignorant blacks under Radical guidance", the high tariff, the critical state of the National Bank, and the possibility of Johnson's impeachment and his resistance by force. Of these, he judged the greatest danger to be in Negro enfranchisement and the scope it had apparently given for the freedmen, assisted by Northern Radicals, to assert supremacy over Southern whites: "Nothing can come of the pretension but fearful bloodshed". Some consolation was naturally taken in the losses of the Radicals in the state elections then in progress, the results being seen to indicate a very strong, national reaction against "the unconstitutional and revolutionary violence of the Radical and pro-negro party" and a triumph for the Conservatives who would conciliate, do justice to Southern whites, and save them from Negro domination. But Mackay was nevertheless prepared to recognize that the Radicals would not succumb without first putting up a hard and possibly long fight.

He was still optimistic, however, that the President with the Constitution on his side might yet do much in the struggle, and after considering the contenders prospects of all the chief/as he saw them for the Presidency in 1868, concluded that the ultimate battle would probably be between Johnson representing the old order and Chase representing the new. Nevertheless, Mackay was forced to concede that Presidential failings were partly to blame for the deplorable Radical ascendancy obtaining in America, and he too came cautiously to criticize Johnson for having frequently stood in his own light. Like the

---

2 Ibid., pp. 646, 651.
3 Ibid., p. 637.
Stuarts and Bourbons, the President had always acted too late. His greatest faults had been the timidity and irresolution through which he had allowed unconstitutional characters such as Stanton to thwart his course. Along with granting an early general amnesty to the South, he should have dismissed Stanton and Seward immediately and appointed men who would have worked with him in carrying out the "great Conservative principles of the Constitution". The argument was later repeated and extended to include all secretaries who had not been appointed by Johnson and who had refused to co-operate with him.

Mackay's argument for the immediate sacking of Seward betrays a total lack of understanding of the President's extremely close association with and dependence on the Secretary of State during the early period of his term of office. In part, the conviction that he should have been got rid of probably derived from a widespread British animus against him for his earlier outbursts against Britain and from the personal antipathy which Mackay had by that time developed towards Seward. But it also fitted in exactly with the early Democratic desire to oust the influential secretary. S.L.M. Barlow, part-owner of the leading Democratic organ, the World, had believed in mid 1865 that Johnson had earmarked Seward and Stanton as the principal men he would get rid of; and Barlow let it be known that he felt the only drawback to Johnson's winning control of Congress through a coalition of conservative forces was his adherence to Seward and Stanton. Democratic leaders, looking

1 Ibid., p. 639
2 Mackay, "The American Constitution and the Impeachment of the President" in ibid., June, 1868, Vol. 103, p. 711.
3 For the instrumental role played by Seward in trying to manoeuvre a conservative coalition around Johnson, see Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 38-48.
4 See above, Chapter III, p. 196.
5 Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 50-51, 114.
to full endorsement of Johnson, were from the start "insistent that Seward and Stanton compromised the President in the eyes of the party and that both should be eliminated from the Cabinet". Indeed, Mackay may well have been unconsciously thinking in terms of something vaguely like the 'new party' of conservative forces envisaged by the Democrats when he insisted that Johnson should immediately have gathered round him in the Cabinet and elsewhere men of his own shade of political convictions.

Mackay's admonition was simply in line with many contemporary ones. Johnson was constantly urged to use his powers of patronage to quickly sweep his opponents from office, and the entrenchment of the Radicals in power was attributed to his failure to do so. In fact, he was not at all hesitant about using patronage for political ends. And it is the consensus of recent historians that there were severe limitations on the use of the appointive powers. Excessive use of these would unquestionably have done the President more harm than good; as Professor Brock has commented, "it was against the rules, as normally understood, to use patronage against the party itself". Johnson was restricted at every turn by the rules governing patronage, and the working of the whole appointments/removals machine was a very delicate process, requiring considerable finesse on the part of the operator. Naturally enough, Charles Mackay understood nothing of these limitations, nor could his personal, first-hand experience of the Lincoln administration with its easy, perfect manipulation of patronage have helped him in this respect. The result again was an over-simplification of the American scene.

1 Ibid., p. 59
2 This theme has been repeated by historians, for example Howard K. Beale, The Critical Year (New York, 1930), p. 117.
3 Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, pp. 107-108.
4 See ibid., pp. 107-126; McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 379-389; Brock, An American Crisis, pp. 164-166.
5 Brock, An American Crisis, p. 164.
6 It will be recalled that Mackay was in the United States as wartime correspondent for the London Times.
IV Reactions to the impeachment of the President

It becomes clear that by the end of 1867 there was within Scotland at least a general (if at times superficial) appreciation of the various strands, conflicting and complementary, which went to make up the web of Reconstruction debate. Especially noteworthy in this connection, perhaps, is the fact that while the consensus in the Scottish press came down in principle heavily in favour of the conciliatory, Johnsonian plan of Reconstruction, there were frequent suggestions that the Radicals’ aims were at least still appreciated, if not sometimes actually approved, by Scottish observers. It was not only in liberal, pro-Federal journals such as the Aberdeen Free Press that it was recognized that the North could not be expected to put up with Johnson’s belief that

the conquerors should resign power to the conquered, should allow the South to resume the ascendancy - as if there had been no rebellion, no war, no slavery to be put down, no social revolution to be effected in the South, no need for a change of policy.¹

Despite its steady opposition to Congressional Reconstruction, the North British Daily Mail, for instance, remained quite prepared to acknowledge that the Radicals could not be blamed for refusing to submit at the moment of their triumph to "a coalition of defeated and party opponents of the North", from whom Johnson’s plan of Reconstruction drew its support. Nor were they blameable, the Mail argued, for being anxious to preserve the freedmen’s condition since there was some indication that the ex-planters, left to themselves, would have attempted to revive slavery.² Indeed, perhaps the Mail substantially reflected the views of most Scottish commentators who thought this way but who also could not come to terms with the Radical programme

1 Aberdeen Free Press, 1 Feb., 1867. See also Aberdeen Journal, 2, 16 Jan., 1867; and Dundee Advertiser, 11 Jan., 1867.
2 North British Daily Mail, 5 Dec., 1867. See also ibid., 13 March, 1867; and Dundee Courier, 28 Aug., 6 Dec., 1867.
when it regretted the fact that the Democrats had not produced an alternative plan of Reconstruction, acceptable to moderate Republicans and to Johnson. At the opposite end of the American political spectrum, the President was, after all, as extreme in his fashion as were the Radical Republicans. And the general keynote of Scottish attitudes to the political solutions to Reconstruction was moderation.

The widespread belief among Whig and Conservative journals that the old veneration for the Constitution had been abandoned by the majority of the American people, and that a basic change of critical importance was taking place in the structure of United States government was instrumental in paving the way for the emergence of a solid (if occasionally fluctuating) pragmatism in Scottish thinking on the relative Reconstruction policies of President and Congress. In such an atmosphere, Johnson was bound to attract a great deal of criticism, prepared as he was to cling to his plan whatever the consequences for himself and for the nation. It is worth noting that by the end of 1867, the Scotsman and Blackwood's Magazine, two of the most knowledgeable journals commenting on the American situation, had arrived at directly opposed assessments of what constituted the American President's "greatest faults". For Blackwood, it was his "irresolution"; for the Scotsman, a resolution verging on sheer pig-headedness. For Blackwood, it was his "timidity"; for the Scotsman, a courage running into "obstinacy and recklessness". Yet despite the conflicting nature of the criticisms, both derived from the same source inasmuch as both were stimulated by the disillusionment (this admittedly worse in the Scotsman's case) and indeed fear engendered by Johnson's failure to stem the Radical tide. For the pragmatism which characterized so much of Scottish opinion was a pragmatism grounded in a very real apprehension of the likely consequences for Britain.

1 North British Daily Mail, 5 Dec., 1867.
as well as for the United States of an extension and intensification, under
Presidential pressure, of Radical activity in America. It would seem valid
enough to conclude that the common source of criticism of Johnson's course,
whether as ineffective or as basically lacking in practical common-sense,
was at bottom simply the middle-class fear of social revolution as per¬
sonified by the Radicals, a phenomenon which has been noted earlier. The
recent adjustment to the British political system was as nothing compared
to the apparently traumatic shift in the basis of power from moderates to
radicals in the United States. But in a year when Britain had undergone a
substantial widening of its franchise, it was particularly unhealthy and
unnerving to see the continuing ascendency across the Atlantic of what
tended to be stigmatized as neo-Jacobin forces.

No one was more aware of the revolutionary forces marshalling in the
United States than Charles Mackay; and once the impeachment of Johnson was
finally resolved on, and the trial got under way, he eagerly sought the
chance to support the President in \textit{Maga}, with the apposite reminder to
John Blackwood that "Radicalism is rampant in the States - and anarchy
threatens to be the consequence; unless some unlooked for return of good
sense seizes hold of the American people". In general, however, the news
that impeachment was to go ahead in earnest aroused little immediate excite¬
ment or speculation throughout the Scottish newspaper press. The \textit{Aberdeen
Journal}, for instance, contended that the Republicans had resolved on
impeachment a year before and had been checked only by public opposition.

\begin{itemize}
\item[1] See above, p. 365.
\item[2] He also happened to be desperately short of money at that time - see Mackay to Blackwood, 16 May, 1868, \textit{Bla. MSS.}, MS. 4237, fol. 53-54.
\item[4] \textit{Aberdeen Journal}, 11 March, 1868. Public opinion, it argued, had been brought into line with advanced Republican thought on this issue by Johnson's removal of Stanton.
\end{itemize}
In the *Scotsman*, the dawning of the impeachment year had been marked by an increasing weariness and loss of interest in the whole business of Reconstruction. At the beginning of February, the paper admitted that the ups and downs had become tiresome; there had been so many anti-climaxes that it was difficult to regard news of a fresh phase with "very vivid interest". The contest between Executive and Legislature was itself judged to be virtually over by this time. The Senate's refusal to concur in Stanton's suspension, Grant's quiet but real split with Johnson, and the fresh Supplementary Bill passed by the House of Representatives - "the events of 13-21 January" - had "very materially weakened Johnson's position and impaired the slender remnants of his prestige". The Supplementary Bill in particular was seen as "the most direct, boldest and most insolent" Congressional attack on Johnson to date, leaving him partly "annihilated". The crucial aspect of the measure was seen to be the elevation of Grant to a position of supreme authority over the South. While the *Scotsman* took his endowment with power to carry out the Reconstruction Laws as a definite sign of the approach of the military despotism which it had often predicted as the issue of the American conflict, the significant thing as it affected Johnson was that Congress had secured a man who was almost certain to comply with its wishes. To all intents and purposes, Congress had won.

There was consequently little excitement over the news that on 24 February the House of Representatives had finally voted for the President's impeachment. After all, in view of the *Scotsman's* assumptions regarding the situation already existing in America, even a successful attempt to oust Johnson could have been judged to make little basic difference - apart from

1 *Scotsman*, 6 Feb., 1868.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
a relative increase in upheaval - to the state of affairs in the nation. An impeachment involved dramatic recognition of the fact that all vestiges of co-operation and understanding between Executive and Legislature had finally dissolved. The Scotsman had recognized this months before and had constantly lamented over it. An impeachment involved a showing-up of the weaknesses of the country's political institutions, a humiliating example of governmental failure. The Scotsman had known from the start of Reconstruction and before that of the shortcomings of the American system, and had never lost the many opportunities afforded by the post-war political shambles of pointing them out. A successful impeachment involved the complete loss of his powers and the deposition of the President. By this time, as we have seen, the Scotsman considered Johnson already so stripped of his authority as to be virtually politically "annihilated". And if the impeachment attempt were unsuccessful, things could be expected to carry on much as they had done since the start of the struggle between Congress and President, until November brought a natural release.

Not even the decision to impeach could arouse enough sympathy for Johnson to move the Scotsman from its familiar position. His opposition to the Tenure Act and the Reconstruction Laws had been motivated by a desire to preserve and defend the Constitution, and as such, was excusable: "There is ... in what his friends call firmness, and his enemies obstinacy or something worse, something that looks commendable to those who are neutral. He is doing his best to be a drag on the furious and Jehu-like driving of the Republican majority of Congress".¹ The only flaw was that his course, while lawful, was certainly not expedient, and when it became obvious that resistance would only spur Congress on the more

¹ Ibid., 28 Feb., 1868.
it should [have] occur[red] to a sensible man that the Constitution would be better preserved by not irritating its enemies ... No doubt, we have it on political authority that the just man should see the shattered world dissolve rather than deviate from his purpose; but on the conscience of a statesman and a President, it ought to weigh heavier that he has brought about a sort of revolution than that he has made a concession.¹

The Scotsman's clear implication that Johnson had been the largest contributor to his own impeachment was echoed in the North British Daily Mail,² and in the Dundee Courier, which also stressed that although his imprudence and short-sightedness had led to his current difficulties, he still had the law and the Constitution on his side.³ From the other side of the political fence, the Dundee Advertiser quickly countered this by stating that Johnson had brought the impeachment trial on himself through his firm refusal to be answerable to the laws of the Republic and the will of the people, through his determination to be "President on his own terms or not at all".⁴ William McCombie's Aberdeen Free Press predictably argued along the same lines, although, believing that the grounds and reasons for impeachment were "very imperfectly understood" in Britain, it sought to elaborate on the causes of Congress' critical decision.

The consolidation of a strong, central government in the United States was, the Free Press argued, absolutely vital after the Civil War if continued peace and abolition were to be guaranteed. Congress had accepted this, but Johnson's policy and temper exhibited a "blind or obstinate determination" to act as if no alteration in the exercise of power was necessary. The conflict between the President and the Republican party had therefore been

¹ Ibid.
² North British Daily Mail, 27 Feb., 18 March, 1868.
³ Dundee Courier, 5 March, 1868.
⁴ Dundee Advertiser, 6 March, 1868.
brought to an impeachment crisis by a determination to arbitrarily restore state rights on the part of a President who was still a Southerner in outlook and proclivities, and only "temporarily and accidentally" an anti-slavery man. In such a climate, the Reconstruction Acts, and by implication, the impeachment trial itself, were permissible, since only extreme measures could have prevented the President from assuming and exercising absolute power in carrying out a policy by which the whole effects of the war - and notably that grand result, the extinction of slavery - would have been neutralised. 1

Both the Free Press and the Dundee Advertiser had their confidence in American democracy reinforced by the nature and outcome of the trial. The Free Press considered that with the possible exception of Britain, no country but America could have withstood so great a political crisis without descent into "anarchic confusion". 2 And when the verdict was known, the Dundee Advertiser, while emphasizing that even conviction would have produced no very disastrous results, rejoiced that by the acquittal of Johnson, justice in the United States had been shown to be scrupulously impartial. 3

But comment elsewhere tended to be much less favourable. In retrospect, M.E. Grant Duff, a Scottish M.P. sympathetic to America, judged the impeachment to be "a mismanaged business about which the less said the better". 4

1 Aberdeen Free Press, 27 March, 1868. See also Aberdeen Herald, 7 March, 1868.
2 Aberdeen Free Press, 27 March, 1868. See also Scotsman, 4 May, 1868, where the American correspondent acknowledged that amid the unedifying factors of the impeachment proceedings, the general tranquillity of the nation was highly creditable to the United States.
3 Dundee Advertiser, 19 May, 1868.

Grant Duff was Liberal M.P. for Elgin Burghs and became Under Secretary for India (under the Duke of Argyll) in Dec., 1868 - see ibid., 8 Dec., 1868.
His view was a fairly typical one. The very real shortcomings of the impeachment proceedings gave adequate scope for illustrating the shambles of American democratic processes at work, and the nature of the trial was loudly deprecated in many quarters at the press. The Scotsman made its attitude known in a series of laconic but derisory editorials which simply extended the emphasis on the deplorable condition of America as reported by the American correspondent on the eve of the impeachment resolution:

The epithet 'Traitor' is bandied from Democrat to Republican and from Republican to Democrat - the halls of Congress echo with mutual denunciations and passionate appeals amid the noise of which the small still voice of reason and argument is drowned; the ruling party rushes on its way, trampling everything that opposes its progress into the dust; a vast and irresponsible power is thrust into the hands of one man [Grant] whose greatest merit seems to be that amid a nation of brawlers he alone is silent...

On this showing, Johnson's public harangues, and the personal nature of his attacks, appeared not particularly out of step with the general tenor of American politics. The Glasgow Herald, in criticizing the impeachment attempt as a purely political move on the part of Congress, was indeed ready to argue that Johnson could not validly be censured for his virulent denunciations of Radical Congressmen since many members of Congress had been equally extreme in their verbal attacks on him. An unjust and unnecessary impeachment trial, with its basis in the weaknesses of the United States system, was bound to "lower the prestige of Republican institutions on this side of the Atlantic".

Certainly, Charles Mackay's description of the conduct of affairs at the impeachment trial was calculated to show up the character of American politics at its worst. With customary venomous skill, he chose to highlight

1 Scotsman, 22, 24, 28 April, 1868.
2 Ibid. (U.S./c.), 3 Feb., 1868.
3 Glasgow Herald, 8 April, 20 May, 1868.
4 Ibid., 20 May; 5 March, 8 April, 1868.
the performance of Thaddeus Stevens in presenting the articles of impeachment to the Senate, noting that for the opponents of the Radicals, it was "the melancholy exhibition of hatred and rancour surviving to the brink of the grave, and lending vitality to a frame well-nigh exhausted, and vigour to a spirit that, without much stimulant, might have quitted the feeble tenement through which it infused a fire that was not of heaven".¹

In most cases, the possibility that at least some of the Radical Republicans might be as anxious to win a free hand to carry through policies they sincerely believed in as to win political power for its own sake was simply not considered. The tendency was to suggest that the whole episode was a despicable trial of party strength,² and that a verdict against Johnson would be "a petty party triumph to degrade the President".³ Mackay found that the blatant attempts to cajole or buy Senators to the Radical viewpoint was but further evidence of the fact that in America, "politics are as much a profession as law or physic, and as much a trade as cheesemongery or green-grocery".⁴ And despite its satisfaction over the ability of American democracy to weather this particular crisis, the Glasgow Sentinel was disillusioned to the extent of being convinced that "the President owes his acquittal to money rather than to the justice of his cause".⁵

The connotation put on the outcome of the trial gave much more heart

² See, for instance, Edinburgh Courant, 7 March, 10 April, 1868; Daily Review, 20 March, 19 May, 1868; North British Daily Mail, 18 May, 1868; Inverness Courier, 21 May, 1868; Dundee Courier, 5 May, 1868.
³ North British Daily Mail, 18 May, 1868.
⁵ Glasgow Sentinel, 13 June, 1868.
to the *Daily Review*, however. For the paper, the result symbolized a re-emergence of Southern intelligence and statesmanship on the political scene. The Republican Senators had been "outwitted" by the superior minds of the South which, in pre-war days, had always dominated the country. While the North did have many cultured, eminent men, these tended to have little influence in that section compared with "the more turbulent constituents of society [in the South] ... The result [of the impeachment trial] should not therefore surprise us. It is the old superiority of cultivated minds - the superiority of the Damascus blade over the butcher's cleaver".¹

Generally, however, there was throughout the press a pronounced lack of interest in the actual verdict of the impeachment trial. Scottish observers made no special efforts to analyse the after effects of America's first attempt to dislodge the Executive. Perhaps too much analysis of and speculation on the changing nature of the American political scene had already been made by that time. There was some appreciation of the fact that the Americans themselves were making no fuss about the impeachment attempt,² and the Scottish press seemed keen to reflect their attitude. A fair indication of the wider reaction was given by the *Scotsman*, where comment on the final result was restricted to the brief intimation that Johnson had "completely triumphed".³ At this stage, only the American correspondent was prepared to recognize the real importance of the trial. In his report of 26 May, he judged the decision as to whether Johnson had criminally violated a law or not as

---

¹ See, for instance, Mackay, "The American Constitution and the Impeachment of the President", p. 727; *Scotsman* (U.S./c.), 30 April, 1868, in which the correspondent reported that anyone alluding to the subject of impeachment in New York was "looked upon as an enemy to mankind"; and *ibid.* (editorial), 4 May, 1869.

the smallest of all issues really involved in the case. For
the trial may be said, without exaggeration, to have been the
culmination of that struggle between Slavery and Freedom, and
between the conflicting principles of State Rights and central-ised power which had agitated the United States for thirty-six
years ...  
Allied to this was his readiness to admit that Johnson could scarcely be
regarded as the "complete victor" since although he had won through in
practical terms, he had morally been condemned by a majority of sixteen
votes: "Had the minority been seventeen, he would not only have been con-
demned but removed".  
Modern assessments of the motives behind impeachment have ranged from
seeing it purely as a psychological need on the part of Congress to judging
it "the major attempt on the part of Congress to control the Executive", the
failure of which squashed the nascent idea of legislative supremacy. The
tendency of at least some contemporary Americans was certainly to view it as
a trial of strength between Congress and President. This tendency was imp-
elicit also in Mackay's thinking: yet despite Johnson's ultimate victory, he
concluded in his article in the June, 1868 issue of Blackwood that the office
of President in the United States must from henceforth be doomed, relegated
to a mere shadow of power behind the substance of authority vested in Congress.
The apparent contradiction of the future roles of Executive and Legislature
as determined by Johnson's acquittal was based on the reasoning that a Con-
gress already powerful enough to instigate impeachment proceedings against
the President had already successfully reduced the office to that of a "mere

1 Ibid., 26 May, 1868. (U.S./c.)
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 1 June, 1868.
4 McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, pp. 488-489.
5 Brock, An American Crisis, p. 260.
6 Ibid.
clerk", a mere recorder of its decrees.¹ To some extent, Mackay, like the Scotsman, also seems to have judged that the question of Executive/Legislative supremacy had already been substantially settled before the impeachment bid. Indeed, this attitude was merely in line with that of other journals such as the Manchester Courier and the Irish Times which had also predicted that the President would become simply an executor of the will of Congress.²

Editorially, the Scotsman never did recognize the outcome of the trial as constituting any sort of watershed in the positions of Congress and President. On 6 March, 1869, it acknowledged as now existing the state of affairs which Mackay had predicted, but the occasion which it saw as having decisively marked the change was the inauguration of Grant. His inaugural address, it was felt, had formally chronicled a complete change which meant that from then on, the President would be something very different and very much less than he had been before. What constituted the great difference between Grant and Johnson was that the former had accepted the change as inevitable. It had been "a too faithful adherence to the letter of his patent of privileges with an obstinate ignoring, or blind ignorance of the silent change which events had worked in the position of the President and Congress, that made Mr. Andrew Johnson the execrated man he is". More than that, Johnson had professed to be guided by the will of the people while declining to take Congress as an index of it. There could be no way round the fact that now the sovereignty of the people as represented by Congress had been triumphant.³ Now that the contest between Executive and

---

1 Mackay, "The American Constitution and the Impeachment of the President" p. 727.
2 See Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 65.
3 Scotsman, 6 March, 1869.
Legislature was over, there was no criticism of Johnson for having failed to stem the tide of popular sovereignty but rather for having failed to go with it. The tone of the editorial suggests a fully complete recognition on the Scotsman's part of the concept that the Civil War had marked the end of an era in American politics. Johnson could therefore be seen as the last truly pre-war President, Grant as the first post-war Executive in the new capacity of adviser and executor to Congress. To a greater or lesser degree, it was a view shared and accepted, either regretfully or willingly, by a very substantial section of those who had kept the politics of Reconstruction firmly and consistently in view from the end of the Civil War onwards.

In the time that remained to Johnson as President after the impeachment attempt, there was evident in the Scottish press both a tendency to adopt new lines of thought about the American situation and to stabilize pre-existing attitudes towards Johnson and the late struggle between Executive and Legislature. Inevitably, the emphasis shifted from discussion of the constitutional and legal aspects of Reconstruction to consideration of the existing state of the South, the prospects of Republicans and Democrats in the forthcoming Presidential election, and, once the result of that was known, the probable future of the nation under Grant. The change in tenor of United States politics from the Congressional furore over impeachment to the routine feverish disruption of the months immediately preceding a Presidential election meant for the Scottish press the ending of the recurrent need to relate every political move in America to earlier moves by the contending factions during Johnson's term. The concern was for developments likely to effect future policies, and assessments of these provided room for fresh disillusionments as well as for fresh hopes.
In the Conservative and "moderate-Liberal" sections of the press, the greatest disillusionment which arose at this period was certainly in relation to a Democratic party which at its Convention in July, 1868 had adopted a fiscal policy based on the introduction of greenbacks. The Edinburgh Courant, which had always reserved a negative enthusiasm for the Democrats as the least of American evils in the party political sphere,¹ confessed itself "completely surprised" by the action. Disappointment was acute since the Democrats' move meant that the more conservative element in United States politics would face blacker prospects than it had ever done, and would be "shamefully beaten" in the ensuing Presidential election. There was a feeling, almost, that the Democrats had betrayed their allies in Britain. Thus the Courant petulantly reminded its readers that sensible men in Britain had all along favoured their "enlightened and humane" policy towards the South, and that the "friends of order and constitutional government" in the United States had been prepared to forgive the Democrats a very great deal because of their sound policy of Reconstruction.²

The Courant's response was closely paralleled by that of the Scotsman; indeed, the manner in which these two journals reacted to this assumed heresy on the part of the Democrats illustrates well how akin was Edinburgh's "moderate Liberal" and Conservative thought on the United States at that time. Apart from the bitter attack on the Democratic plan to pay off the national debt in greenbacks, the point was again made in Scotland's leading daily newspaper that the British sympathy accorded the Democrats during the Civil War had been extended into the post-war years in the belief that the party would resist a "mistaken and illegal" Reconstruction programme. In the face of a Democratic

¹ For instance, the Edinburgh Courant, 10 April, 1868, rejoiced over recent signs of Democratic resurgence "not because we believe the Democrats are imbued with any very seraphic morality, but they at least represent the least tainted section of American society".

² Ibid., 14 July, 1868.
fiscal policy which was directly inimical to British interests, however, concern about the nature of American Reconstruction was inevitably pushed into the background:

But such British sympathisers must now drop away. When the Republicans are distinguished from the Democrats by the former declaring 'We must pay the national debts honourably' and by the latter avowing 'We must pay the national debt - in paper', it cannot cost any disinterested person two moments reflection to decide that henceforth, or as long as dishonesty is the cred of the latter, his sympathies must go with the former.1

Predictably, however, the Scotsman itself did not show any real effort actively to transfer its sympathies to the Republican party. Echoing the American correspondent's conviction that there could be no effective Democratic rescission with regard to Southern policy,2 the paper simply cautioned the Democrats that "unconstitutional and void as the reconstruction laws may be, they have served their purpose", and irritably suggested that "Before the Democratic party can come into power, in any event, the Southern States will all be back in the Union again, as firmly as if the laws that brought them there had been wholly constitutional".3 But perhaps hopes remained that the Democrats might after all be successful in the Presidential election. Certainly, there was a tendency to take consolation from the belief that promises made in party platforms were never adhered to when the party was in power.4 And when the early election results showed significant gains for the

1 Scotsman, 13 July, 1868.
British financial interests, to whose reactions both the Scotsman and the Courant might be expected to have been exceptionally sensitive, had been markedly uneasy concerning the future of responsible American sentiment towards Union war debts. Ironically, the Fourteenth Amendment, which was the very measure designed to perpetuate national responsibility for the war debt, occasioned much of these British financial forebodings, as it was felt that a country whose fiscal integrity was to be relied on would not have to go to the length of affirming it in an Amendment to its Constitution.

2 See ibid. (U.S./c.), 25 June, 1868.

3 Ibid. (editorial), 12 Aug., 1868.

4 Ibid.
Republicans, the *Scotsman*, unable to understand the "stoppage of the Democratic reaction", turned to attack the Republicans: "The one thing clear in their policy was, not merely that the Southerners should be punished for rebellion, but that they should if possible be supplanted by the negroes and men from the Northern States". It was further alleged that the Republicans had made inroads on the Irish vote by sympathizing with Fenianism. And most important of all - the *Scotsman* had actually come seriously to doubt that the Republicans would pay the national debt in gold.¹

The *Edinburgh Courant* was similarly reluctant to attack the Democratic party as consistently as it had the Republican. Assessing the American situation on the death of Thaddeus Stevens (and incidentally believing that Stevens' passing had robbed the Democratic repudiationists of a powerful ally), the *Courant* recorded with satisfaction that the Moderate Republicans were in the ascendant in the United States: "Like the Fifth Monarchy men in England, the advanced Radicals will probably disappear in a short time from American history".² By early September, the paper felt immediate Democratic prospects to have improved dramatically, with erstwhile Republican supporters in America and Britain turning from their old affiliations, "confident that the Republican is a losing cause".³ The reason for this was simply the party's Reconstruction policy which, it was argued, would sooner or later lead to a war of races with the probable ultimate extermination of the Negroes.

Meanwhile, Northern men whose manhood is more to them than the triumph of their party must partake in a sense of degradation at seeing their fellow-subjects of (sic) the South dominated over because it suits the paltry aims of a faction, by the miserably ignorant negroes of the Southern States.⁴

---

So far as repudiation was concerned, there was only an oblique reference to "other questions" on which Grant, as the Republican nominee, was much safer. Perhaps because at this period there was an increasing volume of disturbance in the South, the Courant apparently chose to see the threat of national debt repudiation under the Democratic party as outweighed by the threat of "Negro supremacy" under the Republican party. Accordingly, when Grant became President, the paper rejoiced that the Democrats, strengthened as they were in Congress, "need not despair" and required only to drop repudiation and stand by their honest policy of Reconstruction to better their position. But the earlier disillusionment with the party proved to be not an entirely transitory thing. Commenting on the Convention in summer, 1869, the Courant decided that the Democrats had done little since the repudiation commitment to redeem their political reputation. On the contrary, the new platform adopted at Massachusetts was considered "very advanced", and the party was accused of trying to outdo the Republicans in radicalism. The paper concluded that "We are afraid that for a genuine Conservative party in America we must look somewhere else than to the ranks of the Democrats".

Glasgow's North British Daily Mail had never, of course, sought to find a bulwark of American conservatism in the Democratic party, but its frustration at the Democrats was just as real. Disappointment had already by late 1867 been registered over their failure to provide a working alternative plan of Reconstruction, but the greatest blow again proved to be the National Democratic Convention's resolution to support soft money. The decision was evidence that "[the Democrats] moral character appears to have

1 Ibid., 5 Nov., 1868.
2 Ibid., 27 Aug., 1869.
3 See above, p. 441.
sunk with their political fortunes. They now represent nothing but the worst features of political antagonism.¹ This view was reinforced in a later editorial where the Democrats were blamed for failing to recognize that bad relations between the races in the South was not the specific result of Republican legislation but an inevitable part of the social consequences of Negro emancipation. Democratic intimidation of freedmen for voting Republican was also criticized.²

For these erstwhile supporters of the Confederacy, the gross deviation of the Democratic party from the political straight and narrow was a blow which, coming at the back of Johnson's slender acquittal and just before a critically significant Presidential election, left them uncertain and reticent about the direction which United States politics would henceforth take. Basically, it meant that those essentially suspicious of American democracy were forced back to their traditional position of distrusting all sections of American politics, since the reassuring analogy between British Conservatives and the American Democrats - conveniently adopted when Johnson and the Democratic party were battling with "ultra-Radicals" - was no longer even vaguely tenable. And those elements, represented by the North British Daily Mail, which professed to admire American democracy but to eschew Republican "excesses" towards the defeated South were deprived of a worthy alternative party in the United States which they could fully support, so that (temporarily at least) interest in the politics of Reconstruction waned very considerably.

Only those "advanced Liberals" whose outlooks were reflected in a journal such as the Dundee Advertiser derived new hopes and confidence in the nature of America's immediate political development from the Democratic

¹ North British Daily Mail, 11 July, 1868
² Ibid., 26 Oct., 1868.
decision on the national debt. The Democrats' programme effectively ruined their chances of success in the forthcoming election, it was argued, and this was welcomed not only because of the known spirit of the party's domestic policies, but also because "it would be little short of a national calamity if a section so eager to humiliate this country should attain to power", the Democrats always having been strongest in abusing Britain.¹

At the same time, however, the Advertiser characteristically made the most of the Democratic party's discreditable record on slavery, arguing from reference to its behaviour on that issue that the repudiation move had been calculated to appeal to "all secret sympathisers with the Rebellion" in the North and the South, and to the Irish immigrants. When the Democrats subsequently won New York at the Presidential election, the latter element was held solely responsible, and brought to task for its attitude to the Negro:

Exactly the same feeling which is entertained towards the Irish in the Lancashire towns ... is entertained by the American Irish towards the negro, and just as unwisely.²

If the Negroes were accorded justice and security in the region and climate they were used to, they would, it was declared, offer no real competition to Irish labour in the North, just as if the Irish had better prospects in Ireland, there would be less emigration to Scotland and England.³ The analogy appears to lend itself to unfavourable interpretation, but, acknowledging a tendency to subscribe to the standard post-Civil War belief that the Negro race was best adapted to the Southern climate and acknowledging also the fact that many of the Advertiser's readers probably wanted to see the flow of Irish immigration to Dundee halted, there was a genuine

¹ Dundee Advertiser, 10 July, 1868.
² Ibid., 24 Nov., 1868.
³ Ibid.
concern for the victimised in both cases.\(^1\)

Certainly, one of the greatest sources of fresh hope which the paper derived from Grant's accession to the Presidency was in his proven concern for the Negro freedmen. It was stressed that no leading man in America - not even an avowed abolitionist - had spoken out more distinctly for the Negro than Grant. "He had negroes for soldiers, and he knows how bravely and faithfully they fought and died".\(^2\)

The Dundee Advertiser's euphoria over Grant was not unique, however. Although for very different reasons from those of the Advertiser, various elements in the Scottish press responded optimistically to the election of Johnson's successor. In Dundee itself, the Courier voiced a reaction typical of that made by observers who above all desired to see moderation characterize the future course of American Reconstruction. The "whole system of America" still needed to recover from the shock of the Civil War. Grant's tremendous popularity, the indications that he would be a frank and straightforward rather than a brilliant President, and most importantly, his recognized standing as a man prepared to be merciful to the South\(^3\) were all

---

\(^{1}\) For the attitude of the Dundee Advertiser to the general social and political status of the freed Negro, see Chapters VI and VII. So far as Ireland was concerned, John Leng, as Liberal M.P. for Dundee as well as proprietor of the Advertiser, subsequently supported Gladstone's Home Rule Bills - see DNB, Vol. 2 (second supplement), p. 455. The Advertiser showed no anti-Catholic bias, but in this respect it may not have reflected the sentiments of the bulk of its readers. Thus, during a serious trade depression in Dundee in early 1869, George W. Anstiss, Incumbent of St. Mary Magdalene's, wrote to the paper calling attention to the sickness and distress he had been notified of and the extreme poverty he had discovered in the closes, and asking for contribution of money, clothing and so forth - see Dundee Advertiser, 1 Jan., 1869. "A Dundonian" vigorously objected to the appeal, maintaining that "in Dundee - the Geneva of Scotland - it is entirely out of place" and suggesting that if the appeal had been for a widespread general charity it would have been more permissible than that for a congregation which formed "an infinitesimal portion of the community". Ibid., 5 Jan., 1869.

\(^{2}\) Ibid., 9 March, 1869. Grant was also credited with having enlightened attitudes towards the American Indians.

\(^{3}\) Dundee Courier, 6 March, 1869.
cause for confidence that he would effectively cure the nation's ills in a manner acceptable to the less advanced Radical elements in the United States and in Britain. This hope was earnestly held and most clearly expressed by the Glasgow Herald, which recalled his earlier Report for Johnson on the state of the South as proof that he did not belong to the Radical section of the Republican party. "The general idea seems to be that he will moderate the rashness of the Republicans, and represent less the spirit of the party than the general good sense of the nation". It was acknowledged that the difficulties of Reconstruction were immense, and that perhaps it was beyond the powers of any one statesman to effect a lasting, conciliatory settlement; but the ultimately reassuring factor about Grant was that, unlike Johnson, he would not become entangled in theoretical arguments about the Constitution, or be deceived, like the extreme Republicans, by "fervent dreams of negro equality or supremacy".1

This enthusiasm was amply shared by the most Conservative elements. The Edinburgh Courant gladly welcomed Grant as President,2 and confidence was greatly increased by an inaugural proclamation which, it was felt, had shown him to possess a moral courage which would make him an effective President: "we think no more worthy man could be found in the United States ... [H]e is an American Conservative, in the true sense of being not altogether a Republican, or altogether a Democrat, but a member of the NATIONAL PARTY".3 This conveniently labelled fiction indicates the extent to which the Courant still desired to see in America a powerful fusion of all moderate and conservative elements under a sympathetic Executive - an amalgam which would be strong enough to push through the cautious, conciliatory policy of Recon-

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 9 Nov., 1868
2 Edinburgh Courant, 5 Nov., 1868; 20 Feb., 1869.
3 Ibid., 6 March, 1869.
Northern life by his ruthless military strategy, and branding him "the conqueror of one-half of his countrymen". More importantly, his great support was based in the Republican party, in the party of anti-Southerners, "Negrophilists", and all the "immense multitude" who loved the Union above liberty or anything else. But he did also command at least the muted support of the "Union wing" of the Democratic party, so that in mere terms of the volume of sympathy and goodwill, he had become President under very favourable auspices indeed.¹

Mackay was prepared to recognize a considerable degree of merit in Grant's inaugural speech, but he retained a strong conservative scepticism towards the prospects for the "new era" in America primarily because he did not choose to place any significant hopes for a remodelled Reconstruction policy, or for a progression towards American "conservatism", in the Grant regime. He did, of course, acknowledge that the new President still faced the formidable task of more effectively bringing North and South together, and that this must be done "by wise memories, wise forgetfulness, wise condonation, wise lenity, wise reticence". But at the same time, he predicted that the Negro question would soon become a bore and that the important issue of Grant's term would be finance - the question of the national debt. And in this connection, Mackay saw nothing in his contemplation of the struggles ahead which caused him to waver in his essentially pessimistic view of the immediate future in America.²

Scottish attitudes to political initiatives and to the succession of Grant to the Presidency were therefore governed by preconceived ideas regarding the character of American politics and American politicians, but also by new hopes and disillusionments springing from the assumed effects

¹ Mackay, "The Outgoing and the Incoming President", p. 449.
² Ibid., pp. 462-463.
of new policy departures. And of course much also depended on which particular aspect of American affairs was seen to constitute the greatest concern at that time. Despite Mackay's focus on the issue of the national debt, and his casual dismissal of "the Negro question", it is clear that most Scottish observers implicitly recognized that in the initial stages at least, Grant's abilities as a President would be largely judged by his practical response to the problems of Reconstruction. This conviction was reinforced by the fact that in the sphere of race relations, and, indeed, in almost every respect, the already chronic post-war condition of the South seemed to be rapidly deteriorating.

For Scottish commentators, the most disturbing feature of all was certainly the apparent upsurge in violence within the Southern states. The Ku Klux Klan had first come to the attention of the press in mid-April, 1868: and as an organization shrouded in mystery and secrecy, with "a hideous and wholly unintelligible name", it immediately aroused suspicious condemnation in most quarters. Even the North British Daily Mail, which had always tended rather to argue in terms of a Northern conspiracy dedicated to extreme repression of the South, denounced the Klan as an "American Carbonari" organized to wage secret war against the North. The Mail was in no measure prepared to countenance its murderous activities, and early recognized the need for stern reprisals: "pistol-shots can be fittingly answered only with halters". A reader who felt the same way defined it as an "association of assassins in the Southern states", and suggested that the name had been derived from a corruption of the Greek word for a circle, kuklos: "Circles have played a prominent part in Fenianism; and what could be more natural than their importation into the Ku Klux Klan?"

1 Scotsman, (U.S./c.), 21 April, 1868.
2 See above, Chapter II, p. 120.
3 North British Daily Mail, 22 April, 1868.
4 Letter from "C" in ibid., 25 April, 1868.
To some extent, indeed, the Ku Klux Klan was at the outset held to be of special importance because it formed one vivid, violent manifestation of a plethora of secret political organizations in the United States at that time. The Dundee Courier maintained that these "wild, lawless" associations had sprung up in the absence of strong government during the protracted contest between Congress and President. And although the paper clearly had no real idea of what the Klan stood to achieve, it did, perhaps, attempt to play down the fact that this was an exclusively Southern phenomenon perpetrating unique atrocities in the name of the South, by grouping it with the general "anarchistic" stream in contemporary American society:

We had something of the same thing in England during the civil wars of the 17th century — and it is really a sort of civilwar that is going on in America at present — when the vagaries of the Fifth Monarchy men and other enthusiasts startled the nation almost as much as the contending cannon of Royalists and Roundheads. Later in the year, however, the Courier was forced to concede the singularity of Klan actions in producing the "horrible" disorders and the violent animosity towards the Negroes in the South, and to complain of the South's "highly injudicious" course of opening old sores by reminders of the war.

But the most significant and consistent publicizing of the unsettled state of the South was in the columns of the Scotsman itself. In an early report on the Ku Klux Klan, the paper's American correspondent set the tone for his subsequent outlooks on the subject of Southern unrest during 1868. The Klan he judged to be a direct and natural outgrowth of Southern society: there had always, he argued, been a strong proclivity in the Southern people for secret political societies, and after the war, they had soon begun "to

1 An editorial in the Dundee Courier, 20 April, 1868, wondered if Britain would end up with a Ku Klux Klan as part of its "Americanization".
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 16 Oct., 1868. There had been some implication, however, that the Courier was prepared to accept as inevitable a considerable degree of violent action by the Southern whites — see Ibid., 1 Sept., 1868.
practise their old tricks". The report sought to bring out the full horror and savagery of Klan methods and motives; and if the Scotsman editorials had set a tradition of sympathy and understanding towards the courageous - if sometimes bitter - Southerners, the correspondent did not respect it. The fierce intimidation of Negro voters, the murderous attempt to drive all Northerners out of the South, and the systematic attacks on the Loyal League were bluntly ascribed to "the young men of the South", members of an organization in which "the purposes seem to be political, but the tools with which it works are assassination, murder, robbery, and terrorism". Criticism was simultaneously heaped on the Southern press for condoning and fostering the spirit of lawlessness, a spirit which, it was stated, would do nothing to change advantageously the existing Congressional policy towards the South.¹

The main value of the Scotsman correspondent's reports on the South at this period lay, indeed, in his readiness and ability to convey a sense of the interplay of forces contributing to Southern intransigence and violent action. His relative lack of prejudice for either the Northern or Southern point of view during Reconstruction² left him free to imply that military government over the South was a form of oppression,³ but also clearly to demonstrate that a very large portion of the Southern people could not be exonerated from the charge of nursing a bitter, futile and sometimes militant hatred towards the Northern Reconstructionists and the Negro freedmen.

¹ Scotsman (U.S./c.), 21 April, 1868.
² Over the years, the Scotsman's correspondent did not send back strictly consistent reports on the Reconstruction situation. Certainly, he tended to recognize the necessity for much of the Radicals' Reconstruction programme, and he isolated its good points in a manner in which the Scotsman editorials never did. But he could just as readily switch in a subsequent report to a fairly strong defence of a particular Southern viewpoint. And he did consider the Democratic, pro-Southern New York World to be "the most able paper in the metropolis" - see ibid.
³ Ibid.
Especially strong criticism was reserved for the "bloodthirstiness" exhibited by certain influential men in the South. Senator Robert Toombs of Georgia was held to be a leading offender in this respect, and was severely denounced for urging the people of his state to take revenge on the Radical policy makers: "[he is] one of the Elijah Pogroms of the country ... who is now 'firing the Southern heart' just as he did eight years ago, but who took uncommonly good care never to fire anything else during the war".\(^1\)

Nor was he alone in his determination to resist the Reconstruction laws if necessary, and to rouse the populace. The correspondent stressed that throughout the South, leading ex-Confederates were "'stirring up a muss'" in support of Seymour and Blair, the Democratic nominees for President and Vice-President, and being successful to the point of inspiring the reorganization of former regiments and battalions.\(^2\)

And as the correspondent reported it, behind the extreme, organized violence of the Ku Klux Klan and the insidious influence of powerful Southern agitators, there was the open sporadic violence of ordinary civilians in any Southern town. The latter element was forcefully highlighted in a report on the "pre-meditated and cold-blooded" massacre of Negroes by Southern whites at Camilla, Georgia, on 19 September, 1868. It was emphasized that the whole significance of the Camilla "outrage" was its demonstration of the extent to which the work of Reconstruction was incomplete in Georgia, the extent to which the old spirit of slavery and the intolerance of free speech still prevailed:

No sooner are these people relieved from military control than they begin to kill each other ... Of course, there would be peace in the South if the negroes and the white Republicans would resign their political rights and leave the Democrats to have their own way. But peace on any other terms seems almost hopeless.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Ibid. (U.S./c.), 3 Aug., 1868.
\(^2\) Ibid., 15 Aug., 1868.
\(^3\) Ibid., 12 Oct., 1868.
The gloomy picture was reinforced by a catalogue of further white atrocities and acts of defiance from various regions of the South.\(^1\)

However closely they followed the course of events in the South, and however much they deplored the increase in disturbance and disaffection there, it was not possible for Scottish commentators observing the situation from the British side of the Atlantic to appreciate the sense of disillusionment with all schemes designed to offer a reasonable solution, or the feeling of utter hopelessness, which could overtake an observer seeing conditions in the South at first hand.\(^2\) Therefore, in communicating these sentiments, the Scotsman's United States correspondent added to the Scottish outlook on America a dimension generally lacking in home-based comments on Reconstruction. The absence of Scottish travellers to the South who were prepared to record the full extent of Southern unrest and violence at this critical, formative period\(^3\) renders the correspondent's reports the more valuable in this connection. Certainly, as we have observed, the Scottish press was not unaware of, or even unduly reticent about, the extremely unsettled state of the South. But attitudes towards it were for the most part severely rational and unemotional.

Because it was never really doubted but that a general satisfactory solution to the immense problem of Reconstruction would somehow emerge, a measure of actual social upheaval in the Southern states could even be

---


2 The South throughout Reconstruction could have the same dispiriting effect on Northerners sincerely committed to the attempt to reconstruct it fairly - see, for instance, the mood ultimately assumed by Governor Ames of Mississippi in Blanche A. Ames, *Adelbert Ames, 1835-1933* (London, 1964), pp. 399-402, 465-471.

3 David Macrae was in the South at this time, but apart from a footnoted reference in his book to the continuing existence of Southern hostility towards the North (see above, p.425) he totally avoided the vexed issue of Southern disaffection. The Ku Klux Klan, for instance, is not mentioned.
accepted with a fair degree of equanimity. Thus, at the time when the Scotsman's correspondent was despairing of the state of affairs there, the Glasgow Herald, for instance, was emphasizing that it was "reasonable enough" to find "numerous difficulties" and a very slow pace of Reconstruction in that section of the Union since the very groundwork of society had been changed. It was not to be expected that four millions of ex-slaves would immediately become "sober-living, intelligent citizens", or that haughty slave-owners would look on the loss of their slave property complacently: "we had every right to expect serious obstacles in the process of 'levelling up', from the ignorance and inexperience of one party, and from the jealousy and chagrin of the other". But while the ex-planter Democrats were credited with fomenting part of the recalcitrant Southern spirit, it seemed more reasonable, on balance, to find most of the jealousy, distrust and suspicions due to "Northern firebrands and fanatics ... and raving propagandists" who were stirring up the Negroes against their former masters.¹

Similarly, although it showed relatively more concern over the possible outcome of continued widespread Southern unrest, the Daily Review, in arguing for the retention of troops in the South, maintained an essentially cool attitude of appraisal towards the situation:

The Southern whites, though beaten by the superior force of the North are, we take it, strong enough to deal summarily with the negroes, and fierce and passionate enough to do it. Left to themselves they would be masters, law or no law. The choice of the blacks would be submission, or worse, possibly - for they are not property now - extermination.²

But on most elements in the Scottish press - including those journals such as the Dundee Advertiser and the Aberdeen Free Press which maintained a concern for the condition of the freedmen - the knowledge of the riots and disorders perpetrated by ex-Confederates had surprisingly little

¹ Glasgow Herald, 10 Oct., 1868.
² Daily Review, 12 Dec., 1868.
impact. Perhaps there was a genuine belief in most quarters that the troubles in the South were less due to endemic, apparently unextinguishable antagonisms with the "reconstructed" section than to temporary upheavals brought about by the frustration springing from the long conflict between Executive and Legislature. And disruptions which had their basis in the extraordinary circumstances of the Johnson era could, it was hoped, be fairly rapidly settled by the new President working in harmony with Congress.

VI Final assessments of Andrew Johnson

So far as Johnson himself was concerned, he and his policies were effectively dismissed from serious consideration after the impeachment trial. But there remained the retrospective judgements - indications, generally, that attitudes formed towards him at the height of his struggle with Congress had not substantially changed. Thus, the active encouragement he gave to the South not to ratify the Fourteenth Amendment and his outspoken condemnation of Congressional policy in his last Message to Congress confirmed all the Dundee Advertiser's worst feelings about him, and helped to prompt the final conclusion that with his passing from office, a dead weight had been lifted from America. He had been "the least efficient and most dangerous of all their Presidents", The happy result for the radical Advertiser was that radicalism, acting in the interests of liberty and justice, had triumphed over the dangerous forces of political reaction in the United States.

The paper's mood was shared by those of a kindred spirit on the other side of the Atlantic. Hence Garrison, for instance, had described well the essence of this feeling of release when earlier in 1859 he wrote to the

---

1 The Dundee Advertiser carried no editorial comment on the Southern disturbances of late 1868. In its review of 1868, the Aberdeen Free Press briefly alluded to the fact that Southern conduct had effectively killed any sympathy for the South on the part of Northern moderates - see Aberdeen Free Press, 1 Jan., 1869.

2 Dundee Advertiser, 24 Nov., 11 Dec., 1868.

3 Ibid., 9 March, 1869.
prominent English abolitionist, Mary Estlin, that the American Presidential election had been "a mighty trial of strength between the powers of light and darkness, of good and evil, of liberty and slavery", where right had gloriously prevailed, leaving bright hopes for the future. "When Andrew Johnson shall leave the White House ... on the 4th of March, there ... undoubtedly will be deep regret among the bad; but jubilation among the wise, the good, the patriotic, the friends of equal rights universally. So bad a man has never before been raised to such a station of trust in this country". ¹

But if Scottish radicals could rejoice in the "defeat" of the outgoing President, Scottish conservatives could conversely claim to be satisfied with the final reckoning on his Presidency. In the Edinburgh Courant's judgement, as well as opposing the scheme for "negro supremacy" in the South and preserving "relatively friendly" relations with Britain, Johnson had, most importantly of all, been "a pertinacious and happily successful champion of law against the most unscrupulous cabal that has ever held power even in America".² The Courant had earlier, however, been as exasperated by Johnson's lack of statesmanship as had most other Scottish observers, and it only took his final Message to Congress to bring about a sweeping reversal of the assessment of his contribution as President. It was carefully emphasized that as an organ of Scottish Conservatism, the Courant had never had any sympathy with the Radicals, and rarely even with the more moderate Republicans, in the United States. But the main burden of the editorial was to deprecate Johnson for an "obstinacy and perversity"

¹ William Lloyd Garrison to Mary Estlin, 1 Jan., 1869, Estlin Papers, 1840-1884, Microfilm N745/24.124.7, Edinburgh University Library. An extract from Garrison's letter, including these observations, was published in Robert Smeal's British Friend, April, 1869, pp. 87-88.
² Edinburgh Courant, 5 Nov., 1868.
which had led him to pursue a policy calculated to push the Radicals to ever greater extremes. The final word on Johnson from this conservative source therefore came to approximate very closely to that of the radical source we have already considered: "America has had a good many Presidents during the eighty-five years of its existence; but we doubt if it ever had one who has done more mischief to the country than Andrew Johnson". ¹

The most comprehensive assessments of Johnson's role from the Conservative and moderate-Liberal viewpoints respectively were made, however, by Blackwood's Magazine and the Scotsman. And in these there was, again, little significant change in the attitudes already formulated. Writing in Blackwood, Charles Mackay had never really favoured the common argument that Johnson should have sacrificed principle for expediency in his Reconstruction policy. Unable even by June, 1868, to subordinate his personal opinions on how the South should, ideally, be treated to the more objective consideration of whether it was not better, for the sake of peace, to acquiesce in the Congressional plan, he continued retrospectively to applaud Johnson's vetoes of Congressional measures. It was an applause born as much of bitter hatred for the Radical Republicans and their policies as of positive admiration for the President's course per se. There was the resentment at their "eternal babble about the negroes - the continual hypocrisy of interest in the welfare of the freedman, the sole object of which was to obtain the negro vote for the Republican party in the election of 1868".² There was also the loathing for individuals like Stevens, whom he stigmatized as "the Robespierre, Danton and Marat of America all rolled into one".³ Such a judgement fitted in perfectly with the widely prevalent view of all American Radicals as

¹ Ibid., 12 Dec., 1868. The Courant did later imply that Johnson might have been proportionately less personally to blame for precipitating Radical measures, however, when it argued that a collision between Legislature and Executive was probably largely unavoidable at that time, whatever the character of the President. See ibid., 9 March, 1869.


³ Ibid., p. 717.
revolutionaries, a view which we have already noted the Scotsman adhering to. Mackay's respect for the President's steady devotion to his principles led him to believe that Johnson had actually coveted impeachment. The trial had really come about because Johnson, not content with a moral victory over Grant, had wanted a physical victory over Congress and Stanton: "He had a strong conviction that he was right and preferred dismissal for support of the Constitution to continuance in office on the sufferance of a Legislature which had usurped powers not legally belonging to it". His conduct throughout the impeachment proceedings had been "exemplary", and he was bound, Mackay estimated, to be assured a high place in history:

The worst that can be said of his public character is that he is too good a man for revolutionary times, too honest for an effective party ruler, and too tardy in all his actions, however rightful these may be, to be available as a hero, though well adapted to become a martyr.3

Johnson, in fact, delighted in seeing himself in the role of martyr; and almost certainly it was from the content of his speeches that Mackay imbibed the belief that he was ready to sacrifice himself for the Constitution. For instance, during his swing-around-the-circle he had constantly repeated that he would be willing to pour out the last drop of his blood as "a libation for his country's salvation".4 Professor McKitrick has concluded that Johnson saw politics in terms of principles to be defended rather than as

1 Mackay's image of Stevens as the evil genius behind the push towards extremism in Congress was not, of course, unique among contemporaries, and it foreshadowed the much later assessments of writers such as George F. Milton and J.C. Randall — see Milton, The Age of Hate: Andrew Johnson and the Radicals (New York, 1930), p. 265; Randall, The Civil War and Reconstruction (Boston, 1937), p. 723. Stevens' role in this connection has recently been depreciated by McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 268.
2 Mackay, "The American Constitution and the Impeachment of the President", p. 716.
3 Ibid., p. 727.
4 See McKitrick, Andrew Johnson, p. 432; also pp. 292-293.
a party organization geared to winning elections. The Scotsman fluctuated between the concept of Johnson the outsider and Johnson the partisan, tending to brand him as the latter when it was particularly exasperated with some new, rash, stubborn or impolitic act, and switching in calmer moments to labelling him a highly principled individual, battling on his own for the Constitution. Mackay's analysis, on the other hand, tended throughout to agree with McKitrick's recent assessment. This may have been not only because of a greater readiness to defend Johnson's character but also simply because the idea of Johnson the outsider, with its ramifications into lone defender of the best American principles, martyr image, and so forth would have appealed to a man of Mackay's romantic turn of mind. Basically, the attitudes of the Scotsman and of Mackay towards Johnson, both as regarded his conduct during the impeachment attempt and his fight with Congress in general, depended on how realistically they were prepared to view the whole Reconstruction scene, how speedily they wanted to see peace and order restored, and how important they felt unbending adherence to principle to be in the face of continuing political chaos.

The Scotsman had early adopted a very positive attitude to the President's unyielding stand in the face of Congressional opposition, and predictably, that attitude did not alter once the impeachment trial was over and Johnson had become a lame-duck President. The paper's editorials merely illustrated the persistence of the old ambivalence. On the one hand, Johnson had been "wiser" than Congress "because he sought to win the South to loyal union with the North, while Congress sought to degrade, to punish and to crush". On the other hand, his final Message to Congress had proved that "He has learned or unlearned nothing since his last Message ... He is a remnant of

1 Ibid., p. 88.
2 Scotsman, 16 Oct., 1868
the antediluvian politics, and he appeals to articles of the Constitution just as if no deluge had come to wash away much of its substance, and still more of the respect for it". 1 It was after all valid enough to conclude that the particular constitutional doctrine to which he clung, with its emphasis on immutable state rights, was by that time obsolete 2 and that his inflexibility was therefore a grievous error: where the Scotsman’s judgement was at fault was in its belief that Radical Reconstruction had rendered the United States Constitution totally obsolete. President Grant’s policy for the South illustrated how things should be done according to the new order which the paper saw as having evolved in America:

Every one can now see how much better it would have been for the South had they (sic) believed Grant and acted upon his advice, turning a deaf ear to the promises of Johnson. Even the Southerners themselves now see their error and are prepared to be wiser for the future. 3

To a very real extent, Andrew Johnson’s failure as President was a personal one inasmuch as the channels for active co-operation with Congress were closed principally by the peculiarities of his totally inflexible character. Yet there remained always the tendency to identify him as the victim of that most blameworthy of establishments, the American governmental system. Accordingly, in the April 1869 edition of Blackwood Mackay argued that greater men than Johnson might have done no better, placed in his difficult position. He repeated the point first stressed by him almost a year earlier, namely, that the United States Presidency was a very "unenviable and invidious" position, where the only praise came from office-hunters. 4 Unpopularity and a failure to command respect while in office were little

1 Ibid., 11 Dec., 1868.
2 See Brock, An American Crisis, pp. 173-175.
3 Scotsman, (U.S./c.), 18 May, 1869.
more than occupational hazards, while ex-Presidents automatically became "objects of irreverence" to an unsentimental, callous American people, going down into the common rank and file hounded by enemies and disappointed office-seekers.¹

But even for Mackay, the failings of the American political system and of the American national character could not be held entirely responsible for Johnson's troubles while in office. Indeed, he now (in the spring of 1869) stressed that no President had ever had better opportunities and that Lincoln, succeeding as Johnson had done to full power with the Union de jure restored, would immediately have issued a general amnesty which the country would have accepted. Johnson could therefore be heavily blamed for having "fomented the flower of unreasoning wrath" against the South in the early days by his conduct towards Davis and others.² So in retrospect, Mackay focussed his attention on the period of the Presidency which he had carefully avoided reference to when Johnson was still in power. He also examined the possible motivation for Johnson's actions - something which the Scotsman never bothered to do, attributing them simply to an official waving of the bloody shirt. The conclusion to which Mackay came was remarkably "modern" inasmuch as it directly anticipated the later arguments of W.E. Du Bois and Kenneth Stamp. It seemed, he suggested, as if Johnson had really wished, for personal reasons, to humiliate the Southern planters and ex-slaveowners. With his poor white background, he had never been recognized by the Southern Senators and Representatives as their social equals - indeed they had ostracised him, as had (to an even greater extent) the "Southern hostesses". "From these still haughty, though humiliated and vanquished, planters and their families he exacted a submission, which was as galling to their pride

¹ Mackay, "The Outgoing and the Incoming President" in ibid., April, 1869, Vol. 105, p. 449.
² Ibid.
as men as it was distasteful to their ideas as politicians".  It is significant that Johnson's psychological hatred of the Southern planter class was seen by Mackay as a fault, and not merely as an excuse, for his early behaviour towards that section of the community.

In this final review of the Johnson administration the old charge against the former President's perpetual hesitancy and indecision was given a new twist by Mackay when he argued that belated Presidential intervention on behalf of the South had usually resulted simply in exacerbating the unhappy situation there. Further, he stated that the Constitution to which Johnson had so persistently adhered was no longer the law. Thus at the end, Blackwood's Magazine came to approximate closely to the Scotsman's consistent viewpoint. Both were probably feeding their readers' conclusions on the United States which they wanted to believe, as, indeed, were those other Scottish journals of similar political persuasions. American political institutions being already recognized as so very much inferior to their British counterparts, it may have aroused a secret smug satisfaction (most especially among Edinburgh's legal minds) that the United States Constitution, the one element conceivably worthy of some British respect, had now been discarded. And behind the criticism levelled at Johnson for aggravating rather than accepting the course of Radical Reconstruction lay a gloomy interpretation of the whole nature of contemporary America. For the readiness with which the Scotsman and its companions in the Scottish press urged Johnson to comply with Congress, and the impression of utter futility these journals attached to his efforts to combat the Radicals, implied the conviction that in post-Civil War America the forces of conciliation, clemency and justice had not one hope of triumphing against the forces of retribution.

1 Ibid., p. 451.
2 Ibid.
oppression and self-interest. If the attitudes of a substantial section of Scotland's middle-class can be taken as having been represented by their newspapers and periodicals, then for that stratum of society, the acceptance of the Congressional victory over Johnson meant a somewhat complacent (if disturbing) acceptance of the complete subordination of principle to the dictates of a quasi-authoritarian regime in the United States. Simply, the forces of "good" were seen to have had no chance, in the degeneracy of over-democratized, immigrant-saturated America, of triumphing over the forces of "evil". Thus Mackay could pay a glowing tribute to the ex-President's brave, conscientious adherence to the course he had believed in, and sadly conclude that honesty was of little use in "times of revolutionary rancour".¹

But while there was definitely a natural tendency in many quarters to gloat over the debacle in Reconstruction America as providing proof of what too much democracy led to, this was, as we have seen, severely limited by apprehensions at what was recognized to be the new, radical base of power in the United States. The Scotsman in its obituary on Johnson was perfectly sincere when it regretted that he should have had to suffer the humiliation of impeachment "for defending [the written Constitution] against the attacks of the powerful party which, ... drunk with victory, cared only for its ends and nothing for the means by which these were to be reached".² But the regret was actually for the passing of the old constitutional order (which had not been saved by Johnson's acquittal) with its safeguards against popular sovereignty, rather than for any degradation which the President himself had endured.

Middle-class fears regarding the new hegemony of the masses as represented by Radical Congress, and middle-class bias for the elegant, cultured society

1 Ibid.
2 Scotsman, 31 July, 1875.
of the ante-bellum "Southrons" prompted organs such as Blackwood's Magazine, the Scotsman, and the Edinburgh Courant to align with whatever force appeared to have the greatest power to stop the "Radical extremists". In the event, however, it might be suggested that the alignment of Palmerstonian-Liberal and staunchly Conservative forces with the brash, poor white stump orator who just happened to be President of the United States was from the outset an unnatural one. To some extent, this fact contributed to the impatience, even coldness, which so often characterized attitudes towards Johnson. Hence in October, 1867, for instance, the Scotsman's American correspondent gave a vividly condemnatory picture of poor white trash in the South, stressing that it was from that class that Johnson had sprung and that "The vices which still stain him may be but the lingering remains of these early associations".¹

Four years later, in an editorial approving the predominance of eminent Southerners in the Presidential office through the years, Johnson was - perhaps reasonably enough - listed as a sort of afterthought and significantly dismissed as "not of the same social class nor having the same political instincts as his predecessors".² The obituary proved that to the end, the Scotsman was never happy with the background and personality of the ex-President. Stress was put on his total lack of scholastic education, his "ludicrous" egotism, and, inevitably, on the fact that he had been "habituated to an excessive indulgence in intoxicating drinks".³

Even those who were prepared to credit Johnson with possessing the intelligence and perseverance necessary in the truly self-made man were constantly reminded of the apparently serious weaknesses in his character. For instance, on a trip to America in 1868, a traveller from the north-east of

1 Ibid. (U.S./c.), 16 Oct., 1867.
2 Ibid. (editorial), 27 July, 1871.
3 Ibid., 31 July, 1875.
Scotland who met the President was subsequently informed by Johnson's opponents that if he had drawn the cork from a bottle of real Glenlivet and given Johnson a smell of the cork, he would have been immediately rewarded with an excellent government appointment. Surprisingly, none of these personality defects weighed too heavily with Charles Mackay, who for all his bias against "the people" in politics seemed willing enough to accept Johnson for what he was. The acceptance was probably based on resignation: he had already decided that the office of the United States Presidency had been irretrievably lost to respectability with the election of Andrew Jackson.

VII Conclusions

Understanding the political problems and conflicts of the Reconstruction era was in itself difficult enough for Scottish observers, and attempting to explain to a wider public the motives and subtle political manoeuvrings behind specific measures of legislation called for at least some degree of steady interest in the constantly changing, yet often tedious and exasperating, state of political affairs in the United States. In terms of general interest, and of ease in commenting, the condition of the Negro freedmen and the general social and economic situation in the South since the end of the Civil War were much more attractive subjects for consideration. Thus very few individual Scots, even among those who travelled to America during the first four years

1 "A Summer in America: things seen and heard on a tour in the United States and Canada, 1869" by an unnamed contributor, in Elgin Courant, 11 June, 1869.
2 Mackay, "The Outgoing and the Incoming President" in Blackwood's Magazine, April, 1869, Vol. 105, p. 450.
3 It is interesting to note that in connection with the impeachment proceedings, for instance, even so astute an observer of the American scene as John Elliot Cairnes confessed himself puzzled by the "kaleidoscopic changes of parties and opinions" - see Weinberg, John Elliot Cairnes, p. 119.
of Reconstruction, were prepared to make any open, sustained pronouncements on the respective merits of the contenders in the struggle between President and Congress, or to speculate on the likely results for the nation of a final defeat for Johnson's policy. Because of this, and because the volume of comment suggests that there was some considerable degree of Scottish public interest in the complex political battles which helped to mould Reconstruction policy, attention has, necessarily, been concentrated primarily on the attitudes of the Scottish press towards the antagonistic plans for Reconstruction. Furthermore, it has been considered worthwhile to look in some detail at these attitudes not only because they provide the only consistent guide to Scottish thinking on this critically important facet of Reconstruction but also because in several cases, by virtue of regular reporting on the political issues a general pattern of attitudes has been seen to be built up in like-minded sections of the press.

It becomes clear that with the exceptions of the ultra-radical - but by no means uninfluential - Dundee Advertiser and Aberdeen Free Press, the hopes of the majority of Scottish journals for the reunion and reorganization of post-war America had been substantially contained in the Johnsonian plan of Reconstruction. It was primarily a sense of deep disappointment and frustration at the defeat of that plan which caused most of the Whiggish-Conservative organs to turn against the architect and accuse him of indecision, obstinacy, and incompetence. But however much it can be argued that these were elemental weaknesses in Johnson's character, it was perhaps an essentially hazy understanding of the tremendous complexity of forces moulding the political and social structure of Reconstruction America that was mainly responsible for the general tendency to lay virtually all the blame for his failure at Johnson's own doorstep. It becomes evident that these particular observers did not really come near to fully understanding American politics
at this time. This is apparent not only from their attitude to such issues as partisanship and the use of patronage but also from more fundamental misconceptions such as the definite tendency to over-simplify the party structure. There was, for instance, little appreciation in any section of the press of the tremendous battle between the Conservative forces in America for Johnson's support - no conception of the power struggle which issued in bitter feuding between the Conservative Republicans, championed by the New York Times, and the Democrats, with their party organ, the World. The tendency to see the Conservative elements as monolithic meant failure to appreciate that Johnson had to contend not only with opposition from the Radicals whom he had offended, but also with the extremely delicate problem of deciding which group of Conservatives - if any - he was ultimately going to favour. The significance of the fact that he eventually chose, through the National Union Party movement, to try to effect a merger of the two was consequently lost on those reporting on the situation from the British side of the Atlantic.

Similarly undetected by Scottish commentators was the degree of fragmentation within the Republican party itself, where even the moderate group was splintered to include members sharing Conservative and Radical instincts. Certainly, there was a general, vague recognition that there existed a "moderate" wing of the Republican party which, if given the right opportunities and conditions, could be of great value as an element of support for Johnson; but for the most part, the nature of such an internal division was perceived in greatly over-simplified terms. The Caledonian Mercury, for instance, did identify a split of sorts in the Republican ranks, but as we have observed,

1 For an examination of this conflict, see Cox and Cox, Politics, Principle, and Prejudice, passim.
2 See above, p. 370.
it was based on the naive reasoning that in contemporary American politics "Republican" was synonymous with "Radical", the only point of contention being the degree of radicalism which ought to be followed through. On that interpretation, Johnson could be - and was - optimistically hailed as working for justice within the Republican/Radical framework. While this did admittedly remain a unique attitude, nevertheless, practically all Scottish observers mistakenly judged the Radicals within the Republican party to be a solid, united group, possessed of a very positive sense of where they were going and what they, collectively, wanted. But outside of mutual desires to see guarantees for the Negroes' future safety and freedom, there was, in fact, little on which the Radicals were firmly in agreement. Of course, it was a natural enough reaction for Scottish observers to impose a non-existent unity on the ruling party; the contemporary American Democratic press did not help their understanding of the situation by its insistence on applying the term "Radical" to the entire Republican strength in Congress.¹

Moreover, the constantly shifting groupings, the increasingly complex fragmentation of parties in the United States was surely rendered that much more obscure for British commentators generally, involved as they were at home with a growing consolidation of opposing political opinion centering round the figures of Gladstone and Disraeli. The difficulties caused by slow transatlantic communications (not perceptibly helped by the advent of the electric cable in 1866) and by the readiness of hostile journals like the Scotsman to ridicule rather than objectively to analyse the ins and outs of an alien form of government also did much to check a better understanding of Reconstruction politics. Distorted interpretations meant that all sections

¹ The error of classifying the Radicals as a cohesive group has, in fact, been a remarkably persistent one: in this connection see, for instance, the interpretations offered in Beale, The Critical Year, passim; T. Harry Williams, "An Analysis of some Reconstruction Attitudes" in Journal of Southern History, Nov., 1946, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp. 473, 486.
of the press were seriously handicapped in their attempts to put Johnson's policy and actions into proper perspective.

Yet the complexities and inconsistencies which characterize the attitudes to Andrew Johnson also arose largely from conflicting pulls and divided sympathies which were felt towards the issues raised by the whole vast process of Reconstruction. The main antagonistic pulls which could be said to have existed to a greater or lesser degree among all who favoured Presidential Reconstruction can be fairly easily enumerated:

1. the ideal of a lenient policy of Reconstruction for the South versus the acknowledgement of the realities of a situation where Congress had won control;

2. the desire to see continued adherence to the written Constitution versus the efficacy of accepting the fact - as both the Scotsman and Blackwood's Magazine saw it - that most Americans now judged it to be a dead letter;

3. the wish to see the struggle between President and Congress continue in the hopes of Johnson's "noble" Reconstruction policy emerging victorious versus the desire to see as quick an end to the fight as possible for the sake of a return to national order and stability;

4. the continued sincere belief in Johnson's policy as the best and fairest versus irritation at the man himself for the blundering, unstatesmanlike way he often went about trying to put it into effect;

5. the strong preference for Johnson's policy versus the knowledge that the majority of people in the North were apparently against it and for the Congressional course.

The short time for which it was possible to trace the ultra-Liberal Caledonian Mercury's attitude to Johnsonian Reconstruction revealed that there, too, there was a crisis of divided sympathies. In the Mercury's case,
it was a pull between guaranteed liberty and equality for the individual, and the perpetuation, intact, of American democracy through strict adherence to the Constitution on the question of state rights. For the paper, the two goals had regrettably, but nevertheless unquestionably, turned out to be totally incompatible. Forced to show its preference on this critical issue, the most radical element of the Edinburgh middle-class press proved itself after all well out of step with the forward march of Radicalism in the United States. It was the tragedy of many of those Edinburgh liberals who admired American democracy and who also wished to see its tenets apply to the freedmen to be hamstrung by the fallacy that democratic institutions in the United States could only be preserved by adherence to a strictly inflexible Constitution. It was because it believed that the essence of the Constitution was under attack from rash (though well-intentioned) Radicals, but was still capable of being saved, that the Caledonian Mercury rallied to the support of Johnson. If the Mercury had survived beyond summer, 1866, this support might also, of course, have been whittled away. But the fact that the paper should, even up until its demise, have continued to endorse Presidential Reconstruction was in itself indicative of the difficulties of properly appreciating the aims of contending factions and the need for special legislation at a time when the confused political situation lent the actions of American politicians open to an even wider range of interpretations than usual.

But for those analysing and commenting on the situation in the United States throughout the long, bitter contest between Legislature and Executive, it was inevitably, in one respect or another, an unedifying and frustrating spectacle. Admirers of America and of American democracy were infuriated by the blatant attempts of Johnson to disrupt the legal, democratic functioning of government. And declaimers of America and of American democracy were
at the same time increasingly confirmed in their revulsion towards the United States political system and genuinely alarmed by the failure of the President to check a hastening tide of Radicalism. Both sides had good reason to look with relief and with equally high hopes to Grant, whose politics appeared to be moderate and unobtrusive to the point of having made it possible for him to be in the running for both the Republican and the Democratic nominations. His reticence, combined with the diverse hopes and fears of those who watched the progress of the United States from across the Atlantic, tended to make him, initially at least, all things to all men, just as Johnson himself had once been. But with the unhappy administration of Johnson finally over, it seems reasonable to suppose that most of those in Scotland who looked with interest on the political prospects under the new President sincerely hoped that, first and foremost, Grant as Chief Executive would simply be "a good man for it".

1 Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, 2 June, 1868, APL, Argyll MSS.
CHAPTER V

A QUESTION OF RACE

The increasingly centralized nature of the American government after the Civil War could arouse unease among observers of all political persuasions in Scotland: the accession to power of such a President as General Grant could offer them a glimmer of hope that from henceforward, the administration of the country would be smoother and more effective. But whatever the base of legislative power within the Union, and whatever the character and capabilities of the Chief Executive, it was recognized that the greatest difficulty facing the United States in the immediate post-war years - the crux of the Reconstruction process - remained stubbornly the same. The task of providing for four millions of uneducated ex-slaves and of accommodating them as rapidly as possible into the body politic was widely recognized to be one of the most formidable ever to tax the initiative and resources of a nation.

Sympathetic Scots, recommending substantial help for the American freedmen's aid movement, indicated that the United States was in as critical a position as it was possible for a country to be, beset with political and social difficulties of a magnitude which it was not easy for Britons to appreciate. And it was stressed that at the centre, and "most embarrassing of all" was the "Negro problem": "the question of how the negro shall be dealt with will tax all the statesmanship of the Government, all the skill of the Executive, and all the charity and patience of the whole American people".¹ Less generously concerned elements were similarly ready to emphasize that the freedmen posed a tremendous problem, and also to suggest

that in the aftermath of the war, emancipation had become looked upon by
the Americans not with joy but with grief and a sense of bewilderment at
the proportions of the change. "At a gigantic cost, they [the Americans]
have raised what the mass of them seem to be regarding only as a gigantic
difficulty". Indeed, the "Negro question" was felt to be "like a comp-
lication of diseases", where the cure for one evil was merely the aggravation
of another.¹ Tending to view this crucial aspect of Reconstruction as "the
most stupendous work of regeneration that the world has ever seen'',² many
Scots, at least in the early months following the Civil War, could only
look towards the dawning period of transition in America and, with regard
to the ex-slaves, apprehensively enquire "what will they do with them?"³

It was a question to which there appeared to be absolutely no easy
answers. The natural difficulties involved in settling the social and
political position of a large new "community" within the United States
were seen to be complicated by the fact that

The people of the North loved the negroes little before the war;
and ... they love them still less now. Their antipathy has rather
increased, and the dread was never so great as it is now of the
intermingling of the two races.⁴

Contemporary Scots — including many of those favourably disposed to the Northern
states during the war and after — had never been slow to demonstrate their
knowledge that this section of the United States harboured prejudices and
hostilities towards the Negro race fully as strong as, and sometimes more
bitter than, those held by Southerners. And for those out of sympathy with
the Radical regime in America during Reconstruction, one of the standard

¹ Scotsman, 13 Sept., 1865.
² Glasgow Herald, 3 Aug., 1865. See also ibid., 12 Sept., 1865; 22 Oct., 1867.
³ Editorial heading in Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 1 Sept., 1865. See
also Scotsman, 18 May, 1865.
⁴ Elgin and Moravshire Courier, 1 Sept., 1865.
ways of denigrating the Republican legislators was to insist that although they were attempting to impose Negro domination on the South, neither they, nor the vast majority of the Northern people, had a genuine concern for the black race, or a sincere belief in its total equality with the white.

In identifying the importance of American attitudes to race as a determining factor in the progress and direction of Reconstruction, Scottish observers were simply acknowledging a trend in American thinking which reflected their own preoccupation at that time. Ultimately, for both Britons and Americans the status of the Negro freedman during Reconstruction and after came to hinge on the question of race. Indeed, for some Scottish onlookers, the future of the American nation itself seemed destined to be governed by "the principle of Race".¹

The feuding and lack of stability which characterized Reconstruction politics by late 1866 seemed to afford conclusive proof that racial dissimilarities were at the bottom of America's difficulties. There still existed a wide gulf between blacks and whites: "It must strike any thoughtful observer of American politics that this distinction is the pivot upon which their politics turn". It could after all be validly argued that

if the negro could be bleached white or removed from America ... [there would be nothing to veto, no reason to dispute the power of Congress, no strong motive for supporting State rights, and hindering the change of the Federal into one great state, and republicans and democrats (sic) would have to seek other subjects of dissension than those which now occupy their attention.²

Concomitant with the recognition of positive antagonisms and problems caused by the divergence of races within the United States there was an apprehension about the long-term effects on the nation of the lack of an American racial consciousness. The Daily Review found it impossible to guess what the United States would be by the end of the 1870s, since the "role of race" was

---

1 Banffshire Journal, 25 Sept., 1866.
2 Ibid.
so different there from what it was in Europe. In the old world, each race had a recognized character which was accepted as a guide to a country's likely future action. But this did not apply in the case of the United States where there was simply a heterogenous mixture of races, each largely preserving its own separate identity:

While in the old world we seem to be almost able to explain the past, and to be prepared to accept the future, there is no such element of what we may call "naturalness" in the influences which have been at work in the United States ... Knowing something of the character of races, we know something of their springs of action, we have some probable clue as to how they will act, or may be acted on. Their movements do not and probably will not burst upon us as utter surprises. But as to America, we have no such data. There is no American race, and it is doubtful if there ever will be. America is a chaos of races — white, black and coloured. They have not had time to blend, if ever they can be blended, into a homogeneous whole.

While the four million whites might eventually amalgamate, the four million blacks never would — "or if they do, we must infer it will cause the deterioration of the whole".  

1 The tradition of ambivalent Scottish attitudes towards race, and the influence of missionaries on the formation of opinion in the 1860s and 1870s

The paramount importance assigned to the question of race by both Britain and the United States during the Reconstruction period was not only a natural result of the freeing of a vast number of Negro slaves, but also the direct continuation of a process of fascination in, and speculation on, the subject throughout the earlier half of the nineteenth century. The debate between the monogenist and polygenist schools of thought, the advent of Darwin's theory of evolution, the popular cult of phrenology, and the increasing impact of such racist doctrines as those encapsulated in the Teutonic Origins theory helped to ensure that the complexities of the questions concerning

1 Daily Review, 31 Jan., 1868.
2 Ibid.
mankind's origins and racial characteristics were kept firmly - and often sensationaliy - in the limelight on both sides of the Atlantic.

The pattern and history of these writings and ideas have been well examined by modern scholars. From their analyses, it becomes evident that in helping to mould early Victorian attitudes to race, Scots played an important part, contributing several pivotal interpretations on the nature and development of the different races of man. For instance, one of the most influential works in this field to appear in the mid-century was certainly Robert Chambers' Vestiges of Creation. Chambers was the younger brother in the famous Edinburgh publishing firm of W. and R. Chambers, a prolific author of books on various facets of Scottish life and history, and a keen, serious, amateur scientist. In Vestiges, he offered the "first thoroughgoing presentation of evolutionary theory in Britain", directly anticipating Darwin by fifteen years. The book, advancing as it did so remarkable and complete an evolutionary hypothesis, aroused an immediate furore. It was fiercely denounced and loudly ridiculed, one source of vehement attack within Scotland itself being the Free Church. But against this, it was also widely read, and attracted much praise from various quarters.

---


3 *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* was anonymously published by the London publishers, John Churchill, in 1844.


If Darwin's theories can be seen ultimately to have had the effect of helping to bolster up racist arguments, then, in at least equal measure, so can those of Chambers. Thus, it was clearly argued in *Vestiges* that man had taken his earliest origins from the Negro race, had gradually improved as he progressively passed through the Malay, Indian and Mongolian stages, and had finally arrived at the highest type of race, the Caucasian. Contemporaneously, the famous and popular Scottish phrenologist, George Combe, similarly helped to spread misconceptions about the natural place and capabilities of the Negro race.

But by far the most uncompromising "scientific" promulgation of the doctrine of Negro inferiority was made by an Edinburgh medical doctor, Robert Knox, whose influential book, *The Races of Men*, was published in 1850. The work provided (as no work had so clearly done before) a direct pseudo-scientific basis for blatant, overt racism, and opened up whole new theoretical concepts of innate racial superiority. The strength and vigour of Knox's arguments were simply derived from his solid conviction that "in human history, race is everything". It was the irrevocable law of nature.

2 Chambers, *Vestiges of Creation*, pp. 306-307. Gossett, Race, p. 68, has remarked that Chambers' ideas of evolution as applied to race was "exactly what millions of people came to believe when evolution became respectable".
4 Robert Knox, *The Races of Men: A Philosophical Enquiry into the Influence of Race over the Destinies of Nations* (London, 1850), p. 2. Robert Knox, the son of a mathematics master at Heriot's Hospital, Edinburgh, was born in 1791 at Edinburgh. Following a distinguished scholastic career at the High School, he studied medicine at Edinburgh University, graduating M.D. in 1814. In 1815 he was commissioned as assistant surgeon in the army, and gained much surgical experience in Brussels after Waterloo. He went to the Cape with the 72nd Highlanders in 1817 and engaged in ethnological, zoological, geographical and medical researches. Returning to Britain in 1820, he settled in Edinburgh, took an active part in founding the museum of comparative anatomy and pathology, and was associated with the museum till 1831. He became head of an anatomical school in 1826, and was fiercely denounced by the public for his involvement with body snatchers - and most notably for his contacts with the murderers, Burke and Hare. His popularity as a lecturer waned in the later 1830s, but in 1846 he lectured at several places on "The Races of Men", and he became a prolific contributor to scientific and popular journals. In 1856 he became pathological anatomist to the Cancer Hospital, Brompton. He was made an honorary fellow of the Ethnological Society of London in 1860, and honorary curator of its museum in 1862. He died in December of that year. See DNB, Vol. 2, pp. 331-333.
that the weaker nations must recede and be displaced by the conquering might of the stronger ones. And the single factor determining the strength or weakness of a nation was race.

The Anglo-Saxon urge to expand was therefore the product of racial qualities - "inordinate" self-esteem, love of independence, and a hatred of dynasties and governments which made members of the race "democrats by nature, the only democrats on the earth, the only race which truly comprehends the meaning of the word liberty".¹ As we have seen,² the concept of the British and Americans as the only representatives of a true democracy, a democracy which they must spread throughout the world, was still a tremendously popular one in Scotland by the 1860s and 70s. For Knox himself, the United States had represented the "greatest of all experiments" - a land which demonstrated "the practicability of self-government, or democracy ... which first brought out the true character of the Saxon race, of the Saxon mind".³

As against the aggressive expansionism and independence of spirit exhibited by the Anglo-Saxons, the static, unprogressive character of their civilizations betrayed the basic inferiority of the "dark races". These would inevitably perish, Knox believed, before the advance of the intolerant Saxon, and America was (even at this early stage) singled out as an area where this process of "extermination" was already getting well under-way:⁴

Since the earliest times ... the dark races have been the slaves of their fairer brethren ... The Saxon will not mingle with any dark race, nor will he allow him to hold an acre of land in the country occupied by him (sic); this, at least, is the law of Anglo-Saxon America.⁵

¹ Knox, The Races of Men, p. 46.
² See above, Chapters I, pp. 26-29; III, pp. 280-291.
³ Knox, The Races of Men, p. 249. An American edition of The Races of Men was immediately published and gratefully welcomed by the Southern slaveholders - see Curtin, The Image of Africa, p. 372.
⁴ Knox, The Races of Men, p. 244.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 224, 229.
But it was in relation to the "black races" of Africa that the full extent of Knox's views on racial inferiority was most clearly displayed. His basic contention (perhaps best illustrated in references to the inferiority of the Hottentots and Bosjemans) was that these races could never be civilized: "nothing in the history of mankind permits us to believe in the perfect civilization of the Negro race." Nor did Knox seek to underplay the disdain and antipathy which he believed all Anglo-Saxons harboured towards the peoples of Africa. If his insistence on the allegedly manifest differences between the "Negro proper" of Central Africa and the Anglo-Saxon race was a significant contribution to mid-Victorian outlooks on this subject, scarcely less interesting was his stress on the hypocrisy which he felt to be endemic in some sectors of the British attitude to the future of the coloured races: "What an innate hatred the Saxon has for him [the Negro of Central Africa], and how I laughed at the mock philanthropy of England!"

Nowhere had this "mock philanthropy" been more laughed to scorn or more viciously ridiculed than in the writing of yet another Scot, Thomas Carlyle. The publication of Carlyle's famous "Occasional Discourse on the Negro Question" in Fraser's Magazine actually preceded Knox's work by one year, and had effectively set the trend for subsequent attacks on the character and aims of contemporary British philanthropists. The Exeter Hall group, deeply concerned as it was with the condition and fate of the Negro race throughout the world, was bitterly castigated for its part in influencing fellow-Britons to become sunk in "rosepink sentimentalism", "deep froth-oceans of 'Benevolence'", "'Fraternity'", "Emancipation-principle", "Christian philanthropy", and

---

1 Ibid., pp. 238-239, 244.
2 Ibid., p. 268.
3 Ibid., p. 243.
similar "baleful ... jargon".¹

Beyond this relevant spate of criticism, however, there lay the real kernel of Carlyle's argument, so forcefully and uniquely presented as to provide surely the most powerful popular exposition of Negro inferiority in mid-century Britain, and to lay a sound literary foundation for caustic racist remarks by commentators who subsequently followed his pattern. In Carlyle's estimation, as in that of Robert Knox, there was simply no question but that the Negro race was naturally inferior to the white. This being so, Carlyle's determinist beliefs in the inevitable hegemony of the strong and wise man over the weak and ignorant helped him to conclude that the Negroes' only rightful place was as the servant of "those born wiser than they". Indeed, for all men, one of "Heaven's laws" – immutable and unchangeable – had always been "To be servants, the more foolish of us to the more wise".²

In arriving at this basic conviction, Carlyle had constructed an elaborate and incisive tract designed to demonstrate not only that it was "the everlasting duty of all men, black or white, who are born into this world" competently to work for their living,³ but also that there existed an innate inferiority in the character of the Negro which prevented him from understanding this truism. The essay consequently proved to be an influential airing-ground for the advancement of the "Happy Sambo" stereotype, as well as for a virulent brand of racial prejudice, well epitomised in the author's description of the Negroes of the West Indies as "indolent two-legged cattle".⁴

The essay was subsequently reprinted as a pamphlet in 1853, in which edition the title was altered to "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question".
² Ibid., p. 677.
³ Ibid., p. 673.
⁴ Ibid., p. 675.
Concentrating his attention on the situation which had existed in the British West Indies following Negro emancipation, Carlyle put much emphasis on the natural laziness of "Quashee", on his refusal to labour beyond what was necessary to satisfy his minimum needs, and on his proven inability to cultivate the land independent of European aid:

Never by art of his [the Negro] could one pumpkin have grown ... [in the West Indies] to solace any human throat; nothing but savagery and reeking putrefaction could have grown there.1

The corollary of all this was that if - as seemed to be evident - the Negro was not of his own free will prepared to labour consistently, nor willing to be induced to do so, then it was the right and the duty of others to compel him to work.2 From here, it was but a short step to arguing, as Carlyle readily did, that the ideal form of contract between "the Black gentleman" who was "born to be a servant"3 and his white master was one in which the servant was hired for life, or at least for a long period. Such a solution could be achieved by the instigation of "a proper code of laws" relating to the rights of Negroes and whites, an experiment which Carlyle felt should immediately be attempted by the planters in the Southern states of America in order to avoid the social upheaval caused by emancipation.

Having paid token acknowledgement to the abuses inherent in the institution of slavery, Carlyle reserved the full force of his literary powers to advocate retention of "the precious thing in it",4 namely, the stability and continuity in labour relations which the slave system produced.

1 Ibid., p. 675.
2 Ibid., pp. 673-674. Carlyle extended his dictum to include all "indolent persons" of every race and social standing, insisting that the exercise of "the divine right of being compelled ... to do what work they are appointed for" would make for a perfect world - see Ibid., p. 674.
3 Ibid., pp. 676-677.
Because Carlyle sought to deal in a specific way with the double questions of race and the moral obligation of the individual to engage in labour which would materially benefit both himself and society at large, the "Occasional Discourse" is a unique amalgam of philosophical reasoning, popular misconceptions about the nature of slave society, studied lack of compassion, and unrestrained racism. Almost certainly, so vigorous and vivid a work by so famous a literary figure had the effect of paving the way for future uninhibited pronouncements on the status and character of the Negro race by less prominent and less theoretically minded commentators. One of these especially worthy of some notice in this connection was the Hon. Amelia Murray, who in 1854 toured the United States, Cuba and Canada and whose published account of the trip contained a vein of extreme racist opinion which matched that found in Carlyle's work.

As a lady-in-waiting to Queen Victoria, a Scottish noblewoman, and a personal friend of the American abolitionist Eliza Lee Pollen, Amelia Murray fully realized that her views on slaves and slavery would be highly unpopular with her friends, but she insisted that she had not been cheated or hoodwinked into her defence of Southern institutions. Rather, she returned from


The Hon. Amelia Matilda Murray was the fourth daughter of Lord George Murray and grand-daughter of John, third Duke of Atholl (her father being the third Duke's fourth son, and bishop of St. David's). In 1805, she became known to the royal family, and on her mother being appointed in 1808 lady in waiting to the Princesses Augusta and Elizabeth, she was frequently at court where she attracted much notice on account of her liveliness. One of the most intimate friends of her earlier years was the abolitionist-minded Lady Byron. She became an excellent botanist and artist, and interested herself in the education of destitute and delinquent children, being an original member of the Children's Friend Society (established 1830), as well as a member of other charitable institutions. In 1837, she was chosen maid of honour to Queen Victoria. On returning from her transatlantic tour in 1855, she announced her intention of printing an account of her travels, whereupon she was reminded that court officials were not allowed to publish anything savouring of politics. She resigned in 1856 rather than suppress her opinions, but was subsequently made an extra woman of the bedchamber. See DNB, Vol. 13, p. 1,244. Gordon Goodwin, the author of the DNB article on Amelia Murray, quaintly concludes that she returned from her American tour "a zealous advocate for the abolition of slavery".
the United States sincerely convinced that her mind had been "accustomed from childhood to erroneous views upon the slavery question ... I now see the great error we have committed is in assuming that the African race is equal in capacity with the European; and that under similar circumstances, it is capable of equal moral and intellectual culture".¹

It must have required considerable courage and conviction on Amelia Murray's part to write as she did at the very time when, following the initiative taken by the Duchess of Sutherland, a large proportion of the British aristocracy were rallying to the cause of the Negro as popularized by Harriet Beecher Stowe.² Perhaps it was partly the lonely realization that most of her social acquaintances were involved in anti-slavery agitation,³ and partly

---

¹ Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 15.  
² Harriet Beecher Stowe had visited Britain in 1852-53, and the Stafford House Address had been signed in 1852. It would appear that Queen Victoria refused to allow the book to be dedicated to her - see Eliza Wigham to Louis Chamerovzow, 14 Feb., 1856, A-sl. P., MS C37/74. Eliza Wigham, finding the work "really remarkable" (see ibid.), had hoped that rumours of the royal displeasure were authentic and wanted to see the rebuke "prominently mentioned" in the Anti-Slavery Reporter: "it is a strong and good rebuke to the pro-slavery writers so prevalent these days" - Eliza Wigham to Chamerovzow, 25 Jan., 1855, ibid., MS C37/66.  
³ Amelia Murray's keen awareness that she was publicizing views on the slavery question which ran counter to those held by her personal acquaintances seems to have made her anxious to prove that in other respects, she was fully in accord with aristocratic outlooks and politics. Thus, she eagerly defended the then Duchess of Sutherland from the American charge that she had callously depopulated the Scottish Highlands, stressing that the Clearances had been undertaken by the former Countess Duchess "whose energetic plans aided the starving Celts she caused to emigrate" - see Amelia Murray, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 1-2. It was somewhat ironic that the task of publicly setting the record straight on the personalities involved in highland depopulation should have fallen to Amelia Murray, since the American abolitionist, Arthur Tappan, had stressed the need for some British aristocrat to exonerate the current Duchess from this charge and give the facts to Americans who "reverenced" her - see A.H. Abel and F.J. Klingberg (eds.), A Side-Light on Anglo-American Relations, 1839-1858 (Lancaster, Penna., 1927), pp. 323-324. In 1854, the Earl of Shaftesbury noted that "The Yankee press is still very violent against the Duchess of Sutherland and myself; against the Duchess, they rake up the oft exploded stories of the Scotch clearings". See Earl of Shaftesbury to Elizabeth, Duchess of Argyll, 24 Jan., 1854, AFL.
the desire to draw their earnest attention to the misguided nature of their sympathies which prompted her so repeatedly to warn against "the well-intentioned but ill-judged interference of the present English generation about the slavery question".\(^1\) While she did not in principle uphold the actual institution of slavery (no one in Scotland — not even Carlyle — was prepared to positively condone the slaveholding system as it existed in the United States), Amelia Murray was quite ready to insist that in the Negroes' as well as in the planters best interests, it would be wisest simply to allow slavery to die a natural death as an unprofitable labour system.\(^2\) Ineffect, she agreed with all the standard arguments brought forward by the Southern slaveholders to prove that at least for some time to come, the Negro race was actually better under slavery, being especially impressed by the planters' paternalism and by the idea that the slaves would quickly die out if manumitted too suddenly.\(^3\)

The absorption of the belief that "the 'Legrees' are as much exceptional beings as idle and profligate landholders among ourselves"\(^4\) went hand in hand with the absorption of a total belief in the natural inferiority of the Negro race. Much stress was laid on the childlike nature of the slaves, on their "amusing" characteristics, "their monkey-like [eating] habits" and on their lack of common sense: "I begin to doubt whether they ever grow mentally after twenty".\(^5\) Although the Negro might benefit from a limited degree of education, it was impossible to change the Ethiopian character:

\(^1\) Murray, Letters, Vol. 1, p. 244. British philanthropists and British lack of understanding of the South were further censured in Vol. 1, pp. 302, 315-320; Vol. 2, pp. 1, 4, 8, 221. Significantly, Uncle Tom's Cabin, the book which had been instrumental in attracting the British aristocracy to the anti-slavery cause, was criticized as a libel on the slaveholders as a body — ibid., Vol. 1, p. 303; Vol. 2, p. 40.
\(^2\) Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 48, 190-191.
\(^3\) Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 315-320.
\(^5\) Ibid., Vol. 1, pp. 304, 298-299, 303; Vol. 2, p. 60.
I must repeat, over and over again, our ideas of negro character, and its capabilities, are little grounded upon truth. It has pleased Providence to make them [the Negroes] barbarian, and as barbarian they must be governed ...[1] They are devoted servants, and miserable free popele. 1

In fact, Amelia Murray's conviction that the Negro race would require a lengthy period of white supervision may have been more in line with the basic beliefs of the Stafford House set than she herself imagined. 2 But the stridently racist tone of her polemic and her open admiration for the slaveholding society of the Southern states certainly struck a discordant note in the harmony of Scottish aristocratic concern for the Negro slave. Indeed, in Amelia Murray, Scotland produced perhaps something of a Victorian phenomenon — a woman traveller to the United States who returned impressed with many of the aspects of the slave system, and who was apparently completely devoid of all feminine compassion for the miserable plight of the enslaved. 3 The Irish abolitionist, Richard Davis Webb, was suitably dismayed that "a Scotch lady of high connexions, a member of the ducal house of Atholl" should have produced something so "unique among books of travel", but he was obviously shocked and amazed by the fact that "All through her letters Miss Murray evinces a loathing contempt for the African race, an

1  Ibid., Vol. 2, pp. 5, 6, 25.
2  Rice, op cit., p. 511 has indicated that the Stafford House Address was gradualist in tone primarily because the signatories considered that the slaves would be fit for freedom only after prolonged white tutelage, and because they may not have accepted that the Negro possessed a rational nature.
3  The Hon. lady had even gone so far as to conclude that if she had been black, she would have preferred slavery to freedom — see Murray, op cit., Vol. 2, pp. 112-113.
absence of all womanly sympathy for them (sic)."  

Thus, by the mid 1850s, Scotland had the undesirable distinction of having produced two pioneering works in the related spheres of evolution and race, both of which tended in varying degree to foster ideas of racial inequality; a leading phrenologist who considered the Negro skull inferior to that of the Caucasian; one of Britain's leading men of letters, who had been ready to lend his massive talents to the production of a fiercely racist essay; and a female member of the aristocracy who had defied the conventional feelings of her sex and social rank to run the whole gamut of Southern prejudice against the Negro race.

It becomes obvious, then, that a vigorously racist element went to make up one strand in the background of Scottish attitudes to race during the 1860s and 70s. Balancing this, however, there was the fervent Scottish abolitionist response of the 1830s and 40s - the ceaseless activity and passionate convictions of the largely middle-class Scottish emancipation societies. It can be argued that abolitionist agitation was based almost as much on a commitment to abstract principles of justice and equality as on a positive sympathy for the Negro, and partly on an "idealization" and "de-

---


On the other hand, the Duchess of Argyll, who had always held all the "right" sort of views on slavery, could be informed that "It is very pleasant to hear what you think of the leading [American] topics of the day, especially as Ladies of your calibre often take ... a more just view of affairs than gentlemen do" - Sir John Lawrence (Vice-Roy of India) to Duchess of Argyll, 16 June, 1855, Argyll MSS.

The natural pity which Victorian womanhood was expected to evince towards the Negro bondsman was well symbolised by the front page of the annual reports of the ELES which carried the print of a male and female slave holding up their fettered hands, and underneath this, the plea

Can we behold unheeding,
Life's holiest feelings crushed -
While Woman's heart is bleeding,
Shall Woman's voice be hushed?

(Original emphasis)
humanization" of the slave. But at the same time, the insistence by the early Scottish abolitionists (bolstered up as they were by Scottish ministers of religion) that all men were equal under God and that no man had the right to hold another in bondage, nevertheless provided an active and vocal counterblast to the emerging school of racist ideas.

In Scotland, therefore, the mid-century spate of pseudo-scientific writings on race, and the extremism of Carlyle's views, were superimposed on a society already inured to a vigorous insistence on the equality of man. A fusion - or perhaps more accurately, a confusion - of these influences produced a middle ground in which uncertainty and equivocation about the status of the Negro in the scale of mankind was balanced by an essentially sympathetic outlook towards the Negro race, and a belief in its "improveability". During the mid 1850s, this category was well represented in the writings of William Chambers, W.E. Baxter, and James Stirling, all of whom toured the United States at that time; and, indeed, by the aristocratic, Stoweite abolitionist circle.

As Provost of Edinburgh from 1865-1869, William Chambers, the printer and publisher, was to show himself keenly interested in the plight of the American freedmen. It was an involvement stimulated not only by a general interest in the domestic affairs of a country with which, as a businessman, he had commercial connections, but also by a genuine, if paternalistic, concern for the future of the freed slaves whose condition as bondsmen he had witnessed with shocked and "painful feelings" during his trip to America in 1853. Yet, Chambers' earliest account of his impressions of the United

1 See Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race, pp. 29-30.
2 See Chapter IX, p. 107; and Appendices II(c) and II(d).
3 Speech by Chambers, presiding at a public freedmen's aid meeting in the Freemason's Hall, Edinburgh, 5 Dec., 1865, in Scotsman, 6 Dec., 1865; William Chambers, Things as they are in America (Edinburgh, 1852), p. 255.
States betrays a clear indecision on the question of the Negroes' status among the races of men. First-hand experience of the slaveholding society of the Southern states obviously did not have the effect of crystallizing his opinions either one way or the other. Certainly, he had been bombarded with, and was evidently much concerned over, the American belief in Negro inferiority. Significantly, the scope and virulence of American views on the Negroes' lack of mental energy and forethought and on their disinclination for steady labour came as something completely new to him, and he was amazed to discover that the North, though repudiating slavery, was as prejudiced against the Negro character as the South:

The people of England, who see a negro only as a wandering curiosity, are not at all aware of the repugnance generally entertained towards persons of colour in the United States; it appeared to me to amount to an absolute monomania.¹

But while he found it difficult to understand American feeling on the issue of Negro equality, and while he strongly deprecated the conduct of both North and South towards the coloured race,² Chambers himself was not without reservations on the mental capacities of the slaves. Probably influenced by his brother Robert's writings to pay some heed to "scientific" speculations on race, his observations were an ambivalent amalgam of basically racist assumptions and a fundamental, traditional belief in the essential unity of all mankind. Visiting a slave auction at Richmond, Virginia, for instance, he was convinced that none of the Negroes felt deeply on the subject of being sold, nor showed anything more than a momentary distress over their situation.³ But this did not lessen his shock and amazement on realizing that according to the planters' beliefs, "That dark object, whom I have always been taught to consider a man, is not a man".⁴ The essence of the ambiguity in Chambers'
attitude was simply the unsolved question of the exact position of the Negro in the scale of civilization.

Perhaps, also, there is something wrong with his craniological development. Being at all events so much of a man - genus homo - is it quite fair to master him, and sell him, exactly as suits your convenience - you being, from a variety of fortunate circumstances, his superior?  

The related issues of slavery and racial inferiority needed to be argued, he believed, "less on political and philanthropic than on physiological grounds".  

In a subsequent work, devoted entirely to the examination of "slavery and colour" in America, Chambers showed relatively more confidence, both in analysing the growth and perpetuation of American slavery and in acknowledging Negro abilities and the injustices fostered by race prejudice. Indicating that the free Negroes had overcome difficult circumstances and had become as prosperous and well mannered as the whites, he sought to isolate the prevalent colour prejudice as a peculiarly American phenomenon:

That the colour of a man's skin, without the slightest reference to his moral qualities, or to his wealth, should determine his social or political position, savours of the ridiculous to Europeans ... [T]he more aspiring among [the free American Negroes]... who have visited Great Britain, do no discredit to the land of their nativity, and are treated in every respect as if they could boast of a purely Anglo-Saxon origin.  

But however sincere the sympathy and concern for the Negro in slavery, and however convinced the belief in the race's potential for elevation, so far as the basic question of racial equality was concerned, there remained a solid, restrictive force, militating against open consideration of the subject. This was the apparently visible perfection and superiority of the Anglo-Saxon civilization, the criterion against which the "inferiority" of...

1 Ibid., p. 285.  
2 Ibid., pp. 354-355.  
the coloured races could most readily be demonstrated, and against which Scots such as W.E. Baxter and James Stirling almost involuntarily tended to base their early attitudes to the Negro race in America.

Like William Chambers, W.E. Baxter became a strong supporter of the freedmen's aid movement in Scotland following the Civil War, and by 1868, was not only prepared to stress that Negro "helplessness and ignorance" were simply attributable to centuries of oppression, but also to argue that "Thousands of negroes and mulattoes in the South are far better educated than the mass of low whites". Furthermore, he consistently deprecated political discrimination on the grounds of race. Visits to the United States in 1846 and in 1853-54 had convinced him of the highly deleterious effects of slavery on both slaves and masters in the Southern states, and he had firmly condemned those who refused to take any steps towards abolition. But despite this, his desire to take an "unemotional appraisal" of slavery had helped to make him critical also of "well-meaning" British abolitionists - the "class of people in philanthropic Britain who carry on a kind of Quixotic crusade against everything which savours of injustice", and whose interference had tended merely to injure the Negroes' cause. "Ultra-abolitionists" of the Garrisonian stamp he found "very unwise and intemperate", and much given

1 Speech by W.E. Baxter presiding at a public freedmen's aid meeting in Ward Chapel, Dundee, 6 Jan., 1868, in Dundee Advertiser, 7 Jan., 1868.
2 See ibid.; and his speech as chairman at a public freedmen's aid meeting in Ward Chapel, Dundee, 26 Sept., 1865, in ibid., 29 Sept., 1865.
4 Baxter, America and the Americans, p. 192.
5 Ibid., pp. 170-171.
6 Ibid., pp. 187-188.
to "fanatical doings", and he later freely admitted that he had been "castigated by British Abolitionists" for having maintained that a slave-owner could be a Christian.  

While Baxter shunned the institutionalized activity of the Scottish anti-slavery societies, there is little reason to doubt the depth of sincerity of his personal commitment to the cause of Negro freedom in America. More suspect, perhaps, were his early opinions on the innate capabilities of the enslaved race. He carefully avoided making any pronouncements on this vexed question in the 1850s, but in this connection, his attitude to the American Indians at that time is surely revealing. Welcoming the white settlers' displacement of the Indian tribes in the Far West, he was moved to comment:

When I think of the schools and churches and other beneficent institutions which keep pace with the march of the conquering race, I cannot but rejoice in the transformation, and thank God for raising up such a people to govern the American continent.

Pride in the British achievement in colonising the United States and making it great was shared in full measure by James Stirling, a Scottish banker who made an extensive tour of the country during the autumn-spring of 1856-57. In Stirling's view, the success of America was largely due to the strength and nobility of the "English" (as distinct from merely "Saxon") race which had colonized it. Furthermore, he was convinced that the "barbarous institution", the "fatal anachronism" of slavery was inevitably

---

1 Ibid., pp. 189-190.
2 See lecture by Baxter on "The Great Struggle in America" to Blairgowrie Mechanics' Institute, 17 Jan., 1865, in Dundee Advertiser, 20 Jan., 1865.
3 Baxter, America and the Americans, p. 24. For further allusions by Baxter to the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race in the American continent, see above, Chapter I, pp. 27-28.
destined soon to perish in the "refined" and "highly civilized" society of the South: "Slavery may subsist in Brazil or Cuba, among degenerate, sensual races, but it cannot exist side by side with Anglo-Saxon civilization... The South ... knows full well the evils connected with her social system ... In her secret heart she feels and deplores the plague that is upon her, but she is too proud to confess her pains".1

But while, like Baxter, Stirling was prepared to be "just to the South",2 his condemnation of slavery was total. Basically, his sympathies lay with the abolitionists.3 The confidence with which he asserted his hatred for all facets of the slave system was a testimony to the courage of at least one Scot who was ready vigorously to dispute the contentions of his countryman Carlyle - even to the extent of stating that "Labour, unhonoured by a patrician race, becomes dishonourable when identified with slave-labour".4 Carlylean arguments were again implicitly rejected in Stirling's deliberate, emphatic vindication of Negro emancipation in Jamaica. The material prosperity of the island might have suffered as a result of it, "But this is not a question of rum, but of right and wrong ... and no ruin, even though the British Empire had fallen with Jamaica, could cloud the glory of that great act of national justice".5

1 Ibid., pp. 344-345.
2 Ibid., p. 344.
3 See ibid., p. 74, where he defends American abolitionists from the charge of having intensified Southern intransigence on the question of slavery.
4 Ibid., p. 64. Stirling did not hesitate to illustrate how easily the arguments of Carlyle (and of Scotsman Archibald Alison and writers in Blackwood's Magazine) could be appropriated by Southern slave-owners - ibid., p. 112. And he argued that few would be willing to accept Carlyle's contention that in labour relations, the only choice was between a well fed slave or a hungry freeman - ibid., p. 113. "Free labour", he declared, "has never yet had fair play. Let the labourer be really and truly a free man, and he will soon vindicate his claim to genuine independence and self-reliance" - ibid., p. 115.
5 Ibid., p. 121.
Stirling questioned the allegation that the Negroes of the British colonies were lapsing into barbarism, and he insisted that in any case, it was certain that the American slaves, following the example of the free Negroes in the North and South, would be fully prepared to work when liberated. It was, however, in this very consideration of the ultimate nature of the freedman's role in United States society that the influences of restrictive racist assumptions came most clearly to bear on Stirling's thinking. Given his powerful assault against the institution of slavery, in Stirling's reasoning, freedom for the Negro race meant essentially freedom for a labouring race to pursue its natural menial duties without compulsion, in an atmosphere of independence which would foster diligence and self-respect. Thus, one of his primary reasons for totally rejecting all Negro colonization schemes was that they would rob the South of its sole labouring class ... by whom all the coarse labour and much of the mechanical work of the community are performed. How could the want of this great working-class be supplied? Who would till the fields when the 'nigger' was gone? Who would grind in the Philistine mill if the Ethiopian Samson were away?

His closely reasoned argument for gradual emancipation hinged on the conviction that with free-labour incentives, the Negro slave would "work harder, more intelligently, and more cheerfully; he will become a better worker, and a nobler man", and on the optimistic belief that once the Southerner realized the worth and value of the emancipated slave, "he will put his prejudice in his pocket, and learn to respect the labourer whose destiny is inseparably bound up with his own". Yet, even these fairly lucid

1 Ibid., p. 121.
2 Ibid., p. 238. Stirling did, however, also take the Negroes' attitudes into consideration in making his objection to colonization schemes - see ibid., pp. 237-238.
3 Ibid., p. 241.
4 Ibid., p. 245.
indications of Stirling's feelings do not convey the full extent and complexity of his attitude to the race he so sincerely wished to see free. His desire to refute De Tocqueville's argument that emancipation and a nominal social equality would intensify white prejudice against the Negroes led him to the unique conclusion that

Increased mixture of blood is surely the best criterion of decreasing aversion ... I cannot but think that if only freedom were once established there would be a gradual admixture of the races, and the negro, partly through an infusion of Anglo-Saxon blood, and partly through the civilizing influence of Anglo-Saxon industry, would gradually rise to be a very respectable, if not superior man.¹

Certainly, these views could not be construed as implying a belief in Negro equality - indeed, rather the reverse. But considering the tremendous aversion towards the idea of miscegenation which existed on both sides of the Atlantic throughout the century, Stirling's outspoken opinions during the mid 1850s must be accepted as somewhat remarkable, although there were, of course, distinguished antecedents for them earlier in the century, when racial intermarriage was defended without Stirling's racist argument as to the improvement in the Negro character which mingling of bloods would bring.²

The middle ground between the unshakeable doctrines of inequality propounded by the "scientific" writers and by Carlyle and his disciples, and the abolitionists' unquestioning belief in the fundamental equality of mankind, was therefore occupied by those who were unequivocably opposed to slavery and anything approaching it, but who were also seriously grappling with the complicated problem of determining the actual place of the Negro race in the scale of civilization. As we have seen, ambivalence and indecision tended to characterize the opinions of this group. In the Reconstruction era, when

¹ Ibid., pp. 54-55.
the question of the "irrepressible Negro" in America forced British thinking to focus ever more directly on the subject of race, all of these traditions in the Scottish outlook survived. Consequently, Scottish attitudes to the Negro during the 1860s and 70s included virulently racist opinions on the one hand, and arguments in favour of Negro equality on the other, while midway between were still, perhaps, the bulk of Scottish opinions, characterized by a basic uncertainty about the absolute equality of Negro and Caucasian, and a correspondingly strong belief in the improvableility of the Negro race along the lines of skill and achievement mapped out by the whites. And of course by that stage, there was a substantial increase in general paternalistic, condescending sympathy towards the coloured races - the "white man's burden" attitude, fostered by the "cultural chauvinism" of the missionaries, in whom Scotland was so rich.

This said, the nature of the ultimate impact of David Livingstone's pronouncements on the Negro race is not, however, easily determinable. Certainly, among those who sought to emphasize that the Negro "is fully as much a perfect man as we are", at least two of the most influential Scottish speakers in the freedmen's aid cause, the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie and the Duke of Argyll, found it readily expedient - and tremendously effective - to draw on the written testimony of Scotland's most celebrated missionary. Totally refuting all arguments that the Negro was inferior in intelligence, and that he was not of the family of man, Guthrie told a crowded public meeting in Edinburgh on behalf of the American freedmen:

I say the ground on which we stand is this, that the negro is our brother, he is bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh; he has never got justice, and you have only to read Dr Livingstone's

---

1 Curtin, The Image of Africa, p. 326. See also Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race, p. 111, et seq.

2 Report of speech by the Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie, at a freedmen's aid meeting in Freemason's Hall, Edinburgh, 5 Dec., 1865, in Scotsman, 6 Dec., 1865.
travels to find that the negro off the coast, where he is completely away from slavery, its deteriorating and degrading influences, is in many respects a noble specimen of humanity.

The reference was greeted with loud cheers from the capacity audience.¹

Just over two years later, in his chairman's address to a packed meeting held for the same cause in the City Hall, Glasgow, the Duke of Argyll made a similar appeal to the findings of Dr. Livingstone, and received the same measure of popular approbation. He maintained that in common with the Scottish missionary, he passionately believed that had it not been for "the accursed slave-trade", which was still blighting the entire continent, African civilization would have advanced steadily. Like Guthrie, he stressed Livingstone's "remarkable" discovery that the most "civilised ... peaceable, humane, civil and truthful" tribes were "not those in contact with Christian nations but those in the remotest, most inaccessible corners of Africa, untouched by the slave-trade" (cheers from the audience).² Furthermore, as a keen, competent, and authoritative amateur scientist in his own right,³ the Duke of Argyll had clearly been interested and impressed by Livingstone's favourable conclusions on the early origins and past history of the Negro race in Africa, and he was not slow to make these findings the basis for his own powerful defence of the achievements of antecedent African civilizations.⁴

¹ Ibid.
² Report of speech by Duke of Argyll at a freedmen's aid meeting in City Hall, Glasgow, 27 Jan., 1868, in Glasgow Herald, 29 Jan., 1868. The Duke had early been convinced, not only by Livingstone's observations but by the related experiences of Grant and Speke, that "The civilisation of Africa increases exactly as you get away from the contact of whites" - see Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, 27 May, 1863, AFL, Argyll MSS.
³ The Duke of Argyll was elected F.R.S. in 1851. Throughout his life, he wrote voluminously, as well as delivering many papers on a wide range of scientific subjects to numerous lay audiences and distinguished societies, The greater bulk of his contributions were on geology, his principal scientific interest - see Dowager Duchess of Argyll (ed.), The Duke of Argyll: Autobiography and Memoirs (London, 1906), Vol. 2, p. 509; see also list of Argyll's published works, in ibid., pp. 595-560 (Appendix).
⁴ This facet of the Duke's speech is considered in greater detail below, pp. 586-587.
Shortly after the close of the American Civil War, around May, 1865, Livingstone himself had been asked to attend a public meeting on behalf of the American freedmen. Although unable to accept the invitation, he was "at pains to express his opinion on the capacity of the negro in connection with what was going on in the United States," and took the opportunity to make a bold statement which concentrated more heavily on indicting generations of British and Americans for their advancement and perpetuation of slavery than on speculating upon the wondrous spiritual and "cultural" advantages which would henceforward be opened up to the American Negroes as a result of their free contact with white Anglo-Saxon civilization. While recognizing that their American "kinsmen" deserved the "warmest sympathy" of the British in their difficulties involving the freedmen ("those freedmen for whose existence as slaves in America our own forefathers have so much to answer"), Livingstone stressed that he had no fears about the mental and moral capacity of the Negroes for civilization and elevation:

We who suppose ourselves to have vaulted at one bound to the extreme of civilization, and smack our lips so loudly over our high elevation, may find it difficult to realise the debasement to which slavery has sunk those men or to appreciate what, in the discipline of the sad school of bondage, is in a state of freedom real and substantial progress. But I, who have been intimate with Africans who have never been defiled by the slave-trade, believe them to be capable of holding an honourable rank in the family of man.3

It has been argued that during the years of American Reconstruction, British commentators on the problem of race were severely blinkered by their

---

1 William G. Blaikie, _The Personal Life of David Livingstone_ (London, 1880), p. 354. Blaikie does not specify the actual date or venue of this meeting, but it seems likely that the invitation related to a meeting held by the National Committee of British Freed-Men's Aid Societies at Westminster Palace Hotel, London, on 17 May, 1865, where the Duke of Argyll presided - see report in John Rylands microfilm. Certainly, no freedmen's aid meeting was held in Scotland at this early date.


3 Quoted in _ibid._, p. 354.
total inability to appreciate the distinction between the nature of man and the nature and effects of his particular environment. While this probably holds true for the vast majority of cases, it becomes clear that Livingstone's strong insistence on the cardinal importance of the slave-trade as an adverse force acting upon the mainstream of African civilization was sufficient to influence other important contemporary Scots to recognize the impact of environmental factors on the development of specific Negro communities. The renewed British agitation over the East African Slave Trade in the early-mid 1870s gave increased relevance to Livingstone's arguments. Paying tribute to his researches in East Central Africa, and to his general conclusions on the effects of the slave-trade, the Aberdeen Free Press protested that "The slave trade is slowly but steadily moving westward, carrying with it devastation and misery, demoralising and brutalising races which are by no means the lowest rank in civilisation". 

Implicit in all this was, of course, the automatic acceptance of the need for the ultimate "improvement" and elevation of the African peoples to white European standards, but the acceptance of such a need does not invalidate the significance of the comments of those who followed Livingstone into the conviction that factors other than alleged innate racial inferiority had produced the apparent stagnation of African culture. The North British Daily Mail, hardly the most likely source in which to look for particularly sympathetic or sensitive consideration of the Negro character throughout the Reconstruction years, had nevertheless by the mid 1870s begun to display a real concern about whether Britain was fulfilling "her duty to the Negro". Basically, it questioned whether emancipation was in itself enough:

1 Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 128.
In the recent excitement regarding the Slave Circular, the most distressing fact was that the suppression of the slave trade alone received attention. No writer or speaker spoke for the Negro; all spoke against slavery.¹

As part of its assertion that "non-European races" were capable of improvement, the Mail foresaw a special role for the Negro race in the years to come, the assumption of which would greatly benefit not only the Negro himself but also the whole world. Clearly, the African Negro had a great destiny before him:

[A] fresh departure in civilisation is not merely possible but probable under his auspices. The Negro stock had attained to a high degree of development in Egypt when the Semitic invaders seized the throne and drove the native race slowly southwards. Its development arrested before maturity had been reached, ... that race is, so to speak, in its infancy.²

Following Palgrave's idea that there should be a large-scale emigration of East and West Africans to South America, where their "pent-up energy" would get scope and would inject "fresh life into a region where Europeans have failed", the Mail implied that the time for such a contribution from the Negro race was inevitably approaching. The "torch of civilisation" had "passed from hand to hand", through Ayrians, Greeks, and Romans to West Europeans, and there was no valid argument, "though plenty of prejudices", against the possibility of a Negro empire superseding the unprofitable white class in South America.³

So far as the American Negro was concerned, however, perhaps an additional factor contributing to the reverence of Livingstone by such committed Northern supporters as the Duke of Argyll⁴ was the missionary's personal

---

¹ North British Daily Mail, "The Future of the Negro", 29 June, 1876.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
⁴ When in Scotland in 1864, Livingstone visited the Duke of Argyll at Inveraray, and pronounced it "the most delightful [visit] I ever paid" - see Thomas Hughes, David Livingstone (London, 1889), p. 116.
close affinity with the Federal cause, and his subsequent confidence in the freedmen's continuous progress. His own natural championship of the North had been tragically dramatized by the death of his eldest son, Robert, in a Confederate prisoner of war camp, following his enlistment in the Federal army under an assumed name.¹ It was to Robert, indeed, that Livingstone had early expressed his detestation of Britain's guilt in "keeping up slavery by giving increased prices for slave-grown cotton and sugar [from the Americas],"² and the same sense of disappointment with his countrymen's response to the Civil War prompted him to write to Gordon Bennett of the New York Herald: "I fear that a portion at least of the sympathy in England for what simple folks called the 'Southern cause' during the American civil war was a lurking liking to be slaveholders themselves".³ He had had no hesitation in speaking out strongly against the Southern States in a lecture to the British Association at Bath in the autumn of 1864;⁴ and the biggest dent in his golden pre-war image of the United States had certainly been caused by the enactment of the Fugitive Slave Law in 1850.⁵

¹ Blaikie, The Life of David Livingstone (London, 1910), p. 285, indicates that Robert was "extremely restless", and, having made an abortive attempt to join his father at Natal, crossed to America and fought for the North. He was buried at Gettysburg.


⁴ See brief intimation to this effect in Scotsman, 10 Jan., 1865. Curiously, no record of Livingstone's address can be found in the relevant published transactions of the British Association.

Yet, however appropriate it seemed for Scottish supporters of the American freedmen's aid movement to cite in their cause the authoritative remarks of Livingstone, however appropriate it seemed for the coloured students of Fisk University, Tennessee, to name their new missionary hall after him, the fact remained that in general terms, the cultural, tending to racial, arrogance which since the 1830s and 1840s had characterized the information disseminated by British missionaries did not substantially decrease as the century wore on, and the "conversionist sentiment" which throughout the middle decades of the century aroused a flood of enthusiasm for the "elevation" of the Negro race to the standards and culture of Western civilization was really only an off-shoot of this basic attitude. Perhaps it was inevitable that to some extent, even Livingstone would become a prisoner to the racial doctrines of his times and, more specifically, of his vocation. Certainly, random reports of missionary talks to Scottish audiences at that period indicate that the speakers' emphases remained firmly on the existing state of "barbarism" of the African Negroes, and on the potential for their improvement through the saving powers of Christianity and education.

Perhaps a fairly typical example of the temper of the Scottish missionary's address was that delivered in Aberdeen, late in 1866, by the Rev. Alexander Robb, a United Presbyterian missionary of Old Calabar. Robb, who was a native of the city, addressed a capacity audience of over five hundred members from the different U.P. congregations in Aberdeen, gathered "to express their interest in missionary work" and in his services in particular. Much of his lecture was devoted to vindicating the Negro race from "the aspersions of anthropologists" and to producing his own set of facts to

1 See Glasgow Herald, 30 Sept., 1876.
3 Ibid., p. 415.
prove "the negro’s title to humanity".¹ This aside, however, Robb was equally explicit in defining his attitude to the question of the Negroes’ place in the scale of human civilization:

They are not a distinct or inferior race; they are men — we know what sort of men. They are vile, but this need occasion no surprise. Tracing them back to the Ark, we see that the children of Ham have been left to their own devices. They have received nothing from without. But they are men; they are improveable ...

To loud cheers from the audience, he concluded that only through missionary efforts could "the fallen races of mankind" be redeemed from "degradation and death".²

Seven years later, another appreciative Aberdeen audience was being assured by no less a personage than the Rev. Dr. Robert Moffat of the tremendously beneficial effect of the gospel on the degraded, down-trodden Africans. Having laboured for almost half a century in South Africa, and with the "civilizing and Christianizing" of the Bechuanas to his credit, Moffat was eminently qualified to deliver a speech which was characterized by a singular stress on how thoroughly he had persuaded the tribesmen to convert to European ways, dress, and religion.³ It was symbolic of the general attitude of the country towards the Negro race (in the United States only in slightly less degree than in Africa) that Moffat should have chosen to respond to the accolade of a Public Breakfast by relating his achievements in transforming "savages to merchants".⁴ Perhaps few at that time were willing to join the

---


² Ibid.

³ Report of a public meeting to hear the Rev. Dr. Robert Moffat in the Music Hall, Aberdeen, 19 May, 1873, in Aberdeen Journal, 21 May, 1873. The large crowd gave Moffat a standing ovation of several minutes when he rose to speak.

⁴ Report of a Public Breakfast for Moffat held in the Douglas Hotel, Aberdeen, 20 May, 1873, in ibid. Around two hundred people attended the function.
Rev. John Mackenzie of the London Missionary Society in readily acknowledging the extreme difficulties and essential gradualness of the process of changing the "savages" mode of life.¹

There can be no way of determining the exact extent to which missionaries' theories and convictions influenced the formation of popular Scottish opinion on the complex subject of race. But considering the frequency of and tremendous popular enthusiasm for missionary lectures, the volume of printed information on missionary work,² and - most significantly of all - the extremely generous financial support given by congregations throughout Scotland to the vigorous missionary activity pursued by all denominations of the Scottish church,³ it would seem valid to conclude that the earnest and sympathetic interest displayed in the missionaries' services was combined with a basic acceptance of their widely stated conclusions on the character of the native races among whom they had worked. Certainly, the strength of the Scottish missionary contingent and the remarkable zeal of the churches' foreign missions through mid-century must have helped to create the strong vein of "cultural chauvinism" which continued to characterize the utterances of such sympathetic Scottish ministers as Guthrie, Blaikie and Macrae towards the American Negro freedmen during Reconstruction.⁴

¹ See report of a lecture by the Rev. John Mackenzie held under the auspices of the Bishopmill Mutual Improvement Society, in the Congregational Church, Elgin, 23 Jan., 1871, in Elgin Courant, 27 Jan., 1871. Mackenzie was an Elgin man who had been a compositor on the Courant for seven years before joining the London Missionary Society and going to South Africa.


³ For the period from 1865-1877, the massive extent of Scottish public support - both moral and financial - for the plethora of foreign missions, and the scope of missionary activity, are carefully recorded in the relevant volumes of The Church of Scotland Home and Foreign Missionary Record; The Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church; The Home and Foreign Record of the Free Church of Scotland; The Reformed Presbyterian Magazine. The U.P. church would seem to have continued to lead the field in both volume of and support for missionary work.

⁴ See below, pp. 644-647; and Chapter VIII, pp. 466-496. Strictly speaking, David Macrae was a theology student when he recorded his observations on the freedmen, not being ordained until 1872.
Perhaps for Scotland (relative to England), the influence of her home-grown missionaries in moulding the attitudes of the people towards the Negro race throughout the world was greater inasmuch as these men may have been regarded as very special hero figures - fine staunchly religious Scotsmen who were bringing international admiration and respect to the country of their birth, putting Scotland on the map in no uncertain fashion at a time when her submersion in "Britain" was at its peak. Blaikie, for instance, proudly saw Livingstone as a pioneer, a forerunner of missionaries, going to Africa to blaze the trail for others.\(^1\) And amid the loud and prolonged cheers which greeted his reference to the recent assurances that Livingstone was safe, the Duke of Argyll publicly asserted that "We are all proud of him ... as a countryman of our own (applause) ... [w]e are proud ... of him as one of the noblest, bravest, and gentlest spirits that ever devoted himself (sic) to the cause of Africa".\(^2\) In a period when the interests and aspirations of Scotland were so closely bound up with those of England, and when "nationalism" as such could be seen as potentially disruptive, it is possible that there was a partial sublimation of Scottish nationalist sentiment into fulsome admiration for and pride in the labours and explorations of Scottish missionaries.

II Attitudes towards the administration of coloured races in the British colonies: the impact of the Jamaican insurrection on assessments of the Negro race

But if a disproportionate number of Scots staffed foreign mission posts, and significantly contributed to popular Scottish attitudes towards the

---


2 Speech by Duke of Argyll at a freedmen's aid meeting in City Hall, Glasgow, 27 Jan., 1868, in Glasgow Herald, 28 Jan., 1868.

For an examination of the specifically Scottish traits in Livingstone's character and general outlook, see G.A. Shepherson, "David Livingstone the Scot" in Scottish Historical Review, Vol. 39, No. 127, April, 1960, pp. 113-121.
Negro race, Scotland had yet another strong, direct involvement with the British Empire through her prolific supply of colonial administrators. If it can validly be argued that continuous personal contact with coloured races in the colonies tended to soften the harsher edges of racist thought\(^1\) (except, of course, among colonial slave-holders early in the century), then the Scottish public apparently stood to benefit from a double source of more balanced, "enlightened" first-hand knowledge on the question of race. On the other hand, it has been contended that for Britain as a whole, it was primarily "the sense of fear and frustration produced by the problems of administering an empire which shaped British attitudes to the racial aspects of [American] reconstruction".\(^2\) It would seem, however, that so far as Scotland in particular was concerned, this hypothesis is not strictly applicable. That most influential of Scottish institutions, the church, remained in all its main branches buoyantly optimistic about the steady, unimpeded spiritual and cultural advancement of the coloured races under the spreading aegis of the missionary impulse. And at least one of Scotland's most distinguished colonial administrators, Sir George Campbell, was ever ready to stress the achievements, and the future potential achievements, rather than the gloomy side of British colonial rule.

Campbell's long and distinguished record as a liberal administrator in India\(^3\) had by 1878 left him neither fearful nor frustrated about the prospects for general progress and utilization of natural resources in the various corners of the empire. It had also left him with an enquiring, fairly open mind on the character and capacities of the Negro race, and a desire to get some insight into the state of relations between the black and white races.

---

3. For a biographical note on Campbell, see Appendix I.
in the United States as a possible guide for Britain in her methods of dealing
with the black races in Africa and elsewhere. 1 In his attempt to determine
the capacity of the Negroes in the United States and throughout the British
colonies, he merely ended up by displaying the old, familiar Scottish equi-
vocation on the question of absolute equality - an ambivalence born of a
recognition of the undeniable existence of wide discrepancies in the material
condition and cultural status of different races in the nineteenth century:

In one sense all men are born equal before God; but no one supposes
that the capacities of all men are equal, or that the capacities of
all races are equal, any more than the capacities of all breeds of
cattle or dogs, which we know differ widely. There is, therefore,
no prima facie improbability of a difference of capacity between the
white Aryan and the Negro race, though I believe that there is no
ground for presuming that white races must be better than black. 2

From this standpoint, Campbell went on to examine the role of the freed
Negro labourer in the Southern states, as well as the freedmen's response to
their changed social and political condition, and he tended to be favourably
impressed with many aspects of their adaptation from slaves to freedmen. 3

Certainly, his attitude to the American Negro was not governed by a pess-
imistic brooding on the difficulties of administering the "barbarous" races
within the British Empire. Indeed, he was much readier to argue that if parts
of that empire appeared to be ungovernable, or badly governed, this was essen-
tially the fault of the British colonists rather than of the native races.

Desperately concerned about the lack of British legislation to protect
the free status of coolie labourers emigrating from India to the colonies,
he was extremely forthright in condemning the system's abuses and the
injustices which he knew to be frequently perpetrated by colonial

1 Campbell, White and Black, p. 126.
2 Ibid., p. 126. Original emphasis.
3 Campbell's attitudes to specific issues concerning the reconstruction of
the South and the Negroes' part in it are discussed in more detail below,
authorities. So far as the African Negroes were concerned, while his American experience had wooed him away from his old belief that Britain should leave them to retain their own laws to a conviction that they would be better off if "converted in manners, religion, language and clothing, and assimilated to the white man's standard", he confidently believed that Britain could minimize her difficulties by a simple policy of justice and equality:

I am greatly disposed to think that if, by a just and equal rule, we humanise and improve these African natives, protecting them from class tyranny of the white man on the one hand and from their chiefs on the other, and teaching them to work as free men with the white man, great things may be achieved by these large populations in a vast country of great capabilities.

Totally against "whites lording it over coloured races", he was prepared to advocate the admittance of the latter to a share of the political franchise as a check to white exploitation.

Among other elements in Scotland much less familiar with the internal workings of the British colonial system than Campbell, there was similarly as much concern about British treatment of native colonial populations as about the ability of Britain to find an easy way of administering her diverse empire. It was perhaps to be expected that alongside its observations on the condition of the American freedmen, the ELES should include references to British colonial maladministration: although the primary emphasis of

1 Campbell, White and Black, pp. 113-119. Campbell's book was really the extension of two articles he had had published in the Fortnightly Review in March and April, 1879, under the title "Black and White in the Southern States". In the book, he added a preface to the extended version, headed "The management of coloured races", in which he discussed the problem of the Indian coolies and British treatment of the Negroes in Africa.

2 Ibid., p. 121.

3 Ibid., p. 124.

4 Ibid., p. 124

5 Ibid., p. 113.

6 See references to British rule in Jamaica and Sierra Leone in Annual Report of the ELES ... 4 April, 1867, pp. 1-4.
its annual report continued to be on the progress of the liberated Negroes of the United States, it studiously continued to maintain a wider concern for the welfare of the Negro race all over the world.

More significant, perhaps, was the concern about the nature of British rule shown in John Leng's *Dundee Advertiser*. As in its championship of the cause of the American Negro - slave and free - the *Advertiser* maintained a remarkably consistent course in defending the position of native coloured races against the abuse of power by the ruling whites. Despite the fears and reactionary sentiments stirred up in many British minds by the 1864 revolt in New Zealand,¹ for instance, the *Advertiser* did not hesitate to attack a letter to its editor from the Rev. Henry H. Brown, a Church of England minister at Omata, New Zealand, in which the Maoris were depicted as ferocious savages with cannibalistic tendencies, whose lands it was the duty of the British settlers to appropriate. The paper had earlier carried a strong editorial refutation of Brown's known views, and continued to counter his opinions by insisting on the faithlessness of white colonists towards the native population:

*We never represented the Maoris as angels, but we certainly have spoken of them as amongst the finest specimens of savages converted to Christianity, and we have regretted that the conduct of the Europeans towards them has frequently been such as to bring both Christianity and civilization into reproach.*²

Shortly before this, the *Advertiser* had taken pains to dismiss the Times' imputation that emancipation in the West Indies had been a failure,³ and following Governor Eyre's arbitrary punishment of the Negroes supposedly implicated in the Jamaican insurrection, it earnestly hoped that Britain

---

¹ See Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 252.
³ Ibid., 15 Aug., 1865.
would be lead to consider more deeply its duties to its colonial races.¹
By 1872, in common with Sir George Campbell, it was fiercely denouncing
Britain's leading role in encouraging the "hideous commerce" in coolie
labour from China to British Guiana, characterized as it was by an "infamous"
treatment worse than that meted out to the American Negro, whose master had
at least been anxious about him as property.²

But certainly the gravest indictment of Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards
coloured races, both in the British colonies and in the United States, was
contained in an editorial comment sparked off by the refusal of printers in
Washington to work with the son of Frederick Douglass. The Advertiser
accepted the incident as a symbolic reminder of the imperfection of Anglo-
Saxon civilization: "one curse clings to it. It is pursued by a feeling
of race-hatred that is becoming woven into the blood". While other European
races would intermarry with native populations, the British would not: nor,
above all, would they give the subject race fair and just treatment. Past
empires had certainly been based on the mixture of races:

No conquering race ever stood on the conditions on which our country-
men and men of our race are now trying to stand in various parts of
the world.³

The aloofness of the Anglo-Saxon race throughout the world was deplored
as a heinous trait productive of a race prejudice which, in the eastern states
of America at least, had given way to a mere prejudice against the colour of
the skin. It was deplored also as a self-defeating trait for British colonials
- "In New Zealand we have the Maori, in East India a host of races, but we
mix with none of them, which simply shows that sooner or later we must be
prepared to leave India" - and as a self-defeating trait for White Americans,

¹ Ibid., 5 Dec., 1865.
² Ibid., 5 March, 1872.
³ Ibid., 13 July, 1869.
who could not conceivably hope to get rid of their Negro population and whose prejudice and hostility towards it could do no good but much harm to the progress of the country.¹

In at least one small sector of the Scottish Presbyterian church, the liberation of four million slaves in America had earlier been the sign to issue a stern warning to the United States, and an admonition to Britain, regarding the treatment of the emancipated Negroes. The Original Seceders frankly acknowledged the American Civil War to have been "a signal divine judgement" on the country for its toleration of slavery, and accepted the concomitant drain on American wealth and resources as a just retribution for the subjection of the African race to severe trials and anguish and to the deprivation of its "birth-right of personal liberty".²

While sincerely hoping that the United States, with British help, would do much to aid the freedmen, the Seceders' magazine warned America against concluding too confidently that all danger of future calamity was over. Since freedom was merely the slaves' right, there was no room for glorification in the simple fact of emancipation, which in itself did not guarantee a satisfactory measure of justice to the freedmen nor offer them adequate compensation for old wrongs. The insistence that there must be an extensive liberal compensation, that "a great national measure is demanded by eternal justice", was based on the conviction that Britain had failed in her duties to the emancipated slaves in Jamaica and must continue to reap the unhappy fruits of that wrong: "A greatly demoralised handful of white inhabitants in power has been pampered while the comfort and well-being of the black race has been sadly neglected".³

¹ Ibid.
³ Ibid., pp. 474-477.
Generalizations on the shortcomings of British colonial rule later tended to be stimulated, indeed, by reflections on the most spectacular manifestation of Britain's troubles in Jamaica, the insurrection of November, 1865. Governor Eyre's defence of his course of action in crushing the rising, for instance, provided a man from Barbadoes, resident in Glasgow, with the chance to state his views on British colonialism and the Negroes' response to white domination. Disputing the charge of ungratefulness to their benefactors levelled against the Negro race, he cited the exemplary conduct of the slaves in the Southern states during the Civil War, and the sense of gratitude which they had felt towards their liberators, and demonstrated in practice by their enlistment in the Northern armies. Basically, he was pessimistic about the future moral and social condition of the black race in the British colonies; but his pessimism - and his warning - were based on probable future blunders rather than on past mistakes in the British colonial experience. Thus, he readily acknowledged that "the British have in times past done more for our interest than all the other nations put together", and consequently had a right to expect the Negroes to be loyal and law-abiding subjects. The crux of his message, however, was that having freed and enlightened the Negro, Britain could hardly expect him to be content with laws which did not provide justice for his race.¹

Ironically, it was left to Scots themselves to make less generous strictures on Britain's treatment of her colonial subjects. There was the strictness of the Reformed Presbyterian conscience, which could not easily be appeased by rationalizations about the actions of Eyre and others. The basic conviction remained that in her colonial dealings, Britain - and all of Britain, not simply British administrators - had been guilty of wrong-doing in the eyes of God:

¹ Letter from "A Native of Barbadoes" in North British Daily Mail, 8 June, 1868.
Were God to deal with us in strict justice for our behaviour as a nation, in the colonies He has given us, He would punish us for our selfishness, our pride, our rapacity, our injustice, and our great cruelty. Instead of one portion of the community denouncing another [a reference to those seeking further punishment for Eyre] all ought to be humbled, and unite in making the most generous efforts for the good of others.¹

While the mainstream of the Reformed Presbyterian Church therefore stressed how lucky Britain had been in escaping God's wrath for the criminal maladministration of her divinely ordained empire, the minor, breakaway sect within the church was totally convinced that the deity would yet wreak a terrible vengeance on Britain, and that the colonies would be used as one of the instruments for His purpose. This more rigidly orthodox group of Reformed Presbyterians had broken with the majority of their church in 1863.²

In late 1867, the magazine which they had established, the *Reformed Presbyterian Witness*, carried a review of a book on George W. Gordon, the prominent coloured member of the Jamaican Legislative Assembly who had been executed without trial by Eyre as an alleged leading protagonist in the rebellion. Defending Gordon as a good man who had been victimized in "the cause of freedom" through "anti-religious rancour, political spite, and official stupidity and blundering", the reviewer extended his censure of British colonial administration beyond the sphere of the West Indies, suggesting that Britain seldom realized the responsibilities her colonies brought upon her. In the vast majority of cases, she had neglected, or even refused, to use her influence in favour of Christianity, so that the native populations were subjected to the grossest injustices and mismanagement. From the fundamentalist Reformed Presbyterian standpoint, such conduct, added to the laxity of religious conduct within Britain itself, could only contribute to a spectacular retribution:

² For details concerning the 1863 split in the denomination see Chapter VIII, pp. 592-593.
Of no truth are we more convinced than this, that when the 'gathering storms' burst on Covenant-breaking, Christ-dishonouring Britain, no inconsiderable part of its fury will come from the direction of its colonies and dependencies

It becomes evident, then, that fear and frustration produced by difficulties in managing the coloured races may not have been the predominant themes in the Scottish outlook on the administration of the British colonies. Factors other than the mere intractibility and "savagery" of the native populations were frequently taken into consideration. As a result, from an astute colonial administrator such as Campbell, through the radical Scottish press, to the Presbyterian church, there ran a strong vein of conviction that most of the problems encountered in administering the British Empire were self-inflicted. As we have seen, the racial aspects of Reconstruction were certainly linked with British colonial difficulties, but often in such a way as jointly to censure America and Britain for their mutual failure to deal justly with their coloured races, or (as in the case of Campbell) in such a way as to point directives for the pattern of future British administration, drawing on the more successful aspects of American policy towards the Negro freedmen.

This said, however, it remained true that for some elements of the Scottish population, at least one area of the British Empire provided in the mid 1860s a focal point on which to base general, gloomy prognostications on the trials and terrors of attempting to govern the unruly native races in the colonies, and to argue for the essentially immutable barbarism of the Negro race throughout the world. The news, which reached Britain in November, 1865, of the Negro insurrection in Jamaica had the immediate effect of unleashing in Scotland a vigorous strain of racial prejudice among those who had always insisted on the absolute inferiority of the Negro and who had shown some impatience with those devoting their energies to his improvement

1 Reformed Presbyterian Witness (Glasgow), Nov., 1867, Vol. 2 p. 305.
and wellbeing. And initially at least - the gruesome reports of the revolt caused more moderate and liberal minded observers to betray an underlying sense of pessimism about the progress made by Britain up until then in "civilizing", Christianizing, and generally improving the Negro race.

Inevitably, so great a blow to British pride and British authority in Jamaica produced in some quarters a hardening in attitude against the Negro race which naturally extended beyond the colonies to include the American freedmen. The revolt, bringing the West Indian Negro up for scrutiny, was used to emphasize that the chronic vices and shortcomings - as well as the latent savagery - of the Negro character were universal, present only in varying degree wherever the race was found. Coming so soon after the end of a civil war which had left four millions of Negroes as free men in the United States, the Jamaican insurrection encouraged and forced out into the open racist attitudes which, in the short-term at least, could not fail to influence Scottish thinking on the Negro population in America.

The specific setback to the smooth functioning of British colonial administration did serve to heighten an awareness of the essential similarities of Britain's and America's problems. It had become abundantly clear that in the governing of the Negro race, both countries must face gigantic difficulties:

It is remarkable that the two leading nations in the world, descendents of Japhet - the British and the Americans - should be each burdened with difficulties arising from their connexion with the children of Ham. The Americans would gladly be rid of their negroes; and our colonists have no love for their emancipated blacks. What is to be done with them?[^1]

The *Dundee Courier* which, as we have already noted,[^2] was considerably

---

[^2]: See above, Chapter IV, pp. 348-349.
swayed by the reports of the Jamaican rebellion from a relatively open-minded, liberal attitude towards the American Negro to a harsher, more highly prejudiced racist opinion, conceded that British government of the island had been deplorably bad. But the greatest priority in its call for remedial action was to forestall the possible establishment of the "absurdity" of a Negro Republic.

It is by no means unlikely that England, as well as the United States, may have to face the formidable question of how to rule aright a race whose inferiority, whether constitutionally, or from long-continued circumstance, matters little, it is the merest folly to deny.¹

Fully concurring in the popular view that the insurrection had been "attended by all the ferocity and cruelty which mark a contest in which a semi-savage race are engaged",² the Courier was quick to pinpoint the significance of the revolt for the United States as well as for Britain. As a basis of censure for the ultra abolitionists of both countries, it used the "atrocities" perpetrated by the Negroes to emphasize the potentially dangerous state of matters "which zealots alike in America and England were prepared to risk in the late Confederate States, and the actual realization of which we ... believe some of them would not have vastly regretted, but, in the plenitude of their Pharisaism, would have regarded as a just judgement on the slaveholders".³

That the American Civil War itself had had some real influence in stimulating the revolt in Jamaica was a popular conception not totally discounted in the Scottish press. Certainly, the Dundee Courier's rival, the Dundee Advertiser, always ready to defend the United States from undue criticism and anxious also to find some legitimate basis for Negro unrest

1 Dundee Courier, 6 Nov., 1865.
2 Banffshire Journal, 14 Nov., 1865.
3 Dundee Courier, 15 Nov., 1865.
in Jamaica, quickly dismissed the suggestion that the rebellion had been a Haytian or Yankee-inspired plot. The prevalent idea, first mooted by a correspondent of the *Dublin Daily Express*, that there had been an American scheme to draft freed Negroes to Jamaica to establish a republic for the black population of the United States was specifically rejected as "the wild dream of some fervid Irishman". And the *Daily Review* similarly refuted this particular interpretation, deciding that there was no real evidence to suggest that America had been implicated or that the revolt had been propelled by anything other than "the very fanaticism of barbarism".

This conclusion was the fruit of reflection and factual assessment, however. The *Review* early recognized that the Jamaican Negroes had been "deeply moved by the issues of the American Civil War", and when the notion of a "Yankee plot" had first been publicized, the paper had not only accepted the very real possibility of such a scheme but, as an erstwhile Free Church organ which preserved some links with that denomination, had offered its own equally fantastic supplementary suggestion:

> It may be imagined, too, that the Fenians on the other side of the Atlantic have their eyes open to the project [the establishment of a Jamaican Republic by American Negroes], if they are not actually engaged in it, and that they look to see troops withdrawn from Canada, and thus obtain a favourable opportunity for raids into that country.

So far as the *Edinburgh Courant* was concerned, the American Civil War was seen as having bequeathed a legacy of evil to Britain as well as to the United States, with the 'Alabama' claims, Fenianism, and the Jamaican insurrection all more or less directly its results. In the case of the Jamaican insurrection, while British legislation was perhaps "partly to be blamed", there

1 *Dundee Advertiser*, 14 Nov., 1865.
was little question but that the trouble was due largely to the excitement produced in the minds of the black population by recent events in the United States.\(^1\) While assigning substantially greater blame to the British for mismanagement of their colony, the Glasgow Sentinel believed that it had been essentially a combination of contemptuous treatment by the British and practical aid from "incendiaries" from Hayti and the United States which had produced agitation in Jamaica.\(^2\) Although the paper later became increasingly sceptical of reports which stated that the revolt had been engineered primarily by Yankees, it remained convinced of the important psychological impact of Negro freedom in the United States for the black population of Jamaica:

The Civil War in America, and the emancipation of the slaves in that country, have no doubt been closely watched by the negroes in Jamaica, and perhaps they may have imbibed some notion that in America the negro had not only obtained freedom, but that he was supported by the Freedmen's Bureau, and some other idea of that sort may have had its share in the present outbreak.\(^3\)

While due consideration was thus given to the possible influence of the American Civil War in precipitating the crisis in Jamaica, there was a simultaneous concern for the effects which the revolt would have on the course of American Reconstruction. The Glasgow Sentinel, anxious by this time to see preserved the fair reputation of the United States as the home of democracy and liberty for all men,\(^4\) bitterly regretted that "the American party opposed to the negro" would regard the insurrection as a great windfall:

---

1 Edinburgh Courant, 14 Nov., 1865.
3 Glasgow Sentinel, 18 Nov., 1865.
4 It is worth noting that the Sentinel, in discounting the Dublin Express' story that America had incited the Negroes to revolt in Jamaica, turned the difference of opinion into a class issue by stressing that the Express was a "Tory paper" - see ibid., "The Irrepressible Negro", 18 Nov., 1865.
[The revolt] affords an ocular proof of the bad qualities of the negro, and the risk incurred by trusting him. Had the Jamaican negroes taxed their inventive powers for a plan to damage their brethren in the States, they could not have hit upon a more effectual one than by rising in rebellion and committing those atrocities which are reported at Morant Bay and St. Thomas in the East.

Deprecating the British maladministration which it believed had largely brought about the Negroes’ discontent, the Dundee Advertiser was similarly disturbed about the likely repercussions on the American situation. With its usual conviction that the cause of right would triumph in America, however, the Advertiser was not unduly pessimistic:

At first sight it looks sad that this event should have occurred just when America was adjusting the new state of things in the South, but the Sovereign Ruler of the World, who over-rules all events for good, may make our misrule and this insurrection a great lesson to the planters in the South ...

But generally, there were no illusions about the likely nature of the effect which the rebellion would have on the hard core who were opposed to liberal legislation for the freed Negroes of America. Those not themselves prepared to argue for a particularly dynamic policy of Reconstruction were at least ready objectively to admit that

The use that will be made of all this by those who maintain that the negro is by nature incapacitated from becoming a free citizen in a civilised country, and by those who are in the United States resisting his claims to be admitted within the Constitution, will be vigorous and effectual.

Even the Reformed Presbyterian church did not share the Dundee Advertiser’s optimism that the experience of Britain in Jamaica might produce a more reasonable attitude among prejudiced Americans, but rather suggested that the simultaneous problem of United States Reconstruction only increased the

---

1 Ibid.
2 Dundee Advertiser, 24 Nov., 1865. The Aberdeen Free Press, 22 Dec., 1865, judged the Jamaican outbreak to be a warning to the United States to be more farseeing in her treatment of the Negro population.
3 Inverness Courier, 16 Nov., 1865.
calamity of the insurrection, "for many will point to the Jamaican negro as a proof that the race is physically, intellectually, and morally inferior to the white, and incapable of a high Christian civilization".¹

Within Scotland itself, precisely this construction was put on events by the Edinburgh Courant. In an editorial giving full vent to racist arguments, the Courant took pains to demonstrate that the Negro had not only been the cause of the terrible American Civil War but had subsequently cost the American government "more anxiety than all its other administrative concerns put together". Emphasizing the continued existence of the commonly recognized vices in the Negroes' character - that they would work only under compulsion, that there were "the willing slave[s] of every brutal form of sensual indulgence" - the paper argued that Negro emancipation had been long postponed in the United States from "the well-grounded apprehension" that the Negro was not ready for independence, and that "placed side by side with more energetic races, he is worse off in an emancipated than in a servile condition".²

Convictions such as these made it natural that the Courant would be cheered by the prospect that the Jamaican outbreak would "check the ardour" of the American abolitionists and encourage President Johnson in his policy of Reconstruction. Especially reassuring to the Conservative journal was the setback which it believed would inevitably be sustained by those advocating Negro suffrage; Johnson's "very decided ... policy towards the negro can derive nothing but support and justification from the past history and recent outbreak of black Fenianism in Jamaica". Yet, in the Courant's reckoning, the long-term future was not particularly bright for the United States, forced as she was to contend with the internal problem of four million new freedmen who were not fit to be free:

2 Edinburgh Courant, 7 Nov., 1865.
Wherever the negro had been set free from the shackles of enforced labour he has invariably relapsed into his originally semi-bestial state; or, if he ever rises to be a taskmaster, he is seldom more than a lazy, self-indulgent and withal cruel tyrant.

A continuation of the situation in which free Negroes competed on an unequal basis with whites would in the course of a few years widen the gulf between blacks and whites and give rise to an embittered, comparatively idle Negro population which would constitute a potential rebel force within the United States. ¹

The Edinburgh Courant has already been identified as one of the most rabid and consistent Scottish forces opposing American democracy and American society during the Reconstruction era. Its record of extremism in this sphere was matched by the unrelentingly racist nature of its comments on the Negro race. Yet, the dramatic trauma of the Jamaican revolt, by eliciting an immediate, widespread Scottish reaction to the actuality of a Negro insurrection within the British Empire, was instrumental in demonstrating that the Courant was by no means particularly exceptional in Scotland, either in the depth or scope of its racist sentiments. The grim details of the Negro "atrocities", so sensationally and comprehensively presented in the Scottish press, provided the perfect background against which to bring out underlying beliefs in Negro inferiority. Certainly, there was little enough in the United States experience at that time to prompt a flood of Scottish statements on the "savagery" of the Negro race. ² The uprising in Jamaica, by virtue of its sheer unexpectedness, caught Scots' observers unaware, and caused them to voice blatantly racist views which deserve to be glanced at since they throw an indispensable light on basic Scottish attitudes to the Negro race.

¹ Ibid.
² In America, the Negroes did not even stage the much expected uprising at Christmas, 1865.
throughout the world at the very outset of the Reconstruction era in the United States.

Among even the most liberal commentators on the disturbing event, attempted explanation and defence of the Negroes' actions tended to assume a painfully condescending character. Such an attitude was well exemplified in the initial responses to the reported "brutalities" of the radically, philanthropically orientated Dundee Advertiser:

It is neither fair nor reasonable to judge them [the Jamaican Negroes] by our own standard, for it must be remembered that they are the immediate descendants of heathen barbarians, while we have inherited the advantages of centuries of enlightened civilization.¹

Indeed, unique in the Scottish press was the Aberdeen Free Press' failure to accept the likelihood of racial origins as a prime factor contributing to the gruesome nature of the Jamaican uprising. William McCombie's Free Press was immediately ready to assert that "The atrocities perpetrated by the blacks reveal the pent up wrath of a generation ... The public [in Britain] will not rest content with the sweeping and scornful denunciations of the negro, into which some of our leading journals have rushed with such evident gusto and avidity".²

Certainly, the general feeling communicated in all sections of the press was that the Jamaican rebellion represented a serious retrogression into semi-barbarism by the Negroes, on whom the influences of Christianity and white civilization had patently failed to have more than a superficial effect. Simply, the uprising was accepted as offering positive proof of the essential savagery and inferiority of the Negro character. If these facts were disturbing, they could readily enough - almost, indeed, complacently - be taken

---

¹ Dundee Advertiser, 17 Nov., 1865. The Advertiser had earlier duly printed in detail the nature of the "brutalities" - see ibid., 14 Nov., 1865.
² Aberdeen Free Press, 17 Nov., 1865.
as incontrovertible. Robert Carruthers' Inverness Courier, for instance, succinctly defined its view by branding the insurrection a "war of races in spirit and fact" and by elaborating on this to argue that

the negroes, reversing the fate to which they themselves were subjected for centuries, have found the white man 'guilty of a skin not coloured like their own'. Scarcely, if at all, less important is the terribly complete proof afforded in the brutalities of the outbreak of the fact that freedom, civilisation and Christianity have only had a superficial effect upon the negro - scratch the black Christian and freeholder, and you find the African savage.1

It was a sad fact that "the persons most distinguished for barbarity and bloodthirstiness" had been subjected to "all the influences which either civilization or Christianity could bring to bear upon them".2

Britain - and America - it was implied by a somewhat less prominent Northern newspaper, the Banffshire Journal, must henceforth resign themselves to a truth which "political events and ethnological enquiry" were constantly enforcing, namely, that

The difference between the white and black races is wider than most people now-a-days are inclined to believe. Individuals carefully trained are raised to a level with the whites; but it is to be apprehended that generations of subjection to religious, moral, and intellectual culture and civilizing influences will alone suffice to raise the blacks to a par with the pale faces.3

And, provided credence was given to the accounts of the vicious murders and tortures supposedly indulged in by the Negro rioters, no amount of insistence on the extent of the British misgovernment and injustice which had existed

1 Inverness Courier, 17 Nov., 1865. It is perhaps of some small interest to note that among the many prominent literary men whom Carruthers knew personally was Robert Chambers, author of Vestiges of Creation. Carruthers had collaborated with Chambers to produce most of the original material for Chambers' Cyclopaedia of English Literature in 1843-44, and he was in charge of revising the third edition in 1876. He provided the appendix for the third edition of Robert's Life of Sir Walter Scott in 1871, and with William Chambers, had co-edited Chambers' Boudlerised "Household Edition" of Shakespeare in 1861-63. See DNB, Vol. 3 (1908), pp. 1093-1094.

2 Inverness Courier, 23 Nov., 1865.

3 Banffshire Journal, 14 Nov., 1865.
in the island could detract from the apparent truth of the racist conviction that the Jamaican Negroes were "rapidly falling back ... to the condition of their ancestors in the African woods". ¹

Even the Reformed Presbyterian Church felt constrained to acknowledge at least a temporary retrogression on the part of the coloured population. But unlike the many contemporaries who eagerly emphasized the latent primitive savagery of the "civilized" Negro, the conclusion was a harrowing one for the Reformed Presbyterians:

It is sad and humiliating that after a long period of freedom, and the enjoyment of so many advantages, the negro should suddenly discover the barbarous instincts and fierce habits of the African race [⁷] for no alleged oppression on the part of the whites can ever extenuate the fiendish atrocities of which he has been guilty. Seen in the light of the recent revolt, he appears to be a cruel and unrelenting savage.²

As we have already noted,³ the action of the Negroes in Jamaica was deeply regretted by the Reformed Presbyterian church because of the adverse effect which it would be likely to have on the cause of the American freedmen.

It must, however, have been equally as disheartening for this small section of the Scottish Presbyterian church, so devoted as it was to missionary work, to learn of an area of British colonial power where matters had come to such a pass as to produce the complete antithesis of Christian doctrine. Although care was taken to implicate them in fomenting the rebellion,⁴ it was not enough simply to blame it all on the preachings of Baptist missionaries: there had to be some darker, remoter force working to produce such atrocities. It was either an acceptance of that, or the acceptance of the fact that British government, and, more importantly, Scottish

¹ Dundee Courier, 15 Nov., 1865.
³ See above, pp. 532-533.
missionary efforts, had so totally failed in their relative tasks as to produce - and be unable to contain - so fearful a Negro rebellion. Later, when deeper understanding of the uprising brought a clearer recognition of the substantial degree of British maladministration involved, there was a greater willingness to admit the difficulties which faced Christian missionaries in this particular sphere of operations. Although encouraged by official confirmation of the continued place for the labour of missionary societies in Jamaica, the Reformed Presbyterian Magazine was nevertheless moved to remark that "the difficulties interposed by the selfishness of professing Christians, and by the gross immorality of many British people in our colonies, are very serious". In this instance at least, it seems possible, therefore, that the Reformed Presbyterian reliance on the strength of the "heathen" and "barbaric" origins of the Negro race served partially as a defence against the unhappy acknowledgement that Jamaica was one field where missionary work had been found to be sadly wanting in achievement.

Sensational press speculation about the ultimate roots of the Jamaican rioters' activities must have suggested to the Scottish public that their country's massive missionary contribution had made little real impression on the Negro mind - at least in some quarters of the globe. The Daily Review issued a warning to the United States as well as to Britain in maintaining that wherever the Negro race existed in force, and in an unequal state of civilization among the whites, that country was a "volcanic region":

To the mental and moral inequalities which human nature in black and white may always be expected to present, must be added in the case of the negro another series of inequalities arising from the different degrees of civilisation in which the black man is found. That under any social condition, and after ages of Christian training, there will still be Africans capable of perpetrating awful atrocities is only what we must expect - for the same capability exists among Englishmen:

---

1 Ibid., "Notes on Public Affairs: Jamaica and Governor Eyre", Jan., 1866, p. 31.
the atrocities are less to be wondered at ... when the lowness of the social condition and the imperfection of this Christian training, among many of our West Indian negroes, are fairly taken into account.

This apparently fairly generous estimation of the situation merely set the scene, however, for the Review's main argument, namely, that the Jamaican insurrection (like the Indian mutiny) had had its origin in "an offended paganism", and had aimed at the "extirpation of an alien and hated race". Nor was the incidence of ritual paganism recognized as being confined to Africa and the West Indies. It was insisted that secret rites (some of which were graphically described) of a pagan religious character were still practised by the black population in the Gulf States of America, that a portion of the Negroes in the Southern states and in the West Indies were still bound together by "the tie of an interdicted religion as well as by the tie of race". ²

The Review's belief that a proportion of the Negro population in the United States and the West Indies had retained a store of "traditional" atrocities "derived from their habitat in Africa" should not be considered as a representative Scottish attitude towards the Negro race at that time; but it does at least give some indication of the fantastic speculations which could be conjured up about the alien cultures and civilizations of the coloured races. Furthermore, in the Daily Review this peculiarly sensationalist brand of racism accompanied a more pedestrian, Carlylean brand of racist thinking which was echoed elsewhere in Scottish writings of the period. Acknowledging the value of the contribution made by Carlyle to the better understanding of the Negro character, the Review reasserted that Negroes were constitutionally lazy, temperamentally sensual, deficient in reflective

---

1 Daily Review, 14 Nov., 1865.
2 Ibid.
powers, and over-emotional:

This combination of qualities accounts for the black races remaining savage and unimproved when left to themselves. It seems to be a condition of their advancement that they shall be brought into contact with the white man, have the opportunity of imitating him, and be placed under his guidance, and perhaps under his control.

Although at this stage no direct speculations were made on the likely nature of the Negro freedmen's progress in the United States, it was felt that in Jamaica at least, the experiment of trying to determine whether the Negro was capable of progress other than in a state of tutelage had afforded unencouraging results. It had been demonstrated that, as freemen, the Negroes' natural lack of self-control could too easily result in an "extreme of ferocity".¹

Similar disillusionment with the entire Negro race as a result of the Jamaican experience was shared by the Glasgow Herald, which reminded its readers that emancipation in the West Indies had been accompanied by the general belief that Jamaica would "prove the best field for drawing out the dormant energies of the sable race". To explain why this hope had not been realized, the Herald also fell back on a Carlylean interpretation of the Negroes' character. In arguing that freedom had really been a stumbling-block to the social improvement of the black population, there was little attempt to conceal the debt to Carlyle's Occasional Discourse:

The newly liberated slave, rejoicing in his freedom, had a positive antipathy to hard labour when he found a piece of land on which he could 'squat' and rear as many yams and bushels of maize as would support life in a state of laziness.²

With unparalleled hope for advancement and improvement, the general conduct of the free Jamaican Negroes, and their general descent in the social scale "can only be accounted for by one theory, and that is - that the negro race

¹ Ibid., 17 Nov., 1865.

if left to itself, even under the most favourable circumstances, is incapable of rising above a state of semi-barbarism".¹

But easily the most direct successor to Carlyle in the sheer virulence of his denunciations of the Negro character - and of those who too enthusiastically championed the Negro cause - was Charles Mackay. The trenchant racism of Mackay's article, "The Negro and the Negrophilists", which appeared in the May, 1866 edition of Blackwood's Magazine clearly indicates that at the time when Reconstruction in America was getting fully into its stride, when the storm over the mode of legislating to ensure Negro freedom and equality had already broken, and when the freedmen themselves were striving to adapt to their changed condition, there still existed within Scotland (and within the pages of Scotland's most influential periodical) a place for racist arguments framed in the same vitriolic style, and voiced with the same passionate conviction, as those offered by Carlyle almost two decades before.

Mackay's article would appear to have been inspired by the Jamaican insurrection and, more specifically, by the desire to castigate the British philanthropists and that section of the British public who, with "unchristian malevolence and theological rancour",² had condemned Governor Eyre's action towards the rioters. Deeply interested as he was, however, in the situation in post-war America, and keenly concerned about the mutual interaction of British and American society at all levels, the scope of his arguments concerning the innate capacities of the Negro race did not merely extend to include reference to the developing position of the black population in the United States but actually concentrated on forecasting the probable future situation in America from analyses of the Negroes' condition in other parts

¹ Glasgow Herald, 25 Nov., 1865. Original emphasis.
of the world. As well as aiming to censure British "negrophilists", Mackay's stated intention in writing the article was, indeed, to illustrate the "prospects of the negro race in America". ¹

While other Scots of his time tended to view the mutual race problems of Britain and the United States in terms of the equable, satisfactory settlement of the Negro population within a clearly defined stratum of society, Mackay saw the difficulty as consisting first and foremost in the "moral malady", common to both countries, of "negrophilism". This slant on the question was presented in a fashion which suggests that Mackay may consciously have been taking up Carlyle's mantle in inveighing against the philanthropists of the time who were involved in advocating the Negroes' cause. The disease of "nigger on the brain" did not, he argued, attack nations or individuals not of Anglo-Saxon stock, nor those of the Roman Catholic faith, but was confined almost exclusively to English-speaking people and Protestants.² Nonconformist religion was naturally isolated as a major source of this phenomenon, and, so far as British defenders of the Jamaican and American Negro were concerned, it was apposite for Mackay to extend this particular area of censure to include "the politicians of the conventicle and of the ultra-radical school" who wanted to Americanize British institutions.

Although what might be termed the emotional aversion to the manner and matter of those who championed the Negro remained (as with Carlyle) the strongest stimulus for his ridicule, Mackay did seek also to draw on the century's "scientific" findings on the races of man, both to back up the depth of his convictions about Negro inferiority and to further discredit

¹ Mackay to John Blackwood, 22 March, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 14-15.
² In Mackay's estimation, the French were scarcely affected, and the Spanish, Portuguese, Italians, and Roman Catholic Irishmen totally untouched, by the excessive concern for the Negro which he saw as characterizing the British and Americans - see "The Negro and the Negrophilists", p. 581.
the "negrophilists". Having at the request of John Blackwood moderated some of the original language and content of the article, he insisted that his allusion to the sterility of the mulatto after the fourth generation be retained:

In order to be quite certain on the point, I consulted my excellent friend, Dr. James Copland, author of the Cyclopaedia of Medicine, who resided for several years in his youth on the Coast of Africa and who has made the negro his particular study. He fully confirms what I state - that the mixed race dies out in the fourth remove.1

A major charge against the philanthropists could therefore be that they were wilfully ignorant of scientific facts which were incompatible with their precious theories. "A too intimate acquaintance with negroes in America", Mackay suggested, "may have rendered me somewhat over impatient with negro worshippers, here and elsewhere[2] who know nothing about them". The point was forcefully made in the article itself, where the American Civil War was largely laid at the door of those whose love for the negro is theological rather than humanitarian, and who promulgate the theory, without understanding the truths of ethnology which point to a different conclusion, that 'God made of one blood all the nations of the earth'.

1 Mackay to John Blackwood, 16 April, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 18-19. The argument was duly put forward in his article - see "The Negro and the Negrophilists", p. 592.

James Copland was born in Orkney in 1791. Having graduated M.D. from Edinburgh University in 1815, he was unable to find suitable work in London and eventually went to the Gold Coast as medical officer to the settlements of the African Company. He landed at Goree, Senegal, Gambia and Sierra Leone and gained knowledge of the diseases there. In 1818 he returned to Britain, and two years later became licentiate of the College of Physicians of London. Choosing to rise in his profession by constant writing and publication, he began by writing on the medical topography of West Africa in the 1820 issue of the Quarterly Journal of Foreign Medicine. He became in 1822 editor of The London Medical Repository and contributed much to it. Further publications followed in the next few years, and from 1824-25 he also lectured at a medical school in London and at Middlesex Hospital. In 1832, Longmans issued the first part of an encyclopaedia by him which ultimately extended to three volumes, under the title The Dictionary of Practical Medicine. He was elected F.R.S. in 1833 and a fellow of the College of Physicians in 1837, eventually becoming President of the Pathological Society. His medical writings continued into the 1860s; and it has been asserted that he wrote more on medicine than any contemporary colleague - see DNB, Vol. 12, pp. 171-172.

2 Mackay to John Blackwood, 10 April, 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4212, fol. 16-17.
Belonging to this lethal fraternity were "preachers, professional lecturers, salaried philanthropists, and weak-minded women ... together with the philosophers, and the strong-minded women, who are too strong-minded to attend either church or chapel, and all the multitude of theorists who would abolish slavery even at the cost of abolishing the negro".¹

In Mackay's view, it was merely "the moral pest of negrophilism" which was preventing "the reconstruction ... of the great union of free white people, which it was the main and only legitimate object of the war to accomplish".²

The strong implication was that the Negro simply was not worth all the trouble, anxiety, and misery which the subject of his wrongs or his rights was producing. Mackay's singularly narrow interpretation of the scope of "reconstruction" was governed by a thinly veiled conviction that unless the whites were in absolute control, it was impossible for European races to live in peace and amity with the African race in any part of the world where both were equal in numbers, and, more especially, where there were black majorities such as those in Jamaica and South Carolina. The philanthropists were accused of disregarding the basic question affecting the stability and development of post-war America - the question, that was, of whether or not the Negro freedman could become a responsible citizen through acquiring the virtues of "steady labour", "thrift" and "prudent forethought".³

In seeking himself to answer this question, Mackay looked in some detail at the state of the Negro race in Africa, Hayti, Jamaica and in the Southern and Northern states of America. As was to be expected, he identified in each of the varying circumstances a different set of relevant "facts" proving the indisputably low status of the race in the scale of civilization. Africa

² Ibid., p. 582.
³ Ibid., p. 586.
offered perhaps the best sphere in which to focus upon the unextinguishable "primitive barbarism" of the Negro. Amid fulsome references to his pagan superstitions, his slave dealing, his "sloth" and "base animal indulgences", and his cannibalistic tendencies, the best that Mackay was able to say of the African Negro was that he was "not ... of the fiercest order of savages ... but ... a pastoral and agricultural savage of a milder type". But savage he remained, having at no stage in history understood or promoted civilization: in contrast to the founders of the ancient civilizations and the continuing greatness of the Caucasian stock,

the negro has done nothing. In all the record of history, from Moses downwards, the negro has been the same. He has remained in Africa, fastened like a limpet to his rock, and given no sign of improvement in the long interval, or shown the least capacity for self-advancement. He is as unchanged as the beaver, the bee and the monkey. As he was four thousand years ago, so he is now. Had he not been discovered by the European races and forcibly removed from his own habitat like a horse, to be made available as a labourer in a country which knew him not, he never of his own accord would have sought his fortune, or been impressed with the remotest desire of seeking it elsewhere than in his own tropical fields and jungles.\(^1\)

Both Hayti and Jamaica with their declining economies served his purposes in illustrating the inability of the Negro race to meet independence responsibly. In Hayti, "the negro, content with little, basks in the sun, as careless and about as nude as the hog", while in true Carlylean fashion, the black population of Jamaica was denigrated for failing to make the best use of the island's natural resources and for cultivating only enough land "to grow pumpkins, ...[their] prime necessity".\(^2\)

From this premise, it was but logical to argue that under slavery in the Southern states of America, the Negro had generally not been "miserable, morose and dangerous", but well enough reconciled to a way of life which allowed him to enjoy the benefits and advantages of his master's extensive

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 587.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 589
paternalism. The inability of the race adequately to fend for itself and to hold its own in conditions of free, open competition with white labour was seen to be demonstrated in the sad—and worsening—fate of the free Negroes in the Northern states. Once the whites had inevitably displaced them from even the menial tasks, there were no alternatives for them but "pauperism, the grave, or emigration." In respect of the thousands of freedmen who had flocked to the Northern towns, he was, even at this early stage of Reconstruction, prepared gloomily to conclude that "liberty and the grave speedily become one and the same blessing".

By the unrelieved pessimism which it communicated, Mackay's wide-ranging examination of the Negro character clearly sought to convey the impression that there was but little prospect of the coloured population in the United States making any real, rapid advancement as freedmen. "Nature", he declared, "which fixed the limits of the white man's mind fixed those also of the black; and no training, no example, can cultivate the lower animal into the higher". It was left to him finally to imply that there could be no panaceas for the smooth and swift assimilating of the American Negroes into the body of the nation as fully responsible citizens who contributed their fair share to society. The outstanding priority was to ensure that the Negro freedman conformed to "the great and paramount law of civilisation"—that one must work or perish. This conclusion, the related belief that "labour is a sacred duty", and the argument that if the freedmen would not work voluntarily, they must be organized into "labour companies" were of course essentially the points made by Carlyle in relation to the free Negroes of Jamaica.

1 Ibid., p. 588.
2 Ibid., p. 590.
3 Ibid., p. 596.
4 Ibid., p. 592.
5 Ibid., p. 596.
In order to increase Scottish doubts and apprehensions about the American freedmen's ability to prosper, there was, during the transitional Reconstruction years, no need for someone of Mackay's strongly racist views to shift the emphasis from the obligation on the Negro to work consistently and well. The concept of "work or want" was at this time so strongly ingrained in the minds of Scotsmen (at all social levels) as a fundamental axiom that any section of mankind who by practice appeared openly to flout it must stand to incur a generous measure of Scottish censure. And whereas legitimate excuses could be made for any slowness on the part of the American Negroes in educational progress, or in acquiring social sophistication and political acumen, there could be none for a failure to recognize the evident necessity - and the duty - of working conscientiously for one's living. Mackay skilfully sought to involve his readers in his racist beliefs when he drove home an argument which they were all, in principle at least, bound to accept, namely, that the freed Negroes could not be allowed to lounge around the country, beg in the cities, possess Southern lands and let them go out of cultivation, and "breed up a race of paupers to prey on the industry of better men".

It would seem, however, that at this early stage in the Reconstruction process in America, most Scottish observers did not in fact hold such inflexibly derogatory attitudes towards the Negro race in general as did Charles Mackay. Certainly, the Marquis of Lorne, during his tour of the Tropics and America in 1866, found plenty of evidence to convince him of the serious shortcomings and basic inferiority of the Negro race. High on the list of failings was of course the indisposition to work. In Hayti, he lamented that

---

1 For further consideration of Scottish arguments that the Negro must prove himself fit for freedom by his achievements as a voluntary labourer, and in his efforts at self-help, see below, Chapter VII, passim.

"laziness is the rule", and in both his book and - more outspokenly - the original letter to his mother, he deplored the fact that the material advantages left by the French settlers "have never been made use of as they would have been with a race destined to hold its head up in the world ...

There is no ambition to push their way. When they are pushed they do things well enough - but there must be a must". The Southern states of America likewise afforded him examples of "niggers loafing". Exasperation, resulting from personal experience of Negro incompetence, prompted on one occasion a pertinent reference to a Haytian guide as "an ugly black moustached animal".

Nor did Lorne seek to disguise his belief that the Negro race - at least that section of it found in Jamaica - was "degraded ... idle and inferior". But while he did not envisage any rapid intellectual improvement in the black population of the island, he was tremendously anxious to stress that their great ignorance could and should be alleviated by the establishment of "a well-conducted system of education... Education, in my opinion, is the greatest want of Jamaica, and if a proper system were once established, I should not despair of the island. They are not a bad people". Visiting

1 Marquis of Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, p. 27
2 Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, Port au Prince, 7 Feb., 1866, Letters of the 9th Duke: West Indies and America, 1866, Argyll MSS.
   In the printed version, there is less implication that the Negro race simply could not rise to a high position because it was not destined to - compare A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 32-33.
3 Ibid., pp. 281, 282.
4 Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, Port au Prince, 7 Feb., 1866, Letter of the 9th Duke ..., Argyll MSS.
   The word "black" is omitted in the book - see A Trip to the Tropics, p. 35.
6 Marquis of Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, pp. 148-149.
one school at Kingston, he had been favourably impressed by the performance of black scholars,¹ and in Hayti, the "courtesy and refinement" of President Geffrard had made a very real impact on him.² Similarly, he was enthusiastic about the work and achievements of Freedmen's Bureau schools in the Southern states,³ as well as being, on occasion, encouraged by signs of Negro enterprise⁴ and optimistic about the freedman's future as a free labourer in the South.⁵

Evidently, then, although again deliberately opposing his parents in being convinced of a deeply inherent Negro inferiority, and in tending to descry "the Bright school" which sought to exonerate the Negroes from culpability in the Jamaican revolt,⁶ the Marquis of Lorne was much readier to envisage a substantial measure of "improveability" for the Negroes, and

1 Ibid., p. 148.
2 Ibid., p. 71.
3 Ibid., p. 309. He visited a large freedmen's school at Charlottesville, Virginia. See also ibid., p. 335.
5 Ibid., p. 336.
6 Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, on board 'La Plata', 22 Jan., 1866, Letters of the 9th Duke ..., Argyll MSS.

Lorne related that he had met a Colonel Nelson who had documents proving "a good deal more against the blacks". On board ship, he also became very friendly with a highly prejudiced Jamaican planter called Mitchell - see ibid; Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, 29 Jan., 1866, in ibid. The passengers included emissaries of the Anti Slavery Society and of the Quakers, going to Jamaica to investigate British action after the revolt. The Quakers he described as "spectacled - smooth-faced, and very greasy looking people" - Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, 16 Jan., 1866, in ibid. One of them, he remarked, "talked Morning Star sort of twaddle about negroes" - Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, 22 Jan., 1866, in ibid.
much less bitterly contemptuous of the race than Charles Mackay. Lorne’s racism, for instance, tended generally to be expressed not in the virulent manner of Mackay but in terms of sardonic amusement at the child-like simplicity, the pretensions, and the impressionable nature of the race. Indeed, the extreme calumny of Mackay towards the Negro would appear to have been adequately matched in contemporary opinion only in the testimonies sent by Scots in Jamaica on the nature of the insurrection.

Like Mackay, the Jamaican Scots insisted on emphasizing not only the idleness and sheer barbarity of Negroes, but also the misapplied sympathy of those philanthropists in Britain who sympathized with them. Most clearly in the communication of the Rev. J. Radcliffe, a Church of Scotland minister in Kingston, Jamaica, could the derision of the Negro race and the censure of those who championed it be extended, by implication, to apply to Negroes elsewhere in the world. Thus, Radcliffe asserted that the British tended always to romanticize the circumstances concerning the Negro, seeing him as a victim of white oppression. Insisting that poverty among the Negroes was invariably the result of their own laziness, and providing evidence of the "murderous orgies" which had marked the Jamaican revolt, he declared:

Surely, the people of England will at last have their eyes opened to the character of the negroes ... The hopes of missionaries are broken down as to the improvement of the negro ... We therefore

1 It is inconceivable, for example, that Mackay would ever have wished permanently to retain a Negro servant. But Lorne, having been extremely impressed by a particular black servant in Hayti, wrote to his mother "I never saw a man I sh[ould]d more like to have as a servant, but it w[ould]d only be cruelty to bring a negro to England, I am afraid. The whole Servant's Hall w[ould]d march out in a body if he sat down to table with them" - Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, 7 Feb., 1866, in ibid. He continued to feel that he "must get a black servant somewhere", however, and hoped that "we could protect him against English flunkey bullying" - Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, 12 Feb., 1866, in ibid.

2 See, for instance, A Trip to the Tropics, passim, and Passages from the Past, Vol. 1, p. 157, where he referred to an African woman who had asked a Scottish missionary to baptize her baby "Twenty-two Queen Street", the address of the Edinburgh mission house.
beseech ... that all sentimental young ladies, and all philanthropic ladies, and all old ladies of both sexes, will discard from this time forward all romantic ideas about the gentleness of the negro.¹

Radcliffe's views were echoed elsewhere in reports from the island.

A correspondent of the Dundee Courier in Port Marie furnished the paper with an extremely detailed and grisly account in which absolutely no quarter was given to the rioters, and full emphasis placed on the complete worthlessness of the Negro character. Britons were accused of serious misapprehensions in this respect ("what appears the devil to us shines as an angel of light to you"), and it was suggested that the Anti-Slavery Society would "sympathize deeply with those amiable creatures whose amusements in killing and mangling the white inhabitants were interfered with".² An Aberdeenshire man, resident in Nova Scotia but who had been in Jamaica at the time of the uprising, sent back to Scotland similar extreme views, suggesting that the African ex-slave was "such an admirable subject for the display of cant and mock philanthropy", and significantly deciding that Jamaica afforded "a striking illustration of the incapacity of the negro race to manage their (sic) own affairs, and consequently the folly of investing them with liberty, except under wholesome restrictions".³

³ Account of a trip to Jamaica by "a native of Strathbogie", employed in the District Pay Office, Halifax, Nova Scotia, in Huntly Express, 3 March, 1866.

See also letter from "A Strathbogie man" (who had been seven years in the West Indies) to his brother, printed in ibid., 17 Feb., 1866; also letter from Alexander Chisholm, overseer of a plantation in Jamaica, to his brother J. Chisholm, Pluscarden, Morayshire, printed in Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 8 Dec., 1865, in which he embellished the usual tales of atrocities by concluding "Martial law has been proclaimed here now, and we can shoot and flog to any extent".
Obviously, such sentiments had their relevance also for the American situation, which in almost every respect save the cataclysmic experience of Negro revolt, was analogous to the British experience in the West Indies. The adverse accounts of Negro character, printed in small regional journals and, most importantly, written by men of the district, would almost certainly have had some effect in stimulating attitudes towards the Negro race as a whole at a time when attention was already focussed on the phenomenon of a vast number of new American Negro freedmen. Accordingly, we find in the strictures of a Banffshire man a vein of thought regarding the economic and political condition of the Jamaican Negroes which directly anticipates that of other Scots in relation to the American Negroes. The free Negro of Jamaica had, he argued, greater advantages and comforts than a crofter and small farmer in the North of Scotland. Revolt had been precipitated by over-indulgent humanitarians:

The negro has before and after emancipation been made the pet of a misnamed Philanthropic Section of the English people. They have given him who was a slave and almost a savage yesterday credit for virtues they do not recognize in the working classes of England, and endow ... a comparatively inferior being with political rights that have not yet been granted to the respectable and honest English partisan or peasant.

Backing up this argument was a fierce condemnation of the coloured population as "undeserving and thankless, dangerous ... ignorant, gross and sensual, below the ordinary minimum of the European lower classes in capacity for mental or social improvement ... vain, conceited, and overbearing".¹

It is possible that there were relatively less direct comparisons and analogies made on the Jamaican and American situations in the Scottish press than in the English.² But so far as the specific question of race is

¹ Letter from "a Banffshire man", Kingston, Jamaica, in Banffshire Journal, 21 Nov., 1865. See also a second letter in ibid., 23 Jan., 1866.
² Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race, pp. 75-76, 96, indicates the volume of British press analogies between the race question in America and Jamaica.
concerned, there is at least an indication that Scots were inevitably conscious of similarities between the relative populations. Ironically, this was most forcibly demonstrated in an analogy drawn between the white populations of the two countries. Eventually distressed by the "ruthlessness" of the white authorities in their reprisals on the rioters, the Daily Review subsequently deplored the Rev. J. Radcliffe's attitude as expressed in his letter to the Times, taking particular exception to his call for martial law. Describing in some detail the arbitrary punishments and executions meted out by the British military force immediately after the insurrection, it concluded that the Jamaican planters, in applauding this, had been shown to be nearly, or as, barbarous as the Negroes themselves.

The act of emancipation [in Jamaica] which made free men of the Negroes made 'mean whites' of their masters; and the feeling with which the blacks came to be regarded thenceforward by the planter, was not the feeling with which they used to be looked on by the class to which Washington and Stonewall Jackson belonged, but that of the class from which President Andrew Johnson sprang.  

The Review, still preserving some reputation as an organ of the Free Church, seized on Radcliffe's attitude as indicative of the reactionary, redundant place of the Established Church in the West Indies. A main basis of condemnation of the clergy of both the Church of Scotland and the Church of England was that they had had little influence on the Negro mind: "To these dignified personages the negro ... owes nothing". The "unhallowed savagery" of some ministers, coupled with "the generally low character of Jamaican mean whites", had produced a state of affairs which "looks immeasurably liker a massacre of the black than ... of the white man".

1 Daily Review, 18 Nov., 1865.
2 Ibid., 21 Nov., 1865.
3 Ibid. See also letter from "a Scottish missionary" of twenty years' standing in Jamaica, in Glasgow Herald, 16 Feb., 1866, in which he censured the Church of England clergy, "who generally have little sympathy with the black population, and appear to take it for granted that they are in much better circumstances than the planter".
Yet, there was, of course, plenty of support within Scotland for the desperate action of Eyre and the British soldiers. There was some feeling that even if Eyre had overstepped the limits of repression somewhat, it was understandable and largely excusable, faced as he was with so dangerous an emergency. Initially, at least, it was possible to judge Eyre as having acted "admirably" in dealing with "alien races who [had] suddenly developed all the savage propensities of their original state". Even the Reformed Presbyterian church, when still uncertain of the measure of British guilt, ventured to suggest that "True mercy often consists in sharp and decisive rigour. The revolt was diabolical in its cruelty and excesses". And even after it became clear that British "retaliation was too indiscriminate and prolonged", the instigators of it could be almost totally vindicated for having effectively crushed a revolt "to extirpate the whites, and set up a black Republic". The Scotsman judged it a "race" insurrection, aimed at the extermination of the whites and the establishment of "negro anarchy". Finding the uprising "one of the most deplorable and disheartening events of our times", the paper maintained that all Carlyle's formerly unpopular views on the Negro character had been fully vindicated:

Mr. Carlyle may argue that he has found justification for his harsh sentiments and dark predictions. Equal laws, kind treatment, ease and plenty, religion itself, have availed little - the Jamaican negro has suddenly started up as blind and furious a savage as was his ancestor on the banks of the Niger or the Senegal, and has turned like a wild beast on the power that has long protected, tended, and guided him.

1 See, for instance, Glasgow Herald, 19 Feb., 1866.
2 Dundee Courier, 21 Nov., 1865. See also Inverness Courier, 23 Nov., 1865.
4 Glasgow Herald, 3 May, 1866.
5 Ibid. See also Inverness Courier, 14 Feb., 1867.
6 Scotsman, 13 Nov., 1865.
Defending the conduct of Eyre and his colleagues, heavy censure was levelled against those - notably more radical in their domestic political affiliations than the Scotsman - who were over-ready to condemn their own country and race.

There are people like Mr. Bright who, in every one of the many and various controversies in which this country has been engaged during their time - whatever the subject-matter, and whoever the other party - whether despotic or republican, barbarous or civilised, European, Oriental, or Occidental, black, white or brown, foreigners, colonists, or our mutinous soldiery - have always and at once decided that this country was wrong and cruel and everybody else right and oppressed.¹

This charge was repeated in an editorial deploring the public meetings which sought to indict Eyre before a full Government enquiry had been made.²

When the Jamaica Committee (spearheaded by such champions of the Negro cause as John Bright, Parson Chamerovzow and - up until this time, when he resigned - Charles Fowell Buxton) finally decided to press for Eyre's arraignment on a murder charge, the Glasgow Herald was outraged: "are we going to accuse him of murder because he did not act quite according to the feelings of the advocates of the negro, who have never experienced Sambo's rage and have never had occasion to tremble under his brutality?"³

The spectacle of a committee constituted of "philanthropists" sitting in judgement upon Eyre similarly angered the Edinburgh Courant, which dismissed the leading members as "political fanatics, or unscrupulous partisans, or vainglorious busy-bodies, desirous of ventilating their crotchets, or advancing their party and personal interests". The case of the Jamaica committee proved, it contended, the inferiority of English law practice to Scottish, under which such a private prosecution could not have taken place.⁴

---

¹ Ibid., 20 Nov., 1865.
² Ibid., 2 Dec., 1865.
³ Glasgow Herald, 14 July, 1866.
⁴ Edinburgh Courant, 15 Nov., 1866.
The Courant not only succeeded in presenting its censure in such a way as to score a point for the Scottish legal system, and to attack the politics and principles of the "philanthropists". Years later, the Eyre controversy was also used as a weapon of attack against the United States. The opportunity was afforded by the American government's treatment of the Red Indians of the Plains, which the Edinburgh Courant triumphantly represented as "a spectacle of tyranny, double-dealing, outrage and massacre which is only to be paralleled by the career of a Cortes or a Pizarro". Against this, it cynically deplored the traditional tendency among Americans to insist that Britain, in its colonial relations and especially in its treatment of "inferior races", had been a hard task master, unjust and cruel. Specific reference was made to United States' denouncement of Eyre's conduct in Jamaica, and it was significantly concluded that "the persistent malice with which Mr. Eyre was persecuted by a small but determined band of ultra-Radical doctrinaires at home was loudly encouraged by the philanthropic and negro-loving North".¹

The "race question" as such therefore provided within its transatlantic ambit scope for attack on individuals and societies whose politics and political institutions respectively were anathema to Scottish Conservatives. Charles Mackay was similarly able to vent a little more spleen towards the United States by involving it in the Eyre business. "Malignant" British philanthropists had, he suggested, been encouraged in their efforts to discredit Eyre by sensationalist and utterly deceptive headlines in the American press describing "eight miles of dead bodies", and so forth.²

The yet more nationally famous (though not necessarily more rabid) Scottish arch-critic of United States democracy was more inclined, however,

¹ Ibid., 3 Sept., 1869.
² Mackay, "The Negro and the Negrophilists", p. 589. The anti-abolitionists in America were even included in this particular indictment, Mackay explaining that they had used the "delusion" of large-scale massacre of Negroes in an effort to scare off abolitionist attempts to secure equality for the Negroes in the South.
to insist not upon American encouragement of British "negrophilism", but rather to emphasize the reverse process. Thomas Carlyle, presumably in 1867 more convinced than ever of the utter folly of Britain's historic course in emancipating her Jamaican slaves, briskly stated that the American furore about Negro freedom had been directly influenced "by nonsense sent over by Britain". The ensuing results, both in regard to the American Civil War and its aftermath, had been disastrous:

[H]alf a million ... of excellent White Men, full of gifts and faculty, have slit one another into horrid death, in a temporary humour ... and three million Blacks, men and brothers (of a sort), are completely "emancipated"; launched into the career of improvement - likely to be "improved off the face of the earth" in a generation or two! 1

Carlyle, after a public silence of almost twenty years on the subject of Negro emancipation and Negro abilities, made it quite evident in "Shooting Niagara" that his views were as firmly and uncompromisingly racist as those expressed in the "Occasional Discourse". The settlement of "the Nigger Question" in the United States following the war he considered to be essentially trivial, and in itself, of little concern to mankind. He was enabled to see it in that perspective because, like Mackay, he accepted the Negroes' social and economic position within the Republic as being irrevocably set - predetermined by their mental capabilities, but also because, unlike Mackay, he did not have the necessary personal knowledge of and contacts with contemporary America to help him to realize (as Mackay unquestionably did) that the practical problems of assimilating the freedmen within American society were immense and complex. Accordingly, although his pronouncements on the

---


Carlyle's impatience with the American abolitionists for having brought about the Civil War was well reflected in a comment he made to an American in London in 1862: "So you're quarrelling out there? Why don't you let the Southerners go to the devil with their niggers if they like, and you go to Heaven with your virtues if you can?" - Todd, The Life of Sophia Jex-Blake, p. 161.
Negro race in relation to American Reconstruction may have been valuable props for other Scots who sought to diminish the need for American legislation and American philanthropy on the freedmen's behalf, they appear essentially superficial by the standards of contemporary Scottish comment on the subject - little more, indeed, than a regurgitation of his earlier opinions on the Negro race with no apparent recognition that, like it or not, the Civil War had occurred and had left behind it new difficulties and questions:

One always rather likes the Nigger; evidently a poor blockhead with poor dispositions, with affections, attachments, - with a turn for Nigger Melodies, and the like - he is the only Savage of all the coloured races that doesn't die out on sight of the White Men; but can actually live beside him, and work and increase and be merry. The Almighty Maker has appointed him to be a servant ... To me ... the Nigger's case was not the most pressing in the world, but among the least so! 1

Carlyle's aversion to philanthropists concerned with the Negro cause likewise remained as strong as ever. It surfaced in his reaction to the proceedings of the Jamaica Committee. Eyre, he contended, was being "thrown out of the window by a small loud group ... and nothing but a group or knot of rabid Nigger-Philanthropists, barking furiously in the gutter". 2 Jane Carlyle had earlier expressed the hope that her husband would stand up for Eyre because "I should be surprised and grieved if I found him sentimentalizing over a pack of black brutes!" 3 He took a positive step towards publicly defending the ex-Governor by joining the Committee of the Eyre Defence and Aid Fund, with a stirring letter of acceptance to the Secretary in which he maintained that Britain never sympathised with "miserable mad seditions, especially of this inhuman and half-brutish type". 4

At the Committee's first

---

2 Ibid., p. 325.
4 Thomas Carlyle to Hamilton Hume (Secretary, Eyre Defence and Aid Fund), 23 Aug., 1866, printed in Daily Review, 13 Sept., 1866.
meeting in late August, 1866, he took the chair. 1

Elected as Rector of Edinburgh University a few months previously - "a tribute of admiration for Mr. Carlyle, as a Scotchman who possesses in an extraordinary degree the rough strength which young Scotchmen admire" 2 - Carlyle remained at this time the undisputed literary giant of his native Scotland. As such, his actions and his renewed denigration of the Negro race were the more regretted in some quarters. The man from Barbadoes who, as a resident of Glasgow, occasionally aired his views on racial questions to the editor of the North British Daily Mail, was deeply distressed that a man of Carlyle's ability and national standing should have shown himself to be so prejudiced. He apparently tended to believe, however, that many others would not be unduly eager to follow the great man's lead, feeling that "the efforts Mr. Carlyle is making to degrade the whole of her Majesty's black subjects is a little too rancid for the digestion of a thinking mind", and considering that Carlyle's reference to the Negro as "half-brutish" displayed an "un-British extravagance". 3

The United Presbyterian church was similarly concerned to suggest that the majority within Scotland might not share in wishing to see Eyre defended. Extremely disturbed to see Carlyle, whom they admired for many qualities, give his support to the Defence Fund, the compilers of the United Presbyterian Magazine widened their censure to include noblemen, writers, clergy, and - most importantly - dissenting ministers who were opposed to a national public condemnation of Eyre. "It is time to see where we stand", the Magazine declared, "when such men are volunteering themselves as the apologists of

1 See North British Daily Mail, 3 Sept., 1866.
3 Letter from "A Native of Barbadoes" headed "A Black Man on Mr. Carlyle and the Jamaica Business", in North British Daily Mail, 22 Sept., 1866.
what has revolted so grossly the national heart and the national conscience.¹

The U.P. church, in drawing specific attention to the clergy of the Established Churches and the ministers of other dissenting denominations who were supporting Eyre, thus found in the race question a channel through which effectively to attack the aims and motives of their rivals. It was basically the strategy of Conservative Scots in reverse.

Nor did the United Presbyterians limit their attack to theological spheres. Their social and political radicalism helped them to sharpen their barbs against the "aristocracy of birth" even more than against the "aristocracy of genius", a combination of which, they believed, dominated the plan to vindicate Eyre from the "moral indignation" felt by most of the country.

Probably both because he was a well-known Scotsman and because he was rendering sterling service to the nefarious cause, the United Presbyterian Magazine singled out the Marquis of Lorne for special obloquy as the representative of the "aristocracy of birth". The devastating comment was clearly phrased to imply a condemnation of Lorne which extended beyond the scope of his activities within the Eyre Defence Fund to include his attitudes to the Negro race throughout the world and the likely nature of his performance as a Liberal M.P. The Marquis of Lorne, it was indicated,

has written to the newspapers a letter which leads one to apprehend that the cause of popular liberty has not much to expect from him. Some of the friends of the negro, who had grown grey in their philanthropic labours when he was in leading-strings, or in the perambulator, will question whether, with all his ancestral honours, he has a right to speak of them as he does. Having a strong liking for the aristocratic branch of the constitution, we are sorry to observe that so many of the heirs of our noble houses have been suffered by their parents to grow up so imperfectly inoculated with the genuine spirit of liberty.²

This concluding judgement was, of course, the more withering inasmuch as it directly involved a telling rebuke on those leading aristocratic


2 Ibid., p. 476
champions of the North during the Civil War and of the Negro cause before and after emancipation, the Duke and Duchess of Argyll. By implication, the United Presbyterians were casting a dubious light on the basic nature of the Duke and Duchess' long established philanthropic interest in the Negro race. It is the more noteworthy that this should have been so at a time when the Duchess herself was indeed showing a slight tendency to be influenced by Lorne's "very interesting letters" to her from Hayti and Jamaica. Thus, she had written earlier in 1866 to Charles Sumner:

One understands the indolence of the Negroes after their terrible associations with labour, but it is more difficult to understand their breaking of domestic ties, which seems the most hopeless part of their case in Jamaica and in Hayti, and I suppose in the other West Indian Islands. My boy is seeing it all, in a very enjoying but thorough manner.¹

Lorne's letter to the press which had so largely helped to kindle United Presbyterian resentment towards him had been in the nature of a reply to a letter which had appeared in the Daily News accusing Eyre of atrocities and of harbouring a deep personal hatred of the influential coloured member of the Jamaica Assembly, George W. Gordon.² Although Lorne asserted that he did not agree with all of Eyre's actions, he suggested that the excesses had simply been carried out under "the stress of the moment" and that in general, the Governor had shown "fearless confidence" during the insurrection. Pointing to Eyre's dismissal, his broken health and his ruined prospects, Lorne insisted "Surely ... this should suffice for the keenest Negrophilist".³ So strongly did Lorne feel on this particular subject

¹ Duchess of Argyll to Charles Sumner, 20 March, 1866, PMHA, p. 106.
² It is perhaps worth noting that although Gordon ultimately became a Baptist, and a lay preacher in that denomination, he had been reared as a member of the U.P. church - see Samuel, The Governor Eyre Controversy, p. 38.
that he had even optimistically ventured to hope for some parental public support for his hero: "If Eyre is turned out", he wrote to his mother, "I do hope you will do something to show him that Englishmen think it was want of judgement and not want of anxiety to do his duty for which he is removed. I never felt more sorry for a man".

The spirited defence of Eyre by Lorne prompted a public rejoinder by John Gorrie of the Temple, in which he asked: "Does Lord Lorne approve of putting a citizen to death, either 'on the stress of the moment' or otherwise, for political agitation? If he does, the sooner we take steps to prevent young noblemen holding these principles from attaining power the better". Gorrie was a high-ranking Scottish advocate who in 1862 had commenced practice at the English bar, and who had subsequently combined his legal profession with journalistic work which included a period as leader-writer on Bright's Morning Star. In 1865, he was selected by the Jamaica Committee to go to Jamaica to investigate evidence suitable for use in any forthcoming arraignment of Eyre. He handled the task ably, and undoubtedly much to the satisfaction of the Committee, if not to that of some of his fellow Scots.

Lorne answered him by reiterating the kernel of his argument and by suggesting that those wishing for a trial wanted to strike a fallen man. Still more illustrative of the width of the division which existed between Scots on this specific aspect of the race question in the colonies, the Glasgow Herald caustically stigmatized Gorrie as "a patriotic Edinburgh

1 Marquis of Lorne to Duchess of Argyll, Baltimore, 20 May, 1866, Letters of the 9th Duke ..., Argyll MSS.
3 Letter from Marquis of Lorne to Daily Telegraph, printed in North British Daily Mail, 22 Sept., 1866.
advocate of advanced-liberal repute" who had been sent to Jamaica by "negroes' friends" in Britain "for the purpose of hunting up evidence against Mr. Eyre and the military". His findings were dismissed as "a set of sensation stories which are scarcely credible", and it was frankly stated that he, and correspondents of radical British journals, were not in Jamaica to find the truth but "for the special purpose of finding 'facts' to support a preconceived theory - ... that the Negroes were a deeply injured race, that there was neither a conspiracy nor an insurrection, and that Governor Eyre was a murderer".2

It becomes evident, then, that insofar as the Jamaican insurrection and the related prosecution of Governor Eyre formed a sounding board for Scottish attitudes to the Negro at this time, there remained a strong stream of unsympathetic racist thought in the country. Pro-Eyre sentiment was, indeed, judged by the Committee of the Eyre Defence and Aid Fund to be general and positive enough to warrant the formation of a sub-committee in Edinburgh which would collect Scottish donations and get up an address for presentation to Eyre. Acknowledging John Blackwood's cheque for £7 to the national Fund, the secretary requested Blackwood to consider using his influence for the purpose of instituting such a movement in the Scottish capital:

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 19 Feb., 1866.
2 Ibid.

Gorrie's career was eventually ruined by his concern to see justice done to the coloured races. In 1869, he was appointed substitute procureur-general of Mauritius, and from then on, was an active and progressive Chief-Judge of, successively, the Fiji Islands (1876), the Leeward Islands (1882), and Trinidad (1886). In each post, he worked vigorously in the interests of the native races, and this was especially true of Trinidad, where he made legal judgements in favour of the Negro labourers and pioneered schemes which bitterly angered the planter class. Planter opposition to him reached a climax after Tobago came under his jurisdiction, and to combat it, he exceeded his legal power of commitment for contempt of court. A special commission report led to his suspension in 1892. He died before getting the chance to appeal. DNB, Vol. 22 (1909), pp. 757-758.
"It is most important that Edinburgh should have a Committee acting with us as the feeling[,] I am glad to say[,] throughout Scotland appears to be one of deep indignation at the infamous treatment Mr. Eyre has received after his great services to his country".¹

But Scottish opinion on this vexed question did not begin to approach the unanimity which the hopeful Hamilton Hume imposed upon it. Perhaps the best indication of this is the fact that a Scottish sub-committee such as the national organization had envisaged was apparently never constituted. As in England, support for Eyre's actions was at least balanced by the volume of condemnation which was ultimately voiced when the full extent of the British reprisals became known. In Edinburgh itself, Provost William Chambers promptly received a petition from the citizens requesting him to call a public meeting to consider memorialising the Government and petitioning Parliament for a "serious inquiry" into the insurrection and its suppression.² Commenting on the meeting which was to take place that evening, the Caledonian Mercury - which had earlier called for an immediate enquiry at Government level³ - hoped that it would totally condemn Eyre's actions, as meetings in English towns had done. With Englishmen insisting on the Governor's immediate recall, Scots, it was emphasized, must do likewise.⁴

Chairing the meeting, William Chambers, however, did his utmost to ensure that the proceedings would be essentially low key. Indicating that he would not hold himself in any way compromised by any sentiments which might be voiced by the speakers, he called for a spirit of charity and

¹ Alexander Hamilton Hume to John Blackwood, 21 Sept., 1866, Bla. MSS., MS. 4209, fol. 64.
² Scotsman, 7 Dec., 1865.
³ See Caledonian Mercury, 5 Dec., 1865.
⁴ Ibid., 11 Dec., 1865.
justice, and urged the assembly not to assume as fact "that which is perhaps nothing but hearsay". Judgement should be suspended, he felt, until the truth was fully revealed. By and large, Chambers' plea was respected in the lengthy speech of A.M. Dunlop, M.P. for Greenock; in Sheriff Cleghorn's appeal for a "most searching inquiry" (in the course of which he referred to the "keen and anxious interest" which had been taken "perhaps in this part of the country, and in the city of Edinburgh, as much as in any part of Great Britain" in West Indian emancipation); and in the concluding address of the Rev. Dr. W. Lindsay Alexander, who stressed that all the meeting was demanding was an investigation, and who felt it important to disabuse the public of the idea that those attending the meeting were simply "negrophilists".

Less accommodating, however, was Duncan McLaren, who bluntly stated that the charitable judgement which Provost Chambers had requested the meeting to exercise towards Eyre and the others had not been a quality displayed by Eyre himself in his virulent denunciations of British philanthropists and Christian missionaries in Jamaica. McLaren raised the temperature of the meeting very considerably not only by stern, positive indictments of traditional British misgovernment and injustice towards the Negroes of Jamaica, but also by firm declarations of his belief in Eyre's guilt as a heinous murderer. Although McLaren was given loud cheers at the end, his speech had served to bring to the surface some dissenting voices, including one who urged him to consider "the murdered Englishmen". As Provost, with a position to support, Chambers had been shrewd to dissociate himself at the outset from the predictably inflammatory oratory of Edinburgh's radical M.P.

Reflecting the public mood, the Scottish press contained its fair share of support for a searching enquiry into the whole business. Joining

---

1 Report of a public meeting on the Jamaican revolt, held in Queen Street Hall, Edinburgh, 11 Dec., 1865, in Scotsman, 12 Dec., 1865.
the Caledonian Mercury, Edinburgh's other "dissenting" organ, the Daily Review, finally decided that both the content of Eyre's report and the reputation of Britain abroad merited a thorough investigation of the matter. But of course despite its concern, the old racism and condemnation of Negro savagery, which we have observed as characterizing its initial attitude to the nature of the insurrection, had not evaporated. A double standard of conduct had simply been introduced which allowed room for equal denunciation of both parties in the revolt. Deploiring the details in the despatches of one Colonel Hobbs, the Review concluded that the "fiendish" acts of the Negroes had been fairly well matched by the deeds of the Colonel. "Besides, we are not to forget", the paper declared, "that Paul Bogle [a leader in the Negro riots] and a British officer are not to be judged by the same moral standard. The one was a benighted black, the other should have been a cultured Christian English gentleman". The Caledonian Mercury, on the other hand, had chosen to represent the coloured population of Jamaica as "defenceless negroes ... shot down as they ran, fugitives tracked out like wild beasts" in a "war of extermination" conducted by British officers behaving like "brutes or demons".

In Glasgow, although there was, surprisingly, no public meeting in protest against British action, certain sections of the local press took up the cry for a Government enquiry. The North British Daily Mail maintained that unless an enquiry resulted in the guilty being brought rigorously to justice, "Britain will deserve to have her services and sacrifices in the cause of freedom and philanthropy scouted among nations as the shallow devices of a despicable and transparent hypocrisy". The Glasgow Sentinel, at least

1 See above, pp. 538-540.
3 Caledonian Mercury, 5 Dec., 1865.
4 North British Daily Mail, 1 Dec., 1865. See also ibid., 11 Dec., 1865.
for once in agreement with its press rival on the need for an investigation, nevertheless took a much more fundamental, practical view of the importance of such an enquiry. Having voiced its misgivings about the effects of the Jamaican upheaval on the delicate Reconstruction situation in the United States, the Sentinel urged the need and international relevance of an immediate British examination of the events:

that the rest of the world may know, especially those now settling the position of the negro, whether he is a cold-blooded savage, as the butchers in Morant Bay, without explanations, would lead us to believe, or only driven to desperate measures by the failure of justice from those from whom he was lead to expect it. 1

If Britain presented all the facts to the world, "we may be able to form something like a correct conclusion on the greatest social problem of the age." 2

The Sentinel was simultaneously concerned, however, to safeguard constitutional liberties at home in the light of so flagrant an abuse of them in a British colony. Utterly condemning the unconstitutional action taken in regard to Gordon, the paper believed it had a duty to call for an immediate enquiry

lest the same kind of law and justice applied to the Jamaica blacks may be applied to recusant whites nearer home ... If such be accepted as a precedent, we may by-and-by, in the case of a Fenian rising in Ireland and the country being proclaimed, have sympathisers in Glasgow seised upon political warrants, and the prisoners packed off ... to Cork or Dublin to be tried by drumhead law. 3

So far as the British colonies were concerned, there was at least a recognition by Scots that Negroes, whatever their standing in the scale of civilization, were entitled, as British subjects, to all the rights and privileges conferred by the British constitution: 4 self-interest, as illustrated in the reasoning

1 Glasgow Sentinel, "The Irrepressible Negro", 18 Nov., 1865.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., "The Jamaican Massacre", 2 Dec., 1865.
4 The petition of the Edinburgh people for a public meeting on the revolt contained, for example, a preamble which (naturally enough in the circumstances) condemned the military executions as "an unwarrantable interference with the Constitutional rights of the subjects of the British crown" - see Scotsman, 7 Dec., 1865.
of the Glasgow Sentinel, helped to make it so. As will be seen, there was also a concern in some quarters to see the American Negro freedmen accorded the full legal and constitutional rights of the country. There was a prevalent feeling that it was not creditable for Britain to set itself up as champion of the world's oppressed and then to allow flagrant Constitutional injustice to pass unchallenged. The same sentiment applied with at least equal force to the American republic.

Aside from desiring an enquiry to clear Britain's reputation as a lover of justice and freedom or to check the possible insidious spread of undesirable extra-Constitutional practices on the domestic front, there was a widespread feeling in Scotland of genuine revulsion at the "extremism" of British military reprisals in Jamaica. The Edinburgh Ladies' Emancipation Society was naturally in the vanguard of those deploving the action of the authorities, and looking aside from its activities on behalf of the American freedmen, contributed a small sum both towards the expenses of the investigating committee and later towards the Restitution Fund. The Reformed Presbyterian church inclined to view Gordon's death as "judicial murder", and the Duke of Argyll, unable to take the same partisan outlook as his son, found the Jamaican executions a "bad business" which amply illustrated how badly both Jamaica and the United States needed immediate attention. He could see no defence for the treatment of Gordon: "The more people think of it here [in London], the more ugly it looks - it will give us much trouble and difficulty".

1 See, for instance, Dundee Advertiser, 5 Dec., 1865; and ibid., 21 Nov., 1865.
2 Annual Report of the ELES for ... 1866, p. 25; Annual Report of the ELES for ... 1867, p. 3.
4 Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, London, 23 Nov., 1865, AFL, Argyll MSS.
The entire outbreak had convinced him that "Man, Black or White, is little better than a wild beast very often",¹ and he was later to communicate to Gladstone his deep regret at British action: "How bloody we are when we are roused [and] frightened - and impelled by hatred of race."²

Edinburgh's radical M.P., Duncan McLaren, decided that the most effective way in which he could publicly demand Eyre's arraignment for murder was to compare his (and his colleagues') actions unfavourably even with those of the Duke of Cumberland towards the Jacobites. Cumberland had sanctioned mass slaughter in 1745, he decried, yet "there were not so many lives taken then, after the Highlanders had fought two pitched battles with the Queen's troops, and had beaten them once, as have been put to death in Jamaica".³

The *North British Daily Mail* likewise maintained that the shooting of disarmed Negroes who had flocked for protection to the soldiery had been a deed hardly exceeded in brutality by the Glencoe massacre, and an action against which Cumberland's cruelties at Culloden appeared "trivial".⁴

The editorial, in totally deploring the "overwhelming atrocities" of the British military, even sought to play down the extent and nature of the alleged atrocities perpetrated by the Negroes, suggesting that these were nothing more than were usually committed by "infuriated mobs in every part of the United Kingdom". For a match to the horror of the British measures, however, it was necessary to call to mind "Yankee Butler".⁵

---

¹ Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, Glasgow, 13 Nov., 1865, *ibid.*
⁴ *North British Daily Mail*, 20 Nov., 1865.
⁵ *Ibid.* The incongruity of resurrecting the American South's most hated villain, Benjamin F. Butler, in this context not only recalls the direction of the Mail's sympathies during the American Civil War but also helps neatly to reinforce the paper's frank admission that its denunciations of Eyre were not based in "mawkish philanthropy or negrophile sentimentality" but in the Negro rebels' rights as British subjects.
In many sections of the press, initial stress on Negro savagery came increasingly to be balanced by firm indictment of British measures. The Dundee Courier, for instance, originally yielded to none in its utter condemnation of the rioters' violence, and was even ready to argue, while accepting that the conduct of the military had been over-rigorous, that the suppression of the revolt was but illustrative of "what an inferior race has to expect at the hands of a stronger, against whom it has plotted". But as the account of British action became more detailed, even the Courier came unreservedly to criticize it. The Aberdeen Journal regretted the blot on Eyre's hitherto enlightened service to the colonies, but readily conceded that the retribution on the Jamaican Negroes had been "simply horrible". Much blame was placed on the nature of government in the West Indies, where local cliques were judged to monopolise every office. The Constitution tended to be inoperative "where the peasantry are a different race from their rulers, and where one set of the latter are in a hurry to get rich and be off".

In all three leading Aberdeen newspapers, indeed, there was a tendency to see the basis of the unrest, and of the harsh reprisals, in terms of a class as much as of a race struggle. According to the Aberdeen Herald, for instance, Gordon had been executed less on account of his "crimes" than because he had been "specially successful in exposing the wicked system of class legislation that has for years prevailed in Jamaica, and by which the faces of the poor have been ground for the benefit of the rich".

---

1 Dundee Courier, 5 March, 1866.
2 See, for example, ibid., 7, 20 March, 1866. See also Daily Review, 18 Nov., 1865; Elgin Courant, 15 Dec., 1865; Huntly Express, 25 Nov., 9 Dec., 1865.
3 As Governor of Australia, Eyre had formerly distinguished himself by his liberal, sympathetic policy towards the Maoris.
4 Aberdeen Journal, 6 Dec., 1865. The Journal had earlier been dismayed by Negro "cruelty" and "ferocity" – see ibid., 15, 22 Nov., 1865.
5 Aberdeen Herald, 9 Dec., 1865.
Aberdeen Free Press had early recognized "class-hatred" as a main cause of the revolt itself. Inadequate wages and unjust tax burdens on the Negro population had produced an uprising such as had never been experienced in the Southern states of America during the long years of slavery. The lesson for Britain - and for the United States - was that "emancipation needs to be accompanied and followed up by appropriate measures, political and social".

In reviewing the American political situation at the end of 1865, the paper emphasized that the Jamaican outbreak must be seen as a warning to America that freedom for the Negro was in itself not enough: "The freedmen must not only have justice guaranteed to them, but they must be treated in a spirit of generous consideration", with careers readily opened up to them in free industry.

Acknowledgement of some degree of British misgovernment as being at least partially responsible for stimulating the revolt in Jamaica was not uncommon in the Scottish press, tending frequently to be linked to criticism of British military action. Hence the Caledonian Mercury, exceedingly anxious to make amends for having too hastily repeated the "delusions" fostered by most of the rest of the British press about the Negro atrocities insisted that there had been no wild conspiracies and fanaticism at the back of the uprising:

"There is not a shadow of proof that the coloured people are not as well disposed to good government and fair treatment as the negroes of the Southern States of America have shown themselves to be since the day of their emancipation, or as we ourselves are."

1 Aberdeen Free Press, 24 Nov., 1865.
2 Ibid., "The Political Situation in America", 22 Dec., 1865.
3 On 13 Nov., 1865, the Caledonian Mercury had carried an editorial describing the "fiendish cruelty" of the Jamaican Negroes and giving full play to the gruesome stories of massacre and butchery. It had been gratified that the authorities were taking active measures against the revolt, and had indicated that the dreadful reports would scarcely be credible "but for our knowledge of what a semi-barbarous people can be guilty of".
4 Ibid., 16 Nov., 1865.
Quite simply, the cause of insurrection was seen to lie in a list of basic social, political and economic grievances which would have been conducive to rebellion in any part of the world. One of the specific fountainheads of oppression had been "a depraved and venal Government, made up of the refuse of the old slaveholders", which had denied political rights to the black population. It was a case of "the poor plundered and starving blacks", pushed to the limits of human endurance, rising, with justice, against a "crowd of thieves and robbers". The paper's 'London Letter' went further towards extricating the Mercury from the unhappy position of having subscribed to the current stereotype of the Negro as a semi-civilised savage. The writer deftly concentrated an attack on the Times for its emphasis on Negro ferocity, and personally observed that "it is not the native ferocity nor the laziness of the negroes which has caused this explosion, but the old, old cause of all insurrections, to wit, long continued galling oppression".

In the Glasgow press, both the North British Daily Mail and the Glasgow Sentinel put much stress on the tradition of British misgovernment and planter mismanagement which lay behind the final eruption of violence. The Sentinel accepted with relish the chance to attack the capitalist planter class, accusing it of being devoid of enterprise and unable to accommodate itself to the altered circumstances after emancipation. Despising the Negroes as the source of all their troubles, there had been no efforts to improve the freedmen, who had been left "to die off or become savages".

The state of Jamaica is a forcible illustration of the evils of slavery by debasing both masters and slaves. It is all very well to accuse the poor slaves of laziness, but the want of energy and enterprise on the part of their masters seem to be altogether ignored ... Jamaica of today is expiating the crime of a former generation by universal pauperism.

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid., 'London Letter', 18 Nov., 1865. See also ibid., 16 Dec., 1865.
3 See North British Daily Mail, 13 Nov., 1865.
The British people, it was suggested, had never bothered to consider how badly the colony had been retrogressing, and would probably scarcely appreciate how largely bad government was to blame for the disturbance.¹

There was no shortage of attempts to educate the public on this point, however. While radical journals with a fairly extensive circulation drove home the message that the planters had been "a poor bankrupt, helpless set, who did not know how to arrange fairly with their labourers, even for their own interest",² and even the influential Edinburgh Courant bent its patriotic conservatism by the merest fraction to admit that "our legislation for Jamaica is partly to be blamed",³ small local newspapers also made attempts to show that there had been faults on both sides. For example, the Huntly Express, which boasted a London correspondent, was particularly conscientious in bringing to its readers' attention the long-standing political and economic injustices practised against the Negro population of Jamaica.⁴ And in his popular travelogue, the Marquis of Lorne himself had been obliged to concede that in the parishes which led the revolt, administration and juridicial affairs were "such as no Englishman could have stood for a week".⁵

We have seen how, in common with its impact in the rest of Britain,⁶ the Jamaican insurrection did have a direct immediate effect in encouraging within Scotland a stream of racist thinking and a hardening of sentiment away from

¹Ibid., 16 Nov., 1865.  
²Dundee Advertiser, 24 Nov., 1865.  
³Edinburgh Courant, 14 Nov., 1865.  
⁴See Huntly Express, 'Our London Letter', 25 Nov., 1 Dec. (in which Gordon was lauded as a great reformer), 1865; 5 May, 1866; 10 March, 1866 (editorial). See also Banffshire Journal, 7 Nov., 1865; Elgin Courant 10 Nov., 1865; Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 24 Nov., 1865.  
⁵Marquis of Lorne, A Trip to the Tropics, p. 103. See also Sir George Campbell, White and Black, p. 113.  
⁶Bolt, Victorian Attitudes to Race, Chapter 3, has shown the tremendous importance which British reactions to the Jamaican revolt had on general attitudes to the freed Negro in the Southern states of America.
the Negro at this time. How fundamental or permanent the effect was on
pre-existing attitudes to the race question it is less easy to determine,
however. While such journals as the Scotsman, the Edinburgh Courant and
Blackwood's Magazine, fortified by the hysterical reports of Scots in
Jamaica, certainly intensified their insistence on the innate inferiority
and vicious savagery of the Negro race, it would appear that the general
trend of Scottish opinion, even in those quarters not particularly sym-
pathetic to black populations, tended to retain views which were less cut
and dried. It became evident, for example, that even the Marquis of Lorne
held essentially ambivalent views on the character and capabilities of the
Negro race in the Tropics and in the United States; and once the first
shock of the sensationalist accounts of Negro ferocity had been absorbed by
the Scottish press, a healthy degree of scepticism crept in, to be bolstered
up by subsequent reports of British "atrocities". The vehemence which char-
acterized much of the Scottish condemnation of Eyre, and the vigour of the
dissenting churches, of individuals, and of the press in acknowledging a
tradition of British misgovernment in the colony, indicates that a substantial
proportion of Scots believed firstly, that (racial traits aside) English
gentlemen could be just as savage as Negroes, and secondly, that the black
population of Jamaica did after all have real enough grievances to provoke
it to violence. In Scotland, it is clear, such ideas were not confined to
philanthropists, nor to those contemptuously dismissed by Charles Mackay
as "negrophiles". With the focus fixing ever more closely on the condition
and progress of the freedmen in the United States, Scottish attitudes to
the Negro race remained fully as complex, and almost as open, after the
Jamaican insurrection as before it.
III The significance of the Christian emphasis on the basic unity of mankind and of "scientific" theories on race

However much hindsight leads us to identify the unpleasantly predominant strains of racial superiority and cultural chauvinism in the attitudes of churches and their missionaries towards the coloured races, it seems valid enough to conclude that during the Reconstruction era, the doctrines and pronouncements of the dissenting Scottish churches on the basic brotherhood of all mankind did have a considerable influence in stimulating an independent, enquiring Scottish outlook on the subject of racial equality. At least it might be claimed for the dissenting Presbyterian ministers that they assiduously strove (and successfully, if the public contributions for missionary efforts are anything to judge by) to imbue their congregations with feelings of sympathy and compassion rather than fear or bitterness for the Negro race, and to communicate the necessity of considering the rights and requirements of the Negroes as men, not savages. With so many converts and so much prestige still to be won through missionary efforts all over the world, it simply was not tenable for the dissenting Scottish Presbyterian churches to write the coloured races off as unmanageable and unimproveable, despite the successive setbacks of the Indian Mutiny, the New Zealand war, and the Jamaican insurrection.

Accordingly, the United Presbyterians made a special point of insisting that the revolt in Jamaica had not been the work of "savage black against innocent white". It was shown, rather, as merely fitting into the pattern of other political risings - the ancient Scottish one, and more recent ones: "Are the Fenians negroes? Perhaps it may be asked whether they were all black men who, for four years, converted the United States into a field of blood?"¹ There was a bold assertion of confidence in the future and an

emphatic pronouncement on the misleading aura of gloom spread by the sensationalist press:

They [those who saw the revolt as an outbreak of savagery] concluded that the enmity between the black and white races is irreconcilable; that the tint of savagesism (sic) cannot be eradicated from the negro nature; that the policy of emancipation has been a failure; that the missionaries in Jamaica are useless. They judged under the influence of excited passion, and hence they judged amiss ... [let the spirit of the gospel regulate all the intercourse and relations of the two races. Hope remains.]

Hope remained, in the United States no less than in Jamaica, because the Negroes were free, and part of mankind, and therefore unrestricted in their ability and eligibility to receive the word of God. Following the end of the Civil War, and the emergence of four million freed Negro slaves in the United States, the Scottish U.P. church had issued a timely reminder that it gave no quarter to the polygenist theories of race which had been rife throughout most of the century. It was an attitude solidly grounded in fundamentalist thinking - the bible unequivocably stated that the human race was sprung from two persons, therefore the unity of the race was held to be a settled question. Where modern science bore this conclusion out, however, it was eagerly appealed to. Stress was put on the fact that the existence of different races of man had been found to be not incompatible with unity of origin; and where the variations appeared not to be produced mainly as the result of climatic or environmental circumstances, the church considered they were probably due to "some divine and direct interposition ... And, for aught we know, there may be some hidden but important adaptation, in the peculiarities of each of the great divisions of mankind, to the countries and climates where they have been settled by the arrangements of Providence".

---

1 Ibid., p. 569. See also ibid., Jan., 1866, Vol. 10, pp. 46-47.
3 Ibid., pp. 349-350.
There was reassurance in the knowledge that science had offered nothing strictly incompatible with bible teaching on the origins of man. Throughout the world, man had the same intellectual powers, moral affections, and ability to distinguish between right and wrong, the *United Presbyterian Magazine* argued, and it scathingly suggested that in very many cases, the polygenist theory was accepted "seemingly for no other reason than to justify the holding in slavery of so-called inferior races". ¹

The Scottish church in all its major denominations was, indeed, largely enabled to transcend the difficulties of eliciting help and sympathy for the Negroes and of insisting (at a time when their visible "backwardness" made it seem unlikely) that once their potential was fully realized, they would reach the level of European civilization, by adhering to a strict interpretation of the biblical tenet that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men that dwell on the face of the earth". Through the long years of anti-slavery agitation in nineteenth century Scotland, the message had got across with some impact to at least a section of the population, and during and after the American Civil War its relevance as a force governing Scottish attitudes to the American Negro remained. In 1863, the Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, member of the Church of Scotland and later President of its National Bible Society,² and the son of an earl who had been active in the aristocratic branch of the abolitionist crusade,³ sought to explain the American crisis to an allegedly misapprehending British public by intimating that "the great principle" underlying the contest was, quite simply, that "God hath made of

---

² See report of annual meeting of the National Bible Society of Scotland in the Trades' Hall, Glasgow, in *Dundee Courier*, 1 Feb., 1870.
³ G.C. Taylor, *Some American Reformers*, pp. 41-42, 142, where the eighth Lord Kinnaird is cited as a leading supporter of the American abolitionist clergyman, Cheever.
one blood all nations, and has not given one the right to enslave another. The determinist belief nurtured by the United Presbyterian church that whatever the outcome of the war, slavery was bound to perish in America since it was doomed by the Almighty, was accompanied by the blunt observation that "God's image in ebony is not to be sullied and dishonoured for ever."

The popular concept of the American slave as the white man's equal who, given freedom, would rise to high achievements, had been well voiced during the years of abolitionist activity by a minor Scottish poet, William Millar of Dalkeith. On Millar's death in August, 1865, the Caledonian Mercury printed a sonnet of his which it considered to be "most appropriate to the times". The poem was a eulogy on Frederick Douglass, welcoming him to Britain as an ex-slave whose liberty had freed his powerful genius:

Self-taught, self-cultured, and by self refined,
They mental powers display a polished mind!
Thou to the world giv'st proof what slave may be
If brother man would set his brother free.

---


3 "To Frederick Douglass", sonnet by William Millar, Dalkeith, in Caledonian Mercury, 19 Aug., 1865. The poem is quoted in full in Appendix IV. No biographical information has been discovered on William Millar. He did, however, publish a book of poems in 1835 entitled Hours of Solitude in which he was at pains to stress that he was of limited education. The content of several of the poems suggests that he had the twin causes of oppressed peoples and national liberty very much at heart. For example, an early composition, "To the Thistle", was a chauvinistic piece relating how freedom was secured for Scotland by Edward's defeat at Bannockburn and how the Scots had been resigned to die rather than to live in slavery. "Lines to Poland" (pp. 10-12), written during that country's unsuccessful attempt to win independence in 1830, lamented the fate of Poles banished from their land by Russia and prophesied that "freedom's glorious beam" would see Poland triumphant again. An ode to Earl Grey on his visit to Scotland in 1836 hailed him as the champion of reform and a friend of the people's rights who had proved himself ready to defy those opposing liberty (pp. 72-75). And "Stanzas" (pp. 69-71), written on the suppression of the Reform Bill at the second reading and the resignation of the Ministry, were full of mournful reflections on the blow to British liberty and popular rights which these proceedings represented.
It was especially galling to the Christian conscience of Scottish ministers in particular to have to acknowledge that their Presbyterian counterparts in the Southern states of America had been in the vanguard of those categorically refusing to accept the basic unity of mankind. After the Civil War, and following his trip to the United States, David Macrae visited the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod in connection with a special commission which the American Missionary Association had given Macrae to attend the Scottish General Assemblies to enlist the sympathies of the Scottish churches and the Scottish people for the Association's work on behalf of the freedmen. He found the prominent Church of Scotland minister still prepared bitterly to attack the attitude which the Southern church had taken towards slavery:

"It is pitiful to see how the Church knuckles down to the world. If we want specimens of heroic daring - of martyrdom for an idea - we have to go outside the church, to soldiers, and even to politicians ... [There was in the South] not a minister to stand up in the face of public sentiment and become, if necessary, a martyr,"

Macleod's own travels abroad had clearly increased both his awareness of the widespread existence and strength of racial prejudice and his hatred of it, and this in turn had helped him to form very positive views of his own on the subject of Negro equality. "The prejudice against the negro is universal", he told Macrae, "but it is unchristian. I found the same in India with regard to the natives". He had told a British lady there that she would have to tolerate the fellowship of some Indian natives in heaven, and she had replied that she hoped not. "And in Egypt when I said to a Yankee, 'If you get to Heaven you will have to put up with negroes there',

---

1 The visit probably took place early in 1869, since Macrae appeared as a deputy for the AMA at the General Assemblies of both the Free Church and the Church of Scotland in May, 1869 - see Procs, Free Church G.A., May, 1869, pp. 217, 219; Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, May, 1869, p. 48.

2 Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod, quoted in Macrae, America Revisited and Men I Have Met, p. 164.
he said: 'I shouldn't like the prospect. But I guess they'll have a heaven of their own.'\footnote{1} The basis of Macleod's repulsion towards such views, and towards the attitudes of the old Southern planter class and clergy, was simply that they did not recognize that brotherhood of man, "which lies at the root of Christianity":

If we say 'God is our Father', your father and mine, then we are brothers. It follows irresistibly. Hence the Southern people had to deny that the negro was a man — that God was his Father as well as ours. But the negro is a man. He has the spiritual nature — the power of knowing and having communion with God. That is what constitutes the species man ... There may be a link between man and the gorilla; I don't know. But it is the spiritual nature that makes the man.\footnote{2}

It was essentially from these beliefs that the stimulus for Macleod's own involvement in the freedmen's aid cause within Scotland came. At the public meeting held under the auspices of the Glasgow Freedmen's Aid Society, and at which Dr. Storrs of the National Freedmen's Aid Society of New York and the Rev. Sella Martin of the American Missionary Association described the condition, capabilities and prospects of the freedmen in America, Macleod, as a leading speaker, reminded his appreciative audience that the root question of the late Civil War had been whether the Negro was a man or not — "Was Sella Martin, the slave, a brute or a brother?" (Applause). Recalling his feelings when offered a woman and child for sale at a slave auction in America, he condemned slavery as "an insult to the race of which Jesus Christ is a brother".\footnote{3} As one of Sella Martin's chief sponsors in the latter's efforts to extend his fund raising activities in Scotland,\footnote{4} Macleod's

\footnotetext{1}{Ibid., p. 164.}
\footnotetext{2}{Ibid., p. 165.}
\footnotetext{3}{Report of speech by the Rev. Dr. Norman Macleod at a public meeting held under the auspices of the GPAS in City Hall, Glasgow, 22 Sept., 1865, in Glasgow Herald, 23 Sept., 1865.}
\footnotetext{4}{See Sella Martin to unidentified recipient (probably Aspinall Hampson, secretary of the National Freedmen's Aid Union, 1865-1867), Glasgow, 18 Aug., 1865, A-sl. P., C159/68.}
practical contribution to the furtherance of a belief in Negro advancement and Negro equality was complete.

Also lending his official assistance and approval to Martin's work was the Free Church's Rev. Dr. Thomas Guthrie. It has already been shown that, like Macleod, Guthrie made his appearance at a freedmen's aid meeting the occasion for driving home his personal belief in the equality of the Negro race as part of mankind. Later, the Free Church as a body was to record its official sympathy for the aims of the freedmen's aid movement in a manner which recalled Guthrie's particular emphasis on equality. Acknowledging the personal appeal made by the Rev. J.A. Thomas of the AMA to the General Assembly in 1867, the Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Roxburgh of Glasgow, began by stressing that as a Church, the Free Church of Scotland had always uncompromisingly held that God had made of one blood all nations of men. From this root, he went on to state his Church's natural concern for the condition of the American Negroes:

and we held this, that when any class or race have for centuries or generations been singularly oppressed and trodden down - as the slaves of America have been ... - and, in consequence of such treatment, have sunk into a state of debasement, it is the peculiar duty of Christians and of Christian Churches ... to seek by all means in their power to raise them to the same social, moral, and religious platform with themselves ...3

The freedmen's aid cause provided, of course, the perfect public platform from which to make favourable pronouncements on the subject of racial equality. Such statements made in that particular context were ensured of an audience generally receptive to them - whether it was an audience at a

---

1 See ibid.; also letter from Sella Martin in Glasgow Herald, 2 Aug., 1865; and also North British Daily Mail, 19 Sept., 1865.

For further reference to the work of Guthrie, Macleod and others in this connection, see below, Chapter IX, pp. 91, 96.

2 See above, pp. 509-510.

3 Report of speech by the Moderator, the Rev. Dr. Roxburgh, Glasgow, at the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, May, 1867, in Procs. Free Church G.A., May, 1867, p. 78.
public meeting, assembled specifically to hear of the freedmen's plight, or an audience composed of ministers and elders at a General Assembly. Furthermore, a strong personal conviction regarding the basic unity of all mankind could validly be exploited as an effective basis of appeal for aid by those immediately concerned in stirring up local Scottish interest in the needs of the freed Negroes in the United States. This was well demonstrated in the address of one Baillie Wood, chairman of a freedmen's aid meeting held in the town of Banff in December, 1865. Having made an earnest appeal for a generous response to the object of the meeting through allusions to the difficulties experienced by the Negroes as a result of the sudden nature of their emancipation, Wood dramatically switched the emphasis of his speech to plead on behalf of the American Negroes as fellow men who for generations had been subjected to the gravest cruelties and injustices by the Southern slaveocracy. Maintaining that if the Negro freedman's intelligence was low and debased it was purely because of the stultifying and restrictive influences of slavery, he virulently denounced the Southern clergy's argument that the slave system was warranted by the Bible. There was an urgent religious fervour in his insistence on equality:

He [the Negro] was originally made, ... white man, in the same image as you — with a principle within him that shall never die, with a soul endurable and indestructible as its Maker — stretching in parallel lines with eternity itself; and I can never believe that a being so formed, and with so noble a destiny before him, could ever have been intended to have been bought and sold as sheep and oxen, ay, although it was presented to me in legible characters in my Bible in letters of fire, I would not believe it.¹

The importance of recognizing the Negro race as simply part of the Divine pattern of human civilization was not, however, confined during the Reconstruction era to those actively campaigning for the Negroes' cause, nor to ministers in the Scottish churches. The biblical concept that all nations

¹ Report of speech by Baillie Wood at a freedmen's aid meeting in Banff, 11 Dec., 1865, in Banffshire Journal, 12 Dec., 1865. For further reference to this meeting, see below, Chapter VIII, pp. 450-451, 462; Chapter IX, pp. 161-165.
were of one blood according to God's creation was apparently sufficiently impressed upon the Scottish mentality to be usable as a basis of reasoning in the daily press. We have already observed that before the Jamaican uprising seriously blighted its outlooks on the race question, the Dundee Courier had shown a close concern for the condition and prospects of the American freedmen. The Courier regretted the tendency of many Southerners "to render the lot of the freedman as hard as possible", and deplored the evidence of lingering "pro-slavery influences and prejudices" in the Southern refusal to accept coloured witnesses in courts of law. But at least in October, 1865 these impediments were not seen gravely to cripple the progress of effective Reconstruction legislation, or the long-term prospects of the Negro freedmen, because:

unless something yet worse is done to him, the negro will rise superior to all this, vindicating the Apostolic axiom, 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men that dwell on the face of the earth'. However hard the Southern states may fight against that axiom, they will find themselves in the long run more completely beaten than in the war just closed.  

Only as the distastefully radical and chaotic nature of Reconstruction came to deepen the paper's disillusionment about the future of the freedmen in the United States was this fundamental tenet of Christianity set aside in favour of a more positive belief in the immutable inferiority of the Negro race.

In his attempts to determine the truth about man's origins and the nature of his development - and retrogression - up until the nineteenth century, the Duke of Argyll also felt it necessary to state his basic acceptance of the brotherhood of man as a Divinely ordained fact:

[We know that the barrier of Hybrid barrenness which nature sets against the mixture of different species does not impede the amalgamation of even the most diverse varieties of man. It is therefore certain that in this sense, which involves the full possession of a common nature, 'God has made of one blood all nations to dwell

---

1 See above, Chapter IV, pp. 347-348.
2 Dundee Courier, 26 Oct., 1865.
on the face of the earth'.

This in itself was probably a modest enough acknowledgement of the essential equality of all the races of men, but its tone does suggest that intruding upon the Duke's scientific speculations was the influence of the strictly religious doctrines of his two great personal friends, the Rev. Drs. Macleod and Guthrie. Furthermore, this particular conclusion was but part of a wider, fairly unique attitude which was grounded in a "scientific" acceptance of the fact that all mankind had not only originally sprung from the same stem, but had also originally been endowed with broadly the same level of intelligence and spiritual awareness.

In publicising his personal views on the subject, the Duke of Argyll acknowledged his partial debt to the ideas of Archbishop Whately of Dublin, whose basic contention was that man was incapable of raising himself up on his own accord and, consequently, that there had been no progression by mankind from an originally savage to a civilized state. On the contrary,

1 Duke of Argyll, "Recent Speculations on Primeval Man" in Good Words, May, 1868, p. 283. The Duke's contribution on this subject took the form of four papers, printed in the magazine from March to June, 1868.

2 Macleod, who was editor of Good Words at the time when Argyll wrote his contributions for it, was a visitor to Inverary Castle during the Reconstruction period - see 8th Duchess's Journals, 8 Jan., 1866, Argyll MSS; and Guthrie was on even closer terms of acquaintance with the Argylls - see Duke of Argyll to Duchess of Argyll, 12 June, 1865, AFL; 8th Duchess's Journals, 30 Oct., 1861; 25 April, 1864; 26 Sept., 1865; n.d., 1866, where she recorded that Guthrie stayed at Inverary during July and August of 1866, Argyll MSS; correspondence of Guthrie with Duke and Duchess of Argyll in the Guthrie MSS, National Library of Scotland.

The Duke of Argyll, although remaining a member of the Church of Scotland, was strongly sympathetic to the Free Church. His first contribution to public questions had been a pamphlet (published in 1812 when Argyll was eighteen) on the struggle in the Scottish church, in which he condemned abolition of patronage, though not actual disruption for the sake of the principle. He apparently converted his father to these views, so that it was the 7th Duke of Argyll who, although one of the largest holders of patronage in Scotland, (unsuccessfully) introduced in 1842 a Bill designed to increase somewhat the right of the male communicants of a parish to object to the appointed minister - see Dowager Duchess of Argyll (ed.) The Duke of Argyll: Autobiography and Memoirs, Vol. 1, pp. 169-178.
it was the currently primitive and barbaric races who had degenerated. Although Argyll did not agree with all of Whately's findings, he much preferred his general argument to that of Sir J. Lubbock, who as a speaker at the British Associations's meeting at Dundee in 1867, had suggested that the condition of primitive man had been one of utter barbarism, from which gradual progress had been made towards civilization.

Disputing Lubbock's conclusion that the move among mankind was always from a primitive state to a more civilized one, the Duke significantly chose the Negro race as illustrative of what he judged to be the contrary process. He cited the existence of an Egyptian picture, dating from almost 1,400 B.C., in which a Negro knelt at the feet of the Egyptian king "in the same attitude of bondage and submission which typifies only too faithfully the enduring servitude of his race". Even more importantly, from a period not much later than that, there survived graphic evidence of battles between Egyptian and Negro nations, "representations which go far to show that the Negro race was then more able to maintain a contest with other races than it has ever been in recent times". Since the Negro race had been "already in the time of Abraham what it is in contemporary times", Argyll felt himself justified in asking how long one was supposed to allow for the process of development.

While Argyll thus rejected arguments for the natural progress of man from an originally savage state, he nevertheless simultaneously challenged Whately's assumption that no "savage" race had ever raised itself. The most vital factor in the Duke's thinking would seem, in fact, to have been the one most commonly ignored in contemporary speculations on race, namely, the influence of the environment. The kernel of his own speculations on the

1 Duke of Argyll, "... Primeval Man" in Good Words, March, 1868, pp. 155-156.
2 Ibid., May, 1868, p. 283.
3 For references to the reluctance of many commentators to consider the effects of environmental conditions on the different races of men, see Bolt, British Attitudes to Reconstruction, p. 128.
primitive condition of men (both ancient and modern) was accordingly con-
tained in the belief that the more degraded tribes of men were simply those
who, as the result of tribal wars caused by continuing increases in pop-
ulation, had been driven, as the weaker elements, to uncongenial climate
and land. Harsh conditions, in forcing them to concentrate on the basic
necessities of life, had dissipated their cultural and intellectual achieve-
ments. He was ultimately prepared to rest his case by arguing that it was
possible for a high knowledge of God to exist alongside total ignorance of
the Arts, that in many cases, barbarism had been due to adverse external
circumstances, and that elements of corruption and degeneration existed
within men at all times, and in the highest civilizations.¹

One of the Duke's main arguments in refuting the theory that men pro-
gressed up through conveniently signposted stages of civilization was his
demonstration of the fact that most nations might not have experienced a
stone age. Again in this connection, the past history of the Negro race was
used to prove his conviction:

In Africa there appears to be no traces of any time when the
natives were not acquainted with the use of iron ... The finding
of flint instruments ... in England, or in Denmark, or in France,
affords no evidence whatever of the condition of the Industrial
Arts in the same age upon the banks of the Euphrates or the Nile.²

The statement implied, of course, the recognition of a relatively high
degree of civilization in ancient Africa. This theme had been even more
forcibly stressed in public by the Duke of Argyll when a few months earlier
(in January, 1868) he had presided at the American freedmen's aid meeting
in Glasgow. Having referred in general terms to the "great mystery" sur-
rounding the origins, history, and future prospects of the Negro race, Argyll
had on that occasion gone on to rejoice in Livingstone's encouraging findings

¹ Duke of Argyll, "... Primeval Man" in Good Words, June, 1868, pp. 386-392.
² Ibid., pp. 390-391.
in the African continent. The African people, the Duke emphasized, had been shown to possess "a very ancient civilization" which was being systematically destroyed by slave-traders. Livingstone had found "no trace of the earliest and most barbarous stage of humans, the stone age" in Africa, but on the contrary, even the rudest tribes had had excellent iron and blacksmiths. The audience were asked to compare this with the extreme primitiveness of their Scottish ancestors:

Measured as archaeologists measure barbarism, by men's actions and command over the resources of nature, our own ancestors were in a more barbarous condition than any of the tribes in Africa have been in historic times, or even in times in which there is any kind of account remaining in Africa.\(^1\)

Apart from their "very advanced" early knowledge of implements, the Duke isolated three features of civilization which had characterized native African communities in the past - a knowledge of cereal cultivation, the tending of sheep and cattle, and the use of iron. The only explanation he could offer for the stagnation, if not deterioration, of this immensely promising race was the popular one which put most of the blame on "the accursed slave-trade". Despite these fine professions of the ancestral capabilities and worthiness of the Negro race, however, the Duke of Argyll showed himself to be after all a prisoner of his times through an eloquent display of condescension towards the Negro as a servant.

Seeking, with the best of intentions, to illustrate that the Negro was a more useful sector of humanity than the intractible American Indian, Argyll suggested that it was because of their "moral qualities" - great physical endurance, great mental patience, affectionate, forgiving and faithful disposition - that the race had made such excellent servants. Following this, it is difficult, with hindsight, to appreciate the exact role in which

\(^1\) Report of speech by the Duke of Argyll at a freedmen's aid meeting in City Hall, Glasgow, 27 Jan., 1868, in Glasgow Herald, 28 Jan., 1868.
the speaker envisaged the Negro race becoming "valuable in the future civilization of the world". It says something about the nature of the response to the freedmen's aid cause that this section of the Duke's speech was immediately received with applause and cheers. The "docile" Negro, eager for intellectual advancement as a freedman, and carrying with him into freedom all the best character traits which he had exhibited as a slave, was obviously a target much more vulnerable to white Anglo-Saxon paternalism and condescension than were the more persistently "savage" races of men, or even the more "barbarous" Negro tribes in some parts of Africa. The Duke of Argyll would seem to have been sincerely concerned to impress upon the public that the primeval condition of the Negro race was very far from being one of total barbarism, and that before external circumstances contributed to produce a stagnation or deterioration, it had shown very positive signs of a level of cultural development which, unimpeded, would have put the Negro civilization on a plane with the white. But the impact of such theoretical suggestions was inevitably dulled by the practical evidence of a time when Britons were standing at the pinnacle of civilization while Negro races so clearly remained on the lower rungs of the ladder. As the Duke of Argyll's speech itself demonstrates, notions of racial "equality" were too often a hair's breadth removed from a complacent reliance on restrictive stereotypes.

Nevertheless, in the context of the times, Argyll's views on race were radical enough. Certainly, their acceptance beyond Scottish freedmen's aid circles and the clerical hierarchy of the Scottish churches was probably minimal. Somewhat surprisingly, his speech in Glasgow did bring praise from the Glasgow Sentinel which appreciatively announced that "His Grace... is decidedly Liberal in his opinions for a Duke", and suggested that perhaps he had inherited this trait from his ancestors, who had been the only
Scottish aristocrats to cast their lot with the people in "the struggle for liberty" in the seventeenth century. Endorsing his advocacy of the freedmen's aid movement, the Sentinel recognized his views as entitled to respect because of the consistency of his attitude during the American Civil War.

1 Glasgow Sentinel, "The Duke of Argyll on America", 1 Feb., 1868.

   Probably the reference to the House of Argyll's creditable performance in the 17th century "struggle for liberty" pertains to the activities of the 8th and 9th Earls in the cause of upholding the Protestant religion in Scotland. Archibald, 8th Earl and Marquis of Argyll, succeeded to the Earldom in 1638 and became extremely equivocal in his loyalty to Charles I, acting for him when he constitutionally could but opposing him rather than betraying the dictates of the Covenant. In 1639, he took his stand against the King's attempts to force episcopacy and the liturgy on Scotland, and in 1640 and 1644, fought against Charles' allies, the Earls of Athol, Hantly and Montrose. Nevertheless, he had received the title of Marquis from the King in 1641 and paid him respect when the latter surrendered in 1646. And, although eventually promising submission to Cromwell in 1653, it was Argyll himself who invited the young Charles to Scotland in 1650 and who personally crowned him the following year. The romantic element in his reputation was probably enhanced for posterity by the fact that in 1660 he was executed for treason by the King he had crowned. Similarly ambivalent in his affiliations but also ultimately gaining something of the image of the martyr was his son, Archibald, 9th Earl of Argyll. Although he had fought for Charles I and been shown Royal favour after the Restoration, the 9th Earl was eventually to fall foul of the monarchy in respect of James, Duke of York's Test Act. His protests at the measure, centred as they were on the clauses in the Act which related to the King's authority over attempts to change the government in church or state, and especially on the proposal to exempt the royal family from the action of the test, led to his imprisonment for high treason and perjury, and only the personal intervention of Charles II saved his life. He escaped to Holland, and remained there till 1665 when as a supporter of Monmouth he returned to Scotland in an attempt to restore Protestant succession in Britain. He raised his clan in Argyllshire and issued two proclamations referring to the political situation and to his public grievances. One of these was a Declaration in the name of the "Protestant People" of Scotland: and in his private proclamation, he declared he had taken up arms against James II for having "invaded the Religion and Liberties of the Kingdom", and that he considered it his duty to God and country to "oppose and repress his Tyrannical Usurpation". His cause collapsed, and he was eventually executed at Edinburgh market cross. The Argylls subsequently became champions of the Protestant succession in Britain.


2 Glasgow Sentinel, "The Duke of Argyll on America", 1 Feb., 1868.
But much more characteristic was the response of the Glasgow Herald which, unlike the Sentinel, felt no compulsive need during the Reconstruction years to atone for wartime support of the South by making special efforts to champion post-war America and those in Britain who were sympathetic to her. The Herald certainly agreed with the Duke of Argyll that the United States faced a massive problem in its task of reconstructing the Union to accommodate socially, economically, and politically—four millions of Negro freedmen. And it acknowledged that Britain had little cause to sneer at American statesmen's endeavours, or even to preach lessons at them, since their experiment was a novel one and probably unparalleled in the whole range of human affairs. There was, moreover, a definite realization that in the situation obtaining in the United States, the principle of laissez faire was completely untenable.

The Herald also professed itself largely in accord with Argyll's argument that the Negro was the exception to the rule of the lesser race dying out in the face of the greater. But the paper's line of reasoning which brought it to that conclusion was blatantly racist, and as such, the very antithesis of what the Duke had intended the basis of his argument to be. Where Argyll had been at worst vague on the future social status of the Negro in America, the Glasgow Herald displayed a Carlylean confidence in consigning him to his allegedly rightful, preordained place in society, as well as offering the Carlylean explanation of why the Negro race did not die out in the midst of white civilization:

The negro is not of a nature to fret after independence and nationality, but being volatile, childish, and happy in his disposition, accommodates himself rapidly to any conditions in which he is placed. These peculiarities peculiarly (sic) fit him for servitude, and of all races he is the only one which in almost all countries is found in that condition. It scarcely matters where he is placed; if the temperature is high, he lives and flourishes as the slave of any race that is his intellectual superior. He is quite as genial in central Arabia, under the con-
trol of the Wahabees, as he was in Virginia under the dominion of the Southern chivalry.¹

The gulf between the Duke of Argyll's opinions and those so promptly expressed in the Herald was more explicitly illustrated, however, by the paper's subtle implication that the Negro race might not be of the same human species as the white. The all-purpose condemnation of slavery was used to make the point that even if the Negro was of an "inferior race" and a "different species", "is that any excuse for placing him upon the same level with creatures that have no human affinities whatever?" Having reached this standpoint, it was only logical to launch an attack on Argyll for having presented "too flattering a view" of Negro capabilities. The Negroes' failure to use their knowledge of iron significantly to advance their civilization was a ready source of indictment; and nowhere was the importance of the visible contemporary divergence between white and black levels of civilization more clearly illustrated:

The African has remained the same from time immemorial - not absolutely savage, but apparently incapable of any characteristic civilisation. Probably the negro made excellent iron when the aborigines of the Clyde scooped out their canoes with sharp flints; but many people will be disposed to think that the difference between the hollow canoe and the ocean steamers of to-day measures to a large extent the capabilities of the two races of men.²

There does seem to have remained, however, a vein of more radical Scottish thinking on race, which refused to accept that the Negro was predestined by the character and character deficiencies of his race to remain the social inferior of the white man. The extreme anger recorded by the Dundee Advertiser over the refusal of printers in Washington to work with Frederick Douglass' son has already been alluded to.³ It was made the

¹ Glasgow Herald, 30 Jan., 1868,
² Carlyle put forward his views on Negro ability to withstand contact with white civilization in "Occasional Discourse ...", passim: "Shooting Niagara ...", p. 321.
³ See above, p. 523.
occasion for the paper firmly to state that no men or body of men ever made any real progress in the world by trying to keep others back, especially on grounds of race:

The objection to work with a man (sic) ... because of a black skin is below what can be reasoned with. It is unutterable meanness, and deserves the reprobation of the civilized world. It is ... an outrage on all free principles ... [T]he prejudice that would deny social rights to a negro, because he is a negro, is one of the last infirmities of any race ever professing to be noble.¹

Shortly after the war's end, the Glasgow Sentinel had concerned itself with the future of the entire Negro working population, and had, perhaps predictably, interpreted the existing and the potential situation in terms of a class war. The Southern planters, it was argued, furious at the Negro freedman as the living symbol of their defeat and poverty, were insisting on the Negroes' inferiority, and on their consequent incapability of providing voluntary labour, simply as an excuse for fixing the black workers' wage scale at a ridiculously low level. Totally rejecting the hypothesis that the two races could not exist compatibly together, the Sentinel maintained that "The negro, unlike the Indian, is capable of civilization, and the stories circulating about his laziness are so many untruths set afloat by those who are the secret supporters of black slavery in America and white slavery in Britain". The current discussions about inferior and superior races was summarily dismissed as "twaddle":

The truth of the matter is, that those who argue that the black man is inferior to the white do so more from prejudice than conviction, and instead of being a scientific deduction, is nothing more or less than the old feudal creed of Europe which made the Norman superior to the Saxon.²

While this particular editorial prompts the suspicion that the paper was using a nominal rejection of the creed of racial inferiority primarily to

further its own political beliefs, it nevertheless seems clear that the *Sentinel* did have a somewhat more disinterested concern in refuting the total belief in Negro inferiority which characterized some sections of the contemporary press. Having decided that even social scientists could give no definite indication of the Negroes' place in the scale of civilization or in modern society, the *Glasgow Sentinel* formed the independent opinion that insofar as character failings were concerned, the Negro race was essentially no worse than the white. A possible tendency to laziness and general lack of industry was attributed to the influence of the tropical climate, a climate which had produced "langour and slothfulness" in white men of "the most energetic races". As with the Duke of Argyll, a recognition of the importance of environmental circumstances was surprisingly strong, and helped greatly towards the conviction that there was "no radical difference between black and white":

> When we consider that the negro race has been exposed to the influence of the torrid zone for thousands of years, it is not remarkable that ... [the Negroes] should not display the same energy as is manifested by races reared amid the bracing frosts and temperate summers of a Northern climate ... [The relative position of the two races is more the result of accident than of any essential difference in the intellectual and moral constitutions of the two races.]

Perhaps the earlier contributions of Robert Chambers and Robert Knox to the literature on race had helped to breed an especially keen interest among Scots in the "scientific" theories on the subject which emerged over the years. Certainly, among those who rejected the doctrine of innate racial inferiority there was a conscious tendency to concentrate on forming their own quasi-scientific explanations for racial characteristics (as in the case of the *Glasgow Sentinel*, for instance), or on challenging on a scientific basis the more common assumptions of contemporary scientists. The Duke of Argyll's public statements, and his treatise in *Good Words*, were...

---

as much protests aimed against the early evolutionary theories of his
countryman, Robert Chambers, as against the findings of subsequent evolu-
tionists. And as the Duke's statements also indicated, there was a measure
of religious objection to accepting the popular argument that man had pro-
gressed from an original state of utter barbarism, in which he had been
devoid of all spiritual grace.

This latter strain of protest was most strongly exemplified in a pam-
phlet by "An old member of the Edinburgh Geological Society", who took ex-
ception to a lecture by one David Page in which Darwin's "survival of the
fittest" theory had been extended to incorporate the argument that the col-
oured, as the inferior race, must disappear before the civilized white.
Page's contention that man had become the modifier of nature, the unconscious
agent of his own illimitable progressive advancement, was strongly disputed
by "Old Member" as not representing the whole truth about the character of
man. The crux of his argument was that teachings and theories such as
Page's involved a total rejection of Christian truth. It was necessary for
the writer to turn the theory of evolution upside down (much as the Duke of
Argyll was to do later) in order to accommodate his belief that the whole
of mankind was still more or less in a degraded condition and must strive
towards restoration to its original state. Accordingly, he questioned if
there could be any real progress where man was not influenced by the
principle of justice, and mercy, and fear of God:

Modern thought ... improving upon the wisdom of our fathers, who
expended millions of money (sic) for the redemption of our negro
fellow-subjects, and upon the conduct of our transatlantic friends,
who not only spent money but shed much blood for the same object,
now tells us that the negro and other lower races of man are in-
capable of improvement, doomed to extermination, and ..., fit for
nothing but the dunghill. By this is ignored the provision made
by Infinite Wisdom and Compassion for the recovery and elevation
of the whole race of man; and cruelty, inhumanity, and destruction
receive the high-sounding names of science, philosophy, and civilisation.¹

It is extremely significant that the "Old Member" based his case against Page entirely on the argument that it was the Christian duty of the civilized world to elevate and improve the coloured races rather than to exterminate them. His terms of reasoning savour, as a result, much more strongly of missionary ideology than did the more strictly "scientific" statements of the Duke of Argyll; and his commitment to a belief in the absence of basic inequalities between the different races of men is correspondingly less clear. At the same time, however, the implicit acceptance of the existence of a Divine spark within all men, and of the relative stages of degredation in which all of mankind existed, were gateways to a ready belief in a vast potential for improvement among the "more degraded of fellow-men" and in the influence of environmental factors on a race's position in the social scale. No race of man, it was insisted, was incapable of moral, intellectual, and religious improvement:

The Esquimaux and Hottentot, the Hindu and Negro, have ... all shown evidence of change of character and moral habits, under the power of truth received and obeyed. The physical conditions or the external circumstances of those races account, in a very great measure, for their past and present state.

A number of individuals, especially in the Negro race, had, it was argued, risen to eminence, Toussaint L'Ouverture being cited as the prime example.²

IV Observations on the character, capabilities and potential of the Negro freedmen in the United States

The debate on the fundamental place of the Negro within the family of man and in the hierarchy of civilization was perhaps to some extent both a

---


2 Ibid., pp. 18-20.
stimulus for and a reflection of a persistent and vigorous inclination
to assess the immediate character and potential of the race as demonstrated
by its activities in the United States in the early years after emancipation.
Thus, visiting America in 1868, David Macrae, for instance, was eager to
draw attention to the dignity, culture and high intelligence which he found
in the person of Francis L. Cardozo, former fellow-student of his at Edin-
burgh and Secretary of State for South Carolina from 1868 to 1872.
Immensely impressed with Cardozo's library, he pertinently remarked, "I
have heard strong pro-slavery men in the South declare that you can no more
teach a negro than you can teach a mule. But there are no mules that have
yet learned to read Ruskin and Horace".  

While the belief in the improveability of the Negro race remained so
firmly the corner-stone of most arguments which insisted on the possibility
of black civilization ultimately being elevated to a level with white, it
was desirable to substantiate this belief by providing visible evidence
of the intellectual abilities of the American freedmen. Accordingly, Macrae
made a point of visiting a large number of freedmen's schools during his
tour through the South, and heard approximately ten thousand Negro scholars
of all ages examined in them. His conclusion was a mixture of natural,
extreme optimism, overlaid by a somewhat incongruous caution - a tacit
acknowledgement, perhaps, of his failure to plumb the depths of contemporary
scientific thinking on race. He thus stated his inability to pronounce on
whether the Negro was capable of as high a culture as the white man, but
professed a belief that

there are differences between races as there are between individuals
of the same race. Even in the same family we find one boy cleverer
than his brothers; and in the family of mankind ... the white race
has shown more energy, more grasp of thought, and more power of

---

1 Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 211.
command than the black race. But a boy in the family, who is not naturally so gifted as his brother, may be capable of immensely improving by education; and this I take to be the case with the negro.¹

This said, he went on to give an extremely encouraging picture of Negro educational achievements in the schools and colleges of the United States, and to list a large number of important professions and occupations which Negroes were already occupying efficiently and responsibly in America.² He later asserted that his visits to the freedmen's schools had left him "inspired with great hope of the coloured race", especially with regard to the children, whose proficiency had sometimes amazed him.³

In 1871 - the year in which Macrae took his licence to preach as a United Presbyterian minister - a Deputation from the Mission Board of that church visited Jamaica and the United States. Comprised of the Foreign Mission Secretary, the Rev. Dr. Hamilton M. MacGill, and James H. Young, a member of the church, the Deputation travelled over three thousand miles in the United States, visiting a large number of schools, colleges and churches for freedmen, and gaining "great insight" into the capabilities of the Negroes. To some extent, its report mirrored the attitude of Macrae, first expressed in the earliest edition of his book on his American trip, published the year before. Thus, while MacGill and Young were not prepared to risk affirming that the black population would as a matter of course move through life with an aptitude for rising to success and influence equal to that of the white, they were well satisfied that where "ordinary acquisitions" were concerned, the freed Negro at school level was as able as the Anglo-Saxon, "with his fairer skin and his social pre-eminence". Moreover,

1 Ibid., p. 265.
2 Ibid., pp. 265-266.
3 Macrae, Amongst the Darkies, p. 31. Macrae again stressed the high intellectual attainments of individual Negroes in America — see Ibid., pp. 25-30.
it was stressed that the reasons for Negro backwardness were based not so much in native intellectual inferiority as in past domination of white over black, and surviving prejudices.  

The Free Church also had its spokesmen ready to give personal testimony to the educational capabilities demonstrated by the Negro race during the crucial years of Reconstruction. Complementing the Duke of Argyll's speech to the freedmen's aid meeting in Glasgow, the Rev. Dr. Patrick Fairbairn, Principal of the Free Church College of Glasgow, and a member of the deputation which had visited the Presbyterian churches of the United States in 1867, stated that in the many freedmen's schools he had seen, he had detected no inferiority between the intellects of the Negro children and those of the same age in Scotland. And, seeking as late as 1872 to stir up support for the freedmen's aid cause in Aberdeen, the Rev. Alexander King of that city told a public meeting that in his experience, Negro children in the day schools in America showed much greater aptitude for acquiring knowledge than did the white children.

1 Extracts from the Report of the U.P. Mission Board's Deputation to Jamaica, in Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church, Nov., 1871, New Series, No. 69, Vol. 4, p. 665. The Rev. Dr. Hamilton N. MacGill had long been actively associated with Missionary Society work, and was appointed Foreign Mission Secretary in 1868, a post which he was to hold for eleven years - see C.H. MacGill, Memories of the Rev. Dr. Hamilton N. MacGill (Edinburgh, 1880), pp. 15-21.

James H. Young was sufficiently committed to the objectives of the Deputation to pay all his own expenses through America and Jamaica - see treasurer's statement in Missionary Record, April, 1872, No. 76, Vol. 5, p. 140. Like MacGill, he had over the years sustained an extremely deep and effective interest in his church's foreign missions, and especially those in Jamaica. He had contributed generously to Dr. Heugh's church earlier in the century, and according to MacGill, was earnestly pledged to help establish a native ministry in Jamaica. He died in November, 1871, shortly after his return from the trip - on his way home from a meeting of the Foreign Mission Committee - see obituary by MacGill in ibid., Jan., 1872, No. 73, Vol. 5, p. 11.

2 Report of speech by Principal Fairbairn at a freedmen's aid meeting in City Hall, Glasgow, 27 Jan., 1868 in Glasgow Herald, 28 Jan., 1868.

These findings were echoed by a London-Scot, James Macaulay, who was a member of the Church of England and editor of the religious magazines Sunday at Home and The Leisure Hour. Macaulay enthusiastically quoted American educationalists on the "remarkable intellectual capacities of coloured children", and on their continued equality with whites in the sphere of higher education: and his own opinion, formed as the result of a visit to Howard University, was that "whatever may be the inferiority from natural constitution, or from the effects of centuries of oppression and wrong, there is the same capacity in the coloured race as in the white for indefinite improvement by intellectual and moral culture". And at the back of this attitude, the familiar theme prevailed - the rooted belief that above all else, the power of Divine truth and grace would bring all races to the same high standard of Christian excellence.¹

But all Scottish travellers - churchmen included - who wished to see the freedmen advance their condition during Reconstruction were not quite so confident as these of the Negroes' ultimate ability to assimilate intellectual concepts which would put the race generally on a cultural par with Anglo-Saxon Americans. The Free Church's Rev. Dr. William Blaikie (great champion, be it remembered, of Livingstone's ventures) was decidedly reticent about the prospects for indefinite Negro advancement. A visit to Howard University in 1870 during his trip to the United States as a delegate to the Presbyterian churches left him somewhat sceptical about its future. He had a snobbish objection to the status of "university" being applied to "schools designed to teach a few negroes some of the higher branches", and although faithfully recording the coloured law professor's optimism about the Negro students' academic potential, Blaikie made it clear that he

¹ Macaulay, Across the Ferry, pp. 293-295.
himself had no personal knowledge of the capacity of Negroes as scholars or of the likelihood of their succeeding in a university career. And in his opinion, Howard University itself was in too crude and undeveloped a condition to be capable of producing high achievements.  

Blaikie's hesitancy in committing himself on the open question of Negro intellectual advancement beyond a certain level represented, however, a natural enough response for a man of his times, placed as he was in an influential position, yet himself inevitably aware of some of the more predominant ideas on race which had sprouted throughout the century. In 1856, the French phrenologist, Gratiolet, had advanced the theory that while young Negro children were just as intelligent as their white contemporaries, they began to lag behind at the age of thirteen or fourteen, because in the Negro race the coronal suture of the skull closed at an early age, gripping the brain, arresting its growth, and consequently preventing exceptionally high intellectual development. Only in the 1880s was it finally recognized that measurement of crania did not offer a valid indication of intelligence, and in the intervening period, the idea had been popularized, gratefully appropriated by those anxious to prove the natural inferiority of the Negro, and apparently not without impact on those who had comparatively open minds on the subject.

During the Reconstruction era, the belief that the Negro was capable of parallel development with the white only up to a certain standard was still part of the common currency of thinking on race. Within Scotland, the uncertainties produced by such an imponderable were in some measure reflected

---

1 Blaikie, "America and the Americans: Impressions of a Three Months Visit in 1870"; sixth paper, "In Washington", in Sunday Magazine, March, 1871, p. 336. He had also thought the higher schools for Negroes hastily organized and inferior in equipment and teaching methods — ibid., p. 335.

2 See Gossett, Race, p. 75.
as much in the attitudes of the U.P. church as in the reticence of individuals like Blaikie. Those who, like Charles Mackay, continued to hold a total belief in the natural inferiority of the Negro race, found it a good time to insiduously reinforce racist ideas by restating the argument that the Negro could be educated in the "imitative" skills of reading, writing, and simple arithmetic, but not in the "creative professions".2

That there might soon need to be a re-assessment of pre-existing hard-line attitudes to Negro capabilities was, however, hinted at in the Glasgow Herald at one stage. In an editorial devoted to the discussion of the latest Freedmen's Bureau report on the schools for freedmen, the Herald recorded its great admiration and support for the educational programme which the Bureau was successfully organizing, and, having given details of the numbers of schools and of scholars attending them, it remarked:

It is generally admitted, even by those who have a very poor idea of the capacity of the negro, that he learns for a short time with great aptitude, but it is denied that he is capable of much advance in the higher branches. The statistics of this report do not favour the latter theory.3

Yet, in varying degree, there remained uncertainties and reservations among most Scots visiting the United States at that time. For instance, the Rev. Charles Grant, assistant Professor of Latin at Aberdeen University, made a tour of American schools and colleges in 1868, and decided that while Negro children were "remarkably smart" in answering in response to a gesture or expression which the examiner might make, they had little power of reflection and continually looked outward and not inward for their replies. Although he did not recognize it as such, Grant had at least been rewarded

1 See above, p. 597.
3 Glasgow Herald, 26 Nov., 1869.
with one example of original thinking by a pupil at one of the freedmen's schools, however. He tried a class out with a little of the broad Scots' dialect of Aberdeenshire and asked the scholars what it was. Eventually, one black boy replied, "I guess, sir, it is an imitation of English by some barbarians".  

Sir George Campbell was ready enough to concede that there was a tendency among the younger coloured children in America to be as quick and bright as the whites, but to fall off in performance to some degree when they became older. But he still felt the need to stress that such views required considerable qualification since in very many cases, the intellectual gulf between the two races did not seem to be very wide or evident. His general conclusion was that while the Negro race was on the whole lagging behind the Anglo-Saxon in America, it was not very far behind.  

The great difficulty for all Scots trying to build up a composite picture of Negro intellectual abilities during the Reconstruction era was the fact that so many popular old prejudices and racial theories had to be cut away, like so much dead wood, before it was possible to get a fresh view of the question. In addition, those who visited the United States at that time could in the nature of things merely observe and comment upon the earliest stages of what they recognized as being a complex and lengthy process of educating and elevating the American Negroes. The visible progress being made by black scholars within the freedmen's schools certainly helped to encourage hopes of greater things to come, but it did little immediately to solve the perpetual question of the ultimate "limit" of Negro intellectual and cultural advancement. Understandably, there was in many cases a conscious effort not to pre-judge the outcome of America's great educational experiment: regrettably, there was

1 Rev. Charles Grant, Notes on Schools and Colleges in America, from a summer tour in 1866. An Address delivered to the Aberdeen University Debating Society, November, 1871. Published in pamphlet form in Aberdeen, 1871, pp. 16-17.  
2 Campbell, White and Black, p. 136.
also in many cases an unconscious tendency to restrain optimism by backward glances in the direction of cautionary "scientific" theories on racial capabilities.

While Sir George Campbell was thus unwilling to pronounce the Negro race as doomed to a position of eternal inferiority to the white man, by the end of the Reconstruction era he still felt justified in declaring that few Negroes had risen to high positions since the Civil War and that if the race had been a very pushing and capable one, the free Negroes educated in the North would have made more headway in the South after the war.

The negroes are certainly not a race remarkable for energy and force under difficulties ... On the whole, I think it must be considered that at present, whether from natural defects or from want of cultivation, they are to a certain extent inferior to white men in the qualities which lead to the higher grades of employment.¹

He acknowledged that it was still early days for the freedmen, but his argument had nevertheless concluded with the significant observation that the Negroes in America, with their "very good temperament and nature", their docility, and so forth, were adequately endowed with the "qualities that admirably fit them for labourers".²

The ambiguities which crept into the Duke of Argyll's speech when he alluded to the peculiar "attributes" of the Negro character have already been observed.³ Campbell merely stated in straightforward language what had come to be accepted as a common enough equation in Scottish thinking on the freedmen's future - that the obedient, easy-going Negro character represented the very stuff of which first-class labourers and servants (rather than owners and employers) were made. The idea remained that the Negroes had brought from slavery times "a sort of childish want of respect for property in

¹ Ibid., pp. 138-139.
² Ibid., p. 139.
³ See above, pp. 587-588.
certain things", so that while they did not commit violent and vicious crimes, they resorted to petty stealing. Apart from small misdemeanours, Campbell found them, however, "a good sort of people" who were always ready to give assistance and do odd jobs for tobacco: "They certainly seem a remarkably easily-managed, good-natured set of people".

Observing the American situation around the same time as Campbell, Sir David Wedderburn came to very similar conclusions. Although more openly pessimistic about the rising generation of American Negroes, whom he judged to be "thriftless and idle", improvident, and growing up in ignorance equal to that of their parents, he also recognized that, by way of redeeming features, the Negro was "docile, good-tempered, little disposed to crime, except petty larceny, and never riotous or aggressive". Commenting much earlier on the developing political aspect of Reconstruction, the North British Daily Mail had condemned Northern initiatives to organize the freedmen in the South into political Societies, explaining that it was a great mistake on the Radicals' part to attempt to keep the planters and Negroes in opposition to each other. The basis for this argument was that the Negro was not by nature vindictive like the Red Indian, that he was very accessible to kindness, and that the best policy for the planter was to "coax and court" him.

Such analyses carried a clear connotation of innate weakness in the Negro character - a deficiency of the Victorian virtues of ruthless dedication to the work in hand, the ability to advance by one's own initiative, and drive and ambition. The paradox arose whereby the future low status of the American

1 Campbell, White and Black, p. 170
2 Ibid., p. 342.
3 Percival (ed.), Sir David Wedderburn, p. 231. These views were formed during Wedderburn's return through the United States from a trip to Australasia in 1875.
4 North British Daily Mail, 11 April, 1867.
freedman in society was apparently pre-determined by the attributes of his character.

There was, of course, within Scotland also some measure of genuine, unalloyed respect and regard for the qualities which the Negroes in America had shown themselves to possess during the great upheaval caused by the Civil War. Their conduct as soldiers fighting in the Northern cause was applauded in both the Aberdeen Free Press and the Dundee Advertiser, and by David Macrae. But a more popular stimulus for praise was the slaves' general conduct, both in the army and on the Southern plantations, during the entire period of hostilities. The Duke of Argyll demonstrated a more straightforward appreciation of the Negro character when at a meeting of the National Committee of British Freedmen's Aid Societies held immediately after the war he stressed the recent peaceful and "exemplary" conduct of the black population. He indicated that the absence of slave revolts against masters in wartime had demonstrated that the Negroes simply were not prepared to gain their desired liberty by crime and violence, and, paying tribute to the strength of their Christian spirit, he contended that the ex-slaves had shown "some of the greatest virtues of human character".

This section of the Duke of Argyll's speech had met with a particularly warm response from his audience, and similar references were also enthusiastically received by Scottish sympathizers with the freedmen's aid cause. Thus, at a meeting on behalf of the freedmen held in Perth in September, 1865, Sella Martin was rewarded with "great cheers" when he stated that the American Negro population was distinctly order-loving and asked his audience to recall how patient the slave had been in bondage and in his conduct throughout the

---


2 Speech by the Duke of Argyll at a meeting of the National Committee of British Freedmen's Aid Societies held at the Westminster Palace Hotel, London, 17 May, 1865, on John Rylands Microfilm.
The lack of "aggression" in the Negro character won perhaps its highest accolade, however, in the columns of Robert Smeal's British Friend. Shortly before the end of the Civil War, the Glasgow Quaker chose to review in his magazine a book on the conflict by an American author, E.Y. Robbins. A main concern of the work was to dispute the righteousness and expediency of attempting to liberate the slaves by war, and this being so, it was enthusiastically received by the British Friend. Most significant, however, was the emphasis and attention given by the reviewer to the section of Robbins' book which argued that the condition of the Negroes in the United States was extremely pitiable and serious because they were by nature disinclined to war and bloodshed, a fact which was proof of their true manhood and showed that in them there was "unmistakably the image of the God of peace, in which man was created". Quaker respect for the patience and fortitude with which the black population had suffered the rigours of slavery had always been total. With the coming of the American Civil War, which tore at the pacifist conscience of the Quakers, Robert Smeal therefore seized the opportunity to illustrate that although the Negro was at the centre of the armed controversy, by natural inclination he remained outwith the physical violence of it. The sympathy which the Friends had accorded to the slave could therefore be confidently extended to the freedman during Reconstruction given the reassurance that the Negro race had proved itself to be of an essentially pacifist temperament. Writing to the Friend from Virginia later that year, an American Quaker stressed how, working among the freedmen, his admiration for the

1 Report of speech by Sella Martin at a public meeting on behalf of the freedmen held in City Hall, Perth, 28 Sept., 1865, in Perthshire Courier, 3 Oct., 1865.

Negroes had increased and his sympathy for them been even more aroused by their "patience and Christian spirit" in time of need. Lack of aggressive tendencies - one of the main strands in the condescending attitude of so many Scots towards the Negro race - was thus accepted by the small band of active Scottish Friends as the great strength of the Negro character, as well as being welcomed, perhaps, as the ultimate vindication of the massive Quaker involvement in the Negro cause throughout the century.

Yet, there was still a persistent tendency for quite sincere tributes to the Negro character to be voiced in excruciatingly patronizing terms. The principal barrier to the formation of completely fresh attitudes towards the Negro freedmen after the Civil War was of course the prejudices which lingered on from slavery times. Chief among these was the "Happy Sambo" stereotype, which spilled over into the Reconstruction era to be reconstituted in the familiar picture of the good-natured Negro who would be an easily-managed, obedient, and happy free labourer. The restrictive influence of "traditional" views on the essentially carefree nature of the Negro could dominate the thinking not only of openly racist commentators such as Carlyle and Mackay, but also of Scots with more open minds on the subject of race who visited the South during Reconstruction. Laurence Oliphant, for instance, who was by no means unsympathetic to the plight of the freedmen after the war, remained supremely nonchalant to Negro complaints that they had been cheated of their wages by whites:

Providence has, however, provided that, under all circumstances, even the most trying, negroes should be very happy dogs. I have seen them digging graves and burying their comrades with an

---


2 See, for instance, a poem written in 1867 by a Morayshire man, celebrating the fidelity of a Negro slave to his master - Appendix IV.
irrepressible lightheartedness.1

During his steamship journey from West Virginia to Tennessee, Sir David Wedderburn found it
great fun to see the lazy, jovial way in which the negro porters on board go about their work, always on the broad grin, chaffing one another, each trying to let his neighbour do the lion's share of work, tumbling about over pigs, or under cotton bales, and never getting hurt.2

Wedderburn's comments accord perfectly, of course, with the contemporary Music Hall stereotype of the Negro as a happy, lackadaisical, rollicking individual. And for Scots at home, variety entertainment of the time certainly did a very great deal to perpetuate and buttress this image.

Reference has already been made to the plethora of acts purporting to represent the essence of the Negro character and way of life.3 In fact, the performances of these "Negro delineators" had the effect of consigning popular portrayal of their subject well and truly to the realms of burlesque. Throughout the Reconstruction years, Edinburgh and Glasgow music hall audiences were especially well catered for by such acts as "Mr. and Mrs. West in their laughable Negro Delineations".4 Other popular double acts specializing in the same brand of entertainment included Mr. and Mrs. Coleman,5

1 Oliphant, On the Present State of Political Parties in America, pp. 16-17. Something of the flexibility (not to say perversity) of Scottish attitudes to the Negro character is, however, neatly reflected in a comparison of this particular view of Oliphant's with that of a generally much more racist observer, the Glasgow Herald's "Rambling Reporter". Near Petersburg, Virginia, in 1866, he met a Negro funeral procession, on which he commented: "Everyone looked sober, serious and respectable, and after the sable cavalcade passed on to the cemetery I felt that the negro character had risen a good deal in my estimation by the spectacle" - "Rambling Reporter", in Glasgow Herald, 25 Aug., 1866.

2 Percival (ed.), Sir David Wedderburn, p. 82. This comment was recorded during Wedderburn's American trip in 1866.

3 See above, Chapter II, pp. 68-76.

4 General notice of programme at Southminster Music Hall, Edinburgh, commencing 6 April, 1868, in Scotsman, 1 April, 1868.

5 General notice of current programme at Southminster Music Hall, Edinburgh, in ibid., 5 May, 1868.
Mr. and Mrs. Hurley, Manhill and Rawlins, and Hardie and Davis, "the Celebrated Refined Negro Delineators." And at least as frequent were the stage appearances of solo "coloured comedians" and song and dance men, like "the funny negro delineator" Joe Lund, Will Brown, A. Cox, Orville Parker, and James Wallace. The criterion of excellence for each of these acts was clearly the degree of stereotyped "minstrelsy" and humour which the performers were able to offer. In the early 1870s, the Scotsman, for instance, could still commend the "Negro entertainers" Manhill and Rawlins simply for having sustained their part of the variety programme "in a sufficiently amusing style." 

By virtue of their boisterous, hilarious nature, these stage characterizations certainly assumed, on occasion at least, a novelty value which directly linked them with other novelty acts in the variety programme. Thus,

---

1 General notice of current programme at Whitebait Concert Rooms, Glasgow, 6 Jan., 1868, in North British Daily Mail, 6 Jan., 1868.
2 General notice of current programme at Southminster Theatre of Varieties, Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 2 April, 1873.
3 General notice advertising services of Hardie and Davis for soirees, concerts, etc., in North British Daily Mail, 19 Jan., 1866.
4 General notice of current programme at Southminster Music Hall, Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 19 Sept., 1870. See also general notice advertising Lund's availability for engagements, in North British Daily Mail, 3 Feb., 1876.
5 General notice of current programme at Southminster Music Hall, Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 5 May, 1868.
7 General notice of current programme at Brown's Royal Music Hall, Glasgow, in ibid., 19 July, 1869.
8 General notice advertising Wallace's availability for engagements, in ibid., 31 Aug., 1869.
9 Scotsman, 2 April, 1873.
at one production in the Dundee Music Hall, the "Funny Niggers in new burlesque and comic scenes" shared the bill with Sloman the Man-Bird, while several years before that, Edinburgh audiences had watched one Alexander Deulin present a "Nigger Entertainment" which concluded with "The Rival Gorillas". Mackney, one of the most celebrated and (in Edinburgh at least) popular "Negro delineators", included in his repertoire not only Negro songs and a "wonderful performance on the Violin, with imitations of Zulu Kaffirs, etc.", but also a burlesque entitled "The Nigger Paganini (with the Wonderful Farmyard Imitations)", one performance of which was seen by Lord Provost William Chambers himself. The popularity of such acts among Scottish music hall audiences, and the deleterious effect which they could have both in entrenching a stereotyped opinion of the Negro character and in fostering a yet more "racist" view of the Negro as a human novelty, is brought out to some extent in the nature of the benefit performance given in Edinburgh's Southminster Music Hall for Tom Handford, yet another "unrivalled Negro delineator". This took the form of a competition to find the best "amateur nigger", the prize for the winner being a handsome silver medal.

The "latest and greatest novelties in negro minstrelsy" were certainly

1 See general notice of current programme at the Music Hall, Dundee, in Dundee Courier, 9 Sept., 1876.
2 See general notice of current programme at the Theatre-Royal, Edinburgh, in Scotsman, 5 March, 1867.
3 General notice of Saturday Evening Concert at Edinburgh Music Hall on 18 Feb., 1865, in ibid., 15 Feb., 1865. Mackney enjoyed a highly successful run at the Edinburgh Music Hall in November, 1866, and in anticipation of his last appearance, the press advised that "those desirous of hearing this Inimitable Artiste should make early application for tickets" - see ibid., 20 Nov., 1866.
4 General notice of current programme at Edinburgh Music Hall, in ibid., 8 Dec., 1865.
5 General notice of programme in Southminster Music Hall, Edinburgh, on 27 Feb., 1867, in ibid., 27 Feb., 1867.
6 See general notice of performances by Christy Minstrels at the Operetta-House, Edinburgh, in ibid., 3 Sept., 1870. The Female Christy Minstrels were appearing simultaneously at the Southminster Music Hall.
most widely and persistently presented by the various troupes of Christy Minstrels who during this period played to enthusiastic audiences throughout the length and breadth of Scotland. 1 While the Female Christy Minstrels enlivened the Music Halls and village halls of the early 1870s with "Walk Rounds", the "Original Black Can Can", and exuberant assertions of the slogan "Black, but that's no matter!", 2 the Wilson and Montague troupe of Christy Minstrels had already given the whole concept of black-face minstrelsy the firm seal of respectability and acceptability by appearing before Queen Victoria at Balmoral in 1868. 3 The Original Christy Minstrels even offered a serious explanation of their role as accurate interpreters of the Negro character as it really was:

As each member [of the troupe] has accepted Negro Minstrelsy as his profession, and therefore has made the peculiarities of the Negro Race his special study, imitating with close fidelity his very nature, language, voice and actions, he thus throws into his delineation the True Lights and Shadows of Plantation Life. 4

By the closing years of the Reconstruction era, at least the North British Daily Mail saw fit to warn its public against taking its impression of Negroes solely from "the vulgarities of Christy Minstrelism, sacred or secular". 5 And the paper had indeed shown much earlier detestation of this

1 The Christy Minstrels performed regularly in Edinburgh during the autumn of 1866 - see general notices in ibid., Sept-Oct., 1866; and in Glasgow on 20, 21 and 22 Feb., 1865, when they were billed to appear as "The Public's Old Favourites" - see Glasgow Herald, 13 Feb., 1865. For notices of performances further North, see Dundee Courier, 8 Feb., 1866; Inverness Courier, 21 May, 1866. They even appeared in village halls in Banffshire and Aberdeenshire - see Huntly Express, 14 July, 1866.
2 See general notice of coming performances by the Troupe in Glasgow, in North British Daily Mail, 14 April, 1871.
3 See ibid., 21 Oct., 1868.
4 General notice of performance by Original Christy Minstrels in City Hall, Perth, 1 Feb., 1866, in Perthshire Courier, 30 Jan., 1866.
5 North British Daily Mail, 29 June, 1876.
form of entertainment when, welcoming the appearance of a genuine Negro group of musicians in Glasgow, it commented, "Other things being equal, we should patronise a negro entertainment by negroes in preference to one by Cockneys disguised by means of grease and charcoal". 1

It was also of some small significance that at least one Scot who was personally acquainted with Negro performers, and whose knowledge of Negro behaviour was therefore not confined to their stage representations, apparently did not subscribe to the familiar music hall caricatures of the race. "M.L.L." from Angus had at one stage boarded in a house where all his fellow-lodgers had been concert hall artistes, and included among whom had been a Mr. and Mrs. Ebony Screed. Although he described the couple as "unrivalled delineators of African irrepressibility", his own observations on their conduct scarcely matched in every last detail the stereotyped figures they probably portrayed on stage. Rather, he found that "These coloured folks were good-humoured, kindly, and industrious; the wife made, mended, washed, ironed, marketed, baked and cooked; and the husband employed his leisure hours in fabricating banjos". 2

Such judgements, or even reservations such as the North British Daily Mail expressed, were bound to be exceptional, however. It seems clear that the general effect of stage portrayals of Negro life and character would have been at least to reinforce old unfavourable stereotypes, if not to encourage the belief that the Negro race throughout the world, freedman as well as bondsman, was, on the whole, capable of very little positive achievement or cultural advancement.

With the focus of public attention in Britain so keenly fixed at this time on the prospects and capabilities of coloured races, any popular medium

1 Ibid., 23 Dec., 1867.

which tended to emphasize the apparently frivolous, essentially childlike nature of the Negro inevitably helped in some small way to create a climate conducive to the growth of a belief in the race's innate inferiority. The important thing was that beyond the stereotypes presented purely for entertainment on the variety stage, there were elements in the popular press which sought more earnestly and deliberately to impress upon the public mind the basic idea of racial inequality. The stream of uncompromisingly racist thought which permeated some Scottish attitudes towards the Jamaican Negroes was accordingly undiminished in relation to the Negro freedman in the United States. It has already been indicated that assessment of the black populations of both countries often tended to be linked together. Charles Mackay decided that the most effective way to highlight the natural inferiority of the American Negro was to make a sweeping general survey of the condition of the race in other parts of the world. 1

The Jamaican revolt had prompted the Daily Review to observe that to some extent, the relative intellectual advancement of the Negro race throughout the world was determined by environmental factors. But even in speculating upon an environment which seemed to be on the brink of offering the Negro a higher degree of civilization (according to Anglo-Saxon standards) than he enjoyed elsewhere, the Review had remained sceptical of the Negroes' ability to adapt. Whilst it was recognized that every section of the Southern community would face great trials and hardships during Reconstruction, the paper insisted that the coloured freedmen would have to endure the worst difficulties of all in the transition period in America. Nor did this spring merely from the fact that they had been "bred into abject dependence"; racial considerations had also to be taken into account:

There is no alternative but to regard the liberated slaves

1 See above, pp. 544-547.
as beings of an inferior race, who have been trained under the worst circumstances, and thrust into liberty without being fitted to enjoy its advantages or bear its responsibilities ... They have to carry through the heaviest burden, with the least strength and the most uncertain foothold.¹

The Review, mindful, perhaps, of its recent close affiliation with the Free Church, did at least "pity the poor negroes, who are, by the acts of others, threatened with being made the victims of the transition", and it even urged a generous public response to appeals for freedmen's aid in Britain. But mixed in with this Christian philanthropy was a total acceptance of the conviction that however unjust, the Negroes' immediate unhappy plight as independent freedmen was inevitable. It was useless to ask why the Negroes had inherited the heaviest burden after peace:

We must recognize the fact that men are answerable in consequences, not merely for what they do but for what they are; no matter how they blame what they are, whether by their own fault or by that of others. That is the universal law, and under it the poor negroes are doomed to a state of suffering from which it is doubtful when and how, if ever, they will emerge without help.²

An opinion reinforcing the Review's pessimism about the Negro during Reconstruction, but with none of the paper's apparent compassion for the freedmen, came from an American correspondent who, during the war, had written accounts of the military action for the paper, under the pseudonym "U.S.A. officer". In his view, the "Almighty Nigger" represented the only real difficulty in the way of a speedy resettlement; since his emancipation, "he has gone into the world like a boy who leaves home for the first time, and he comes back whining, 'I ain't got no friends'". It was an attitude based, at bottom, on the same grounds as the Review's own - a belief in the intellectual inferiority of the Negro race. Thus, the prospect of Negro enfranchisement appalled the writer as a scheme designed to give the vote to "men who, apart from their inferior mental organisation, have (the majority) for ages been brought up in ignorance almost as profound as that

¹ Daily Review, 6 Oct., 1865.
² Ibid.
of their brothers in Africa". The Review's continuing lack of confidence in the rapid development of Negro intellectual abilities was clearly indicated later in an editorial which dealt with a currently popular story circulating in the press about a very talented American Negro sculptress studying in Rome. It was pointed out that while the sculptress' father was a Negro, her mother was an American Indian, and it had been from the latter that she had inherited her intellectual and emotional character. The message was carefully spelt out that the "phenomenon" should not be taken as "a proof of the existence of undeveloped capacities in the negro race", which it clearly was not.

Similar attitudes were not lacking elsewhere in the Scottish press. The Edinburgh Courant never wavered throughout the Reconstruction era in stigmatizing the Negro as a greatly inferior being to the white, Anglo-Saxon American. Whenever the Civil War was over, the paper pounced on "the frantic partisans" of the North everywhere - and in Britain in particular - by predicting that "the future of the black population of the South is not so clear and so bright as the 'friends of the slave' in this country affirm it to be". Lincoln was cited as having recognized the great difficulty posed by four millions of emancipated Negroes, and William Rathbone Greg was triumphantly hailed as having swung from holding "an exaggerated admiration of the black" to advancing basically Carlylean views on the duties and prospects of the American freedmen. Quite simply, the paper remained totally convinced that the Negroes in America were not adequately prepared for so sudden a change in their condition as that brought about by

2 Ibid., 7 March, 1866. See also ibid., 18 Jan., 1868.
3 Edinburgh Courant, 24 April, 1865.
emancipation: "If the Garrisons and Wendell Phillipses of the Northern States had been really the friends of the negro, and not the dupes of their own fanaticism, they would have advocated the mitigation of the harsher features and facts of slavery, instead of clamouring aggressively for its abolition 'total and immediate'".  

This early editorial pointed the direction of the Edinburgh Courant's attitudes towards the American Negroes for the remainder of the Reconstruction years. Those who sought to help and elevate the freedmen continued to be the objects of derision and sarcasm, as the abolitionists had been before them. Perhaps the bitterest comments in this connection were, however, contributed to the paper by "A Confederate Soldier", who attacked Northern schoolteachers in the South by suggesting that they were concentrating their attention on the more "genteel" elements of the Negro population:

I would only gently hint to the fair New Englanders who are so deeply interested in Cuffie at present, that 'cullered gemmum' of the barber persuasion and ambrosial smelling ringlets ought not to exclude poor darkies who, as simply such, have nothing 'rich', 'warm', mulatto or Beecher-Stowish in their nature, from their influences; that a field hand, if not romantic, is genuine, and not a Mosaic production.2

In the wake of the Jamaican uprising, the Courant itself was ready to identify an unfavourable, seditious streak in the Negro character which, it was argued, manifested itself in every country where the race had got its freedom. As a matter of course, the United States, with its newly emancipated millions, would eventually be faced with Negro revolt. Firstly, there was "the mimetic faculty which, among other signs of his degenerate character, the negro possesses in such vigour", and which caused him "to ape not only the vices of his betters, but the sedition of his kinsmen". Secondly, there was the fact that a wide chasm between black and white would emerge in the matter of employment: "A jealous, embittered, and comparatively idle

1 Ibid.
population will arise from the emancipated negroes, and petty squabbles
will develop into party strife, until the whole black community may be
organised into something like a rebel force". ¹

But the belief in Negro inferiority ultimately produced also the more
reassuring conviction that the black population in America simply was not
intellectually fit or naturally energetic enough to pose a real threat of
any kind to the white population of the South. The paper had strongly
deplored the Northern policy of establishing the rule of an "inferior" and
"miserably ignorant" race over the high-spirited Southerners.² But by
mid-1869, it was satisfied that "the superior race is winning back its old
ascendancy. The emancipated negro has been forced to recognize the stern
fact that no resolutions of Congress can reverse or evade the decrees of
nature".³ The conviction grew that the Negro could never reach "the high
level of an intelligent civilisation",⁴ and even the black voters' failure
in the later stages of Reconstruction to protect themselves against the
intimidation and violence of Southern Democrats was contemptuously turned
into a race issue:

The truth, perhaps, is that ... [the Southern Negro] cannot value
his privileges as an ordinary rational being should. He has no
confidence in himself as having the right to assert the privileges
conferred upon him by the Fifteenth amendment. He is lamentably
illiterate, stupid, and conceited.⁵

The Negroes who had succeeded in holding on to offices in State Senates
throughout the South were derisively lampooned as "looking with pride on the
pile of blue-books, all ... [their] own, feeling their weight as if they were
so many pumpkins".⁶ In late 1876, the influence of Carlyle's "Occasional

¹ Ibid., 7 Nov., 1865.
² See Ibid., 31 July, 1867, 8 Sept., 1868.
³ Ibid., 7 July, 1869.
⁴ Ibid., 15 Sept., 1871; see also ibid., 7 July, 1869.
⁵ Ibid., 13 Oct., 1876.
⁶ Ibid.
Discourse" lingered on.

No less consistent in its suggestion of the inferior nature of America's Negro population was Edinburgh's (and Scotland's) leading journal, the Scotsman. In its columns, too, the violence perpetrated in the late seventies by the Southern whites towards the Negroes merely had the effect of producing comments which reflected an increased scorn rather than an increasing sympathy for the victimized. In this connection, the Scotsman, however, adopted a slightly more sophisticated journalistic approach than the Edinburgh Courant, employing a fiercely satirical line which conveyed with great effect the tremendous contempt which this influential mouthpiece of "moderate liberalism" felt for the earnest strivings of the liberated Negroes to understand and come to terms with the complexities of freedom.

The paper suggested that while the Republican press in America was insisting that the Negro population of the South was being indiscriminately slaughtered by unrepentant white rebels and the Democratic journals were accusing the Negroes of perpetrating vicious crimes against the whites, the Republican "stories" were the more thrilling. In Republican versions of what happened when a Negro was shot, "Your negro victim is invariably a model man; he has all the Christian virtues of Uncle Tom, added to the mental gifts of Frederick Douglas[3]."

Making full use of what were accepted as "negrophilist" stereotypes of the freedmen, the Scotsman went satirically on to list the usual sort of ways in which, according to the Republicans, the Negro was employed when seized and dispatched by Southern whites. He might be sitting at the door of his "'humble but comfortable cabin'" in domestic bliss, reading the latest edition of the "'Dismal Swamp Clarion of Freedom'" when gunned down. He might be working in a cornfield at noonday "rehearsing the speech which he is to deliver that night at the meeting of his political club" when the Ku Klux Klan seized him and cut his throat: or he might be strung up on his way to
the market town "to sell his cotton - fruits of a long year's toil", or shot down along with his companions when "peaceably travelling by rail to the county town to attend a Republican convention". The Scotsman itself tended to believe that the freedmen were generally the aggressors, and it was with satisfaction that the paper's American correspondent had earlier recorded that the Negroes in riot situations were "soon cowed by the superior skill, intelligence, and organisation, of the whites; and, as in South Carolina, lay down their arms and beg for mercy".

When Reconstruction was only just beginning, the Scotsman's views on the Negro race had to some extent been incorporated in the remarks of an earlier correspondent from America who had sent reports to the paper from the South during the war, and who had emigrated from Scotland to South Carolina around 1862. In a lengthy letter in July, 1865, he recalled how astonished he had been to find that in the South "the so-called slaves were treated better, and were more happy and comfortable than are the majority of the free white people in our own manufacturing towns". Slave accommodation he had considered "infinitely superior to the dwellings of the labouring classes in Edinburgh, for instance", and he had been immensely impressed with the general paternalism which obtained on the plantations. Behind his predictable argument that there had been little incidence of brutality towards slaves lay a total belief in the inferiority and insensitivity of the Negro race:

Philanthropists must remember that the coarse, uneducated and even brutal mind and deadened sensibilities of the negro are not amenable, and are impenetrable to disgrace and to the species of mental punishment which we award to offenders. To place a negro in jail, and lodge and feed and clothe him, would be to admit him to a species of Paradise, to which he would endeavour to attain on every opportunity; and as he cannot be fined, the only

1 Scotsman, 17 Oct., 1876.
other mode in which he can be punished is to appeal to the sensibilities of his brute nature and punish him corporally.¹

At a time when independent Scottish attitudes to the disposition and capabilities of the coloured freedmen had scarcely begun to form, the Scotsman readily published his strictures on those who mistakenly sought to romanticize the character of the Negro in America:

> It is impossible for any one who has not mixed with them fully to estimate the brutalised nature of a genuine field-hand. Their brute passions are fully developed - they regard no law, and unless they are controlled by the strong right hand of power, are mere cucumbers of the ground... [It] is an error to judge of a negro's nature by our own. He has no feelings or ties of affection such as we have and in that characteristic of their (sic) nature, they show a nearer affinity to the brute creation than in any other of the numerous indications of their inferiority to other species of the human race.²

Editorially, the Scotsman naturally tended as a matter of course to use more guarded language in its derogatory pronouncements on the American freedmen, but such views were basically in keeping with the overall sentiments of the paper on this subject. There was particular consternation about the role of the Negro as voter and as politician, and in this context, the paper's regular American correspondent occasionally gave vent to the essentially racist feelings which governed these objections to Negro participation in government. Thus in mid 1869, he sent a report on the "deplorable social condition" of Washington, where nine Negroes had recently been elected to offices in the city government. Most of the 60,000 Negroes in the city were, he contended, of the class known as field-hands - "negroes who worked in gangs in the plantations, lived in hovels by themselves, and were wholly ignorant, degraded, and brutal". Flocking from the surrounding states as contraband of war, they had congregated in a part of Washington known as "the Island", from whence the whites had "retired before the invasion of

---

¹ Letter from correspondent in Alabama, 7 June, 1865, in ibid., 6 July, 1865.
² Ibid.
the African hordes.

That these negroes do not live by honest industry is certain, as none of them are ever seen at work ... [They] are a mass of thieves and murderers - the lowest of the low and the vilest of the vile. Well, these are the constituents of the local government which was elected in ... Washington the other day. 1

It revolted all the Scotsman's concepts of "good government" to contemplate the assignation of power to a section of the American community which not only formed the most menial labouring section of the population but which was also patently unfit in every respect for the assumption of political responsibility. Voicing an arly opposition to the introduction of Negro enfranchisement, the paper suggested that black voters would merely be under the influence of neighbouring whites - "that influence over the blacks which superior intelligence and habits of command must wield". 2

When it became clear that the Radicals in Congress were determined to secure for the freedmen not only the franchise but also representation at legislative level within the Southern states, the Scotsman's American correspondent reflected the paper's general attitude:

And when the new Governments [in the South] are formed and set in motion, we shall see what never was before seen; a people of intelligence governed by a people of ignorance - a people of proprietors governed by a people who own nothing - eight millions of white people governed by four million of blacks. America is a strange country, and is prolific of grotesque spectacles; but of all the strange sights with which it has in times past astounded an amused world, this is the most curious. 3

Where natural racial inferiority was assumed, and backed by a tradition of support for the Southern cause, there could be no concessions for inexperience on the part of Negro legislators. The disdainful belief was encouraged that the Negroes "earn[ed] their few dollars in making grimaces at one

1 Ibid. (U.S./c., New York, 16 June), 28 June, 1869.
2 Ibid. (editorial), 28 Feb., 1866.
another in the Capitol", and that the South was on the road to ruin through the policies of the Negroes and Northern carpetbaggers - "both specimens of that semi-barbarous state of civilization unfortunately yet so common in this model Republic".

The Scotsman's counterpart in Glasgow, the Glasgow Herald, did at least appreciate the importance of the election to Congress of a Negro Senator from Mississippi, Hiram R. Revels, and made some attempt to assess the development objectively. On the face of it, the Herald seemed to approve heartily of Revels' appointment, not least on the grounds that it was a permanent blow to the forces perpetuating racial discrimination in American society and politics, an acknowledgement that henceforth ... [America] will count her people by minds, not by skins; and that she is surrendering to the spirit of intelligence and humanity the frightful and degrading belief, long practically acted upon, and not yet wholly dead, that the negro, if not exactly an irrational animal, is yet barely a reasonable being.

But such a statement did not carry the corollary that the educated Negro was therefore equal in all respects to the Anglo-Saxon. Underlying the rejection of extreme racialist sentiments was a layer of milder, yet itself unmistakably "racist" thinking. Accordingly, the Herald was unable to resist speculating on whether Revels was a pure Negro or a mulatto:

If he is the former his case is only the more notable, though nothing wonderful; if the latter - that is to say, if he has a drop of Saxon blood in his veins - his case is perfectly natural. The white man thinks, speaks, and acts through the black man, and the latter, by means of the former, with unmistakable ability.

With regard to the abilities of the race in general, the Herald came to the cautious conclusion that "Nobody has presumed that the elements of what we

1 Ibid. (U.S./c., New York, 2 Feb.), 16 Feb., 1871.
3 Glasgow Herald, 7 April, 1870.
4 Ibid.
call greatness exist in the negro nature; but there is some fineness in it, and curious adaptabilities; and there is always much that is good, short of what is absolutely great". ¹

By the Reconstruction years, Scottish observers were striving to reach a definition of the ultimate status of the Negro race in the scale of civilization by reference to the capabilities of the freedmen in the United States. But, hampered to a large extent by a backlog of prejudices, the task proved as difficult, and the answers as elusive, as observers such as James Stirling and William Chambers had found a couple of decades before. Moreover, as the unedifying spectacle of Reconstruction dragged on, with little apparent progress towards a peaceful, satisfactory settlement of America's difficulties, Scottish attitudes towards the Negro - at the centre of the problem - tended in some instances to harden. Hence by 1874, in the wake of the New Orleans riot, the Glasgow Herald itself was clearly stating that

A higher and a lower race placed upon the same political platform, and called upon to act together, can only work in anything like peace and order by the lower being subject to the higher. To place the inferior in power is to create an anomaly which cannot last.²

Much more significant, however, was the sweeping change which took place in the outlooks of the Aberdeen Free Press. Disillusionment caused by the continuing inability of America to bring the Southern states into a normal relationship to the rest of the country eventually helped to produce a startling departure from the Free Press' former markedly liberal and enlightened attitude towards the Negro race. Regretting the lack of positive general advancement in the "material and moral condition of the black race" since emancipation, the paper in 1873 suggested that British experience in

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid., 17 Sept., 1874.
the West Indies had been enough to check an over-optimistic estimate of
the effect of liberty on the Negro in America:

The negro is not by nature an energetic individual; and in
his native regions, where nature yields a spontaneous abundance,
and where he can get his hunger appeased and his laziness grati-
ified with little trouble, does not concern himself about the
comfort or improvement of his condition.

The Northern carpetbaggers were loudly blamed for their part in delaying
the satisfactory adjustment of relations between the black and white races
in the South, and it was acknowledged that they too were partially res-
ponsible for the fact that "the condition of the negro after eight years of
the most complete social and political freedom is very far indeed from what
it were desirable to see". Yet, the Aberdeen Free Press was ready to accept
the findings of a Southern correspondent of the New York Tribune which
argued to the effect that the Negroes were also suffering badly because of
their character and conduct, marked as it was by a lack of energy and economy,
by idleness, dishonesty, lax hygiene, and a tendency to indulge in "childish
fancies". By 1877, editorial comment was arguing that America comprised
"a population of which the major portion consists of a race ignorant and
shiftless, and essentially defective as regards the possessions and qualities
that constitute fitness for free and self-governing citizenship". At least
so far as the devolution of political power was concerned, the paper had come
substantially into line with the views of one of its regular correspondents,
James Alexander, an Aberdeenshire emigrant who had established himself as a
farmer in Nebraska. In Alexander's view:

The negro is timid and offenceless: but he is by Nature the
least qualified to rule. That he is fit to keep his place side
by side with white men in any matter requiring sagacity is not

2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 5 Dec., 1877.
generally believed; with any training that the black race have yet undergone he certainly is inferior ... When to the dogged ignorance of the released darkies ... is added their immorality and superstition, it has to be allowed that their control of public affairs is such as no white man ever could or ought to tolerate. 1

The Dundee Advertiser, which for the greater part of the Reconstruction era had shared the Aberdeen Free Press' hopes and optimism for a rapid and smooth assimilation of an increasingly competent Negro population into the American body politic, was also considerably disillusioned by the mid 1870s. Again the riots at New Orleans provided the immediate impetus for taking stock of the whole situation in the South up until that time. The Advertiser was forced to admit that "The healing process has been painfully slow so far", exacerbated by "that latent race hatred which can only be eradicated by time". But while a great deal of blame for the difficulties and disturbances was naturally attributed to the recalcitrant Southern whites and Northern carpet-baggers, there was a somewhat dubious acknowledgement that "It is a difficult task to uproot race prejudices, more especially when the inferior race holds the controlling influence in government". 2

As against this tendency to draw away from old egalitarian views on the relative status of the Negro race, the Dundee Advertiser's rival daily, the Dundee Courier, had never, since the Jamaican revolt, slackened in its total belief in the inferiority of the Negro to the Anglo-Saxon. Although emphasizing that the American Negro was "much in advance of his brethren in Dahomey", 3 the Courier still maintained that the freedmen were "only removed from African savagery by that one step of civilization which was incident to their state as slaves". 4 This being so, it was folly to suppose that the
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1 "Notes from Nebraska" by James Alexander, Filmore County, Nebraska, 19 Aug., 1876, in ibid. 8 Sept., 1876.
3 Dundee Courier, 2 Feb., 1866.
4 Ibid., 16 April, 1867.
recently emancipated Negro could exercise his political privileges competently, far less keep the South in subjection: "almost anybody will allow that the fact of negroes being invested with votes will never give them sway over a superior race of English origin". The basic premise of all the Courier's comments on race could be stated quite simply: "The strongest zealot on behalf of the negro cannot believe that, man for man, black is equal to white. All history, all present-day experience, demonstrates the contrary".

The Glasgow Herald also chose to take a straightforward, pragmatic view of the race situation by declaring that "The decision may go forth that all men are equal, but the feeling of antipathy and superiority will remain with the dominant race, and the poor darkskin must be content, as of old, to take an inferior place". There was a willing enough resignation on the paper's part to accept a state of affairs in which such prejudice was natural and inevitable. After all, the Herald itself was ready to argue that while education and experience would certainly produce an improvement in the character and capabilities of the Negro, "those well-meaning and imaginative people who expect to see him rivalling the white man in intellectual capacity will, we venture to think, require to live a long time to see their waking dreams realised".

The most vivid suggestions of innate Negro inferiority fed to the public through the columns of the Glasgow Herald had appeared several years earlier, however, not in editorial comment but in the "Rambling Reporter's" accounts
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1 Ibid., 15 June, 1868. See also ibid., 15 Oct., 1866; 16 April, 1867.
2 Ibid., 1 Sept., 1868.
4 Ibid.
of his experiences in the Southern States.\footnote{The "Rambling Reporter" left for the United States in late March, 1866, and immediately prior to doing so he wrote a "farewell address" in which he provided illuminating information on the range of his past experiences as a press reporter, and stated the main objectives of his trip to America. According to his personal testimony, an article which he had written on the Channel Fleet some four years previously had secured him the post of the Herald's "Rambling Reporter". In that capacity, he had gone to London during the summer of 1862 and "done" everything from the Royal palaces to the cellars of Billingsgate Fish Market", earning for himself the scornful attention of the Times, which branded him "a sour Scottish critic" and a ""Glasgow Puritan" for his account of a Sunday ramble through the metropolis. During the following years, he had rambled through France, Ireland, the Derby at Epsom, and Scotland itself. The range of his Scottish assignments had included visits to prisons, poor-houses, lunatic asylums, reformatory institutions, schools of industry, sugar houses and coal pits, and exploration of "the lower regions of Glasgow during dead of night". With regard to his American trip, he stated that his principal intention was to mix with as many people as possible in order to give "a true account of things as they are", at the same time making it clear that he was not going to write a "heavy history of the United States" but planned rather to "take up with life in its lightsome and humorous aspects". Explaining that he had chosen a route which would afford him the opportunity of seeing the North, South and West of the country, he also furnished considerable details of the main points in his itinerary. From these, it emerged that so far as the South was concerned, his intentions included journeys to Washington, famous Southern battlefields, Richmond and Petersburg, North Carolina as far as Wilmington - "where I expect to see a pretty considerable number of negroes, and perhaps not a few 'critters' called 'mean whites'", Charleston, Fort Sumter and the surrounding district - where he hoped to inspect some cotton plantations and to "mix with the negro population and see how they (sic) live in their first year of freedom", Georgia (Sherman's route to Atlanta), Chatanooga, and Nashville, Tennessee. See article headed "The Rambling Reporter Starts For America" in ibid., 29 March, 1866.}

Travelling on foot from Washington to Virginia, the Reporter had ample opportunity to see at first hand the conditions obtaining in the huts and shanties which the Negroes had erected, frequently near the site of ruined mansions. In his encounters with the "sable farmers" and their families he was not always unfavourably impressed. At least some of the shanties which he examined he found to be "clean and decidedly more comfortable than many of the muchnovels that I have
seen in old Ireland". But when he arrived at Freedman's Town, a Negro village situated on the property of General Lee, he was unsparsingly critical of the state of affairs in the settlement - as, indeed, he had apparently expected to be. Having been somewhat daunted on his approach by hearing the inhabitants "yelling like hyenas" and playing games on the Sabbath, he was confirmed in his unflattering impression by the appearance of the place, which struck him as being "rough and ready" and likely to remain so for a long time. Dismayed by the apparent lack of competent agricultural management and the widespread wastage of good arable land which he saw all around, the Reporter automatically fell back on the old tried and - evidently - true racist stereotype of the lazy, unthinking black:

As a general rule, the negroes are lazy, dirty, and not very frugal in their habits, and Freedman's Town bore too strong evidences of these well-established facts ... [N] is a whole, the place reminded me of the tabernacle or vineyard of the sluggard.

Paced with exactly the sort of conditions which he had clearly expected to find in a freedmen's village, he naturally applied the preconceived explanation for the existence of such a state of affairs. There was no need, or inclination, to try to identify immediate, particular causes for the unsatisfactory circumstances of the Negro freedmen as independent agriculturists. The massive post-war social and economic dislocation in the South, and (perhaps even more importantly) the formidable and effective attempts by Southern whites to thwart most schemes for the rapid and successful transition of the Negroes from dependent slaves to responsible free men, were alike ignored - dismissed, it would seem, merely as factors additional and incidental to the great, principal drawback which prevented the Negroes
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2 Ibid. It is possible that the Rambling Reporter was particularly predisposed to be prejudiced against Freedman's Town because of its situation on Lee's old property. He entered Lee's house itself with "a feeling of reverence", and was deeply distressed that the great mansion should have become a place "where picnic parties from Washington assemble to discuss the war, along with lobsters and champagne" - see ibid.
from speedily becoming competent, worthwhile members of the community, namely, their natural intellectual inferiority and weakness of character.

The most predominant facet of the *Herald* reporter's racist outlook was, however, the fiercely derogatory descriptions of individuals of the Negro race which he furnished for his paper. An apparently exceedingly strong personal revulsion for the physical characteristics of the race spurred him on to represent the Negroes which he encountered in terms which variously held them up to amusement and ridicule, came near to equating them with "the brute creation", and uneasily classed them as a mysterious, totally unknown quantity, thereby introducing an element of fear and suspicion into his portrayal of the race.

As befitted his style, the Rambling Reporter was fond of communicating his prejudice by means of lightly "humorous" remarks, calculated simultaneously to amuse the enlighten the reader. Thus, the occupier of the first Negro shanty which he visited was described as "a motherly-looking negress, pretty fat, terribly greasy ... and ... furnished with a double seam of grinders that would have stricken terror to the heart of a dentist". Her son, whom she claimed knew nothing, did apparently recognize money, but this accomplishment hardly raised his status in the eyes of the Reporter who, having offered him a few cent pieces, recorded that he "grinned like a half-grown gorilla, and grabbed at the money". Lack of previous contact with the Negro race combined with ingrained beliefs in their essentially bestial nature to produce a distinct feeling of unease in the Reporter's mind as he first entered an exclusively Negro community (Freedman's Town):

I felt as if I had been in the heart of Africa. I was the only white person in the whole settlement at the time, and on every hand were woolly heads, flat noses, terrible teeth, and countenances as black as Egyptian darkness, and anything imaginable but divine.¹

Significantly, he felt it worthwhile to stress that the Negroes did not "disturb" him.

A yet fuller exposition of the Reporter's repugnance towards the physical appearance of the Negro and his use of this to convey a sense of the inferior character of the race was contained in a subsequent article published several weeks later in the Glasgow Herald. This report consisted of graphic descriptions of scenes which the Reporter had witnessed at a Negro dance, at a revival meeting, and at a sermon in Richmond. He confessed himself unable adequately to describe the form of the dancing which he had seen at the ball, but during the course of the evening, he had begun to think that he had got "into a negro mad-house by mistake". The appearance and actions of the participants convinced him of the inherent lack of all taste and restraint in the Negro character:

It was rare to see the negro wenches dressed in fancy-coloured cottons, with wreaths of roses and ribbons round their wolly heads, and milk-white collars round their bare black necks ... There was one big, lounging fellow, with a mouth of terrible dimensions, who leaped like a kangaroo in his agony, and roared "Yaw, yaw!" like a frantic baboon.¹

Attendance at a Negro service in the Baptist church afforded him further scope for highly disparaging remarks on the conduct and personality of the freedmen. Concentrating his attention on the occurrences which took place after the sermon had been read, he gave full play to the moaning, screaming, dancing and groaning which followed a prayer concerning hell, delivered by a Negro. The latter's performance had itself been a main focus of the Reporter's ridicule:

He [the coloured preacher] talked and sometimes roared about the devil and the bottomless pit, and the lake of fire and brimstone, and the roasting of sinners, till the froth was dropping from his mouth and the tears from his eyes. He rocked himself backwards and forwards, groaned every two or three sentences, flung his arms wildly about, turned up his eyes to the ceiling, and seemed altogether the picture of a raving madman.²

¹ Rambling Reporter, "A Day Among the Darkskins; or a Negro revival meeting, a sermon, and a Dancing Ball at Richmond", in ibid., 18 Aug., 1866.
² Ibid.
The evening service which he also attended provided for him as big a spec-
tacular, with the Moaners (those under the influence of the "Spirit") sitting
apart and "[keeping] up a continuous sound like the caterwauling of a huncred
tom cats". Again, Negro preachers were singled out for special ridicule:
"I am not disposed to laugh at or make light of religious ceremonies of any
kind, but I ... was nearly breaking down several times that evening as I ...
listened to those negro prayers". During the entire proceedings, he had
found himself seated between two Negro women, "as black as ink, and not by
any means as beautiful as Mary Queen of Scots or Cleopatra". 1

Beyond his clear indication of the intellectual inferiority of the Negro
race in America, the Rambling Reporter's accounts illustrate well a further
dimension of racism, discovered among many of the Scottish travellers to
the United States at that time - the often involuntary sense of repulsion
and unease, or, at least, amusement, at the physical features of the black
population. At least equalling the strength of the Herald reporter's feelings
on this subject was the attitude of Robert Somers, the Glasgow ex-journalist
and financial expert who toured the South in 1870-71, and who also shared
the Rambling Reporter's deep frustration at the waste of agricultural resources
in the Southern states. 2 Lamenting the dearth of quality livestock on the
post-war plantations of Alabama, he included the Negroes in his assessment
of the relative merits of the existing cotton plantation stock:

The negro and negress, and the pickaninnies, who are not nearly
so numerous as they are said to have been in slavery times, have
not much comeliness to boast of. The mules ... are handsome
enough creatures ... But for the merry and lively beings of a
cotton farm, commend me to the hogs. 3

1 Ibid.

2 For further details of Somers' views on this and allied problems of
Reconstruction, see below, Chapter VII, pp. 202-227, 230.

3 Somers, The Southern States, p. 123.
Somers' strain of thought was effectively echoed some years later by a fellow Glaswegian, A.W. Finlayson, who made a short business tour of the United States in 1878. Having been amazed to find that in Washington "Niggers are everywhere - nigger cabmen, nigger barbers, nigger labourers, nigger waiters, nigger shoeblack, and nigger loafers; in fact one feels almost unfashionable by not being a nigger", he gave his judgement on the conduct and appearance of the race:

I never saw a black population before, and was particularly amused at the youngsters; they looked like young gorillas; some stood on their heads, others rolled in the gutters, while their comrades danced the clog dance ...

Although manifested in conjunction with widely varying degrees of prejudice towards the race, the tendency remained extremely prevalent to view the Negro, because of his physical appearance, as a being incontrovertibly distinct from his white counterpart. An element of apprehension, such as we have already observed as existing in the case of the Rambling Reporter, was common in the reaction of Scots confronted - usually for the first time - with the alien aspect of the Negro race. Indeed, even among those who had had considerable contact with "savage" races, there was some sign that this particular response could not easily be eradicated. Indicative of this was the content of an article contributed anonymously to *Chambers's Journal* in 1869, in which a traveller described his sojournings among the few small colonies of Negroes on the Atlantic coast of Central and Southern America. Talking with a man called Joe, who had been captured as a slave, landed at Sierra Leone, captured again, and finally rescued and taken to the West Indies by a British ship, the writer was obviously greatly incensed by the old wrongs perpetrated against the Negro race by white slave-traders, and judged Joe's life story.

---

the most pathetic tale I ever heard ... The blood seems suddenly to rise and boil at my heart, thinking of the story ... He, made in God's image, a man most brave and true and kindly, had been buffeted about the world, with no more comprehension of cause or reason than has a dog ... 

But for all this, behind the humanitarian concern the prejudice, the unease rooted simply in the strikingly "different" physical characteristics of the Negro, remained, to be communicated somewhat spectacularly to a section of the Scottish public which itself would have no opportunity of eroding the prejudice by personal association with the coloured races. Thus, along with the picture of Joe as the innocent victim of white man's callousness and greed, the readers of Chambers's Journal were offered a less attractive picture of Joe on a hunting expedition:

To see Joe stalking through the dim ... forest, his lithe figure, clad in flannel rags patched with fur, bending and swaying ... his great feet treading noiselessly ... his eyes rolling round and round beneath ferocious brow; his thick lips twisting and twining all the while ... was to behold a somewhat startling apparition.

That personal observation of the conduct and appearance of the Negro race could materially increase a belief in its inherent inferiority - and, indeed, foster perhaps a new sense of hostility towards it - was effectively demonstrated in the attitudes of the Rev. Dr. John Tulloch, Principal and professor of theology in St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, chaplain to Queen Victoria, and one of the Church of Scotland's most prominent ministers during the second half of the nineteenth century. In 1862, he had become editor of the Church of Scotland Missionary Record, but there is no evidence that he was actively associated with the efforts of other leading ministers of all denominations in the cause of the American freedmen. He made a tour of the United States and Canada in 1874, and when in Washington, he experienced something approaching positive alarm when he attended a Negro service.

---

1 "Savages I Have Known: the Negro" in Chamber's Journal (conducted by William and Robert Chambers), No. 276, 10 April, 1869, p. 226.

2 Ibid.
Writing to his wife about it, he explained that he had refused an invitation, extended to him as a minister, to take a seat among the Negro officials gathered round the pulpit:

The fact is, I was rather frightened. It is rather dreadful, the sight of men and women, a congregation of them, as black as the grate... Some of the women and men, too, only partly coloured [are] almost fine-looking, but for the greater part, uglier than you can imagine.¹

The "nigger preacher" had left him "nearly appalled", but most distressing of all had been the over-emotionalism of the congregation's responses. Like the Glasgow Herald's reporter, he had been amazed and repelled by the "ranting" and "roaring" and "bellowing" of the Negro worshippers, and informed his wife that

the whole affair was like Bedlam, and I was really glad to get away. I doubt if I had lived here if I should have been much of an Abolitionist. They certainly look an inferior race.²

To put this attitude into perspective, it is necessary to set it against Tulloch's wider view of American society and Americans. His feeling that the United States was unfairly misrepresented by British travellers on their return to Britain has already been recognized.³ In fact, he himself, while acknowledging a certain crudeness and lack of polish in the social manners of America,⁴ was on the whole immensely impressed by the social and intellectual climate of the country. He was especially pleased with the freer and franker exchange of opinion among the "higher classes" in the United States; but, significantly, the most reassuring discovery for him was that there existed in the politics, literature, and society of Boston

¹ Rev. Dr. John Tulloch to his wife, Washington, 3 May, 1874, quoted in Mrs. Oliphant, A Memoir of the Life of John Tulloch, B.P. LL.D. (Edinburgh, 1889), p. 293. Original emphasis.
² Ibid., p. 294.
³ See above, Chapter I, p. 23, fn. 1.
⁴ Tulloch, "America and the Americans" in Good Words, 1875, p. 648.
and New York a "stronger and more intelligent conservatism" than he had ever before encountered. An intellectual Conservative, extremely cordially received both in academic and social circles in the United States and exultant over the fact that "The better classes in New York are very much like those in London and Edinburgh", Tulloch was presumably helped by a distaste for the appearance and character of the black population to regard the presence of the freedmen as one of the principal blots on the fair face of America.

But a tendency to experience some degree of revulsion at the physical characteristics of the Negro race was by no means confined to Scots, such as the Glasgow Herald reporter or Tulloch, who had given no previous sign of harbouring a particular sympathy or concern for the American freedmen. The interest in the progress of the coloured children which had impelled the Rev. Charles Grant of Aberdeen to visit freedmen's schools in the South did not, for instance, preclude a certain sense of shock in his initial reaction to a class of black pupils at Georgetown, a reaction of which he was later somewhat ashamed:

I entered a large hall containing some two hundred black children. And as the two hundred black faces turned upon me with the white of their eyes, and their teeth appearing all the whiter because of the surrounding blackness, I almost started back, and my first feelings and impressions were such as I do not like to describe.

Even Sir George Campbell, who had spent over thirty years of his life among "coloured races", and who was sympathetic enough to the plight of the American freedmen, felt compelled to record, with regard to the schoolchildren which

1 Ibid., p. 647. Tulloch's delight with the United States was not uninfluenced by the fact that a book which he had written, and which had been little appreciated in Cambridge, England, was enthusiastically acclaimed at Harvard, "amidst an intellectual atmosphere really more broad and brilliant than in Cambridge. I am not likely ... to think less of America on this account" - quoted in Oliphant, Life of John Tulloch, p. 290.

2 Oliphant, Life of John Tulloch, p. 647.

3 Charles Grant, Notes on Schools and Colleges in America, p. 16.
he saw, that "many ... are very black and hideous. I hardly knew before what an ugly race some of the blacks are". ¹

But perhaps most significant of all was the response of the Revs. William Arnot and William Blaikie and their wives when brought into close contact with the American Negro population during the ministers' trip to the United States as Free Church deputies in 1870. During the party's stay at the home of a plantation proprietor in Virginia, a Negro baby, a few days old, was brought in for their inspection. In his monthly magazine, Arnot later recorded:

I observed that the ladies of the proprietors family fondled it freely; but the ladies of our party, I must confess, fought shy of it. It need not be denied that the little animal, as it lay wriggling in its nurse's lap was, according to our aesthetical notions, anything but a beauty.²

That Arnot was so frank about this incident perhaps tells us as much about the probable racial attitudes of the readers of the Family Treasury as about his own. But Arnot's personal opinion as expressed here is of particular importance because of his strong, active involvement in the Scottish movement for freedmen's aid. There is, of course, no reason to suppose that Arnot's discovery of an aversion for the physical characteristics of the Negro race diluted his genuine sympathy for the American freedmen: although he probably felt a deep personal revulsion at the appearance and conduct of the drunks in Edinburgh's Grassmarket, he remained a zealous temperance reformer.³ Victorian philanthropy did not require of its moving spirits an emotional so much as an organizational and business-like approach

¹ Campbell, White and Black, p. 294.
² Arnot, "Sketches in the United States", paper IV ("Miscellaneous") in Family Treasury, 1871, p. 258.
³ A. Fleming (ed.) William Arnot, p. 255, indicates that from its inception in 1849, Arnot gave his full and hearty support to the Free Church Total Abstinence Society.
to the subject of the exercise. Nevertheless, so far as attempting to define the nature of the Scottish involvement in freedmen's aid is concerned, it is significant that this friend and patron of the American Missionary Association's Sella Martin should, when brought into association with more than merely isolated individuals of Martin's race, have reacted so unflatteringly towards them. Abstract involvement in the principle of materially aiding and elevating the American freedmen could not, in such circumstances, prevent the surfacing of what might be termed an involuntary racism. In the post-war Southern environment it was as difficult for Arnot to banish his prejudice against the physical appearance of the Negro freedmen as it was for him to resist forming a high opinion of the intellect and social graces of the Southerners whose cause he had so vehemently execrated.¹

Where actual revulsion was not inspired by such a period of frequent association with the Negro race, other Scottish ministers of religion who had shown themselves eager to advance the freedmen's cause were capable of demonstrating their underlying, stubborn awareness of the "aesthetical" differences between black and white by making the Negroes' appearance a source of amusement. The Rev. Dr. George C. Hutton, United Presbyterian minister of Canal Street Relief Church, Paisley, was a regular attender at Glasgow public meetings on behalf of the freedmen and a commendable collector of contributions on their behalf from his congregation.² In addition, he was especially interested in the church's flourishing Missionary Society, attempting to get everyone in full communion in his parish to be a member,

¹ Reference to Arnot's and his party's tendency to fall victim to the blandishments of their Southern hosts is made above, Chapter III, pp. 229-230. The warmth of Arnot's reception in the South cautions us against accepting a monolithic interpretation of his and other Free Churchmen's popularity in the United States such as that offered in the EH's entry on him: "Having been a steady sympathiser with the Northern states and their anti-slavery movement, he was received in the United States with extraordinary cordiality". EH, Vol. 1, pp. 591-592.

² See Appendices II(c); III(a) and III(b).
and to persuade the young people to join the Juvenile Society. ¹ He did, in fact, visit America in 1870, and apparently devoted specific attention to the effects of the war and to the Negro problem, but no record remains of his general impressions or of his attitudes towards the coloured population. ² What is certain, however, is that on learning that a native Kaffir missionary had come to Britain to marry a white girl, he felt it pertinent to remark that "My only concern is about the children, in case they should be shepherd tartan."³

The same order of joke was made by the Rev. William Robertson, United Presbyterian minister of Trinity Church, Irvine. On his way back from the North of Scotland after officiating at the marriage of a white man to a black woman, Robertson had visited the Rev. Dr. George Gilfillan at Dundee. Gilfillan, one of Scotland's leading champions of the visiting Frederick Douglass in 1846-47, but apparently largely unconcerned over the fate of the American Negro after the defeat of the South, asked Robertson how he had managed to kiss the bride. Robertson's reply was scarcely complimentary: "Easily. I practised for a fortnight on the kitchen kettle before leaving home."⁴

While it would of course be fallacious to place too great an emphasis on incidental remarks such as these, they do at the same time serve to give some indication of the nature of the thinking on race which could permeate

---

¹ Alexander Oliver, Life of George Clark Hutton, D.D. (Paisley, 1910), pp. 37, 40. Hutton had organized the U.P. Total Abstinence Society in his student days - ibid., p. 40.

² Ibid., p. 64, indicates that Hutton, on his return to Scotland, delivered a lecture on America entitled "Memories and Impressions" in which he considered the problems of Reconstruction. But although the book's chapter on America is based on this lecture, Hutton's allusions to post-Civil War difficulties are passed over.

³ Quoted in Macrae, America Revisited and Men I Have Met, p. 230.

⁴ Quoted in ibid., p. 230.
the ranks of U.P. ministers most closely associated, both by personal inclination and by church policy, with missionary efforts all over the globe. Both Hutton and Robertson would probably have denied that they held racist views - and they could perhaps have done so with some justice, since simply to condone a mixed marriage at a time when miscegenation was generally rejected in no uncertain terms on both sides of the Atlantic implied a considerable degree of "enlightened" thinking on race. The important point was the readiness of both ministers to accept that the physical appearance of the Negro race remained a valid basis for humour. Restrictive beliefs in the natural barbarism and inherent intellectual inferiority of the Negro could be largely overcome - or at least dampened - by a strict interpretation of certain religious tenets, and (by the 1860s and 70s) by the acceptance of selected scientific theories. But there remained at least one massive hurdle which was stubbornly impervious alike to the forces of religion and science - the irrational prejudice against the "different" physical features of the black race. Whether it manifested itself in outright revulsion and acknowledged racism, as in the case of Tulloch, or in seemingly innocuous amusement, as in the case of Hutton and Robertson, this factor would seem to represent a singular, peculiarly insidious bar to the growth of an acceptance of the equality of black and white.

Such involuntary feelings naturally helped in some instances to frustrate thinking on the future place of the black population in American society.

It has already been noted that Sir George Campbell found the physiognomy of some of the Negroes which he encountered "hideous", and it seems valid to suggest that such a consideration played at least some small part in producing the total amazement which he felt on discovering that "the humblest blacks"

1 See above, p. 636.
were allowed to ride in the American tramway-cars with the "proud whites".  

Despite the evidence of enforced integration, however, Campbell perceived that at the roots of the American community, there existed a distinct "caste separation" between the black and white races, a separation akin to that which existed between Hindu castes and which had, in the immediate future, virtually as little chance of abatement. While he did concede that the prohibition of intermarriage constituted "an extraordinary state of things among a people putting the equality of man at the head of all their Constitution", he was nevertheless prepared to accept the caste system as a not uncongenial fact. Applying the eye of a successful British colonial administrator to the post-war American situation, Campbell could see no reason why the existence of two castes in the United States should present an insuperable obstacle to the country's well-being. He believed that it was possible to be "extremely sanguine" about America's future, provided that she was prepared to ensure a place for "a settled, industrious, and progressive coloured population, fitted to fill the portions of the country not adapted for the white race", a population which would contribute its share of wealth and greatness to the nation. 

Campbell's willingness to see the caste system entrenched in a country where both the positive act of emancipation and the Constitution itself had seemed to offer some hopes of a less stratified racial society after the Civil War betrays a basic complacency in his whole conception of the nature of national co-existence between distinct races. In the South, the spectacle of black and white labourers working together at the same work and for the same wages had prompted him to remark that the work was being accomplished "in a way which, to our Indian ideas of the dignity of the white race, is

---

1 Campbell, White and Black, p. 195.
2 Ibid., pp. 195-199.
somewhat distressing". Visiting the United States at the very end of the Reconstruction era, when the Southern Democrats had already effectively smashed the freedom of Negro voters at the polls and curbed black representation on the state legislatures, Campbell was inclined to think that the Negroes had remained good-natured in the face of these changed circumstances simply because they had accepted their defeat as a foregone conclusion. By implication, then, they would presumably also placidly accept, as an immutable law of nature, the gradual construction of a smoothly operating, basically just, but essentially segregated society within the United States.

Perhaps Campbell was doubly encouraged in his hopes for the workability of a two tier race system in America because he envisaged the emergence of a free black population which in its culture, outlooks, and general way of life would not differ significantly from the white Anglo-Saxon civilization above it. It pleased him to note, for instance, that in Christ-church parish, South Carolina, where the whites were outnumbered by fifty to one, the Negroes seemed to have "got very much into the ways of white people", and were shopping as much as whites did anywhere in the world. "The only difference seems to be that they are black, and perhaps a little dirtier than the average of civilised mankind". The best, indeed, the natural and inevitable, line of progress for the American freedmen was still automatically assumed to be that which had its basis in a straightforward and direct copying of the social conventions, economic ambitions, and cultural aspirations of contemporary white Americans.

1 Ibid., p. 164.
2 Ibid., p. 345. Campbell tended to agree with the Northern man who was President of the Benedict Institute for Negroes in South Carolina when the latter stated that the black population had "characteristically" shown no energy against the Southern Democratic challenge: "They have caved in and allowed themselves to be beaten by fair means or foul" — quoted in ibid., p. 333.
3 Ibid., p. 342.
This assumption, a mild variant as it was of the current "conversionist" ideology of British missionaries, had been nicely illustrated several years earlier in the report of the two-man United Presbyterian Deputation which had visited the church's missions in Jamaica and also investigated the condition of the freedmen in the United States. Since the main purpose in sending the Deputation had been to explore the Jamaican situation with a view to making the missions there gradually more self-supporting and ultimately capable of substituting a native ministry for the costly European one, MacGill and Young were particularly concerned to determine the extent to which the Jamaican Negroes had absorbed the qualities and aptitude necessary to conduct their own missionary efforts. In this connection, they found it worthwhile to compare and contrast the relative circumstances and progress of the freed Negroes in the United States. They had no hesitation in unreservedly commending the rapid adaptation of the ex-slaves in America to their altered condition:

1 For many months prior to the departure of the Jamaican Deputation in October, 1870, a sub-committee of the Board of Missions' Foreign Committee had conducted an intensive examination of the history and condition of the United Presbyterian Church's Jamaican mission, and the Deputation itself was largely the product of this study. The sub-committee's investigations had conclusively revealed that Jamaica had become not only the most extensive but also the most expensive of the U.P. missions; and while pledging itself to avoid a "sudden and sweeping retrenchment" - a course which would obviously have unjust and deleterious effects on "the deeply wronged, but interesting African race in Jamaica" - the Church was nevertheless equally determined that "a gradual reduction of expenditure on the mission must be secured". Towards this end, the 1870 Deputation was charged with the task of assessing the position in the colony in preparation for the gradual withdrawal of European missionaries and their replacement by an exclusively native missionary force. The ultimate achievement of this aim was recognized to be a long-term process, but already in 1870, MacGill and Young carried with them on their Jamaican trip the sub-committee's basic, firm recommendation that "It ought unquestionably to be laid down, as an object to be aimed at, in every duly settled and established foreign mission, that an average native congregation should in due time support a native pastor". In the short-term, it was the U.P. Church's intention to concentrate on organizing a more thorough scheme of tuition for native schoolmasters and pastors. See Missionary Record of the United Presbyterian Church, Oct., 1870, No. 68, Vol. 3, pp. 281-283.
Indeed it is a marvellous credit to the black people of the States, that they have met the enormous recent change in their position with so much moderation and energy, and have been able so rapidly to adjust their new relations to society in a manner at once so safe to themselves and to the white population.¹

With regard to the Jamaican Negroes, however, a less reassuring picture was offered, the Deputation's report indicating that they had accommodated themselves to their new status after freedom much less rapidly than their American counterparts, and that they exhibited a comparative slowness and lack of ability to rise to positions of "comfort" and "usefulness". The most significant observation related, however, to the cause of the apparent discrepancy between the two branches of the race. MacGill and Young were careful to point out that in their opinion, the Jamaican Negroes had shown a relative lack of energy and enterprise not because of any specifically inferior disposition or capacity on their part, but because of the widely divergent environmental circumstances which obtained in the United States and in Jamaica. While incidental reference was made to the enervating influence of the tropical climate as against that of the United States, the principal reason for the difference in the level of advancement and achievement of the separate Negro populations was seen to be grounded in the strikingly dissimilar proportions of whites to Negroes which prevailed in the two countries. The vital clue to the matter was the fact that in America, there was a white majority of seven to one, while in Jamaica, the blacks outnumbered the whites by thirty to one, a state of affairs which meant that in the latter country, "the influence exerted by the ascendant race, in the way of stimulus, is immeasurably more faint and inconsiderable".² It was logically argued

¹ "The Negro Race and their Prospects in the United States and Jamaica": observations made by the Deputation consisting of MacGill and Young and published for consumption by the rank and file members of the U.P. church, in ibid., Sept., 1871, No. 69, Vol. 4, p. 609.

In this article, MacGill and Young made it clear that they had not been officially called on to express their opinion on the American Negroes but that they had felt it worthwhile to make publicly known, in some small measure, their thoughts and conclusions on that subject.

² Ibid., p. 610.
that if the proportionate mingling of the races in Jamaica could become more commensurate with that of the United States, there would be an immense acceleration in the development of the capacities and energies of the Negro population, and hence a greatly improved utilization of the island's resources: "The communication of a spirit of enterprise from the white to the black is due quite as much to the imitative faculty of the negro as to the native force of the Anglo-Saxon".¹

Writing a year earlier² on his recent observations of the condition and prospects of the American freedmen, David Macrae had largely foreshadowed these official U.P. opinions on the nature and genesis of the black race's advancement. No one was more keenly and outspokenly aware of the diabolical curses of slavery than was Macrae.³ Yet, so convinced was he of the desirability of instilling Christianity and an appreciation of the white man's civilization into the Negro mind that he was prepared to go out of his way to enumerate the "blessings" which slavery had also conferred on certain sections of the black population in America. Along with ensuring that most of the slaves got at least some glimmerings of Christian knowledge - more, certainly, than they would have received in "the heathen darkness of Africa"⁴ - slavery in the South had had the advantageous effect of bringing the greater proportion of the Negroes, and especially the domestic servants, under the powerful influence of white civilization. Through their acquisition of the English language and so forth, the groundwork had been laid in slavery times for their rapid education and evangelization by teachers and missionaries

¹ Ibid., p. 609.
² The Americans at Home was first published in 1870, Macrae having made his trip to the United States in 1868.
³ See, for instance, ibid., pp. 246-252.
⁴ Ibid., p. 244.
after emancipation.1 Nor was that the full extent of the influence of slavery on the Negroes: as Macrae saw it, a fundamental effect of the system had been to "[teach] the negro to look up to the white race - to regard the white man as the standard of perfection, and therefore the pattern for imitation".2 Although he was ready enough to concede that certain unhappy consequences had resulted from this tendency, Macrae was confident that the long-term effects of this attitude could only be advantageous for the Negro race:

The general effect of making the white man the model for imitation by the black, which slavery did, was upon the whole good. It taught the negro to look up to and imitate men higher in the scale of civilization than himself, and has made it all the more probable now that he will seek the apotheosis of his race in conformity with "white" ideas.3

It becomes clear that among Scottish travellers to the United States - and, indeed, among Scots' observers on the British side of the Atlantic - who took a particular concern in the Negro and in the "Negro question" at this time, there was no real conception of any sort of a planned, integrated black/white society in America as the natural (or even particularly desirable) outcome of Reconstruction. There is certainly plenty of evidence that Scottish commentators fully realized the tremendous practical difficulties inherent in the problem of fitting four millions of Negro freedmen into the mainstream of American life. But aside from vague generalizations on the gradual advancement of the black population along the illustrious, preordained path of Anglo-Saxon civilization, there seems to have been no concrete vision of a permanent plan of harmonious existence for the black and white races in the United States. Perhaps this deficiency is understandable enough. Even among observers sympathetic to the Negroes' immediate plight, there were simply

1 Ibid., p. 244.
2 Ibid., p. 245.
3 Ibid., p. 245.
too many imponderables in the American situation. Furthermore, there existed, as we have seen, certain crippling tendencies to be hamstrung by ingrained prejudices of one sort or another.

It was, accordingly, possible even for David Macrae, one of the most astute and sensitive Scottish observers of the post-war scene in America, to give a detailed description of the South as he found it without presuming to produce any sort of personal blueprint for the type of Southern society which could emerge from the Reconstruction process. He was apparently content to recognize as the ultimate, successful conclusion to the contemporary "Negro problem" the time when, after education and evangelization, the Southern Negroes would have assimilated enough culture and civilizing influences to emulate ever more closely the way of life and the social position of the white Americans.

Behind this lack of fresh, constructive thinking was the tacit acceptance of the current (in 1868) superiority of the white population to the black in the United States. For instance, although Macrae was eager to acknowledge the merits of Francis L. Cardozo as South Carolina's Secretary of State, he took it for granted that Negroes, despite the help of Northern carpet-baggers, would not for long exert their new, predominating influence in the Legislatures of the South. It was outwith his comprehension that the Southern whites would continue in political subjection: "Superior men, pulled down by external circumstances, will rise again by virtue of the superiority inherent in them. Blood and culture will tell in spite of imprisonment and political disabilities". Even with regard to areas where the black population preponderated, he dismissed as groundless the Southerners' fears of Negro domination:

1 See above, p. 596.
2 Macrae, The Americans at Home, p. 223.
Where is the boasted superiority of the Anglo-Saxon if he cannot rule without being in the majority? ... The world is not governed by votes. It is governed by ideas. Majorities never rule. Even a democracy has its policy determined by the men ... who are able to act upon and sway the majority. This power of filling other heads with his own thoughts - of making other hands the willing instruments of his purpose - belongs to the Caucasian far more than to the negro, and belongs pre-eminently to the Anglo-Saxon. Anglo-Saxon ideas are moulding America from Canada to the Gulf, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific. They have been moulding the negro both in slavery and freedom; and every case in which a negro has risen to prominence in the States is another proof that his power depends for the most part upon his ability to conform himself to those ideas, and assist in their development. There seems, therefore, no danger whatever of "white ideas" giving place to black.

Such cultural chauvinism precluded the possibility - or, indeed, the necessity - of attempting to define the nature of the changed American social and political structure which might be expected to develop to accommodate four million Negroes, free and equal under law, and politically enfranchised. It is significant that the only specific racial plan for American society to be mapped out by a Scottish observer at this time was Sir George Campbell's, which unashamedly advocated the adoption of a two caste system.

V Speculations on the future position and status of the Negroes within the United States

Immediately the Civil War ended, the precise future of the Negro freedmen in the United States had of course become a central thorny focus of speculation in Scottish outlooks on America. The wide diversity of views towards the Negro race which we have already observed to exist among Scots at that time helped to ensure that in Scotland, as in the United States itself, there was never from the outset anything approaching a consensus of opinion on the probable pace and direction of the freedmen's "progress", and assimilation within the American Anglo-Saxon community. Certainly, in perceiving in the United States a unique problem of unprecedented magnitude, many Scottish commentators found it difficult not to be essentially pessimistic about the situation, especially in the early months following the close of hostilities.

1 Ibid., pp. 233-234.
But even this was by no means a unanimous response; particularly among those who were basically in sympathy with American ideals and democracy, there was considerable confidence, as well as hope, that the Negro population would rapidly, and without too much difficulty, be absorbed into the body politic as actively employed free citizens who made a worthwhile contribution to society.

Accordingly, by May, 1866, the Caledonian Mercury was optimistically looking to the freedmen to play an instrumental part in recouping and augmenting the financial fortunes of the United States in the post-war years. The Mercury showed itself again ready to assail its domestic political adversaries through reference to the transatlantic situation by scorning the "baseless" predictions of those in Britain who had felt that America would succumb to the financial difficulties brought about by the Civil War. Arguing that the national strength and resources of the United States had weathered the war in a way which had commanded world-wide admiration, the paper contended that in the immediate future, the main source for an increase in the country's wealth would be a rapid increase in the number of farmers and in the acreage of cultivated land. Despite the seductive calls of Southern land agents to Scottish farmers and farm labourers, it is significant that the Mercury did not envisage European immigration as the principal basis of this revitalizing agricultural force: "Is it too much to hope that many of the freed negroes of the South will soon be farmers, maintaining themselves in comfort, and bearing part of the burden incurred for their emancipation?"¹

At the root of this sanguine outlook, there was, given the current policies of President Johnson and the mood of the Southern whites, perhaps even an over-optimism, stimulated by the radical journal's over-eagerness to prove that "notwithstanding all the bluster we make to the contrary",

¹ Caledonian Mercury; 19 May, 1866.
Britain had more caste and sectional feeling than was prevalent in the post-war United States. Thus, the *Mercury* was prepared to believe that ultimately, after the initial "irritation" had worn off, the freedmen would be fairly treated even by their worst opponents.¹ This premise naturally led to an extremely optimistic view of the future as it related to the Negroes. One year after the end of armed hostilities, the *Mercury* triumphantly recorded that one half of the freedmen were already in employment, wereworking well, and were well treated, and it had no doubts but that as things settled down, all the others would be able to find satisfactory work.² The paper did cautiously concede that in the time to come, the position and well-being of the freed Negroes in the South would largely depend on whether the South nominated its members to Congress in good faith, and "discharge[d] its duties to the coloured people in good spirit".³ But generally, the *Mercury*'s overwhelming desire to see the United States prosper materially and vindicate and preserve its democratic and egalitarian reputation in its dealings with the Negro race, tended to make the paper somewhat over-confident in predicting an imminent, uniformly bright future for the freedmen, safeguarded by justice and the law.

Essentially the same sentiments were at work to produce a similar attitude in the columns of the *Dundee Advertiser*. American celebrations for Thanksgiving Day, 1866, were the cue for John Lang's paper to attack those in Britain who believed that the British were "God's favoured people" and that the Americans did not have enough to thank God for. As well as hailing the end of the war, and the great gain in terms of individual liberty which had accrued to the nation as a result of it, the remarkably quick recovery of the

---
¹ *Caledonian Mercury*, 17 April, 1866.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
United States again became a focus of laudation. And alongside this, there was praise for the start of that work which would "eventually obliterate every trace of the old slavery spirit" and raise the black population to the same platform as the white. ¹ It was recognized that the main initiative in this work must come from the South, but optimism was not the less strong for that. A good beginning had already been made in that quarter, it was felt, with "Southern men of intelligence" recognizing the need to educate the Negroes. Following on education, the Dundee Advertiser foresaw other changes of great magnitude in the freedmen's condition, including an early concession of civil rights. Furthermore, it maintained that the respect for life and property shown by the Negroes during the Civil War was bound to influence ex-masters to give the race justice, and it vaguely, if confidently, predicted that the solution of the Negro problem in the South would dissipate many of the "erroneous theories" based on the supposed incapacity of the black population. ²

Like the Caledonian Mercury, the Dundee Advertiser was at an early stage prepared to put a cheerful interpretation upon what was in fact an essentially dismal course of Reconstruction partly because of its abiding admiration for the United States and its continued concern to see that country honourably survive the trauma of civil war and the emancipation of its slaves. Accordingly, hopes for justice for the Negro race could not be separated from wider hopes for a swift resumption of harmony between North and South. Reconstruction would be watched with great interest, it was indicated, not only to see how positively the Negroes' freedom could be secured but also to see whether, by early 1867, the North and South could join hands and fulfil "the great mission which still lies before them". ³

¹ Dundee Advertiser, 30 Nov., 1866.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
Because in the Dundee Advertiser's view the United States, reunited and strong, had a very special role to enact as standard-bearer of liberty throughout the world, the paper was in effect willing Reconstruction to succeed quickly, not only for the Negroes' sake but also for the sake of the United States and the cause of international radicalism. By 1869, with Grant in the Presidential chair, the Advertiser was still basically optimistic about the future for the Negro race within America. When the coloured population was experiencing opposition to its legal assumption of civil rights, and seeking legally to defeat this opposition, the Advertiser was confident that it would have a "well-deserved" and "memorable" victory: "Sooner or later they [the Negro litigants fighting for their rights] are bound to succeed: no battle waged in this way, slowly and persistently, ever failed to secure victory in the end".  

The Dundee Advertiser's rival, the Dundee Courier, did not share the same eager "radical" desire to see the United States wax strong and influential, nor did it (as we have earlier observed) tend to preserve so high an opinion of the Negro race as did the Advertiser. Nevertheless, at least initially the Courier did look forward with some hope to the prospects for the freedmen in America. But perhaps because it was relatively less closely interested in hoping for the speedy accomplishment of a totally reunited America, this journal was significantly less sanguine, and considerably more realistic, about the Southern response towards the Negro population. It was asserted quite bluntly that so far as free Negro labour and race relations in general were concerned, the Southern whites were doing all in their power to create difficulties. Credit was given purely to the freedmen themselves for the

1 Ibid., 21 Dec., 1869. The editorial noted that among those recently bringing legal action for refusal to grant civil rights were the sons of Frederick Douglass, and Sella Martin, who was suing the Trustees of a district school for refusing to admit his daughter.

2 See above, pp. 529, 536–537.

3 The Dundee Courier's arguments to this effect were considered in more detail above, Chapter IV, pp. 347-348.
fact that in a city such as Richmond, Virginia, where Negroes comprised half of the population, only one-tenth of the paupers were black; "after the utmost allowance for peculiar circumstances, it is obvious that the coloured race is not just now the race likely to become a burden upon the resources of free society". And there was confidence that many freedmen would rise to enjoy a good career in industrial enterprise. It was noted that of the 15,000 ex-slaves who had gone to Richmond after its capture, almost all had, by mid-August, 1865, found employment; and results in Alexandria, Virginia - where the Negroes were engaged in an impressive programme of building houses, churches and schools, were even more promising.

Juding this encouraging state of affairs to exist in many places throughout the South, the Dundee Courier confessed itself rather surprised by the facts: "the negro is everywhere exhibiting at once a capacity and a willingness to work utterly subversive to the commonly received opinion of his character". While this augured well for the future progress of the South, the least reassuring feature in the early post-war picture was the lack of "common sense" displayed by intransigent Southerners, the sort of perversity demonstrated by the spectacle of Richmond "with a third of its white population, supported by the Government, electing rabid secession municipal authorities". The clear implication was that in general, the Negro population in the South was adapting better and more quickly to the post-war situation than was the white, and that it deserved all credit for this.

Although the Jamaican insurrection had a startlingly adverse effect on the overall attitude of the Dundee Courier to the Negro race, even the impact of that event could not totally eradicate the journal's earlier hopes for the gradual, satisfactory progress of the American freedmen. In early

---

2 Ibid.
1866, the Courier chose vigorously to attack Laurence Oliphant for his publicly expressed views on the "Negro question" in the United States. It seems extremely likely that in this instance, the American focus was yet again being used to further specifically domestic antagonisms: politically, the fairly staid Dundee Courier almost certainly had little time for the flamboyant radicalism of the member for the Stirling burghs. But whatever the main purpose of the exercise, the fact that the Courier still felt strongly enough on this subject to frame an attack on the basis of it, and the nature of the paper's arguments refuting Oliphant, were in themselves significant.

Sarcastically depreciating Oliphant's whole attempt to "enlighten his constituency" on the urgent problem of the future status and condition of the freedmen in the South, the Courier accused him of being hasty, of over-generalizing, and of making conclusions which did not come near to the truth. His lecture had been the more damaging, it was implied, because these loose generalizations had been thrown out on the very point on which people in Britain were striving to get some settled ground of conviction. The central concern of the editorial was, however, totally to reject his conclusion that the only possible result of emancipation must be the extermination of the Negro race in the United States. All his speculations in that vein were derisively dismissed as being borrowed from the "utterly unsound" published theories of William Rathbone Greg, and the Courier adamantly insisted that the belief that emancipation in America must result in nothing short of extermination, slavery or forced labour contracts for the Negroes in the Southern States was completely unwarranted. Significantly, the paper was at pains to point out that such convictions had "only received a faint colouring of probability by the unhappy degredation into which the negroes of St. Domingo and Jamaica have sunk".

---

1 Ibid., 2 Feb., 1866. Oliphant delivered his lecture on "The Political Condition of the United States" in the Music Hall, Dunfermline, on 29 Jan., 1866.

2 Dundee Courier, 2 Feb., 1866.
The burden of its argument was that it was not the fact of a Negro's "race" that accounted for his nature in set circumstances. Most specifically on the question of readiness to work, the Courier deliberately broke with the traditional Carlylean line to suggest that there was "too much cant about the dignity of labour", most people of any race preferring to get their livelihood with as little drudgery as possible. In the United States, as in Barbadoes, where the Negroes fully realized that they had to work or starve, "the number of those who will refuse to work at all will not be more considerable than those who refuse to work in Europe, and their fate will be quite as hard". Since a low race in contact with a higher one was always improved, not degraded, there was every reason to suppose that the American freedmen could prosper by working, provided that they encountered no competition in labour from white men. Thus, the Dundee Courier was able to refute Oliphant's opinions from the basis of its continued conviction that the black population could and would make steady, subsidiary progress to the white population in the United States over the ensuing years: "We have the firmest belief that the condition of the negro on American soil will be, not a brilliant one, of course, but a comfortable and gradually progressive one". 1

At least by modern standards, the Courier's conclusion was one founded not (as the paper itself sought to imply) on an essentially less "racist" attitude to the Negro than Oliphant's, but rather on a differently slanted racialist outlook. Whereas Oliphant believed that the Negroes in the United States must inevitably perish in the face of the hostility and direct competition of the superior white race, the Dundee Courier believed that, as an inferior but improveable race which had already been for generations influenced by Anglo-Saxon civilization, the Negroes would not only survive but

1 Ibid.
advance as a result of continued association with and assimilation of the superior civilization of the white Americans. Thus, the difference of opinion really revolved not around the question of the Negro race's inferiority - which both parties accepted - but around the ability and strength of a particular branch of this race to withstand the challenging transition from slavery to freedom in the midst of a generally hostile environment. But the Dundee Courier's criticism of Oliphant did at least have the effect of illuminating the strange ironies which could result from public enunciations during the Reconstruction era on the complex problem of the Negroes' future in America. Hence in this instance, it was the radical Laurence Oliphant, supporter of the North and friend of American democracy, who appeared to hold the more conservative, reactionary, "racist" views on the freedmen's prospects, while the politically Conservative Dundee Courier, with a record of sympathy for the Confederacy and a proven fund of vitriolic opinions on the Negro race in Jamaica, seemed to represent the more optimistic, encouraging, and "enlightened" thinking on the subject.

That it was possible to recognize the Negro as a permanent part of the American scene yet still harbour strongly racist feelings towards him was, however, nowhere made clearer by a Scottish commentator than in the Kelso farmer John Clay's account of his trip to the United States in 1874. With nine years of Reconstruction behind it, the South which Clay visited presented, if not a more stable picture, then at least a somewhat clearer model of the likely direction it would take than it had done for Scottish observers in the early post-war years. Assessing the social structure of the Southern states at this period, he morosely concluded that slavery had so demoralised master and slave, especially with regard to attitudes towards work, that neither the ex-planter class nor the freedmen would "do much good for this generation at least".¹ Most importantly, however, Clay

¹ Clay, New World Notes, p. 6.
introduced a somewhat novel dimension into Scottish attitudes to the future of the two races in the South by suggesting that it was the "demoralised" white element - meaning primarily the ruined planter class - rather than the Negroes who would soon disappear from the land:

He [the demoralised white] is a man of quick improvement and rapid intellectual growth when placed beside the freed slave. The former will die out or be supplanted by fresh blood in a generation; not so fast with the nigger; naturally a man of low attainments, long years of slavery have made him worse.

It would seem valid to conclude that this hypothesis rested on an assumption of white superiority which had its basis in a belief that a degraded white class could not survive since it was not in the order of things that there should be such a class. Clay's reasoning implied that whites, as superiors, were bound to reaffirm and consolidate their superiority through a natural process of extinction of the weaker, degraded elements, or their "supplanting by fresh blood" in the next generation. Meanwhile, although progressing little, the Negroes, as the inferior race, would remain.

An idea vaguely analogous to that of Clay's, but differing radically from it in the nature of the views on the capabilities of the freedmen, had been voiced many years earlier in the Edinburgh Review, when P.W. Clayden had dared to suggest that the best hope for Southern society lay in the ultimate replacement of the degraded poor white element by "elevated" blacks. Clayden's statement had, however, sprung from a buoyant optimism about the general future of the Negro race in the United States, and a very positive vision of its social and intellectual advancement. Writing in the spring of 1866, Clayden found encouragement in the activities of the Freedmen's Bureau, but greatest encouragement of all in the character of the Negro race itself, and in its response to freedom:

1 Ibid., p. 7.
2 For an earlier reference to this argument, see above, Chapter III, p. 240.
It is characteristic of the African race that it neither dies out nor recedes in presence of 'superior' races. The negroes have great facility in adapting themselves to outward change. With a fair chance, we believe they will adapt themselves to the new conditions of the Southern States. They expect to work and will work, not all at once with the zest and energy of freemen, but in the way they have been used to and with the languid manner of the slave.¹

Beyond this, he saw stretching out ahead an era when the freedmen as a class would rise to industrial and commercial importance, and through that to political enfranchisement.

Clayden was too realistic, however, not to recognize the very evident fact that "one of the great difficulties of ... reconstruction ... [is that] the old planters and the mean whites ... will co-operate in denying political and social, perhaps even civil rights to the freedmen".² Despite his bright hopes, he was acutely alive to the enormity of the task of absorbing into the nation four million Negroes "who have been denied a country, and have lived as outcasts in their native land", and he assured the United States of "the sympathy of the great Liberal party, not only in England, but all over Europe".³

One of Scotland's most advanced Liberal journals, the Aberdeen Free Press, was similarly concerned to see social and political justice done to the Negro race in America, but unlike Clayden, it early allowed its recognition of the obstacles which would be raised by the Southern whites to cloud its optimism on the issue. Believing that the South was ready to reunite with the North only because there was no alternative and because of love of the "almighty dollar", and holding that President Johnson's Reconstruction policy was too lenient, the Free Press could envisage no immediately encouraging future for the freedmen:

² Ibid., p. 549.
³ Ibid., pp. 555-556.
Under such a spirit of unwilling Southern acceptance of abolition it is not at all wonderful that the hostility to the negro should remain, and that the despicable spite of the ex-slaveholders should seek every opportunity for its gratification...[A]nd with the President’s leniency to the South, and the too great facilities and inducements he is holding out to the states for rapid reconstruction, the look out of the negro for some time to come is a dark one.1

The Aberdeen Herald shared the Free Press’ dismal forecast during the early months of Reconstruction, and shared also its inclination to place the blame for the unpromising outlook largely on the shoulders of the white Southern population and the mistaken policy of Johnson. With reports from America of conflicts between coloured and white troops as well as between coloured and white civilians in the South, and with the possibility that the freedmen, if refusing to accept low wages, would not be employed at all, the Herald focussed attention on the generally "shameful maltreatment" of the Negro, "who is being beaten about in a style and on a scale of which he has had no previous experience".2 Significantly, the paper was later highly sceptical about Johnson’s resolution to pursue a policy of confident conciliation towards the South:

For the poor blacks, with full and unrestrained power placed in the hands of their late masters, the prospect is gloomy enough, foreshadowing as it does physical cruelty and privation indefinitely worse than any that as a rule could be known under slavery ... Lincoln would never have turned his back so heartlessly on the defenceless negro.3

For both the Herald and the Free Press, the twin evils of Southern recalcitrance and the over-conciliatory approach of the President were deplorable principally because they had the direct effect of preventing the Negro race in the Southern states from getting a chance to prove itself at the very time when it was most vital that it should have a free and fair scope to show to the world its ability to adapt to its sweepingly altered circumstances.

1 Aberdeen Free Press, 29 Sept., 1865. See also ibid., 27 Oct., 1865.
2 Aberdeen Herald, 8 July, 1865; 1 July, 1865.
3 Ibid., 30 Sept., 1865.
But a sense of outrage that the Negroes' potential for successfully weathering the difficult, early transitional stage from slavery to freedom (and thereby laying the foundations for a prosperous future as free men) might be being deliberately curbed by grossly unjust actions was not always the main corollary of a realization that Southern attitudes were exacerbating the difficult problem of providing for the Negro during Reconstruction. The Glasgow Herald, like the Aberdeen Herald, was dismayed by skirmishes between the races at Charleston, South Carolina, and especially by the "several disgraceful outrages [which] have been committed on the poor negroes at Norfolk, Virginia". ¹ But whereas the latter journal, along with the Aberdeen Free Press, had unequivocally indicted the Southerners for their vindictive and unjustified conduct on this and other occasions, the Glasgow Herald was prepared to go some way towards understanding - if not excusing - the extent of Southern antagonism to the black race. The root of the trouble, the paper argued, was the fact that emancipation had been accomplished "at the point of the bayonet. It was the offspring of force and the result of subjugation".² As such, it had impoverished thousands of planters, and had caused the South to look bitterly on the free Negro as the original cause of the war and all the resultant ruin. In these circumstances, the Negroes in the South could hardly expect to find themselves receiving much sympathy or respect.³

It is relevant to note here this partial sympathy for the feelings of the Southern whites because behind it there was a basically gloomy conception of the prospects - at least in the short term - of the freedmen in America. Arguing from the premise that "instantaneous" abolition had been a mistake, the Glasgow Herald sought to demonstrate that the deleterious influences of

¹ Glasgow Herald, 3 Aug., 1865.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid.
slavery had left the ex-slave seriously unprepared suddenly to meet the social and political demands of freedom. The tone of the statements made in this connection suggest, however, that the Herald was in fact really seeking to put across a thinly-veiled argument for the basic incapacity of the Negro race, irrespective of its crippling involvement with slavery, immediately to prove itself fit for freedom. Thus, in the insistence that "people were far too inclined to impute to the hereditary bondsmen their own hatred of slavery", there was a clear implication that the Negro slave had lacked the sensibility fully to appreciate the anathema of enforced labour for life:

[Slavery] is that [tradition] in which he and his fathers were born and bred, and if he naturally does not possess the energy and self-respect of the freeman he at the same time wants the acute sensibility which looks with shame upon complete submission to another's will.1

It followed from this that it was "perfectly chimerical" to suppose that the Negroes could become self-dependent, self-reliant free men at once. They would not understand that freedom meant the need to work or starve: "Freedom is simply another name for no work among the majority of black field-hands".2 That the Glasgow Herald really felt that such a belief on the Negroes' part was as much the consequence of an innate character defect of the race as an idea fostered by slavery was, however, indicated in the paper's acceptance of the generally pessimistic view of the Negroes' prospects furnished by General Grant in his report of his official tour through the Gulf states in late 1865. With Grant, the Herald eagerly criticized Freedmen's Bureau agents for spreading the view that the estates of the former slaveholders were to be divided among the freedmen, significantly emphasizing that "this seems to have fostered the idea which is native to the African mind, that a

1 Ibid., 15 June, 1865.
2 Ibid.
free man ought to be above all menial labour. The negro thinks that all who are not slaves are gentlemen”.¹ The paper was quite ready to accept Grant’s conclusion that a severe labour system of laws and penalties for the black population might be the only alternative to "slow extermination through idleness and its attendant vices"; and the Herald itself was prepared to suggest that the contract system might solve the difficulty by "taking the ingrained idleness out of the bones of the negro".² Such attitudes merely foreshadowed a subsequent observation that "barbarism ... still lies at the bottom of the Negro character”.³

In the Glasgow Herald’s Edinburgh counterpart, the Scotsman, reports from correspondents in the United States tended to reflect a similarly discouraging picture of Negro prospects, and to relate that dismal picture to the inherent inferiority of the race. Early experience of free Negro labour had, the paper was informed by a correspondent from Alabama, helped to bear out the planters’ contention that voluntary labour would fail, the Negro since freedom having proved to be "more indolent, vicious, and depraved than he was ever before believed to be".⁴ The drawbacks imposed simply by the race factor were in the correspondent’s view sufficient to proscribe the freedman’s hopes for future advancement in every direction: he was "hated and despised" both by those wishing to re-enslave him and by those who had freed him, he was deprived of the benefits which had accrued from his former employer’s self-interest, and, most importantly, he was unable to compete with the whites except in "the most menial and agricultural pursuits".⁵

¹ Ibid., 5 Jan., 1866.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid., 3 March, 1866.
⁵ Ibid.
And by 1869, the Scotsman's regular American correspondent was assiduously recording that the Republican press, no longer seeking to make political capital out of advocating Negro suffrage, had switched to a more sincere and truthful policy of printing "the most doleful letters [from their Southern correspondents] concerning the negroes, who are daily sinking lower and lower into the gulf of degradation and misery". The New York Tribune's correspondent was triumphantly cited as having concluded that "The continued degradation and squalid misery to which the negroes are already brought makes their elevation ... almost an impossibility".¹

The bleakness of the Negroes' future in the United States was accepted as inevitable by the Daily Review, both on account of the natural inferiority of the race, which would restrict its capacity readily to cope with the problems of free labour and white competition, and the extreme "unkindness or cruelty which is prompted by the feelings of antipathy and repugnance held toward ... [the Negroes] by the masses of whites both North and South - and by nearly all, in fact, except the comparatively few sincere ultra-Abolitionists". It was, indeed, a central argument in the Review's prognostications on the harmonious development of the two races in America that attitudes in both sections of the Union would make the total, effective expiation of the old "crime" of slavery a grim and protracted business. The paper remained adamant, however, in asserting that "The negro is not to be done without. He is there, and he cannot be got rid of by fair means at all events, and any other means would add to crime instead of expiating it".²

We have already observed how strongly Charles Mackay believed that the American Negroes were doomed to a permanently gloomy existence because of

¹ Ibid. (U.S./c.), 16 Nov., 1869.
² Daily Review, 2 Nov., 1865.
³ Ibid., 28 Aug., 1865. Original emphasis.
the serious inadequacies of their character and intellect and the unfeigned hostility of the white Anglo-Saxon majority.¹ Half a decade of Reconstruction did nothing to shake this early conviction: surveying the condition and position of the Southern freedmen in 1870, he still insisted that "Freedom as yet has proved but a poor boon to the great bulk of the negroes".² For one thing, white antagonism to the race had not abated, so that "if ... [the Negro] be free to assert his social equality, he is not free to enforce it". No laws could compel the whites to associate on friendly terms with the black population, "[E]quality does not now, and never did, exist at the North, and will never be tolerated either at the North or the South". Already, he suggested, there had been signs that the Southern Negroes were aware of this, and partially, if not wholly, reconciled to it "as a fact that exists in white human nature, and against which it is useless, and might be suicidal, for black human nature to rebel".³

Furthermore, Mackay was prepared to lay just as much emphasis as he had done at the outset of Reconstruction on the character weaknesses of the Negro race as a principal factor determining its miserable status within the United States. Free black labour was little in demand throughout the South, he indicated, because it was unskilful, uncertain, and costly:

Indolence - resignation to the dolce far niente - contentedness with a merely animal existence - thoughtlessness and heedlessness of the morrow, and all that it may bring forth - and the want of guidance and direction, are the faults of the negro character; and worse than all, they are faults so deeply engrained as to appear all but ineradicable. A race like this is not well suited - leaving colour out of the question - to the requirements of the United States.⁴

¹ See above, pp. 541-546.
² Mackay, "The Antagonism of race and colour; or white, black and yellow in America", in Blackwood's Magazine, March, 1870, Vol. 107, p. 325.
³ Ibid., p. 325.
⁴ Ibid., p. 326.
Clearly, in direct competition with white agricultural labour the freedmen must be the losers. Envisaging a time when the black population would be reduced to wholesale pauperism and ultimately, perhaps, to death by famine, Mackay believed that the United States would soon be forced to reconsider whether it had done its whole duty by the Negro in giving him liberty and the vote, "and whether the negroes, like the Red Indians, might not advantageously be set apart in reserves, to govern themselves, under the protection of the Federal Government".\(^1\) His own solution was to despatch a proportion of the Negro population - and especially the "aimless, destitute, helpless" freedmen swarming about in the cities - to the Sea Islands to become proprietors on the cotton plantations there, and to divide Texas into three or four states, one to be set apart as a "negro reserve on which the negroes, under the most favourable auspices, might prove to the world, if the fact be possible, that they are as fairly amenable to all the influences of civilisation as the Caucasians".\(^2\)

Mackay's novel proposal was, of course, but the logical culmination of the long-held, deeply racist conviction that there could be no satisfaction and contentment for the black population - and, indeed, precious little for the white - so long as American legislators vainly strove, against a massive bank of hostility, to integrate elements which were naturally not destined to be integrated. But although his designation of "negro reserves" may have struck some as a somewhat severe and unattractive appellation, it seems probable that many Scottish observers of the American situation would have judged Mackay's plan as neither particularly unique in its basic conception, nor particularly racist in its discriminatory designs. The continuing unsettled and unhappy state of the South at that time occasionally made it

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 326.
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 326.
difficult for Scots, however well disposed to the freedmen, to foresee how it would be possible in the future for the two races to live amicably and prosperously in the same community.

During his visit to the South, the Rev. Dr. William G. Blaikie, for instance, was appalled by white atrocities on the schools and teachers of the Negroes, and in particular, by the hanging of a white Canadian teacher and four black pupil-teachers at a Negro school established by a Southern friend of his. Although he indicated that such "wild manifestations" were peculiar to the mean whites and were becoming less frequent, the disruptive nature of the Southern environment almost certainly influenced him to reserve judgement on the ultimate destiny of the black population. Significantly, however, he did tentatively suggest that the best solution to the problem of the Negroes' future in the United States might turn out to be the creation of a separate state - not a penal or compulsory area but a "real negro settlement", where the race could fully develop its brain-power.

Such plans for separate Negro states (into which Mackay's heinous variant of "negro reserves" could obviously fit fairly innocently) retained a certain attraction both because they seemed to afford the simplest and most effective solution to a massive and acute problem, and because they could be seen to have their origins in the eminently respectable colonization schemes of the venerable President Lincoln. Although direct advocacy of mass Negro colonization seems to have been surprisingly infrequent among Scottish commentators on the early, chaotic months of Reconstruction, there is some evidence that this remedy was by no means totally dismissed at this period. In the press, at least the small Elgin and Morayshire Courier was bold enough to assert that even the "intelligent" Negroes in the United States

---

1 Blaikie, "America and the Americans ..." ("Richmond" - seventh paper) in
Sunday Magazine, April, 1871, pp. 403-404.

2 Ibid., p. 404.
were advocating the wholesale emigration of the race "as the only security against ultimate extermination". ¹ And it stated its own faith in such a solution by offering as the best remedy by which the Americans could "finally dispose of their negroes" the fine, negative vision of a mass exodus of the entire Negro population "to some land of promise that has yet to be discovered."²

More significantly, in his acceptance speech on being returned unopposed as Liberal M.P. for Berwickshire in 1865, David Robertson referred to Lincoln's plan for a special state or separate colony for the American Negroes as perhaps the best that could have been advanced to meet the problems and exigencies of the post-Civil War era. And when he subsequently quoted a verse of a poem extolling the benefits of removing the Negro back to Africa, he was loudly cheered by his constituents. ³

That the project of mass Negro removal from the United States was more widely circulated in Scotland immediately after the end of the Civil War than popular comment would suggest was indicated by desultory attempts to reject the viability of such a scheme. Thus, the Aberdeen Free Press, in pleading for a fair deal for the coloured population, felt it necessary to discount the idea on the grounds that it was based on a mercenary, hypocritical contradiction:

If they [the Negroes] are not fit to be entrusted with a minor share in the government of the community among whom they are now dispersed, still less can they be fit to govern themselves. ⁴

The Daily Review made it clear that while Lincoln had been wise in advocating colonization, the Negro simply would not go. It was not Africans, the paper cynically suggested, who were raising the current cry of "Africa for the

¹ Elgin and Morayshire Courier, 11 Aug., 1865.
² Ibid., "What will they do with them?", 1 Sept., 1865.
Africans": "The 'American citizens of African descent' mean to stay where they are, or at most to move from one State to another".  

This view was being hammered home to Scots around the same time by the most prominent "American citizen of African descent" in Scotland during the early Reconstruction years, Sella Martin. In early August, 1865, the Glasgow Herald had carried an extract purportedly from the Black Republican, a paper apparently published by a Negro in New Orleans, in which it had been argued that the coloured and white races in America could not live harmoniously and that the sooner Congress gave the Negroes a place to themselves, the better, since continued association with the hostile white civilization would ultimately result in their extinction. Martin, in Glasgow at that time on freedmen's aid business, was prompted to write a strong letter to the Herald, disputing the existence of the Black Republican and refuting the statements contained in the published extract. Not one Negro in fifty in the United States, he contended, held the doctrine that the two races there could not live together on terms of equality. With his usual facility for framing his arguments in a way that ensured their maximum effect, he stated that if he were to accept such a dismal interpretation, his faith in man - almost in Providence itself - would be severely shaken:

If the negro race, having been dragged from Africa against their (sic) will, are again to be dragged somewhere else in utter hopelessness of justice from the white race, all faith in humanity, at least in Anglo-Saxon humanity, must wither and disappear.

2 See extract headed "The Black Man's Own Testimony" in Glasgow Herald, 2 Aug., 1865.

In America four or five years later, Martin played an active role in attempting to advance racial harmony against the original discriminatory policies of a section of the black population. When there was a clash over the admittance to the Coloured National Labour Union (organized in Dec., 1869) of white delegates - and especially two accused of being Democratic party spies - Martin defended them against the charge and won the admittance of the white delegates by stressing that the Negro workers could not afford to reject their friends' support - see Sumner E. Haislon, "The Labour Movement and the Negro During Reconstruction" in Journal of Negro History, Vol. 33, Oct., 1948, No. 4, p. 460.
Sella Martin's optimism about the future direction of race relations in the United States was not uninfluenced, it might be suggested, by his own warm reception, apparently on terms of total equality, in Britain, and especially in Scotland. But at the same time, Martin was too shrewd a man not to have realized the very exceptional nature of his particular position as an educated coloured man in the midst of groups of white men whose depths of enthusiasm and sympathy for the elevation of the Negro race was in itself unrepresentative. It seems clear, then, that Martin's conviction regarding the future of the freedmen within the United States was indeed based on a set of carefully thought-out deductions which he was anxious to communicate to the Scottish public.

Accordingly, he also sounded a warning note to the effect that if the Negroes were forced to leave the United States, or made to feel they had to, it would be the start of an evil which would bring the Anglo-Saxon race to exclusiveness and therefore to deterioration: "By driving out all supposed inferior blood, it will become itself inferior". He further suggested that the "expatriated" freedmen settled on or near the American continent would, in case of war against the United States, be much more formidable as tools of a foreign power "with the sorrows and hate of exile in them". The best way for the Anglo-Saxons to get rid of the Negroes, if they really wanted to, was to oppressively control them and perhaps fully extirpate them, "like the

---

1 As a Baptist preacher, Martin almost certainly carried over his strong views on this subject from wartime. In this connection, it would seem to be significant that in the autumn of 1861, a Convention of Negro Baptists considered it their "duty to protest against the operations and designs" of those organizing and supporting the then current scheme for the mass, subsidized emigration of American Negroes to Haiti. In a firm, forthright denunciation of the colonization plan, the coloured Baptists deeply regretted the discouraging and divisive effect which the "widespread evil" of the idea was having on the newly emancipated race, and condemned "the infamous doctrine ... that the white and black races cannot live together upon this continent in a state of freedom and equality". Extract from the report of a meeting of Negro Baptists in New Bedford, in Liberator, 25 Oct., 1861; quoted in James M. McPherson, The Negro's Civil War (New York, 1965), p. 86.
Indians". But the essence of his optimism was the belief that the "real" native Americans, as opposed to "the foreigners in America", did not wish to see the black population expatriated, and that this sentiment was balanced on the Negroes' side by an overwhelming desire and determination to remain in the country of their birth, which they loved.¹

While Martin's arguments presumably had a tremendously heartening influence on the friends of the Negro race in Scotland, his summary dismissal of the possibility that the black population might ultimately be extirpated by the whites was countered by the opinions of those who viewed the freedmen as constituting a great nuisance and burden for most of the American people. For some who saw the problem in these terms, it was not too incredible to judge that "the negro difficulty ... will [probably] ultimately solve itself by something like an expulsion, almost approaching an extermination, of the unfortunate race".²

Foremost in expounding such theories in the Scottish press was - predictably - the ultra-Conservative Edinburgh Courant. Taking an early cue from the London Times,³ the Courant consistently maintained that because of his utter incapacity to adapt to the obligations required of free men in an Anglo-Saxon civilization, the Negro would eventually "rot out" in the United States, as the American Indian was doing. Half a century would see the total disappearance of the Indians, and by that time, the date of the Negroes' extinction would be calculable.⁴ American radicalism, instantly

¹ Letter from Sella Martin, Glasgow Herald, 3 Aug., 1865. Original emphasis.
² Inverness Courier, 17 Aug., 1865.
³ See extract headed "The Negro Difficulty in the States" in Edinburgh Courant, 5 Aug., 1865, where a "more than usually instructive and suggestive article" from the Times was quoted, arguing that Negroes would not work without compulsion, that they would never secure a prosperous future for themselves in the South, and that they would probably perish.
⁴ Ibid., 16 Feb., 1866. See also ibid., 7 July, 1869.
indictable for producing the error of immediate emancipation which was the basis of the trouble, was subsequently censured for pursuing Reconstruction policies which paved the way for a war of races, the probable result of which would be the "ultimate extermination of the blacks". ¹ Reporting from New York, the Daily Review's American correspondent had earlier voiced exactly the same opinion, both on the inevitability of a conflict between the races as a consequence of Republican measures, and on the certain annihilation of the Negro race as the result of such a collision.²

VI Assumptions concerning the conquering impulse of the Anglo-Saxon race and the relative merits of the coloured races of the United States

Positive convictions regarding the eventual disappearance of the Negroes from United States soil were almost certainly grounded in two basic, interrelated beliefs which were strikingly popular in some sections of the Scottish press during the mid 1860s-1870s - the cast-iron belief that all coloured races throughout the world were destined to be displaced and ultimately to vanish before the conquering, colonising strength of the superior Anglo-Saxon race, and the equally strong belief that the Anglo-Saxons, in their dealings with "inferior races", invariably displayed an innate, unmerciful savagery. Fears about the latter characteristic as it related to the position of the Negroes in America were well brought out by the Dundee Courier, which by the autumn of 1868 was likewise tending to argue that a prolongation of Congressional Reconstruction would precipitate a race war. The paper predicted that any Negro combination against the interests of the Southern whites would definitely prove disastrous for the black population:

If the negro vote is given against the white man, as it will be so long as the South is occupied by Northern armies, and the negro is fed from the freedman's bureau, the poor black is but placing himself in a position of hostility to a race before

¹ Ibid., 8 Sept., 1868.
whose wrath he would fly as chaff before the wind. When one reflects on the tiger-element which lurks in our Anglo-Saxon nature, and which, as in the Indian mutiny, leads people of English blood into the wildest excesses if once they are aroused to scorn and hatred of 'niggers', we may well devoutly hope, in the interest of mankind, that the experiment which Congress is trying in the South may come to an end before the passions of the white people are too deeply stirred.¹

Significantly, the nature of the American Civil War had early convinced the Daily Review of the existence of this savage trait in the Anglo-Saxon character. The reports of guerilla activities in border states where the population had been divided in affiliation between North and South had prompted the Review to conclude that

What we call 'our civilisation' is, so far as the sentiments, if not the moral faculties, are concerned, a very superficial affair - a thin varnish over the original nature below. Underneath, and not far underneath either, are the passions of the savage, and probably in fewer races closer to the surface than in that mixture of races which peoples these islands.²

It was indicated that there were known guerilla atrocities against women, children, the old and infirm, "which must have been perpetrated in hot blood, by men as merciless as the Indians whom their predecessors dispossessed, and more sensuous than the phlegmatic Red man", by men with Scottish and English names, - "people with the same blood as ours in them".³

To a considerable extent, however, the Daily Review was prepared to accept such apparently unpalatable truths as simply representative of the natural, unavoidable characteristics found in races of men whose energy had not wasted away.⁴ Taken in conjunction with the belief that it was the destiny of the white races (and the Anglo-Saxon race in particular) to colonise the habitable parts of the globe, there was necessarily a certain

---

¹ Dundee Courier, 1 Sept., 1868.
² Daily Review, 13 Nov., 1865.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid.
complacency, if not an actual pride, in such Scottish acknowledgements of the "savagery" of the Anglo-Saxon race. Nowhere was the inherent intolerance and belligerence of the Anglo-Saxon towards other races more readily recognized and accepted than by Charles Mackay in Blackwood's Magazine. We have already noted that Mackay reasoned that both in Britain and in America there was an ingrained Anglo-Saxon antagonism towards other races, an antagonism which defied analysis and logic.¹ This antipathy against peoples of different colour sprang firstly, he argued, from a desire to rule and possess; and "savage aborigines" who stood in the way of the invading colonisers had been "invariably persecuted with relentless ferocity".²

Applying his critical eye to the relative positions of the races in the Southern states in late 1867, Mackay prophesied that if the Negroes persisted in claiming supremacy over the whites, a war of races was certain to be the outcome. The result would, of course, be the banishment of the black population from American soil, or its extermination "by fire and sword".³ Two years later, he was still convinced of the eventual disappearance not only of the black race but of all coloured races from the United States: "The red men are nearly gone; the blacks will follow; and next will come a tussle with the yellow men, or Chinese, who are now swarming in countless numbers into California and Oregon".⁴ John Blackwood recognized that there was enough speculative interest in the future of the coloured races in America at that time to accept the article Mackay proposed to write on the antagonism arising from race in that country.

¹ See above, p. 663.
³ Mackay, "The impending crisis in America" in ibid., Nov., 1867, Vol. 102, p. 646.
⁴ Charles Mackay to John Blackwood, 26 Nov., 1869, Bla. MSS., MS. 4250, fol. 100-101.
It was in this article, published in early 1870, that Mackay offered the fullest exposition of his views on the instinctive antipathy of race and the natural destiny of the white races to subjugate and dispossess the native coloured races. He was concerned to point out that among the several Caucasian peoples of Europe, there was scarcely any sentiment approaching antipathy of race, other than the "vulgar" prejudices and hatreds which had always existed, such as that currently nurtured between the Irish and English, and that which had once been fostered against Scotsmen by "such one-sided writers as Dr. Samuel Johnson and others and ... aided more or less by the traditions of the stage". There was, however, a very great distinction between that and the attitudes towards coloured races: "the real antipathy or antagonism of race - whatever the feeling or instinct may be called, which, with occasional exceptions on the part of individuals, forbids and prevents the union of the sexes - is almost wholly a matter of colour".

Alongside these sentiments, and directly related to them, there was the simple assumption of the intrinsic superiority of the Caucasian race which, as this chapter has attempted to demonstrate, so forcefully permeated Scottish thinking, both at conscious and at subconscious level, throughout the 1860s and 70s. If little else complimentary can be said of it, Mackay's article did at least serve the useful practical purpose of offering a straightforward and succinct chauvinistic analysis of the attitudes of white colonisers and the nature of the urge which spurred them on to dispossess the "inferior races", an analysis which almost certainly reflected the views of many others in Scotland who thought in essentially the same way but who were less willing to candidly admit it.

Himself endorsing wholeheartedly the expansionist mentality of the

---

1 Mackay, "The Antagonism of race", p. 314.
2 Ibid., p. 314.
Caucasian race, Mackay did not hesitate to record that when the white went abroad to subdue and form settlements, he "[goes] as a superior being, assumes possession by the right, if not by the divinity, of his colour, and will listen to no terms on the part of the original possessors of the soil but absolute submission to his sovereign will". The simple law of the encroaching Caucasian race was that natives who offered no resistance might live, those who were troublesome must be subdued, and those who resorted to permanent rebellion had to be exterminated. It was a rule which was never relaxed by the Anglo-Saxons, Anglo-Celts, or Teutons, "who now between them form the great all-conquering, all pervading race, that replenishes the waste places of the globe and clears the way before it by the dispossess and subjection of the natives".

With his own personal orientation towards the United States and its problems, it was perhaps natural that Mackay should identify America as the country where the question of the predominance of race had assumed the largest proportions and worked itself out in the most remarkable way.

The British and the Americans are alike in this respect. It is in the blood, the bone, the flesh, and whole spirit of the people ... Wherever they go, they must be kings and lords over all men who have skins of a different colour from their own.

The United States, it might be suggested, did not so much bear out Mackay's theories about the relationship of the white and coloured races as form the actual basis on which these theories were constructed. Thus, in the "proud and haughty" Red Indian race there was the phenomenon of the savage who would not submit, and against whom the colonising whites had accordingly pursued a systematic policy of dispossession and extermination over three centuries. In the "docile and useful" Negro race, on the other hand, there

1 Ibid., p. 314.
2 Ibid., p. 315.
3 Ibid., pp. 315-320.
was the phenomenon of the savage who submitted readily enough to enslavement by the white, and who consequently avoided the bitter racial antagonism which had existed between white and red:

In the South, during all these years [of slavery], there was neither antipathy nor antagonism between the white race and the black. The negroes conceded their social, their legal, and their human inferiority, and there was not only peace, but a certain amount of friendship and regard between them and their masters.¹

It becomes obvious, then, that Mackay's excessive criticism of "integrationist" Republican policies during Reconstruction, his conviction that such laws simply could not become operative, and his grim proposal of colonisation and "negro reserves" as the only possible future means of existence for the American Negroes were all based in the belief that in the post-war United States, a fundamental law governing the natural relationship between a white and a coloured race had been broken. And to his way of thinking, this serious blunder must inevitably have immediately injurious and potentially dangerous consequences for the whole nation. As late as 1874, he was offering to write for Blackwood an article on "the impending war of races, black and white, in America"² in which he would seek to warn that "The blacks must be utilized - not exterminated; though they are in danger of the latter fate - not from the hate of their enemies - but from the stupidity of their friends".³

Mackay's clear, deterministic conception of the subjugation and dispossession of the coloured races by the Caucasian was echoed in the Scottish press throughout the period. Colonial revolts, and the ability of British might to quell them, provided adequate contemporary proof of the essential

¹ Ibid., p. 323.
² Charles Mackay to John Blackwood, 29 Aug., 1874, BLA. ESS., MS. 4322, fol. 17-18.
³ Charles Mackay to John Blackwood, 16 Sept., 1874, ibid., MS. 4322, fol. 19-20.
soundness of such an assumption. The mood which such events engendered in some Scots during the sixties and seventies was well illustrated by a leader on the Maori war in New Zealand which appeared in the Elgin Courant in May, 1865. The fight was identified as one primarily for land — in reality, part of an "everlasting" conflict, "for a superior or more civilised race is always driving an inferior people from their land, or, as they call it, colonizing distant countries". As the weak inevitably went to the wall, the conquerors took over their lands:

This is the way we act in India, as well as in New Zealand; it is ... the way that all nations act, and have acted, since the Romans built a dyke between Forth and Clyde to keep back the Northern barbarians ... Everywhere over the world the savage is perishing before the civilised man. The child of nature will not stoop to sober, plodding industry. A kind of instinct repels him from the plough and the hammer, and, retiring ... yet further back in his native wilds as the colonists advance, he at last disappears from the country.

A subsequent war in New Zealand three years later elicited a similar response, and in 1871, an Elgin man who had emigrated as a sheep farmer to South Africa demonstrated how the same reasoning could be applied to the African Negro. Totally subscribing to the theory that the white race would replace the black, he envisaged a magnificent white civilization stretching out from the Free State:

an extent of country ... to become the centre of a vast concourse of people, building towns with American rapidity, developing industries, establishing trades, pursuing agriculture, ... grafting the old world's method to the adaptability of African systems, infusing new blood and generating new ambitions, till the mighty Continent shall roll on with a tidal wave of prosperity, and the dusky sons of Southern and Equatorial Africa recede before the advanced Western civilization, and the splendour of the old monarchies of Europe pale in the lustre of the Southern Cross.

1 Elgin Courant, 19 May, 1865.
2 Ibid.
3 See ibid., 6 Nov., 1868.
4 "Life in South Africa": letter from 'An Elgin Man' in ibid., 17 Feb., 1871.
British colonial experience, plus reports of United States Federal actions, helped to foster the conviction that as a race "unable to emancipate ... [itself] from savage life", the American Indians were irrevocably doomed to extinction. There might be a shred of fleeting regret that like the Maoris, the North American Indians, "a fine race in body and mind ... a noble race compared with the New Hollander, or the negro, and other races that might be mentioned", should be annihilated. But there was simultaneously an underlying acceptance of the fact that the white Americans were merely doing what the British had done and were still doing in Australia. It fell to the Edinburgh Courant to sound the most harshly realistic note on the fate of the Red Indians. Stressing the race's "cunning", "treachery", and murderous courage, the Courant urged that the public should dismiss the romantic notion of the American Indian as a chivalrous savage, derived as it was from Fenimore Cooper and "his imitators". Acknowledging that there was perhaps "something sad" in the prospect of the total extinction of the race, the paper argued that "the demands of civilisation admit of no other alternative", since the great programme of American railway expansion could no longer be retarded by "a few depraved, drunken and wellnigh intractable Red Indians".

On the other hand, however, in its unceasing efforts to discredit the American nation, the Courant was on occasion ready enough to portray the American Indian as the poor, innocent victim of despicable American double-dealing and savagery. Hence in countering United States criticisms of Eyre's measures against the Jamaican Negroes, the paper, as we have seen, mounted a scathing attack on the American Government's treatment of the Red Indians.

1 Dundee Courier, 19 July, 1876. See also Daily Review, 10 Sept., 1868.
2 Elgin Courant, 6 Nov., 1868.
3 Edinburgh Courant, 17 Dec., 1868.
4 See above, p. 556.
Reference to consistent American cheating on land deals was coupled with accusations against United States troops of needless killing and atrocities, of taking "a fiendish delight in slaughter which is not to be equalled in the most sanguinary episodes of history". One incident in particular, where a Colonel Chevington had shot down in cold blood a mixed company of friendly Cheyennes with whom his party had been allowed to encamp, was strongly likened to the Massacre of Glencoe.¹

The Scotsman was similarly afforded the welcome opportunity to attack the inhumanity and rapacity of the Americans by professing its detestation of government policy towards the Indian tribes. Grant's restructured policy of 1869 was interpreted as being designed to incite the several tribes to kill each other off, and again, United States officers who had participated in Indian wars since that time were accused of having perpetrated excessive barbarities. Famous old stalwarts of the Northern cause who were closely associated with the direction of government policy on this issue were opportunistically scorned: "The complete extermination of the Indian race in the ... United States seems to be rapidly approaching - and it is known that President Grant, General Sherman and General Sheridan regard this consummation as one devoutly to be wished".²

But the manner of the Red Indians' "extermination" at the hands of the Federal Government did give rise to considerable genuine concern in the Scottish press, apart from also proving, in some cases, a convenient enough weapon to use against the Republic. The Glasgow Herald, for instance, fully accepted the current Darwinian conviction that it was the law of nature that the weaker must go to the wall, "but justice and humanity demand that neither cruelty nor force be resorted to, but that nature be allowed to

¹ Edinburgh Courant, 3 Sept., 1869.
² Scotsman, 19 Dec., 1873. See also ibid., 7 July, 1876.
pursue her own gradual but sure and inevitable course". Suggesting that the Anglo-Saxon race had often been tyrannical and ruthless in its dealings with coloured natives, and deploring the old underhand actions of the Americans towards the Indians, the Herald welcomed proposals to set territory apart for the race. The idea of "extermination by force" was "as absurd as it is inhuman". But although commending it as a relatively more humane and Christian step by the United States, the Herald in 1869 was not confident that Grant's proposal to create large reservations for the Red Indians would be successful. The continuing unsettled aspect of the Negro population in the Southern states, where the freedmen's "bad habits" were "seriously retarding the efforts to settle and civilise them", and the uncertainty about the Negroes' future, contributed to a generally cautious attitude towards the prospects of all coloured races in the United States: "The black, red, and yellow races in the States are all a source of considerable uneasiness, because what their future position is to be is not as yet very well defined".

Clearly, the probable future of one coloured race, no matter how exceptional the government's treatment of it, could not be considered in isolation from the probable future of the other coloured races in America. Humanity was consistently urged as a guide line for immediate Federal policies. But with regard to the American Indian, it was recognized that whether the attempt was made to "settle and civilise" the race, or to continue to meet aggression with aggression, the ultimate result would be extermination in any case. Similarly, although Grant's pledge to ensure that the Negro was placed in full possession of all civil rights was recognized as laudable, the Herald considered the Negroes' future "absorption" (if not extinction) pre-determined by the limits of the race:

1 Glasgow Herald, 10 Aug., 1867.
2 Ibid., 9 Dec., 1869.
He [the Negro] will then have a fair chance in the struggle for life; and if we can hardly imagine that he will take root and grow in freedom, or attain to any position amid a strong, pushing Anglo-Saxon race, the Americans have little to fear. Their country is so large, and the increase in their population is so rapid, that in a few years any sort of element would be absorbed.  

With the resurgence to power of the Southern Democratic element by early 1877, and the anticipated deterioration in the political and social status of the freedmen, the Glasgow Herald tended to bring together the separate strands of the race problem in the United States and to construct a general pattern of inevitable antagonisms and responses, not unlike that suggested by Charles Mackay several years earlier:

It would almost seem as if struggles between the races are inevitable in America. The white man will have to hold his own against the black, as he has already held it against the red man, and is now ... holding it against the heathen Chinese. This may be a matter of regret, but yet it may simply mean that history has a bad habit of repeating itself ...  

For the Glasgow Herald, the exercising of a measure of justice and humanity by the United States towards its coloured populations remained, in the last analysis, necessary as a palliative, but totally ineffective as a permanent check, on the inexorable forces of nature.

In the relatively more liberal - and also, significantly, more pro-American - Dundee Advertiser, however, criticism of the bad faith on the part of white Americans which had produced the "interminable contests" with the Indian tribes was coupled with an implied belief that the extinction of the race from the American continent was by no means inevitable. Blaming the government and people of the United States for causing the Sioux war of 1876, the Advertiser upbraided the States for failing to establish a satisfactory, harmonious relationship with the native Indians in the way that the Canadians had done.  

Several years earlier, the Aberdeen Free Press

1 Ibid., 6 March, 1873.
2 Ibid., 3 April, 1877.
3 Dundee Advertiser, 7 July, 1876
had reviewed the attitudes of the British and Americans to their coloured subject races and had even more explicitly suggested that the American Indian was not destined, any more than was the freed Negro, to die out. Deploring the traditional policy of "extirpation and cruelty" which had been pursued against the tribes, the Free Press welcomed United States government proposals to train Indians in the ways of industry, and give them permanent obligations to the country:

The Indian, like the negro, is expressly excluded, by the Constitution which declares that all men are free and equal, from citizenship. His admission to the right must one day become a question. So long as he is in any degree treated as an alien, an outcast, or a necessary evil, he must be expected in some way or other to prove himself worthy of the compliment.¹

Both the Aberdeen Free Press and the Dundee Advertiser were forced by genuinely strong feelings on this subject to censure the mood and policies of a country which, throughout the troubled Reconstruction era, they had generally sought to champion. Criticism continued to be sharply direct elsewhere, even in a small journal like the Elgin Courant which believed so implicitly in the natural dispropriation of the coloured races by the white. Here, likewise, the United States in its shameful treatment of the Indian tribes was heavily berated for betraying its principles regarding the equality of all men.² The Aberdeen Journal deplored the exterminatory process carried through with "Yankee barbarity" over the span of a century: "What a strange history ... of civilization eating up barbarism in its worst way, not by humanising and enlightening it, but degrading it in every way till it die out".³ And while the Inverness Courier was hardly notable for extending its sympathies to the coloured races of the United States, even Carruthers felt it necessary to raise a protest against a course of action

¹ Aberdeen Free Press, 3 Jan., 1873.
² Elgin Courant, 25 July, 1876.
³ Aberdeen Journal, 30 March, 1870. See also ibid., 2 Sept., 1876.
which seemed despicable enough to merit the use of a picturesque (if perhaps somewhat unlikely) analogy: "President Grant appears to be treating the Modoc Indians as the Government of William III treated the Macdonalds of Keppoch".¹

Essentially the same historical equation had been offered by the Glasgow Sentinel in 1870 when in an editorial headed "An American Glencoe", a recent massacre of a whole tribe of Indians in Montana territory had been viewed as an act exceeding in barbarity the massacre of Glencoe.² Yet, like the Aberdeen Free Press and the Dundee Advertiser, the Sentinel was prepared to dispute the premise that the American Indians were doomed to go down before the advance of civilization, and had early argued that they were slowly dying out simply because they were the victims of the white man's injustice.³ Moreover, the paper was eager to suggest that too much attention was being directed to the American Negro population, while neither the blacks nor the whites had as much claim to the country as had the Red Indian.⁴ This theme persisted, and was subsequently importantly elaborated upon:

The whites look upon the Indians in much the same light as we do vermin in this country, and although the nigger has plenty of friends now everywhere in America, there do not appear to be any sympathisers with the Indian, although he is greatly superior in every respect to the African and has besides a right to the country which the 'nigger' has not.⁵

The Glasgow Sentinel's attitude serves to highlight the fact that in many Scottish comments on the character and qualities of the several coloured races in the United States at that time, the American Negro comes out less

---

¹ Inverness Courier, 17 April, 1873.
² Glasgow Sentinel, 26 March, 1870
³ Ibid., "The Last of a Race", 1 Feb., 1868.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid., 26 March, 1870.
well in some respects than either the American Indian or the immigrant Chinese. We have already observed a direct comparison between the Negro and the American Indian which was favourable to the latter;\(^1\) and in the tone of the comments by Mackey, and in such journals as the Scotsman, the Glasgow Herald, and even the Edinburgh Courant (for all its fulminations against the romanticization of the Indians) which had always held predominantly gloomy views on the Negroes' character, there was an implication that for all its untameable savagery, the Red Indian race was basically a finer one than the Negro. This attitude is largely explainable simply by the fact that while there could be (at a time when the Anglo-Saxon race was itself so fully exhibiting such qualities) a grudging recognition of the racial qualities of pride, spirit, desire to preserve independence, and fierce resistance to external subjugation which had been the red man's undoing, on this plane there was really nothing innate, nothing positive for which the Negro could be respected. Docility and submission were expeditious characteristics, but not qualities in the abstract sense. Sir George Campbell, mainly concerned to see the Negro freedmen justly treated, and only casually critical of American governmental policy towards the Indians,\(^2\) came across the notion from the head of an agricultural institute for Negroes in Virginia that the American Indians were stronger in intellect than the Negroes but less improvable simply because they were much more difficult to manage.\(^3\) He did not seek to dispute the assumption.

The Chinese, whose numbers on the Western seaboard of the United States

---

1 See above, p. 677.
2 Campbell, White and Black, p. 274.
3 Ibid., p. 261. Campbell's own comparisons between the intellectual abilities of the Negro race and other coloured races could sometimes border on the ridiculous as, for example, when he concluded that "The [Negroes] would seem to be the opposite of the Hindoos, who have a great turn for metaphysics and everything ratiocinative" - see ibid., p. 272.
were, in the 1870s increasingly attracting the attention of transatlantic observers in Scotland, added a further dimension against which the American Negro could be judged. Certainly the most spectacular divergence in attitudes towards the two races as represented in the United States was found in Charles Mackay, whose praise of the Chinese immigrants was almost as extravagant as his denigration of the Negro freedmen. He was furious about the antagonism and antipathy shown towards them on their initial arrival in California by the "vulgar whites", who resented them both on account of their colour and the competition they presented in the wage-stakes; and he vigorously championed them against unjust attacks and victimization. But because of the admirable qualities of character which they were displaying, he was glowingly optimistic that the future of "this deserving people" in the United States would be a bright and successful one. Being an "industrious, frugal, abstemious, ingenious, indefatigable, and peaceable" race who in the role of servants were more industrious than the Negroes and not given, like the Irish, to assuming airs of social and political equality "to make its service repulsive", Mackay was confident that very soon, there would be no real difficulties between Europeans and Chinese in America.¹ He himself neatly summed up his entire attitude towards the relative roles of the Chinese and the Negroes in the post-war United States when he concluded that "The problem is not how to deal with the yellow men who are coming, but with the black men, who ought never to have been permitted to come as slaves, or encouraged to come as freemen".²

Mackay was not alone among those with contemporary American contacts or contemporary first-hand experience of the situation in the United States in pinpointing the attractive, worthy characteristics of the Chinese. Sir

² Ibid., p. 330.
David Wedderburn, on a journey through America in 1875, noted that while Negroes worked well and cheerfully at jobs involving short spells of severe work, they were, unlike the Chinese, unsuited to steady, continuous labour.\(^1\) Two years later, on his return journey through the United States from an Eastern trip which had included China and Japan, he noted that the waiters at his San Francisco hotel were all "coloured gentlemen" who were "quite kind and condescending for men of their haughty race".\(^2\) The difference in the degree of respect accorded by him towards these Chinese servants and towards the Negroes, whom he almost without exception referred to as "niggers", is striking. Doubtless it was conditioned in part by his recent, clearly favourable, contact with the Chinese race during his trip to their country, but obviously the contrasting attitude goes beyond that. Again, there is the admiration for the persistence of a haughty pride, an admiration which we have seen as operative in assessments of the American Indian.

It has already been noted that Sir George Campbell, while making every allowance for the restrictive, adverse influences of generations of slavery, felt obliged to admit that if the Negro race had been a very pushing and capable one men educated in the North would have made more headway in Southern affairs by the late 1870s.\(^3\) In addition, he indicated that it was fairly widely accepted that in such circumstances, the "Chinaman" would have fared better.\(^4\) Also visiting the United States, and in particular the mid and far Western states,\(^5\) at the very end of the Reconstruction era, John Leng of the

\(^{1}\) Percival (ed.) *Sir David Wedderburn*, p. 231.


\(^{3}\) *Campbell, White and Black*, p. 138.


\(^{5}\) Leng was on an exploratory tour of the region - see above, Chapter I, p. 56.
Dundee Advertiser had an opportunity to assess the position of the Chinese within America, as well as to get a somewhat more fleeting chance to observe the relationship between the black and white races in the South, the subject which had so absorbed his attention since the end of the Civil War. With regard to the Chinese, he was politely complimentary, finding them very clean, active, and reliable "up to a certain point". Califionians could not get along with them, he found, and tended to abuse them: "So far as I could make out, they really offend the idle by their industry, the improvident by their thrift, and the intemperate by their sobriety".  

Nevertheless, Leng, having for upwards of twelve years held the highest hopes for the successful assimilation of the Negro freedmen into the American body politic, was not at all ready to concede, as Mackay had argued, that the Chinese constituted less of a racial problem for the United States than did the Negroes. On the contrary, he judged that there seemed to be less repulsion between the Anglo-Saxon and the Negro than between the whites and "the Chinaman, who may be a servant but never seems disposed to become a friend". Indeed, his unpromising conclusion that "in the course of time" America "might" assimilate the Chinese apparently helped to fashion an uncharacteristically despondent note in Leng's outlook towards the coloured races in the United States:  

The presence of the negroes, the Chinese, and the Indians is one of the social as well as the civil difficulties of America, and we may be thankful that we have not to contend with it.  

Although Leng's Dundee Advertiser made no effort to do so, the Scottish press to some extent bolstered the conception of the Chinese immigrants as

1 Leng, America in 1876, p. 316.  
2 Ibid., p. 171.  
3 Ibid., p. 316. The Dundee Advertiser had many years earlier carried an editorial scarcely conveying a flattering picture of the Chinese immigrants to the United States - see below, Chapter VII, pp. 243-244.  
4 Leng, America in 1876, p. 317.
consistent, industrious workers who deserved their just rewards in the United States. Despite carrying in early 1877 a blatantly racist editorial on the Chinese in America, in which it attributed a grossly degraded character to the race and even cited phrenological evidence that their brains were incapable of appreciating political laws and principles, the Glasgow Herald had generally emphasized that this racial element made better servants than the Negroes, that the Chinese were far from being "simple savages" the more educated among them being very adept commercially, and that it was highly unethical for some Californians to try to influence the United States to check Chinese immigration because of the threat that it posed to white labour. The Aberdeen Free Press similarly found the clamour against Chinese labour "grossly irrational", and saw no valid reason why the Chinese, like other nations, should not try to further their fortunes in America. The Mongol race, the paper reminded its readers, had after all in former days played "a conspicuous and not inglorious part in the history of the world".

But so far as comparison with attitudes to the American Negroes is concerned, one of the most significant defences of the Chinese in the United States was advanced by the North British Daily Mail. The main importance of the Mail's editorial objecting to the illegality of Chinese testimony against whites in California was that it formed the basis for an attack on "unwholesome" American racial prejudices which was framed with reference to the Chinese rather than to the Negro race, despite the fact that the latter had suffered under these particular injustices relatively more intensely, and over a longer

1 Glasgow Herald, 31 March, 1877. See also Aberdeen Journal (American correspondent, Philadelphia), 31 Aug., 1876, 4 Sept., 1876.
2 Glasgow Herald, 9 Dec., 1869.
3 Ibid., 9 May, 1876.
period of time. It was unfair dealing towards the Chinese population which in 1871 stimulated the paper to make its most pointed attack on the survival of the white slaveowner's mentality in Reconstruction America:

The pride of race is noble and ennobling when ... it makes humanity one of its characteristics; but when it seeks to rest its claim to supremacy solely on the colour of the skin, it practically retrogrades into the most debasing and most contemptible barbarism.

At the root of this, there was a positive respect for the Chinese race: "The Chinese were a civilised and educated nation when the skin-clad ancestors of the Californians roamed half-naked through the swamps and morasses of Europe". In terms of the relative capabilities of the coloured races, a factor working strongly in favour of the Chinese was that they had a cultural heritage which could not be, as the African one usually was, summarily dismissed as non-existent.

The treatment accorded to the immigrant Chinese in California had earlier been the source of an interesting protest by the Reformer, another Scottish journal which claimed to represent the cause of the labouring man. Californian action towards the Chinese, it was suggested, was such as to shame a Christian land. Had the crimes of which we read been perpetrated upon negroes in the South the Radical papers in this country, no less than in America, would have been in a white heat of passion. As it is, they are all but silent on the subject.

Perhaps to some extent, sympathy could more fully be registered for the oppressed Chinese than for the oppressed Negro freedmen because unlike the latter, the immigrants from China seemed to pose no indigenous threat to the stability and progress of the Republic. It was generally believed that they had no political aspirations and that they simply wanted to make some money and then go home to China.

1 North British Daily Mail, 1 Feb., 1871.
2 Ibid.
3 Reformer, 5 Sept., 1868.
4 See, for instance, Mackay, "The Antagonism of race", p. 330; Glasgow Herald, 31 March, 1877.
At the same time, the Reformer's statement is virtually identical with the Glasgow Sentinel's charge that a disproportionate amount of attention and philanthropy was being lavished on the Negro freedmen while the Red Indians were being abandoned to an official policy of extinction. The point was that it was seen by some Scottish observers as equally a crime to cosset "inferior races" (as in the Federal Government's apparent policy towards the America Negro), and to exterminate them (as in the Federal Government's apparent policy towards the Red Indians). The attitude was nicely transmitted by Robert Somers in the course of a little idyll on the vanished romance of Alabama: "The North is becoming every year more savage and implacable against the Red Man, and the South so much more indulgent towards the Black that he is already elevated into a sort of fool's paradise."  

It was unjust but perhaps largely inevitable that the Negro race, as the favoured "inferior" should have been more harshly judged and more loudly execrated in some quarters than the "inferior" race which was in imminent danger of extinction. There were several reasons why this should have been so, apart from the obvious fact that the circumstances and numerical strength of the freedmen caused them to be seen as a potential threat to American stability in a way that the American Indians could never be. For one thing, the crime earlier committed - and continuing - by white Americans against the Indian tribes was utterly indefensible because it sinned against the ethics of ownership and possession. Those in Scotland who did not go so far as Mackay and the Americans in judging it to be divinely ordained that the white race should make the best of the United States' soil by dispropriating the Indians found that even in regard to an "inferior" race, such ruthless and devious dispossession grated on their sensibilities. Even allowing for the paper's readiness to pick holes in the fabric of American democracy, the

_____
1 Somers, The Southern States, p. 112.
comments of the Scotsman regarding the American government's violation of treaties make this clear.

On the other hand, not only had the Negro been liberated from any former persecutions he might have had to bear at the hands of the white man and (ostensibly at least) been placed under the protection of the law, he had also become free to acquire land which could be guaranteed rightfully to belong to him - the privilege in practice so systematically denied the American Indian. As will be shown in a subsequent chapter, the apparent reluctance of freedmen to make the most of this opportunity by acquiring independent patches of land, and the use, or rather alleged misuse, of that which they did appropriate was one of the major factors held strongly against them by critics of their post-war response to freedom.

Equally disturbing in relation to the American Indian was the complete breakdown of the nascent concept of what was later termed the white man's burden. It was all very well, and in most cases at least superficially reassuring, to argue that the Indian could not be educated and assimilated because he was a wild, untameable savage and therefore destined to inevitable extermination. But at the same time, there was in the temper of several of the comments which have been cited the implication that the white man had not really tried very hard where the American Indian was concerned. As against this, of course, there was the apparently disproportionate concern for the elevation of the freed Negroes, the excessive consideration of their wants and needs, social and political.

At least among some Scottish commentators on the coloured races in America during the later phases of Reconstruction, then, the Negro became the poor relation in terms of eliciting sympathy on behalf of a "noble" or "industrious" or even an "abused" character. Yet, despite the intrusion of the American Indians and the Chinese for increased consideration by Scots in
the 1870s, the Negro still remained unquestionably the predominant race on which the great bulk of attention, sympathetic and otherwise, was fixed, and around which the hottest controversy could continue to arise within Scotland itself. For instance, the fact that the Negroes' equality was at least recognized in law in the United States but not, in practice, by most elements in the Southern States, tended to become the basis of deep contention - which persisted throughout the Reconstruction era - between those who condemned the criminal futility of attempting to legislate against natural prejudices and in defiance of natural racial inferiority, and those who insisted that every step must be taken to ensure that all men, irrespective of race or colour, be awarded their full and equal rights in accordance with the basic principles of the American Republic.

VII. The Scottish Good Templars and the issue of Negro equality

Nor did Scottish involvement in Southern recognition of the Negro race's equality stop at a purely academic level. As late as 1876, the issue was still alive enough to provide at least the ostensible, but perhaps also largely the genuine, cause of the schism which split the British and American branches of the organization known as the Independent Order of Good Templars. In the concern of the greater proportion of this body to ensure that it was seen to uphold the principle of the equality of all men, no group was more avid than the majority of the organization's members in Scotland. But to understand the precise nature of the conflict which led up to the final division, and to appreciate the bitter intensity of feeling which accompanied that separation in Scotland, it is necessary first to look briefly at the developments which had taken place over the immediately preceding years within the Order in the United States, and to consider the relationship and responses of the British Good Templars towards the parent American body at this time.
The Independent Order of Good Templars (IOGT) had spread to Britain from the United States in 1868, and its earliest advocates on this side of the Atlantic had believed and declared it to be an organization formed to unite, on teetotal principles, the entire human family, irrespective of creed, race, colour, or nationality. It had therefore come as a very great surprise to the English and Scottish representatives attending the Right Worthy Grand Lodge (RWGL) session in Madison, Wisconsin, in 1872 to discover that in America, this rule was not in every case strictly adhered to. Some Southern Lodges, it became apparent, had expressly excluded Negroes from membership alongside whites, and had denied them the privilege of participating at any level in the work or legislation of the original Order. This restriction differed in kind from that operative in some Northern and middle Western states, where it was the practice to allow the Negroes to form lodges by themselves (which they allegedly did by mutual preference) but at the same time to admit their representatives on perfectly equal terms to the legislative bodies of the Order.

At the Madison RWGL session, the full extent of the discrimination which existed within the Southern branch of the Order in the United States was brought home to the appalled British representatives. It was learned that in some Southern states Negro lodges had preceded white ones, but that when the latter were eventually formed, their organizers had not requested the Negroes to participate in forming the Grand Lodge, and had refused to share their adopted password with the black lodges. Furthermore, it became clear that not only was the Grand Lodge of Kentucky still functioning on rules formulated in slavery times, but that, in common with certain other Grand Lodges throughout the South, it had formed an Order specially for Negroes entitled "The Order of True Reformers". Matters were brought a crucial stage further at the Madison meeting when the secretaries of Alabama and
Georgia presented memorials calling on the existing formation of separate Negro lodges in the South to be called a "coloured" instead of an "Independent" Order, and to be constituted with a significantly changed form of ritual. The revelation of all these features had a great impact on the English and Scottish delegates, and they promptly condemned the proposals put forward by Alabama and Georgia by protesting against the "mutilation of the Order" which such a move would incur, and by refusing to sanction any action by which the inferiority of the Negro race would be recognized by the Good Templars. It was unwillingly that they finally agreed to a temporary compromise with their American colleagues which permitted the South at least to carry on encouraging the Negroes to form their own lodges.

This stop-gap solution of 1872 merely papered over the first sign of an Anglo-American rift, however. Rumblings of British discontent increased the following year, when further discussion at the RWGL session led to the discovery by British representatives that a proportion of Negro lodges were totally unrecognized in the South. And at the 1874 meeting in the United States, further conflict arose when Britain played an instrumental part in defeating an attempt to have "The Order of True Reformers" officially recognized.

But the depth of the gulf which had developed between the British and American sectors of the IOGT was yet more forcefully demonstrated at the RWGL session held at Bloomington, Wisconsin, in 1875. At that meeting, British representatives flatly opposed not only a proposal to form dual Grand Lodges for coloured people but also, significantly, other American ideas for splitting up white lodges in the United States. These latter proposals were objected to on the grounds that the projected restructuring of the organization would give an undue preponderance of influence to the Order in America, and destroy the international balance of power. Accordingly, when the Report containing both sets of proposals was adopted,
Joseph Malins, Grand Worshipful Chief Templar (GWCT) of England, and the Rev. George Gladstone, influential GWCT of Scotland and chaplain to the British Order, resigned their offices, and the entire contingent of English and Scottish delegates signed a protest. Again, however, every effort was made to preserve the transatlantic unity of the movement: on being given a solemn pledge that if asked for, existing Grand Lodges' Charters should be given and granted to the Negro members of North Carolina and Maryland, Malins and Gladstone resumed their offices.

The principal cause of the conflict with the American body was therefore still seen to be the question of the status of the coloured freedmen's lodges within the organizational framework of the Order in the Southern states, and the basic, concomitant question of the Negroes' equality with the white members of the IOGT. In Britain itself, the Grand Lodges kept the emphasis firmly on this aspect of the disagreement with the United States, strongly approving their representatives' action at Bloomington, and resolving that in the case of any Grand Lodge offering the Order to whites only, the RWGL should be authorized to send missionaries to organize lodges for Negroes in the same jurisdiction, and that Negro lodges wishing separate Charters for Grand Lodges should be granted them. And when the ultimate split took place between the British and the American Orders, it was presented to the Scottish public purely in terms of a division resulting from a serious difference of opinion on "the Negro question". The uneasy peace achieved in 1875 was irrevocably shattered on 25 May, 1876, at the last session of the RWGL held in Louisville, Kentucky, and the final rupture did indeed centre predominantly on the vexed question of Southern Good Templar attitudes towards coloured members. With the Rev. George Gladstone taking a leading part, the British representatives demanded affirmation of the principle of the equal rights of

man as it applied to Good Templar membership and organization. When the weight of the Southern vote was used to defeat this demand, the British Good Templars formally separated from the American Order.\footnote{See \textit{ibid.}; but for the fullest information on the split and the antecedent disputations, see \textit{Glasgow Herald}, 1 June, 1876. The Canadian Good Templars also broke with the United States Order at this time.}

In the Scottish press, little attention was immediately paid to the split between the British and American branches of the IOGT except, that is, in the columns of the \textit{Glasgow Herald}. Why the \textit{Glasgow Herald} should have shown a disproportionate interest in the inner conflicts of the Good Templars at this comparatively early stage in the saga is not abundantly clear. It may have been that the paper considered itself justified in giving unusually full coverage to the event because one of the prize actors on the British side - and certainly the most prominent and zealous Good Templar in Scotland - the Rev. George Gladstone, had just left a religious charge at Govan to become the colleague of his father-in-law, the Rev. Principal Morison, at Dundas Street Congregational Union Church, Glasgow.\footnote{See John J. Rae, \textit{The Ministers of Glasgow and their Churches} (Glasgow, n.d.), pp. 74-86.} It may even have been that, given the undoubted strength of temperance reform activity in Glasgow, the \textit{Herald} felt singularly obliged to provide its readers with both a close factual account of, and pertinent editorial comment on, the momentous disruption which had just taken place in the ranks of the most spectacular of all such reforming societies. But whatever the reasons, a full exposition of the rupture and the controversies leading up to it was followed by several extremely interesting editorial observations, which at least serve to give some insight into the sort of opinions which could be held by interested, knowledgeable Scots on the nature and basis of this transatlantic furore.
It would appear that the Glasgow Herald used the Anglo-American split in the Good Templar movement to frame what was in effect a three pronged indictment. This involved criticism — in varying degree — of 1) the closed, ritualistic nature of the Order as constituted everywhere; 2) white American Templarism and, by natural extension, American society as a whole; 3) the "negrophilists" within the British IOGT, and within British and American society generally.

The Herald was ready to identify the "disastrous and humiliating" split as reflecting a "very despicable state of matters" within the international ambit of the IOGT. But the gloomy surveillance of the Order's immediate situation was based neither on a particularly sympathetic nor even on a particularly disinterested attitude towards the Good Templars. While it willingly acknowledged that the Order had an excellent objective in fighting alcoholism, the Herald was openly opposed to the Templars' mysteries and clandestine rituals, which it found "somewhat repelling" and which, it implied, could profitably be reviewed as a consequence of the current upheaval in the Order. Necessarily ignorant about the inner workings and machinations of the Order, and therefore somewhat sceptical and suspicious of it, the paper's professions of surprise about the apparent lack of unity within the movement had a patently contrived, and rather cutting, ring:

"After this it shakes our trust in human nature to discover that the breast that beats beneath a sash may be the home of hatred, that a medal often covers malice, and that the banner ... may flaunt in the breeze over all uncharitableness".

But if an ingrained disapproval of the institutional procedures of the IOGT strongly persisted, the nature of the transatlantic schism helped the Glasgow Herald to direct the brunt of its immediate criticism towards

---

1 Glasgow Herald, 2 June, 1876.
the American rather than the British branch of the Order. It was recognized, indeed, that the British Good Templars were "not at all discredited" by the split since they had "displayed a very proper spirit in protesting in favour ... of the 'equal rights of man'". The American Templars, however, were judged to have deviated sadly from the generously egalitarian principles of the Order. Intended as it was to embrace all creeds and races, the very special and intense discrimination against the Negro within the movement in the Southern states was eagerly highlighted by the Herald:

So far had ... [the] catholicity of spirit gone that a Red Indian had once served as a chief officer of the Order, but then that was in Canada, which is not the same thing as Kentucky, and Mr. Fenimore Cooper has thrown an odour of romance round the Red-skins which is quite wanting to the dusky hides of the niggers.¹

Nor was the Herald so generous as the British Templars in condoning the racial policy of the Northern and mid Western lodges, where "liberalisation ... extends only to allowing Negroes to form lodges by themselves". The principal charge against all white American Templars was that they had permitted — indeed in some cases encouraged — an organization professedly based on the equality of all men to become seriously tainted with the bitter race prejudice of contemporary American society. This should not have happened, it was suggested, because the Order was in a sense removed from the pressures and traditional biases of society and organized religion in the United States, being constituted on high principles which transcended common prejudices, and dedicated to one specific, laudable objective which could be pursued by all races of men. But despite this, in the United States the vital foundation regarding the equality of mankind on which the Order rested

is calmly dug out from under it, as if the superstructure [of the IOGT] were the same thing as the American social system or

¹ Ibid. In fact Dr. Oronhyatekha, who addressed Edinburgh Good Templars on the Negro question in April, 1877, and who with ColonelDickman represented the American viewpoint at the London conference to discuss possible reunion in October, 1877, was an American Indian — see The Negro Question and the I.O.G.T., passim; Edinburgh Courant, 25 April, 1877.
the American religious system. A nigger may not sit in a theatre or a tramcar cheek-by-jowl with a white, and he has to get to Heaven in some mysterious way of his own. But after all that he has heard of Good Templarism, it might have been expected that white would have joined hand in hand with black in the assault on the "accursed thing".

Implicit in these sentiments was of course a contemptuous indictment of the much vaunted "liberal" and "egalitarian" society of the United States. It was declared that "the white American Templars' arrangement that the nigger's salvation from Bourbon whisky must be worked out in a way suitable for black persons only throws a curious light on American society and American Templarism". And in a subsequent observation, the Glasgow Herald tied the Order in America inextricably to the imperfect social structure which had spawned and nurtured it by concluding that:

They [the white American Good Templars] could not lay aside their social and political prejudices even before the influence of the mingled benevolence and fanaticism which is so strong a bond of union here ... We see ... how wholly ineffectual ... [Good Templarism] is to wipe away distinctions which have a firm root in the conditions of society. So strong is the antipathy, political and social, between whites and blacks that they cannot unite even on the ground of hatred to drunkenness.

In the last analysis, the failure of the Good Templars in the United States to adhere to the principles on which their Order was constituted could be seen as a largely inevitable offshoot of the wider failure of post-war American society to abide by the principles on which the American Republic itself was constituted.

It is clear that the Herald dwelt on the transgressions of the American Good Templars not from any sudden development of a heightened concern to see the Negro race accorded full and equal status at all levels in the United States, but simply because the exploitation of the situation offered

1 Glasgow Herald, 2 June, 1876.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., 12 Dec., 1876.
a splendid means of once again drawing attention to the shortcomings of American society in living up to its professed principles and pretensions. Somewhat ironically, however, the Herald was also more than ready to use the Good Templar controversy as the basis for an attack on that section of the American population who apparently did seek to carry the Republic's principle of equality into practice by championing the cause of the Negro in the United States. Commenting on the split at the end of 1876, by which time serious efforts at reunion had proved fruitless, the paper was careful to re-emphasize the relative power of prejudices against principles and "fanaticism"; the Southern Templars, it was bluntly stated, "hate the Negro more than drink". Simultaneously, the opportunity was seized to launch an attack on a group whose attitudes, it was implied, were at least much less genuine and sincere than those of the Southern Templars. The criticism was directed at those in the United States who regarded the Negro "abstractly" as a man and a brother, and whose philanthropic posturings could not conceal their essentially hypocritical attitude towards the black race. "They embrace him and make much of him in figures of speech and from a distance", but all objected to him at close quarters, the Herald indicated.

Religion, commerce, education, politics - in none of these things has the white [in the United States] any community with the 'nigger'. One may lustily sing hymns for the salvation of the poor African, and refuse to shake hands with him. Sending money to convert his relations on the Gold Coast is quite consistent with an objection to sit with him in a railway carriage or a theatre.1

Criticism of "negrophilists" was not confined at this time to the American brand, however, but was extended to include the British variety who, it was alleged, had a comparatively easy task in championing the Negro cause: "[W]e may love or hate the 'nigger'. In this hemisphere he does not enter to any extent into our social system, and he is the object of a cheap and

1 Ibid.
easy philanthropy. On the other side of the Atlantic, he takes the place of the poor with us, and is always 'with them'".  

Along these lines, the Glasgow Herald accordingly framed an implied rebuke to the British Good Templers for pontificating to their American brethren on a problem of which they had no personal experience, based as they were in a country "where black men are as rare as black swans".  

For those Scottish observers who were not particularly in favour of the methods and character of the IOGT, the furore caused by the British Order over the Negro question provided a perfect opportunity to impute a charge of safe, detached liberalism to the British lodges, and to voice the cynical hypothesis that if faced with a Negro difficulty of similar proportions, they would "frankly carry out their principles regardless of inconveniences which Americans find too much for them".  

Outwith the careful editorial analyses in the Glasgow Herald, the split between the British and American branches of the IOGT also became the basis for provoking a measure of latent public hostility towards the Good Templar movement in Scotland. In a letter to the Herald in early June, 1876, "S.W." of Glasgow used the "very deplorable state of affairs" which had been shown to exist within the American Order to attack the lack of compassion and crass intolerance of Scottish temperance reformers. While expressing a spurious regret over "the inconsistency of this humiliating event [the Anglo-American schism] in a system calculated to improve the morals of the white and black races of men", he maintained that it was worse to find "the same unchristian, exclusive principle" in "enlightened Glasgow". By way of amplifying this charge, the correspondent cited the case of one United Presbyterian minister in the city who would not allow a publican, nor any man or woman connected

1 Ibid.
2 Ibid. See also Ibid., 2 June, 1876.
3 Ibid., 6 June, 1876.
with the alcohol trade, to be a member of his church. Special reference was duly made to the plight of one old couple who, it was contended, would either have to give up their life's work or leave the church.¹

The letter encouraged "An Ex-Testolar" to publicize his agreement with the charges of intolerance levelled against the Order in Scotland. Renouncing the "hothouse zeal" of the Good Templars, he claimed that they broke up families, and used pressure to get people to join by telling them that they would otherwise lose their friends and relations.²

This concerted attack on the actions of the Scottish Order inevitably impelled an immediate defensive response. Declaring that the "deplorable" aspect was only one side of the transatlantic split, "D.M." insisted that it was "worthy of all admiration and honour" that the British and Canadian Good Templars had preferred separation to sacrifice of principle. Since the "exclusionist" principles of at least some U.P. members of the Order were being directly challenged, the correspondent necessarily discussed the ethics of excluding publicans from church membership. The practice, he emphasized, did not mean that the offenders in question would not be saved: writing in the mid 1870s to convince the Protestant public of Glasgow, "D.M." employed a shrewd logicality in supporting the position of the maligned U.P. Templar - "there are many very good Protestants who believe that the drinking system of this country is doing immeasurably more mischief today than Popery is ... And if it is justifiable for one Church to require a man to give up Roman Catholicism before becoming a member, it seems equally justifiable in another Church to require that a man before becoming a member shall give up whisky-selling". Significantly, he foresaw that in Britain, the whole question of teetotalism and the churches' attitude towards it would eventually assume the

¹ "Good Templarism in America and Glasgow": letter from "S.W.", Glasgow, 5 June, 1876, in ibid.
² Letter from "An Ex-Testolar", 6 June, 1876, in ibid., 7 June, 1876.
same controversial importance earlier enjoyed by the slavery question in the United States, when one section of the populace had argued that the American Presbyterian Church had no right to exclude from membership slaveholders who were otherwise good men, and the other had insisted that the Church must put its mark of reprobation on slavery by this practice. 1

Almost certainly as a direct counter to the views and vindications offered by "D.M." in his letter to the editor, the Glasgow Herald simultaneously carried an editorial which hailed "S.W.'s" expose of the spirit of exclusion which existed within the Good Templar fraternity of Glasgow as an attempt to turn the tables on "these Negrophilists" in the Scottish lodges and elsewhere who had been so outraged by the revelation of American shortcomings. And the controversy stirred up over the exclusion issue prompted the paper to give some close attention to the question of whether there was anything in the creed and principles of the U.P. church to prevent a publican or distiller from becoming a member. 2 Having provided its readers with this intoxicating whiff of a potential religious dispute, the Herald was subsequently inundated with letters regarding the exclusion principles and allied matters in Glasgow churches, 3 in which the consideration of the relative merits of Good Templars in the United States and in Britain - the original cause of the debate - slipped quietly from view.

---

1 "Good Templarism in America and Glasgow": letter from "D.M." (no date), in ibid., 8 June, 1876.

It is possible that "D.M." was David Macrae who was U.P. minister at Gourock at this time. A keen temperance advocate, and himself a teetotaler, he had cast a critical eye on drinking habits in America during his U.S. trip, comparing in some detail the pattern and incidence of liquor consumption there and in Britain. Due acknowledgement had been made of the activities of the various temperance societies - see Macrae, The Americans at Home, pp. 118-123. It is likely he would have entered into the spirit of a twin attack on U.P. and temperance principles, being "naturally a fighting man" - see MacRitchie, "David Macrae", p. 189.

2 Glasgow Herald, 8 June, 1876.

3 For example, no less than five letters on this topic appeared in ibid., 10 June, 1876.
For Scots who were not themselves members of the Order, the separation of the British and American branches of the Good Templars over "the Negro question" thus provided a focus for wider controversial observations on the failings in American society, on the character and procedure of Good Templarism on both sides of the Atlantic, and, ultimately, on the complex obscurities of U.P. theological principles. At the same time, however, within the actual ranks of the Scottish Templars, the split came to have serious repercussions which not only kept the vexed debate on the principles of equality constantly in the very forefront of the Order's deliberations but also tended periodically to thrust the original issue once more on to the attention of the general public.

It was at a Conference of the representatives of Scottish Good Templars, held in Aberdeen in mid July, 1876, that there first emerged an indication of the unhappy, divisory effect which the break with the United States was to have on the Order in Scotland. On a day totally occupied in "animated debate" over the British action regarding the Negro question, most of the addresses delivered certainly supported the course adopted by the Scottish and English delegates to the United States. And the GWCT, the Rev. George Gladstone, must have been extremely reassured by the result of the final vote on the issue, no less than 347 Scottish representatives voting in favour of the action taken by him and his colleagues at Louisville and declaring that any other response would have constituted a violation of the fundamental principles of the Order. Only twenty-eight voted against the British course. ¹

But the overwhelming vote in support of British policy did not secure the capitulation of the small minority who disagreed, nor yet did it ensure an easy path for the now clearly dominant faction within the Order. Rather, the conscious strength of the massive majority which rallied behind Gladstone

¹ Ibid., 13 July, 1876.
merely helped to ease the very considerable frustrations which were subsequently caused by a breakaway group of Scottish lodges, formed with its nucleus in the handful of dissenting Templars who had demonstrated their adherence at Aberdeen.

Coming at the back of the spectacular British-American schism, the brewing domestic storm within a fraternity pledged to labour harmoniously for the elevation of mankind probably did little to raise the reputation of Scottish Templarism among the general public. Furthermore, as an organization which, as we have observed, already attracted a fair share of suspicion and open hostility, the Good Templars could ill afford to have their public image further damaged by internecine feuding. Nevertheless, so strong were the feelings generated on both sides by Britain's separation from the United States that the minority which condemned British action did not scruple to split the Scottish Order in two by seeking to establish an autonomous Order where they might assert their own principles and beliefs.

Accordingly, there was held in late September, 1876, a meeting of Templars who disapproved of the action taken by the Grand Lodge of Scotland in seceding from the RWGL of America. Simply as a concrete step towards constituting a rival, opposition body to the main wing of the IOGT in Scotland, this meeting has considerable importance; but for our purposes, its significance is greatly increased by the fact that at the end of it, there was carried unanimously a resolution recommending the subordinate lodges in the district and throughout the country to reject the decision given by the majority of the representatives at Aberdeen, and to apply to the RWGL for the Charter of the Grand Lodge of Scotland. A committee was appointed to act on behalf of "all lodges and members loyal to the Right Worthy Grand Lodge". 1 Clearly, this proposal represented an attempt to involve enough

1 Ibid., 4 Oct., 1876.
Scottish Good Templers in the minor section of the Order to make it possible for that group to become, with the blessing of the American RWGL, the "official" branch of the IOGT in Scotland. It becomes evident that, having once registered its dissent from the majority's endorsement of the breach with America, the splinter group rapidly showed itself to be keenly concerned not merely (and perhaps not even primarily) with "the Negro question" as such, but also with the much more practical domestic issue of the future basis of power as it related to the rival Orders within Scotland.

Such was the unhappy state of affairs in Scottish Templarism when in mid-October, 1876, a Conference was held in London of the representatives of the British Grand Lodges and the representatives of the American Lodges to negotiate for reunion between the two branches of the Order. Here, Scottish members not only played influential roles in the proceedings but also, by the diverse nature of their participation, reflected and amplified the wide difference in outlook which existed within the two sections of the fragmented Scottish Order. Taking a leading part in the heated controversy which developed at the Conference was the Scottish GWCT, the Rev. George Gladstone,¹ who naturally spoke vigorously in support of the earlier British secessionist action which he personally had so greatly helped to implement, and who was not prepared at this stage to accept a compromise which could conceivably imperil the principle on which the majority of British Templars had chosen to take their stand. Elected Chief Templar in 1873, Gladstone not only led Good Templary in Scotland for four years, leaving the deepest impress of any one individual upon it, but also enjoyed a world-wide reputation in the Order. It was he who had in effect emerged as the leader of those arguing for equal rights for the Negro freedmen in the Southern lodges of the United States, and he continued to play a most conspicuous part in

---

¹ See The Negro Question and the I.O.G.T., pp. 2-3, and passim.
the events and controversies following the disruption of May, 1876.¹

Supporting Gladstone as a Scottish delegate at the Conference was William Watson Turnbull, a zealous Templar from Edinburgh. Joining the Order in 1870, Turnbull had progressively worked his way up through the ranks from secretary of the local lodge to District Secretary, then, in 1872, to Grand Worthy Assistant Secretary to the Grand Lodge of Scotland, and finally, a year later, to the elected office of Grand Worthy Secretary, a position which he was to hold for eighteen years.² His competence, enthusiasm and dedication to the principles which had resulted in the split with America were sufficient to merit his appointment to the important post of secretary to the London Conference.³

As against the significant contributions of Gladstone and Turnbull to the defence of the British course, however, Scotland also provided in William McDonald of Edinburgh a Good Templar who was prepared to be actively associated with the American representatives on this occasion in order to enable them to bring their numbers up to a par with the British delegates.⁴ It had been McDonald who, as a member of the minority faction of Templars in Scotland, had put the motion recommending an attempt to win members' support for an application to the HJGL for the Charter of the Grand Lodge

---

¹ Tom Honeyman, Good Templary in Scotland: its Works and Workers 1869-1891 (Glasgow, 1894), p. 65.
² A contemporary Scot who had seen Gladstone speak on behalf of the temperance cause later wrote of his great oratorical powers and his immense popularity, and recorded that "The name of the Rev. George Gladstone is as well known in Temperance circles as that of his great namesake in the political world". He also held a prestigious position within the Congregational Church, being the first Chairman of the Scottish Congregational Union. See A.S. Cock, Pen Sketches and Reminiscences of Sixty Years (Aberdeen, 1901), pp. 357-358.
³ Honeyman, Good Templary in Scotland, p. 89.
⁴ The Negro Question and the I.O.G.T., p. 2.
of Scotland.  

While the groupings at the London Conference thus highlighted the schism within the Scottish Order, its result merely served to emphasize the depth of the gulf which continued to separate the British and American branches of the IOGT, for in the end, the intransigence of both sides ensured that no early reunion would take place. The details of the breakdown in the negotiations were the more unedifying because of the apparent closeness which the Conference had come to achieving a reunion of sorts. As spokesman for the American delegation, Colonel J.J. Hickman, Chief Templar of the RWGL, had submitted an agreement adopted by the Southern states' Grand Lodges which stipulated that while the Negroes should still be excluded from white lodges, they should be allowed to form lodges of their own. It was further agreed by the Southern Templars that the RWGL would do the necessary missionary work among the freedmen. The British representatives accepted these terms of reunion, but only on the understanding that this acceptance be recognized by the Americans as representing an "armistice" until the final decision was reached by the supreme bodies of the Order the following May. Hickman, however, flatly refused to agree to this reservation, and demanded the right to form other Grand Lodges if those representing the existing ones did not consummate reunion immediately.  

But the British representatives had gone as far as they felt they could. The Americans had given the impression of really desiring total British surrender, and with stalwarts like Gladstone to influence their thinking, such a basis for reunion still remained completely unacceptable to the vast majority of British Templars.

1 See above, pp. 704-705.

Following the depressing outcome of the London Conference, the focus for continued disruption both in the transatlantic and in the domestic sphere swung sharply to Scotland, where the visit of Colonel Hickman to Dundee in mid-November amply demonstrated the violent feelings which persisted among both the "pro-American" and "pro-British" sections of the Scottish Order. Hickman's purpose in addressing the Good Templars of Dundee was quite simply to explain and vindicate the actions and attitudes of the RWGL towards Negro members in the United States, and to try to get the disputatious majority in Scotland to agree with his point of view. Gratified by a good attendance at the meeting, and a contingent on the platform who had remained subservient to the RWGL, Hickman forcefully stressed the allegedly highly successful operation of the separate Order for Negroes in the Southern states, and implied that pressure might eventually be put on the seceding British Grand Lodges to reunite by indicating that the RWGL had the power to enforce obedience.

During the entire course of his address, something approaching pandemonium reigned in the audience. He was frequently interrupted by cries of "question" and repeatedly challenged on specific statements by Templars, several being on their feet at one time and shouting to get a hearing amid "a storm of hooting, hissing, and cheering". Complete uproar finally broke out after a notion in support of Hickman had been proposed: when the American resumed his seat, "this action was the signal for the most of the audience rising excitedly to their feet, waving their hats in the air, and hissing, howling, and cheering in the most demonstrative manner". Pamphlets were thrown at him, and a considerable disturbance lasted for a quarter of an hour, to be renewed when one member called for three cheers for the

---

speaker. Even when leaving the hall, Hickman was jostled and hissed.\(^1\)

The advantage which such an extreme display of hostility gave to Scottish detractors of the Good Templars was well exemplified by the comments of the apparently deeply shocked Dundee Courier. To anyone outside the sphere of the Society's ideas, it was suggested, the scene was bound to appear "simply disgraceful", especially since there was no excuse at all for the "shameful" and "indecent" reception accorded to Hickman. The bond of the temperance brotherhood surely entitled him to civility, the Courier argued; and with a certain smug satisfaction, the paper concluded that the deplorable treatment of "an intelligent American", arguing a "simple and not very inflammable question", showed the "unreasoning ignorance and vulgarity" which existed within the Order. And not only did the fracas give the Courier a splendid pretext for denouncing the local IOGT, it also provided the paper with the chance to demonstrate its determined failure to recognize the importance of the Negro question to the British Order:

The question is one that we neither know nor care a great deal about. So far as we have an opinion on the matter, it seems to us that all the pother (sic) about whether the negroes shall call themselves "Coloured Templars" or "Good Templars" is a sorry tempest in a teapot, and that the difference is one between tweedledee and tweedledum.\(^2\)

But within Good Templar circles, the question of the Negroes' equality of status within the Order clearly remained - ostensibly, at least - the principal, highly charged controversial issue from which all debate, division, and sub-division directly stemmed. Accordingly, in Dundee itself, in a move almost certainly calculated to checkmate the initiative taken by Hickman just a week earlier, the Grand Lodge of Scotland held a special meeting where Gladstone explained emphatically that the exclusion of the Negro from

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) Ibid. "Good Templar Rowdyism", 13 Nov., 1876. With a rather dry wit, the Courier decided that the Templars "could not have treated ... Hickman worse if he had been a publican".
the Order in the Southern states was the real cause of the disruption of the IOGT. Having fully accepted this argument, the special session unanimously adopted a resolution reiterating its approval of the action taken on this issue by the Executive of the Scottish Grand Lodge and by the British representatives at the London Conference.¹ That same evening, Gladstone, Turnbull, and the Rev. John Kay, General Superintendent of the Juvenile Templars of Scotland, delivered lengthy addresses explaining all facets of the break with the United States to a huge audience of eight to nine hundred people. They were received with attention and much enthusiasm, and besides unanimously endorsing the firm stand taken by the British delegates at the London Conference, the meeting formally expressed "unabated confidence" in the Executive of the Grand Lodge of Scotland and sympathy for its action on "the negro question".²

On the American side, Hickman's second-in-command at the London Conference, Dr. Oronhyatekha, similarly kept the debate on the split firmly grounded in the controversy over the Negro's position as a Templar. Addressing a meeting on the issue in Edinburgh in the spring of 1877, he was greeted with hisses and general uproar, much as Hickman had been at Dundee. And once again, the incident gave scope for the press to descry "intemperate temperance"; and to suggest that the problem of the Negro Good Templars was one "which English or Scotch Good Templars have about as much real business with as the result of the late Presidential election".³ Yet, however much non-Templars might depreciate the importance of the issues involved in the

1 Report of a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Scotland in the Kinnaird Hall, Dundee, 17 Nov., 1876, in ibid., 18 Nov., 1876.
2 Report of a meeting to hear addresses of the Executive of the Grand Lodge of Scotland in Kinnaird Hall, Dundee, 17 Nov. (evening) 1876, in ibid., 18 Nov., 1876.
3 Edinburgh Courant, 25 April, 1877.
Order's own "Negro question", and however much British embroilment in it might be impatiently dismissed as unwarranted meddling, the apogee of Scottish Templary's involvement in and contribution to the controversies dividing the IOGT was not to be reached until one full year after the separation had taken place at Kentucky.

The event immediately responsible for intensifying the bitter dispute within the Scottish Order itself, and for throwing Scotland officially into the forefront of the international transactions of the IOGT, was the convocation of the yearly session of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge of the World at the Queen's Rooms, Glasgow, on 26 June, 1877. Although apparently analogous in structure and function to the RWGL which had held session at Louisville a year earlier, the body which met at Glasgow in fact comprised the international supreme court of the Order which had been reconstructed by British and other representatives of the Order in 1876, following the refusal of the then existing RWGL at Kentucky to grant the Negro race equal rights with white Templars. It was recognized by a very large proportion of members all over the world as the true supreme Lodge because of its advocacy of the original principles of the Order, including the universal brotherhood of man, and it naturally commanded the total allegiance of the larger faction of Scottish Templars led by Gladstone.

The warmth of the Scottish majority's support for the reorganized ruling body was well demonstrated, and the tone of the entire session was set, at a public reception given in the City Hall for members of the RWGL by the Glasgow Order. Presiding at the function, George Gladstone welcomed the guests as "our brethren" and intimated that the Grand Lodge of Scotland had at its last session pledged undivided fealty to the reconstructed RWGL as the supreme court "guarding the great principles of true brotherhood". The divisory

1 See North British Daily Mail, 27 June, 1877.
subject which continued to be uppermost in the minds, and to dominate the organizational proceedings of Good Templars everywhere inevitably dominated Gladstone's speech, as it was to dominate the whole conference. The fervour normally applied in calmer times to attacking the demon drink was systematically channelled into the presentation of arguments in favour of Negro equality; and in Scotland, no one's utterances on the issue carried more strength and conviction than Gladstone's.

Separation from the old association, he told the company in the City Hall, had been approved by a world-wide majority of Good Templars because they had wanted to practice internationality and to rid the Order of "a foul blot that had unrighteously been put upon it, and from an unfair and illegal limitation" and because they had objected to the exclusion of Negroes from several jurisdictions, an exclusion stemming "not from any fault of their own but because God had been pleased to make them blacker of skin than ourselves". Most significant was the GWCT's vehement refutation of the suggestions emanating from some quarters that it was not primarily the Negro question but some other which had been the cause of the separation. Without indicating the nature of the alleged alternative basis for the split, he insisted that he and his colleagues who had voted on the matter at Louisville had been influenced only by the consideration of the one issue, and rashly pronounced those who argued otherwise as either ignorant or corrupt or both - a statement for which he was applauded.¹ By way of reiterating the belief of the major Scottish sect of Templars in the equality of all races of men, and of demonstrating to the international delegates its faith in the highly esteemed Gladstone, Brother Archer, Grand Worshipful Councillor of the Grand Lodge of Scotland, formally honoured the men who at pain to themselves "vindicated one of the fundamental principles of Good Templarism -

¹ Report of speech by the Rev. George Gladstone at a public reception for the RWGL in City Hall, Glasgow, 26 June, 1877, in ibid., 27 June, 1877.
the equality of men and the universal fatherhood of God" (cheers).¹

Whatever the principal, original reason for the schism with the American lodges, on the basis of the proceedings at the RWGL session in Glasgow (and, indeed, of the mood at earlier meetings of the main branch of the Scottish Templars), it seems valid to conclude that at least by mid 1877, the "Negro question" had in a very real sense become accepted by Gladstone and his followers not merely as the spurious, "high-minded" issue which neatly served to camouflage other more selfish issues, but as the main - if not the only - serious, insurmountable bone of contention between the Orders in Britain and the United States. Helping in a practical way to demonstrate the prime importance which the major section of the IOGT sought to place on the question of the Negroes' status within the Order was the appearance at the public reception of Dr. William Wells Brown, the ex-slave who had visited Scotland in 1851 at the request of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, and who in the course of his journeyings through the country on abolitionist business had lectured with great success to the Total Abstinence Societies of Edinburgh and Aberdeen.²

It is scarcely possible to dismiss as carefully contrived enthusiasm the tumultuous reception accorded to Brown by an audience which actually rose

¹ Report of speech by Brother Archer, in ibid.
² W. Wells Brown, Three Years in Europe: or, Places I have seen and People I have not (London and Edinburgh, 1852), pp. 164, 172, 305.

Of Aberdeen, Wells commented: "I have visited few places where I found more warm friends than in Aberdeen ... It reminds one of Boston" - ibid., p. 305. And at "the splendid soiree of the Edinburgh Temperance Society", an extremely enthusiastic audience had unanimously voted both himself and the famous escaped slave William Craft, who was also present, life members of the Society. That Wells was this early impressed by the Scottish Temperance movement's recognition of the equality of the black and white races is evidenced by his quoting in a letter to Frederick Douglass the speech of the President of the Edinburgh Total Abstinence Society, in the course of which the latter had declared: "In the name of the Temperance reformers of Edinburgh - in the name of universal Scotland, I would welcome these two victims of the white man's pride, ambition, selfishness and cupidity. I welcome them [Brown and Craft] as our equals in every respect" (great applause from the audience) - see Brown to Frederick Douglass, 18 Jan., 1851, quoted in ibid., p. 173.
to receive him. And certainly, the slant of part of Brown's speech was calculated to strengthen the impression that among the Scottish Templars at least, the stated concern to see justice done to the Negroes within the Order was likely to be both deep and sincere. Thus, he took a pride in informing the audience how, twenty-six years before, he had first stood on the platform of City Hall "to ask the sympathy of Glasgow citizens on behalf of the Negro race and to create public feeling against slavery", and how he would never forget the warmth of the Scottish reception.¹

Having referred to the instrumental part which he had taken in first introducing the resolution for admission of the Negro to the Southern lodges, he described how Colonel Hickman had been in the habit of telling Southern Negroes wishing to become Templars that it was a white man's Order. The consternation caused in the audience by this revelation was a cue for Brown to resort to a little of the petty rancour which in such full measure characterized the statements from members of both sects in the Scottish Order. Accusing Hickman and Oronhyatekha of stirring up strife and disloyalty while in Britain, he triumphantly informed his audience that the two had themselves quarrelled during the British trip. Brown ended an immensely popular address by reasserting that the only point of conflict in the ranks of the IOGT was the Negro question.²


² North British Daily Mail, 27 June, 1877. Brown also gave a short address at the demonstration of Juvenile Good Templars in City Hall, 30 June, 1877 - see Glasgow Herald, 1 July, 1877. 20,000 young people were connected with this Society in Scotland - see North British Daily Mail, 2 July, 1877.
To some extent, the statements of William Wells Brown, and even more, those of George Gladstone, threw down a direct challenge to the minority group of Templars in Scotland. This was immediately taken up on behalf of the group by J.M. Cunningham, who fiercely attacked Gladstone's declaration that those who disagreed about the importance of the Negro question were either ignorant or corrupt, and suggested that while such a pronouncement "may become the lips of a ministering servant of the meek and lowly Jesus", it was not the language of a gentleman towards those who merely differed in opinion. But as well as displaying the customary bitterness which characterised the responses of antagonists at all levels of division within the Order, Cunningham also took the opportunity to counter Gladstone and Brown's monolithic concept of the split by stating publicly exactly what his section believed to be the essence of the conflict. In their view, the basic reason for secession from the American Order had been not so much the question of the Negroes' status as British opposition to American proposals for increased division of power within the Order in the United States. The really major issue at the Bloomington session in 1875, where serious disagreement had foreshadowed the separation of 1876, had been the "stiff fight" between Britain and America over the American desire to divide Grand Lodges and have more than one in a state. Gladstone, Cunningham alleged, had himself acknowledged the importance of this dispute, and Malins, the English GWCT, had also "fought for something more than the Negro" by his action in vigorously opposing the idea of white lodges multiplying themselves.¹

At the final sitting of the RUGL in Glasgow, however, there was still no indication that the international Executive of the Order was prepared to countenance any such heretical suggestions. On the contrary, the resolutions taken prior to the disbanding of the session remained firmly

¹ Letter from J.M. Cunningham, in ibid., 26 June, 1877.
grounded in the basic conviction that the source of all the trouble was
the Negro question. Accordingly, a unanimous vote was recorded for the
important resolution that no reunion was possible until the rights of all
races were acted on, and that no steps should be taken to compromise the
existing stand. ¹

The official proceedings in Glasgow continued to stimulate individual
Scottish Templars to defend their respective affiliations with singular
displays of virulence. "A Dundee Representative" scathingly attacked
Cunningham for imputing to Gladstone views which he did not hold, and for
grossly misrepresenting the whole basis of the dispute: "The Good Templars
of Scotland happen to be just a little too well posted up on the Negro
question not to see through Mr. Cunningham's little game". ² Cunningham,
for his part, could not resist replying. In once more seeking to argue
that the Negro was not the only question at issue, he attempted to play
something of a trump card by indicating how he personally could not be
charged with prejudice against the Negro race. Disputing his antagonist's
suggestion that the Negro question was his "pet hobby", Cunningham combined
acknowledgement of his own earlier association with the cause of the Negro
with an implied contempt for the contemporary involvement of the Templars
and others: "During a long life, I have had many hobbies, and for many
years the negro question was my 'pet hobby', but that was long ago - it
was at a time when to befriend the negro was not cheap philanthropy as it
is now-a-days".

During the time that he "rode the negro hobby", he had helped many
"coloured gentlemen", including, as he pertinently revealed, William Wells
Brown. His own position could be easily stated:

１ Report of RWGL proceedings at Glasgow, in ibid., 30 June, 1877.
２ Letter from "A Dundee Representative", in ibid., 30 June, 1877.
Though the negro question is not now my 'pet hobby' I have never ceased to love the race, nor refrained from doing what little I could to help them to attain their rightful position among men. But that is not the question now in dispute.

Cunningham (and probably most of his colleagues in the smaller sect of the Scottish Order) found it convenient enough to cash in on the tendency — by this time quite common — to denigrate the efforts of those still concerned with the condition of the Negro race in America. The majority of Templars in Scotland, he maintained, had been too well posted on the Negro question, and consequently left extremely ignorant of other issues connected with secession. "They have got negro on the brain", he declared, "and though an angel from Heaven were to attempt to bring aught else but the negro before them his 'little game would be seen through'."¹

Gladstone's followers meanwhile apparently continued to live up to such censure by framing their actions exclusively with reference to this particular facet of the split in the Order. A report of a special committee on the "Negro question", heard at a meeting of the Grand Lodge of Scotland in early July, unreservedly endorsed the majority Scottish stand up until that time, and recommended no association or re-unification with any Grand Lodge "which refuses, by precept, practice, legislation, or in administration, to confer the rights and benefits of the Order equally on every member of the human race; or with any Grand Lodge which directly or indirectly connives at the violation of this fundamental principle of our Order".²

On the same day, in another hall in Glasgow, the rival body of Scottish Templars was also meeting. Retrospectively, its pretensions on this occasion appear merely farcical, but in the context of the times, they represented better than any public polemic or partisan banter the intensity

---

¹ Letter from J.M. Cunningham, in ibid., 3 July, 1877.
of this section's conviction that its minority stand was the truly sincere, legitimate one, and that it, and not the major group, constituted the only officially established IOGT in Scotland. The meeting was duly convened under the label of the "8th annual session of the Grand Lodge of Scotland", in accordance with the claim that this body was the original Good Templars. It was a claim made with a sterling confidence but based on a line of reasoning which totally defied the realities of the existing situation. The acceptance of such a presumption necessarily involved accepting that it was the other, larger section, and not they, which had broken away and caused the schism within the Scottish Order. Credence was readily, unreservedly given to this premise, Gladstone's huge group being held to have seceded from the original body over the question of Negro membership.

Presiding as GWCT over this important session of the minority sect, D. Mackay of Edinburgh therefore found nothing incongruous about referring to the difficult position in which the Order was placed "due to the secession of the majority of lodges in Scotland". Nor was there any hint of embarrassment about his revelation that the number of lodges currently adhering to the "original Good Templars" was forty-nine while the number which had "seceded" was 3,501.1 The unbending conviction that its continued allegiance to the American Order2 was totally warranted by the circumstances of the split, and an equally strong belief that continued adherence to its stand did not involve a deviation from the principles of the Order, gave this exceedingly small minority group the determination to assert that its was the authentic voice of Good Templary in Scotland.

---

1 Report of meeting of the "8th annual session of the Grand Lodge of Scotland of the I.O.G.T." (meeting of the minority sect) in City Hall Saloon, 4 July, 1877, in ibid.

2 The meeting unanimously resolved to draft and despatch to Col. Hickman an expression of "condolence and loving sympathy" to him in his "present severe affliction" - see ibid.
Of course, underlying everything was the basic disagreement between the two Scottish Orders about what constituted the true source of the British-American disruption. The pronouncement at the minority group's annual session that the majority had seceded over "Negro membership" was no more than an acknowledgement of the ostensible reason which Gladstone and his colleagues had given for the domestic rift: it by no means implied a new acceptance of this question as the real issue dividing Gladstone's group from the American Order or, in turn, from Mackay's small Scottish Order. The Glasgow Herald, somewhat disgusted by the spectacle of the twin, rival meetings in the city, and by the public vulgarity which accompanied them ("mysterious alphabetical combinations ... stare upon us from every dead wall and hoarding"), lambasted both sects for not even being able to agree on the points of difference and division. In the wake of so much important Templar activity in Glasgow, the Herald decided to clarify for its readers the relative arguments of both sides in the Scottish Order regarding the principal issue in the split with the United States. Its analysis was simple and direct. Gladstone's Order insisted that the separation was due to the policy of lodges in the Southern states on Negro admission, and declared that the Negro question was the only cause of the split. Mackay's Order claimed that the split had arisen from British fear of division of power by the multiplication of Grand Lodges, and maintained that the American Grand Lodge had never excluded the Negro race.¹

Although the Herald stressed that the quarrel was one which outsiders were hardly in a position to take up, in effect the paper came down fairly heavily on the side of Mackay and the minority sect of Scottish Templars. Gladstone's Order, it was indicated, had formerly passed a law stipulating that "There shall be but one Grand Lodge in any State or country, except

¹ Ibid., 7 July, 1877.
where difference of language or race prevents united working". This the Herald naturally construed as incorporating both a desire to check division of powers and an inclination to establish separate Negro lodges. Furthermore, the paper was prepared to recognize the right of any body of men combining for a certain purpose to refuse to be forced into uncongenial community with others who simply happened to have similar views. Though race and colour distinction were "very wrong", Good Templars could best profit the cause by keeping clear of hard and fast rules of universal centralization or universal admission. The influence of Mackay's group might ultimately be advantageous to the Order.¹

It might be suggested that the Herald preferred Mackay's section of Templars not only because they appeared to occupy a less hypocritical stand on the cause of the American separation but also because they apparently represented a less fanatical, less potentially disruptive strand in an organization which tended to be altogether too zealous for general public approbation. Moreover, they constituted a less formidably large body. Indeed, in charting the protracted course of the debate on "the Negro question" within the ranks of Scottish Good Templary, it becomes clear that, although in one way or another this particular issue always remained the focal point, in both press comment and in the diatribes of some Scottish Templars against their domestic opponents there was a distinct tendency to allow other considerations, other sources of contention to flow from, or impinge upon, the original question.

Nowhere was this more clearly illustrated than at a Public Breakfast held a couple of days after the annual session by members of Mackay's Order in honour of the officers of the Grand Lodge. Speaking from the chair, J.M. Cunningham, whose stormy attitudes we have already observed,²

---

¹ Ibid.
² See above, pp. 715-717.
immediately extended the grounds of the dispute within the Scottish Order far beyond the narrow confines of the issue about Negro membership. In his view, the small body of "Original Good Templars" felt themselves to be a small, noble army, fighting for right and truth and an object which struck deep and spread its influence wide - "an object for which Scots have fought for centuries" - the right to think, and a fair field to declare their convictions.¹ The charge that the major organization of Scottish Templars was attempting to achieve total hegemony by strangling the minority's opposition was implicit in Cunningham's address. The minor Order's lack of numerical strength had to be compensated for by constantly bolstering up the conviction that its principles were stronger and truer than those of its rival, and its morale likewise required to be bolstered by constant reference to the intolerant, doctrinaire character of the larger body. Since the leader of this latter faction also happened to be one of the most influential men in international Templary, the brunt of the small group's invective naturally tended to devolve on him. Fresh from denouncing Gladstone in the Glasgow press for insulting those who differed from him in opinion, Cunningham accordingly entered with gusto into framing a vicious attack on the rival group's GWCT for referring to Mackay, his opposite number in the "Original Good Templars", as a "common rag merchant".²

Given such provocation from so high a quarter, almost the only way for so small a minority group to fight back was for it to retaliate in kind. This the "Original Good Templars" were more than willing to do, and they thereby intensified a process which inevitably led to the entire quarrel between the two sides being reduced to a petty slanging match. D. Mackay himself did much on this particular occasion to add fuel to the fires of

¹ Report of Public Breakfast held by the "Original Good Templars" in Wyatt's Hall, Glasgow, 6 July, 1877, in Glasgow Herald, 7 July, 1877.
² Ibid.
sectional enmity. Declaring in no uncertain manner that he was an "honest merchant" and in a social position equal if not very superior to that of a minister, he accused many of the ministers within the movement of being unprincipled. Special obloquy was reserved for Gladstone, who was charged with leading the majority of Scottish Good Templars astray on the Negro question by intentionally missing out part of the statement on this subject by the Templars of the Southern states. William McDonald went even further by implying that by careful manipulation, Gladstone had been fleecing his own pockets out of the Order.\(^1\) On both sides, there was a conscious widening of the gulf between the two Scottish factions, and as this development gained momentum, and bitter personal recriminations increased, the intrinsic importance of "the Negro question", while not perhaps diminished, came increasingly to lie in its function as a sounding board for other, wider antagonisms.

The reunion of the opposing factions of the IOGT both at national and at international level was not accomplished until 1887. In retrospect, it does seem rather astonishing that an apparently responsible Order, committed to furthering a popular cause, and carrying in its ranks ministers of religion who might be expected to have been men of charitable views, should, when split, have displayed on both sides so singularly vitriolic a strain of attack on opponents, and such uncompromising stubbornness in adhering to the rigidly partisan interpretations of the reason for the disruption. By the last years of the nineteenth century, in a calmer atmosphere, Scottish Templars were fully prepared to acknowledge that two questions had been involved - the relation of the Order in the Southern states to the coloured population, and the question of Grand Lodge jurisdictions.\(^2\) But at the time of the actual

---

1 Ibid.

2 See Honeyman, Good Templars in Scotland, p. 31. Honeyman naturally enough pays little attention to the highly unedifying split of 1876 in his work on Scottish Templary, but he was of course forced to recognize it.
split, such a reasoned conclusion was rendered impossible because those who approved and carried through the separation from America insisted that they had done so purely on the issue of Negro equality within the Order, while those who opposed the schism countered by seizing on the other problem as the real issue and denouncing the secessionists as hypocrites.

Within Scotland, as we have seen, the fervour of the majority who insisted that their actions and affiliations had been governed solely by a belief in the equality of all mankind was very great indeed. Nor is there any real reason to doubt that most of these Templars were perfectly sincere in their professions. But because a schism of a particularly venomous nature took place in the Scottish Order, there developed an irresistible temptation on both sides to twist the race question into a weapon for narrow, intersectional squabbles. This was especially so on the part of the minority faction of Scottish Templars which did not, of course, accept the exclusive importance attached to "the Negro question" in the first place. The domestic split in the Order, directly precipitated by disagreement over both the cause and the accomplishment of the transatlantic division, provided the opportunity for this small group to transcend the immediate issue in dispute and to challenge the majority sect for recognition as the only genuinely established Templar organization in Scotland. The deliberate pursuit of this prestige struggle was doubtless part of the defence mechanism of a small Order hanging on to a separate existence in the shadow of a massive rival body. But it also strongly suggests that prior to the disruption of June, 1876, there had already been underlying factional grievances and antagonisms simmering within the IOGT in Scotland. Some indication of the possible nature of these is perhaps given in the mutual attacks of Gladstone and Mackay on each other's social status.
Coupled with the increasing impingement of colonial problems on the British mind, the massive task of reconstructing the post-Civil War United States with its huge population of Negro freedmen helped to keep alive among Scots in the 1860s and 1870s something of the absorbing interest in the Negro race which they had displayed earlier in the century. Yet, despite this continuous close focus on, and earnest analysis of, all aspects of the race question, it would appear that throughout the Reconstruction era there still existed within Scotland as much confusion, as much uncertainty, and as much strong diversity of opinion on the subject as there had always been. Indeed, in a very real sense the intensified concentration on racial traits, racial abilities, and racial relationships merely increased the range within which new misconceptions, new (as well as old) prejudices, and new controversies could flourish. In the United States alone, so far as the question of race was concerned, the scope of considerations and, inevitably, the scope of disputation, was dramatically widened after the Civil War. The volume of conflicting Scottish opinion which we have seen to exist during Reconstruction in relation to every facet of this problem testifies to the increased difficulties which faced Scots attempting at this period to reach definitive conclusions on the ultimate character, intellectual capabilities, and status of the Negro race within the United States - and elsewhere.

But if a Scottish consensus on the question of "the irrepressible Negro" was no nearer at the end of American Reconstruction than at the beginning of it, at least within the pattern of diverse and conflicting opinion certain broad, familiar trends in the Scottish outlook can be distinguished.

Even in considering this central aspect of the United States' post-war difficulties, the old Scottish habit of using a particular focus on America as a means of advancing more localised interests persisted. Thus, the attitudes
allegedly held by certain sections of the Scottish population towards the Negro race in the United States and elsewhere at this time were readily used as a basis for attacks, usually of a fairly broad nature, by domestic rivals or enemies. This was most spectacularly illustrated in the conduct of the antagonistic factions within the Scottish Order of Good Templars, but as we observed throughout the chapter, the tendency also clearly existed in relation to the Conservative, Whig and Radical press in Scotland, and with regard to the United Presbyterian Church. Prominent among those bearing the brunt of such attacks were, of course, British philanthropists, the "negrophilists" whose concern for the Negro race could so often be seen to be equated with a dangerously radical, if not anarchical, attitude towards British politics.

Likewise identifiable in the mass of widely diverging Scottish attitudes to the Negro race during the Reconstruction years are specific lines of thought which would appear to carry on a certain ambivalent tradition of Scottish thinking on this subject. It was suggested that earlier in the century, the Scottish outlook towards the Negro race had been broadly characterized by three main approaches to the problem - 1) a virulently racist strand of opinion; 2) an equally firm insistence on the basic equality of all races of men under God; and 3) a genuine uncertainty and equivocation about the real position and function of the Negroes in the scale of civilization, generally resulting from a sympathetic outlook and from a sincere but not altogether successful desire to credit the race with the possession of significant, undeveloped intellectual potential. All of these aspects, it might be suggested, were perpetuated in the Reconstruction era.

Thus, in the emotionalism, absolute conviction, and unrelenting rancour of his writings on the Negro race, Charles Mackay proved himself a worthy successor to Thomas Carlyle. On the other side of the coin, the early efforts of the middle-class Scottish abolitionists to put across their belief
in the equality of mankind found echoes in the attempts of those Scots involved in championing the freedmen's aid cause (speakers like the Rev. D. S. Guthrie and Macleod, for example) to assert the principles of basic racial equality and the brotherhood of man. And clearly, the uncertainties and ambivalence about the race which characterized the early opinions of such travellers to the slave South as Chambers and Stirling persisted in the attitudes of shrewd and sympathetic Scots like David Macrae and Sir George Campbell, who, respectively, visited the United States during the very height of the Reconstruction period and at the end of it.

Contributing in large part to the continuation of essentially cautious pronouncements and predictions about the black population in America, as well as to the continuation of the fiercely racist polemic of Mackay and the more Conservative sections of the Scottish press, was the survival into Reconstruction times of old prejudices about the Negro race. Within Scotland, as we have seen, these lingering restrictive beliefs were adequately fed by contemporary factors such as missionary lectures, Music Hall acts, and the continued popularity of certain "scientific" findings. But if old prejudices died hard, at least they were not continuing to exist simply for want of fresh discussion on the question of race. In the United States and in the British colonies, new attitudes were inevitably formed in response to new, changing relationships between the black and white communities. Old, basic prejudices remained, and with them the old, basic controversies. But with the new Scottish focus on the American Negro as freedman rather than as slave there was at least the indication that some Scottish observers were ready to try to push ingrained prejudices to the side and to make a genuine attempt to start afresh on assessing the true qualities and potential of the race in its vastly altered circumstances. If at the end of the Reconstruction era the basic trichotomy of Scottish attitudes towards the Negro race remained, it was
certainly through no failure on the part of Scots to identify the question of race as the vital pivot of Reconstruction, and, as such, to accord it due attention and discussion.